

HOW FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES PERCEIVE
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

by

Carmen Joseph Tegano

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

W. E. McCubbin, Co-Chairman

R. K. Stratton, Co-Chairman

~~J. J. Weber~~

Charles D. Taylor

~~Michael Appleby~~

Kenneth E. Underwood

May, 1980

Blacksburg, Virginia

DEDICATION

This is dedicated to Bill McCubbin.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to numerous individuals. Special appreciation is extended to Dr. William McCubbin for his guidance and assistance throughout my graduate studies. The hours spent discussing athletics in his office are priceless and will always be cherished. Also, appreciation is extended to Dr. Richard K. Stratton for his critical remarks, assistance, and guidance throughout the writing of my dissertation. The confidence of these co-chairpersons resulted in the completion of my graduate studies.

A special appreciation is extended to Dr. Charles Taylor for his friendship; Dr. Michael Appleby for his support, and Dr. Kenneth Underwood for his help. A special thanks is extended to Dr. Larry Weber for his assistance and encouragement. His friendly attitude and helpful advice were deeply appreciated.

I would like to also acknowledge _____, _____, _____, and Dr. _____ for their help and assistance. Also, a special "thanks" to _____, _____, and the recreation faculty at Radford University.

Finally, I would like to thank one last individual. _____, your help, support, and just plain love throughout this endeavor will always be remembered.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Definition of the Terms	3
Statement of the Problem	4
Justification	4
Significance of the Problem	8
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
History of Intercollegiate Athletics	10
Student Participation and Control	10
Transfer of Control	11
Early Problems	12
National Collegiate Athletic Association	16
Role of Athletics in Education	19
Faculty Representative	26
Summary	29
3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE	30
Subjects	30
Instrumentation	30
Procedure	32
Analysis	33
4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	34
Introduction	34
Demographic Information	34
Responses of Faculty Representatives' Perceptions	40
Summary of Findings	71
5. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	76
Discussion	76
Summary	76
Implications	78
Conclusion	81
Recommendations for Further Study	83

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

	Page
REFERENCE NOTES	85
BIBLIOGRAPHY	86
APPENDIXES	
A. Questionnaire	93
B. Cover Letter	98
C. Follow-Up Letter	100
D. Second Follow-Up Letter	102
E. NCAA Geographical Breakdown of Districts	104
VITA	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Returns by District	35
2. Representatives' Years on Campus	36
3. Representatives' Previous Association with Competitive Sports and Capacity of Competition	38
4. Level at which Competition Occurred	39
5. Representation of the Faculty and Methods Used to Gather Faculty Concerns	41
6. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 1	42
7. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 2	43
8. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 3	45
9. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 4	46
10. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 5	47
11. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 6	48
12. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 7	49
13. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 8	51
14. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 9	52
15. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 10	53
16. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 11	54
17. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 12	55
18. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 13	57
19. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 14	58
20. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 15	59
21. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 16	60

LIST OF TABLES (cont.)

Table	Page
22. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 17	62
23. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 18	63
24. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 19	64
25. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 20	65
26. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 21	66
27. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 22	68
28. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 23	69
29. Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 24	70
30. Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses Regarding Role of Intercollegiate Athletics	72
31. Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses Regarding Funding	73
32. Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses Regarding Recruiting	74
33. Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses Regarding Governance	75

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The rise of intercollegiate athletics is possibly one of the most unique aspects of the development of organized sport in this country. In 1850, the existence of athletics on the college campus was minimal. In half a century, it became one of the most important social functions of private and public institutions across the land (Lucas & Smith, 1978). Recently, intercollegiate athletics have gained national recognition of unprecedented distinction. Scandalous reports, in some isolated cases leading to F.B.I investigations, are becoming daily news. Consequently then, what is the role of intercollegiate athletics in America today?

Bruce Ogilvie and Thomas Tutko surveyed 15,000 athletes and concluded:

. . . it seems that the personality of the ideal athlete is not the result of any molding process, but comes out of the ruthless selection process that occurs at all levels of sport. . . There is indeed evidence that the athletic competition limits character development in some areas.

(in Edwards, 1973, p. 78)

However, Jesse Hill, Athletic Director at the University of Southern California expressed a different opinion about the role of intercollegiate athletics:

Athletics develop dedication and a desire to excel in competition, a realization that success requires hard work

and that life must be lived according to rules. An athlete learns a sense of loyalty and a respect for discipline. (in Edwards, 1975, p. 71)

Is the presence of intercollegiate athletics in the American universities an educational endeavor, or as suggested above, a non-educational endeavor? In recent years, intercollegiate athletics were labeled by some as a segment of the establishment that has outlived its usefulness (Harold & Lowe, 1973). There remained a question in the minds of many interested parties: Are athletic programs in larger universities no more than programs of entertainment for the students, alumni, public, and faculties with no educational merits? (Kidd, 1970).

In order for intercollegiate athletics to assume their place in education, Plant (1961) asserted that they must be given consideration in terms of the educational contributions to the individual participant and also the represented school. The consideration of intercollegiate athletics involved more than the responsibility of enforcing the principles of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and other governing bodies. The principles on which intercollegiate athletics were developed were viewed as having their foundation in educational fact and were expressed in terms of educational purposes compatible with the purposes of higher education (Shea & Weiman, 1967).

The exposure of amateur athletics through the media, especially television, resulted in an increased emphasis on athletics. For example, in 1976 the American Broadcasting Company paid 15 million dollars for the right to broadcast NCAA football games (Coakley, 1978). Consequently,

some educators advocated the elimination of intercollegiate athletics from the total educational spectrum which encompasses the college atmosphere (Coakley, 1978). Other individuals believed that institutions, which are desirous of providing intercollegiate athletic competition, should seek to sponsor professional teams (Bradley, 1979). Despite the beliefs of individuals who are involved or uninvolved in education, athletics were a visible part of the campus life in most Division IA universities in the NCAA. Therefore, an appraisal of intercollegiate athletics was deemed necessary. Hopefully, the appraisal would examine the particular role that intercollegiate athletics should occupy in relation to the university's mission, as perceived by the faculty representative to athletics.

Definitions

The following was compiled as list of definitions to be used throughout this investigation.

Athletic Council. The policy-making body for intercollegiate athletics on the individual campuses. The specific title and function of this body may vary from campus to campus (Quarles, 1977).

Division IA. The highest level of competition within the NCAA governed schools.

Faculty Representative to Athletics. A faculty member who serves as a liason between the president of his institution and that institution's athletic program. This person also represents the university at the NCAA annual meeting, and votes on all issues presented (Ramer, in press).

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The largest association governing men's intercollegiate athletics in the United States. This association identifies four major divisions of intercollegiate sports programs (Coakley, 1978).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty representatives' perceptions about intercollegiate athletics and its role in higher education throughout the United States. Issues such as recruiting, funding, governance, NCAA, and the faculty representatives' specific roles were investigated.

Justification

Due to the increasing expansion of and emphasis on intercollegiate athletics, i.e., the NCAA's Division IA classification, many administrative issues dealing with athletic control have arisen. Since most colleges accept intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the total program, the writer contended that provisions should be made to analyze and evaluate the parameters facing this phenomenon.

In seeking information about intercollegiate athletics, a diversity of related literature was found. After reviewing the literature, it was apparent that many opinions concerning intercollegiate athletics exist. The scope of opinions was broad in nature, covering all phases of intercollegiate athletics. The presidents of both two-year and four-year institutions were surveyed concerning their perceptions of intercollegiate athletics (Mason, 1969; Sterrit, 1970; Voetsch, 1976;

Yarnell, 1970). Opinions and attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics of the board of trustees were analyzed (Moore, 1972). Kelliher (1956), Reno (1963), and Quarles (1973) conducted studies which ascertained the athletic director's role in athletics. Other studies dealing with the areas of recruiting, violence, and Blacks received a great deal of attention. The NCAA (1934, 1960, 1972, 1973) conducted studies into almost every area of intercollegiate athletics. Every facet of the media (television, radio, and the newspaper) lent much of their valuable time and space to the issues of intercollegiate athletics.

Bundy (1968), Munford (1951), Newborn (1964), Pepper (1894), and Pfnister (1970) conducted investigations pertaining specifically to the faculty of higher education. These studies concerned themselves primarily with the faculty's roles regarding governance of athletics.

Furthermore, because intercollegiate athletics occupy a notable place in all Division IA institutions, the writer suggested that the governance and administration of these programs must function as smoothly as possible. Involved in this governance were not only administrators and athletic personnel but members of the faculty. The faculty members of universities were noted as having an interest in sports (Blackburn & Nyikos, 1974), and therefore a consideration of the faculty's perceptions toward intercollegiate athletics was judged as vital to the smooth functioning of athletic programs.

It was determined that it would be a gigantic task to investigate the perceptions, with regard to intercollegiate athletics, of all faculty members at the sampled universities in this study. Hence, the faculty

representative to athletics was selected to theoretically represent the faculty of the universities selected for this study.

Ramer (in press) conducted a nationwide study, sponsored by the NCAA, which pertained to the assignments and activities of the faculty representative to athletics. After a thorough analysis and discussion of the findings, Ramer made several recommendations which were relevant to his own investigation. Ramer pointed out that the position of faculty representative had been in effect for at least 25 years in nearly half of the institutions surveyed. He commented: "One wonders why it (the faculty representative position) has not received more attention in professional literature. . . especially since it is dedicated heavily to the educational credibility of athletics" (p. 164). This investigation into the perceptions of faculty representatives was seen to address the preceding statement by Ramer, in that the study contributes to the professional literature on the topic.

Secondly, Ramer discussed the need for faculty representatives to know more about the potential of their position. By looking at faculty representatives' perceptions of athletics, one hopes in some way to illuminate the importance of the faculty representatives' role and to recognize a concern about faculty representatives' attitudes toward athletics. Inherent in the existence of the study and in the NCAA's support of Ramer's study was the idea that faculty representatives play a significant role in athletics.

It is believed that university administrators may be able to utilize the research skills of the faculty members. In addition, the

writer asserts that from the faculty's interests in sports may come the basis for some critical, yet useful, remarks. To further this point, James Michner (1976) observed the following in his book, Sports in America:

Universities whose major moral positions have been dictated by sports have not encouraged their faculties to analyze the problems they create; it is easier to find a good study on the Flemish language of the children of Antwerp than to discover from articles in learned journals what really goes on in the sports department of the university in which the scholars reside. (pp. 22, 23)

Since a university faculty comes in contact with athletes during the academic year and because they have an interest in sports (Blackburn & Nyikos, 1974), their perceptions about intercollegiate athletics should be explored. In a NCAA funded national study, Ramer (in press) approached the question of the faculty representatives' role in the decision-making process of intercollegiate athletics. He reported that three-fourths of those questioned believed that the faculty representatives were important in the decision-making process.

