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(ABSTRACT)

Throughout history men have been divided into groups, and attitudes have often been formed according to these groups. This study examined the attitudes of faculty members, as a group, toward intercollegiate athletics and student athletes. Three concepts were used to analyze the data. First, Rokeach's idea of attitudes-toward-an-object verses attitudes-toward-a-situation was utilized. Second, Allport's Contact Hypothesis was tested. Third, Sumner's notion of the in-group was incorporated.

Types of analysis used were Chi square, regression, and Pearson r correlation. The analysis revealed several interesting things. The initial finding was that faculty members were unable to distinguish between the object (student athletes) and the situation (intercollegiate athletics) in terms of their attitudes. Other results indicated that the experience of attending athletic events was the best predictor of attitudes. Those subjects who attended games frequently had less negative, or slightly more positive,
attitudes than other subjects. It was also found that subjects, other than the avid spectators, had very little variance in their attitudes. The results of this study have important implications for defining the role of intercollegiate athletics in the university setting.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

The concept of separating people into groups according to particular characteristics dates back almost as long as there have been men. Throughout history, men have distinguished groups of "other" people and clearly differentiated between "us" and "them". Groups have been formed along the lines of kinship, faith, politics, culture and tradition, and real or imagined racial differences. These concepts form the foundation of folkways and mores. One of the landmark works in this area is Folkways by William Graham Sumner (1904). As he developed the specifics of the principles of folkways and mores, Sumner introduced and popularized the terms "in-group" and "out-group". It is impossible to separate folkways and mores from in-group and out-group; they are intertwined and go hand in hand. These are some of the most basic tenets of the study of group relations.

The factors mentioned above have served, separately or in combination, as the basis of in-group solidarity and ethnocentric pride. This practice has existed from the earliest man, as shown by ancient wall drawings, to modern man; virtually no race or society of man has been exempt from this practice (Rose, 1968: 11-29).

Chapter I
Along the same lines, Robert Park (1950) holds that all humans have the tendency to develop prejudices. "Prejudice, . . . no matter have reprehensible in itself, is a profoundly human phenomenon" (Park: 230). These prejudices begin almost simultaneously with life; the traditions with which men are born become infused with prejudices. Then, along the way, more prejudices are acquired. Park believes that man is unable to think a thought, regardless how original it may be, that does not have a "credit base"; that is, all thoughts have a basis in some previous thought or experience. For Park (1950: 230), "A man without prejudices is a man without conviction, and ultimately without character". Park goes on to reason that prejudice is as natural as friends and friendships; all of our sentiments are based upon and supported by prejudices. Prejudice has its origin in the very nature of man and is fixed into every part of man's life and society. Therefore, prejudice is a social attitude which cannot be denied (Park: 230-31).

The word prejudice derived from the Latin noun 'praecjudicum', like many words, has undergone changes in its meaning since its origin. The first meaning of prejudice was a judgement based on previous decisions and experiences. Later, the meaning became a judgement formed before due examination and consideration of the facts—a premature or hasty judgement. Finally it came to mean a favorableness or unfavorableness that accompanies such a prior and unsupported
judgement (Allport, 1958: 6-7). Allport cautions that, although prejudice is most commonly used in reference to negative feelings, prejudice can be applied to positive or negative attitudes (Allport: 7).

Social scientists have studied prejudice and attitudes in a variety of situations. Thomas and Znaniecki were the first to give systematic priority to this concept. The sociological study of The Polish Peasant by Thomas and Znaniecki (1918) is credited as being among the first studies to propose that social attitudes are the fulcrum of social psychology and, therefore, an integral part of sociology.

Muzafer Sherif (1958) conducted studies on the interactions between groups. Sherif first specifies that persons within a group have shared attitudes, sentiments, aspirations, and goals that are related to and implicit in the common values or norms of the group (Sherif: 350). It is asserted here that faculty members comprise a group. This study seeks to learn if faculty members of schools of one athletic conference, as a group, have a set of shared attitudes about intercollegiate athletics and student athletes.

"Athletics is a small part of the higher education industry; it accounts for not more than about 1 percent of the $55 billion currently spent by institutions of higher learning" (Atwell, 1979: 367). Further, athletes participating in college athletics represent a very small proportion of total enrollment at colleges and universities. Only about
60 percent of colleges and universities have intercollegiate athletic programs. Yet, these figures are not truly representative of the importance of intercollegiate sports on the national scene. As Atwell notes, some highly distinguished universities are better known for their athletic accomplishments than for their scholarship. And certainly no other subject can stir the interests of the alumni or governing board more quickly or more intensely than athletics (Atwell: 367-68). In consideration of the positive and negative media attention given to intercollegiate athletics and student athletes and the prominent position occupied by them in society, it would seem important to conduct a systematic inquiry into attitudes about intercollegiate athletics and student athletes.

The field of the Sociology of Sport has a varied library of literature and research. Studies on high school sport and athletes have focused on athletes' status (Coleman, 1961; Cusick, 1973) or on athletes' academic achievement (Davis and Cooper, 1934; Eidsmore, 1961; 1963). There is a separate branch of studies on women in sport. Generally, these studies have targeted the appropriateness of female participation in sport (Gilbert and Williamson, 1973; Harris, 1971, Metheny, 1965), female socialization into sport (Greendorfer, 1978; Hart, 1971), and the traditional stereotypes about femininity, females, and sport (Hall, 1978; Birrell, 1978). There is also an arm of the discipline that has looked at
attitudes; however, these studies have been centered on race relations within sport (Chu and Griffey, 1985; Czula, 1978; Ibrahim, 1968; Kraus, 1968; Rees and Miracle, 1984; Sargent, 1972; McClendon, 1972). These works, by and large, have attempted to measure social integration in sport using the contact hypothesis. This hypothesis asserts that feelings of prejudice can be changed through exposure to the object of those feelings. For the most part, the contact hypothesis has been confirmed in sport.

**Historical Overview of College Sports and Faculty**

Yet, for all of the work in the Sociology of Sport, the surveys on high school athletes' status by Coleman and Cusick are the ones that most closely approximate probes into attitudes toward athletics and athletes. Clearly, it is time for the study of sport to take its place among studies of other societal institutions. Since intercollegiate athletics and student athletes and faculty members are parts of the same larger educational institution, faculty members appear to be a logical starting point for such an investigation.

Even as far back as the early part of this century, academicians have voiced concerns about the state of intercollegiate athletics. Slosson (1910) cites instances of faculty members questioning the legitimacy and propriety of college sport. This continued into the 1930s when faculties criticized intercollegiate athletics for the corruption
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in recruiting and exorbitant financial expenditures (Nixon, 1976: 63). In more recent times, a major confrontation has occurred between university faculty and an athletic program. This confrontation, of course, resulted in the famous Kemp Trial at the University of Georgia. This legal battle came about as the result of one faculty member, Jan Kemp, speaking out against favoritism for student athletes. During the course of the trial, a number of irregularities were brought to light that only served to create a larger chasm between the faculty and the athletic department (Associated Press, 1986A; 1986B).

What are the implications of reports such as these? How might they affect a university and/or athletic program? Although only one part, the faculty is an admittedly powerful part of a college in most cases. The faculty, as a whole, has the potential to heavily influence the administration and its decisions on a number of fronts, one of which is athletics. In fact, the faculty just might have the ability to cancel the school's intercollegiate athletic program all together, or to at least severely reduce it. With this in mind, it would seem that athletic departments would be most interested in the opinions and attitudes of faculty members toward their programs and student athletes. In addition, faculty members are in a unique position to view athletics and student athletes from rather an insider's perspective. This also makes the faculty attitude an important one.

Chapter I
Much has been written on how the faculty as a unit can and should use its influence on the athletic programs in colleges and universities. There have been numerous local, state, and national committees and commissions, comprised of faculty members, formed to discuss these matters. From these commissions have come a variety of suggestions for changes in the current state of intercollegiate athletics; however, far too often college presidents and other officials seem to prefer to hide behind smokescreens rather than confront the problems and issues. These suggestions for improvements are frequently met with polite indifference. The handful of presidents who have stepped forward to deal with the issues get branded as "Robin Hoods". George Hanford has come to be respected as one of the leading voices on intercollegiate athletics. Hanford (1979) has described the state of college sport in terms similar to those above. However, he feels that perhaps the crux of the problem is that the role of intercollegiate athletics in the educational setting has not been clearly defined. Hanford insists that problems of financing, principle, and practice cannot be resolved until the question of role has been resolved (Hanford: 362-65). Harry Marmion (1979) presented policy statements made by the American Council on Education. Although these statements covered a wide range of topics, there was one underlying theme. That theme was the same as Hanford's--the role of intercollegiate
athletics. Marmion also urged action in setting the role of college sports.

