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This study investigated the attitudes of faculty members toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in selected institutions of higher education. The perceptions of the faculty members were collected by means of a questionnaire comprised of three sections: Section 1 requested demographic data; Section 2 requested responses to forty-eight items relating to intercollegiate athletics, and Section 3 requested additional comments. A five-point Likert scale containing five response categories including strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree was utilized in Section 2.

The forty-eight items included in the questionnaire were formulated primarily through the literature review, and from discussions with leading experts in the field. These items were divided into one of the five following topic areas: policies and policy determination, financial considerations, coaching staff, current trends, and philosophical considerations.

The colleges and universities used in the study were chosen on a random basis from within the Big-Ten Athletic Conference, the Mid-American Athletic Conference, and The Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association. These Conferences were selected on the basis of the diverse range in enrollments and athletic philosophies of the members.
institutions as well as the geographic proximity. Over 1,000 questionnaires were sent to randomly selected full-time faculty members at the selected colleges and universities, with a return of slightly better than 51%.

Analysis of the data included a total frequency count for each item as well as an item mean. A one-way analysis of variance was computed to test for significant differences between the mean responses of faculty members at institutions within one conference when compared to the mean responses of those faculty members at institutions within the other two conferences. When the one-way analysis of variance indicated significant differences between the three groups beyond the .05 level, the T-method developed by Tukey was utilized to determine if there were significant differences between all of the means.

The findings of the study indicate that intercollegiate athletics appear to be an integral part of the total educational program at the college and university level. However, it is apparent from the data that there is need for constant evaluation and control of intercollegiate athletic programs to maintain a philosophy of athletics consistent with educational goals. The "big-business" aura of intercollegiate athletics present in many institutions of higher education was seen as highly undesirable. A reduced emphasis on intercollegiate athletics and an increased emphasis on intramural programs was stressed.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

During the past century intercollegiate athletic programs have developed from an informal beginning to a highly organized and complex undertaking involving national and regional associations, boards of trustees, presidents, faculty, students, and the general public.

The exposure to the American public of both amateur and professional athletics, especially through the medium of television, has resulted in increased interest at all levels of competition. However, at many institutions of higher education, this increased interest has merely added to the perplexity and controversy surrounding intercollegiate athletics today.

Declining enrollments and tight budget situations have caused cutbacks in programs and personnel at many colleges and universities around the country.

Gillis (1971) reported that many colleges and universities, like other institutions in our society, face a period of economic readjustment. Present financial difficulty and in some cases declining enrollment are forcing many institutions to make substantial reductions in academic staff. Many colleges are cutting back on course offerings and eliminating programs to reduce instructional costs.
As these cutbacks in programs and personnel become more numerous, the faculties of the institutions facing these problems are becoming increasingly more critical of other areas within the institutional setting. Intercollegiate athletics have been one of those areas under criticism, perhaps the most severely criticized of all.


From the earliest intercollegiate competition, during the 1850's when an upsurge of interest in boat racing occurred, college and university faculties have played an important role in the development of intercollegiate athletics. After early attempts to abolish intercollegiate athletics failed, faculties realized the importance of gaining control of athletics. This eventually led to the formation of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and later the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), the current governing bodies and enforcers of intercollegiate athletics.
Plant (1961) stated that when it comes to effectuating institutional control over athletics, however, there is some question concerning where the responsibility ought to lie within the institution. Opinion on this question is by no means unanimous. There is considerable difference of view as to the part that should be played by the faculty of the institution, as distinguished from that of the administrative officers.

However, regardless of the degree to which faculty members act directly on specific policy governing athletics, their attitudes and opinions are highly respected by institutional administrators and their desires usually find expression in written policy.

Hutter (1970) stated that it is primarily the responsibility of the faculty, administration, and coaches to control, evaluate, and improve the intercollegiate athletic program. The success and improvement of the intercollegiate athletic program is dependent upon these people who are, by virtue of their close contact with participants, in the best position to deal with the program. Those responsible for the administration of intercollegiate athletics will not have continued improvement unless their purposes are directed toward this goal.

Much has been written about intercollegiate athletics, however, little relevant research in the field has been pursued.

Significant research in the area of college athletics is necessary to evaluate current programs and provide objective data by which administrators can effectively plan for the future direction of intercollegiate athletics. It is in this regard that the study was undertaken.
to pursue the position of academic faculties regarding the status, and quite likely the future of intercollegiate athletics.

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to examine and report faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in selected institutions of higher education.

Specifically, this study was concerned with the following: (1) to analyze thoroughly the current problems and trends in the area of intercollegiate athletics; (2) to develop a questionnaire from the analysis of the current problems and trends in intercollegiate athletics; (3) to determine a random sample of faculty members at representative institutions of the three selected conferences; (4) to request the faculty members to complete and return the questionnaire; (5) to analyze and report over-all faculty responses to the questionnaire; and (6) to analyze and report significant differences in the attitudes of faculty members at member institutions of one conference when compared to the other two conferences.

Need for the Study

Recent controversies surrounding athletics at the college and university level have raised doubts in the minds of many as to the need, purpose, and future direction of intercollegiate athletics.

Owing to rapid expansion of the intercollegiate athletic programs, college athletics must continually be evaluated in order to
help solve existing problems. This evaluation can best be accomplished through an organized program of study and research.

Fredericks (1958) reported that each institution must enforce its own regulations even though they may differ in some details. He stressed the importance of integrity in athletic controls.

An article entitled "The Education-Athletics Nonsense," stated that while some school administrators do not agree, most professors and many administrators believe that competitive intercollegiate athletics are a moderately heavy and unnecessary drag on higher education in the United States.

Small (1949) expressed the opinion that the majority of college administrators and faculty have dealt with intercollegiate athletics as a necessary evil, something which they tolerate because of public demand.

Butler (1970) wrote that athletics are being attacked in so many places that the cooperation of all is essential.

While there is no single best answer to satisfy all situations which directly or indirectly touch upon the intercollegiate athletic program, problems associated with institutional size, aspiration, level of competition, administrative control, and support, result in the need for critical examination of some appropriate guidelines.

The major problems in the athletic field are extremely complicated. They involve basic educational philosophy, economic factors, sociological factors (including race relations), administrative problems, public-relations elements, and, in some places, heavy political
overtones. They will never be solved by off-the-cuff generalities or
by enacting prejudices into law, however laudatory they may be. They
will be solved they way most other difficult problems are solved, which
is by careful, dispassionate study and a great deal of trial and error.

According to Wilson (1952), the basic problems of intercollegiate
athletics were divided into the following areas: academic favoritism
for athletes, the recruitment of athletes, and subsidization of ath­
letes.

In addition to these, recent controversies surround the following
areas: policy determination in intercollegiate athletics, aims and
goals of intercollegiate athletics, control of intercollegiate athletics,
growth and direction of women's intercollegiate athletics, use of
athletic facilities, the relationship of intercollegiate athletics to
the academic curriculum, and eligibility requirements for the student-
athlete.

There is need to establish through practice, research, and exper­
imentation a factual body of knowledge relative to the attitudes and
opinions of various segments of the college and university publics.
Difficulty in administering intercollegiate athletics arises when
practices and methods used in intercollegiate athletic programs do not
coincide with the objectives and philosophies set forth for such pro­
grams.

This study attempts to contribute toward attainment of a factual
body of knowledge in the area of intercollegiate athletics by analyzing
and reporting faculty attitudes toward many of the controversial trends and issues facing intercollegiate athletic programs today.

Delimitations of the Study

The study included only the current trends and issues in intercollegiate athletics in the five categories selected.

The three conferences were selected on the basis of: (1) affiliation with the National Collegiate Athletic Association; (2) a minimum of eight varsity sports in the intercollegiate athletic programs of the member institutions in the Conference; (3) relative geographic proximity; and (4) the diverse range in enrollments and basic athletic philosophy between member institutions of the Conferences.

Institutions used in the study were chosen on a random basis from among the total number of colleges or universities in the specific Conference. The faculty members chosen for the study were also selected on a random basis.

It is recognized that some of the respondents did not answer all of the questions.

The investigator realized the possibility that some of the answers given by faculty members may not be true statements. If these answers were false, the possibilities of error were the same as in any investigation involving questionnaires: that the person in question was not well informed; or that all people questioned did not interpret the statements in the same manner.
Definition of Terms

The following definitions and explanations were used as a frame of reference throughout this study:

1. **Administration.** Means to manage or conduct. Applied to the program of competitive sports, involves direction, conduct, and management of all matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics.

2. **Athletic Conference.** Group of colleges in the same geographic area which are logical rivals in athletics and which are somewhat similar in such matters as curriculum, entrance requirements, educational philosophy, size of student body, and financial support.

3. **Attitude.** A relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner.

4. **Big-Ten Athletic Conference.** Member schools include Indiana University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Ohio State University, Purdue University, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, and University of Wisconsin.

5. **Faculty.** Full-time members of the college or university staff with the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor.

6. **Intercollegiate Athletics.** Games or sports in which duly authorized teams of one institution of higher education meet in contests with those of another under college control.
(7) **Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association (M.I.A.A.)**. Member schools include Adrian College, Albion College, Alma College, Calvin College, Hope College, Kalamazoo College, and Olivet College.

(8) **Mid-American Athletic Conference (M.A.C.)**. Member schools include Ball State University, Bowling Green State University, Central Michigan University, Eastern Michigan University, Kent State University, Miami of Ohio University, Northern Illinois University, Ohio University, University of Toledo, and Western Michigan University.

(9) **N.A.I.A.** National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.

(10) **N.C.A.A.** National Collegiate Athletic Association.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Although there has been an increase in the number of studies conducted in the area of intercollegiate athletics in recent years, a review of the literature disclosed no studies of the exact nature of the one being proposed.

This review is divided into five general categories all relating to intercollegiate athletics: (1) policies and policy determination; (2) financial considerations; (3) coaching staff; (4) current trends; (5) philosophical considerations. Specific areas within the categories, referred to in Chapter I, will be dealt with appropriately.

The literature review was essentially limited to journals, books, and dissertations containing contemporary issues, trends, and questions which continue to be raised regarding the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education.

Policies and Policy Determination

Intercollegiate athletics have been a center of controversy almost from the very beginning and it is not surprising that institutional administrators sought to control Collegiate athletics.

As early as 1882 the faculty at Harvard University had become involved with intercollegiate athletics. A faculty committee was appointed to investigate and to study the number of games which the
varsity baseball team should be allowed to play during the season. The problems created by intercollegiate athletics were new to the college administrators of the early 1900's and they were unable to cope with them. As a result of this condition, Chancellor McCraken of New York University, in 1905, was instrumental in the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association by calling a meeting of college presidents to discuss athletic problems. From early organizations such as this evolved the current regulatory bodies of intercollegiate athletics, the N.C.A.A. and the N.A.I.A. Despite national controls by the N.C.A.A. and the N.A.I.A., and regional Conference controls, the need exists for institutional controls through policy making.

Shea (1967) defined policy as a statement satisfying the need to be consistent when one must take action or form a decision or judgment in a number of cases which are similar. It enables one to make relatively individualized decisions but at the same time to treat with consistency each case within a group of similar cases. He concludes that each institution should clearly state in its catalogue the reasons for its program of intercollegiate athletics. These purposes should be approved by its faculty and should make explicit the official position of the institution on such matters as educational outcomes to be achieved through athletics and the relationship of athletics to the educational programs as a whole.

According to Duer (1960) administrators should make a clear statement of the institutional aims and purposes of the athletic program so that coaches, athletes, faculty, student body, and sports enthusiasts will give support to the emphasis of the program.
Shwank (1971) stated that the place and purpose of intercollegiate athletics in relation to the over-all educational curriculum should be clearly defined by colleges and universities.

Hoy (1966) made a study of practices in the control of intercollegiate athletics in selected conferences around the country. He reported that an institutional athletic handbook, containing objectives, policies, and practices should be developed by the individual institution in order to improve the administration of intercollegiate athletics.

The need for some form of institutional control was unanimous among college and university administrators. However, they are far from unanimous on where the responsibilities of determining policy should lie, what the general statements of policy should be, and designation of those individuals who will ultimately determine athletic policy.

Hoy's study revealed that the responsibility for developing philosophy, aims, objectives, and policies in intercollegiate athletics should rest with the university administration and/or athletic board (faculty committee) and should not be the responsibility of the athletic director.