Based on a number of personal interviews conducted with the faculty representative to athletics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, insights were gained (not contained in the literature) concerning the roles and responsibilities of the faculty representative. It was further discovered, through these interviews, that national studies containing information pertinent to faculty representatives were lacking (Bell, Note 1; Robertson, Note 2).

Significance of the Problem

National studies were conducted to investigate the roles and responsibilities of the faculty representative to athletics (Ramer, in press; Smith, 1973). Some specific concerns cited in these studies were:

(a) the input of faculty representatives regarding decisions pertaining to athletics; (b) faculty representatives' responsibility to maintain ethical conduct in sports and (c) amount of time devoted by faculty representatives to his tasks regarding athletics.

Are faculty representatives important in the decision-making process of each university in relation to their athletic program? Three-fourths of the presidents surveyed at all NCAA colleges felt that the faculty representative served an important role in the decision-making process. Athletic directors at these same universities agreed at a level of two-thirds (Ramer, in press).

Chief executives, athletic directors, and faculty representatives were asked whether faculty representatives ignore their responsibilities in maintaining ethical conduct in sports. Of these three groups, only eleven percent responded in the affirmative. These groups consisted of 447 presidents, 506 directors of athletics, and 409 faculty representatives (Ramer, in press).

The amount of time devoted by faculty representatives to their tasks, congruent of athletics, is an important concern. The range of time spent on athletics varies from five percent to twenty-five percent at different universities (Ramer, in press). Consideration is also being given to decreasing faculty representatives' academic loads, thereby increasing his

time spent on athletic concerns. (Tow, note 3). Because of this possibility, more serious attention must be given to the question of academic loads, and the implications for the various departments.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Intercollegiate Athletics

Intercollegiate athletics, as we understand it today, had its beginning in the post Civil War period of the 1860's and 1870's (Scott, 1951). Most history books state that the first intercollegiate contest of any sort was between two Ivy League schools, Harvard and Yale. The activity in which these two schools engaged was crew and the year was 1852. Other pre Civil War contests were sporadic affairs, largely an outgrowth of what we today consider intramurals (Keefe, 1975).

In the mid 1870's, students attending eastern colleges organized teams in football, baseball, crew, and track and field. By the turn of the century, athletic participation by colleges had expanded from coast to coast (Keefe, 1975).

Student Participation and Control

"The games of college students are as old as the colleges themselves" (Rice, 1929, p. 6). With no direction or encouragement from faculties or administrators, the students took the initial step in organizing intercollegiate athletics. Because of the large increase in college enrollments at the beginning of the twentieth century, the student administered programs of intercollegiate athletics took hold. The task of maintaining facilities, hiring professional coaches, planning trips, and other assorted administrative duties fell to the students' direction (Shea & Weiman, 1967).

However, as programs developed and more sports were added, it became apparent that student control of intercollegiate athletics was neither practical nor adequate. The scope of the total endeavor had mushroomed so quickly that the task of administering these programs properly was far beyond the time available to and the abilities of students. Since students were a transient group, they failed to provide the needed continuity from year to year. Eventually it became necessary to employ graduate managers, coaches, and trainers to provide adequate leadership for this expanding enterprise (Keefe, 1975).

Even with the additional leadership, the administration and control of the programs were still haphazard. The lack of proper care to injured athletes and the misuse of money were some specific problems. Moreover, the most crucial area was the lack of uniform rules regarding eligibility. This deficiency led to a great deal of abuse by participating institutions (Shea & Weiman, 1967).

This state of affairs eventually forced authorities at participating institutions to take a stand and demand necessary controls to operate the programs properly (Scott, 1951). Consequently, in 1905, a joint effort to unite these colleges resulted in the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association which, in 1910, became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (Keefe, 1975).

Transfer of Control

Eventually, as educators realized that athletics are an integral part of education and that athletics would be present as long as the sponsoring institutions are present, they exerted greater control over

the negative aspects. Prior to this understanding, educators believed that they did not have adequate time to devote to athletics, nor did athletics warrant attention. Hence, with the growth of intercollegiate sports, it became increasingly difficult for entire faculties to control athletics. Consequently, administrators appointed selected faculty members to serve on boards which were designed to control and govern athletics (Hart, 1890).

The creation of faculty committees on athletics had significant bearing on bringing the athletic programs under the control of the institutions. At the beginning of the twentieth century, there were few programs which did not come under advisement of either the faculty or administration (Shea & Weiman, 1967).

Early Problems

Even after the administration of the athletic programs changed hands (from students to administrators), problems were present. Due to the upsurge of interest in athletics, the new regime was not prepared to handle the perplexity of these problems. Finances, facilities, eligibility, and scheduling were some of the initial problems faced by the institutions (Heatherington, 1907; Sargent, 1906).

The financing of intercollegiate athletics represented the foremost problem by which administrators were confronted. In a report about intercollegiate athletics during its early development, Robert J. Keefe stated:

The main sources of income were of course gate receipts and student fees. Since student fees were very limited, most of the money had to come from paid admissions. Naturally, football provided by far the largest portion. This led to the age-old vicious cycle: in order to take in more money you must have winning teams, which in turn means better players, which requires more extensive recruiting and subsidization. Also, it requires the services of an expert coach who ultimately became another administrative headache. (Keefe, 1975, p. 8)

These causes eventually led to the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and all the other controversial issues surrounding sports presently.

Because of the tremendous emphasis placed on athletics which was exhibited in a short period of time, adequate facilities were lacking at most institutions. The existent playing fields, swimming pools, and field houses were considered antiquated. Institutions were forced to spend large sums of money to update the facilities (Keefe, 1975).

The eligibility of players posed yet another major problem for administrators. For many years, no eligibility rules existed. In 1890, Albert Bushell Hart, a Harvard historian, described the athletic recruits as "the few young men who became regular members of the college in order to develop and exhibit their skills as athletes" (p. 65). Also, it was commonplace for outstanding athletes of smaller colleges

to play for the larger institutions (Lucas & Smith, 1978). Administering and controlling these issues created a problem for each institution.

A problem of less magnitude, but of notable importance was scheduling. With financial gains a priority, and pleasing the alumni also important, administrators spent a great deal of effort constructing accommodating schedules. A common practice for large institutions was to play smaller colleges to guarantee a win, and in return the battered schools would realize a profit large enough to justify the defeat. Next, the administrators would construct the schedule with intersectional rivals in mind. This maneuver would hopefully increase interest which generated a great deal of revenue at the gate (Keefe, 1975).

A review of the literature revealed that any investigation into intercollegiate athletics, with regard to problems during its early development, would be insufficient, without specific reference being given to the Carnegie Report of 1929. Two groups, the American Association of University Professors and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, entered into studies concerning intercollegiate athletics (Wilkins, 1926).

In conducting the Carnegie Report, the appointed committee investigated all the pertinent aspects of sports in American institutions. These aspects included: a) the growth of athletics, b) administrative control, c) the results of participation, d) athletic training, e) the position of the coach, f) extramural relations, and g) the overall values of athletics (Shea & Weiman, 1967).

With the aid of \$125,000, the Carnegie Foundation published a report on intercollegiate athletics that was to be one of the most widely publicized and critical reports ever made. This investigation was the third of the kind undertaken by the Foundation. The first, in 1920, dealt primarily with American universities; and the second, in 1927, dealt with athletics in England (Savage, 1927).

These investigations were authorized by the trustees of the Foundation and directed by Dr. Howard Savage. The purpose was:

. . . to ascertain the significant facts concerning college athletics in the United States and Canada, to analyze these facts in relation to American college and university life, with such reference to school and college athletics in other countries as may shed occasional light upon our problems and to present a summary of American college athletics, their merits and their defects, together with such suggestions looking to their improvements as may grow out of the material in hand. (Savage, 1927, p. 1)

The Foundation revealed that out of all colleges investigated, only 28 were free from professionalism (Danzig, 1954). Also, the study reported that questions prevalent earlier in the century concerning conditions and problems of intercollegiate athletics, are still present. Some of the more important conclusions of this study were: a) very few controls were placed on college athletics; and b) serious quarrels between colleges were developing which were continually demanding attention (Savage, 1929).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

In 1905, there was much concern about the future of intercollegiate athletics. This concern was centered primarily around the roughness associated with football. Deaths and paralyzing injuries caused some officials to give serious thought to abolishing the game completely. However, Theodore Roosevelt wanted to save football and invited athletic leaders to the White House to consider some rule changes which he deemed necessary (Hickock, 1977).

From this original meeting developed the first conference of college presidents and faculty representatives which would focus on intercollegiate athletics. Thirty institutions were represented in this assemblage which was named the Intercollegiate Athletic Association (Shea & Weiman, 1967). This title was eventually changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910 (Hickock, 1977).

During the early stages of its development, the NCAA was concerned primarily with establishing rules for the various sports. Eligibility rules for participants had not been formulated (Luehring, 1947).

Concerning the present format of the NCAA, the first big development took place in 1939. In that year, the constitution was rewritten so it would be inclusive of definite standards that were to be requirements for membership. Ratification of this constitution took place in 1941 (Hickock, 1977).

Basic principles were established in 1939 that are characteristic of the association to this day. As given by Leuhring (1947, pp. 707-709), these principles were directly related to the following:

The Principle of Amateurism

The Principle of Institutional Control and Responsibility

The Principle of Sound Academic Standards

The Principle Governing Financial Aid

The Principle Governing Recruiting

The Principle Governing Ethical Conduct

The Principle Governing Competition in Post Season and
Non-Collegiate Sponsored Contests

The Principle Governing Out-of-Season Practice

In 1951, the establishment of a machinery to deal directly with members who might not live up to the set standards was instituted (Shea & Weiman, 1967). Also, in 1951, Walter Byers, who was a part-time executive assistant in the association, emerged to become the first full-time executive director. It is noted that Mr. Byers remains in that capacity at this writing. Kansas City, Missouri was established as the NCAA headquarters the following year (Hickock, 1977).

Present Organization

At this writing, the NCAA has nearly 800 member institutions (Whitacre, Note 4). Each year the NCAA conducts a convention at which all institutions are represented by their faculty representatives to athletics. The purpose of this convention is to bring forth relative issues regarding athletics, in order that each institution may have an opportunity to express their opinion by means of a single vote. Prior to the convention, each institution is advised of the matters to be discussed in order that all members of that university's athletic council

can voice their opinion on how that university should vote (Bell, Note 5). Also during this convention, an 18 member council (elected by the faculty representatives) directs policy. This conclave is composed of eight district vice-presidents at large, a secretary-treasurer, and a president (Hickock, 1977; McQuire, 1975).

The most significant present day readjustment concerning the NCAA's format occurred on August 6, 1973. During a special convention, the member institutions voted to divide the NCAA into three divisions. It was agreed that each division would be able to legislate its own rules of conduct relative to specific tangibles inherent within each college (Koch, 1975).