Obviously this is an area in which faculty members could make a difference. Faculty could play a major part in determining what the role of athletics is. In a practical application, it would be important to know what faculty members perceive the role of athletics to be currently and what they perceive the role should be. This perspective makes the faculty attitude additionally vital.

Statement of the Problem

This study investigates college faculty members for their attitudes toward intercollegiate student athletes and intercollegiate athletics. There are three different concepts which will be tested with respect to this sample. Those concepts are 1) attitude-toward-an-object verses attitude-toward-a-situation, 2) the contact hypothesis, and 3) in-group attitudes verses out-group attitudes.
CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Sociology is the study of groups of men in society as opposed to the study of individuals, as in psychology. Since men have always, somewhat naturally, selected themselves into groups, it followed that some scholars would be interested in how those groups are formed and how they act and interact. Studies on the interactions of groups have covered a variety of approaches. Some of them have looked simply at the existence of an attitude, such as prejudice; one example is the work by Ferber, Huber, and Spitze (1979) on preferences for men as bosses and professionals. Another topic has been the attempt to bring about change in attitudes, particularly those of negative prejudice. McKee McClendon dealt with this in a study of college basketball teams and racial prejudice. A third area of research has focused on the behavior resulting from attitudes; most commonly, the behavior is discrimination. Ferber and Loeb (1973) present work on discrimination among male and female college faculty.

This study looked at attitudes of college faculty members toward student athletes and intercollegiate athletics. Unfortunately, to simply ask "What is your attitude about
such-and-such?" is not manageable. Therefore, this work was divided into three analytical approaches.

A. Object vs. Situation

The first approach involved attitudes toward an object and toward a situation. For the most part, attitude theorists have been interested in the theory and measurement of attitudes toward objects, across situations. The term object can refer to a concrete or abstract thing such as a person, a group, an institution, or an issue. Rokeach (1968;1972) suggests that researchers should also consider attitudes toward situations, which can be any dynamic event or activity (Rokeach, 1968: 118). There are scales that measure attitudes toward Blacks, Russians, the church, education, and labor. However, there are not scales that measure attitudes toward situations such as eating in a restaurant, driving a bus, or selling real estate. In other words, the study of attitudes-toward-objects has become separate from the study of attitudes-toward-situations. To account for behaviors in specific social situations, social scientists have developed new concepts like "legal constraints", "social pressure", and "definition-of-the-situation" (Rokeach, 1968: 119). In Rokeach's opinion, this separation has retarded the growth of attitude theory. One result has been a failure to appre- ciate that an attitude object is always encountered within
some situation, about which there is also an organized attitude (Rokeach, 1968: 119).

Some of Rokeach's ideas were built upon the work of Carlson (1956). Carlson speaks of an attitude toward Blacks about a certain event, for example moving into white neighborhoods. If this is one attitude, then there must be literally hundreds, even thousands, of attitudes toward the Black: attitudes toward Blacks "going to white schools", "swimming in white pools", "using white beaches", and so forth. Rokeach criticised Carlson saying that in this approach the concept of attitude loses its conceptual power (Rokeach, 1968: 129). Therefore, it seems more appropriate to say that the way someone feels about Blacks "moving into white neighborhoods" involves the activation of at least two attitudes that interact with one another. One attitude concerns the Black as an attitude object; the other concerns the everyday activity of living in the neighborhood, or the situation.

Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) have tested this proposition with college students. The students were asked about cutting classes and whether the cuts were motivated by attitudes toward the professor or the general activity of going to class. The results showed that a measure using the attitudes on both of these questions was a considerably better indicator of behavior.
Although this study did not follow through to measure behaviors, it is logical to heed Rokeach's words. The attitude of faculty members toward both an object and a situation must be considered and compared. The object here was to be the collegiate student athlete. The situation was to be the general athletic situation, both in the individual institution and in the broader scope. A thorough comparison must be made of the attitudes toward the object and the situation in order to see if they are consistent with one another.

B. The Contact Hypothesis

Perhaps Gordon Allport and his book, *The Nature of Prejudice*, are the most frequently cited sources on prejudice and group relations. Allport gives an expansive definition of prejudice which has already been reported. In addition to that, Allport believes that prejudice would often be more appropriately called "prejudgement" because it is an opinion formed with a lack of information. He goes on to say that "prejudgements become prejudices only if they are not reversible when exposed to new knowledge" (Allport: 9). This also implies that a prejudice is not necessarily based on a lack of sufficient information; a person might have a lot of information about something and still have a negative attitude toward it.

As is evident from his definition, Allport feels that prejudice is commonly due to a lack of knowledge about a
given thing or group of people. Remember in his definition of prejudice he states that a prejudgement becomes a prejudice only if it is not reversible when exposed to new knowledge. However, Allport believes that prejudice can also be changed or affected. Allport outlines several types of contacts and their effects, or lack thereof, on prejudice; yet, he comes to one conclusion. That conclusion is that, in general, prejudice may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. If the contact is sanctioned by institutional supports and leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of two groups, the effect of the contact on prejudice is greatly enhanced (Allport: 250-67).

The notion of equal-status shows the influence of Robin Williams on Allport's work. Williams (1947) asserts that in order for research on intergroup relations to be effective, it must be oriented in terms of the total social system in which they occur (Williams: 47). This includes far more factors than the few issues upon which a prejudice may be centered. In other words, individuals must interact as functional equals to accomplish any lessening of prejudice.

Going back to Allport, Allport expands Williams' concepts to set the conditions under which prejudice can be reduced. Allport's efforts yielded four conditions; prejudice is lessened when the two groups: (1) possess equal status, (2) seek common goals, (3) are cooperatively dependent upon
each other, and (4) interact with the positive support of authorities, laws, or customs (Allport: 252-54, 263-65).

There are a few drawbacks for this study in trying to test Allport's Contact Hypothesis. First of all, there are no data measuring the subjects' attitudes toward athletes and athletics prior to contact with them. In fact, it is possible that the subjects have had some level of contact with athletes and athletics throughout most of their lives. Secondly, the conditions of contact in this study do not match the conditions set forth by Allport. The fourth condition is met, the interaction between faculty members and student athletes and athletics is supported by the authorities of the institution, or the school administration. In the third condition, dependent cooperation is sought. Faculty members are not cooperatively dependent on student athletes or athletics in the normal university setting; student athletes are dependent on faculty in some respects. However, there is an attempt within the institution at large for the faculty and athletics to display cooperation for the good of the whole institution. Idealistically, the second goal of seeking common goals is in place in this study. In theory, all components of the university seek to advance the goal of providing an educational experience for its students. Working on the assumption that the education of students is the goal of faculty members, it was be determined if faculty members feel that athletics are in pursuit of a common goal. The
condition of equal status is not met for faculty and student athletes, except to consider faculty who previously were athletes as quasi-equals. It might also be purported that these faculty and student athletes are seeking or have sought common goals. Theoretically, faculty members and the athletic department personnel are of equal status as separate components of the university. For the purpose of this study, that equal status will be assumed. However, there is no way to accurately determine if this is correct at this time.

Numerous researchers have worked with Allport's theory or with concepts closely resembling it. Among them have been Homans (1950), Rokeach (1960), Byrne and Wong (1962), Triandis (1961), Stein, Hardyck, and Smith (1965), and Robinson and Preston (1976). George Homans is often cited as one of the leaders of the study of groups; his premiere work is The Human Group (1950). In this book, Homans covers a variety of groups, focusing on different elements of group dynamics in each study. One group examined was a group of workers in a Western Electric plant. A segment of this particular work dealt with the mutual interaction and sentiment of the members of the group of workers. In this section, Homans discusses concepts very similar to those later developed and labelled by Allport as the Contact Hypothesis. One of Homans' hypotheses is that "persons who interact frequently with one another tend to like one another" (Homans: 111). He later refined this to read "If the frequency of
interaction between two or more persons increases, the degree of their liking for one another will increase, and vice versa (Homans: 112). Homans' was able to bear these hypotheses out in his observations of the workers.

