5-12-2015

Success From The Sideline: How Communicative Processes Of Coaches' Decision-Making Styles Relate To Rugby Team Success

Kelley Sullivan
Illinois State University, kelley.sullivan2@gmail.com

SUCCESS FROM THE SIDELINE: HOW COMMUNICATIVE PROCESSES OF COACHES' DECISION-MAKING STYLES RELATE TO RUGBY TEAM SUCCESS

Kelley A. Sullivan

70 Pages August 2015

This study investigates the relationship between communication processes collegiate rugby coaches utilize when making decisions and team success. Along with measuring coaches' collaborative decision-making levels, this study explored various communication opportunities coaches report offering to players during decision-making processes. The results show there is no linear relationship between collaborative decision-making levels and winning percentage, nor is there a linear relationship between offering communication opportunities and winning percentage. Analysis revealed no one specific communication opportunity was a significant predictor variable of team success. While the variables tested did not have any correlation with college rugby winning percentage, it was found that collegiate rugby coaches most often invite players to communicate about scheduling practice, the starting lineup, and determining practice content.

SUCCESS FROM THE SIDELINE: HOW COMMUNICATIVE PROCESSES OF COACHES' DECISION-MAKING STYLES RELATE TO RUGBY TEAM SUCCESS

KELLEY A. SULLIVAN

A Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

School of Communication

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

2015

SUCCESS FROM THE SIDELINE: HOW COMMUNICATIVE PROCESSES OF COACHES' DECISION-MAKING STYLES RELATE TO RUGBY TEAM SUCCESS

KELLEY A. SULLIVAN

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Daniel Cochece Davis, Co-Chair

Lance Lippert, Co-Chair

William R. Cupach

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis is dedicated to my mother, best friend, and rock. I thank her for raising me to be the independent young woman I am, and always supporting my limitless dreams.

Next, I would like to thank my co-chair, Dr. Daniel Cochece Davis for being my academic and life advisor for the last five years, and seeing the potential I was blind to as a lost undergraduate student back in New York. Cochece, while never shining a light easily on any answers to my questions, was sure to subtly point me in the right direction, allowing me to find the way myself.

I am very appreciative for my other co-chair, Dr. Lance Lippert, for his continuous positivity, which was invaluable during this process. Also, I am honored to have Dr. William Cupach as a committee member during his final years at Illinois State University. His faith in my project was able to keep me encouraged when I doubted myself.

Aside from my committee members, several others helped me through the process of completing this thesis. I would like to extend a special thanks to my parents, Jim and Connie, my sister Kate, along with my East Coast lifelines, Robyn, Kara, and Diana, whose love and support has never faltered. My roommates, and dear friends, Caitlin and Julie, provided constant and continuous support, especially in times of frustration. I honestly could not have survived these past two years without you two by my side (we

did it!). Also Patricia Franz, who is the most selfless and kind-hearted person that I know; she is always fighting in my corner and I thank her for that and the unconditional support she provides for every graduate student in this program.

Finally, I would like to thank the faculty, staff, and graduate students in the School of Communication for the help, support, and memories throughout my two years at Illinois State University. Graduate school has sure been a long journey I will never forget!

K. A. S.

CONTENTS

TABLES

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Statement of the Problem

Sports play a pivotal role economically and socially, not only in the United States, but internationally, as well. According to Collignon and Sultan (2014), "the sports market has grown faster than GDP in nearly every country— and many times more in some major markets such as the United States, Brazil, the UK, and France" (p. 1). Along with selling tickets to sporting events, other means such as licensed products and media rights produce income. Overall, the sports market generates about $700 billion worldwide, with North America accounting for $266 billion of the sports spending (Collignon & Sultan, 2014). Fans use sports as sources of emotion and excitement, along with creating para-social relationships with specific players; spectators also form passionate commitments to the game (Weiss, 1996). As sports teams' accomplishments increase, multiple benefits arise, such as gaining fans, competing at more prestigious events (e.g. Superbowl, World Series), and greater media coverage and recognition of the team or franchise. However, when a team is not successful, coaches receive the blame, and "many coaches' jobs depend on how many matches have been won or lost" (Kidman & Hanrahan, 2011, p. 17). This is because when it comes to team performance, athletically or organizationally,

the responsibility for wins or losses falls on the shoulders of those in charge. While in actuality, players and subordinates are directly producing results, and supervisory positions influence groups' dynamics, and leaders make decisions facilitating team performance.

As the popularity of sports continues to grow, and the pressure to perform becomes more demanding, it is imperative for coaches to understand the complexity of sports leadership. Coaching demands many requirements such as time, energy, and preparation; thus, effective coaches need to understand how to maximize success, while simultaneously controlling for challenges (Kidman & Hanrahan, 2011). Sports teams function as groups within larger organizations, thereby making organizational group communication conclusions applicable within sport contexts, and, conversely, athletic findings appropriate for organizational group settings. It is mutually beneficial for sports teams and organizational groups to learn from each other when it comes to the communicative processes of decision-making and influences decisions have on performance.

Leaders are responsible for making decisions influencing entire organizations, whether on sports teams, police squads, or business firms. However, interactions between superiors and subordinates during the decision-making process influence the manner in which teams receive decisions. Past scholars have approached decision-making from a strictly psychological standpoint (e.g., Chelladurai, 1990; Derue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011; Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Baldes, 2010; Gould, Voelker, & Griffes, 2013; Vealey, Armstrong, Comar, & Greenleaf, 1998), and not enough literature explores decision-making using a communicative lens.

Therefore, the present investigation examines the relationship between the communicative processes of coaches' decision-making styles and team success. Focusing specifically on how communication is reflective of coaches' decision-making styles, this study will add new knowledge to multiple disciplines. In addition, there will be analysis of qualitative data to reveal opportunities when coaches most often communicate with players and invite them to participate directly in making a decision

Review of Literature

Sports Teams as Organizational Groups

To understand fully the scope of this study, one must acknowledge the similarities between sports teams and traditional business organizations, accepting the notion that sports teams function as organizational groups. Etzioni (1964) describes organizations as groups of people or social units that intentionally assemble to accomplish specific objectives. Therefore, athletes who play on the same team are working together to achieve a goal: beating the competition. While at younger ages winning might not be the focus of playing sports, the more serious the competition, the more pressure there is to succeed. By the standards of Etzioni's (1964) definition, a sports team is an organization. Due to the strong connections between organizational teams and sports teams, this paper will be transferring and applying organizational and group concepts to the context of sports teams.

Corporate organizations are shifting away from individual tasks and increasingly relying on teams in the workplace (Katz, 2001). From an organizational standpoint, businesses also look to successful sports coaches for leadership techniques and advice (Guenzi & Ruta, 2013). It is mutually beneficial for sports teams and organizational

teams to learn from each other when it comes to the communicative processes of decision-making. Sports teams fit the general characteristics of formal organizational teams, and sports coaches act as organizational supervisors (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Cortini, 2009).

There are strong similarities between coaches' roles and supervisors' roles, while athletes typically take the roles of subordinates. Structurally, both sports teams and organizational groups are task oriented, require interdependency, and have formal designated leadership roles. Due to parallels between sports teams and work teams, prosperous teams can become models for emulation by businesses. When this is the case, companies look to coaches of sports teams for tips on success and other organizational advice. The communicative processes of decision-making are dictated by head coaches of sports teams, whether it be a downward flow of information or a collaborative communication process. Success, for organizational or sports teams, would not be possible without communication and effective leadership.

Organizational Communication

"The key to organizational excellence is effective communication" (Shockley-Zalabak, 1995, p. 6). The notion supporting the necessity of communication for organizational success is not a novel idea and dates back decades (Barnard, 1938). Not only is communication present in every organization, but communication exists within all levels of organizations.

Since organizations are typically interdependent with external environments, organizations must to be quick and nimble when responding to changing conditions (Grimes & Richard, 2003; Shockley-Zalabak, 1995). Adaptive change is not possible

without making decisions, which require organizational communication. Mykkänen and Tampere (2014) explain how "organizations as systems have a need for communicative action and organizations live in communicative rationality" (p. 132). Decisions are a specific subtopic of organizational communication that are essential for the survival and evolution of organizations.

Organizational decision-making communication. Mykkänen and Tampere (2014) argue, "the existence and the form of the organization are based on decisions. Organizations cannot stop making decisions, because they would cease to exist as an organization" (p. 132). Making a decision involves steps including the analysis of information and culminating a resolution depending on several alternatives (Eilon, 1969; Shockley-Zalabak, 1995). These steps of organizational decision-making depend on communication (Baraldi, 2013; Cheney, Christensen, Zorn & Ganesh, 2004).

Scholars even argue decisions are forms of communication (Andersen, 2003; Gouran, 1982; Mykkänen & Tampere, 2014; Politi & Street, 2011). Whether at intrapersonal levels or mass communication levels, decisions rely on communication. Mykkänen and Tampere (2014) found discourse surrounding organizational decision-making often influences organizational effectiveness. The scholars claim, "effective decision communication can be considered as the backbone of organizational communication, which can benefit the whole organization from top management to lower levels" (p. 131). Members of all levels in organizations make decisions; however, supervisory decisions hold more significance, potentially affecting more aspects of an organization.

Supervisory decision-making. Choices supervisors make affect other people, such as subordinates, and effects of supervisors' decisions trickle down organizational hierarchies or laterally depending on organizations' structures. Supervisors have power, and in group settings those with power, "have a greater say and, hence, are more influential than others in determining how tasks will be performed" (Gouran, 1982, p. 125). Bisel, Messersmith, and Kelley (2012) outline the significance of supervisory decisions by explaining how relationships between supervisors and subordinates are power-laden, and "create contexts that shape interactions, expectations, and outcomes—both for good and for ill" (p. 129). Therefore, through effective communication, supervisors can use decisions as competitive advantages. Supervisors choose what style of communication to use when going through the process of making a decision. Different styles of communication correlate to the amount of superior-subordinate interactions (Tannebaum & Schmidt, 1958).

Downward communication. The label "downward communication" reflects the direction of communication and information flow within organizations. Hierarchical dynamics exist between those who make decisions (supervisors) and those who execute decisions (subordinates) (Baraldi, 2013). Downward communication focuses on power within organizations, with high authority people developing messages and then transmitting decisions and information to those with lower authority (Shockley-Zalabak, 1995). This top-down method of decision-making is a form of organizational gatekeeping (Yeung, 2004). The metaphorical gate serves the purpose of inhibiting communication from subordinates moving upward to superiors (decision-makers). Gatekeeping stifles potential feedback that could occur during communicative decision-making processes,

and managers hold the gatekeeping position in relation to their subordinates (Shockley-Zalabak, 1995). Autocratic supervisors tend to use this style of communication. When supervisors implement downward communication while making choices, the outcomes are classifiable as delegations. This is because subordinates receive messages as announcements, and they have no input during the processes leading up to the decision finalizations. An alternative to delegating decisions is to communicate with subordinates during decision-making periods and use collaboration.

Collaborative communication. High communication levels with subordinates when making choices entails collaboration. Converse to a top-down decision-making style, collaborative communication promotes both upward and downward messages. This makes collaborative communication a two-way vertical flow of information. More members of organizations are able to express opinions and perspectives about decisions at hand (Baraldi, 2013). When communication flows upward, while also simultaneously flowing in the opposite direction, it provides supervisors with opportunities to receive feedback on previously made decisions and enables subordinates to voice opinions about current decisions (Mykkänen & Tampere, 2014). Collaboration incorporates preferences and encourages discussions, which are not present with downward communication flows (Politi & Street, 2011).