Many reasons existed concerning the development of this division format which was completed despite earlier opposition (Keith, 1973). Initially, the plan permitted each school to choose the division in which it wished to participate, with the exception of the major football powers, which must belong to Division I (since then changed to Division IA). In addition, each division wrote their own rules based on their specific requirements. Lastly, and possibly most importantly, was the area which dealt with the major football powers. Major programs threatened to secede and construct an organization of so-called "super-powers." This development caused great concern, primarily because these colleges would then possess the opportunity to negotiate such matters as television contracts (Hickock, 1977; McQuire, 1975).

The Role of Athletics in Education

What is the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to higher education, and how is their place in the educational process defined? Discovering answers to these questions can be complicated due to the great number of proponents and critics who have opinions about intercollegiate athletics (Coakley, 1978; Hanford, 1974).

The literature indicated that the populus representing those interested in athletics is composed of many different factions. Administrators and faculty members were seen to have understandable and genuine interests in intercollegiate athletics.

Administration. According to Shea and Weiman (1967), the principle role of administrators involved with intercollegiate athletics was to establish policies governing these enterprises. Specifically, the chief administrative office was given the responsibility to see that athletics were conducted in a wholesome manner. This individual, who may hold the title of president, chancellor, or provost was directly responsible to the board of trustees (Shea & Weiman, 1967). Another problem confronting administrations was enrollment. The task of bringing students into higher education was becoming a concern. Hence, a successful athletic team was suggested as a means to alleviate this problem (White, 1974).

The question surrounding policy formation was examined by many investigators. Forsyth (1966), Harden (1976), and Plant (1961) all expressed beliefs that policy should be established by the board of trustees and the president. They also believed that the president and

athletic director must conduct the program in accordance with the established policy.

Since the chief executive of all colleges is responsible for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, he was expected to be cognizant of the need for furthering the educational aspects of athletics. Shea and Weiman (1967) discussed administrative policies, previously outlined by Scott (1956), of which an administrator must be aware:

He must be instrumental in crystallizing the philosophy and objectives of his own institution and understanding the part intercollegiate athletics is to play in these goals. (Shea & Weiman, 1967, p. 60)

He should acquaint himself with the issues of athletics and familiarize himself with the recommended principles and practices in the field. Then he should set about to discover what is taking place in athletics at his institution. (Shea & Weiman, 1967, p. 61)

He can give continuous surveillance to the program of athletics in his institution. (Shea & Weiman, 1967, p. 61)

He can insist that intercollegiate athletics be made an integral phase of the educational curriculum and the benefits extended to all students. (Shea & Weiman, 1967, p. 61)

And finally, the president can make certain that a competent, full-fledged educator is appointed to administer the program of athletics in his institution.

In making this appointment he can assure this person of the same academic status, confidence, trust, and cooperation accorded heads of departments in other areas of the curriculum. He can then hold him accountable for qualitative adherence to established principles and practices in the field of competitive sports and in education. (Shea & Weiman, 1967, p. 62)

However, the longevity of a college president was sometimes hampered due to problems arising from athletics. Alumni and presidents had conflicts concerning a difference of opinion with regard to athletic programs. Most of the conflict centered around presidential policy and the overall direction of athletics (Blackburn & Nyikos, 1974; Shea & Weiman, 1967).

Shea and Weiman (1967), in one of the few texts available concerning the administration of intercollegiate athletics, noted a few of the concerns that have caused conflicts between presidents and alumni:

. . . excessive loss of football games has led to widespread dissatisfaction with the administration by the alumni and public; any punitive action taken by an athletic conference or parent body has reflected on the president throughout the state; the alumni . . . insistence for nationally successful teams has contributed to the resignation of some; and demands for bringing the practices in athletics into line with the educational and administrative practices of the college sometimes has resulted in loss of alumni support. (p. 63)

Gene A. Budig, currently President of West Virginia University, conducted a study in 1974 with regard to intercollegiate athletics. His investigation sampled opinions of faculty members and administrators of all Big 8 institutions. One of the conclusions suggested that institutions with winning or successful athletic programs are given priority with regard to fiscal support from their legislators. Furthermore, administrators who support athletic prowess believed that since colleges must compete for students, a high quality athletic program is a necessity in order to generate applicants (Budig, 1974; Coakley, 1978; Crase, 1974). These proponents believed that sport is a necessary and a fruitful advertising mechanism. An institution stripped of its athletic teams was believed to be incomplete in the eyes of prospective students, not to mention parents who pay tuition (Lowe & Harold, 1973; Renick, 1974).

Fan loyalty, alumni support, and student matriculation (with their corresponding dollar-and-cents support) was seen by Sharp (1974) to be of notable importance for administrators when establishing policy for intercollegiate athletics. Dr. Paul Sharp, President of the University of Oklahoma, said his administration is forced to resist "constant external pressures to use athletics for political or commercial purposes" (p. 161) much of the time.

The educational credibility of sports is a concern that has faced administrators for a long time. These administrators may be no nearer a solution today than they were one hundred years ago. However, it is an important issue and should continue to receive attention.

Faculty. How do academic professors perceive the role of intercollegiate athletics? Do they believe athletics is an integral part of the educational mission of universities, or the contrary? And just what is their role, if any, regarding intercollegiate athletics? These are some concerns involving the faculty and intercollegiate athletics.

In 1974, Louis E. Alley, Chairman of the Department of Physical Education at the University of Iowa, wrote that "athletics in education should be thought of as a two-edged sword, capable of cutting in opposite directions. The direction the sword cuts depends on those who swing it, not on the sword itself" (p. 33). Moreover, faculty members surveyed in the Big 8 expressed similar beliefs. They reported that winning athletic teams can detract from the overall educational mission of the college (Budig, 1974).

Harry Edwards (1973), professor at the University of California at Berkeley, believed that athletics have no educational merit. He asserted that athletics' main function was to exploit the athlete and the sponsoring institution. Thomas Tutko, who has conducted extensive research in the area of athletics, was quoted: "Athletics today builds characters, not character" (in Crase, 1974, p. 100).

Also, in 1974, the American Council on Education published a report; the findings of this report which indicated that college athletics have "warped" priorities. It was contended that because of these

priorities expensive athletic facilities are being constructed prior to academic buildings (Kniker, 1974).

Furthermore, Robert T. Blackburn (1974), a professor of higher education at the University of Michigan, conducted an investigation into the faculty's perceptions of intercollegiate athletics and arrived at the following conclusion: "An athletic program that places first priority on winning contests may well be a destructive educational force. Not only may the social development of the athletes themselves suffer, but the youngsters who are weeded out may be permanently impaired" (p. 113).

Many professors of higher education believed that one of the biggest drawbacks to athletics is the competition spawned by a "win at all costs" philosophy. Hellison (1973), Ogilvie & Tutko (1971), Scott (1974), and Weis (1974) were in agreement that unhealthy competition can be a result of a "win at all costs" philosophy. Increased emphasis on athletic programs may also induce unethical practices in recruiting, unhealthy manipulation of athletes, and possibly the misuse of drugs to increase performance and gain an advantage over opponents.

Hence, do intercollegiate athletics have genuine and positive features? The answer is yes.

Many university presidents have pointed to a number of buildings made possible by generous alumni who were influenced by winning athletic

teams. Also, entire universities have risen to intellectual respectability because of money raised by athletics (Blackburn & Nyikos, 1974).

Moreover, intercollegiate athletics have provided benefits to society. Experts believed that athletics open doors to young people who otherwise may not have attended college. And, on Saturday, a home game has provided togetherness not occurring in other activities. Finally, game attendance has provided various links across subcultures that has been vital to the overall functioning of a university (Blackburn & Nyikos, 1974).

Since positive aspects of intercollegiate athletics exist, what can be done by the faculty to enhance these vital concerns? Blackburn and Nyikos (1974), Crase (1974), Plant (1961), and White (1974) believed that the faculty possesses the opportunity to be a viable force regarding the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics. After all, was not the initial administration of athletics the responsibility of the faculty?

Marcus Plant, one time president of the NCAA and a law professor at the University of Michigan, wrote in 1961 that the faculty possessed the chance to control athletics, something non-existent for other factions on campus:

. . . although the control and administration of these activities are the legitimate responsibility of all three groups; the administrators, the athletic staffs, and the faculties, only the faculty is essentially free from the pressures which have made it possible to

realize the desirable objectives of intercollegiate athletics. (1961, p. 131)

Gordon White, sports Editor of the New York Times and one who is concerned with the future of intercollegiate athletics, reported on the faculty's potential role in intercollegiate athletics. His interview with Joe Paterno, coach at Pennsylvania State University, revealed Paterno's opinion: "The faculty of universities do not need to be monitored if they cheat, then let's all cheat and win football games. . . however the faculty have not asserted themselves enough, if they took an interest in athletics, as they do in some other areas, they could be a viable and positive force" (1974, p. 106-107).

Faculty Representative

A review of the literature revealed no study directly and completely related to the perceptions of faculty representatives regarding intercollegiate athletics. Isolated concerns regarding this topic were found in a few general studies pertaining to other aspects of athletic administration. Furthermore, two recent studies (Ramer, in press; Smith, 1973) dealt with the roles of faculty representatives. These studies will also be cited in this section of the review of literature.

Based on a historical study (Hoover, 1958) it was revealed that faculty representatives were included in the group that met in Kansas City in 1956 to revise the "Aims and Objectives of the NCAA." Hoover also noted that the Faculty Athletic Committee was formed very early and came into focus in the late 1950's. The primary concern of these committees were eligibility, standards, and organizations.

The role of the faculty representative to athletics appeared to be much less significant during the 1960's. In a study conducted by Marshall (1969), faculty representatives at only 53% of the voting colleges had official voting privileges, contrary to today's number of 100%.

Three major questions were found to be prevalent in the literature reviewed regarding the faculty representative. These concerns were: the importance of the faculty representative in the decision-making process; the procedure used to appoint a representative; and what are the specific duties of each representative.

Powell (1963) conducted a study of faculty representatives in the Big Ten, and regarding decision-making, he summarized ". . . faculty representatives should stay clear of administrative details and deal only with shaping policy and stressing principles" (p. 132). However, Ramer (in press) stated that 78% of the faculty representatives at Division IA universities felt they should assist the director of athletics and advise the chief executive on athletic matters.

Regarding procedure of appointment to the position of faculty representative, Marshall (1968) reported in his nationwide survey of athletic directors that the faculty representative should be appointed by the president or chancellor. Ramer (in press) agreed with this finding, but added "appointments should be made only after the president had received recommendations from appropriate groups" (p. 23). Furthermore, Ramer stated that some specific behaviors should be present regarding the individual such as: integrity, interest, and willingness to assist the college and athletic department.

The last and possibly the most important concern found throughout the literature was identification of the representatives' specific role and responsibilities. Mott, in 1953, conducted a study of Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, and found the following duties to be the most common:

- 1) represent the institutions at conference meetings
- 2) represent the institutions at NCAA meetings
- 3) interpret the rules and regulations of both conference and NCAA
- 4) sign and certify eligibility lists
- 5) meet with the athletic staff
- 6) keep the president informed (p. 91).

