

2011

# NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics

Kevin Lee Sanger  
*Iowa State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

## Recommended Citation

Sanger, Kevin Lee, "NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics" (2011). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 11949.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/11949>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [digirep@iastate.edu](mailto:digirep@iastate.edu).

**NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics**

by

**Kevin Sanger**

A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Major: Education (Educational Leadership)

Program of Study Committee:

Larry H. Ebbers, Co-major Professor

Stephen R. Porter, Co-major Professor

Barbara L. Licklider

Ann M. Gansemer-Topf

Dean Anderson

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	iv
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	3
Conceptual Framework	3
Research Questions	6
Significance of Study	7
Delimitations and Limitations	9
Definition of Terms	9
Summary	10
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Impact of College Sports on Society and Higher Education	12
History of Intercollegiate Athletics and Faculty Governance	16
NCAA Division III	18
Role of Institutional Mission and Intercollegiate Athletics	22
Intercollegiate Athletics and Academics as Loosely Coupled Systems	25
Who's in Charge of Intercollegiate Athletics-Market Forces vs. Faculty Governance?	28
Reform Movement in Intercollegiate Athletics and Faculty Governance	33
Summary	37
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	39
Overview	39
Research Design	39
Population and Sample	41
Instrumentation	41
Data Collection	45
Population	46
Data Analysis and Procedures	47
Descriptive statistics	47
Multiple regression analysis	48
Ethical Issues	51
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS	52
Demographic Characteristics	52
NCAA Division III faculty	52
Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics	56

Faculty Satisfaction Related to Academic Oversight, Faculty Governance, and Fiscal Oversight	63
Factor Loadings of NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with the Intercollegiate Athletics Survey	67
Regression Analysis	70
Summary	81
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	83
Summary	83
Discussion	84
Limitations	93
Implications	94
Division III institutions	95
Athletic conferences	98
NCAA	100
Future Research	100
Final Thoughts	102
APPENDIX A. NCAA DIVISION III FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS SURVEY	104
APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANT LETTER	112
APPENDIX C. REMINDER PARTICIPANT LETTER	113
REFERENCES	114
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	117

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1.	NCAA Division III faculty who participated in the study by institution	42
Table 3.2.	Sample and response rate for the survey	47
Table 4.1.	Demographics of participants by years at current institution, faculty status, tenure, FAR experience, and participation in high school and/or college athletics	54
Table 4.2.	Demographics of participants by gender, ethnicity, and athletic events/competitions attended per semester	55
Table 4.3.	Demographics of participants by contact with athletes, age and NCAA affiliation	57
Table 4.4.	Faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics	58
Table 4.5.	Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by years at current institution, faculty status, tenure, and FAR experience	59
Table 4.6.	Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by athletic participation in high school or college, gender, and ethnicity	60
Table 4.7.	Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by athletic events attended, athletic knowledge, and contact with athletes	62
Table 4.8.	Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by age and NCAA affiliation	63
Table 4.9.	Faculty oversight of academics and satisfaction with the amount of influence in oversight of academics in: the admission process, academic performance, academic support, classes, graduation rate, and academic experience	64
Table 4.10.	Faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics and satisfaction with the amount of influence in: athletic governance, policies-procedures, mission-goals, FARs, role of athletics, and athletic control	66
Table 4.11.	Faculty oversight of fiscal activities base on amount of influence	67
Table 4.12.	Factor analysis correlation	68
Table 4.13.	Summary of factor loadings	69

Table 4.14.	Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction for all respondents	73
Table 4.15.	Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by faculty status	74
Table 4.16.	Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by NCAA Division III athletic knowledge	76
Table 4.17.	Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by gender	79

**ABSTRACT**

Few studies have focused on faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). Further knowledge of faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics will help lead the reform effort needed to reestablish the academic integrity that has been tarnished by the practices and behaviors of those involved in managing college athletics (Kuga, 1996).

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions. The unit of analysis was faculty members who responded to the Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey in the fall of 2010.