This is different from upward communication and horizontal communication because upward communication is still a one-way flow of information, and while horizontal is a two-way flow, the messages remain among individuals of similar power levels (Shockley-Zalabak, 1995). Collaborative communication is an engaging style between supervisors and subordinates. It is important for collaboration to occur when

supervisors are making decisions because those organizational choices directly affect subordinates.

While supervisors are not necessarily all leaders, they all hold formal leadership positions within organizations. Therefore, it is important to explore leadership because it is such an influential concept relating to how supervisors make decisions.

Leadership

Leadership history. Leadership is a social and communicative influential process. The extensive history of leadership dates back to the emergence of civilization (Wren, 1995). Leadership literature has expanded and evolved and leaders continue to be present in all organizations today. Leaders, great or corrupt, have shaped the history of the global community. Effective leadership is essential to the success of any team, and all teams have a leader, whether they are in a formal position or naturally emerge. Leadership is an extensively researched topic, but because leadership is an abstract concept, it has been difficult for scholars to agree and designate a singular concrete definition to the term. While there are numerous leadership definitions, according to Yukl (2012), leadership, according to the majority of scholars, involves an influential process related to the completion of a communal task.

Leadership approaches. Many leadership theories exist because of the broad definition. The "great man" theory was the popular belief in the early 19th century and postulated that leaders were born and not made (Kirkpatrick & Locke, 1991). Those who believed this theory saw leadership as one's destiny as unalterable. Scholars transitioned from the "great man" theory into trait theories, which suggest that good leaders should encompass characteristics such as intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity,

and sociability (Bass, 1990). Skills theories are another popular approach to leadership. As a result of scholars critiquing trait approaches skills theories developed (Derue et al., 2011). Skills theories argue that people train to be leaders in various ways such as observation, training, and firsthand experience (Germain, 2012; Northouse, 2007).

The debate between traits approaches and skills approaches is not the only dichotomous argument in the leadership field. There is an ongoing debate as to whether a leader should be more task-oriented or relationship-oriented, and style theories capture this discussion. Blake, Mouton, and Bidwell (1962) placed orientation to task and orientation to relationship on axes to create a managerial grid. Results support that groups yield the most success when a leader has a balance of concern for production as well as concern with people (Blake et al., 1962). Certain occupations require more technical skills (e.g., a cardiovascular surgeon), and other professions stress relationships (e.g., a marriage counselor). However, on a sports team both technical and interpersonal components affect individual performances and winning percentages (Fletcher & Roberts, 2013). Finding a delicate balance between tasks and relationships is difficult for leaders.

There are also situational leadership theorists. Situational leadership theorists follow the notion that different facets of situations influence the effectiveness of a leader (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). The appropriateness of leadership styles varies based on situations and composition of the followers. More recently, there has been a shift to decentralize leadership within groups and approach leadership from a collaborative or collective viewpoint. Shared leadership distributes functions and responsibilities,

typically associated with a single leader, among numerous team members (Small & Rentsch, 2010; Stagnaro & Piotrowski, 2014).

As with any complex and abstract phenomenon, such as leadership, a universal theoretical agreement is an impractical endeavor. There are different approaches to leadership; it is not a "one size fits all" concept. However, leaders equipped with organizational communication knowledge can gain competitive advantages over opponents. While leadership scholars may differ in the definitions, theories, and approaches to leadership, leaders play pivotal roles in all organizations and the groups that exist within.

Organizational leadership. The success of an organization often falls in the hands of the leader. Park and Kwon (2013) explain how, "effective leadership is highly correlated with perceptions of organizational effectiveness and has been studied as one of the key variables that relates to overall group or team effectiveness" (p. 28). Groups need a sense of direction, and without appointed leaders it can be disorienting and unproductive (Bales & Strodtbeck, 1951; Bennis & Shepard, 1956; Fisher, 1970; Gouran, 1982). Effective leadership is imperative because it improves organizational communication, employee morale, quality of work, and productivity (Van Loveren, 2007). Organizational leaders are responsible for producing corporate results and progressive organizational performances. When providing criteria for judging organizational performance, Petrick, Scherer, Brodzinski, Quinn, and Ainina (1999) named one of the main standards as 'profitability and productivity'. This broad criterion is applicable to different organizational settings. In the context of sports teams, profitability is performing better than opponents perform, and ultimately winning.

Titles of leaders within organizations may vary; however, overall responsibilities are similar. Formal leadership roles come with different titles depending on the organization. For example, corporations have CEOs, school districts have superintendents, and sports teams have coaches.

Sports leadership. While most sports teams have a captain, acting as a leader on the field, ultimately, the head coach has the highest leadership position on a sports team. Coaches are responsible for technical aspects, such as developing players' finesse and team strategies, but they also have strong interpersonal responsibilities in fostering team cohesion and trust. As sports leadership scholar Kidman (2010) articulates, coaching is a "dynamic and extremely complex process" (p. 12).

If there are tryouts, coaches decide who makes the cut, hand selecting the composition of the team. Coaches run practices, and coaches choose not only where athletes play, but how much playing each person receives. Before games, coaches usually give pregame speeches to motivate and inspire athletes just moments before competitions (Mack, 1999; Vargas-Tonsing & Guan, 2007). Dionne, Yammarino, Atwater, and Spangler (2004) found improving team motivation results in direct improvement of individual performances. In accordance, Peterson (2007) stated that, "motivation can inspire, encourage, and stimulate individuals to achieve great accomplishments" (p. 60). It is the job of coaches to act as the motivator before the game. If sports teams were armies, coaches would be the Generals leading troops into battle. This responsibility makes examining the interpersonal relationships between coaches and athletes significant.

Coach-athlete relationship. Communication scholars show that within coach-athlete relationships, coaches have major influences on athletes by taking leadership roles that encompass support, instruction, and guidance (Kassing & Infante, 1999; Turman, 2003; Turman & Schrodt, 2004). Coaches supervise athletes, and when exploring the supervisory-subordinate relationship in organizations, Shockley-Zalabak (1995) states that, "can be described as the primary interpersonal relationship structured by the organization" (p. 159).

Coaches are potentially the most influential factor on athletes' self-efficacies, positively or negatively (Cortini, 2009; Jurko, Tomljanović, & Čular, 2013; Pratt & Eitzen, 1989). Australian scholars Clough, McCormack, and Traill (1993) discovered that coaches are one of the top three reasons athletes are discouraged from continuing to participate in a sport. According to Westre and Weiss (1991), coaches' behaviors influence both players and team cohesion. Many studies also show how coaches play necessary and vital parts in the development of those they teach and lead (Hellstedt, 1987; Officer & Rosenfeld, 1985; Parrott & Duggan, 1999; Roberts, 1984). Researchers have found that coaches' specific leadership behaviors are crucial in improving or decreasing players' morale and team performance (Bird, 1977; Westre & Weiss, 1991). These elements may be the keys that bring about team success (Chen, 2013).

Not having coaches would lead to detrimental consequences for teams. Athletes would find themselves in a power struggle because they are each other's peers, and there would be a lack of formal training and instruction. With formal coaches, it has been found that the coaching staff has a significant impact on athletic team performance (Aghazadeh & Kyei, 2009; Gillet et al., 2010; Jowett, Lafreniere, & Vallerand, 2012;

Mach, Dolan, & Tzafrir, 2010). Having coaches creates supervisor-subordinate dynamics, providing structure to teams. As outlined earlier, supervisors are responsible for making decisions that affect subordinates. On sports teams how coaches make decisions is very important to team functioning.

Coaches' decision-making styles. Decisions are messages, and when coaches make decisions, they need to communicate the messages to the teams. Part of the reason for this is because effective coaching is reliant on effective communication (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004). However, the processes that coaches go through when making decisions differ from person to person. Some coaches are very inclusive of player feedback and provide athletes with communication opportunities to speak about the decision at hand, while others do not. Chelladurai and Saleh (1980) discovered previous sports leadership scholars had not developed a valid scale to assess and describe coaching behaviors and decision-making styles, so the Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) was created. Chelladurai (1990) identified one of the main purposes of the LSS as examining coaches' perceptions of their own behaviors. The scale outlines five different categories of leadership behaviors that are not mutually exclusive, but depending on coaches' styles, coaches tend to score higher in certain categories. Two of the five categories are dedicated to measuring coaches' decision-making styles and are reflective of communicative opportunities for players.

Coach-centered coaching (autocratic behaviors). One category in the LSS, regarding coaches' decision-making styles, measures autocratic behaviors. With autocratic tendencies, authority is valued and coaches make decisions independently. Leaders who approach decision-making processes autocratically do not consider athletes'

feedback and employ downward communication styles. According to Pratt and Eitzen (1989), autocratic leaders utilize extrinsic motivational incentives and strive to attain as much control as possible. Sari, Soyer, and Yigiter (2012) found that when coaches utilize more autocratic behaviors, athletes' basic psychological needs such as need for relatedness, need for competence, and need for autonomy are deficient. This could have adverse effects later, especially when athletes are under pressure. Leadership decision experiments have found the autocratic style of leadership to have the highest levels of discontent and aggression between team members (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939). "A person who is coach-centered tends to be prescriptive, espouses knowledge on to athletes, and can actually inhibit athletes' learning" (Kidman & Hanrahan, 2011, p. 8). In regard to organizational communication styles, coaches who are more autocratic delegate decisions and engage in downward communication.

However, an autocratic decision-making style can be effective in certain environments and situations. Sometimes choices made by authorities are the only sensible way to make a decision (Gouran, 1982). Lewin et al. (1939) outline appropriate conditions for autocratic decision-making styles: when there is no need for contribution from others on the decision, where the decision would not alter because of input, and where the motivation of subordinates to carry out subsequent actions would not change based on their level of involvement in the decision-making process. Regardless of how coaches make decisions, it is important for coaches to explain their choices, so that athletes can understand why the coach is utilizing that specific method (Kidman & Hanrahan, 2011).

Past literature has found a significant positive relationship between perceived autocratic leadership styles and predicting the "burning out of athletes" (Vealey et al., 1998; Zardoshtian, Hossini, & Mohammadzade, 2012). Athlete burnout is a negative psychological phenomenon, commonly correlated with athlete ill-being and low determination levels (DeFreese & Smith, 2013). The autocratic style will likely have a myriad of other negative correlations with sports teams as well, such as winning percentage. Grunig and Dozier (2002) explain for organizations to be effective, leaders must inspire rather than dictate. With an autocratic decision-making process, coaches make decisions and delegate them to athletes, rather than including athletes in the process.

Player-centered coaching (democratic behaviors). It has been found that for decisions to be successful, the different interests of those involved must be taken into consideration (Saaty, 1999). This can be achieved through democratic behaviors, which is the second LSS subscale reflective of coaches' decision-making.

Coaches who are athlete-centered, "tend to promote a sense of belonging as well as give athletes a role in decision making and ensure a shared approach to learning" (Kidman & Hanrahan, 2011, p. 9). Democratic decision-making allows athletes to participate in important coaching decisions associated with group goals, practice methods, game tactics, and strategies. This allows collaborative communication to occur. With this style of decision-making, while collaboration and mutual participation are present, one party still makes the decision, in this situation, coaches (Politi & Street, 2011). Since players have input in decisions, using democratic behaviors reflects an optimizing decision-making strategy in which, "conclusions are based on a thorough

examination of all the information and issues relevant to the problem at hand" (Gouran, 1982, p. 6). Hirsch and Kinal (2012) found that the most successful Olympic coaches capitalize on understanding their players to effectively convey messages, and this is accomplished through communication and democratic actions.

From an organizational perspective, Luthar (1996) found that, "democratic managers are perceived to be much higher performers and superior leaders when compared to autocratic managers" (p. 337). Democratic leaders are supportive, considerate, and consultative, encouraging participation in their decision-making processes (Bhatti, Maitlo, Shaikh, Hashmi, & Shaikh, 2012; Lewin et al., 1939; Pratt & Eitzen, 1989). It is important to note that democratic decision-making style is highly participative, but not completely hands-free.