Mott's sample was faculty representatives and athletic directors.

On the other hand, Ramer (in press) cited responses from athletic directors, faculty representatives and presidents (n=1357) and listed the following as primary functions:

- 1) informing the athletic department of faculty concerns,
- 2) informing the faculty,
- 3) serving as chairman of the athletic committee,
- 4) representing the campus to the NCAA and Conference,
- 5) serving as liaison between the president and the athletic department,
- 6) informing the administration of faculty concerns.

Both of the lists are in rank order.

Faculty representatives for athletics exist on about 85-90% of all NCAA member colleges. As mentioned earlier, these individuals have been recognized in higher education for many years, and it is the writer's belief, in view of present developments, these individuals will be more recognized.

Summary

This review attempted to trace the origin and growth of inter-collegiate athletics in the United States. Historically intercollegiate athletics belonged to the athletes and faculty. This review has documented its evolution into its present day, almost autonomous status. Particular attention was placed on the NCAA and the role of athletics in education.

Chapter III

Methodology and Procedure

Subjects

All faculty representatives for athletics of NCAA Division IA colleges (N=139) that sponsor varsity football teams were surveyed in this investigation. The National Collegiate Athletic Association Directory and a telephone interview with officials of the National Collegiate Athletic Association were utilized to identify the names and addresses of the representatives and their respective institutions.

Instrumentation

Questionnaires which were used in similar studies conducted by Eberle (1974), Mason (1969), Quarles (1976), Steitz (1973), and Voetsch (1976) were reviewed to aid in constructing the initial questionnaire. The initial questionnaire consisted of thirty questions. The use of a questionnaire was necessitated by large geographic area and relatively large sample population involved.

Also, a review of texts, professional journals, and related studies was conducted to aid in compiling a list of concepts believed important to a faculty representative in the determination of his perceptions of intercollegiate athletics. The concepts reviewed for investigation included: the role of the NCAA, educational functions of athletics, outside agencies, the mission of athletics. These topics were discussed as they related to the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics.

Furthermore, several interviews were conducted with two previous faculty representatives. Dr. Earl Ramer, from the University of Tennessee, and Dr. Wilson Bell, from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, were consulted and asked to evaluate the questionnaire.

Based on the review of literature and interviews, the following areas were deemed important: (a) role of athletics, (b) funding, (c) recruiting and the role of the NCAA, and (d) faculty representatives' views about their role. Questions pertinent to the above areas will be used in the questionnaire to ascertain the faculty representatives' views.

The role of intercollegiate athletics in the overall mission of higher education was found to be a relevant issue (Edwards, 1973) with special emphasis on the values gained by the participants in organized athletics (Eberle, 1974; Mason, 1969; Quarles, 1976; Steitz, 1973; Voetsch, 1976). The expenditure of money was regarded as another area which needed investigation (Eberle, 1974; Quarles, 1976; Ramer, in press). Because recruiting of athletes is one of the most controversial issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics today (Ramer, in press), because the NCAA is continuously faced with this problem, and because of the significance of recruiting in Division IA schools (Coakley, 1978), this issue was given consideration. The last area chosen was the faculty representatives' views about possible adaptations of their role. The need for this perspective was noted by Ramer (Ramer, in press).

During July, 1979, a pilot study was conducted that surveyed the faculty representatives of the Ohio Valley Conference (N=10).

An 80% return was realized from this investigation. The questionnaire in the pilot study was modified for use in the final investigation in such a way as to diminish ambiguity, i.e., to insure that each respondent saw the same meaning in each item.

To provide a systematic analysis of the data, a Likert-type scale was utilized (Manley, 1970). The questionnaire was constructed so that respondents had four possible answers from which to choose. This range consisted of: (a) agree - A, (b) tend to agree - TA, (c) tend to disagree - TD, and (d) disagree - D.

The initial step in constructing a Likert-type scale consisted of collecting a number of statements concerning the topic to be investigated. It was important that these responses to the questions express definite favorableness or unfavorableness of a particular area. Also, it was important that the questions were presented in a good psychological sequence, in order to enhance the flow of thought from question to question (Manley, 1970). To insure this, a discussion was held with the investigator's advisory committee to revise construction and length of the questionnaire.

Procedure

A packet including the questionnaire (see Appendix A), a self-addressed envelope, a pencil, and a cover letter explaining the investigation (see Appendix B) was mailed to faculty representatives in February, 1980. Purcell, Nelson, and Wheeler (1969) conducted research that

supported this procedure as viable for obtaining the best results in gathering data.

In order to increase the percentage of returns, two follow-up letters were sent to non-respondents. The first follow-up letter was sent three weeks after the initial mailing (see Appendix C). The second follow-up letter was sent two weeks after the first follow-up letter (see Appendix D). This last letter contained the same materials sent in the initial study. This procedure was employed to increase the percentage of returns (Manley, 1970).

Analysis of the Data

To analyze the data collected, the following statistical treatment was employed: percentage and frequency counts.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

In this chapter the data collected during this study are reported in terms of frequency of responses representing the perceptions of faculty representatives. To permit more detailed analysis, the data are broken down to represent each of the eight NCAA districts (see Appendix E). Table 1 indicates the frequency and percentage of returns from each district. Additionally, because of the NCAA's format of presenting information by districts, the writer believed this was the best manner in which to display his findings.

The first section of this chapter is a summary of the demographic information collected. The second section deals with the frequency of responses from each district. A matrix summarizing the frequency of responses by district is presented in the final section.

Demographic Information

The analysis revealed a sizeable difference pertaining to the sex of the representatives. Ninety-one of the respondents (95.8%) were male and four of the respondents (4.2%) were female.

Regarding the length of time the representatives were on campus, there was a notable difference. Sixteen percent reported that they were on campus for under 10 years, while eighty-four percent were on campus from 11-20 years (see Table 2). Thirty-two (33.7%) were graduates of their universities, while sixty-three (66.3%) were not graduates of the college they represented.

Table 1
Returns by District

District	Total NCAA Representatives	Responses Returned	% Returned
1	6	2	33.3
2	14	10	71.4
3	41	24	59.0
4	25	19	76.7
5	11	8	72.7
6	17	13	76.4
7	9	7	77.7
8	16	12	75.0
Total	139	95	68.5

Table 2
Representatives' Years on Campus

Years on Campus	Districts								Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
0 - 5	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
6 - 10	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	12
11 - 20	0	4	13	5	2	2	2	4	32
over 20	1	3	9	12	4	8	4	7	48
Total	2	10	24	19	8	13	7	12	95

Eighty-one percent of the representatives had been associated with competitive athletics prior to being named faculty representative (see Table 3). Seventy of the representatives were players, twenty-three coached, and fourteen were both referees and/or administrators previously (see Table 3).

The level at which the respondents' competition happened varied. Of the respondents, 68 were involved in high school, 50 at the college level, and 4 were associated with professional athletics (see Table 4).

Eighty-one (85.3%) of the respondents expressed a desire to remain in the position of faculty representative. On the other hand, 13 (13.7%) desired not to continue as representatives of the faculty. One representative did not respond.

The representatives were asked to indicate their level of interest in both the position they hold, and in athletics at the university. Eighty-two of the respondents showed that their interest in the position was high, eleven felt it was medium, while only two of the respondents believed it to be low. Furthermore, eighty-one (85.3%) of the representatives had a high interest in the university athletic program, ten (10.5%) were medium, and four (4.2%) had a low interest. It was noted that of the six respondents who indicated a low interest in both athletics and their position, five indicated that they would not like to remain in the capacity of faculty representative.

A very important concern among demographic information was whether or not the faculty representative did, in fact, represent the concerns of the faculty. Seventy-eight representatives believed that they did, in fact, represent the concerns of the the faculty. Nine indicated they

Table 3

Faculty Representatives' Previous Association
with Competitive Sports and Capacity of Competition

	Districts								Total	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
<u>Previously Competitive</u>										
	2	9	19	17	6	9	5	10	77	81.1
<u>Not Previously Competitive</u>										
	0	1	5	2	2	4	2	2	18	18.9
<u>Capacity of Competition</u>										
Player	2	8	18	14	6	9	4	9	70	73.7
Coach	0	4	7	7	1	2	2	0	23	24.2
Administrator	0	0	8	2	0	3	1	0	14	14.7
Referee	0	1	7	4	1	0	0	1	14	14.7

Table 4
Level at Which Competition Occurred

Level	Districts								Total	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
High School	2	8	18	14	6	9	4	7	68	71.6
College	0	5	13	12	1	7	5	7	50	52.6
Professional	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	4	4.2

did not represent the concerns and eight did not know (see Table 5). Three specific methods of gathering information were presented: polls, group meetings and private discussion. Eleven said they used polls, forty-seven gathered information through group meetings, and seventy-two said that they used private discussion as a resource (see Table 5).

Responses of Faculty Representatives

This section is a report of how the faculty representatives perceived current issues relevant to intercollegiate athletics. Each table presents the data collected according to each specific district.

With regard to the development of intellectual and individual fitness, seventy-seven (82.8%) of the faculty representatives agreed or tended to agree that intercollegiate athletics did develop intellectual as well as individual fitness. Only sixteen (17.2%) of the faculty representatives disagreed or tended to disagree with the statement (see Table 6).

Opposed to what has almost become daily news, faculty representatives do believe that intercollegiate athletics are an integral segment of higher education. Ninety-one (97%) agreed or tended to agree that athletics are integral. Only two tended to disagree, and no faculty representative disagreed with that statement (see Table 7).

Does intercollegiate athletics act as a recreational outlet for the physically fit student? The faculty representatives were in agreement. Fifty-three (58.2%) of the respondents agreed and twenty-three

Table 5
Representation of the Faculty and
Methods Used to Gather Faculty Concerns

Representation of Faculty										
	District								Total	%
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Yes I Represent the Faculty	1	6	23	16	7	12	5	8	78	82.1
No I do not Represent the Faculty	0	3	0	1	1	0	1	3	8	9.5
Do not Know	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	8	8.4
Gathering Information										
Polls	0	0	5	0	1	2	2	1	11	11.6
Group Meetings	1	1	19	8	3	7	4	4	47	49.5
Private Discussion	1	6	21	13	7	11	5	8	72	75.8

Table 6

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 1:
 "Intercollegiate athletics develop intellectual fitness
 as well as individual physical fitness in young athletes"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	3	5	0	2	10
3	8	13	2	1	24
4	6	7	4	1	18
5	3	4	0	1	8
6	5	5	1	2	13
7	6	1	0	0	7
8	3	6	2	0	11
Total	35	42	9	7	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 7

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 2:
 "I feel that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part
 of the university"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	2	0	0	0	2
2	8	2	0	0	10
3	22	2	0	0	24
4	16	2	0	0	18
5	4	3	1	0	8
6	12	0	1	0	13
7	7	0	0	0	7
8	9	2	0	0	11
Total	80	11	2	0	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

(25.3%) tended to agree. Only nine (9.9%) tended to disagree, and six (6.6%) disagreed (see Table 8).