Jerry Robinson and James Preston (1976) conducted a study on racial desegregation of faculty in public schools. The study was a test of Allport's Contact Hypothesis. In this research some teachers were exposed to institute training sessions where teachers of both races were present; other teachers did not participate in the institute training sessions. All subjects had been interviewed prior to the training sessions to determine their racial attitudes. Following the training sessions, all subjects were again checked on racial attitudes. The results showed a marked decrease in racial prejudice by teachers who were involved in the training sessions while other teachers did not show a decrease in racial prejudice. Thus, Allport's premise was once again supported.

Each of the researchers listed above found support for the notion of prejudice reduction through contact. This study attempted to follow suit. As mentioned before, one drawback of this study is that there was no previous measure of attitude. Therefore, a proper comparison after contact could not be made. Still, it could be seen if there was currently a difference in attitude between those subjects who have had contact and those who have not.

Chapter II
C. The In-group

The third analytical device to be considered was that of the in-group. While developing the concepts of folkways and mores, William Graham Sumner popularized the use of the terms "in-group" and "out-group". Sumner leads to the concept of in-group through a discussion of tradition and its restraints. He describes the manner in which children learn customs from their parents and grandparents and, thus, perpetuate small groups with characteristics pertaining to that group (Sumner: 11-12). This type of characteristic is evident in groups other than family groups. In all groups, there is some commonality which draws the members together and holds them together. These groups are called "in-groups"; persons not possessing the critical trait are considered to be part of an "out-group" (Sumner: 12). As a rule, the sentiment by the in-group members is favorable toward the in-group and its members and unfavorable, to varying degrees, toward out-groups. Each group looks to protect its interests against conflicting interests of other groups. All members support and defend their group (Sumner: 12). Perhaps Sherif sums it up best with the following observation. He notes that in the process of interaction among members "an ingroup is endowed with positive qualities which tend to be praiseworthy, self-justifying, and even self-glorifying" (Sherif: 351).
Hubert Blalock has also been instrumental in advancing the field of minority group relations. In one of his works, Blalock (1967) explains the differences in attitudes of persons as directed toward their in-group or an out-group. What Blalock found was that even low-status members of the in-group are seen considerably more positively than high-status members of an out-group. Thus, in-group members reserve favorable attitudes for members of their own group (Blalock 1967: 52). In a later piece, Blalock suggests that persons select themselves into and out of groups according to the match in their own attitudes and values and those of the particular group (Blalock, 1982: 23).

Homans also extended his ideas to address sentiment within a group. He surmised that the members of a group would develop similar attitudes, sentiments, and behaviors. The notion of similar attitudes within an in-group is what is interesting to this study. Homans found similar attitudes in both the Western Electric workers group and in the Norton Street Gang (Homans: 108-30,156-89). In instances when attitudes referred to the group itself and its members, the attitudes were positive, or favorable. In other words, those in the in-group approved of the in-group.

In-group memberships are not permanently fixed. For certain purposes an individual may affirm one category of membership, for other purposes a slightly larger category. It depends on his need for self-enhancement" (Allport: 34).
It is logical to reason that persons may well retain the positive attitudes toward a group even after they have left the group. This idea may apply particularly well to this study. Some subjects were, at one time, members of the athletic in-group. One can leave this in-group under amicable conditions, such as when one's eligibility is completed. Might not subjects who were athletes, or who identify with that in-group, retain favorable attitudes toward their previous in-group?
CHAPTER III

Methodology and Hypotheses

A. Methodology

The data for this project have been gathered through the distribution and return of a survey questionnaire. (See Appendix A.) The questionnaires were sent to one hundred faculty members at each school of one athletic conference. The conference is composed of eight NCAA Division I schools; all schools are universities. The sample was randomly obtained. Four hundred and sixteen questionnaires were returned for a return rate of approximately 51 percent.

The questionnaire is made up primarily of Likert-type items. This yields ordinal level data for analyzation; however, as is common with Likert item data, the data was treated as interval. Two items which were used were not Likert-type, though they were ordinal variables. These two variables received different analysis than the other dependent variables. All independent variables were treated as discrete dichotomous variables.

The independent variables that were used are V9 'high school athlete', V10 'college athlete', V12 'attends athletic events', V13 'taught student athletes in the past year', V13B 'taught student athletes in the past five years', and V14
'advised student athletes in the past five years'. Variables 9, 10, and 12 were used to test the in-group hypothesis. Variables 13, 13B, and 14 were used to test the contact hypothesis. The dependent variables correspond to that number question on the questionnaire. (See Appendix A.) The variables that formed the scale for Attitude-Toward-An-Object are V21, V22, V23, and V24. The Attitude-Toward-A-Situation scale was composed of V29, V30, V31, and V32. This, of course was dependent upon determining that it was feasible to form scales; this will be discussed later. Variables 37 and 38 were also considered for the situation, but they were not part of the scale. These two variables were compared on the issue of the role of intercollegiate athletics in the educational setting as part of the situation factor; the comparison of these two variables also provides a check for the second condition for contact as presented by Allport. Each variable will be discussed in more detail, including its role in the analysis, in the following sections.

B. Data Transformations

Before the actual statistical analysis could begin, there was a series of data transformations which had to be completed. First, independent variables number 12 and number 14 were recoded. V12 asks subjects about their attendance at major sport athletic contests. V12 was used in testing the in-group hypotheses. The reasoning here is that some
persons who are avid spectators, but have never participated in sport as an athlete, do identify with the athletic in-group. For this study, avid spectator was defined as someone who attends all or most home games and some away games for some major sport. Therefore, categories 1 through 3 were combined into a 'No' category with the value of '0'; categories 4 and 5 formed a 'Yes' category with a value of '1'. This yielded a dichotomous variable for 'attends sports events'.

Variable 14 also needed some collapsing. The question on the questionnaire actually asked for the number of student athletes the subject had advised over the past five years. So, all responses of 1 or greater were combined and assigned a value of '1' and became 'Yes'. The responses of '0' became 'No'.

The independent variables were assigned to one of two groups. Each group represented one of the theoretical concepts of the study. Variables 9, 10, and 12 made up the analytical concept 'in-group'. V9 determined whether or not subjects had been high school athletes. V10 determined whether or not subjects had been college athletes. V12, as discussed earlier, determined subjects' attendance at major sporting events. These variables indicate a subject's membership in the athletic in-group and are each dichotomous. Each variable was tested individually, as will be explained later, but the variables were also combined for one measure.
call 'Ingroup'. The three variables were added together; then the sum was considered. Sums ranged from 0 to 3. The independent variable of 'Ingroup' was left as a continuous variable so as not to lose information.

In much the same fashion, a measure called 'Contact' was developed. Variables 13, 13B, and 14 were involved here. V13 indicated if subjects had taught student athletes within the past year; V13B indicated if subjects had taught student athletes within the past five years. V14 indicated if subjects had advised student athletes within the past five years. Each variable was dichotomous. These variables were added together just as in the 'Ingroup' variable. And, again, it yielded a continuous independent variable, this time called 'Contact'.

The discussion now turns to some transformations of dependent variables. First, consider the variables which formed the Attitude-Toward-An-Object (henceforth referred to as Object) Scale. These were V21, V22, V23, and V24; they addressed student athletes specifically. In order to have a valid scale, all variables must be coded to infer attitudes in the same direction. In other words, 'Strongly Agree' must always indicate a negative attitude or always indicate a positive attitude. To reduce the chances of confusion 'Strongly Disagree' will indicate a negative attitude, and 'Strongly Agree' will indicate a positive attitude. Agreement with statement 21, that student athletes get breaks and
benefits not given to other students, is negative toward student athletes; therefore, the coding for V21 was reversed. Following the same logic, the coding for V22 and V23 was reversed, too. After combining variables 21, 22, 23, and 24 a consistent scale as described above was formed.

The same conditions were present in the formulation of the Attitude- Toward-A-Situation (henceforth referred to as Situation) Scale. For this scale, variables 29, 30, 31, and 32 were used; each variable spoke to the athletic situation in general. In this case, V29, V30, and V31 required the reversal of the coding to maintain a consistent scale.

Values for these scales ranged from 1 to 20. The scales were left in this continuous form so that potentially valuable information would not be lost.

The author has admittedly taken some liberties in making positive and negative interpretations from the responses to the Likert-type items. However, these interpretations were made consistently from item to item and from scale to scale. Each interpretation was also logically decided. Even so, this should not significantly affect the study since the goal is to determine if differences in attitudes exist. If differences exist, then direction can be discussed.