Approximately two thirds of the respondents (62.5%) indicated being somewhat satisfied or very satisfied in the athletic program at their institution. Faculty with “more than 8 years” experience had the highest satisfaction mean scores while those with tenure had higher satisfaction scores than those without tenure. Experience as a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) prompted higher satisfaction scores when compared to faculty with no FAR experience. Participation in high school or college athletics did not produce a difference in overall satisfaction among faculty. Men were typically more satisfied than women with athletics while faculty who attended more athletic events or were more knowledgeable about athletics had higher satisfaction scores. Older faculty had higher satisfaction scores, and faculty who had more interaction and contact with athletes also had higher mean satisfaction scores.

From the regression analysis, faculty perceptions of academic oversight and faculty governance consistently revealed a positive relationship with faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Typically, academic oversight was more influential on overall faculty satisfaction with athletics than faculty governance, except for women. Faculty age also produced a positive relationship with satisfaction with athletics.

Finally, the findings of this study could provide valuable information to faculty, administrators, and governing bodies in efforts to improve higher education and the athletic environment at NCAA Division III institutions. This study did not explore all variables collected by the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. In addition to faculty satisfaction with athletics, several other areas may be studied in the future. Future study may address perspectives of student athletes, athletic directors, coaches, and presidents.



## CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The mission of an institution or governing body is expected to provide vision and purpose. In doing so, this captures the essence of the basic direction and guidelines that will direct and regulate a given entity. The NCAA Division III Philosophy Statement serves as a guide to direct and provide a vision for intercollegiate athletics (NCAA, 2009).

Intercollegiate athletics exist as a major player in the educational process of students.

Supporters of intercollegiate athletics have asserted that “college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p. 82). Shulman and Bowen (2001) attempted to explain the relationship that exists between the values in education and the mission of intercollegiate athletics. They contended that a broad interpretation and understanding of the institutional mission enables athletics to be included into the educational arena. Mission statements are written in a way to encompass a wide range of activities that will ultimately contribute to the student’s learning. Many faculty may argue that there are no real connections between extra-curricular activities or athletics and the pursuit of knowledge or learning. Extra-curricular involvement has generated much debate as to how it “fits” within the framework of higher education (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Since the late 1800s, these competitions with virtually no rules or governing bodies have created significant chaos. The lack of rules and safety concerns caused faculty and administrators to get involved (Masteralexis, Barr, & Hums, 2009). The need for governance and regulation of intercollegiate athletics has continued to the present day.

In order to protect the integrity of higher education and intercollegiate athletics, it is imperative that faculty get involved. Faculty possess substantial authority and control to

direct the future of intercollegiate athletics. Faculty representatives are more powerful than presidents within the NCAA, and the problem is that too many faculty do not see the problems that overemphasizing athletics cause (Atwell, 1991). Reports have described the problems that exist in intercollegiate sports and have offered recommendations to improve the educational experiences for student-athletes. The Association has been called out to protect and preserve the traditional educational values and academic standards and demand more active faculty engagement and oversight of intercollegiate athletics. Reforms are needed in admissions and financial aid practices, closer faculty monitoring of college athletes and their academic progress, and better management of financial operations of the athletics program (AAUP, 1989, 1991; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence, Ott, & Hendricks, 2009).

With the increased scrutiny of intercollegiate athletics, faculty possess the ability to protect the integrity of higher education and intercollegiate athletics. From this perspective, it is important to understand faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics in order to make changes and recommendations that will improve the educational experiences for student-athletes.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Recently, the NCAA Identity Initiative Report (2009) indicated that faculty were different from Presidents, Athletic Directors, Coaches, and Student-Athletes in their perceptions about institutional compliance with the NCAA Division III Philosophy Statement. Overall, faculty agreed that Division III institutions adhered to or fulfilled the Division III philosophy, but their agreement was noticeably less than Presidents, Athletic

Directors, Coaches, and Student-Athletes (NCAA, 2009). While, overall, most faculty strongly believed members schools were fulfilling the philosophy of Division III, faculty opinions were noticeably lower than other constituents. Ninety-nine percent of Presidents and Athletic Directors felt institutions were fulfilling the Division III philosophy whereas 79% of faculty possessed the same view (NCAA, 2009). From this information, it is important to better understand faculty satisfaction and its relationship with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics.