Two questions in Section I were worded negatively. Is intercollegiate athletics contrary to contemporary student beliefs, was largely disagreed upon by the respondents. Fifty-seven (61.3%) disagreed with this statement, while 29 (31.2%) tended to disagree. Four tended to agree, and three agreed (see Table 9).

The other question that was negatively worded, received a number of negative responses. That athletics is irrelevant to the mission of higher education was not supported by the faculty representatives. Only ten (10.8%) agreed or tended to agree that intercollegiate athletics was irrelevant. On the other hand, 17 (18.3%) tended to disagree, and 66 (71%) totally disagreed (see Table 10).

Table 11 presents the responses regarding the objectives of intercollegiate athletics and professional sports. Fifty-seven (61.3%) of the faculty representatives agreed that the objectives of intercollegiate athletics and professional sports differ. Twenty-three (24.7%) tended to agree with the statement. Thirteen representatives tended to disagree or disagreed with the statement.

Seventy-four (79.6%) of the faculty representatives agreed that intercollegiate athletics does foster opportunities to young adults. Sixteen (17.2%) tended to agree to that statement. Only three representatives (3.3%) tended to disagree or disagreed (see Table 12).

Undoubtedly one of the most controversial issues facing intercollegiate athletics is academic prowess of student-athletes. In response

Table 8

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 3:
 "I feel athletics act as a recreational outlet for
 the physically fit student"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	6	2	1	1	10
3	11	8	3	2	24
4	12	4	1	0	17
5	5	0	2	0	7
6	9	2	1	1	13
7	2	4	0	1	7
8	7	2	1	1	11
Total	53	23	9	6	91 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 4

Table 9

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 4:
 "In general, I feel athletics are contrary to
 contemporary student values"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	1	1	2
2	0	1	4	5	10
3	0	0	8	16	24
4	1	2	4	11	18
5	1	0	4	3	8
6	1	1	2	9	13
7	0	0	3	4	7
8	0	0	3	8	11
Total	3	4	29	57	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 10

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 5:
 "I feel athletics are irrelevant to the
 proper mission of the university"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	0	1	0	2
2	0	2	0	8	10
3	0	0	9	15	24
4	1	3	1	13	18
5	1	0	3	4	8
6	1	0	2	10	13
7	0	0	0	7	7
8	0	1	1	9	11
Total	4	6	17	66	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 11

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 6:
 "The objectives of intercollegiate athletics and
 professional sports differ"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	5	2	2	1	10
3	15	8	0	1	24
4	9	6	3	0	18
5	6	1	1	0	8
6	8	2	3	0	13
7	4	2	1	0	7
8	9	2	0	0	11
Total	57	23	10	3	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 12

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 7:
 "I feel that intercollegiate athletics have opened
 opportunities to young adults who otherwise may
 have never entered college"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	5	4	0	1	10
3	20	3	1	0	24
4	15	3	0	0	18
5	7	0	1	0	8
6	12	1	0	0	13
7	6	1	0	0	7
8	8	3	1	0	12
Total	74	16	2	1	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

to question eight, of Section I, the faculty representatives agreed (79.6%) or tended to agree (17.2%) that the athletic department at their respective universities encouraged an athlete to pursue his academic work. Only 3.2% tended to disagree and no representative disagreed with the statement (see Table 13).

Eighty-five of the faculty representatives agreed or tended to agree that athletics are a potent force in developing behavior patterns and attitudes in a constructive fashion. Six tended to disagree, while only one disagreed totally (see Table 14).

The second part of Section II of the questionnaire dealt with funding. A wide divergence of opinion was found pertaining to money, i.e., funding.

Regarding the cost to run the athletic department and the amount of money generated for athletics, the faculty representatives were rather evenly split in their beliefs. Forty representatives (44.0%) agreed; ten (11%) tended to agree, 11 (12.1%) tended to disagree, and 30 (33%) faculty representatives to athletics totally disagreed that the cost to run the athletic program did not exceed monies appropriated (see Table 15).

As can be seen in Table 16, 21 (22.6%) tended to disagree and 34 (36.6%) disagreed that athletes should be granted financial aid on the same basis as any other student. On the other hand, 26 agreed, and 12 tended to agree with this statement. This represented 28% and 12% respectively.

The purpose of question 12 was to ascertain the representatives' perceptions on using tax money to underwrite athletics. Table 17 shows

Table 13

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 8:
 "The athletic department at this university encourages
 an athlete to pursue his academic work"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	9	1	0	0	10
3	19	5	0	0	24
4	14	3	1	0	18
5	7	0	1	0	8
6	9	4	0	0	13
7	7	0	0	0	7
8	8	2	1	0	11
Total	74	16	3	0	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 14

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 9:
 Role of Intercollegiate Athletics
 "Athletics are a potent force in developing behavior
 patterns and attitudes in a constructive fashion"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	2	0	0	0	2
2	3	5	2	0	10
3	13	11	0	0	24
4	6	10	1	0	17
5	5	2	0	1	8
6	6	5	2	0	13
7	6	1	0	0	7
8	3	7	1	0	11
Total	44	41	6	1	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3

Table 15

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 10:
 "The cost to run the athletic department at this
 institution does not exceed moneys appropriated for athletics"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	4	0	2	4	10
3	10	4	3	7	24
4	9	3	2	4	18
5	2	3	0	2	7
6	5	0	2	6	13
7	3	0	0	3	6
8	8	0	0	3	11
Total	40	10	11	30	91 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 4

Table 16

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 11:
 "Athletes ought to be granted financial aid on the same
 basis as any other student applying for financial assistance"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	4	2	2	2	10
3	7	4	7	6	24
4	8	0	2	8	18
5	2	2	2	2	8
6	2	2	1	8	13
7	1	0	3	3	7
8	1	2	4	4	11
Total	26	12	21	34	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 17

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 12:
 "I feel tax funds should be spent on athletics"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	2	0	2
2	1	5	1	3	10
3	4	7	9	4	24
4	8	7	0	3	18
5	2	1	1	4	8
6	5	4	1	3	13
7	0	6	0	0	6
8	3	3	2	3	11
Total	23	33	16	20	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3

that a divergence of thought existed on this concern. Twenty-three (25%) agreed that tax money should be spent on athletics while 33 (35.9%) tended to agree. Contrary to this belief were 16 (17.4%) who tended to disagree, and 20 (21.7%) who totally disagreed.

Do both major and minor sports receive equivalent funding? Forty-eight (53.3%) representatives disagreed with statement 13, while 19 (21.1%) tended to disagree. A total of 23 (25.6%) agreed or tended to disagree (see Table 18).

Part three of Section II dealt with what both proponents and opponents of intercollegiate athletics consider the "root of all evil," recruiting. Three of the four statements in part three showed considerably similar beliefs, while statement 17 had a wide range of responses. Statement 14 asked the representatives if certain policies should be re-evaluated relating to recruiting. Seventy-eight representatives (84.8%) were split evenly in their beliefs to re-evaluate, while 14 (15.2%) were also split exactly in half in their beliefs not to re-evaluate (see Table 19).

Differing with the current popular beliefs, the faculty representatives were not in total agreement on recruiting as a detrimental aspect of intercollegiate athletics. In Table 20 it is shown that 32 (34.4%) agreed, and 37 (39.8%) tended to agree. Furthermore, 16 (17.2%) tended to disagree, and eight (8.6%) disagreed. When addressed with the question of whether or not they would report any known recruiting violations to the president, 83 (89.2%) agreed. Eight (8.6%) tended to agree. Two representatives indicated they tended to disagree, or disagreed with statement 16 (see Table 21).

Table 18

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 13:
 "Both major and minor sports receive equivalent funding"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	1	0	1	2
2	2	2	2	4	10
3	3	2	4	14	23
4	0	3	5	9	17
5	0	1	3	4	8
6	4	1	2	6	13
7	0	2	2	2	6
8	0	2	1	8	11
Total	9	14	19	48	90 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 5

Table 19

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 14:
 "I feel certain policies, for example those relating to
 recruiting, should be re-evaluated"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	2	0	0	2
2	5	4	1	0	10
3	11	8	2	3	24
4	6	8	2	1	17
5	5	3	0	0	8
6	5	6	1	1	13
7	3	4	0	0	7
8	4	4	1	2	11
Total	39	39	7	7	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3

Table 20

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 15:
 "I feel recruiting practices are a detrimental aspect of
 intercollegiate athletics"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	1	1	0	2
2	4	3	3	0	10
3	9	11	2	2	24
4	7	4	4	3	18
5	4	3	1	0	8
6	5	3	3	2	13
7	2	3	2	0	7
8	1	9	0	2	12
Total	32	37	16	8	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 21

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 16:
 "If I were aware of any recruiting violations practiced
 by this university, I would report those infractions to the president"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	2	0	0	0	2
2	5	4	1	0	10
3	23	1	0	0	24
4	18	0	0	0	18
5	8	0	0	0	8
6	12	0	0	1	13
7	6	1	0	0	7
8	10	2	0	0	12
Total	83	8	1	1	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

When asked if ten years from now could universities and conferences handle problems alone, which are now addressed by the NCAA, a divergence of opinion emerged. Thirty representatives agreed (32.3%); 24 (25.8%) tended to agree; 15 (16.1%) tended to disagree; and 24 (25.8%) totally disagreed (see Table 22).

The next seven items of part 4 dealt with the governance of intercollegiate athletics. Specific interest was directed to the faculty representative, the university faculty and the faculty senate governing intercollegiate athletics.

Item 18 addressed the question of whether or not the recommendations proposed by the faculty representative received full support by the president. A large number, 90 (98.2%) agreed or tended to agree that they did receive full support. Only two representatives disagreed (see Table 23).

The faculty representative to athletics should be selected by the athletic committee. Fifty respondents (54.3%) disagreed with this statement. Twenty-nine (31.5%) tended to disagree. On the other hand, eight (8.7%) tended to agree and five (5.4%) agreed. Table 24 is a breakdown of this information.

Fifty-nine representatives to athletics either disagreed, or tended to disagree with in-service training to promote athletics. Table 25 illustrates that 33 representatives do, in fact, agree or tend to agree with this statement.