Laissez-fair styles of making decisions completely minimize leaders' involvements. While with democratic styles, leaders still have control in facilitating the consensus of the group. Therefore, it is important to include subordinates in decision-making processes, but giving them complete control can become ineffective (Lewin et al., 1939). That is why for this study laissez-fair is not a leadership style, because it represents the absence of leadership.

In organizational groups, developing democratic decision-making and communication habits is necessary to improve organizational effectiveness (Mykkänen & Tampere, 2014). Democratic behaviors in the workplace lead to positive impacts on trust and communication between employees, along with facilitating positive relationships (Holtzhausen, 2002). These organizational findings are transferrable to athletic settings. Mach et al., (2010) discovered that trust in other team players facilitates team cohesion.

Jones and Kijeski (2009) found that that on interdependent sports teams there was a positive, significant correlation between cohesion and team success. Andrews (2001) examined competitive cheerleading, an extremely interdependent team, and found that the greater the team cohesion, the more likely the squad was to achieve their goals and have a better performance. Therefore, a democratic decision-making process, leads to increased trust and cohesion, positively influencing team success. When coaches utilize democratic behaviors, it encourages communication between members of the team when making a decision. Furthermore, for coaches to be effective they must take into consideration the perceptions of their players, communicating with athletes makes this possible (Bennie & O'Connor, 2012). Democratic decision-making not only facilitates communication on a team, but also fosters other positive predictors of team performance such as cohesion and motivation.

When studying athletes' preferences of coaches' leadership behaviors, results indicate athletes prefer democratic behaviors to autocratic behaviors (Chelladurai & Arnott, 1985; Hastie, 1995; Sherman, Fuller, & Speed, 2000). Kenow and Williams (1999) found that athletes whose preferences were in alignment with their coaches' leadership styles experienced effects that were more positive, such as less anxiety and higher self-confidence. Consequently, based on these positive effects, athletes should perform better under coaches who utilize their preferred leadership style. Moreover, Pratt and Eitzen (1989) discuss that, "groups characterized by a democratic atmosphere will have higher morale, more commitment to the organization, and greater productivity than those work groups directed by authoritarian leaders" (p. 313). Variables such as player morale, commitment, cohesion, and motivation are micro-level predictors of team

success. A democratic decision-making style is a macro-level predictor of team success because coaches who utilize democratic decision-making, subsequently increase the likelihood of having the micro-level predictors present on their team.

Sport Types

Just as decision-making comes in various styles, there are different types of sports. One can practice a sport solo, such as training for a marathon, or one can practice on a team, such as a cross-country team. On some teams, athletes compete against a teammate for a single spot, such as a wrestler representing a specific weight class, and on other teams, an athlete must trust a teammate physically with their life, such as competitive cheerleading. The success of sports teams tends to be a delicate balance of many forces, but there needs to be talent present. Assemble a relay team with the four fastest sprinters in the world, even if strangers, and the team is more likely to guarantee a win than putting five all-star basketball strangers on a team together. The reason being that some sports are coactive and others are interdependent.

Interdependent sports merit investigation because coactive sports, such as golf and bowling, rely more on individual performance and less on team dynamics. On an interdependent sport team, it is more difficult for a single player to account for the win. Interdependence is the degree to which team members interact with and depend on each other. Within interdependent groups, one change alters all components and relationships in the group (Beebe & Masterson, 1997). The more interdependent a team is, the greater amount of contact, cooperation, and communication that is required among teammates (Cunningham & Eys, 2007; Timmerman, 2000). Examples of interdependent teams include basketball, soccer, and rugby teams. Whereas examples of lower interdependence

sports are golf, wrestling, and ski teams, which can be recognized as coactive teams. On interdependent teams, coaches have more of an influence on the overall team dynamics.

Rugby

Rugby has a massive global footprint, and its prevalence in the United State is rapidly increasing. From 2008 to 2013, tackle football participation in the United States fell 21.1%, and during the same time, rugby participation grew 81% (Sports and Fitness Industry Association, 2014). That impressive increase highlights the direction rugby is heading in the future. A 2013 nationwide survey conducted by the Sports and Fitness Industry Association found rugby was the top participated sport for the 25-34 age group in the United States. For a younger population, rugby proved prevalent, placing in the top five sports played at school/college. This could be because to participate in most other collegiate sports in the United States, a common prerequisite is to have major experience playing the sport. On the other hand, with rugby, many people start playing for the first time in college. However, data shows rugby is becoming popular in younger populations, too. In a 2014 report, rugby was the fastest growing team sport among 6-12 year-olds in the United States (Sports and Fitness Industry Association, 2014).

While rugby is on the rise in the United States, the sport does not have the same level of formal establishment that structures other major collegiate sports such as football, basketball, or soccer. For example, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), founded in 1906, is an organization that regulates thousands of athletic programs and conferences in the United States and Canada (Falla, 1981). With the recent approval of sand volleyball, the NCAA acts as the governing body for 90 different sports (Johnson, 2015). The NCAA classifies rugby as an “emerging sport”, which means with

the few collegiate rugby teams that have varsity standings; there is no official NCAA championship yet. Due to the lack of funding and support from the NCAA, along with tight restrictions, most collegiate rugby teams affiliate with USA Rugby. For instance, in 2014, USA Rugby reports there are 408 colleges with women's rugby programs, yet only 10 are NCAA varsity sanctioned (Breckenridge & Cortez, 2014).

USA Rugby is the national governing body for rugby teams, and with its establishment being only 40 years ago in 1975, is not as structured and developed as the NCAA. Rugby does not have to abide by the strict organizational structure and regulations of the NCAA, allowing collegiate rugby coaches to make more decisions that ultimately influence teams.

With full NCAA varsity sports, many factors influence or control coaches' decisions, such as academic institution regulations, athletic departments, donors, and more. With so many key stakeholders influencing teams and coaches, in the end, there are not as many actual decisions that coaches are able to make. That is not the case with most collegiate rugby teams. Within academic institutions that do not have NCAA sanctioning for rugby, rugby is a school club instead of school sport, freeing coaches from stricter athletic regulations that could dictate coaches' decisions.

USA Rugby's governance is less strict than the NCAA's authority, with conferences shifting and changing yearly. Often times, collegiate rugby coaches have the ability to decide to stay in their current conference, or switch to another, each year. For an NCAA team, the school's athletic director would make that decision, and not the coaches. With the extreme freedom rugby coaches have, compared to varsity-sanctioned sports, understanding the communicative processes when making decisions can shine

light onto the influence coaches' and supervisors' communication habits have on team performance.

Theoretical Framework

Tannebaum and Schmidt's (1958) Leadership Continuum Theory (LCT) illustrates the amount of control and authority managers assert during decision-making processes. The LCT outlines a spectrum of managerial behaviors categorized by subordinate participation levels. Low participative leaders equate to autocratic decision-makers, while highly participative leaders include subordinates in the decision-making process. With this theory, there is an inverse relationship between the two decision-making styles. Therefore, the more autocratic a leader is, the less democratic they are. An autocratic leader will make decisions on her or his own without input from subordinates; whereas democratic leaders allow more feedback opportunities for subordinates during decision-making processes. The amount of communication opportunities offered to subordinates is the key to classifying leaders as either autocratic or democratic within the LCT.

Communication opportunities. The number of opportunities subordinates have to communicate and provide input on decisions relates to leaders' decision-making styles. Autocratic behaviors are comparable to downward communication, or low communication opportunities and democratic behaviors are equivalent to collaborative communication, or high communication opportunities. Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1958) continuum of leadership behavior outlines that, "each type of action is related to the degree of authority used by the boss and to the amount of freedom available to subordinates in reaching decisions" (p. 97). On the far left of the spectrum, "the manager

makes the decision and announces it" (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958, p. 97). This situation represents an autocratic behavior and is boss-centered. This directly relates to subordinate communication opportunities because the leader is making a decision without offering subordinates the chance to participate in the decision-making process. An example within a sports context would be if a coach scheduled a scrimmage on a weekend where the team was not supposed to have a game without consulting the players first.

Continuing across the continuum, the more democratic leaders are, the more freedom subordinates have when reaching decisions, and the more communicative opportunities present. For example, further right on the spectrum, "the manager presents the problem, gets suggestions, and then makes his decision" (Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1958, p. 97). This can be seen as democratic decision-making because although leaders make the final decisions, other members of the team to contribute (Lewin et al., 1939). Using the same scrimmage example from above, democratic coaches would present the scenarios to players and allow them to communicate opinions before making final decisions.

However, one problematic aspect of Tannenbaum and Schmidt's (1958) spectrum is that the far right side, the most democratic side, can be better classified as a laissez-faire style of decision-making. This is where the leader does not make any decisions at all. Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) define the most subordinate-centered leadership as when, "the manager permits the group to make decisions" (p. 97). In this situation, the supervisor agrees in advance to implement any decision the group makes. This extreme freedom rarely occurs in formal organizations. This is laissez-faire leadership because the

leader is not actually making any decisions themselves, and there is, "complete freedom for group or individual decision, without any leader participation" (Lewin et al., 1939, p. 273).

Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958) have autocratic and democratic behaviors on a continuum, inferring that the two categories are in reality, one variable, reflecting the level of collaboration between supervisors and subordinates during decision-making and inclusion opportunities for subordinates to participate.

Summary

The opportunity to find a communication variable correlated with team winning percentage could be groundbreaking in the realm of sports, and would continue to legitimize this field of study for communication scholars alike. Based on the review of literature, there is are considerable lacunae when it comes to how decision-making styles relate to team performance and, specifically, approaching the situation from a communication perspective. Due to the increasing shift toward workplace teams, the societal importance of sports team success and the amount of decisions collegiate rugby coaches make, this topic is worth exploring further. However, after reviewing the literature regarding organizational and group communication, leadership, and decision-making on sports teams, there are still unanswered questions.

The golden question that coaches and scholars should be trying to answer is what makes winning sports teams successful. Through open and closed-ended questions and statistical analysis, this study seeks to explore communicative decision-making determinants of team performance. Furthermore, exploring specific communication opportunities when coaches are inviting players to participate in making decisions, and

the relationship each situation has with team performance, will offer new insights to coaching literature.

Involving athletes in decision-making processes requires trust and communication between coaches and players. There are times when coaches might have to make a quick game time decision and cannot include feedback from players. Other times, it is vital for the coach to communicate with players before making a decision. However, literature has yet to explore specific communication opportunities coaches offer athletes when making decisions. Different opportunities are available for players to partake in decision-making processes, depending on coaches' collaboration levels, but it is unknown how those opportunities relate to winning percentage. This study seeks to close the gap in the literature aforementioned. By asking coaches to self-report opportunities when they invite players to join in making decisions, different categories may emerge. These categories can be analyzed to see when most coaches are inviting players to participate. In addition, different scenarios can be individually tested to see if some are more influential than others, in regard to team performance.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

H_1: As the propensity of utilizing democratic behaviors increases, team winning percentage increases.

H_2: As the propensity of offering communication opportunities to players increases, team winning percentage increases.

RQ_1: What communication opportunities offered to players are the most significant predictor variables of team success?

RQ_2: What democratic communication decision-making opportunities do coaches most frequently report?

This chapter reviewed existing literature regarding different facets of leadership, organizational group communication, coaching styles, rugby and other similar areas of interest to this study. Two hypotheses were posited, along with two research questions, in order to consider what communicative decision-making processes have relationships with team success, specifically within collegiate rugby. The following chapter will outline the methods used to attempt to answer the hypotheses and research questions.