The majority of research that is available about faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics involves NCAA Division I and II. Even with this information, there is little research in the area of intercollegiate athletics and faculty satisfaction. The amount of research in NCAA Division III is very limited.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. The unit of analysis was faculty members who responded to the Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey in the fall of 2010. To examine faculty satisfaction, the Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey was distributed to 7,786 faculty members at 25 NCAA Division III institutions. The results of the survey generated information about faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics.

### **Conceptual Framework**

Few studies have focused on faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). In theory, faculty possess the obligation to protect the integrity of higher education ensuring that all students develop in mind, body, and spirit (Kuga, 1996). Atwell

(1991) found that faculty possess considerable authority and control to direct the future of intercollegiate athletics and higher education. Understanding faculty satisfaction related to intercollegiate athletics will significantly impact the future of higher education and college athletics. Faculty maintain the authority to protect the integrity of higher education and therefore change in intercollegiate athletics must be led by faculty. Further knowledge of faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics will help lead the reform effort needed to reestablish the academic integrity that has been tarnished by the practices and behaviors of those involved in managing college athletics (Kuga, 1996). Faculty satisfaction with athletics is developed, driven, and motivated by past experiences and individual faculty perceptions.

The current study expands on the faculty satisfaction research by focusing on the experiences and individual perceptions of faculty members at 25 NCAA Division III institutions. Most of the studies that have been conducted have involved NCAA Division I and II institutions.

Past experiences have been found to influence feelings of satisfaction for faculty (Lawrence, Ott, & Hendricks, 2009; Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Kuga, 1996). As faculty age, acquire tenure, and lengthen their service on campus, it is likely that faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics changes. With this experience in the profession, faculty may obtain more knowledge and better understand the positive or negative contributions that athletics provide to higher education and, therefore may alter their satisfaction levels. Likewise, academic rank may also influence faculty satisfaction levels. Kuga (1996) performed a study where she found that faculty who previously participated in athletics such as in high school or college were more satisfied with intercollegiate athletics. Cockley and Roswal (1994)

found that faculty who had athletes in class had positive perceptions or were more satisfied with athletic programming. Faculty who work or have worked at Division III institutions have been more satisfied with athletics than those faculty who work at Division I or II institutions (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). The faculty background in Division III may impact their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Similarly, faculty who attended a Division III institution may have more favorable perceptions or feelings of satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Kuga (1996) also found that men were less satisfied than women with intercollegiate athletics and were advocates for reform. From these findings and theories, it can be hypothesized that NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction may be influenced by age, tenure, academic rank, length of service, faculty contact with athletes, gender, faculty participation in athletics, and the undergraduate school attended by faculty.

Perceptions of faculty play a critical role in their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. These perceptions involve faculty experiences on their own campuses. Lawrence, Ott, & Hendricks (2009) found that faculty-led reform of intercollegiate athletics focused on three areas: academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. These areas of reform have been supported by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

The first area of reform involved academic oversight. Faculty perceptions of control and responsibility over admissions, academic support, academic achievement, and programs of studies for student-athletes promote feelings of satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al, 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). As faculty perceive

control and a sense of responsibility over student-athletes' academic endeavors, satisfaction with athletics increases.

Faculty perceptions of governance and control over athletics also influence satisfaction. When faculty view athletics as an auxiliary enterprise where a disconnect occurs between athletics and the mission of the institution, faculty are less satisfied with athletics. A sense of control, responsibility, and consistency between the educational mission and athletic mission promotes a sense of faculty satisfaction (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al, 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). Cockley and Roswal (1994) indicated feelings of empowerment and the ability to make changes cause faculty to be more satisfied with athletics. Lawrence (2009) asserted that faculty who believe academic issues are resolved through collaborative decision making also feel a sense of shared governance is in place with intercollegiate athletics. Faculty satisfaction with athletics appears to have an association with feelings of shared governance.