Table 26 was concerned with the problem of outside interference with the faculty-senate when governing athletics. With the

Table 22

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 17:
 "Ten years from now universities and conferences could handle
 many of the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics that
 are currently addressed by the NCAA"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	1	1	0	2
2	2	4	2	2	10
3	11	5	3	5	24
4	5	4	2	7	18
5	2	2	2	2	8
6	5	4	1	3	13
7	3	3	0	1	7
8	3	1	4	4	12
Total	30	24	15	24	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 23

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 18:
 "I feel that a majority of the recommendations proposed
 by me or my committee receive full support by the president"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	7	2	0	0	9
3	18	5	1	0	24
4	16	2	0	0	18
5	6	2	0	0	8
6	9	4	0	0	13
7	5	1	0	1	7
8	6	5	0	0	11
Total	68	22	1	1	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3

Table 24

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 19:
 "I feel the faculty representative to athletics should
 be selected by the athletic committee"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	1	1	2
2	1	1	4	4	10
3	2	1	8	13	24
4	0	4	5	9	18
5	0	0	3	4	7
6	2	1	2	8	13
7	0	0	4	3	7
8	0	1	2	8	11
Total	5	8	29	50	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3

Table 25

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 20:
 "I feel the faculty representative should initiate
 in-service training on campus to promote an
 understanding of the athletic program"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	1	1	2
2	2	2	1	5	10
3	2	9	8	4	23
4	1	3	9	5	18
5	1	3	2	2	8
6	4	2	2	5	13
7	1	1	4	1	7
8	0	2	6	3	11
Total	11	22	33	26	92 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 3.

Table 26

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 21:
 "I feel the faculty-senate could govern athletics
 at this university without any outside interference"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	1	1	2
2	1	5	0	4	10
3	2	1	3	18	24
4	2	2	2	12	18
5	1	3	1	3	8
6	0	1	1	11	13
7	0	1	2	4	7
8	0	0	2	9	11
Total	6	13	12	62	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

majority of this outside interference being the alumni, 74 representatives (79.6%) disagreed or tended to disagree that outside pressure did, in fact, exist. However, six (6.5%) and 13 (14.0%) agreed or tended to agree that athletics was governed without outside interference.

As shown on Table 27, a large majority of faculty representatives to athletics agreed or tended to agree that the committee elected faculty representative to athletics should be from a department other than athletics. Eighty-three (90.2%) agreed and six (6.5%) tended to agree, while only three (3.3%) disagreed or tended to disagree.

Even though university faculty members at Division IA universities may not have an interest in their athletic programs, the faculty representatives to athletics felt they should. Table 28 indicated the responses the faculty representatives gave to question 23. Ninety-five percent agreed or tended to agree that the faculty should have an interest, while only five percent disagreed or tended to disagree.

The final item of part four found a wide divergence of opinion. Could the faculty representatives' responsibilities be increased? Table 29 reveals that 17 (18.3%) and 30 (32.3%) agreed or tended to agree, respectively, that the representatives' responsibilities could be increased. Exactly half, 26 (27%) and 21 (22.4%) tended to disagree, or disagreed with this statement.

Table 27

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 22:
 "The appointed or committee elected faculty
 representative to the athletic council
 should be from a department other than athletics"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	2	0	0	0	2
2	8	1	0	1	10
3	20	2	1	0	23
4	15	2	1	0	18
5	8	0	0	0	8
6	12	1	0	0	13
7	7	0	0	0	7
8	8	4	0	0	12
Total	83	6	2	1	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 28

Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 23:
 "The faculty at this university should
 have an interest in their college sports program"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	1	1	0	0	2
2	8	2	0	0	10
3	17	7	0	0	24
4	13	3	1	1	18
5	1	5	2	0	8
6	7	5	0	1	13
7	5	2	0	0	7
8	6	6	0	0	12
Total	57	31	3	2	93 ^b

a

A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b

Missing Data = 2

Table 29
 Faculty Representatives' Responses to Question 24:
 "I feel the faculty representatives'
 responsibilities could be increased"

District	A	TA	TD	D ^a	Total
1	0	0	2	0	2
2	3	5	2	0	10
3	6	8	4	6	24
4	4	6	3	5	18
5	2	3	2	1	8
6	2	2	6	3	13
7	0	1	3	3	7
8	0	5	4	3	12
Total	17	30	26	21	94 ^b

a
 A = Agree
 TA = Tend to Agree
 TD = Tend to Disagree
 D = Disagree

b
 Missing Data = 1

Summary of Findings

To present a broader picture, a matrix displaying the four sub-sections was constructed. Each cell will show frequency of response by specific question and district. These tables were constructed to present a summary of the perceptions of the faculty representatives to athletics.

Table 30 is a summary of questions one through nine. This first section dealt with the Role of Intercollegiate Athletics.

The next Table is a summary of questions 10 through 13. This Table pertains to the faculty representatives' perceptions of funding (see Table 31).

Section III is presented in Table 32. This section was a summary of recruiting and intercollegiate athletics, as perceived by the faculty representatives.

Finally, the last seven statements of the questionnaire, 18 through 24, summarized the perceptions of the faculty representatives regarding governance. Table 33 displayed these findings.

Table 30

Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses
Regarding Role of Intercollegiate Athletics

DISTRICTS	QUESTION NUMBERS																																			
	Agree									Tend to Agree									Tend to Disagree									Disagree								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
2	3	8	6	0	0	5	5	9	3	5	2	2	1	2	2	4	1	5	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	5	8	1	1	0	0
3	8	22	11	0	0	15	20	19	13	13	2	8	0	0	8	3	5	11	2	0	3	8	9	1	1	0	0	1	0	2	11	15	1	0	0	0
4	6	16	12	1	1	9	15	14	6	7	2	4	2	3	6	3	3	10	4	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	11	13	0	0	0	1
5	3	4	5	1	1	6	7	7	5	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	2	4	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0
6	5	12	9	1	1	8	12	9	6	5	0	2	1	0	2	1	4	5	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0
7	6	7	2	0	0	4	6	7	6	1	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	0
8	3	9	7	0	0	9	8	8	3	6	2	2	0	1	2	3	2	7	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	8	9	0	0	0	0
Totals	35	80	53	3	4	56	74	73	44	36	11	23	4	6	23	16	41	9	2	9	29	17	2	2	3	6	7	0	6	52	66	3	1	0	1	

1. Intercollegiate athletics develop intellectual fitness as well as individual physical fitness in young athletes.
2. I feel that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of the university.
3. I feel athletics act as a recreational outlet for the physically fit student.
4. In general, I feel athletics are contrary to contemporary student values.

5. I feel athletics are irrelevant to the proper mission of the university.
6. The objectives of intercollegiate athletics and professional sports differ.
7. I feel that intercollegiate athletics have opened opportunities to young adults who otherwise may have never entered college.
8. The athletic department at this university encourages an athlete to pursue his academic work.
9. Athletics are a potent force in developing behavior patterns and attitudes in a constructive fashion.

Table 31
Summary of Faculty Representatives'
Responses Regarding Funding

DISTRICTS	QUESTION NUMBERS															
	Agree				Tend to Agree				Tend to Disagree				Disagree			
	10	11	12	13	10	11	12	13	10	11	12	13	10	11	12	13
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	1
2	4	4	1	2	0	2	5	2	2	2	1	2	4	2	3	4
3	10	7	4	3	4	4	7	2	3	7	9	4	7	6	4	14
4	9	8	8	0	3	0	7	3	2	2	0	5	4	8	3	9
5	2	2	2	0	3	2	1	1	0	2	1	3	2	2	4	4
6	5	2	5	4	0	2	4	1	2	1	1	2	6	8	3	6
7	3	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	0	3	0	2	3	3	0	2
8	6	1	3	0	0	2	3	2	2	4	3	2	3	4	3	8
Totals	40	26	23	9	10	12	33	14	11	21	17	20	30	34	20	48

- 10. The cost to run the athletic department at this institution does not exceed monies appropriated for athletics.
- 11. Athletes ought to be granted financial aid on the same basis as any other student applying for financial assistance.
- 12. I feel tax funds should be spent on athletics.
- 13. Both major and minor sports receive equivalent funding.

Table 32

Summary of Faculty Representatives'
Responses Regarding Recruiting

DISTRICTS	QUESTION NUMBERS															
	Agree				Tend to Agree				Tend to Disagree				Disagree			
	14	15	16	17	14	15	16	17	14	15	16	17	14	15	16	17
1	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
2	5	4	5	2	4	3	4	4	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	2
3	11	9	23	11	8	11	1	5	2	2	0	3	3	2	0	5
4	6	7	18	5	8	4	0	4	2	4	0	2	1	3	0	7
5	5	4	8	2	3	3	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
6	5	5	12	5	6	3	0	4	0	3	0	1	1	2	1	3
7	3	2	6	3	4	3	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
8	4	1	9	2	4	9	2	1	1	0	0	4	2	1	0	4
Totals	39	32	83	30	39	37	8	24	6	16	1	15	7	8	1	24

14. I feel certain policies, for example those relating to recruiting, should be re-evaluated.
15. I feel recruiting practices are a detrimental aspect of intercollegiate athletics.
16. If I were aware of any recruiting violations practiced by this university, I would report those infractions to the president.
17. Ten years from now universities and conferences could handle many of the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics that are currently addressed by the NCAA

Table 33

Summary of Faculty Representatives' Responses Regarding Governance

DISTRICTS	Agree							Tend to Agree							Tend to Disagree							Agree						
	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
2	7	1	2	1	8	8	3	2	1	2	5	1	2	5	0	4	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	5	4	1	0	0
3	18	2	2	2	20	17	6	5	1	9	1	2	7	8	1	8	8	3	1	0	4	0	13	4	18	0	1	6
4	16	0	1	2	15	13	4	2	4	3	2	2	3	6	0	5	9	2	1	1	3	0	19	5	12	0	0	5
5	6	0	1	1	8	1	2	2	0	3	3	0	5	3	0	3	2	1	0	2	2	0	4	2	3	0	1	1
6	9	2	4	0	12	7	2	4	1	2	1	1	5	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	6	0	8	5	11	0	0	3
7	5	0	1	0	7	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	4	4	2	0	0	3	1	3	1	4	0	0	3
8	6	0	0	0	7	5	0	5	1	2	0	5	6	5	0	2	6	2	0	0	4	1	8	3	9	0	0	2
Totals	68	5	11	6	79	57	17	22	8	22	13	11	31	30	1	29	33	12	2	3	26	2	60	26	62	1	2	20

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>18. I feel that a majority of the recommendations proposed by me or my committee receive full support by the president.</p> <p>19. I feel the faculty representative to athletics should be selected by the athletic committee.</p> <p>20. I feel the faculty representative should initiate in-service training on campus to promote an understanding of the athletic program.</p> | <p>21. I feel the faculty-senate could govern athletics at this university without any outside interference.</p> <p>22. The appointed or committee elected faculty representative to the athletic council should be from a department other than athletics.</p> <p>23. The faculty at this university should have an interest in their college sports program.</p> <p>24. I feel the faculty representatives' responsibilities could be increased.</p> |
|--|--|

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION

The position of faculty representative for athletics is one of long standing tradition on all Division IA campuses. However, the specific functions of these individuals and their perceptions about intercollegiate athletics have not been investigated nor have they been well known on a broad basis, even throughout the faculty representatives themselves. It was of interest to note that 32 of the 95 respondents desired to have the results of this study sent to them. Hence, this study will provide the data for sharing of information about their specific perceptions of intercollegiate athletics.