Marco (1960) stated that the control and administration of intercollegiate athletics are the legitimate responsibility of three groups, the administration, the athletic staffs, and the faculties. However, only the faculty is essentially free from the pressures which have made it impossible to realize the desirable objectives of intercollegiate athletics.
A growing tendency toward greater faculty control and supervision by college authorities has evolved since the early beginnings of intercollegiate athletics. Athletic administrators have questioned the wisdom of faculty control of intercollegiate athletics by an appointed committee or board. As problems unfolded in athletics they were resolved, not by personnel responsible for the program of intercollegiate athletics, but by faculty representatives with little background in athletic administration.

Edgar L. Harden (1960), former President of Northern Michigan University, elaborated on the controversy surrounding faculty control in an article entitled "What College Presidents Say About Athletics."

Harden summarized his remarks by saying:

It would seem to me then, that the board of trustees, the president, the director of athletics and the faculty should all feel a sense of responsibility for the program, and that each role should be carefully delineated and defined. The board and the president should formulate policy.

To this end I would recommend the elimination of the middle man—known in most instances as the conference faculty representative. In matters of physics, the president confers with the head of the Physics Department, not with a faculty representative for science. His dealings with the athletic department should be just as direct.

Harden hinted here that intercollegiate athletics should not be placed under tighter restrictions or control than any other department within the college or university.

Scott (1951) offered the suggestion that perhaps the solution to the problem of athletics would be rather simple if they could be stripped of the cobwebs of regulations, traditions, prejudiced thinking, and vested interests. Possibly, he said, all that is needed is
for athletics to be accepted and treated as an integral part of the program of education.

Shultz (1972) reported certain guidelines when making decisions affecting either people or programs in athletics for those who wish to quiet legitimate criticisms leveled at intercollegiate athletics. The first guideline is to seek to broaden the educational experience rather than to narrow it. Secondly, an attempt should be made to relate to rather than conflict with the major social concerns of today's student. Finally, he urged, the temptation to substitute rules for that which is right and ethical in the immediate situation should be avoided.

One might interpret the reports of Shultz, Scott, and Harden as indicating that perhaps there is too much control and too many rules in the area of intercollegiate athletics. The athletic department, one might assume, is simply another department within the college setting and should be handled in the same manner as other departments.

Willett (1952) perhaps best stated the case when he said:

We do not need more standards, more programs, more legislation, more enforcement machinery. We do need more observation of the standards and legislation we already have.

Others contend, however, that intercollegiate athletics are on a path of self-destruction and should be more tightly controlled than ever before.

Paul Cliddens (1970) wrote a report on the 1969 intercollegiate football season. He stated that the pressures to have a winning team and greater income are so powerful that many colleges and universities
have resorted to shoddy and questionable practices and policies which are indefensible from an educational point of view.

Williams (1937) wrote that in college athletics for decades there have been conferences that set standards, establish regulations, and enforce rules. Still, the conditions that brought these procedures into being continue and the varied trappings of college games remain blatant and abused.

Thus the problems of today in competitive sport are simply a re-expression of the problems recognized by Sargent, Heatherington, and others in 1906 and by the Carnegie Report in 1929.

Despite attempts to justify intercollegiate athletics in the educational setting, controversies surrounding the worth of athletics continue to become more numerous. Administrators, faculties, and more recently students are raising more and more questions about the aims and purposes of intercollegiate athletics.

In April 1970 a special committee of students and faculty members at Ohio University recommended to the president that the entire intercollegiate athletic program, with the exception of basketball, be abandoned and replaced by club sports. One reason noted was the high cost of the athletic program, particularly the subsidization of athletes. The second major reason stated was that the student body as a whole derived little physical benefit from athletics. The committee contended that better physical fitness could be obtained from an intramural program. Basketball was to be retained simply as a means
to generate financial gates to help pay for a plush athletic and convocation center completed just prior to the study.

Much has been written about not only general statements of policy, but also about specific policy statements.

In "High Roads: The Case Study of an Intercollegiate Athletic Program," Whitner (1965) made the assertion that providing entertainment for alumni, townspeople, and taxpayers in general appears increasingly to be outside the purposes of higher education. Cries of crisis in higher education are going to have to be backed up increasingly by demonstrations that administrators and faculties are putting their houses in order so that they can stand close scrutiny by those from whom funds are expected.

Perry (1963) wrote that it is high time that college and university administrators began to work more positively for the placement of intercollegiate sports in proper perspective with educational objectives. Perry called for complete elimination of post-season games and conference limitations on length of seasons and amount of time spent in practice periods.

Gardner (1960) took a positive approach to intercollegiate athletics by admitting that college presidents, faculty representatives, athletic directors, and coaches have an alarming problem. He stated that people in administrative positions have failed to meet the problem of intercollegiate athletics with an approach as effective as that used in meeting other issues of higher education. Gardner recommended research projects in co-operative studies to determine the real purposes of the program of intercollegiate athletics and its place in
higher education. He also recommended, as others have done, that intercollegiate athletic programs be expanded in an effort to include more participants.

In his book on administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics, Shea (1967) wrote that it is becoming increasingly apparent that the present problems in intercollegiate athletics will continue to defy solution as long as the symptoms rather than the sources of the disease are treated.

One of the most profound statements made by Shea follows:

Intercollegiate athletics must, in order to assume their true place in education, be given consideration in terms of their educational contributions to the individual participant. This consideration involves more than responsibilities and obligations in enforcing the principles of the N.C.A.A., the N.A.I.A., and the various regional athletic conferences. These principles must be expressed in terms of educational purposes compatible with the purposes of higher education. If intercollegiate athletics are to be recognized as part of the educational program—which indeed they must or they have no justification for existing in the college program—they must receive their direction from educational purpose. Unquestionably, the relationship between education and athletics needs to be constantly re-examined in the light of rapidly changing cultural trends and a realignment made toward integration of the two.

Financial Considerations

Of all the varied issues and problems facing athletics in higher education today, perhaps none is as threatening to the continuance of intercollegiate athletics as the whole area of financing college athletics.
The special committee on financial aid of the N.C.A.A. (1970) reported that intercollegiate athletics are facing a severe challenge. Unless collegiate athletics satisfactorily meet the challenge, future growth and expansion are in jeopardy. According to this report, the problem originates in the general financial pinch that is being felt by virtually every institution of learning in the United States. Colleges have found it increasingly difficult to maintain a balance between athletic income and expenditures. Outgo has risen steadily and generally more than income.

In a recent article in "Athletic Administration," Spechalske (1972) wrote that budgeting considerations rank near the top of the list of problems facing collegiate departments of athletics today. Whether the school is large or small, private or public, the squeeze is on.

Spechalske reported several factors which have helped create this crisis. These included:

(1) inflation, which makes the dollars available to college athletics not go as far; (2) withdrawal of student funds supporting the athletic program; (3) an increase in the number of sports in which schools participate and in the number of dollars needed to support each sport; (4) an increase in the number of coaches and staff members to "keep up with the Joneses"; (5) competition from professional sports teams for the sports dollar requiring both a better and higher priced product as well as a more expensive, more effective public relations program; and (6) an inability of some schools and their
departments to recognize their maximum support level and reconcile their program to it.

Spechalske recommended that departments evaluate their total athletic program including costs, participation, both participant and spectator, and the serving of student interests. He also recommended that departments establish a precise cost accounting system and that most of all, departments keep the public (students, faculty, administrators, alumni, and the community) informed of the need for and benefits of an intercollegiate athletic program.

Gliddens’ (1970) study of the 1969 football season produced several interesting results. A major finding was that despite record-breaking attendance at football games and television contracts, intercollegiate football has moved closer to financial bankruptcy. Expenditures in 1969 far exceeded income.

According to Gliddens, a major item of expense and a heavy drain on the budget of many colleges and universities is athletic scholarships. The Big-Ten Athletic Conference averaged $350,000 in 1969 for tuition for athletes on scholarship; in 1965 the average was $250,000.

The financial drain on college and university resources has become so serious that many solutions are being suggested to trim costs, reduce deficits, and brighten the bleak financial picture. The recent addition of one game to the maximum length of the football season was a direct attempt to increase athletic revenues.

Crase (1970) questioned the ability of universities to continue to finance athletics. He stated that there is a perpetual cycle in athletics in that winning brings on more fans, thus larger gate
receipts which leads to program expansion (larger arenas, more money for recruitment), to more scholarships for more athletes, and more and better athletes leads again to winning. Somewhere along this cycle loopholes are being discovered—coupled with inflation and the shrinking purchasing power of the dollar—and more than a few universities have found themselves in the red financially.

Controversies surrounding the whole area of funding intercollegiate athletics have existed for many years.

Williams (1937) wrote that the manner of financing athletics accounts for some evils existing in this field because many treasuries rely solely upon winning teams. He added that if athletics are viewed as educational experiences, and it seems logical that they should be considered an integral part of the educational program, then it behooves college trustees to finance athletics in the same manner that funds are provided for books, laboratory equipment, and other similar materials.

Williams pointed out that financial problems should be solved with the welfare of the participants in mind. Policies should be shaped by educational rather than financial outcomes.

More recently, Miller and Russell (1971) wrote about sports from a contemporary viewpoint. In this book they discussed among other things, education versus entertainment.

When diverted to commercial ends, athletic contests appear to become entertainment circuses and gladiatorial type of events which encourage winning at all costs and such well known avenues to winning as subsidizing, circumventing rules, and recruiting players who do not qualify as bona fide students.
Because of the high cost to many institutions, subsidizing the student athlete has become an increasingly controversial issue. The financial aid for student athletes resulted in two distinct points of view: (1) there is nothing morally or educationally wrong with subsidizing students with superior athletic ability, and (2) financial aid for athletic ability alone should be renounced. Despite the acceptance of the first point of view by most schools of higher education, the questioning continues.

Perry (1965) reported on the Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and their attempts to place intercollegiate athletics in harmony with the educational philosophies of the member institutions. The PNIAC currently includes seven private schools in Washington, Oregon and Idaho with enrollments ranging from 800 to 1400 students. Most have had in the past, to a varying degree, some form of subsidization of athletics.

Discussions at the presidential level brought about various reforms. In the area of financial aid, all PNIAC institutions are now required to use the College Scholarship Service to determine financial need. As a result, student athletes are no longer differentiated from other students in the granting of financial assistance. Aid granted to athletes is awarded by the same duly constituted financial aids committee in each institution which awards aid to all other students.

The N.C.A.A. has encouraged member institutions to award grants on the basis of "financial need." Because of the difficulty in determining need fairly and accurately, however, financial need as a
prerequisite to the receiving of a grant-in-aid has not received consistent support among athletic administrators.

Despite a lack of agreement on this issue, Hoy (1966) found that there was unanimous agreement among the jury of athletic administrators selected for his study that financial aid (scholarships, grants-in-aid, and jobs) to student athletes should be administered by the same office or committee as all other university awards. Of the schools included in his study, Hoy found that eighty-five percent of these schools awarded either scholarships or grants-in-aid to their student athletes.

Turner (1959) reported the need for adequate financial support for athletics. Since intercollegiate athletic programs are not self-supporting, he said, they should be underwritten as are all valued programs in the institution.

Orwig (1971) wrote that the financing of athletic programs and facilities faces essentially the same problems as those facing the financing of other educational and related programs and facilities in institutions of higher learning. In order to win support for their requests, Orwig related the importance of the athletic director's ability to respond intelligently to the "why" and "how" queries that will be made of him.

Unfortunately, many of the questions being asked of athletic administrators are not receiving adequate answers. Justifying large financial allocations for the benefit of a relatively small number of participants is one of the most difficult issues encountered by athletic administrators today.
The special committee of students and faculty members formed in 1970 at Ohio University to study intercollegiate athletics on that campus found that out of a student body of some 20,000 only 617 persons were found to be engaging in intercollegiate athletics. Despite the numbers, $2,000,000 of the university's $48,000,000 total budget was reportedly spent on intercollegiate sports.

The financial problems of many intercollegiate athletic programs are being further complicated by the demands for greater opportunities for participation by women athletes. Tremendous discrepancies exist in all areas between most men's and women's intercollegiate programs today. Women are demanding that the wide gap between the two programs be narrowed.