The control of money also influences faculty perceptions. Lawrence et al. (2009) indicated that faculty who feel involved and responsible in the budgeting process for athletics are more satisfied. In addition, the perception of transparency in the athletic department concerning issues of finance results in faculty being more satisfied with athletics. From this finding, fiscal oversight also contributes to faculty satisfaction with athletics.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How do faculty members rate their satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics? (Descriptive analysis)

2. How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty age, tenure, academic rank, length of service, contact with athletes, NCAA affiliation, or gender? (Regression analysis)
3. How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty participation in high school or college athletics? (Regression analysis)
4. How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty perceptions of academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight in intercollegiate athletics? (Regression analysis)

### **Significance of the Study**

This research is one of the few to gather data on Division III athletics, more specifically NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. The findings of this study inform institutional policy and practice related to faculty and intercollegiate athletics. For example, results from this research may be used by administrators to better educate policy makers in establishing rules and guidelines that will facilitate better faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. In doing so, the integrity and mission of higher education will be enforced. Information was gathered to provide college leaders with data regarding the relationship or association between faculty satisfaction and NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics. This study investigated the relationship between faculty age, tenure status, academic rank, length of service, contact with athletes, and gender on faculty satisfaction. Faculty participation in athletics and undergraduate school attended was also investigated along with perceptions of academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight in athletics.

Few studies have focused on faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). College athletics have generated significant controversy and debate since their inception (Thelin, 1996). With this debate comes the mindset that “college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p. 82). These are significant and bold statements about college athletics. With these feelings and perceptions, the studies that have been conducted mostly involve the larger, more commercialized institutions and athletic programs of Division I and II. This study looked closely at NCAA Division III. Lawrence et al. (2009) stated that more empirical research is needed, and this study investigates the relationship between faculty satisfaction and intercollegiate athletics.

National organizations such as the AAUP, COIA, and the NCAA could benefit from the results of this research to better understand how policy may impact feelings of faculty and their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. For example, policy may be mandated from the NCAA to require faculty participation in athletic governance. Currently, faculty involvement in governing intercollegiate athletics seems to vary greatly from institution to institution (Kuga, 1996). The perception exists that increased faculty participation and involvement will lead to higher levels of faculty satisfaction (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). The data from this study may be used to improve experiences for faculty and student-athletes. The results may also be used to encourage institutions to conduct regular satisfaction surveys with faculty. Finally, this study provides a voice to faculty within the area of intercollegiate athletics. Sometimes their perceptions and satisfaction levels are lost during the policy and planning process within higher education and intercollegiate athletics.



### **Delimitations and Limitations**

For the purpose of this study, the sample was delimited to include only faculty at 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions who taught during the 2009-2010 school year. The sample was further delimited to include only faculty who had email addresses listed on the institution's website. A final delimitation to this study was that the variable used to assess faculty satisfaction was limited to the one included in the Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A.

This study has several limitations. Because the data gathering procedure entailed utilizing an electronic survey instrument, the willingness, interest and ability of the faculty to respond to all questions, to respond within the timeline of the survey, and to respond accurately cannot be controlled by the researcher. This limitation is critical to the study because interest from the respondent can impact the findings of the research. Current research is limited in that few studies provide information about NCAA Division III faculty satisfaction and perceptions with intercollegiate athletics. Perhaps the lack of interest in the topic has caused minimal research in the area.

The survey for this research was limited to faculty who were listed on the institutional websites as teaching a course at their institution. The 25 institutions selected for this study were randomly chosen from over 400 institutions affiliated with NCAA Division III.

### **Definition of Terms**

The following research terms were defined for use in this study.

*Faculty*: Considered synonymous with the term "professor, instructor, or adjunct". Anyone that taught a class or classes at the university or college was considered faculty.

*NCAA Division III*: Defined as colleges and universities that fulfill the following philosophy statement:

Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletic activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athletes educational experience. (NCAA, 2009, p. 6)

*Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey*: A nationwide survey of faculty at 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions with a sample of 7,786 faculty members.