Summary

This study was divided into two parts. Part I dealt with demographic information about the representatives, and Part II was concerned with the faculty representatives' perceptions of intercollegiate athletics, specifically the role of athletics, funding, recruiting, and governance.

The information was gathered by questionnaire via mailings to the representatives. Frequency distributions were compiled by using a packaged computer program. Further analysis consisted of a breakdown of the data by Districts.

This study was limited to an investigation of perceptions of intercollegiate athletics by faculty representatives at only Division IA universities. The universities sampled were only those that sponsor football.

Functions of the faculty representatives vary according to Ramer (in press). Some of these duties are: serving as chairman of the athletic committee, representing the college at the conference and NCAA meetings and presenting appropriate information to the president, athletic department and the faculty. Also, theoretically the faculty representative represents the concerns of the faculty. The data supported this statements. Seventy-five of the faculty representatives believed that they did represent their respective faculty. Group meetings and private discussion were the means used most often to gather information. Hence, the faculty representatives do in actuality represent the faculty. Furthermore, due to the lack of direct communication to the athletic department, most faculty members have problems expressing their concerns. The faculty representative reported that private discussion was the foremost means of collecting information; this may be interpreted as a positive direct communication line.

In Part II, particular areas manifested enlightening information. A majority of these areas were topics of current debate regarding intercollegiate athletics.

A long standing question exists pertaining to the academic prowess of those involved with intercollegiate athletics. (Today, more so than ever, the academic achievement of athletics has come under public scrutiny). For the first time in the history of intercollegiate athletics, the F.B.I. has been involved in the investigation of academic violations, rather than the area of bribery or gambling.

Usable returns were received from 95 representatives (69%).

Two respondents completed the questionnaire, but removed the locator code. However, a second code was used on the follow-up, and these returns were still able to be analyzed.

Implications

Some areas of this study were more revealing than others. In the demographic section, these areas were: sex, previous association with competitive sports, and representation of the faculty.

Ninety-one of the faculty representatives who returned the questionnaire were male, only four were female. Ramer (in press), reported that the position is initially an appointed one. Based on performance, this position may be held by an individual indefinitely. Consequently, with the emergence of Title IX, one wonders if, in fact, a female representative is in keeping with the contemporary development of intercollegiate athletics.

The next area of the demographic section was concerned with whether the representatives have athletically related backgrounds necessary for understanding intercollegiate athletics, and hopefully be a positive force in the implementation of rules and regulations governing intercollegiate athletics. A large number 77 (81.1%), of the representatives surveyed, have previously participated in competitive sports. This information and the results of statement 9 regarding interest in university athletics, indicate that representatives do, in fact, have a genuine interest in athletics. Then, increasing the representatives' duties would be a legitimate act.

Does intercollegiate athletics enhance intellectual growth and does each athletic department encourage an athlete to pursue his academic work? Contrary to current literature, the faculty representatives agreed that their respective universities do encourage athletes to pursue academics and that athletics are synonymous with intellectual growth.

They were also in agreement that athletics is an integral part of higher education. Again, this is contrary to some current beliefs. The combined responses of agreement was over 90% that athletics is an integral entity of higher education.

A question does deal with the faculty representatives' perceptions of funding, with regard to the cost of running an athletic department. This uncertainty also exists when interpreted according to Districts. The faculty representatives are almost split (55% agree or tend to agree; 46% disagree or tend to disagree) on their opinions with respect to the source of funding, and the cost to run an athletic department. The information from athletic departments about budgets is contradictory which may explain why the representatives are divided in their opinions. This divergence also exists among the Districts. The opinions of the respondents from Districts one, two, seven and eight were found to be split almost in half.

This investigation, and Ramer's study were in agreement regarding the overall ethical conduct of faculty representatives. Ramer (in press) reported that 89% of the athletic directors and presidents surveyed believed that faculty representatives do not neglect their responsibilities

in maintaining ethical standards. The findings of this study coincided with this statement. Eighty-four percent of the representatives agreed that they would report any known violations to the president.

Ten years from now, could universities and conferences handle many of the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics that are currently addressed by the NCAA? The representatives' responses from Districts one, four and five were divided exactly in half, while the other districts did not deviate far from those districts mentioned. Considering that the enforcement division of the NCAA has only 12 investigators for eight districts and 139 Division IA schools, changing the responsibility of governance from the NCAA to conferences and universities could be a possibility for the future of intercollegiate athletics.

Ramer (in press) reported that in most instances the faculty representative is appointed by the president and reports to the president. However, do the faculty representatives' proposals receive support by the president? Ninety of the respondents either agreed or tended to agree that what they proposed or recommended received support.

The faculty representative believes that university professors should have an interest in their college's athletic programs. If faculty representatives do, in fact, have an interest in their college's athletic programs, then this could add substance to the representatives' position. Representing individuals who are concerned with athletics gives the representative more legitimate concerns.

Could the faculty representatives' responsibilities be increased? Yes, said one-half representatives surveyed. However, these beliefs differed from the athletic directors surveyed in Ramer's study (in press), who believed that the faculty representatives' responsibilities should not be increased. Ramer's respondents believed that the duties of the representatives should be more advisory than regulatory. On the other hand, one-half of the respondents from this study agreed with the findings of Ramer's study.

Conclusion

The presence of intercollegiate athletics today is a complicated matter for presidents and administrators. Addressing the issues surrounding the governance and administration of athletics is becoming a difficult and troublesome task, in light of current implications. Based on this study, the writer concludes that the faculty representative should have a more active leadership role, assisting in the handling of these problematic athletic related matters on campus.

However, in agreement with Ramer's study, the writer believes that initiation of this direction should come from the faculty representatives themselves. The fact that one-third of the respondents requested that the results of this study be forwarded to them, indicates a desire on their part to know more about their colleagues' perceptions of intercollegiate athletics.

The faculty representatives perceive intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education, relevant to the mission of

the university, and as a means of enhancing intellectual growth and encouraging academic work. In addition, they perceive intercollegiate athletics as a recreational outlet and as different from professional sports.

On the funding section, a large majority of faculty representatives did not make similar responses, that is, there was an approximate 60-40 split on the responses. The majority however, agreed that cost did not exceed appropriations. Additionally, they felt that tax money should be used for intercollegiate athletics and major and minor sports should not receive equivalent funding.

With regard to the section on recruiting, the faculty representatives expressed a generally negative attitude toward recruiting, i.e., recruiting practices are detrimental and should be re-evaluated. Also, they said that they would report any infractions to the president. The faculty representatives' role in the governance of intercollegiate athletics was examined. They believed that the faculty representatives' position should not be selected by the athletic committee and that the athletic council representatives should be from departments other than athletics. They further believed that the faculty should have an interest in their universities' athletic programs. Fifty percent expressed a desire to increase their responsibilities. Most faculty representatives thought that their recommendations would be supported by the university president. They believed that the faculty senate should govern athletics.

The purpose of this study was to ascertain the faculty representatives' perceptions of intercollegiate athletics and also to discover if the representatives have a genuine concern for athletics. In addition to demographic information, the faculty representatives' perceptions of four specific areas were investigated: role, funding, recruiting and governance of athletics. A general conclusion is that the faculty representatives perceive intercollegiate athletics in a positive way.

Recommendations for Further Study

This study was limited to the perceptions of faculty representatives at Division IA universities that sponsor football teams. This study reflects a representative sample from all districts, except District One. With this as a consideration, the following recommendations are presented:

- A. A study should be initiated which utilizes NCAA Division II colleges in determining the perceptions of faculty representatives to athletics.
- B. A study should be initiated which utilizes NCAA Division III colleges in determining the perceptions of faculty representatives to athletics.
- C. A study should be initiated which utilizes N.A.I.A. (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics) in determining the perceptions of faculty representatives to athletics.
- D. This study should be replicated using the athletic committees.

- E. A study should be done to determine if the faculty representative should be elected by the faculty, or appointed by the president.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Bell, W. Personal communication, June, 1979.
2. Robertson, I. Personal communication, September, 1979.
3. Tow, T. Personal communication, July, 1979.
4. Whitacre, S. Telephone interview, August, 1979.
5. Bell, W. Personal communication, July, 1979.

REFERENCES

- Aigler, R. W. Report of the committee on athletics. North Central Association Quarterly, 1954, 29, 189-196.
- Alley, L. E. Athletics in education: The double-edged sword. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 102-105.
- Blackburn, R., & Nyikos, M. S. College football and Mr. Chips: All in the family. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 110-112.
- Bluebook of College Athletics, 1979.
- Bradley, W. The effects of big-time college athletics (Interview on television). American Broadcasting Company, 1979. (Film)
- Budig, G. Grid stock up - academic stock down. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 56-59.
- Bundy, McGeorge. Faculty power. The Atlantic, 1968, 222, 123-145.
- Coakley, J. Sport in society. Saint Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1978.
- Cruse, D. The continuing crisis in athletics. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 99-101.
- Danzig, A. Progress toward sanity in intercollegiate athletics. The Educational Record, 1954, 35, 261-274.
- Eberle, C. Recommended practices for the control of intercollegiate athletics in the Pennsylvania state conference. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1975.
- Edwards, H. Sociology of sport. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press, 1973.
- Forsyth, C. E. Spell out policies, procedures. American School Board Journal. 1966, 153, 123-145.

- Hanford, G. H. Intercollegiate athletics today and tomorrow: The president's challenge. Educational Record, 1976, 54(4), 68-79.
- Harden, E. What college presidents say about athletics. Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1960, 31.
- Harrold, R., Lowe, B. Intercollegiate athletics in the contemporary student value system. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 345-357.
- Harrison, J. Intercollegiate football participation and academic achievement. Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association meeting, 1976.
- Hart, A. The status of athletics in American colleges. Atlantic Monthly, 1890, 66, 65.
- Heatherington, C. The organization and administration of athletics. Paper presented at the National Education Association, 1907.
- Hellison, D. Humanistic physical education. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973
- Hickock, R. New encyclopedia of sports. New York: McGraw Hill, 1977.
- Hoover, Francis. A History of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1958.
- Keefe, R. J. Intercollegiate athletics in the roaring twenties. Paper presented at the annual convention of the North American Society for Sport History. April, 1974.
- Keith, B. J. They were unable to reach agreement on divorce. Sports Illustrated, Jan. 22, 1973, 57-58.

- Kelliher, M. A job analysis of the duties of selected athletic directors in colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1956.
- Kidd, B. Sportsmen or gladiators? What's the aim of sports and education? Canadian Dimension, 1970, 7(4), 122-125.
- Kniker, C. R. The values of athletics in schools: A continuing debate. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 116-120.
- Koch, J. A troubled cartel: The NCAA. Law and Contemporary Problems, 1975, 38, 136-150.
- Lucas, J., Smith, R. The saga of American sports. New York: Lea & Febiger, 1978.
- Luehring, F. W. The National Collegiate Athletic Association. Journal of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1947, 18, 707-709.
- Manley, George J. Science of educational research. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1970.
- Marshall, Stanley. The organizational relationships between physical education and intercollegiate athletics in American colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Springfield College, 1969.
- Mason, R. T. The role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education as perceived by college and university presidents throughout the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1969.