A Committee on Standards of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports (1969) reported that the budget for women's intercollegiate athletics should be part of the budget of the institution so that the program is assured. A separate budget, according to the report, should be specifically designated for this purpose and should be administered by the women's physical education department as part of over-all administration.

In many institutions, however, the men's athletic program has been forced to take women's intercollegiate athletics under their wing. The increased costs of financing women's intercollegiate athletics has added to the financial burden already existent. The increased costs are not being met with proportionately increased budgets causing further financial strain.
Ley (1962) wrote of the problems which arose when the men's athletic programs were pressured to "do something for the girls" because women teachers would not or could not do much of anything.

Unless reforms are made, it appears that the financial problems facing intercollegiate athletics are likely to continue in the years ahead and may, ultimately, lead to the demise of all collegiate athletics as we know them today.

Mathews (1970) summarized the plight of financing intercollegiate athletics in the following statements:

Now the athletic programs of most colleges and universities are losing money. Costs of recruiting, insurance, equipment, and travel have skyrocketed. The changes in the number of games that football teams can have, the fact that Notre Dame now goes to Bowl Games, and the possible limitations on the number of scholarships are both examples of recent attempts to make more money and cut down costs. These rising costs now make student body fees more necessary than ever before. We have not cultivated or educated the general student. We have not sold him on the merits of our program. Now when we need his support, it is not always granted and I am not surprised.

This contention, it would appear, holds true not only for the student, but for many administrators, faculty, alumni, and the general public.

Coaching Staff

Coaches in the early period of intercollegiate athletics worked on a seasonal basis, had no official college status on the faculty, and often lacked academic preparation for the position. Coaches in higher education today are men and women who have been educationally and professionally prepared to teach as well as coach athletic teams.
Despite the professional competence of today's coach, many questions are raised about the coaches' status in relation to the rest of the faculty and the integrity and morals of coaches as individuals.

In their book on administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics, Shea and Wieman (1967) presented the criteria for the selection and treatment of athletic coaches as follows:

The members of the athletic staff should be considered as regular members of the faculty and, as such, they should be accorded full academic standing, rights, and privileges. They should also be held to the same standards of intelligence, professional education or experience, character, and teaching competence as other faculty members. They should not be selected and compensated primarily on the basis of their ability to produce winning teams through recruitment of superior talent, but rather for their qualifications as teachers and bona fide members of a faculty willing to assume their full share of educational responsibilities.

Havel (1953) surveyed in excess of one thousand coaches at the collegiate level to determine their professional status. His findings indicated that relationships such as those just described do not presently exist in most institutions. Havel reported that the tenure of services by such personnel is comparatively short. Six out of every ten of the head coaches were employed by the same educational institutions for less than seven years. Over one-fourth of the coaches surveyed had received no assurance of retention either by tenure or by written contract.

Savage (1929) did a study for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching entitled "American College Athletics." This study had a profound effect upon the current practices in intercollegiate athletics at the time of the writing, and upon the future direction collegiate athletics have taken since that time.
In a discussion of athletic coaches, Savage wrote that in no other aspect of American academic life is the choosing of a member of the faculty so often affected by the decisions of persons not intimately connected with the administration of the institution. He reported that the position of a coach whose tenure depends upon victory is both unfortunate and unfair. This situation, according to Savage, is deleterious to sports but especially to education, however it be defined.

Scott (1971) wrote that it is the primary responsibility of university coaches to be educators, and not developers of Olympic gold medal winners.

Perry (1963) listed as one of the imperatives of survival for intercollegiate athletics that the members of the athletic staff be integrated with the regular faculty, to include tenure, promotion, rank, salary, and fringe benefits.

Most college and university administrators would agree that, in theory, coaching positions in higher education should be filled by those individuals who are educators first and coaches second. However, in reality, this is often not the case, particularly at the colleges and universities with the so-called "high powered" athletic programs. The major emphasis is placed on winning and coaches are hired primarily on the basis of their ability to produce winning teams.

As Gardner (1960) stated, coaches, administrators, and boards of trustees learned to their sorrow that the American public demands a winner for its money. A state university president found it relatively
easy to get an appropriation from the state legislature following victory in a Bowl Game. A winning coach soon received a salary almost as large as that of the university president (sometimes even larger). The pressures in some areas for a winning team are almost unbelievable. They are exerted by the American public, and no facet of intercollegiate athletics is free from them.

The emphasis on winning often puts great pressure on the athletic director as well as the coach. Regardless of how coaches are ultimately appointed, the athletic director will invariably exert a great deal of influence upon the final selection. In this respect, he finds himself facing a common dilemma with regard to the tenure of the athletic coach.

What happens to the tenured coach who is unable to produce winning teams? Pressures to win usually will result in the termination of coaching duties, with increased teaching responsibilities in the physical education department, and the appointment of a new coach. The ex-coach then becomes what is commonly referred to as "dead wood," an unwanted commodity to the athletic director facing faculty cutbacks. It is evident then, why previous winning records often become the major criteria for hiring a coach.

Duer (1960) wrote an article in which he referred to the basic issues of intercollegiate athletics. One of the major practices resulting from the pressure to win was reported as follows:

Coaches are selected on their ability to win, with relaxed regard for strength of character or personal living habits. The increased pressure to win places great strain on even the most ethical coach, who is fully aware that he
must win to hold his job and reach the top in his pro-
fession. In many instances, the major evidence consid-
ered in hiring a coach is his win-and-loss record rather
than his character and personal habits. The coach who
has a losing season is sure to get a big laugh by stating,
"this year I am teaching character."

Duer further stated that perhaps the coach should be least blamed
for such a situation since he is merely responding to the pressure to
do well what the public, the student body, and often the administra-
tion of the institution inform him, by inference if not by direction,
he must do to hold his job.

Mason (1969) did a doctoral dissertation exploring the rule of
intercollegiate athletics in higher education as perceived by college
and university presidents throughout the country.

Mason's findings clearly indicated that the role of the athletic
coach ought to be more clearly defined regarding responsibility and
qualifications.

Regardless of institutional philosophy with regard to athletic
coaches, it appears unlikely that a decline in the emphasis on winning
will occur.

Lawther (1951), in his book on the psychology of coaching, summed
up his remarks on winning as follows:

The won-and-lost scale will be the measuring stick
applied to the coach, no matter what his private opinion
as to its validity or lack of validity as a measure of
the educational achievement of his players. In contra-
diction to the old maxims, it seems to be whether you win
or lose as well as how you play the game. The coach who
takes his defeats complacently has missed his calling.
Current Trends

Most of the issues and problems of present-day intercollegiate athletics are not new. Financial deficits, subsidization of athletes, recruiting techniques; and control of athletics, are but a few of the issues which confront collegiate athletics today, as they did in the past.

However, one area receiving considerable attention in recent years is a relatively new issue in intercollegiate athletics. That is in the area of women's intercollegiate athletics, an area all but ignored in the past.

The traditional role of the woman as mother and home-maker has changed drastically in recent years. Women are demanding reforms in all areas of society and at all institutional levels. The women's liberation movement has been instrumental in these developments.

Freeman (1971) wrote that the women's liberation movement did not begin on campus, but many of its roots lie deep within the academic setting, student movements, and movements in which students have participated in the last ten years. Likewise, academia is among the first of our social institutions to feel its presence. The university has begun to be and will continue to be a testing ground for its ideas, an arena for some of its battles, a contributor to the conditions which make it necessary, and eventually, a channel for furthering its goals. It will be these things and more, according to Freeman, regardless of the desires or intentions, good or bad, of the diverse members of the university community.
The Sporting News (1971) reported the results of a poll taken by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. In the poll, a questionnaire dealing with ten aspects of athletics was sent to all the college presidents. Of the respondents, 103 "yes," 18 "no," and 9 "not sure," indicated that they felt women should be permitted to take a greater part in the over-all college athletic program.

Ray (1965) in an address to the Central District American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Convention, spoke about the emerging status of women's intercollegiate athletics.

He listed, to aid in the future direction of women's intercollegiate athletics, the following guidelines:

1. Competent women, educationally trained in physical education, should be in charge of devising the program at every level of activity and they should be responsible for its management and control.

2. The goal for such a program should be the development of excellence and the upgrading of performance and participation by women in these activities at home and in international competition.

3. The programs should be a part of soundly based academic programs.

4. Competition for women should be just that. I do not believe men should be allowed to be members of women's teams any more than the leading women in this field endorse the proposition that women should be allowed to be members of men's teams.

5. I believe the N.C.A.A. should stand ready as an organization and its members should stand ready as individuals to give every encouragement and assistance that is requested by women who lead this development.

Mann (1971) wrote an article entitled, "The Lack of Girls Athletics." In this article Miss Mann presented four of the critical issues affecting the growth of girls' athletics. They were as follows:
(1) selling the administration on the idea of a competitive athletic program; (2) securing quality leadership; (3) developing well-defined guidelines; and (4) implementing the program into schools and leagues.

Miss Mann further stated that it is definitely agreed that women should coach and officiate girls athletics, but many men feel that women stand aside and criticize rather than accept the responsibility in the role as coach. She contended that colleges and universities must design their curricula to prepare women in athletic administration and training.

Lambert (1969) wrote of the need to avoid the pitfalls which have plagued the men's programs. It was her opinion that the roots of most of the evils of competition arise from pressure exerted by audiences composed of students, alumni, and the general public.

She believes that financing women's athletics through gate receipts should be avoided and that athletic scholarships for women be forbidden.

One of Lambert's most profound statements, which appears consistent with her thoughts, was as follows:

If a university's prestige does not depend upon our winning, we do not have to entice a particular girl to our gates by a better offer than anyone else can give her. If she is needy and mentally qualified, there are adequate funds available to her on the same basis as to anyone else.

There are, of course, both students and faculty involved with women's intercollegiate athletics who would not agree with this "middle of the road" philosophy. They would favor equality with the men's program in terms of finances, athletic scholarships, recruiting,
and basic philosophy. Some also favor opportunities for women to com­pete on men's teams, regardless of whether there exists a women's team in that particular sport. In some circles, this even extends to con­tact sports such as football and ice hockey.

Miller (1971) offered what is perhaps an explanation for these attitudes. She stated that women have three basic rights. The first is political and the second professional, and that women are now fighting for the most basic of their rights, the physical right, the right to play, to be fit, and to compete in sports.

It appears, however, that despite views to the contrary, Lambert's thoughts appear consistent with those of the great majority of women involved in the conduct of women's intercollegiate athletics.

The Division for Girls and Women's Sports of the American Association of Health and Physical Education and Recreation (1969) published a booklet setting forth the philosophy and standards for girls and women's sports.

Their guidelines were presented, in part, as follows:

1. The program should be directed, coached, and officiated by qualified women whenever and wherever possible.

2. Women should not compete as a team against a men's team in an intercollegiate contest, nor against a single male opponent in an intercollegiate contest.

3. The financing of the women's sports program should be included in the total school or recreational budget.

4. The awarding of athletic scholarships to participants in intercollegiate sports competition should be avoided.
New trends and changes in intercollegiate athletics are not, however, restricted to just women's intercollegiate athletics. Some of the emerging trends in intercollegiate athletics have already been presented in the discussion of the other categories in the literature review. However, some rather sweeping changes have taken place in recent years in intercollegiate athletics which have added to the controversies already surrounding the subject.

The granting of freshman eligibility in all varsity sports and at all levels of competition, beginning in the Fall of 1972, was met with mixed emotions. For many years, experts in the field of intercollegiate athletics had stressed the importance of the freshman year as a year of "adjustment" to college life which should be devoid of the pressures of varsity competition.

As recently as 1967, Shea wrote that the freshman student should not be permitted to participate in intercollegiate athletics as a member of a varsity team representing a senior college or university. It was his contention that a period of adjustment is necessary to permit the student to better comprehend the primary purposes of the institution and to the process of attaining them. It seeks to prevent on the part of the student, according to Shea, an over-balancing of attention and effort in a direction away from academic achievement.

He also presented his belief that no student should be eligible for a varsity team for more than three academic years and should the student fail to meet the standards for normal progress towards a four-year degree, his resulting ineligibility would exhaust one or more of the total years which would regularly be available.
Such a policy prevents the practice of withholding a student from participating in athletic competition while permitting him to reduce the normal credit hour load. This eliminates the practice commonly known as red-shirting.