CHAPTER II

METHODS

The present study seeks to determine how communicative processes of coaches' decision-making styles relate to rugby team success. Because of the freedoms collegiate rugby coaches have when it comes to making decisions, and the limited studies that have examined rugby teams in the United States, this study is seeking to further explore and explain correlates of team success within that specific population. As previously outlined, rugby is a rapidly growing interdependent sport, making this study's findings more easily applicable to the organizational and group communication areas. This study is looks at decision-making through a communicative lens, rather than a psychological standpoint, which very few studies have done.

Sample

A total of 130 coaches participated in the study. Of those participants, 23.7% were female coaches and 76.3% were male coaches. Furthermore, 44.1% coached female rugby teams, and 55.9% coached male rugby teams. The mean age of participants was 42.94 years old, with a range in ages from 21 to 67 years old. All participants had coached rugby for a minimum of one year, with the most veteran coach indicating 45 years of rugby coaching. The average number of years coaching rugby was 11.49 years

while the average number of years coaching their *current* team was 5.67 years. Overall, respondents predominately identified themselves as Caucasian (85.6%), followed by Asian/Pacific Islander (6.3%), Bi-racial/Multi-racial (3.6%), Latina/Latino (1.8%), and finally African American, Middle Eastern, and Native American Indian each represented with less than 1% (.9%).

Upon approval for the study acquired from an Institutional Review Board, participants were initially recruited through e-mail. Recruitment of participants was through a database of collegiate rugby coaches' e-mail addresses provided by the Director of College Rugby for USA Rugby. Through the main method for recruitment was an e-mail invitation to participate, the author also collected coaches' contact information from various rugby conference websites where coaches were encouraged to pass along the survey link. Snowball sampling also occurred through sites such as Facebook and Twitter. Collegiate rugby coaches posted the survey link on social media profiles as a way for other collegiate rugby coaches to participate. This was especially helpful since some e-mail addresses were outdated on the USA Rugby database, or if coaches missed the initial e-mail invitation. Participants were not debriefed after completing the survey, but they had the option of receiving a copy of the research paper if they wished to see the final results

Procedures

This study was conducted during the winter and spring months of 2015, and completed in May of 2015. Collecting data in the winter ensures that coaches have at least one season record to report, as collegiate rugby seasons end in late November, or early December.

Select Survey is a popular survey software application used by many universities and organizations, in which personalized online questionnaires can be constructed and administered. After showing interest in participating in the study by clicking on the Select Survey link, participants were brought to an informed consent page where they indicated they were at least 18 years of age. The informed consent also included information about the confidential nature of this study, and explained how participation was voluntary. If a participant consented, he or she moved onto the survey. Survey questions asked about communicative processes when making decisions as a collegiate rugby coach. Qualitative data was also gathered through open-ended questions to see when coaches most frequently invite players to participate in the decision-making process. Seven demographic questions were asked at the end, including age, sex, and ethnicity/race. Demographic information will be valuable for finding other correlations in future analyses. The final question asked participants to report up to the last three collegiate conference season records of her or his current rugby team. The season records would ultimately be used by the author to calculate composite winning percentages for teams. (See Appendix A for questionnaire).

Measurements

Democratic Decision-Making Behaviors

Chelladurai and Saleh's (1980) Leadership Scale for Sports (LSS) measures the communicative processes of coaches' decision-making styles. Different scholars, in a range of contexts, have used this scale to measure relationships between leadership in sports and other variables (e.g., Carron, Colman, Wheeler, & Stevens, 2002; Mohammadzade, Zardoshtian & Hossini, 2012; Toros, Salman & Sari, 2013; Turman &

Schrodt, 2004; Zardoshtian et al., 2012). Researchers have translated the LSS into multiple languages, and longitudinal studies indicate test/re-test reliability (e.g., Ardua & Marquez, 2007; Fletcher & Roberts, 2013; Nacar, 2013; Sari et al., 2012). Chelladurai (1990) recognized the three main purposes of the scale as: a) to study athletes' preference for specific leader behavior, b) athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behavior, and c) coaches' perception of their own behavior. The present study focuses solely on the coaches' perception of their own communication behavior. However, a future study could focus on the remaining two purposes, to provide a full 360-degree view of the situation regarding coaches' communicative processes when making decisions.

The LSS is a 40 item questionnaire, broken down into five subscales measuring five different leadership styles. The five subscales are training and instruction (13 items), autocratic behavior (5 items), democratic behavior (9 items), social support (8 items), and positive feedback (5 items). The autocratic and democratic behavior subscales were the only two administered, because they are the subscales relating to decision-making. (See Appendix A for subscale items). The Cronbach's alpha calculated for each subscale, as an index of internal consistency, were all deemed acceptable values (Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980).

Item responses ranked on a scale, ranging from never to always, regarded the perception of the coach's leadership behaviors. On the scale, 'never' is equal to 0% of the time, 'rarely' is equal to 25% of the time, 'occasionally' is equal to 50% of the time, 'often' is equal to 75% of the time, and 'always' is equal to 100% of the time.

Items include statements about the coach in order to get a depiction of the coaches' perceptions of her or his communicative processes when making a decision.

Autocratic items reflect a lack of communication opportunities for athletes while democratic items offer a communication opportunity. Example statements about the coach include: "work relatively independent of the athletes" (autocratic behavior subscale), and "ask for the opinion of the athletes on strategies for specific competitions" (democratic behavior subscale).

Using Tannebaum and Schmidt's (1958) LCT, and considering decision-making styles to be a spectrum reflecting communication opportunities, the autocratic items were reverse scored to create a unidimensional variable of collaboration. Since items were ranked on a one to five scale, autocratic items receiving a score of five, four, three, two, and one were reverse-coded, respectively, into the score of one, two, three, four and five. The author reverse-coded only the autocratic subscale because there were fewer items than the democratic subscale.

Communication Opportunities

Communication opportunities are scenarios in which coaches can potentially invite athletes to participate in making decisions. The coaches indicated, on a scale, the extent which they allow or encourage athletes to communicate during 11 different decision-making scenarios. On the scale, 'never' is equal to 0% of the time, 'rarely' is equal to 25% of the time, 'occasionally' is equal to 50% of the time, 'often' is equal to 75% of the time, and 'always' is equal to 100% of the time. There was also a "not applicable" option available for coaches to choose.

In a previous study (Baptist & Sullivan, 2015), 75 collegiate student-athletes qualitatively provided communication situations in which their coaches invite them to participate in making decisions. That is how five of the scenarios provided to the coaches

(regarding practice plans or drills, scheduling practices, additional workouts/other training outside of team practices, post-game or post-season feedback for improvement, and crafting team policies/disciplinary actions) were developed.

The other six scenarios (choosing captains, selecting the starting lineup and playing time for competitions, uniform and apparel choices, athletes returning to play post-injuries, team bonding and team building activities, and non-conference play) were produced through consulting with various sports coaches and athletes to discover more potential decision-making scenarios.

Since scenarios might not have been sufficiently descriptive of all possible situations, there was also an area for coaches to provide up to three other decision-making scenarios and rate the situations on the same scale (See Appendix A questions 4-9). Allowing coaches to offer new scenarios and score them permitted novel decision-making opportunities to emerge that were not originally included. However, many coaches omitted answers to this area, so no new scenarios emerged from the write-in option. This area was excluded from the results due to the low percentage of coaches answering this specific section.

Coaches were also asked to report the top three scenarios in which they most frequently involve players in the decision-making process. These top-ranked scenarios could have been one of the 11 original scenarios provided, or a new situation. The coaches were provided with space to enter up to three scenarios. Some coaches took advantage of the space, providing more than three scenarios. The responses, while many straightforward underwent content analysis. Using qualitative content analysis to examine the texts provided by coaches allows for a connection to quantitative analysis (frequency

count), to answer RQ_2. With coaches rating different scenarios above, having them rank the top three inclusion opportunities adds another aspect of frequency, to better understand how coaches included players in decisions.

Winning Percentage

Winning percentage is a calculation based on the season record of a team after the completion of the season's final game. Many sports communication scholars use winning percentage when measuring team effectiveness (e.g., Kozub & Button, 2000; Martens & Peterson, 1971; Matheson, Mathes, & Murray, 1997). Winning percentage is a calculation of games won, divided by total games played, with tie games counting toward .5 of a win and .5 of a loss. To demonstrate; if a team's record was 14 wins, 8 losses and 5 ties they would have played 27 games total. Out of the total games played for this equation they won 16.5 games (14 wins + 2.5 for the ties), therefore 16.5 wins divided by 27 total games gives the team a winning percentage of .611. In competitive sports, the objective is to get the highest winning percentage possible. In the present study, coaches self-reported the wins, losses, and ties of up to the last three conference seasons of her or his current rugby team. Team winning percentages ranged from 0% to 100%, with the average team winning percentage being 64.16%

Spot checking occurred on 10% of teams to ensure that the records provided were accurate. This was done for teams where the coach provided the name of the academic institution and there was an updated team website to confirm the reported wins, losses, and ties. The research then confirmed that the reported season records were correct.

Analysis

This study triangulated both quantitative and qualitative data regarding coaches' decision-making styles and communication opportunities offered to players.

Correlations

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient (PPMCC) was the principal statistical analysis used to discover the correlation between coaches' composite collaboration scores and teams' winning percentages (H_1). The composite inclusive score is based upon composite reverse-coded autocratic scores and composite democratic scores. Similar to Sari et al. (2012), the composite score will be the mean score of each dimension. A PPMCC will also explore the correlation between amount of communication opportunities offered to players and team winning percentages (H_2). After ranking the frequency at which coaches provide players opportunities to communicate during 11 different decision-making scenarios, coaches received a composite (average) score (1.0-5.0) for how often they offer communication opportunities to players, with 5.0 being the most inclusive.

Multiple Linear Regression

To determine which communication opportunities offered to players are the most significant predictor variables of team success, and answer RQ_1, a multiple linear regression was utilized. The 11 predictor variables which are scenarios where coaches can offer players include: regarding practice plans or drills, scheduling practices, additional workouts/other training outside of team practices, post-game or post-season feedback for improvement, crafting team policies/disciplinary actions, choosing captains, selecting the starting lineup and playing time for competitions, uniform and apparel

choices, athletes returning to play post-injuries, team bonding and team building activities, and non-conference play. Questions pertaining to the predictor variables were analyzed through SPSS to determine which predictor variable, or combination, helps account for the most variance in collegiate rugby team performance.

Content Analysis and Frequency Count

The results of the open-ended survey questions were analyzed through content analysis to determine when coaches most frequently report inviting players to participate in making decisions. When assessing responses, phrases were used as the level of analysis. The level of analysis must be established to determine what units will be counted from the content (Berg & Lune, 2011). An example of a phrase would be "scheduling practice times" or "choosing practice drills". Phrases are the most appropriate level of analysis for these responses because if single words were considered as the units, the categories would not be as rich. If units were singular words such as "practice," this is very vague and there are many decisions and communication opportunities that can arise during practice.

To maintain inter-observer agreement, constant comparison of codes for similarities and differences in units occurred between three separate coders. Inter-observer agreement was established to ensure the precision of category creation (Viera & Garrett, 2005). To begin, each coder read all responses independently. Collected responses were separately unitized into individual units before conversing and approving upon each created unit to be coded. Discussion allowed consensual agreements to arise pertaining to the categories. Next, the units were categorized. With more in-depth

responses, where coaches elaborated or provided multiple scenarios, it was possible that more than one unit was present in the response.

Categories were developed through a combination of inductive and deductive approaches. Inductive category development allows categories to cultivate naturally through responses, trying to keep the categories as near as possible to the answers provided (Mayring, 2000). With an inductive approach, themes emerge naturally from the text and are identified, and with a deductive approach, there are categorical schemes already in place from theoretical perspectives or a priori knowledge (Berg & Lune, 2011). Deductively, the a priori knowledge came from a literature examining communication opportunities offered to collegiate athletes (Baptist & Sullivan, 2015). Overall, the categories met content analysis standards of being mutually exclusive, finite, and reliable (Weber, 1990).