- McQuire, J. The NCAA: Institution under constitutional seige. Journal of College & University Law, 1975, 2(2), 175-190.
- Michener, J. Sports in America. New York: Random House, 1976.
- Moore, W. Community college board of trustees: A question of competency. Journal of Higher Education, 1973, 44, 151-171.
- Mott, Robert. Athletic control in member institutions of the Pacific coast intercollegiate athletic conference. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1953.
- Munford, James C. The functions of faculty committees. College and University, 1951, 27, 79-84.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. Recruiting and subsidizing report. Proceedings of the 29th annual convention, 1934, 29, 69-71.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. Special report on recruiting and financial aid. Kansas City: The Association, 1960.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. Special report on reorganization and financial aid. Kansas City: The Association, October 13, 1972a.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. 1972 television committee report. Kansas City: The Association, December, 1972b.
- Newburn, H. K. Faculty and administration in the governance of the university. Educational Record, 1964, 45, 225-264.
- Ogilvie, B. C. & Tutko, T. Sport: If you want to build character, try something else. Psychology Today, 1971, 5(5), 61-63.

- Pepper, G. W. Faculty and alumni control of college athletics. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1894, 4, 809-810.
- Pfnister, D. O. The role of faculty in university governance. Journal of Higher Education, 1970, 41, 430-449.
- Plant, M. The place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education: Faculty control. Journal of Higher Education, 1961, 32, 4-10.
- Powell, John. The development and influence of faculty representation in the control of intercollegiate sports within the intercollegiate conference of faculty representatives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Indiana, 1963.
- Pucel, David J.; Nelson, Howard F.; and Wheeler, David N. Questionnaire follow-up returns as a function of incentive and responder characteristics. Project Mini-Score, Department of Industrial Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1969, 4-13.
- Quarles, M. Organization and governance of men and women's athletic programs within the big ten conference. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1977.
- Ramer, E. M. NCAA study of athletic boards and faculty committees. Shawnee Mission, Kansas: in press.
- Renick, J. The use and misuse of college athletics. Journal of Higher Education, 1974, 65, 545-551.
- Reno, J. An evaluation of the duties of athletic directors in small colleges in selected states in the midwest. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1963.

- Rice, E. A brief history of physical education. New York: Barnes, A.S., 1929.
- Richards, J. & Tutko, T. Psychology of coaching. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.
- Sargent, D. Physical education. Boston: Ginn, 1906.
- Savage, H. Games and sports in British schools and universities. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1927, 18.
- Savage, H., McGovern, J., & Bentley, H. Current developments in American college sport. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929, 26.
- Scott, H. Competitive sports schools and colleges. New York: Harper House, 1951.
- Scott, H. New directions in intercollegiate athletics. Teachers College Record, 1956, 58, 29-37.
- Sharp, P. Oklahoma rationalizes emphasis on winning university grid teams. Phi Delta Kappan, 54(1), 161.
- Shea, E., Weiman, E. Administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics. Springfield, IL: Charles G. Thomas, 1967.
- Smith, Robert. Analysis of the role behavior and role expectations of faculty athletic committees and faculty athletic representatives in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.
- Sterritt, W. Survey of United States junior college programs in physical education, intramurals and athletics. Master's thesis, College of Albermarle, 1970.

Steitz, E. Administration of athletics in colleges and universities.

Washington, DC: NEA Publications, 1971.

Voetsch, E. Proposed guidelines of intercollegiate athletics in New York state community colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, 1976.

Weis, P. Sport: A philosophic inquiry. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1969.

White, G. S. How to save intercollegiate athletics: Interview with Joe Paterno. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56(2), 106-109.

Wilkins, E. Intercollegiate football: Report by committee G. American Association of University Professors' Bulletin, 1926, 12, 218-223.

Yarnell, D. A survey of physical education and athletics in two-year colleges. Master's thesis, Mitchell College, Connecticut, 1970.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES QUESTIONNAIRE
REGARDING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Section I deals primarily with demographic information. Please mark a check on the line to the right of the question.

1. Sex Male _____
 Female _____

2. Number of years on this campus: 0-5 _____
 6-10 _____
 11-20 _____
 over 20 _____

3. Are you a graduate of this university?

 Yes _____
 No _____

4. Other than being faculty representative, have you ever been associated with competitive sports?

 Yes _____
 No _____

5. If yes in number 4, in what capacity? Player _____
 Coach _____
 Administrator _____
 Referee _____
 Other (specify) _____

6. At what level did this participation occur?

 High School _____ Professional _____
 College _____ Other (specify) _____

7. Do you wish to continue in this endeavor as a faculty representative?

 Yes _____
 No _____

8. How would you rate your interest in the position of faculty representative?

 High _____
 Medium _____
 Low _____

9. How would you rate your interest in university athletics?

High _____
 Medium _____
 Low _____

10. Do you feel that through your position of faculty representative you represent the concerns of the university regarding inter-collegiate athletics?

Yes _____
 No _____
 Don't know _____

11. If yes to number 10, which of the following methods are used to gather opinions:

Polls _____
 Group meetings _____
 Private discussion _____

SECTION II

Please answer the following questions with regard to your personal beliefs. Mark your response in the column to the right of the questions.

Key

Agree = A
 Tend to Agree = TA
 Tend to Disagree = TD
 Disagree = D

A TA TD D

A. Role of Intercollegiate Athletics

- | | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>1. Intercollegiate athletics develop intellectual fitness as well as individual physical fitness in young athletes.</p> | <p>_____</p> |
| <p>2. I feel that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of the university.</p> | <p>_____</p> |
| <p>3. I feel athletics act as a recreational outlet for the physically fit student.</p> | <p>_____</p> |
| <p>4. In general, I feel athletics are contrary to contemporary student values.</p> | <p>_____</p> |

- 5. I feel athletics are irrelevant to the proper mission of the university. _____
- 6. The objectives of intercollegiate athletics and professional sports differ. _____
- 7. I feel that intercollegiate athletics have opened opportunities to young adults who otherwise may have never entered college. _____
- 8. The athletic department at this university encourages an athlete to pursue his academic work. _____
- 9. Athletics are a potent force in developing behavior patterns and attitudes in a constructive fashion. _____

B. Funding

- 10. The cost to run the athletic department at this institution does not exceed monies appropriated for athletics. _____
- 11. Athletes ought to be granted financial aid on the same basis as any other student applying for financial assistance. _____
- 12. I feel tax funds should be spent on athletics. _____
- 13. Both major and minor sports receive equivalent funding. _____

C. Recruiting

- 14. I feel certain policies, for example those relating to recruiting, should be re-evaluated. _____
- 15. I feel recruiting practices are a detrimental aspect of intercollegiate athletics. _____
- 16. If I were aware of any recruiting violations practiced by this university, I would report those infractions to the president. _____
- 17. Ten years from now universities and conferences could handle many of the problems surrounding intercollegiate athletics that are currently addressed by the NCAA _____

D. Governance

A TA TD D

18. I feel that a majority of the recommendations proposed by me or my committee receive full support by the president. _____
19. I feel the faculty representative to athletics should be selected by the athletic committee. _____
20. I feel the faculty representative should initiate in-service training on campus to promote an understanding of the athletic program. _____
21. I feel the faculty-senate could govern athletics at this university without any outside interference. _____
22. The appointed or committee elected faculty representative to the athletic council should be from a department other than athletics. _____
23. The faculty at this university should have an interest in their college sports program. _____
24. I feel the faculty representatives' responsibilities could be increased. _____

APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER

Blacksburg, Virginia 24060

Dear Sir:

I understand how busy you must be at this time, so I will attempt to be as succinct as possible. I am a doctoral student at Virginia Tech and am investigating the perceptions of Faculty Representatives to Athletics, regarding intercollegiate athletics as my dissertation topic.

Enclosed you will find a self-addressed stamped envelope and a questionnaire. Please answer the questionnaire and return it to me in the envelope. All responses are confidential and if any of the data collected is desired by you, just print your name at the bottom of the questionnaire and the information will be forwarded.

As mentioned, it is recognized that the demands for your time are numerous, however, your response to this study is greatly desired. Both my committee and I believe that the Faculty Representative to Athletics is a significant segment of the administration and governance of intercollegiate athletics.

Thank you for your time and consideration in completing this questionnaire. It is my wish that you have a rewarding year both academically and athletically.

Yours truly,

Carmen Tegano
Virginia Tech

Assistant Professor
Division of HPER
Virginia Tech

APPENDIX C: FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Blacksburg, VA 24060

Dear Sir:

The response to my survey regarding the faculty representatives' perception of intercollegiate athletics has been gratifying. The number of early replies indicates a keen interest by those sampled in this study.

However, to date, I have not received your reply. May I again invite you to participate, so all eight districts of the NCAA are well represented. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope that was sent to you three weeks ago.

Thanking you,

Carmen J. Tegano
Virginia Tech

Assistant Professor - HPER
Virginia Tech

APPENDIX D: SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Blacksburg, VA 24060

Dear Sir:

Recently you received a questionnaire and a follow-up letter concerning your perceptions on Intercollegiate Athletics. This correspondence is a follow-up to those previous letters.

Enclosed you will find a second questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Your efforts in completing this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. If you have already taken the time to complete the questionnaire, then disregard this letter.

Thanking you,

Carmen J. Tegano
Virginia Tech

Assistant Professor
HPER Division
Virginia Tech

APPENDIX E: NCAA GEOGRAPHICAL BREAKDOWN OF DISTRICTS

NCAA GEOGRAPHICAL BREAKDOWN OF DISTRICTS

DISTRICT

- 1 Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
- 2 Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, West Virginia
- 3 Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia
- 4 Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin
- 5 Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota
- 6 Arkansas, New Mexico, Texas
- 7 Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming
- 8 Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington

**The vita has been removed from
the scanned document**

HOW FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES PERCEIVE
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

by

Carmen Joseph Tegano

(ABSTRACT)

The general problem in this study was to investigate the perceptions of the faculty representative to athletics with regard to intercollegiate athletics. This national study included the faculty representatives at all NCAA Division IA institutions in the United States. The return rate was 69% (N = 95). Particular concern was given to these specific areas of intercollegiate athletics: (a) the role of intercollegiate athletics, (b) funding of intercollegiate athletics, (c) recruitment of athletes, and (d) governance of intercollegiate athletics. A questionnaire was utilized to gather the responses. Based on this investigation, it was concluded that the faculty representative should have a more active leadership role in assisting the president on matters related to the governance of athletics. Furthermore, contrary to current beliefs, the faculty representative views intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of higher education. Also, the representatives believe that the athletic departments of their respective universities encourage an athlete to pursue his academic work.