As Shea pointed out, interpretations of the policy which permit an intentional re-adjustment in academic courses in order to extend the period of competition connotes over-emphasis to the sacrifice of the social, moral, and educational values of the student.

The 1971 poll taken by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, as reported in the journal of Athletic Administration, disclosed that college presidents were overwhelmingly against the stockpiling (red-shirting) of athletes.

Despite the apparent inequalities inherent in the red-shirting rule, the policy-making faculty representatives of the Big Ten Athletic Conference voted to reinstate the red-shirt rule in May of 1973. Pressures had been exerted for such a move by coaches and fans who contended that the Big Ten was losing prestige as a Conference because of the inability of its member schools to effectively compete with the member schools of Conferences which did permit the red-shirting of athletes. The Big Ten had inaugurated the four-year rule in 1958.

In an Associated Press story, as reported in the Kalamazoo Gazette on May 18, 1973, Marcus Plant of the University of Michigan, chairman of the faculty group, was quoted as saying that the prime factor in adopting the five-year rule was the new N.C.A.A. rule calling for an over-all limit of 105 football scholarships beginning in the Fall of
1977. According to Plant, this restriction will not allow much elbow room for red-shirting.

The Presidents of the Mid-American Conference schools, in a similar move just days after the Big Ten release, voted to reinstate the red-shirt rule which allows the athlete five calendar years to complete four years of eligibility.

Eligibility for intercollegiate athletics has also been extended to the graduate level, an area previously thought of as taboo in terms of varsity athletics. A recent ruling by the N.C.A.A. entitles graduate students to participate in intercollegiate athletics provided they meet established eligibility standards, and have not participated in varsity athletics at another four-year college or university.

This ruling granting varsity eligibility to graduate students appeared in the "official notice" booklet published by the N.C.A.A. following the 67th annual convention held in Chicago in January of 1973. It read as follows:

No. 28. Constitution: Amend Article 3, Section 3-(c), page 12, as follows:

"(c) He is maintaining satisfactory progress toward a baccalaureate or equivalent degree as determined by the regulations of that institution, except that a student athlete who has received his baccalaureate or equivalent degree and who is enrolled in the graduate or professional school of the institution he attended as an undergraduate may participate in intercollegiate athletics provided he has athletic eligibility remaining and such participation occurs within five years after initial enrollment in a collegiate institution."

At the time of this writing, there is no known research available which has studied the effects of freshman and graduate eligibility. However, freshmen are making valuable contributions to many varsity
teams in all sports and at all levels of competition. Future studies will undoubtedly uncover any adverse affects, if indeed there are any, in these areas, particularly with regard to freshman eligibility. It would appear that the freshman eligibility has helped reduce costs in athletics in this period of financial crisis in intercollegiate athletics by alleviating the need for extensive and often costly freshman programs.

Another recent trend, brought about again primarily because of financial difficulties, has been in the use of athletic facilities.

As current facilities become out-dated and costly to maintain, it is becoming increasingly difficult for administrators to justify an allocation of several millions of dollars for new stadia which may be used less than a dozen times per year.

One possible solution appears to lie in the sharing of athletic facilities by neighboring colleges and/or universities. Such facilities would be constructed, financed, and shared on a proportionately equal basis by the participating institutions. Scheduling conflicts, among other problems, will undoubtedly arise and require close cooperation between the neighboring schools. However, this does appear to be a feasible approach.

This approach was contemplated by Western Michigan University, a state-supported institution of over 20,000 students, in the addition, expansion, and reconditioning of the physical education and athletic facilities on that campus. This included the construction of a new four million dollar ice arena-natatorium complex, and an addition to and complete renovation of the existing football stadium. The stadium
construction necessitated removal of the existing outdoor track facilities. Western and Kalamazoo College, a liberal arts college located adjacent to Western and with an enrollment of approximately 1300 students, proposed a plan to improve the outdoor track facilities at Kalamazoo College and share this facility. According to the proposal, Western Michigan University would construct and finance a new all-weather track, at a cost of approximately $100,000, over the present track at Kalamazoo College. Kalamazoo College would make available the land containing the track for the construction work, provide the use of the existing bleacher seats, and be responsible for maintenance and repair work for a twenty-five year period. If the proposed plan had been implemented, both institutions would have had the advantages of improved facilities at a significant savings in cost.

This plan was approved by the Board of Trustees of Kalamazoo College, however, the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University elected to turn down the proposal.

Despite the lack of final approval, the plan was basically sound, and under slightly altered conditions such proposals might well provide some answers for intercollegiate athletics in the years ahead.

The future of intercollegiate athletics appears to lie in the ability of those charged with their administration and control to face the challenge of progress and change in a manner consistent with the educational philosophy of the institution.
Philosophical Considerations

This section will deal essentially with a discussion of inherent values existing in intercollegiate athletics and the relationship of collegiate athletics to the academic curriculum of the institution.

The avalanche of criticism directed toward intercollegiate athletics in recent years appears to stem from the mishandling of certain areas of athletics as opposed to athletics per se. Critics oppose the high cost of athletics and the over-emphasis placed on athletics at many institutions of higher education. Few dispute, however, the benefits to be derived from physical activity and athletic competition when properly conducted.

A series of ten reports (1969) was prepared by the Steering Committee, the Study of Education at Stanford University and reported by the Office of Education of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Stanford Committee was comprised of faculty and students at that institution and their sixth report, The Extra-curriculum, provided many interesting observations and recommendations with regard to intercollegiate athletics. Part of their findings were reported as follows:

1. Whether it is the ideal focus for student spirit or not, intercollegiate athletics are probably the principal, common, non-academic interest of the student body. More than any other single activity on campus it does provide many students with a sense of community.

2. The problem of insufficient integration of athletics within the academic community is related to that of social acceptance of the athlete at Stanford University.

3. Athletic activity has the potential of contributing to both physical and psychological development.
4. Athletic participation can enhance emotional development in terms of the general factors of interpersonal relations, self-image, and goal-directed behavior.

5. Equally important to interpersonal relations is the channelization of aggression within codes of social conduct.

6. A high hope would be that outcomes of athletic participation often described as "sportsmanship" and "fair play" would carry into other spheres of community living.

7. It would appear that sports activity offers opportunities for self-actualization and emotional growth, and the information that we have thus far suggests that some of these potential values are being realized at Stanford.

8. Attempts to realize these potential values through athletics should always be secondary to the central academic pursuits of the University.

9. The realization of many of the above values does not require an increasingly high-powered intercollegiate program and the semi-professional aura of the athletic programs of some universities must be avoided.

William R. Reed (1964), Commissioner of the Western Athletic Conference, stated that the lessons of sports stress and consequently develop loyalty, fundamental concepts of right and wrong, self-reliance, and an understanding of the meaning of self-sacrifice and discipline. He challenged those who decry an alleged over-emphasis in our schools and society by asking in what other halls are these lessons being taught and taught so well.

Long (1962), in a speech before the joint Conference of the Division for Girls and Women's Sports and the Division of Men's Athletics, stated his belief that collegiate sports constitute one of the most powerful forces in American society today and that concentrated efforts should be made to preserve what is good in athletics.
He further stated that intercollegiate sports are a vital and integral part of the educational system and that the importance of education should be stressed to the student athlete. Long spoke against the tendency toward widening the gap between athletics and education and athletics and physical education. He proposed, instead, the narrowing of this gap.

Coleman (1962), in an address to this same Conference, expressed the opinion that a good athletic program and a good academic program are not incompatible but rather complement one another. Furthermore, according to Coleman, there is a place in college athletics for strengthening and reinforcing the fiber that goes into the moral fabric of the character of the youth that participate in college athletics. He is convinced that a good athletic program is a vital part of the life of an institution and helps draw those of the past, present, and future of an institution into a common bond of friendship and fellowship.

Olds (1961), a College President, expressed his concern that many "big guns of higher education," rather than attempting to deal with the discrepancies existing in intercollegiate athletics, would dismiss athletics altogether from the collegiate scene.

With a discussion of the historical importance of athletics dating back as far as the early Greek culture, Olds pointed out that intellectual excellence is not enough to expect from any education. Olds believes that intercollegiate athletics have a definite place in higher education and contribute to the total development of the participant. As he so aptly stated:
If athletics have been prostituted to other than educational ends, let us not throw the baby out with the bath.

This report is a practical approach to the problems of intercollegiate athletics by a college president who admits to athletic shortcomings but envisions the values such a program can provide for the whole man.

Gregg (1971), in a philosophical analysis of the sports experience, reported that the sports experience is one of heightened awareness of self and nonself which for the most part is unmediated by discursive symbolism. Gregg found that athletics are not superior to regular classroom activities but noted that they should be a part of the educational process of the schools.

Whether intercollegiate athletics have a rightful place in higher education is an issue which is likely to be debated for many years to come. Many recent changes have occurred in this area in recent years and many more changes are likely to occur in the years ahead.

As Stern (1972) wrote, students are raising questions concerning the limits of coaches' power and authority in governing sports competition. As in other areas of student life, students are requesting—in fact, demanding—greater voice and vote in making decisions which directly affect their lives.

Minority participation, particularly among black athletes, has increased significantly in the last two decades.

Orr (1969) in his book on black athletes traced the role of the Afro-American in sports in America. He stated that although many of the obstacles placed in the path of the black athlete over the years have been knocked down, many others remain standing.
Little factual knowledge exists as to the extent intercollegiate athletics have aided in breaking down the racial barriers. It would appear, however, that collegiate athletics have, at least to some degree, contributed toward a better understanding of the racial problem.

Whether intercollegiate athletics contribute to leisure activities, whether they are a desirable means for colleges and universities to achieve national recognition, or whether they are "important" to meeting educational ends are also highly debatable issues.

It does appear, however, that when properly conceived and conducted, intercollegiate athletics do have a definite place in the educational framework of colleges and universities and can be a contributing factor to the aims and goals of higher education.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to review the studies and reports closely related to the five areas under consideration in this study. The review of related literature contributed to the organization of this study, provided background material, and helped to verify the need for more research in the whole area of intercollegiate athletics. Many of the statements which comprise the questionnaire for this study were generated through the literature review.

These studies made by committees, organizations, and individuals have been instrumental in developing the operating codes of the N.C.A.A. and the N.A.I.A., and have been invaluable in assessing the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The design and methods used in conducting this research are described under five major headings: (1) Review of the problem, (2) The sample, (3) Design and data collection, (4) Data analysis, and (5) Summary.

Review of the Problem

The purpose of the study was to determine faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in selected institutions of higher education. Specifically, this study was concerned with: (1) total faculty responses to the items in the questionnaire, and (2) significant differences which may occur on the items when the total responses of faculty members at institutions within one conference were compared to the total responses of faculty members at institutions of the other two conferences.

The investigation analyzed the responses to the questionnaire of faculty members selected from within the Big Ten Athletic Conference, the Mid-American Athletic Conference, and the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association.

The Sample

Institutions within each conference, and the faculty members at those institutions selected for the study were chosen on a random basis.
Institutions

Conference affiliation was deemed to be an important prerequisite in the selection of institutions for the study because of the necessity of similar athletic philosophies of institutions with conference membership.

Hoy (1966) found that, after a thorough review of the literature in this field, the best approach to the problems in intercollegiate athletics appeared to be at the conference level, since by nature an athletic conference is especially designed to improve standards.

The definition of athletic conference mentioned earlier in this study defines an athletic conference as a group of colleges in the same geographic area which are logical rivals in athletics and which are somewhat similar in such matters as curriculum, entrance requirements, educational philosophy, size of student body, and financial support.

The conferences selected for the study were chosen on the basis of relative geographic proximity (mid-west), a minimum of eight varsity sports in the intercollegiate athletic programs of the member institutions of each conference, and the diverse range in enrollments and apparent athletic philosophies of the three conferences.

The member institutions of the Big Ten Conference are, for the most part, large (over 25,000 students), state-supported universities with so-called "high-powered" athletic programs. From within this conference, Indiana University, Michigan State University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Illinois were randomly selected for the study.
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The Mid-American Conference member institutions include mid-size (14,000-22,000 students), state-supported universities with a somewhat less "high-powered" emphasis than the Big Ten. Those institutions selected from within the Mid-American Conference included Bowling Green State University, Central Michigan University, Kent State University, and Western Michigan University.