After responses were categorized into different communication scenarios, each category was counted to find the frequency at which each opportunity was being offered by coaches to players. Finding the frequency is essential to answer RQ_2, which asks, "what democratic communication decision-making opportunities do coaches most frequently report?"

Overall, through several participant recruitment methods, participants completed an online questionnaire. Data was analyzed through several methods. The following chapter explains the results of the online questionnaire.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

The preceding chapter described details about the sample, recruitment methods, procedures, measurements, and data analysis procedures. The online questionnaire circulated through the rugby community was effective in receiving 130 usable responses. Quantitative data were analyzed using PPMCCs and multiple regressions, while qualitative data underwent coding and frequency counts for the open ended questions. The present chapter, now, looks to the quantitative and qualitative results in regard to the hypotheses and research questions. Quantitative results will be clarified before qualitative results are explained.

Quantitative Results

Hypotheses 1 and 2

The first hypothesis (H_1) was developed to determine if there is positive relationship between how democratic coaches' are during decision-making processes (collaboration level), and team winning percentage. Similarly, looking for a relationship with team winning percentage, the next hypothesis (H_2) posited that the more coaches offer communication opportunities to players, the higher the winning percentage will be.

In order to test H_1, a Pearson correlation was calculated examining the relationship between coaches' composite collaboration scores and winning percentage. A weak correlation that was not significant was found (r (96) = -.007, p = .948). Coaches' collaboration level is not related to winning percentage.

Another Pearson correlation was calculated to test H_2, and determine the relationship between coaches' composite communication opportunity scores and team winning percentage. A weak correlation that was not significant was found (r (70) = .026, p = .831). The amount of communication opportunities coaches offer to athletes is not related to winning percentage. The coefficients for H_1 and H_2 both indicated weak relationships with team winning percentage, with H_1 being slightly negative and H_2 being slightly positive.

Research Question 1

Research question one (RQ_1) wanted to explore what communication opportunities offered to players are the most significant predictors of team success. RQ_1 was analyzed through a multiple linear regression. Multiple linear regression analysis controls for the other predictor variables measured in the study in order to isolate the ability of any single predictor variable to predict a significant amount of variance in the criterion variable. The level of significance, or alpha, was set to .05 for all statistical tests in accordance with common practices. Each one of the 11 communication opportunities that coaches ranked were considered as different predictor variables, while the criterion variable was team winning percentage.

A multiple linear regression was calculated predicting winning percentage based on different communication opportunities offered to athletes. The regression equation

was not significant (F (11, 60) = .574, p = .842) with an R^2 of .095 and an adjusted R^2 of -.071. Usually a squared number cannot be a negative value; however, with the statistical equation for adjusted R^2, it is common that the value comes out to a negative value and can be interpreted as zero (Fritz, Morris, & Richler, 2012). None of the 11 communication opportunities were significant predictors of team winning percentage. Beta weights for the communication opportunities regression model can be found in Table 1.

Table 1
Beta Weights for Communication Opportunities Model

Predictor Variables		*B*	*SE B*	β
Practice Plans		.001	.036	.006
Scheduling Practice		.003	.036	.015
Additional Workouts		-.061	.046	-.217
Post-game Feedback		.029	.044	.094
Team Policies/Discipline		-.049	.048	-.184
Choosing Captains		.003	.031	.018
Starting Lineup		-.001	.031	-.004
Uniforms/Apparel		-.018	.033	-.081
Returning Post-Injury		.024	.025	.135
Team Bonding		.102	.072	.235
Non-Conference Play		.039	.046	.135
	R^2		.095	
	R^2_{adj}		-.071	
	F		.574	

(n = 71)

Qualitative Results

In addition to the information provided through quantitative data, participants were also given the opportunity to self-report and enter the top three scenarios in which they invite players to participate in the decision-making process. This area allowed

coaches to use either scenarios previously provided by the author, or to enter new unique scenarios that had not been mentioned. Coaches also used this area to make additional comments regarding decision-making specifics which added insight and clarified some responses. These open-ended responses provide further insight into the study to allow for greater understanding as to when coaches are inviting players to communicate and be included in the decision-making process. Some scenarios emerged that were not originally conceptualized by the author.

All qualitative responses were unitized according to prearranged rules, including that units would be counted per each mention, allowing multiple units to be present within the same response. All units were considered and placed in relevant categories that emerged based on reviewing all qualitative responses. For RQ_2, several categories became apparent that were developed based on reoccurring, overarching occurrences in units.

Research Question 2

When given the chance to provide scenarios in which coaches invite players to communicate during different decision-making processes, coaches confirmed opportunities previously provided in the survey, and also offered new scenarios that emerged as categories.

In total, nine different communication scenarios emerged as categories, excluding an additional category of "other" which included miscellaneous answers not having a high frequency of similar responses (at least 18 mentions). The minimum standard to create a category was18 mentions because there were a total of 353 units mentioned,

therefore, 18 mentions is equivalent to 5% agreement among coaches. Once again, the level of analysis for units were phrases.

The nine were: scheduling practices (*n=38*), starting lineup (*n=38*), practice content (*n=35*), team leadership (*n=31*), non-conference matches (*n=22*), team building (*n=21*), assessment and improvement (*n=20*), goals (*n=19*), and game strategy (*n=18*). A frequency count can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Emergent Categories of Communication Scenarios

Scenario	*n*
Scheduling Practices	38
Starting Lineup	38
Practice Content	35
Team Leadership	31
Non-Conference Matches	22
Team Building	21
Assessment and Improvement	20
Goals	19
Game Strategy	18
Other*	111

Note. Other* contains communication scenarios that had less than 18 units reported

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between decision-making style and winning percentage, and the relationship between communication opportunities and winning percentage. Specifically, it was hypothesized that coaches who utilize more democratic styles of decision-making and offer more collaborative communication opportunities to athletes would be rewarded with higher winning percentages. Additional analysis investigated which communication opportunities were determinates of team success, and revealed top-reported scenarios in which coaches include players when making decisions.

The previous chapter outlined the quantitative and qualitative results of the present study. The current chapter discusses those findings. First, a synthesis of findings is provided. Next, implications, limitations, and future directions are discussed before finally concluding.

Synthesis of Findings

Collaborative Decision-Making

Although significant correlations or predictor variables of team success were not revealed, this study still offers important information. The first hypothesis was not

supported, as there was no significant relationship between coaches' composite collaboration score and team winning percentage. Collaboration scores were the average of the coaches' democratic behavior scores and reverse autocratic scores, all relating to how they make decisions. While previous research has outlined multiple benefits of utilizing democratic decision-making behaviors (Bhatti et al., 2012; Holtzhausen, 2002), in this study there was no clear advantage or disadvantage.

The strength of the correlation is almost zero, with the direction being slightly negative. This calls into questions previous literature that has outline benefits of using democratic decision-making, or disadvantages of using autocratic styles (Bhatti et al., 2012; Holtzhausen, 2002). Since the correlation is so close to zero, it shows there is no *linear* relationship between the variables (Cohen, Cohen, Vest, & Aiken, 2013). H_1 predicted there would be a positive linear relationship between coach collaboration scores and winning percentage. In other words, as a coach's collaboration score increased or decreased, winning percentage for that team would go in the *same* direction. A curvilinear relationship is possible; however, after creating a scatterplot it was clear that this was not the situation.

Due to the fact that the relationship was not strong in either direction, one explanation is that coaches should engage in situational leadership approaches when it comes to decision-making. Coaches should adapt styles depending on the decision at hand and consider other factors such as the composition of their teams. An alternative to situational approaches that still accounts for the zero correlation relationship is that leaders can also use a combination of autocratic and democratic behaviors each time. For example, when faced with a decision, coaches could first figure out what they want to do

without talking to players (autocratic behavior), then invite players to communicate about the issue (democratic behavior). This way coaches will establish their own personal opinion and what they think is the best solution, before conversing with the group. An advantage of using a combination of both each time is that groupthink is less likely to be present. Groupthink is a psychological phenomenon where members of highly cohesive groups strive for unanimous consensuses on decisions, ignoring alternative courses of action (Janis, 1972, 1982). Groupthink may occur if coaches are overly democratic and simply agree with what athletes say without questioning the decision. Groupthink's negative side effects, when resulting from democratic leadership behaviors, help to support the notion of coaches utilizing situational approaches or combining styles.

Collaborative Communication Opportunities

The second hypothesis posited that there would be a positive relationship between team winning percentage and number of communication opportunities offered to players. However, no correlation between the two variables was found. The Pearson correlation was very weak. A lack of a linear relationship, similarly to H_1, supports the notion of situational approaches to offering communication opportunities. Coaches must take on the challenge of finding the balance between not offering too many or too little communication opportunities to athletes. The results for H_2 imply that some player input is desirable, but it is not always beneficial to have input on everything.

Also pertaining to communication opportunities, the first research question (RQ_1) explored which communication opportunities were potential determinants of winning percentage. After running a multiple regression, there were no statistically significant results based on the 11 communication scenarios entered into the equation. The 11

scenarios were: regarding practice plans or drills, scheduling practices, additional workouts/other training outside of team practices, post-game or post-season feedback for improvement, crafting team policies/disciplinary actions, choosing captains, selecting the starting lineup and playing time for competitions, uniform and apparel choices, athletes returning to play post-injuries, team bonding and team building activities, and non-conference play. The regression equation was not statistically significant. While the results indicated none of these communication opportunities are predictive of team success, and offer no direct piece of the puzzle regarding determinants of winning percentage, these findings take away options. This allows scholars to move forward in the predictive process, knowing these communication opportunities should not be included in future research.

The final research question (RQ_2) asked about situations in which coaches invite athletes to participate in decision-making. The major categories identified through content analysis were: scheduling practices (*n=38*), starting lineup (*n=38*), practice content (*n=35*), team leadership (*n=31*), non-conference matches (*n=22*), team building (*n=21*), assessment and improvement (*n=20*), goals (*n=19*), and game strategy (*n=18*).

Out of these categories, all of them were scenarios that had been previously provided to the coaches in the questionnaire, except for team leadership, goals, and game strategy. The category of "choosing captains" had been provided to the coaches previously, but the category of team leadership included both captains and team officers. Team officers include positions such as club president, match secretary, and club treasurer. As outlined earlier, most collegiate rugby teams function differently than

varsity sports teams, more closely resembling student organizations or clubs, subsequently requiring teams to have these additional leadership positions.

When examining the nine categories, it appears coaches are open to allowing player participation in regard to practices (e.g., scheduling practices) and aspects relating to team cohesion (e.g., team-building), but there were not many categories reflective of players being invited to participate during game time or competition-based decisions. This could be because coaches are inviting players to be included in some decisions, so players feel the benefits of participating and voicing their opinions, yet players do not have the power to make decisions that may influence team performance during competitions.

While some may deem the aforementioned categories trivial, two of these categories proved central to competitive play. The categories of starting lineup and game strategy were directly related to competitions. In some responses, especially within the starting lineup category, coaches specified which players they invite to participate in making decisions. Since coaches were able to write-in their responses, they often clarified in the open-ended space the specific players, in most cases captains, that were being included. For example, one coach answered, "My captains are involved in most decision-making: line-ups, practices, playing time, etc." while another added, "Captains help determine lineup for matches, assist with practices and game strategy." Statements from coaches such as, "The captains select the competition side(s) for the weekend with very little input from the coach," and, "first 15 plus alternates are reviewed with captains before I announce the side to the rest of the team," stress the importance and value of holding team leadership positions, such as a captain role.