C. Data Analysis

There were several different statistical treatments which were used on the variables. Each variable was consid-
ered individually and within a scale. Below is a refresher list of the variables which were used.

Independent Variables:
V9    High School Athlete
V10   College Athlete
V12   Avid Spectator
VIngroup  Member of Athletic In-group
V13   Taught Student Athletes in Past Year
V13B  Taught Student Athletes in Past Five Years
V14   Advised Student Athletes in Past Five Years
VContact  Contact with Student Athletes

Dependent Variables:
V21   Student athletes receive breaks and benefits in their academic careers that nonathlete students do not.
V22   Student athletes are generally not as bright as other college students.
V23   Student athletes in certain sports (i.e. minor sports) are usually more intelligent and better students than student athletes in other sports (i.e. major sports).
V24   Student athletes are often discriminated against in the classroom.
V29   Many student athletes at NCAA Division I schools are exploited by their school's athletic program.
V30   Many student athletes at NCAA Division I schools are exploited by their universities.
V31   "Big-time" college sports are simply a training ground for professional sports.
V32   College sport is a preparation for a later career in professional sport just as a major in an academic discipline is preparation for a later career.
V37   What is the primary role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting?
V38   What should be the primary role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting?

Object Scale
Situation Scale

The first order of business for statistical computations was to simply report frequency distributions and percentages.
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The next task was to determine the relationships between independent variables and between dependent variables through a correlational-type analysis. This was done using Pearsonian correlational coefficients (r). Values for r range from -1, indicating perfect inversion, to 1, indicating perfect agreement.

The measures making up the independent variables were the first to be correlated to see if they scaled. Variables 9, 10, 12, 13, 13B, and 14 were correlated with each other. Next, the variables intended to be used for the Object Scale (V21, V22, V23, and V24) were intercorrelated and those variables intended to be used for the Situation Scale (V29, V30, V31, and V32) were also intercorrelated.

Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to determine the plausibility of forming scales with the independent and dependent variables. Cronbach's Alpha is a measure of internal consistency for scales. The calculation of Alpha is the same as finding the mean of the interitem correlations. Therefore, Cronbach's Alpha is affected by both the number of variables and the variability across those variables. These tests dictated subsequent data analysis, whether correlation-regression analysis or simple Chi square had to be used.

If the variables did indeed scale, regression analysis could be used to determine the strength and direction of relationships between independent and dependent variables. Two
variables are associated if the distributions of 'Y' change for the various conditions of 'X'. Thus, regression is also helpful in prediction. Regression coefficients would be run for each dependent variable by each independent variable. If not, Chi square analysis would be used in concert with frequency distributions and percentages for testing the hypotheses. Chi square is a nonparametric test that compares expected and observed frequencies. The expected frequency distribution is the normal distribution.

The exact procedures for running Chi square would be determined after the correlations had been computed. With this information, the proper sequences for Chi square would be known. However, V37 and V38 were analyzed through Chi square independent of what the tests for the scales revealed. For the regression and Chi square statistics, the level of significance used was .05. With a sample of this size, a 5 percent chance of error was appropriate (Hinkle, Wiersma, and Jurs: 142).

D. Hypotheses

There were thirteen hypotheses to be tested. The hypotheses are presented here according to the analytical device to which it applies.
First set of hypotheses (Object vs. Situation)

The initial hypothesis was a comparison of the object and situation scales. It was tested for the entire sample. This would establish if there was a difference in perceptions of student athletes verses the athletic program.

H1: There will be no difference in the attitude toward the object (student athletes) and the attitude toward the situation (intercollegiate athletics) within the sample.

Second set of hypotheses (Contact Hypothesis)

The second set of hypotheses addressed Allport's contact hypothesis. The independent variables here determined faculty members' contact with student athletes. The dependent variables were tested individually and in the object scale or situation scale.

H2: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between those subjects who have taught student athletes in the past year and those who have not.

H3: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who have taught student athletes in the past year and those who have not.

H4: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between subjects who have taught student athletes in the past five years and those who have not.

H5: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who have taught student athletes in the past five years and those who have not.
H6: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between subjects who have advised student athletes in the past five years and those who have not.

H7: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who have advised student athletes in the past five years and those who have not.

Third set of hypotheses (In-group vs. Out-group)

The third set of hypotheses dealt with Sumner's idea of in-groups. The independent variables here determined faculty members' membership in the athletic in-group. Again, the dependent variables were those of the object scale and situation scale.

H8: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between subjects who were high school athletes and those who were not.

H9: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who were high school athletes and those who were not.

H10: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between subjects who were college athletes and those who were not.

H11: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who were college athletes and those who were not.

H12: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the object between subjects who are identifying spectators and those who are not.
H13: There will be no difference in attitudes toward the situation between subjects who are identifying spectators and those who are not.

These hypotheses covered all possible relevant combinations of the independent variables and dependent variables. The theme of comparing attitudes-toward-an-object and attitudes-toward-a-situation was carried through all of the hypotheses; that theme was examined in the context of the contact hypothesis and in the context of in-groups and out-groups.
CHAPTER IV

Data Analysis Results

Frequency distributions are the first statistics to be reported. The distribution for each variable can be seen in Table 1. The table gives the frequency of each response, the initial percentage, and the valid percentage. The reader may want to examine this table now and refer back to it from time to time. The frequency distributions in this table reflect the reverse coding of the independent variables.

A. Feasibility of Scale Formation

As reported in the previous chapter, Cronbach's Alpha was utilized to determine the appropriateness of the suggested dependent variable scales and the composite measure independent variables. The researcher had proposed two additional independent variables which would each be the result of combining three of the original independent variables. The composite measure 'Ingroup' was to be made up of V9, V10, and V12; however, Cronbach's Alpha and Pearson r correlation coefficients indicated that this would not be advisable. Table 2 presents the Cronbach's Alpha scores as well as the Pearson r coefficients for this composite. Looking first at the Alphas it can be seen that the composite measure does not
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9 High</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12 Avid</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13 Taught</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA in Past</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B Taught</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA In Past</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Years</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14 Advised</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA In Past</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Years</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21 SA Get</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22 SA Not</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Bright</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As Others</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V23 Minor</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport SA</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Intelligent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Sport</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24 SA Disc</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>criminated</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against in Class-</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>room</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29 SA Exp</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloped by Athletic</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30 SA Exp</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloped by University</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31 College</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Is</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground For</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Sport</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32 College</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Is</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep for</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career In</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Sport</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Value Label</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V37 What IS</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Fitness</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport In The</td>
<td>School Spirit</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V38 What</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOULD BE</td>
<td>Physical Fitness</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role Of</td>
<td>School Spirit</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport In The</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2.

**Reliability and Correlations for the Potential Ingroup Scale**

Alpha = .3293  
Standardized Item Alpha = .3537

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha If Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>.0541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>.1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>.5229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson r Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V9</th>
<th>V10</th>
<th>V12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>.3791</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>.0550</td>
<td>.0292</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.273)</td>
<td>(.561)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (level of significance)
result in a valid measure when using all three variables; the Alpha of .3293 is not sufficient. If V12 were to be deleted, Alpha would jump to .5229, but a composite measure using only two variables is not really useful. The Pearson r coefficients substantiated the relationships between V9, V10, and V12; only V9 and V10 have a coefficient (.3791) significant at the .05 level. When this information was considered, the most viable alternative was to use each independent variable individually and to drop the composite measure.

Table 3 shows the comparable statistics for V13, V13B, and V14 and the proposed composite independent variable 'Contact'. The initial Cronbach's Alpha for this composite measure of .6927 is substantially stronger than the previously discussed Alpha. The 'Contact' Alpha could be improved to .7960 by deleting V14. But again, a strong composite measure should incorporate at least three variables. Correlation coefficients for V13, V13B, and V14 were considerably better than those for V9, V10, and V12. Yet, even with these strengths, the decision was made again to use the independent variables individually rather than compositely.

Now the discussion turns to the formation of the dependent variable scales. The first scale offered was labelled 'Object' and was composed of V21, V22, V23, and V24. For this scale, Cronbach's Alpha and Pearson r correlation coefficients were computed (See Table 4). The initial Alpha for this scale was .5442 which is acceptable, but it is not
### TABLE 3.

**Reliability and Correlations for the Potential Contact Scale**

Alpha = .6927  
Standardized Item Alpha = .6845

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha If Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>.4366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>.4746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>.7960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pearson r Coefficients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V13</th>
<th>V13B</th>
<th>V14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>.6611</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>.3157</td>
<td>.2844</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (level of significance)
### TABLE 4.