The member institutions of the Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association are small (1,000-2,500 students), privately endowed colleges in which the intercollegiate athletic programs are not stressed to the extent of those in the other two conferences. From within this conference, Adrian College, Albion College, Hope College, and Kalamazoo College were chosen for the study.

These institutions were all members in good standing within the N.C.A.A., and within their respective conferences.

Faculty members

Only full-time faculty members with the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor (or their equivalent rank) were selected for the study.

The 1972-73 college or university catalogues were used to establish the population at most of the institutions. In a few cases, the 1972-73 catalogues were not available in which case the 1971-72 catalogues were used.

A total of 1008 questionnaires were sent to randomly selected members of the faculty at each of the institutions selected for the
study. A starting number was assigned for each institution to insure random selection.

Approximately two weeks after the initial mailing, a follow-up card was sent to each of the faculty members.

A total of 516 questionnaires were returned for a percentage of slightly over 51%.

Of the 516 returns, 22 or 2.1% were not usable for various reasons, leaving a total usable response of just over 49%. Of the unusable responses, four faculty members were deceased, three were on sabbatical leave in foreign countries, and fifteen did not complete the questionnaire as instructed, invalidating the results.

Table 1 shows a breakdown of the total sample return and the percent return by conference and by institution.

Design and Data Collection

The criterion measure analyzed in this investigation was the attitudes of the faculty members at the institutions selected for the study. Data regarding these attitudes were obtained through the use of a questionnaire containing forty-eight statements relative to the current issues and trends in intercollegiate athletics.

The construction stages of the questionnaire involved a thorough perusal of literature relevant to the topic area.

Through the literature review, a series of 192 statements and twenty-six different categories were established. Each of the statements was then placed within an appropriate category relative to the specific topic area.
### TABLE 1
**TOTAL SAMPLE, TOTAL RETURN, AND PERCENT RETURN FOR EACH CONFERENCE AND INSTITUTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total Sent</th>
<th>Total Return</th>
<th>Percent Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Big Ten Athletic Conference:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid-American Athletic Conference:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan Intercollegiate Athletic Association:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories were systematically reduced to a workable number of seven. They were as follows: (1) Administration and control of intercollegiate athletics, (2) Publicity and public relations, (3) General considerations, (4) Financial considerations, (5) New trends, (6) Policy considerations, and (7) General purposes.

Because of the general nature of a few of these categories, most of the 192 statements were applicable to at least one category.
Several knowledgeable persons were contacted and informed of the purpose and need for the proposed study. They were then requested to review the list of statements and recommend those statements which they deemed most appropriate to the study.

Contributions to this portion of the investigation included, among others, Dr. Lysle K. Butler, recently retired athletic director at Oberlin College and a noted writer in the field; Dr. Joseph Hoy, director of physical education and athletics at Western Michigan University; Miss Ruth Ann Meyer, director of women's athletics at Western Michigan University; and Mr. Michael J. Cleary, Executive Director of the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA).

Through the assistance of these persons, and a lengthy personal evaluation, the list of original statements was reduced to fifty-one under five general categories.

These categories included: (1) Policies and policy determination, (2) Financial considerations, (3) Coaching staff, (4) Current trends, and (5) Philosophical considerations.

Once the over-all make-up of the instrument had been completed, it was then necessary to establish a format for the questionnaire which could adequately cope with the relatively large sample size.

Edwards (1957) wrote that there has been a desire for a quick and convenient measure of attitudes that could be used with large groups. This eventually led to the development of attitude scales. According to Edwards, a well-constructed attitude scale consists of a number of items that have been carefully edited and selected in accordance with certain criteria.
Kilpatrick (1948) compiled a list of informal criteria for editing statements to be used in the construction of attitude scales. Rather than reprinting this lengthy list, it will suffice to say that every effort was made to adhere to correct procedures in the construction of the attitude scale.

Because of its applicability to problems of the nature of the one proposed in this study, it was decided that the five-point scale developed by Likert would be implemented. In obtaining responses from the faculty members, they were permitted to use any one of five categories: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. For purposes of assigning numerical values for the total mean scores and the one-way analysis of variance scores, these categories of response were weighted in such a way that the responses made by individuals with the most favorable attitudes would always have the lowest score. Thus, strongly agree received a weight of one, an agree response received a weight of two, undecided three, disagree four, and strongly disagree response received a weight of five. These values insured consistency throughout the evaluation portion of the study.

In an attempt to minimize vagueness and misunderstanding of certain statements, personal interviews were conducted with four randomly selected members of the Western Michigan University faculty. The persons interviewed included one faculty member from each of the following departments: mechanical engineering, anthropology, management, and educational leadership. These persons were informed of the title of the study, and the method of response and were then requested to
read over the statements individually, respond in a positive, neutral, or negative manner and, most importantly, to indicate statements, words, or phrases which were vague or lacked apparent relevancy.

Several minor changes resulted from these interviews which added significantly to the over-all usefulness of the instrument.

Validity

In the construction stages of the instrument, content validity was determined by verbal and written interviews with experts in the field. The original list of 192 statements was reduced significantly through this process. The five categories selected from the twenty-six original possibilities were felt to be most representative of the topic areas suggested by the final list of statements used in the questionnaire.

Reliability

The reliability of the instrument was determined by means of a test-retest situation again involving a random sampling of faculty members at Western Michigan University.

Seventeen faculty members were selected and agreed unanimously to participate in the study. Each faculty member was given a questionnaire containing the fifty-one statements under five general categories. A concise cover letter which pointed out the title of the proposed study, the usefulness of the study, and specific directions for completing the questionnaire accompanied the instrument.
The completed questionnaires were picked up the following day and one week later the same faculty members were again asked to complete an identical questionnaire.

One faculty member did not return the second questionnaire and one was not usable leaving a total of fifteen sets of questionnaires for comparative purposes.

The responses from the second administration of the instrument were then correlated with those from the first administration to determine a correlation coefficient for each item.

Figure 1 shows a frequency distribution of the number of items falling within one of five ranges of correlation coefficients.

All items with a correlation coefficient of .45 or above were included in the questionnaire with the exception of two items. These items, pertaining to women’s intercollegiate athletics, and race relations, were felt to be very relevant to the study and were included despite correlation coefficients of less than .45. Three items which did not meet the criteria were eliminated from the final form of the questionnaire.

The highest correlation coefficient was .94, the lowest .11, and the median correlation coefficient was .69.

Once acceptable standards of reliability and validity were established, the questionnaires were mailed to the sample of faculty members.

A cover letter stating the need and purpose of the study was included with the questionnaire. Specific directions for responding to the items were set forth on the first page of the instrument. The
questionnaire was composed of three sections. Section one requested demographic data including name of the institution, academic rank, department, and sex. Section two contained the forty-eight items of response, and section three asked for additional comments.

![Bar chart showing frequency distribution of correlation coefficients on each item](image)

**Figure 1.**—Frequency distribution of correlation coefficients on each item
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Data Analysis

A total frequency count was determined for each item as well as an item mean. A one-way analysis of variance was then computed to test for significant differences between the mean responses of faculty members at institutions within one conference when compared to the mean responses of those faculty members at institutions within the other two conferences. When the analysis of variance indicated significant differences beyond the .05 level between the three groups, the T-method developed by Tukey and presented in the book by Glass and Stanley (1970) was utilized to determine if there was significance between all of the means.

The analysis indicated that 10% of the respondents were female, however, no attempt was made to determine if their responses differed significantly from the male responses.

Upon completion of the frequency count and the one-way analysis of variance, the data were separated into two groups: those which contained additional comments in section three, and those which did not. Those questionnaires containing additional comments were then analyzed to determine if a recurrent thought or idea prevailed.

Summary

The design and methodology chapter of this study included a review of the problem, the sample, design and data collection, and data analysis.
The study is an investigation of faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. A questionnaire containing forty-eight statements in five general categories was developed to determine the attitudes of the selected faculties toward this subject area.

The faculty members and their respective institutions of higher education were chosen on a random basis from within the three selected conferences.

Prior to mailing, a pilot study was conducted to determine the reliability of the statements contained in the instrument. The pilot study resulted in minor revisions to the questionnaire and gave the writer valuable suggestions in recording and interpreting the information.

A total of 1008 questionnaires were mailed out with a return of 516 or 51.1%.

The data were analyzed by determining a frequency distribution, item mean, and one-way analysis of variance between conferences.

Those questionnaires containing additional comments in section three were analyzed for that portion as well.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In each of the five selected areas of investigation (policies and policy determination, financial considerations, coaching staff, current trends, and philosophical considerations), responses of the faculty members selected for the study supplied data for the analysis. The analysis was based on the returns of 494 faculty members from the three conferences.

The faculty members were asked to respond to each item in one of five ways: strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree. The items were weighted in such a way that a positive response received the lowest numerical value. Thus, a response of strongly agree received a weight of one, an agree response received a weight of two, undecided three, disagree four, and a strongly disagree response received a weight of five.

Mean numerical responses were presented in the Tables which follow as well as an evaluation of the items using the following criteria: 1.00-1.80 was considered to be a very strong response; 1.81-2.60 was considered to be a strong response; 2.61-3.40 average; 3.41-4.20 weak; and 4.21-5.00 was considered to be a very weak response.
Policies and Policy Determination

This section was concerned primarily with the structure of the policy-determining body and some of the basic, yet controversial, statements of policy.

Table 2 presents the analysis of the data in this section.

The attitudes of the faculty members at each of three conferences were in close agreement regarding the need for some type of faculty athletic board to establish athletic policy and a written code of ethics revealing institutional philosophy toward intercollegiate athletics.

Whether members of the faculty athletic board should be elected by fellow faculty members or institutional administrators has been a constantly debated question. The data indicated that this should be the practice as perceived by the faculty members involved in this study. The controversy surrounding this question stems from the belief of many athletic administrators that persons elected by the faculty at large are less likely to have knowledge of the program of intercollegiate athletics than those appointed by the administration. On the other hand, many persons believe that appointments to the faculty athletic board too often consist of those individuals interested only in the success of intercollegiate athletics in the won-loss column and do little in the way of controlling unhealthy practices. The faculty members at the Big Ten schools were less in agreement on this item than the other two conferences, although not significantly so.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and Policy Determination</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each institution ought to have</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some type of athletic board that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>establishes the athletic policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each institution should have a</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written code of ethics which</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reveals the philosophy of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution regarding intercol-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legiate athletics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All members of the faculty ath-</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letic board ought to be elected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the faculty at large rather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than being appointed by institu-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tional administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercollegiate athletic pro-</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gram ought to be expanded in an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort to provide the opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for greater numbers of students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to participate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies and Policy Determination</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The major purpose for having athletics in the program of higher education should be to provide entertainment for the student body, alumni, faculty and public.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.14 weak</td>
<td>3.79 weak</td>
<td>4.15 weak</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post season competition ought to be an acceptable practice when sanctioned by the N.C.A.A. or the N.A.I.A.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.60 strong</td>
<td>2.60 strong</td>
<td>2.98 average</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A limited number of sports should be included in the athletic program in order that a higher quality of teams may be developed.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.11 weak</td>
<td>4.01 weak</td>
<td>4.07 weak</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics should be placed under closer scrutiny by the college or university administration than other departments within the institution.</td>
<td>3.26 average</td>
<td>3.26 average</td>
<td>3.14 average</td>
<td>3.44 weak</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There should be no restriction on the distance teams travel for inter-collegiate athletic contests.</td>
<td>3.61 average</td>
<td>3.20 average</td>
<td>3.68 weak</td>
<td>4.12 weak</td>
<td>26.87</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There appeared to be mixed reactions as to whether athletic programs should be expanded to increase opportunities for more students to participate. Certainly one of the primary criticisms of intercollegiate athletics is that they benefit only a select few individuals. The faculty members of the Big Ten institutions were more in agreement than either the MAC faculty members or the MIAA faculty members on this item.

As to the question of whether the major purpose of intercollegiate athletics should be to provide entertainment, the attitudes of the MAC faculty members differed significantly from the other two conferences. Although they disagreed quite strongly to this item, their disagreement was not as great as the others.