In addition, the inclusion of captains opens doors for future research. Since coaches reported inviting players to participate in player selection and starting lineups for competitions, in actuality, they may be inviting only captains or players with formal leadership roles.

Implications

From an organizational communication standpoint, this study offers insight for supervisors and those in leadership positions. From a research and literature standpoint, this study also provides reason for some changes to be made.

Coaches, supervisors in other fields of work, and individuals in leadership positions in general, should be aware that the processes in which they make decisions should not be static, repetitive cycles. Supervisors may lean toward being more democratic or autocratic, however, to make decisions solely using one style could be detrimental. Mykkänen and Tampere (2014) treat organizational decisions as set processes or rituals that must be followed, though that implies that the same process of making decisions will always be employed no matter the situation. Since every decision has unique factors to consider, supervisors may see best results if they strive to analyze situations, individually, to determine the best course of action. In other words, supervisors and those in leadership positions should not have one set way of making decisions, but, rather, possess the ability to make decisions reflective of the various factors in a given situation. Impeding supervisors' abilities to do such may be a result of American society forcing declarative labels on people, such as personality types and decision-making styles. Do leaders need to be assigned these labels exclusively, or should they have the ability to fluctuate? Herein lies the main issue with the current literature

surrounding leadership styles. The rigidness and exclusivity between these two leadership styles may impede a leader's effectiveness, and, as this study suggests, an ability to be either autocratic or democratic, dependent on the situation, may provide a leader and her or his followers the best opportunity for success.

Continuing with this line of thinking, the focus of decision-making styles should not be as polarized as the literature makes it out to be (Lippitt, 1939; Luthar, 1996). The dichotomous perspective of decision-making and leadership tends to view democratic decision-making styles as "right," and autocratic decision-making styles as "wrong" (Bhatti et al., 2012; Luthar, 1996; Sari et al., 2012). For example, if organizations have employees take leadership style tests that result in classifying them as democratic, it is possible this label will result in a self-fulfilling prophecy phenomenon where moving forward, the employee feels obligated to make decisions in a democratic manner. Organizational leaders should not shy away from being authoritative at times, in which they make decisions for the group without member input. However, on the other hand, there are times when supervisors should invite subordinates to communicate about decisions at hand. Every decision ought to be analyzed independently in order to choose how much collaboration should be included.

When the scholarship debate surrounding autocratic and democratic leadership behaviors polarizes the argument, issues arise. This black or white approach between the two categories is classifiable as a false dilemma fallacy (Simonds, Hunt, & Simonds, 2013). Fallacies are arguments built on unsound logic, and a false dilemma exists when a complicated issue or situation, such as decision-making style, asserts that there are only two answers, when, in reality, there are more (Simonds, Hunt, & Simonds, 2013). When

assessments and measures try to classify coaches as either autocratic or democratic, it limits the fluidity and freedoms coaches have to engage in situational approaches. Perhaps coaches use extremely autocratic behaviors when it comes to choosing the starting lineup, however employ democratic behaviors for choosing team leadership roles.

While key situational leadership theorists, Hersey and Blanchard (1969), effectively outline the importance of situational influences of decision-making processes, this approach to decision-making is not apparent in the realm of sports leadership. Previous sports leadership studies (e.g., Carron et al., 2002; Toros et al., 2013; Turman & Schrodt, 2004; Zardoshtian et al., 2012) all use the LSS, which focuses on autocratic and democratic labels, and does not emphasize communication levels, which is at the heart of the decision-making scale items. Scholars should stop focusing on labels, and categorizing traits, such as decision-making and leadership styles, into mutually exclusive classifications.

Approaching autocratic and democratic behaviors on a single, univariate continuum, such as level of collaboration, helps to limit the consequences of dichotomizing behaviors. For example, in this study, combining and reverse scoring LSS items to create one scale, instead of two, reflects coaches' abilities to fall along any point between the two extremes. This is something that has not been done by sports communication scholars in the past due to the heavy reliance on the LSS. Even with the modifications, this univariate continuum still does not accurately portray the situational approach to decision-making. This is because if a coach were to score in the middle, away from the extremes, one conclusion is that coaches engage in situational decision-

making. Some decisions are made with a lot of collaboration from players, and some decisions have no player inclusion, therefore providing a score in the middle. However, perhaps the central score is not because of extremes on each end balancing each other out, but can be attributed to middling scores on all the items. After creating a scatterplot with the data points, there was not a curvilinear relationship.

The uncertainty that comes with this type of finding comprises a drawback to solitary quantitative results: numbers cannot tell a story as well as words. Statistics can reveal relationships, but offer no detailed explanations. Having in-depth qualitative aspects to supplement quantitative results create the best comprehensive conclusions. Further qualitative analysis would have strengthened this study, and perhaps can be implemented moving forward. There are other caveats and future directions surrounding this study to be acknowledged.

Strengths, Limitations, and Directions for Future Research

Strengths and Limitations

This study has several noteworthy strengths. First, the sample was not restricted to a specific geographic area of the United States. Participants reported coaching at schools across the country including California, Texas, Minnesota, Florida, Virginia, New York, and more. If responses were all from one concentrated area of the United States, it would not accurately represent how college rugby coaches make decisions across the country. Intra-cultural differences, based on geographical areas in the United States, play a role in how people communicate and make decisions. The wide range of locations across the country helps to limit the influence intra-cultural differences could have had on this study.

Furthermore, for targeting a very specific population, the sample size was respectable. The fact that rugby is on the rise in the United States means that not every college or university has a team yet. In addition, out of the schools that do have rugby teams, not all have coaches. Since rugby teams are not varsity-sanctioned sports at most schools, they are not afforded with the privilege of having coaches provided through athletic departments. Often times this leaves players with the task of finding coaches themselves, or self-coaching the team. To reach a sample of 130 may not seem like a large number, but after considering the specificity of the target population, it is a noteworthy amount.

As with all scholarship, this study comes with caveats for consideration. One major limitation of this study is that even if positive relationships with winning percentage were discovered, a win can never be a guarantee. Sports leadership scholars Kidman and Hanrahan (2011) reflect this same sentiment perfectly by stating, "winning is important, it is one of the reasons for organised sport; however, as an outcome, it is uncontrollable" (p. 3). Environmental factors (e.g., rain, wind, snow, or heat) can impede performance along with situational factors (e.g., inequity from officials, rowdiness of crowds or unexpected injuries). Rata, Rata, Rata, Mares, and Melinte (2012) found that "fatigue, noise, and weather represent over 50% of the total perturbing factors for the athletes" (p. 370). Higham, Hopkins, Pyne, and Anson (2014), point out that "factors such as players' physiques, fitness and physical ability, skill and technical proficiency are all determinants of the success of a team" (p. 363). Yet, even with the fittest and most talented players, Kidman and Hanrahan (2011) argue, "an athlete can win without performing well and lose even though performance has been outstanding" (p. 17). While

finding the golden formula for team success is desirable, it might be an impossible endeavor.

Commentary from coaches' open-ended answers helped to uncover the next limitation: the importance of considering difficulty of competition. When reporting season records, several coaches would include what division their team competed in that year. Many times, it was noticeable that once moving to a more difficult division, teams' winning percentages dropped. The decrease in team success in those situations would most likely be a result of more difficult opponents, and not due to controllable factors such as decision-making style. As such, it is very difficult on behalf of the researcher to control for this type of effect.

As with any self-reporting measure, caution should be taken when analyzing results. Coaches could perceive themselves to be a democratic decision-maker, but there could be an incongruence with how the players perceive the coach. Coaches could also be hesitant to answer negatively about themselves. Past scholars have noted that coaches' often report lower values for the LSS autocratic behavior items than the other subscales (e.g., Bennett & Maneval, 1988; Dwyer & Fischer, 1998; Salminen & Luikkonen, 1994). This is something to take into consideration, provided that if coaches were self-reporting higher on the autocratic items, future researchers should adjust for this bias accordingly. In this study, the range for composite collaboration levels could be from 1.0 to 5.0; however the actual coaches' scores ranged from 2.78 to 5.0. This means overall, coaches did not self-report low on the democratic items, or high on the autocratic items (which were reversed scored), indicating that coaches may have rated themselves with a bias.

Coaches were responsible for self-reporting season records, which should also be met with some skepticism. It is in the coaches' best interests if season records were reported truthfully, to help enhance and secure the validity of this study. However, it cannot be guaranteed that all records were reported honestly. While there was spot-checking on 10% of the records, there was still a large percentage that were not spot-checked. A hindrance with checking the records individually was that not all teams had an updated website or conference website where records could be retrieved. This would not be an issue if college rugby was structured as formally as college football or other varsity sports, as the national governing body would be responsible for the upkeep of records, and winning percentage would be easily retrievable for all teams. Also, if coaches omitted the question asking which academic institution they coach at, then their responses transformed from confidential to anonymous and there was no way of verifying the reported season records. This study could easily be replicated with other sports where there are reliable locations to find winning percentages. Repeating this study with other sports would also allow potential leadership, decision-making, and communication differences to emerge.

As previously mentioned, many coaches noted in the open-ended question that captains, or players with formal leadership roles, were the ones included in communicating about team decisions. However, this could have skewed the results when reporting the extent to which coaches allow or encourage athletes to communicate during 11 different decision-making scenarios. The purpose of this scale was to see when coaches were inviting the team (majority of players) to communicate about decisions. Unfortunately, the wording of the question may not have been as specific as needed, and

coaches may have interpreted "encourage athletes to communicate," as even just encouraging *some* athletes (e.g., captains) to participate. If this is the case, coaches may have indicated "very often" for the items, but in fact, the team is not offered communication opportunities, just one or two players. This may lead to the stifling of players' opinions, especially if coaches selected captains, and the players do not feel comfortable communicating to the captains. On the other hand, captains usually are intended to be the liaison between coaches and players. If captains can effectively communicate the opinions of players, it may be more effective for coaches to only include these players with leadership positions. This study reveals coaches are inviting players to participate in the decision-making, but it has not been explored in-depth which players are invited, and specifically why these players are included. Besides captains and players holding leadership positions, the other factors influencing the probability of coaches asking for specific players' input merits further investigation.

Directions for Future Research

Hopefully, this inaugural study is one of many to continue exploring the relationship between communication opportunities, decision-making processes and team success. While this study explores the relationship between democratic behaviors (collaboration levels) when making decisions and team success, along with the relationship between communication opportunities and team success, the major missing link is the connection between democratic decision-making and communication opportunities. Does a coach who has a very democratic decision-making style necessarily provide more opportunities for players to communicate? It might be easy to infer that that would be the case, however Chelladurai and Saleh's (1980) LSS does not explicitly focus

on communication opportunities for players. It is the natural next step to explore the direct relationship between the democratic and autocratic behaviors of the LSS and communication opportunities offered. As such, this study can be used as a launching pad for sports and communication scholars to close the gap in the research, which has tiptoed around the communicative nature of the LSS for decades.

Discovering variables that are related to, or predictive of, team success could offer significant competitive advantages to coaches who had access to this information. Due to the communicative nature of this study, the scope remained narrow, looking at a handful of communication scenarios. While this study did not reveal any significant predictors of team success based on the 11 communication opportunities explored, there is still a plethora of variables to be tested. In the realm of communication and beyond, team success is something that both coaches and organizational leaders strive for, and researchers should continue on the quest of finding determinants. This study has eliminated some pieces of the puzzle that proved to be unrelated to team success, so it is up to communication scholars and other researchers to help understand team performance.