Reliability and Correlations for the Potential Object Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>.4866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>.2543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>.3926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24</td>
<td>.6544</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson r Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V21</th>
<th>V22</th>
<th>V23</th>
<th>V24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.    )*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>.4118</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.    )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>.2436</td>
<td>.5072</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.    )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24</td>
<td>-.0175</td>
<td>.1018</td>
<td>.0683</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.730)</td>
<td>(.044)</td>
<td>(.178)</td>
<td>(.    )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(level of significance)*
extremely strong. By deleting V24, Alpha increased to .6544, a more acceptable level. This information was the basis for deciding to withdraw V24 from the scale. The correlations shown in Table 4 indicate fairly strong relationships between the remaining variables. Thus, the 'Object' scale, as an indicator of attitudes toward student athletes, was put in place using V21, V22, and V23.

Similarly a dependent variable scale 'Situation' was formulated. The variables used here were V29, V30, V31, and V32, which represented attitudes toward the intercollegiate athletic situation in general. Table 5 sets forth the Cronbach's Alphas and correlation coefficients for these variables and scale. The initial Alpha was rather weak at .4013. By deleting V32, Alpha was revised to .7454 which suggested removal of V32 from the 'Situation' scale. Examination of the Pearson r coefficients supported that decision; therefore, the 'Situation' scale was set using V29, V30, and V31.

A moment should be taken here to look at the correlations in Table 5 with reference to V37 and V38. As stated earlier, variables 37 and 38 were to be used in the discussion of the attitude-toward-the-situation. It is appropriate to check the correlations between V37 and V38 and the dependent variables used in the 'Situation' scale. Table 5 shows that both V37 and V38 were correlated with the scale variables at a significance level of .05, indicating
### TABLE 5.

**Reliability and Correlations for the Potential Situation Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Alpha if Item Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>-.0970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>-.1188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>.4115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32</td>
<td>.7454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pearson r Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(level of significance)*

Table 5. 40
relationships of fairly good strength. It would seem then that it is logical to include variables 37 and 38 in the consideration of the attitude-toward-the-situation.

A recap of the results of the preliminary analysis would be helpful here. First, the composite measure independent variables, 'Ingroup' and 'Contact', were eliminated, and the independent variables, V9, V10, V12, V13, V13B, and V14, were to be used individually. Second, the dependent variable scales were supported with a couple of adjustments. Variable 24 was dropped from the 'Object' scale; V32 was removed from the 'Situation' scale. Third, V37 and V38 were found to be adequately correlated with the items of the 'Situation' scale to be included in the discussion of the attitude-toward-the-situation. Fourth, with these results for Cronbach's Alpha and since all independent variables were "dummy" variables, regression analysis was the appropriate analysis for testing the hypotheses. And fifth, since the composite measures with independent variables were discarded, some hypotheses were also discarded. This is because these hypotheses were to be tested through the composite measures. These changes are reflected in the previous chapter.

B. Primary Analysis

1. **Object vs. Situation.** The first hypothesis concerned the relationship between attitudes-toward-an-object and attitudes-toward-the-situation. The appropriate statis-
tical tests here were Pearson r correlation coefficients and
the F-test. The Pearson r correlation coefficient of
.3538 was calculated for the scales and found to be signif-
icant at the .001 level. The F-test statistic for these two
items was 30.9136, significant at the .000 level. To compute
F, a t-test was first run. The t-test was a paired-samples
test which compared the sample on two scores, those of the
scales. The t value was 5.56; this squared yielded F. These
statistics suggest that faculty members were unable to sepa-
rate the object (student athletes) from the situation
(intercollegiate athletics).

The highly significant F statistic indicated that Hy-
pothesis 1 be rejected. However, the strength of the corre-
lation coefficient and other information which will be
discussed later suggested that the notion of considering both
the object and the sitation should not be abandoned. This
is because there were significant relationships revealed even
though the hypothesis was rejected.

2. Regression and Correlation Analysis for Scales and
Independent Variables. This portion of the discussion ad-
dresses the Pearson r correlations between the scales and the
independent variables first; this will lead nicely into the
discussion of the regressional analysis. The author is be-
ginning with the correlations in order to set forth the most
basic information about the relationships between the scales
and independent variables first. Correlation was chosen for this portion of the analysis because it is an index of the relationship between two variables. The absolute value of the coefficient indicates the magnitude of the relationship. However, correlation does not take into account other variables, and in terms of variance, it can only be said that the variance in one variable is associated with the variance in the other variable. Thus, regression was used in later analysis.

Table 6 lists these correlation coefficients. Even a quick glance reveals that V12 was the only independent variable that correlated with either scale significantly at the .05 level or below. The coefficient for V12 and the 'Object' scale was .1729; the V12 and 'Situation' scale coefficient was .1521. Neither of these is extremely strong, yet they are significant at the .05 level. The other coefficients ranged from .003, significant at .475, to .0780, significant at .063, and from -.0364, significant at .241, to -.0559, significant at .140.

Now the discussion turns to the results of the regression analysis. Regression was performed for the 'Object' scale and each independent variable and for the 'Situation' scale and each independent variable (See Table 7.). Regression was selected as the primary analysis because it provides a standardized score (Beta) which controls for other variables. Correlation is valuable for looking at
### TABLE 6.

**Pearson r Correlation Coefficients for the Object and Situation Scales with Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Object</th>
<th>Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>.0780</td>
<td>-.0438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.063)</td>
<td>(.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>.0188</td>
<td>.0251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.357)</td>
<td>(.313)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>.1729</td>
<td>.1521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)***</td>
<td>(.001)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>.0033</td>
<td>-.0364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.475)</td>
<td>(.241)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>.0449</td>
<td>-.0416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.191)</td>
<td>(.210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>.0116</td>
<td>-.0559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.411)</td>
<td>(.140)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>r Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object V9</td>
<td>7.794</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>0.00609</td>
<td>2.33973</td>
<td>.1269</td>
<td>.078023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object V10</td>
<td>7.794</td>
<td>2.249</td>
<td>0.00035</td>
<td>1.3457</td>
<td>.7139</td>
<td>.018766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object V12</td>
<td>7.786</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>0.02989</td>
<td>11.73710</td>
<td>.0007</td>
<td>.172874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object V13</td>
<td>7.765</td>
<td>2.252</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.00398</td>
<td>.9497</td>
<td>.003252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object V13B</td>
<td>7.777</td>
<td>2.248</td>
<td>0.00202</td>
<td>0.76620</td>
<td>.3820</td>
<td>.044917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V9</td>
<td>6.997</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>0.00192</td>
<td>0.72378</td>
<td>.3954</td>
<td>-.043774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V10</td>
<td>6.997</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>0.00063</td>
<td>0.23793</td>
<td>.6260</td>
<td>.025114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V12</td>
<td>6.997</td>
<td>2.508</td>
<td>0.02315</td>
<td>8.93297</td>
<td>.0030</td>
<td>.152140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V13</td>
<td>6.989</td>
<td>2.512</td>
<td>0.00132</td>
<td>0.49332</td>
<td>.4829</td>
<td>-.036392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V13B</td>
<td>6.987</td>
<td>2.509</td>
<td>0.00173</td>
<td>0.65048</td>
<td>.4205</td>
<td>-.041613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation V14</td>
<td>7.027</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>0.00312</td>
<td>1.17054</td>
<td>.2800</td>
<td>-.055857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relationships between variables, but it in no way accounts for other variables. Regression also is the procedure most accurate for predicting one set of scores, or responses, from another. For this reason, regression was useful in testing these hypotheses to determine if dependent variable scores can be predicted from independent variables. The analysis for the 'Object' scale will be looked at first.

Regression analyses for the 'Object' scale did not yield results consistently significant at the .05 level; in fact, just one independent variable met this condition--V12, the spectator variable. Variable 12 explains approximately three percent of the variance in the 'Object' scale, as shown by $r^2$. The Beta for V12 (.172874) is the strongest standardized score for any of the independent variables and the 'Object' scale. V12 also, of course, has the only F-test score (3.426) that is significant at the .05 level. Other independent variables are able to explain far less than one percent of the variance in the 'Object' scale. Levels of significance for these variables range from .1269 to .9497.