Significant differences occurred as well on the question of acceptability of postseason competition for athletic teams. The faculty members of each of the three conferences appeared to agree on this item although the agreement of the MIAA faculty members was to a much lesser extent. The mean responses of the Big Ten and MAC faculty members were identical on this item. This would appear consistent with the philosophy of the MIAA member schools to stress participation as the ultimate reward of athletics as opposed to financial or publicity gains experienced through tournament or bowl events.

The faculty members disagreed quite strongly to the notion of limiting the number of sports to develop higher quality teams in the few remaining sports. Although differences were very minimal on this item, the greatest disagreement came from the faculty members of the Big Ten Conference.
Whether athletics should be placed under closer scrutiny than other departments within the institution, was also an item of disagreement, although not nearly to the extent of the previous item. The mean response of the Big Ten faculty members toward this item was 3.26, with the mean of the MAC faculty members being 3.14, and that of the MIAA being 3.44.

On the item of placing no restriction upon the distance teams travel for intercollegiate athletic contests, there were highly significant differences between the responses of the faculty members at each of the three conferences. The MIAA faculty members disagreed to a significantly greater extent than the Big Ten or the MAC faculty members. The MAC faculty members also disagreed to a significantly greater extent than the Big Ten faculty members. In other words, they believed that restrictions should be placed on travel. With financial problems facing most athletic departments, there appears to be little justification for sending athletic teams great distances to participate in athletic contests, when comparable opponents may be only a short distance away.

The faculty members at the MAC schools disagreed to a much greater extent than the Big Ten faculty members on this item, and the faculty members of the MIAA institutions disagreed significantly more than either of the other two. The mean of the MIAA respondents was 4.12 compared to 3.68 for the MAC and 3.20 for the Big Ten conference.
Financial Considerations

As evidenced in the review of the literature in this area, financial problems in intercollegiate athletics are reaching crisis proportions. Unless modifications are made, it appears that these problems are likely to increase in the immediate future.

Table 3 presents the analysis of the data in this area and significant differences were found on all but two of the items in this section of the instrument.

Attitudes were mixed toward the statement that intercollegiate athletic programs should be financially self-supporting. When required to be financially self-supporting, intercollegiate athletics have traditionally become far removed from educational purposes and take on an aura of "big business." Over-all responses indicated a slight tendency toward agreement with this item, despite slight overall disagreement by the MIAA faculties. The T-method indicated that the responses of the Big Ten faculty members were significantly different from those of the MIAA but not from those of the MAC. The responses of the MAC faculty members were found to be significantly different from those of the MIAA.

Over-all agreement was evident among the faculty members at each of the institutions to the statement that resorting to athletic renown as a means of securing public support should not be encouraged. The mean responses of the faculty members at each conference were as follows: Big Ten - 2.27, MAC - 2.40, and MIAA - 2.21.
TABLE 3
DATA ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Considerations</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletic programs should be financially self-supporting.</td>
<td>2.91 (average)</td>
<td>2.85 (average)</td>
<td>2.69 (average)</td>
<td>3.30 (average)</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A high quality institution should not resort to athletic renown as a means of securing public support.</td>
<td>2.30 (strong)</td>
<td>2.27 (strong)</td>
<td>2.40 (strong)</td>
<td>2.21 (strong)</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from admissions to athletic contests ought to be regarded as a source of revenue for the general education fund.</td>
<td>2.90 (average)</td>
<td>2.88 (average)</td>
<td>3.05 (average)</td>
<td>2.69 (average)</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercollegiate athletic program ought to be financed by budget allocations in the same manner as the other departments in the college or university.</td>
<td>2.74 (average)</td>
<td>2.88 (average)</td>
<td>2.82 (strong)</td>
<td>2.41 (strong)</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Considerations</td>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>Mean of Big Ten</td>
<td>Mean of MAC</td>
<td>Mean of MIAA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercollegiate athletic program should be limited to those sports which produce significant revenues to the college or university.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial aid should be available to students based on financial need and/or academic ability, but not for superior athletic ability alone.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants-in-aid for athletes should not exist.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An activity fee ought to be charged even though all students do not desire to attend intercollegiate contests.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other phases of the program of higher education should be adequately provided for before money is spent for athletic facilities and equipment.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Slight over-all agreement was evident to the statement that receipts from admissions to athletic contests should be regarded as a source of revenue for the general education fund, despite slight over-all disagreement on the part of the MAC faculty members. The mean response of the Big Ten faculty members did not differ significantly from either the MAC or the MIAA. The mean response of the MAC faculty members did, however, differ significantly from that of the MIAA faculties.

Over-all agreement was also evident to the next related item pertaining to budget allocations for athletic programs.

The faculties of the MIAA members tended to favor the budgeting of athletic programs in the same manner as other departments within the institution. The Big Ten and MAC faculty members, although not to as great a degree, tended to agree with this item as well.

Although a slight trend toward agreement on these items was evident, it would appear that responses to these statements were, for the most part, undecided.

Limiting the number of sports to only those which produce significant revenues to the college or university was an item receiving very negative responses from each of the conference faculty members. However, significantly fewer negative attitudes were elicited by the faculty members at the MAC member institutions. The over-all responses of the Big Ten and MIAA faculties to this item were identical.

Significantly different results were also found in the next two items pertaining to financial aid for participation in intercollegiate
athletics. Although there was general agreement that athletic talent should not be the sole criterion upon which an allocation of financial aid is based, some discrepancies existed in the responses toward these two items. Both statements dealt with essentially the same information, however, the total mean score for the first item (financial aid should be available to students based on financial need and/or academic ability, but not for superior athletic ability) was 2.00. The next item (grants-in-aid for athletes should not exist) had a significantly higher total mean score of 2.79.

On both items, the faculty members of the MIAA institutions as a whole, tended to agree to a significantly greater extent than either of the other two conference faculty members.

Charging an activity fee to all students, even though they do not desire to attend intercollegiate athletic events, is another controversial issue in intercollegiate athletics today.

Faculty members of the Big Ten and MAC tended to be in slight disagreement toward this statement. The MIAA faculty members tended toward agreement with this item and their responses varied quite significantly from those of the Big Ten faculty members. The mean response of the MAC faculty members also differed significantly with that of the Big Ten faculties. The mean response of the Big Ten faculty members toward this item was 3.58, with the mean of the MAC faculty members being 3.19, and that of the MIAA being 2.91.

There was general disagreement by all of the faculty members toward the statement that all other phases of the program of higher
education should be adequately provided for before money is spent for
athletic facilities and equipment. The mean responses to this item were
as follows: Big Ten - 3.33, MAC - 3.28, and MIAA - 3.32.

Coaching Staff

To the athletic administrator, this area of intercollegiate ath-
etics is often the area of greatest concern and the hiring, rank,
promotion, and dismissal policies are of utmost importance.

Data relative to this topic area are presented in Table 4.

No significant differences were evident between the responses of
faculty members at each of the three conferences to the first two
items. There was general agreement that members of the athletic coach-
ing staff ought to be members of the teaching faculty of the institu-
tion, and rather pronounced disagreement to the statement that coaches
ought to expect more pressure from within the institution than other
members of the faculty. On this item, the mean response of the Big Ten
faculties was 3.75, the MAC 3.62, and the MIAA 3.89.

Three of the next four items dealt with the hiring and retention
of athletic coaches, and significant differences were found on each of
these items. There was over-all agreement that coaches should be
retained primarily upon their contributions to the total education of
the students. The faculties of the MIAA institutions were in signifi-
cantly greater agreement on this item than either of the other two
conference members.

Hiring coaches primarily on the basis of previous coaching records
and retaining coaches primarily upon their ability to consistently
TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA REGARDING COACHING STAFFS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Staff</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All members of the athletic coaching staff ought to be members of the teaching faculty of the institution.</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.43 strong</td>
<td>2.47 strong</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic coaches, by the very nature of their positions, ought to expect more pressure from within the institution to produce tangible results for their efforts than other members of the faculty.</td>
<td>3.73 weak</td>
<td>3.75 weak</td>
<td>3.62 weak</td>
<td>3.89 weak</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches should be retained primarily upon their contribution to the total education of the students.</td>
<td>2.09 strong</td>
<td>2.20 strong</td>
<td>2.12 strong</td>
<td>1.89 strong</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches should be appointed by college administrators in the same manner as are all other faculty members.</td>
<td>2.16 strong</td>
<td>2.25 strong</td>
<td>2.20 strong</td>
<td>1.98 strong</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches should be hired primarily on the basis of their coaching records in former positions.</td>
<td>3.43 average</td>
<td>3.24 average</td>
<td>3.38 average</td>
<td>3.75 weak</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Staff</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaches should be retained primarily upon their ability to consistently develop winning teams.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.80 weak</td>
<td>3.70 weak</td>
<td>4.14 weak</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic department members should have professional status comparable with other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university.</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.23 strong</td>
<td>2.18 strong</td>
<td>2.21 strong</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaches ought to be permitted to receive financial remuneration for public appearances and/or banquet addresses.</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.30 strong</td>
<td>2.39 strong</td>
<td>2.27 strong</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attainment of the Ph.D. or an equivalent degree, ought to be as important for the coach as for any other member of the college or university faculty.</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.94 average</td>
<td>2.68 average</td>
<td>2.65 average</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic department members should receive a salary comparable to other faculty members in a similar rank throughout the college or university.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.11 strong</td>
<td>2.01 strong</td>
<td>1.86 strong</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the nature of the position, college and university coaches should not be eligible for tenure. 3.62

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coaching Staff</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
develop winning teams received over-all negative responses. Again, the MIAA faculty members disagreed more strongly to these statements than the Big Ten or MAC faculty members. Retaining coaches primarily upon their ability to consistently develop winning teams was seen as less undesirable by MAC faculties than the Big Ten faculties, although the difference here was not great.

There was general agreement among each of the conference faculty members that coaching appointments should be made by college administrators in the same manner as are all other faculty members. The Big Ten mean response to this item was 2.25, the MAC mean response was 2.20, and the MIAA was 1.98.

To the statement that athletic department members should have professional status comparable with other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university, the faculty members selected for this study were in consistent agreement. There was also strong consistent agreement that athletic department members should receive a salary comparable to other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university. Differences on this item were not significant, however, the faculty members of the MIAA schools were in stronger agreement toward this item than the other two conference faculty members, and particularly the Big Ten.

Receiving of financial remuneration by coaches for public appearances and/or banquet addresses was viewed as an acceptable practice by a great majority of the faculty members from each conference. A sense of "fair play" was evident here, since faculty members of other
departments are generally free to receive financial consideration for similar activities.

Attainment of the terminal degree as an important criterion in the selection of a coach, was viewed with mixed reactions. Many persons believe that if the coach is to receive similar salary, rank, and promotion considerations as other members of the faculty, that he should be required to reach a similar level of degree attainment. Many others believe, however, that the coaches' expertise lies in areas outside the classroom and that the attainment of the Ph.D., or equivalent degree, would be of little or no practical value. The data indicated that the faculty members of the Big Ten, MAC, and MIAA conference schools did favor the first of these points of view, that the Ph.D. was as important for the coach as for any other faculty member. Agreement on this item was not strong, however, and the tendency was toward indecision on this statement.

Tenure for coaches has been a constantly debated item in the field of intercollegiate athletics for many years. The ramifications of this topic area are many and varied. To the statement that because of the nature of the position, college and university coaches should not be eligible for tenure, there was general disagreement among each of the conference faculty members. The MIAA faculty members disagreed to a significantly greater extent than the faculty members of the MAC and Big Ten conferences. The mean responses for each of the conferences were as follows: Big Ten - 3.51, MAC - 3.57, MIAA - 3.84. This would seem consistent with the philosophy of the MIAA institutions toward an educational emphasis on intercollegiate athletics.
Current Trends

More significant changes have occurred in the area of intercollegiate athletics in the past few years than in any previous period. Traditional attitudes toward many areas within our society, particularly with regard to women's rights, are undergoing rapid change.

Data relative to this area of the study are presented in Table 5.

The faculty members selected for the study were in strong general agreement that institutions conducting intercollegiate athletic programs for women ought to be permitted to operate these programs on the same basis as the men's program. Faculty members at the MIAA institutions, where participation by all students is highly stressed, agreed to a significantly greater extent than the Big Ten or MAC faculty members on this item. The mean response of the MIAA faculty was 1.76 as compared to 1.90 for the MAC, and 1.99 for the Big Ten.