How teams appoint captains would be also be a rich avenue to explore from a communication standpoint. On sports teams, captains hold pivotal positions, acting as communication liaisons between coaches and players. Communication is imperative in maintaining positive relationships between all parties. It is clear from the results that coaches are inviting players to communicate when it comes to choosing team leadership positions, as it was one of the most frequently reported scenarios (n = 31). However, the methods of selection are still unknown. If coaches are inviting players to communicate, it

could be through anonymous voting, verbal nominations, one-on-one private meetings, or other approaches; each one with unique advantages and disadvantages.

Furthermore, while incorporating collaborative communication and providing opportunities for feedback is reflective of democratic behaviors, simply asking players for input might not be enough. If leaders ask for opinions and then disregard them, this may be ineffective and even detrimental, potentially leading to skepticism and feelings of disloyalty. It should be explored whether simply asking athletes' opinions is satisfactory for the athletes, or if coaches must be sincere and follow through, implementing athletes' preferences. This would involve approaching communicative processes of decision-making and leadership from athletes' point of views, instead of just the coaches, which would fulfill one of the LSS's three original three purposes.

Chelladurai (1990) recognized the three main purposes of the LSS as: a) to study athletes' preference for specific leader behavior, b) athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behavior, and c) coaches' perception of their own behavior. This study explores coaches' perceptions of themselves. However, coaches' perceptions of themselves may differ from what the athletes prefer, and how the athletes perceive their coaches. In the future, focusing on the remaining purposes would help get a full 360-degree view of the situation regarding coaches' communicative processes when making decisions. There are other factors meriting exploration, such as cultural differences, language barriers, athleticism, team resources, and influence of diversity; however, to expand on each future possibility would be beyond the scope of the present study.

Conclusion

This study highlights relationships between coaches' communicative processes of decision-making and team success, and explores the roles specific communication opportunities play on college rugby teams. The lack of a linear relationship between decision-making style and team success implies that coaches should be flexible and adaptive, not solely utilizing one style over another. The absence of a linear relationship between communicative opportunities for players and team success indicates that there are certain decisions that coaches may want to make independently, while others times may want to include athletes in the process. However, more research needs to explore which communication opportunities are vital to include players, because the 11 communication opportunities examined in this study yielded no significant predictor variables related to winning percentage. It was found that coaches most frequently reported inviting players to make decisions regarding scheduling practices and choosing the starting lineup. The question remains of whether or not they are really inviting all players, or just those who hold leadership positions.

There is still a great deal to learn about coaches' communication habits, and how they make decisions. In the future, qualitatively analyzing these areas may help in providing insight to several of these unanswered questions. Communication is an important concept within the realm of sports and sports leadership, and this study can be a launching pad for many others. While a win can never be guaranteed, there may still be significant communicative variables that are predictive of team success, and if those are discovered in the future, it could be a game changer.

REFERENCES

Aghazadeh, S., & Kyei, K. (2009). A quantitative assessment of factors affecting college sports team unity. *College Student Journal*, *43*, 294-303.

Andersen, N. (2003). The undecidability of decision. In T. Bakken & T. Hernes (Eds). *Autopoietic organization theory: Drawing on Niklas Luhmann's social systems perspective*. Oslo: Copenhagen Business School Press

Andrews, G. M. (2001). The impact of cohesion-performance relationships in competitive cheerleading. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 4*(1), 1-105.

Ardua, C. M., & Marquez, S. (2007). Relation between coaches leadership style and performance in synchronous swimming. *Fitness & Performance Journal, 6*, 394-397. doi: 10.3900/fpj.6.6.394.e

Bales, R. F., & Strodtbeck, F. L. (1951). Phases in group problem solving. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 46*, 485-495.

Baptist, R. W., & Sullivan, K. A. (2015). *My way or the highway: College athletes' perceptions of coach's leadership behaviors*. Paper submitted to the meeting of the National communication Association, under review.

Baraldi, C. (2013). Forms of decision making: Gatekeeping and dialogic coordination in CISV organizational meetings. *Journal of Business Communication, 50*, 339-361. doi: 10.1177/0021943613497055

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Beebe, S. A., & Masterson, J. (1997). *Communicating in small groups: Principles and practices*. New York, NY: Longman Books.

Bennett, G., & Maneval, M. (1998). Leadership styles of elite Dixie youth baseball coaches. *Perceptual & Motor Skills, 87*, 754.

Bennie, A., & O'Connor, D. (2012). Perceptions of strategies of effective coaching leadership: A qualitative investigation of professional coaches and players. *International Journal of Sports and Health Science, 10*, 82-89. doi: 10.5432/ijshs.201222

Bennis, W. G., & Shepard, H. A. (1956). A theory of group development. *Human Relations, 9*, 415-437.

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2011). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Education Limited.

Bhatti, N., Maitlo, G. M., Shaikha, N., Hashmi, M. A., & Shaikh, F. M. (2012). The impact of autocratic and democratic leadership style on job satisfaction. *International Business Research, 5*(2), 192-201. doi: 10.5539/ibr.vn2p192

Bird, A. M. (1977). Development of a model predicting team performance. *Research Quarterly, 48*, 24-32. doi: 10.1080/10671315.1977.10762145

Bisel, R. S., Messersmith, A. S., & Kelley, K. M. (2012). Supervisory-subordinate communication: Hierarchical mum effect meets organizational learning. *Journal of Business Communication, 49*(2), 128-147. doi: 10.1177/0021943612436972

Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., & Bidwell, A. C. (1962). Managerial grid. *Advanced Management- Office Executive, 1*(9), 12-15.

Breckenridge, T., & Cortez, R. (2014). *Colleges with women's rugby programs*. Retrieved from http://usarugby.org/ncaa

Carron, A. V., Colman, M. M., Wheeler, J., & Stevens, D. (2002). Cohesion and performance in sport: A meta analysis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 24*(2), 168-188.

Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 21*(4), 328-354.

Chelladurai, P., & Arnott, M. (1985). Decision styles in coaching: Preferences of basketball players. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 56*(1), 15-24. doi: 10.1080/02701367.1985.10608426

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 2*, 34-45.

Chen, C-C. (2013). How does paternalistic style leadership relate to team cohesiveness in soccer coaching? *Social Behavior and Personality, 4*, 83-94. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2013.41.1.83

Cheney, G., Christensen, L., Zorn, T., & Ganesh, S. (2004). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections, practices.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Clough, J., McCormack, C., & Traill, R. (1993, Winter). A mapping of participation rates in junior sport. *ACHPER National Journal, 40*(2), 4-7.

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

Collignon, A., & Sultan, N. (2014). *Winning in the business of sports*. Paris, France: A.T. Kearney.

Cortini, M. (2009). Does gender make the difference? An analysis on sport coaches. *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities, and Nations, 9*(5), 49-58.

Cunningham, I. J., & Eys, M. A. (2007). Role ambiguity and intra-team communication in interdependent sports teams. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 37*. 2220-2237. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00256.x

DeFreese, J. D., & Smith, A. L. (2013). Teammate social support, burnout, and self-determined motivation in collegiate athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*, 258-265. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.10.009

Derue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology, 64*(1), 7-52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x

Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L. E., & Spangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 17*, 177-193. doi: 10.1108/09534810410530601

Dwyer, J. J. M., & Fischer, D. G. (1988). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 2*, 34-45.

Eilon, S. (1969). What is a decision? *Management Science, 16*, 172-189. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.16.4.B172

Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Falla, J. (1981). *NCAA, the voice of college sports: A diamond anniversary history, 1906-1981*. Mission, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Fisher, B. A. (1970). Decision emergence: Phases in group decision-making. *Speech Monographs, 37*, 53-66.

Fletcher, R. B., & Roberts, M. H. (2013). Longitudinal stability of the leadership scale for sports. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise, 17*(2), 89-104. doi: 10.1080/1091367X.2013.761021

Fritz, C. O., Morris, P. E., & Richler, J. J. (2012). Effect size estimates: Current use, calculations, and interpretation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*(1), 2-18. doi: 10.1037/a0024338

Germain, M. (2012). Traits and skills theories as the nexus between leadership and expertise: Reality or fallacy? *Performance Improvement, 51*(5), 32-39. doi: 10.1002/pfi.21265

Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (2004). Analysis of coaching science research published from 1970-2001. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 75*, 388-402.

Gillet, N., Vallerand, R. J., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coaches' autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*(2), 155-161. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.10.004

Gould, D., Voelker, D. K., & Griffes, K. (2013). Best coaching practices for developing team captains. *Sport Psychologist, 27*(1), 13-26.

Gouran, D. S. (1982). *Making decisions in groups: Choices and consequences*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Grimes, D. S., & Richard, O. C. (2003). Could communication form impact organizations' experience with diversity? *Journal of Business Communication, 40* (1), 7-27. doi: 10.1177/002194360304000102

Gruing, J. E., & Dozier, D. M. (2002). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guenzi, P., & Ruta, D. (2013). *Leading teams: Tools and techniques for successful team leadership from the sports world.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hastie, P. A. (1995). Factors affecting coaching preferences of secondary school volleyball players. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 80*, 347-350. doi: 10.2466/pms.1995.80.1.347

Hellstedt, J. C. (1987). The coach/parent/athlete relationship. *Sport Psychologist, 1*, 151-160.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal, 23*(5), 26-35.

Higham, D. G., Hopkins, W. G., Pyne, D. B., & Anson, J. M. (2014). Performance indicators related to points scoring and wining in international rugby sevens. *Journal of Sports Science & Medicine, 13*, 358-364.

Hirsch, M. S., & Kinal, T. S. (2012, August 8). Five coaching strengths that produce champions. *Harvard Business Review.* Retrieved from https://hbr.org/2012/08/five-coaching-strengths

Holtzhausen, D. R. (2002). The effects of workplace democracy on employee communication: Implications for competitive advantage. *Competitiveness Review, 12*(2), 30-48. doi: 10.1108/eb046440

Janis, I. L. (1972). *Victims of groupthink.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Janis, I. L. (1982). *Groupthink: Psychological studies of policy decisions and fiascoes* (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Johnson, G. (2015, January 17). *NCAA DII, DIII, membership approves sand volleyball as 90th championship*. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.com/news/ncaa/article/2015-01-17/ncaa-dii-diii-membership-approves-sand-volleyball-90th-championship

Jones, A., & Kijeski, T. (2009, November). *The relationship of team cohesion on performance among collegiate athletic teams competing in coactive team sports*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Communication Association 95th Annual Convention, Chicago, IL.

Jowett, S., Lafreniere, M. K., & Vallerand, R. J. (2012). Passion for activities and relationship quality: A dyadic approach. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 30*, 734-749. doi: 10.1177/0265407512467748

Jurko, D., Tomljanović, M., & Čular, D. (2013). Initial validation of coaching behavior scales in volleyball. *Sport Scientific and Practical Aspects, 10*(1), 47-40.

Kassing, J. W., & Infante, D. A. (1999). Aggressive communication in the coach-athlete relationship. *Communication Research Reports, 16*, 110–120. doi: 10.1080=08824099909388708

Katz, N. (2001). Sports teams as a model for workplace teams: Lessons and liabilities. *Academy of Management Executive, 15*(3), 56-69. doi: 10.5465/AME.2001.5229533

Kenow, L., & Williams, J. M. (1999). Coach-athlete compatibility and athlete's perception of coaching behaviors. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 22*, 251-260.

Kidman, L. (2010). *Athlete-centered coaching: Developing decision makers*. Worcester, UK: Innovative Print Communications.

Kidman, L., & Hanrahan, S. J. (2011). *The coaching process: A practical guide to becoming an effective sports coach*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kirkpatrick, S. A., & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*(2), 48-60. doi: 10.5465/AME.1991.4274679

Kozub, S. A., & Button, C. J. (2000). Original contributions: The influence of a competitive outcome on perceptions of cohesion in rugby and swimming teams. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 31*, 82-95.

Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *Journal of Social Psychology, 10*(2), 271-301. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366

Lippitt, R. (1939). Field theory and experiment in social psychology: Autocratic and democratic group atmospheres. *American Journal of Sociology, 45*(1), 26-49.

Luthar, H. K. (1996). Gender differences in evaluation of performance and leadership ability: Autocratic vs. democratic managers. *Sex Roles, 35*(5-6), 337-361.

Mach, M., Dolan, S., & Tzafrir, S. (2010). The differential effect of team members' trust on team performance: The mediation role of team cohesion. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 83*, 771-794. doi: 10.1348/096317909X473903

Mack, M. G. (1999). Pep talks--- why didn't my team "win one for the Gipper." *Sport Journal, 2*(1), 1-2.

Martens, R., & Peterson, J. A. (1971). Group cohesiveness as a determinant of success and member satisfaction in team performance. *International Review of Sport Sociology, 6*, 49-61. doi: 10.108003634520320 000085063

Matheson, H., Mathes, S., & Murray, M. (1997). The effect of winning and losing on female interactive and coaching team cohesion. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 20*, 284-289.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 1*(2). Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385#gcit

Mohammadzade, Y., Zardoshtian, S., & Hossini, R. N. S. (2012). The relationship between leadership styles of coaches with motivational climate of Iranian elite male volleyball players. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 2*(1), 91-95.

Mykkänen, M., & Tampere, K. (2014, June). Organizational decision making: The Luhmannian decision communication perspective. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, 5*(4), 131-145.

Nacar, E. (2013). A study on leadership styles of coaches of the Turkish professional handball first league. *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 7*, 612-617.

Northouse, P. G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Officer, S. A., & Rosenfeld, L. B. (1985). Self-disclosure to male and female coaches by female high school athletes. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 7*, 360-379.

Park, J. G., & Kwon, B. (2013). Literature review on shared leadership in teams. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics, 1*(3), 28-36.

Parrott, R., & Duggan, A. (1999). Using coaches as role models of Sun protection for youth: Georgia's "Got Youth Covered" project. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 27*(2), 107-119. doi: 10.1080/00909889909365529

Peterson, T. M. (2007). Motivation: How to increase project team performance. *Project Management Journal, 38*(4), 60-69. doi: 10.1002/pmj.20019

Petrick, J. A., Scherer, R. F., Brodzinski, J. D., Quinn, J. F., & Ainina, M. F. (1999). Global leadership skills and reputational capital: Intangible resources for sustainable competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Executive, 13*(1), 58-69. doi: 10.5465/AME.1999.1567322

Politi, M. C., & Street, R. L. (2011). The importance of communication in collaborative decision making: Facilitating shared mind and the management of uncertainty. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice, 17*, 579-584. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2753.2010.01549.x

Pratt, S. R., & Eitzen, D. S. (1989). Contrasting leadership styles and organizational effectiveness: The case of athletic teams. *Social Science Quarterly, 70*, 311-322.

Rata, G., Rata, B. C., Rata, M., Mares, G., & Melinte, M. (2012). Verbal and nonverbal communication during hammer throw training and competitions. *Ovidius University Annals, Series Physical Education and Sport/Science, Movement and Health, 12*, 370-377.

Roberts, G. C. (1984). Achievement motivation in children's sport. In J. G. Nicholls (Eds.), *Advances in motivation and achievement*: *Vol. 3* (pp. 251-281). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Saaty, T. L. (1999). *Decision making for leaders: The analytical hierarchy process for decisions in a complex world.* Pittsburgh, PA: RWS Publications.

Salminen, S., & Luikkonen, J. (1994). The convergent and discriminant validity of the coach's version of the leadership scale for sports. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 25*, 119-127.

Sari, I., Soyer, F., & Yigiter, K. (2012). The relationship among sports coaches' perceived leadership behaviours, athletes' communication skills and satisfaction of the basic psychological needs: A study on athletes. *International Journal of Academic Research, 4*(1), 112-119.

Sherman, C. A., Fuller, R., & Speed, H. D. (2000). Gender comparisons of preferred coaching behaviours in Australian sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 23*(4), 389-406.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1995). *Fundamentals of organizational communication: Knowledge, sensitivity, skills, values* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

Simonds, C. J., Hunt, S. K., & Simonds, B. K. (2013). *Communication as critical inquiry* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Small, E. E., & Rentsch, J. R. (2010). Shared leadership in teams: A matter of distribution. *Journal of Personal Psychology, 9*(4), 203-211.

Sports and Fitness Industry Association. (2013). *U.S. trends in team sports.* Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Sports and Fitness Industry Association. (2014). *U.S. trends in team sports.* Silver Spring, MD: Author.

Stagnaro, C., & Piotrowski, C. (2014). Shared leadership: A critical component in IT project management. *Journal of Technology Research, 5,* 1-22.

Tannenbaum, A. S., & Schmidt, W. H. (1958). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review, 36,* 95-101.

Timmerman, T. A. (2000). Racial diversity, age diversity, interdependence, and team performance. *Small Group Research, 31*(5), 592-606. doi: 10.1177/104649640003100505

Toros, T., Salman, M., & Sari, I. (2013). The comparison of sports coaches' pre-season, in-season, and post-season leadership behaviours in terms of sports psychology. *International Journal of Human Sciences, 10*(1), 237-245.

Turman, P. D. (2003). Athletic coaching from an instructional perspective: The influence of coach experience on high school wrestlers' preferences and perceptions of coaching behaviors across a season. *Communication Education, 52*(2), 73-86. doi: 10.1080/036345 20302465

Turman, P. D., & Schrodt, P. (2004). New avenues for instructional communication research: Relationships among coaches' leadership behaviors and athletes' affective learning. *Communication Research Reports, 21*(2), 130-143. doi: 10.1080/08824090409359975

Van Loveren, R. K. (2007). *The effects of decision-making and leadership styles on relationships and perceived effectiveness in the university development context* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of South Florida, Tampa, FL.

Vargas-Tonsing, T. M., & Guan, J. (2007). Athletes' preferences for informational and emotional pre-game speech content. *International Journal of Sports Sciences and Coaching, 2*, 171-180. doi: 10.1260/174795407781394338

Vealey, R. S., Armstrong, L., Comar, W., & Greenleaf, C. A. (1998). Influence of perceived coaching behaviors on burnout and competitive anxiety in female college athletes. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 10*, 297-318. doi: 10.1080/10413209808406395

Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The kappa statistic. *Family Medicine, 37*, 360-363.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park CA: Sage Publications.

Weiss, O. (1996). Sports as a social substitution: Pseudosocial relationships with sports figures. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 31*(1), 109-117. doi: 10.1177/101269029603100106

Westre, K. R., & Weiss, M. R. (1991). The relationship between perceived coaching behaviors and group cohesion in high school football teams. *The Sport Psychologist, 5*, 41-54.

Wren, J. T. (1995). *The leader's companion: Insights on leadership through the ages*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Yeung, L. (2004). The paradox of control in participative decision-making: Gatekeeping discourse in banks. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 2004*, 83-104. doi: 10.1515/ijsl.2004.016

Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zardoshtian, S., Hossini, R. N. S., & Mohammadzade, Y. (2012). The relationship between leadership styles of coaches with self-determination and burn-out of the Iranian elite female volleyball players. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business & Social Sciences, 2*(1), 30-37

APPENDIX A

ONLINE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you agree to participate?

o Yes, I am at least 18 years old and agree to participate
o No, I do not wish to participate, or I am not 18 years old

2. Indicate your self-assessment of the following statements regarding your coaching style and how you make decisions for your **current** team. The number options are:
(1) Never = ~0% of the time
(2) Rarely = ~25% of the time
(3) Occasionally = ~50% of the time
(4) Often = ~75% of the time
(5) Very Often = ~100% of the time

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
a. Ask for the opinion of athletes on strategies for specific competitions	o	o	o	o	o
b. Get group approval on important matters before going ahead with the decision	o	o	o	o	o
c. Let her or his athletes share in the decision-making process	o	o	o	o	o
d. Encourage athletes to make suggestions for ways of conducting practices	o	o	o	o	o
e. Let the group set its own goals	o	o	o	o	o
f. Let athletes try their own way, even if they make mistakes	o	o	o	o	o

g. Ask for the opinion of athletes on important coaching matters	o	o	o	o	o	
h. Let athletes work at their own speed	o	o	o	o	o	
i. Let athletes decide on the plays to be used in a game	o	o	o	o	o	
j. Work relatively independently of the athletes	o	o	o	o	o	
k. Not explain her or his decisions	o	o	o	o	o	
l. Refuse to compromise on a decision that has been made	o	o	o	o	o	
m. Keep to herself or himself	o	o	o	o	o	
n. Speak in a manner not to be questioned	o	o	o	o	o	

3. Indicate to what extent you allow or encourage athletes to communicate during the following decision-making scenarios. The number options are:
(1) Never = ~0% of the time
(2) Rarely = ~25% of the time
(3) Occasionally = ~50% of the time
(4) Often = ~75% of the time
(5) Very Often = ~100% of the time
(6) Not Applicable

	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
a. Regarding practice plans or drills	o	o	o	o	o	o
b. Scheduling practices (times, days, lengths)	o	o	o	o	o	o
c. Additional workouts/other training outside of team practices	o	o	o	o	o	o
d. Post-game or post-season feedback for improvement	o	o	o	o	o	o
e. Crafting team policies/disciplinary actions	o	o	o	o	o	o
f. Choosing captains	o	o	o	o	o	o

g. Selecting the starting lineup and playing time for competitions	o	o	o	o	o	o
h. Uniform and apparel choices	o	o	o	o	o	o
i. Athletes returning to play post-injuries	o	o	o	o	o	o
j. Team bonding and team building activities	o	o	o	o	o	o
k. Non-conference play (e.g., tournaments and scrimmages)	o	o	o	o	o	o

4. *Other 1*: Please provide another decision-making scenario not listed above (text box)

5. Indicate to what extent you allow or encourage athletes to communicate during the scenario that you provided in question 4 (Other 1)

1 o 2 o 3 o 4 o 5 o 6 o

6. *Other 2*: Please provide another decision-making scenario not listed above (text box)

7. Indicate to what extent you allow or encourage athletes to communicate during the scenario that you provided in question 6 (Other 2)

1 o 2 o 3 o 4 o 5 o 6 o

8. *Other 3*: Please provide another decision-making scenario not listed above (text box)

9. Indicate to what extent you allow or encourage athletes to communicate during the scenario that you provided in question 8 (Other 3)

1 o 2 o 3 o 4 o 5 o 6 o

10. What are the top three scenarios in which you most frequently involve players in the decision-making process?

Scenario 1:	
Scenario 2:	
Scenario 3:	

11. Who makes the final decisions?

o Coach (Yourself)
o Players

12. How many years have you been coaching rugby?	
13. How many years have you been coaching your *current* team?	
14. What is the sex of the current rugby team you coach?	o Female o Male o Co-Ed
15. What is your ethnic background/race?	o African American o Asian/Pacific Islander o Caucasian/Anglo-European o Latina/Latino o Middle Eastern o Native American Indian o Bi-Racial/Multi-racial/Other, please specify
16. What is your age?	
17. What is your sex?	o Female o Male

18. If applicable, please list up to the last three collegiate conference season records of your current team when you were coach. (If you have only coached two seasons on current team, provide two records).

Format
Year: Wins-Losses-Ties
Example: Season: 2014: 5-3-0

Season:	
Season:	
Season:	

19. What is the name of the academic institution at which you coach?

Credit Line:
Items 2a-n were reprinted, with permission, from P. Chelladurai and S.D. Saleh, 1980, "Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development of a leadership scale," *Journal of Sport Psychology* 2(1): 34-45.