These results meant that Hypotheses 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 were not rejected; there was no significant difference in attitudes toward the object within each of these variables: V13, V13B, V14, V9, V10. Hypothesis 12 was the only 'Object' hypothesis which has been rejected. Thus, V12, the spectator variable, was the only independent variable showing attitude differences toward the object. Subjects who were avid spec-
tators had slightly more positive attitudes toward student athletes than did other subjects.

The results of the regression analyses for the 'Situation' scale were very much like those for the 'Object' scale (See Table 7). Again, V12 had F-test scores significant at the .05 level. Probability levels for the other independent variables ranged from .2800 to .6260. This time V12 could explain two percent of the variance in the 'Situation' scale. No other independent variable explained as much as one percent of additional variance. The Beta for V12 was .152140, again the highest score of the independent variables with the 'Situation' scale.

How does this translate into testing the hypotheses? Hypotheses 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 13 tested the 'Situation' scale with the independent variables. Hypothesis 13 was the one hypothesis of this group to be rejected; the independent variable for this hypothesis was the spectator variable, V12. The other hypotheses were not rejected. This demonstrates very little difference in attitudes toward the situation among subjects as a whole. The exception was that of subjects who were spectators, who had attitudes slightly more positive toward intercollegiate athletics than did other subjects.

3. Chi Square Analysis of V37 and V38. The last section of the data analysis discussion focuses on the comparison of
V37 and V38 on the issue of the role of intercollegiate athletics in the university setting. This comparison was also a check on Allport's second condition for contact—seeking a common goal. First, a simple Chi square was done on each variable individually (See Table 8). V37 had a Chi square of 223.727, and V38 had a Chi square of 376.992. Both of these were significant at the .05 level with four degrees of freedom. A look back at Table 1 shows the nearly exact reversal of responses for V37 and V38, and the frequency distributions illustrate why the Chi square statistics were significant at the .05 level.

As further investigation, Chi square was computed for V37 with each independent variable and for V38 and each independent variable. Those results can be found in Table 9. As in the earlier analyses, V12 produced results significant at the .05 level; V14 also was significant at the .05 level with V38. The other Chi square statistics had significance levels ranging from .0590 to .7885.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V37</td>
<td>223.727</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V38</td>
<td>376.992</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.
### TABLE 9.

**Chi Square for V37 and V38 with Each Independent Variable**

#### Variable 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>2.45595</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>6.03696</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>14.10501</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>3.99655</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>9.08525</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>4.59311</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.3316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Variable 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>3.63135</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>1.71209</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>14.64310</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>8.04378</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>7.01296</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.1352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>11.70535</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.0197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

Below is a list of the hypotheses and their test results in terms of rejecting or not rejecting each hypothesis. This will provide the reader with a summary listing of the results.

H1: Rejected  H8: Not Rejected
H2: Not Rejected  H9: Not Rejected
H3: Not Rejected  H10: Not Rejected
H4: Not Rejected  H11: Not Rejected
H5: Not Rejected  H12: Rejected
H6: Not Rejected  H13: Rejected
H7: Not Rejected

These indicate that there were very few significant differences in attitude toward either the object or the situation within the independent variables. Variable 12 was the exception.
This chapter attempts to put into order and make sense of the previous four chapters. This discussion pulls together the theory and the statistics and interpretes what one means to the other. The text here follows the lead of the hypotheses and addresses first the issue of object verses situation, then the concept of contact, and finally the idea of the in-group. Within each section of discussion possible interpretations and implications for further study will be advanced. Lastly, a concluding statement of the overall research project will be submitted.

First Set of Hypotheses (Object vs. Situation)

The first hypothesis was testing for attitudes-toward-an-object verses attitudes-toward-a-situation. The hypothesis was stated as null, that there would be no difference between the two kinds of attitudes. The Pearson r correlation coefficient of .3538 was significant at the .001 level. This can be interpreted that the two scales correlated with each other moderately well. Since F was based on a paired-samples t-test, this gives a good comparison of the two scales, Object and Situation. The F statistic was highly
significant, pointing to a substantial difference in the difference of attitudes. This would require that Hypothesis 1, that there would be no difference in attitude toward the object (student athlete) and the situation (intercollegiate athletics), be rejected. While a difference in the attitudes exists, the scales show a relatively strong relationship. This information points toward a need to include both an object and a situation in the examination of attitudes.

Variable 37, what is the role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting? and Variable 38, what should be the role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting, were also used in analyzing the situation factor. As mentioned earlier, these two variables had responses almost the exact opposite of each other. Subjects indicated that revenue building is the first role and that being part of the educational process is the last role. By contrast, they feel that being part of the educational process should be the first role while revenue building should be the last. Options in between were entertainment, school spirit, and physical fitness. The discrepancy of roles suggests that the situation must be more carefully investigated.

The consideration of the attitude-toward-an-object has merit. But ideally this would mean a stronger coordination between the scales than is evident from the F statistic. The other thing that catches the author's eye is the definite difference of opinion of what the role is and should be of
college sport. It may be that the object and situation have been incorrectly identified. In light of the abovementioned analysis and the statements made by Hanford (1979) and Marmion (1979) on the state of intercollegiate athletics, it is conceivable that the object should be intercollegiate athletics in general with the institution of education, or the college, being the situation. The student athlete may be just a product of the object and situation, redefined, and may not be definitive enough to warrant decisive attitudes. Hanford, Marmion, and the two 'role' variables suggest that intercollegiate athletics is the object to be targeted, preferrably through a look at the role and appropriateness of the object in the situation. This conceptualization would be much more in keeping with Rokeach's notions that any object must be considered with reference to the particular situation within which it occurs.

Another part of Rokeach's theory presumably was not being tested for in this study, that was the use of attitudes in predicting behavior. Rokeach and Kliejunas (1972) discussed this with reference to college students cutting classes. Yet, the concept of behavior may have been involved serendipitously. Variable 12, which indicated subjects' patterns of attending athletic events for the major sports at their schools, was the independent variable which consistently yielded statistically significant results. And this is the only variable which could be considered to be a
behavior--an action resulting from the attitude. It is even possible that this project looked at this relationship in reverse, that the attitude dictates the spectator pattern. Table 10, on the following page, shows the crosstabulation of the spectator variable with each dependent variable. Subjects who are avid spectators have different attitudes from those who are not. It is not entirely correct to say that spectators have a more positive attitude than non-spectators. They respond more frequently with 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'; yet, their distributions still tend toward the negative end. But it can be said that the spectators have a less negative attitude; their negative responses were of a lower frequency than those of non-spectators. These results imply that independent variables might be best selected by looking at those which reflect a behavior.

**Likert Item Analysis**

As mentioned earlier in Chapter III, Likert-type items are a common tool for measuring attitudes. There is an implied interval scale underlying the possible responses which lends itself well to statistical analysis. There are a couple of other assumptions used when measuring attitudes with Likert scales. First, it is assumed that individuals do differ in the strength of their agreement on any given item and that these differences distribute themselves normally throughout the sample. Secondly, it is postulated that the
## Table 10.

### Crosstabulations of Dependent Variables by V12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>V12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>52/19.6*</td>
<td>8/6.3</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>121/45.7</td>
<td>63/50.0</td>
<td>15.62133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>50/18.9</td>
<td>23/18.3</td>
<td>15.62133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>31/11.7</td>
<td>27/21.4</td>
<td>Sig.=.0036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>11/4.2</td>
<td>5/4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22</td>
<td>24/8.9</td>
<td>5/4.0</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>99/36.8</td>
<td>35/28.2</td>
<td>8.33961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>88/32.7</td>
<td>46/37.1</td>
<td>8.33961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>50/18.6</td>
<td>31/25.0</td>
<td>Sig.=.0799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8/3.0</td>
<td>7/5.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23</td>
<td>22/8.3</td>
<td>10/8.1</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>128/48.1</td>
<td>51/41.1</td>
<td>6.56503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81/30.5</td>
<td>34/27.4</td>
<td>6.56503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30/11.3</td>
<td>25/20.2</td>
<td>Sig.=.1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5/1.9</td>
<td>4/3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>72/27.5</td>
<td>22/18.2</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>105/40.1</td>
<td>62/51.2</td>
<td>16.29337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65/24.8</td>
<td>17/14.0</td>
<td>16.29337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18/6.9</td>
<td>17/14.0</td>
<td>Sig.=.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2/.8</td>
<td>3/2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V30</td>
<td>60/23.2</td>
<td>22/18.0</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>100/38.6</td>
<td>49/40.2</td>
<td>10.19935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>69/26.6</td>
<td>23/18.9</td>
<td>10.19935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>27/10.4</td>
<td>25/20.5</td>
<td>Sig.=.0372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3/1.2</td>
<td>3/2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V31</td>
<td>66/24.5</td>
<td>13/10.5</td>
<td>Chi square=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>104/38.7</td>
<td>51/41.1</td>
<td>18.49859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>52/19.3</td>
<td>19/15.3</td>
<td>18.49859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>42/15.6</td>
<td>36/29.0</td>
<td>Sig.=.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5/1.9</td>
<td>5/4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency/Column Percentage
strength of agreement or disagreement is directly proportional to a person's attitude (Schuessler, 1971: 322). With this in mind, the author will now discuss the statistical results in reference to the hypotheses and theory.