Permitting women to qualify for certain men's athletic teams is a highly debatable issue at all levels of sport. The data indicated that this is a desirable practice at the collegiate level, with highly favorable mean responses elicited by each of the conferences. The mean response of the Big Ten faculty members did not differ significantly from either the MAC or the MIAA, while the mean response of the MAC faculty members did differ significantly from that of the MIAA.

A related item, stating that women should not be allowed to compete in contact sports such as football and ice hockey at the intercollegiate level, received over-all negative mean responses, indicating that competing in the contact sports cited was not seen as undesirable for women.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions that conduct an intercollegiate athletic program for women ought to be permitted to operate on the same basis as the men's program.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.99 strong</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When women demonstrate proficiency in sports such as tennis, swimming, and golf, and no women's team is sponsored by the institution, they ought to be allowed to qualify for the men's teams.</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.02 strong</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When institutions provide intercollegiate athletic competition for women, the program ought to be controlled and conducted by professionally competent women.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.34 strong</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women's intercollegiate athletics are, or have the potential to be, as exciting to the spectators as the men's intercollegiate program. 2.31
Athletic grants-in-aid should be available to outstanding women athletes on a proportionately equal basis with the male athletes. 2.41
Women should not be allowed to compete in contact sports such as football and ice hockey at the intercollegiate level. 3.20
Whenever feasible, new athletic facilities should be constructed, financed, and shared on a proportionate basis by neighboring colleges and/or universities. (neighboring - 25 miles or less apart) 2.41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Trends</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's intercollegiate athletics</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are, or have the potential to be, as exciting to the spectators as the men's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intercollegiate program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic grants-in-aid should be available to outstanding women athletes on</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a proportionately equal basis with the male athletes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should not be allowed to compete in contact sports such as football and</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ice hockey at the intercollegiate level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenever feasible, new athletic facilities should be constructed, financed,</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and shared on a proportionate basis by neighboring colleges and/or universities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(neighboring - 25 miles or less apart)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Trends</td>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>Mean of Big Ten</td>
<td>Mean of MAC</td>
<td>Mean of MIAA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen ought to be eligible for varsity competition in all sports and at all levels of competition. 2.27</td>
<td>2.44 strong</td>
<td>2.30 strong</td>
<td>2.02 strong</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing an additional year of college, such as the &quot;red-shirt&quot; program, ought to be retained as an essential feature of the intercollegiate athletic program. (&quot;red-shirting&quot; purposely withholds an eligible athlete from competition for one year.) 3.78</td>
<td>3.61 weak</td>
<td>3.75 weak</td>
<td>4.05 weak</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided they meet established eligibility standards, and have not participated in varsity athletics at another four year college or university, graduate students should be permitted to compete in intercollegiate athletic programs. 2.84</td>
<td>2.79 average</td>
<td>2.82 average</td>
<td>2.95 average</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Controlling and conducting women's intercollegiate athletic programs by professionally competent women was viewed with general agreement by the sample of faculty members. The MAC faculties, although not to a significant degree, were in greater agreement on this item.

There was also general agreement by each of the conference faculty members that women's intercollegiate athletics are, or have the potential to be, as exciting to the spectators as the men's intercollegiate program. Concrete data on this area will undoubtedly become more evident as women's athletic programs gain in numbers and stature in the years ahead.

Athletic grants-in-aid are another controversial issue in intercollegiate athletics, and the data in a previous section of the study indicated that the granting of financial aid for strictly athletic participation is not a desirable practice. The data indicated a consistent trend toward equality between women's and men's athletic programs which was apparently confirmed by the general agreement toward the statement that athletic grants-in-aid should be available to outstanding women athletes on a proportionately equal basis with the male athletes. The mean response of the Big Ten faculties on this item was 2.43 while the MAC mean was 2.28, and the MIAA 2.58.

Shared financing and use of athletic facilities by neighboring institutions is a recent trend in intercollegiate athletics which may provide a realistic means to reduce the high costs of construction and maintenance relative to new facilities. The data relative to this item indicated general agreement by the faculty members at each of the three selected conferences toward this item.
Significant differences in over-all attitudes were evident on the question of whether or not freshmen should be eligible for varsity competition in all sports and at all levels of competition.

The MIAA faculty members were much more in agreement on this item than either of the two other conferences. The mean response of the MIAA faculties was 2.02 as compared to 2.30 for the MAC faculty members and 2.44 for the Big Ten.

Perhaps no greater criticism has been leveled at intercollegiate athletic practices than to that of withholding an athlete, eligible to compete, from competition. This practice is commonly referred to as the "red-shirt" rule and has been a highly debatable issue for many years. The data indicated that there were strong negative attitudes toward the retention of the "red-shirt" rule on the part of the faculty members in this study. The MIAA faculty members disagreed to a significantly greater extent than either the Big Ten or MAC faculties. The mean response of the MIAA faculties was 4.05, while the MAC faculties had a mean of 3.75, and the Big Ten 3.61.

The data indicated an attitude of general agreement toward another area of recent development in intercollegiate athletics, that being the granting of permission for graduate students to participate in varsity athletics. Agreement on this item was rather slight, however, and the over-all responses appear to indicate a tendency toward indecision in this matter. Mean responses to this statement were as follows: Big Ten - 2.79, MAC - 2.82, and MIAA 2.95.
Philosophical Considerations

This section was concerned essentially with thoughts and attitudes toward general statements of purpose and possible outcomes with regard to intercollegiate athletic programs.

The presentation of the data relative to this section is listed in Table 6.

When compared to strictly academic courses, intercollegiate athletics are often referred to as the "laboratory" for general physical education classes and intramurals. The purpose of this "laboratory" setting is to provide those students with gifted motor ability the chance to achieve optimum development of this ability.

There was general agreement toward this statement by the Big Ten and MIAA conference faculty members. The MAC faculties appeared undecided on this item, with the MIAA, with an over-all mean of 2.61, in significantly greater agreement on this item than the Big Ten which had a mean of 2.89 on this item.

There was a small degree of over-all disagreement prevalent in each of the next two items, the first of which stated that the student-athlete is the most sought after product of secondary education today. With a mean of 3.28, the MAC faculty members, although not to a significant degree, were found to be in greatest disagreement on this issue.

On the second of these items, which stated that with increasing leisure time, intercollegiate athletics take on a growing importance, there was general disagreement. With the mean responses of 2.98 and 2.99, the MIAA and Big Ten faculties respectively were in agreement on
### Table 6

Analysis of the Data Regarding Philosophical Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical Considerations</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics are needed in the program of higher education to provide those with</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gifted motor ability the chance to achieve optimum development of this ability.</td>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student-athlete is the most sought-after product of secondary education today.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With increasing leisure time, intercollegiate athletics take on a growing importance.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intercollegiate athletic program has very little relationship to the academic curriculum of</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the institution.</td>
<td></td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the preservation of mental health, intercollegiate athletics fulfill a vital function.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophical Considerations</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
<th>Mean of Big Ten</th>
<th>Mean of MAC</th>
<th>Mean of MIAA</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics are a desirable means by which a college or university can achieve national recognition.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.25 average</td>
<td>3.05 average</td>
<td>3.46 weak</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletes are being exploited.</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.26 strong</td>
<td>2.29 strong</td>
<td>2.02 strong</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics are a contributing factor towards a better understanding of the racial problem.</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.90 average</td>
<td>3.07 average</td>
<td>3.03 average</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercollegiate athletics are an important phase of higher education.</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.79 average</td>
<td>2.66 average</td>
<td>2.56 strong</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this item, while the MAC faculties, with a mean of 3.09, disagreed. The over-all mean of 3.03 would indicate a great deal of indecision toward this item.

The next item, stating that the intercollegiate athletic program has very little relationship to the academic curriculum of the institution, deals with one of the fundamental questions confronting intercollegiate athletics today. With a strong emphasis on the educational benefits to be derived from athletic participation, the MIAA faculties, with a mean of 2.97, differed significantly from the other two conferences in their responses to this item. However, they did tend toward agreement to this statement although apparently very much undecided. The MAC faculties responded similarly with the MIAA faculties, however, the data would indicate that the faculty members of the Big Ten, with a mean of 2.54, were in over-all agreement on this issue.

Whether or not intercollegiate athletics fulfill a vital function in the preservation of mental health is a highly subjective question. The responses of the sample in this study did vary significantly on this item, with the MIAA faculties in greatest agreement on this item. The Big Ten also responded positively to this item, while the MAC faculties disagreed slightly. Means on this item were as follows: Big Ten - 2.94, MAC - 3.13, and MIAA - 2.75.

The data indicated that there was apparent indecision on the issue of whether or not intercollegiate athletics are a desirable means by which a college or university can achieve national recognition. Overall attitudes appeared negative toward this item with the MAC faculties least in disagreement on this item. The MIAA faculties, with a mean
of 3.46, disagreed to a significantly greater extent than the MAC faculties.

The exploitation of athletes has been an often discussed issue in the area of intercollegiate athletics almost from the very beginning. The controversy appears to lie in just how the word exploitation is defined. The faculty members in this study expressed the over-all attitude that athletes are indeed being exploited. The faculty members of the MIAA institutions were in greatest agreement on this item. Their mean response was 2.02, compared to 2.29 for the MAC, and 2.26 for the Big Ten faculties.

Race relations on the college campus are a highly controversial topic area and are viewed by many as an extremely complex issue. Responses to the statement in the questionnaire that intercollegiate athletics are a contributing factor toward a better understanding of the racial problem were highly indecisive. The Big Ten faculties, with a mean response of 2.90 agreed slightly to this statement while the MAC, with a mean of 3.07, and the MIAA with a mean of 3.03, were in slight disagreement.

The final statement on the questionnaire dealt with perhaps the most fundamental question in the whole area of intercollegiate athletics. To the statement that intercollegiate athletics are an important phase of higher education, there was general agreement on the part of the respondents. Over 60% of the respondents were in agreement on this item, with the MIAA faculties in greatest agreement followed by the MAC faculty members, and the Big Ten faculties. The mean response of
the MIAA faculties was 2.56, with the MAC being 2.66, and the Big Ten 2.79.

Section 3 of the instrument dealt with additional comments of the respondents upon completion of the forty-eight items on the questionnaire. Of the usable responses, 220 or 44.5% commented about either the usefulness (or lack of it) of the study, or more importantly, their opinions regarding intercollegiate athletics in the total educational scene.

The large majority of comments referred to the necessity of de-emphasizing the "big business" aspect of intercollegiate athletics and increasing emphasis in the area of intramural and club sports.

Summary

The analysis of the data was organized under the following headings: Policies and policy determination; financial considerations; coaching staff; current trends; and philosophical considerations.

The data indicated that intercollegiate athletics appear to be an integral part of the total educational program at the college and university level. However, it is apparent from the data that there is need for constant evaluation and control of intercollegiate athletic programs to maintain a philosophy of athletics consistent with educational goals. The "big business" aura of intercollegiate athletics present in many institutions of higher education was seen as highly undesirable. A reduced emphasis on intercollegiate athletics and an increased emphasis on intramural programs was stressed.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem was to determine faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in selected institutions of higher education. The purpose was to provide information relative to faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics by: (1) determining over-all responses to the questionnaire by the sample of faculty members selected for the study; (2) comparing the responses of faculty members at institutions within one conference to the responses of faculty members within the other two conferences selected for the study; and (3) providing information upon which further research of other areas of the college and university publics might be based.

A review of related literature revealed a number of studies relevant to the field of intercollegiate athletics. However, no study was found which dealt with the topic area selected for this particular study.

The procedures used to study the faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics were as follows: (1) to analyze thoroughly the current problems and trends in the area of intercollegiate athletics; (2) to develop a questionnaire from the analyses of the current problems and trends in intercollegiate athletics; (3) to determine a random sample of faculty members at representative
institutions of the three selected conferences; (4) to request the faculty members to complete and return the questionnaire; and (5) to analyze and report over-all faculty attitudes as well as significant differences between conferences.

The trends and problems in intercollegiate athletics were discussed with knowledgeable persons in the field. The five general categories and the statements within each category were decided upon after reviewing the available literature and discussing the relevant findings with these persons. A questionnaire was developed after determining the appropriate topic areas and reviewing available methods of sampling the chosen population.