Second Set of Hypotheses (Contact)

The second set of hypotheses addressed Allport's Contact Hypothesis. Allport theorized that contact between individuals or groups can positively affect the attitudes of the majority toward the minority. Three independent variables were selected as being characteristic of contact. The first was a variable showing whether or not subjects had taught student athletes within the past year. This variable did not produce results statistically significant at the .05 level for either the Object or Situation scale. The Beta for the Object scale was .003252, for the Situation scale -.036392. Both of these are weak. Hypotheses 2 and 3, that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the object or the situation between subjects who have taught student athletes within the past year and those who have not, were not rejected.

The second Contact variable designated whether or not subjects had taught student athletes within the past five years. Again the Beta scores of .044917 and -.041613, respectively for the Object and Situation scales, were low. Hypotheses 4 and 5 stated that there would be no difference
in attitude toward the object or situation between subjects who have taught student athletes within the past five years and those who have not. These hypotheses were not rejected.

Hypotheses 6 and 7 contended that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the object or situation between subjects who have advised student athletes in the past five years and those who have not. These were tested by the third Contact variable, had subjects advised student athletes within the past five years or not. The Betas of .011649 and -.055857 were not substantial. Thus, Hypotheses 6 and 7 were not rejected.

Clearly in its operationalization in this research, Allport's Contact Hypothesis was lacking. There were desperately weak relationships between the scales and the contact independent variables; the r squares well below .01 are testimony to the weakness of the independent variables. There are three possible reasons for this weakness. First, as stated in the earlier chapters, there was no measure of attitudes prior to the contact examined here (i.e. teaching and advising student athletes). It may be that there was a change that this project could not detect.

Secondly, the four conditions for positive contact as set forth by Allport were not met. Allport said that prejudice is lessened when two groups: (1) possess equal status, (2) seek common goals, (3) are cooperatively dependent upon each other, and (4) interact with the positive support of
The fourth condition was met; the first and third conditions were not met. The second condition could be checked with the available data. By comparing variables for what the role of intercollegiate athletics is and what is should be, the idea of a common goal was ascertained. This comparison indicated that faculty did not feel that intercollegiate athletics seek the same educational goals as faculty members. Perhaps these conditions are truly crucial to affecting a change in attitude.

Third, it may be that the contact variables focused on the wrong type of contact. Thinking of the spectator variable again, another way in which it differs from the other independent variables is that it is an indicator or something voluntary. Although this variable was not a Contact variable, it can be applied here. The three Contact variables dealt with teaching or advising student athletes. These things are assigned duties from a supervising official. Faculty members have no choice in this kind of contact. Some type of volunteer contact, translated into an independent variable, would likely be a better predictor of attitude.

While the concept of contact did not work out exactly as anticipated, it did show up significantly in some secondary analysis. This analysis was a stepping stone to the primary analysis; yet, it deserves to be noted. Appendix B discusses these unexpected but welcome results.
Third Set of Hypotheses (In-group)

The third set of hypotheses was concerned with the notion of the in-group and how it might affect attitudes. The supposition was that in-group or former in-group members would have different attitudes than those who had never been in the athletic in-group. The first In-group variable asked whether or not subjects had been high school athletes. Hypotheses 8 and 9 stated that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the object or situation between subjects who had been high school athletes and those who had not. Weak Betas of .078023 and -.43774 were calculated. The test statistics lacked strength. Therefore, Hypotheses 8 and 9 were not rejected.

The next In-group variables utilized indicated whether or not subjects had been athletes while in college. The analysis of this variable and the Object and Situation scales did not provide evidence of a significant relationship between the variable and either scale. Hence, the author, once again, did not reject the hypotheses. These hypotheses were numbers 10 and 11; they maintained that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the object or situation between subjects who had been college athletes and those who had not.

The last independent variable for the In-group concept marked the subjects' patterns of attending major sport athletic events at their schools. It would appear that this
variable is a variable that reveals some differences in attitudes within the Object and Situation scales. The Beta scores were not tremendously strong but they did indicate relationships of some strength. The levels of significance were well below the prescribed level of .05. The relevant hypotheses here were numbers 12 and 13. They stated that there would be no difference in attitudes toward the object or situation between subjects who were avid spectators and those who were not. Hypotheses 12 and 13 were rejected.

As with the Contact Hypothesis, the concept of In-group did not hold up as expected. Only the spectator variable was able to explain even a full percentage of the variance in the dependent variables. It was surprising to this researcher that the experience of having been a student athlete did not significantly affect attitudes of the faculty members in either direction. This might be explained by analyzing which sports were played by the subjects, how many years have passed since their participation, and at what type of school they participated.

There is also a way in which the spectator variable is different from the other variables. The measure of attendance at sporting events is a current measure. The other In-group variables tapped experiences from some years past. It may be that the independent variables should look at the present, the here-and-now, especially since people are prone
to change over time. "Current" indicators might add merit to the idea of in-group membership affecting attitudes.

**Concluding Statement**

It is supposed that every researcher would like to find that his statistics support beautifully his theory. Alas, that has not been the case with this study. Nonetheless, this researcher is not yet ready to abandon the ideas addressed here. Possibly the ideas are right and they need only to be nurtured with the proper variables. And maybe the variables incorporated in this work do contain significant information that can be ferreted out with other theoretical approaches. Whichever is the case, and both could be, the topic deserves further attention. As evidenced by the literature review, there is a need for studies of this nature. Since this was an exploratory study, there are still many questions unanswered. Those questions are not likely to go away; intercollegiate athletics appear to be here to stay. In conclusion, this researcher suggests that the research process be continued.
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APPENDIX A. THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Faculty Member,

You have been randomly selected from your university to receive this questionnaire. The questionnaire addresses a number of related issues concerning faculty attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics and student athletes and is being sent to 800 faculty members of the (deleted for confidentiality) Conference schools.

The research is supported by Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University. Jane Alexander, candidate for the M.S. in Sociology, is the principal investigator. Data gathered during the research will provide the basis for a Master's thesis.

Please be assured that your individual identity will remain anonymous; there are no markings on the questionnaire which could be used to identify you. Please do not sign your questionnaire. My interests lie in group responses rather than individual responses; therefore, the data will be reported only as group data. No information will be used in any way which could be detrimental to an individual respondent, an individual university, or the conference as a whole. This research project has been approved by the Human Subjects Review Board here at V.P.I. & S.U. and by the administration at your university.

Although the questionnaire may appear to be rather long, it should take only about 15 minutes to complete. I hope that you can fill in and return the questionnaire as soon as possible. An addressed, stamped envelope has been provided for the return of the questionnaire. The quality of this research depends on your assistance. Through your responses I hope to be able to better understand the relationship between academics and athletics. At the completion of the project I plan to have the results available for your consideration; if you are interested in these, please notify me and I will be happy to pass them on to you.

Once again, thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jane H. Alexander

Appendix A. The Questionnaire
Your cooperation in completing this questionnaire is greatly appreciated. Please be candid in answering each of the following questions. Completing the questionnaire should take about 15 minutes. Most responses can be made by checking or circling the answers. Your responses will be treated anonymously and with strict confidentiality. Thank you for your help.