The data obtained from the questionnaire were analyzed relative to over-all responses, significant differences between conferences, and additional comments made by the faculty members.

It was believed that those items receiving over-all mean responses within the range of from 2.61 to 3.40 should not be included in the findings since the data on those items appeared to be inconclusive.

Findings

Salient findings of the study were as follows:

Each institution should have some type of faculty athletic board, and a written code of ethics for establishing and publicizing athletic policies and philosophy.

The faculty athletic board ought to be elected by the faculty at large as opposed to being appointed by institutional administrators.
The major purpose of intercollegiate athletics should not be to provide entertainment for the spectators.

Post season competition should be an acceptable practice when sanctioned by the appropriate governing bodies of intercollegiate athletics.

The number of sports included in the athletic program should not be limited in an effort to develop higher quality teams.

Some restrictions should be placed upon the distances which teams travel to engage in intercollegiate athletic contests.

Resorting to athletic renown as a means of securing public support should be discouraged.

Intercollegiate athletic programs ought to be financed by budget allocations in the same manner as the other departments within the college or university.

The intercollegiate athletic program should not be limited to only those sports which produce significant revenues.

Financial aid should be available to students based on financial need and/or academic ability but not for superior athletic ability alone.

All members of the athletic coaching staff ought to be members of the teaching faculty of the institution.

Athletic coaches should not expect more pressure from within the institution to produce tangible results for their efforts than other members of the faculty.
Coaches should not be retained primarily upon their ability to consistently develop winning teams nor should they be hired with their previous coaching records as the major criteria.

The members of the athletic department ought to have professional status, and salary comparable with other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university.

Receiving of financial remuneration by coaches for public appearances and/or banquet addresses ought to be an acceptable practice.

Athletic coaches, regardless of the nature of their positions, should not be excluded from receiving tenure.

Coaches should be appointed by college administrators in the same manner as are all other faculty members.

If an institution conducts an intercollegiate athletic program for women, the program should be operated on the same basis as the men's program.

When no women's team is sponsored by the institution, and women demonstrate proficiency in sports such as tennis, swimming, and golf, they ought to be permitted to qualify for the men's teams.

When women's intercollegiate athletic programs are sponsored by the institution, they should be controlled and conducted by professionally competent women.

Women's intercollegiate athletics are, or have the potential to be, as exciting to the spectator as the men's athletics.

Appropriating grants-in-aid to outstanding women athletes on a proportionately equal basis with the male athletes should be an acceptable practice.
Whenever feasible, new athletic facilities should be constructed, financed, and shared on a proportionate basis by neighboring colleges and/or universities.

Permitting freshmen to engage in intercollegiate athletics in all sports and at all levels of competition ought to be an acceptable practice.

The practice of withholding an eligible athlete from competition to prolong his collegiate career (red-shirting) should be discouraged.

Athletes at the college and university level are being exploited.

There is a great deal of indecision on items pertaining to philosophically oriented statements.

Intercollegiate athletics are an important phase of higher education.

Conclusions

Conclusions based on the findings are as follows:

1. The philosophy and policies of intercollegiate athletic programs should be clearly defined and controlled to the extent of eliminating practices which do not meet appropriate educational standards.

2. Intercollegiate athletics should be financed in such a way that educational outcomes can be derived without resorting to unethical practices in a "big business" atmosphere.

3. Coaches should be hired and retained only if they have the capabilities of contributing to the total educational development of the students with whom they come in contact.
4. New developments in athletics, particularly with regard to women's intercollegiate athletics, should be carefully evaluated at the national, regional, and institutional level to best determine the appropriate direction to be taken in such areas.

5. Efforts to provide greater opportunities for more students to participate in athletics, especially through intramural programs, should be encouraged.

6. Conference affiliation is an important consideration when obtaining and evaluating the attitudes of faculty members toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education.

7. When properly conducted and controlled, intercollegiate athletics are an important part of the total program of higher education.

Recommendations

On the basis of this investigation and the findings therein, the following recommendations for further study are made:

1. Studies be undertaken to determine attitudes of other publics within the college or university setting toward the role of intercollegiate athletics.

2. Studies be undertaken to determine the effects of the current developments in the area of intercollegiate athletics such as sharing facilities, freshman eligibility, and women's intercollegiate athletics.

3. Studies be undertaken to determine faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics at other conferences and institutions around the country.
4. Studies be undertaken to determine the most effective methods of determining and controlling athletic policies.

5. Based on this study, future follow-up studies be undertaken to determine changes in attitude toward the role of intercollegiate athletics at the selected conferences and institutions.

6. Studies be undertaken to determine if the apparent benefits of athletic competition could be achieved in a more feasible manner through expanded programs of intramurals or club sports.
APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER INCLUDED WITH QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Faculty Member:

Intercollegiate athletics are one of the most perplexing issues with which administrators must deal. Diverse opinions have been expressed by various segments of the college and university publics regarding the need, purpose and objectives of intercollegiate athletics. The tight financial squeeze which faces most colleges and universities today has caused many individuals to look upon athletics with increasing skepticism. However, little relevant research has been pursued to determine the perceptions of faculty members regarding this aspect of higher education. While faculty members do not always act directly on specific policy governing athletics, their attitudes and opinions are highly respected by institutional administrators and their desires usually find expression in written policy.

Being directly involved with intercollegiate athletics and concerned about the future direction to be taken by athletic programs, I feel this study will provide much needed information pertaining to faculty perceptions of this aspect of higher education. The attention has been focused on what ought to be the role of intercollegiate athletics rather than what place it actually occupies at present.

You are respectfully requested to participate in this study by recording your reactions to all items. In the event you desire to qualify your answer to an item or area, please feel free to utilize the space for comments at the conclusion of the questionnaire. The information collected will be kept strictly confidential and the data will be revealed only in terms of collective replies. In no instance will individual perceptions be revealed by name.

Your considered judgments will be truly appreciated and should serve to synthesize contemporary thought regarding intercollegiate athletics at a time deemed most appropriate by educators throughout the country.

Sincerely,

William D. Neal
Hockey Coach
Western Michigan University
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
INFORMATION SHEET

Please complete the information requested on this page prior to filling out the questionnaire. This information is invaluable in tabulating the results.

NAME OF INSTITUTION ___________________________

YOUR ACADEMIC RANK ___________________________

DEPARTMENT ___________________________________

MALE ____  FEMALE ___
FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ROLE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
IN SELECTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

DIRECTIONS

You are requested to respond to the items in one of five ways: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD). Please respond to all items as to your feelings of what ought to be, rather than knowledge of what is. Please avoid answering Undecided (U) as much as possible. Place an X in the appropriate space provided for each item.

QUESTIONNAIRE

I POLICIES AND POLICY DETERMINATION

1. Each institution ought to have some type of faculty athletic board that establishes the athletic policies for the institution.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

2. Each institution should have a written code of ethics which reveals the philosophy of the institution regarding intercollegiate athletics.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

3. All members of the faculty athletic board ought to be elected by the faculty at large rather than being appointed by institutional administrators.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

4. The intercollegiate athletic program ought to be expanded in an effort to provide the opportunity for greater numbers of students to participate.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

5. The major purpose for having athletics in the program of higher education should be to provide entertainment for the student body, alumni, faculty and public.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

6. Post season competition ought to be an acceptable practice when sanctioned by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) or the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA).

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___
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7. A limited number of sports should be included in the athletic program in order that a higher quality of teams may be developed.

8. Athletics should be placed under closer scrutiny by the college or university administration than other departments within the institution.

9. There should be no restriction on the distance teams travel for intercollegiate athletic contests.

II FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Intercollegiate athletic programs should be financially self-supporting.

2. A high quality institution should not resort to athletic renown as a means of securing public support.

3. Receipts from admissions to athletic contests ought to be regarded as a source of revenue for the general education fund.

4. The intercollegiate athletic program ought to be financed by budget allocations in the same manner as the other departments in the college or university.

5. The intercollegiate athletic program should be limited to those sports which produce significant revenues to the college or university.

6. Financial aid should be available to students based on financial need and/or academic ability, but not for superior athletic ability alone.

7. Grants-in-aid for athletes should not exist.

8. An activity fee ought to be charged even though all students do not desire to attend intercollegiate athletic contests.
9. All other phases of the program of higher education should be adequately provided for before money is spent for athletic facilities and equipment.

III COACHING STAFF
1. All members of the athletic coaching staff ought to be members of the teaching faculty of the institution.

2. Athletic coaches, by the very nature of their position, ought to expect more pressure from within the institution to produce tangible results for their efforts than other members of the faculty.

3. Coaches should be retained primarily upon their contribution to the total education of the students.

4. Coaches should be appointed by college administrators in the same manner as are all other faculty members.

5. Coaches should be hired primarily on the basis of their coaching records in former positions.

6. Coaches should be retained primarily upon their ability to consistently develop winning teams.

7. Athletic department members should have professional status comparable with other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university.

8. Coaches ought to be permitted to receive financial remuneration for public appearances and/or banquet addresses.

9. The attainment of the Ph.D., or an equivalent professional degree, ought to be as important for the coach as for any other member of the college or university faculty.
10. Athletic department members should receive a salary comparable to other faculty members in similar rank throughout the college or university.

SA A U D SD

11. Because of the nature of the position, college and university coaches should not be eligible for tenure.

SA A U D SD

IV CURRENT TRENDS

1. Institutions that conduct an intercollegiate athletic program for women ought to be permitted to operate on the same basis as the men's program.

SA A U D SD

2. When women demonstrate proficiency in sports, such as tennis, swimming and golf, and no women's team is sponsored by the institution, they ought to be allowed to qualify for the men's teams.

SA A U D SD

3. When institutions provide intercollegiate athletic competition for women, the program ought to be controlled and conducted by professionally competent women.

SA A U D SD

4. Women's intercollegiate athletics are, or have the potential to be, as exciting to the spectators as the men's intercollegiate program.

SA A U D SD

5. Athletic grants-in-aid should be available to outstanding women athletes on a proportionately equal basis with the male athletes.

SA A U D SD

6. Women should not be allowed to compete in contact sports such as football and ice hockey at the intercollegiate level.

SA A U D SD

7. Whenever feasible, new athletic facilities should be constructed, financed, and shared on a proportionate basis by neighboring colleges and/or universities. (neighboring = 25 miles or less apart)

SA A U D SD

8. Freshmen ought to be eligible for varsity competition in all sports and at all levels of competition.

SA A U D SD
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9. Providing an additional year of college, such as the "red shirt" program, ought to be retained as an essential feature of the inter-collegiate athletic program. ("red shirting" purposely withholds an athlete who is eligible to compete, from competition for one year)

10. Provided they meet established eligibility standards, and have not participated in varsity athletics at another four year college or university, graduate students should be permitted to compete in inter-collegiate athletic programs.

V PHILOSOPHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Intercollegiate athletics are needed in the program of higher education to provide those with gifted motor ability the chance to achieve optimum development of this ability.

2. The student-athlete is the most sought after product of secondary education today.

3. With increasing leisure time, intercollegiate athletics take on a growing importance.

4. The intercollegiate athletic program has very little relationship to the academic curriculum of the institution.

5. In the preservation of mental health, intercollegiate athletics fulfill a vital function.

6. Intercollegiate athletics are a desirable means by which a college or university can achieve national recognition.

7. Intercollegiate athletes are being exploited.
8. Intercollegiate athletics are a contributing factor towards a better understanding of the racial problem.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

9. Intercollegiate athletics are an important phase of higher education.

SA___ A___ U___ D___ SD___

COMMENTS:

_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

A stamped self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the questionnaire. In the event the envelope is misplaced, please return the completed questionnaire to:

William D. Neal
5508 Blindman's Cove
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49009

Please reply at your earliest possible convenience.

Your time and assistance is truly appreciated. THANK YOU.
APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP REQUEST
Dear Faculty Member:

Recently you were requested to respond to a questionnaire relating to faculty attitudes toward the role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education.

The returns to date have provided interesting and important feedback. However, many have yet to respond and a large number of replies will greatly add to the significance of the study.

If you have returned the questionnaire, please disregard this notice and accept my sincere thanks. If it has slipped your mind, however, kindly return the completed questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,

William D. Neal
Hockey Coach
Western Michigan University
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