Background Information

1. What is your sex?
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. What is your academic department?

3. What is your faculty status?
   _____ Instructor
   _____ Assistant Professor
   _____ Associate Professor
   _____ Full Professor

4. Highest academic degree earned? _________
   Year received? _________

5. How many years have you been at your current university? _________

6. Are you currently teaching undergraduates?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

7. Have you taught undergraduates within the past five years?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
8. How did you vote in this year's presidential election?
   ____ Republican
   ____ Democrat
   ____ Independent
   ____ Other, please specify ________________________
   ____ Did not vote

9. Were you a varsity athlete in high school?
   ____ Yes In what sport(s)? ________________________
   ____ No

10. Were you a varsity athlete in college?
    ____ Yes In what sport(s)? ________________________
    ____ No

11. How frequently do you engage in physical exercise and what type of exercise is it?
    ____ Frequently (3 or more times weekly)
        Type_________________________
    ____ Often (1 to 2 times weekly)
        Type_________________________
    ____ Sometimes (once every 2 weeks)
        Type_________________________
    ____ Seldom (less than once every 2 weeks)
        Type_________________________
    ____ Never

12. How often and for which sports do you and/or your family attend athletic events in the major sports (i.e., football, basketball, or baseball) at your university? (Please specify the sport(s) with the frequency of attendance.)
    ____ Frequently (all home games and some road games)
        Sport(s)_____________________
    ____ Often (all or most home games)
        Sport(s)_____________________
    ____ Sometimes (half of the home games)
        Sport(s)_____________________
    ____ Seldom (less than half of the home games)
        Sport(s)_____________________
    ____ Never
13. Are you aware that student athletes in the major sports are or have been enrolled in your classes in the past year?

____ Yes Approximate number__

____ No

Are you aware that you have taught student athletes in the major sports within the past five years?

____ Yes

____ No

14. Approximately how many, if any, student athletes in the major sports have you been academic advisor for during the past five years? ______
Attitudes Toward Intercollegiate Athletics

Each of the following statements has appeared in the media in one form or another over the past few years. Please indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement by circling one of the five responses directly beneath each item. The letters correspond to the following scale: Strongly Agree(SA); Agree(A); Neutral(N); Disagree(D); and Strongly Disagree(SD). There are no right or wrong answers for any of these items; simply record your opinion.

15. Although a marginal student, an athlete should be admitted to an accredited university on a regular matriculating basis.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

16. If a marginal student is admitted to a university as an athlete, some university agency, other than the student, has a responsibility to see that the student graduates.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

17. Transcripts are frequently tampered with in order to admit student athletes to universities.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

18. Faculty members should advise student athletes.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

19. Student athletes should be provided with a specialized academic advising program in addition to having a faculty advisor.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

20. Faculty members are often pressured to "aid" student athletes in their classes.
   SA  A  N  D  SD

21. Student athletes receive breaks and benefits in their academic careers that nonathletes do not.
   SA  A  N  D  SD
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22. Student athletes are generally not as bright as other college students.
   SA A N D SD

23. Student athletes in certain sports (i.e., minor sports) are usually more intelligent and better students than student athletes in other sports (i.e., major sports).
   SA A N D SD

24. Student/athletes are often discriminated against in the classroom.
   SA A N D SD

25. Student/athletes should be more visible in general campus activities such as student government, fraternities, etc..
   SA A N D SD

26. Athletic coaches at universities should have faculty duties, e.g., teaching and researching, in addition to coaching duties.
   SA A N D SD

27. Even if coaches are not members of a university's teaching and researching faculty, they should have the opportunity to be granted tenure, like faculty members, after a certain number of years of service.
   SA A N D SD

28. Members of the athletic department should serve on university committees and commissions dealing with issues other than athletics.
   SA A N D SD

29. Many student athletes at NCAA Division I schools are exploited by their schools' athletic department or association.
   SA A N D SD
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30. Many student athletes at NCAA Division I schools are exploited by their universities.

SA  A  N  D  SD

31. "Big-time" college sports are simply a training ground for professional sports.

SA  A  N  D  SD

32. College sport is preparation for a later career in professional sport as a major in an academic discipline is preparation for a later career.

SA  A  N  D  SD

33. Athletes today should attend college to improve their athletic ability en route to a career in professional sports.

SA  A  N  D  SD

34. Athletes today do attend college to improve their athletic ability en route to a career in professional sports.

SA  A  N  D  SD
Social Support for Student Athletes

For questions 35 to 38 please rank order the responses listed indicating your preference. One (1) indicates your first choice, (2) your second choice, and so on.

35. Who should provide additional academic advising for student athletes? (Rank order from 1 to 5, 6 if Other is used.)

[Ranking options: Athletic department, University academic administrators, Student/athlete's major department, Specially trained faculty, Interested faculty, Other, please specify]  

36. Whose responsibility is it to see that student athletes graduate? (Rank order from 1 to 4, 5 if Other is used.)

[Ranking options: Student athlete himself/herself, Faculty members, Athletic department, University administration, Other, please specify]  

If you feel that the responsibility for graduation of a student athlete resides with those other than the student, can you offer any suggestions on how this can be done?

37. What do you feel is the primary role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting? (Rank order from 1 to 5, 6 if Other is used.)

[Ranking options: One aspect of the educational process, Promoting physical fitness, Building school spirit, Public entertainment, Revenue building, Other, please specify]  
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38. What do you feel **should be** the primary role of intercollegiate athletics in today's university setting? (Rank order from 1 to 5, 6 if Other is used.)

   ____ One aspect of the educational process
   ____ Promoting physical fitness
   ____ Building school spirit
   ____ Public entertainment
   ____ Revenue building
   ____ Other, please specify ________________________

39. Have you personally felt pressure to "aid" student athletes in your classes?

   ____ Yes, frequently
   ____ Yes, occasionally
   ____ No

   If yes, from whom did you receive pressure (e.g. student athletes, coaches, other faculty, etc.) and through what means (e.g. letters, telephone calls, visits, etc.)? **Please do not name specific individuals.**

40. Do you willingly offer and give additional help, or "aid", to student athletes in your classes above and beyond that given to all students?

   ____ Yes, frequently
   ____ Yes, occasionally
   ____ No

   If yes, through what means (e.g. extra tutoring, extended deadlines, etc.)?
41. Have you received "benefits" from having student athletes in your classes (e.g. free tickets to athletic contests, free T-shirts, use of athletic facilities, etc.)?

_____ Yes, frequently
_____ Yes, occasionally
_____ No

If yes, what "benefits" have you received and from whom (e.g. student athletes, coaches, alumni, etc.) did you receive them? Please do not name specific individuals.

42. Do you feel that there are groups of students on campus, other than student athletes, that are given special privileges because they are talented?

_____ Yes
_____ No

If yes, what groups are those?

Thank you for your help and cooperation with this project. Please feel free to include any further comments or observations that you would like to make in the space below.
APPENDIX B. SECONDARY RESULTS OF IMPORTANCE

In the course of obtaining statistics for the primary analysis, a group of statistics, which would not be used in the main discussion, was generated which warranted mentioning. These statistics give some credence to the contact hypothesis and support the further investigation of the role of college sport. Earlier analysis indicated a general pattern of attitudes in the sample that college athletics are not what they should be. A discovery was made when looking at V38, what the role should be, and the independent variables. The In-group variables had scores on V38 within 5 percent of each other regardless of whether subjects were in-group members or not. But the Contact variables showed a different pattern. These variables were consistent with the others, that being part of the educational process is what athletics should be; yet, within each variable an interesting thing occurred. Within the variables, the percentage of that response out of the total responses showed a widening gap between subjects who had had contact with student athletes and those who had not. Perhaps this is more easily discerned by the figures below. The numbers represent the number of subjects responding to this option on the questionnaire and the column percentage, or the percent of subjects for each independent variable condition. Remember, all of these re-
sponses indicate that athletics should be another part of the educational process. The 'No' and 'Yes' refer to responses for the independent variables, V9, V10, V12, V13, V13B, and V14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-group:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>120/57.1*</td>
<td>98/59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>187/57.7</td>
<td>31/62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12</td>
<td>147/58.1</td>
<td>70/58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13</td>
<td>101/53.2</td>
<td>113/63.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13B</td>
<td>66/50.8</td>
<td>150/62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>151/53.4</td>
<td>64/72.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Frequency/Column percentage

These figures seem to testify to some strength of the contact hypothesis, or at least of the variables chosen here to represent contact. But what may be most telling is not directly related to this particular research question. The evidence here is that as subjects (professors) become more acquainted with student athletes the more strongly they feel about the role of intercollegiate athletics. Those subjects who had advised student athletes within the past five years were most emphatic about about this issue. One might speculate that this is because in the role of academic advisor, the professor has knowledge of the student athlete and his situation that others do not. To the author, this alone has Appendix B. Secondary Results of Importance 79
justified the entire project. These statistics verify the need for further investigation on the subject.
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