*Overall Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics*: Faculty perceptions or feelings of consistency between the educational mission and athletic mission promotes faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; Trail, 2000).

### Summary

This research sought to inform faculty, administrators, policymakers, and governing bodies by providing insight into the current perceptions of faculty and to identify the relationship between faculty satisfaction and NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics. The findings will assist in identifying factors that associate positively or negatively with faculty satisfaction and help make changes in the future.

Chapter 1 provides an overview of this study including the statement of the problem, purpose, conceptual framework, research questions, significance of the study, delimitations and limitations, and definition of terms. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the literature reviewed for this dissertation. The chapter begins with a review of the impact college sports

make in society and higher education. The history of intercollegiate athletics and faculty governance are also reviewed along with a brief look at the formation of NCAA Division III. Next, consistency between institutional mission and athletics is reviewed along with how decisions are made in higher education and intercollegiate athletics and what the reform movement has in store.

Chapter 3 begins with a brief overview of the study including the research questions to be addressed. The remaining sections of this chapter will define methodology, research design, population and sample, instrumentation data collection results and data analysis procedures. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the results of the statistical analyses of the study including descriptive data, exploratory analyses and multiple regression analyses. The final chapter includes a summary and discussion of the findings as well as suggestions for future research.

## CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. The review of literature is divided into eight subsections related to faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics: (1) the review of the impact college sports make in society and higher education; (2) history of intercollegiate athletics and faculty governance; (3) NCAA Division III; (4) role of institutional mission and intercollegiate athletics; (5) intercollegiate athletics and academics as loosely coupled systems; (6) who's in charge of intercollegiate athletics—market forces versus faculty governance; (7) reform movement in intercollegiate athletics and faculty governance; and (8) summary of the literature.

In the first section of this chapter, a review of the impact college sports has made in higher education and society provides insight into the influence intercollegiate athletics have had on college campuses across our country. In sections two, three, and four, the history of intercollegiate athletics, faculty governance and NCAA Division III provides significant information on how the debate and controversy surrounding institutional mission and intercollegiate athletics surfaced. Sections five and six explain the faculty perceptions that exist concerning intercollegiate athletics existing as an auxiliary enterprise where a disconnect occurs between athletics and academics. Faculty governance and the reform movement in intercollegiate athletics are discussed in section seven and section eight summarizes the literature reviewed for this study.

### Impact of College Sports on Society and Higher Education

Interest in intercollegiate athletics in American culture has grown tremendously. College sporting events generate a great deal of interest from people across the country. This

notoriety and interest has revealed that Americans love their sports. On Saturday afternoons in the fall, stadiums are filled with spectators cheering for their favorite college football teams. During “March Madness”, arenas across the country are overflowing with fans and alumni watching their college basketball teams competing for a “Final Four” berth.

Numerous examples such as these exist as ways in which our culture enjoys the competition of college athletics. The platform used most often to display these athletic competitions involves institutions of higher education. The question is often asked, “How do these athletic programs ‘fit’ within the framework of higher education?” Institutions of higher education exist to provide students with learning opportunities in the classroom while also providing opportunities to participate in intercollegiate athletics. This statement causes some distress and is a source of concern for many involved in higher education. Many people believe that intercollegiate athletics serve as an auxiliary enterprise which has no place in providing students with learning experiences that are consistent with the educational mission of institutions (Benford, 2007).

Control and governance over intercollegiate athletics is currently viewed as a major flaw within higher education. The Knight Foundation (2001) concluded, “sanity had to be restored to this bleak scene and the values of higher education put above all else in the world of intercollegiate athletics” (p. 9). Within the culture of higher education, college faculty control decisions with regard to academic issues. These issues may include curriculum, program offering, and promotion and tenure. Ideally, faculty possess a majority control on academic matters. Faculty have the most at stake in preserving the academic culture and standards and protecting the integrity of higher education (Earl, 2004).

Currently, many academic programs are facing dramatic budget cuts while athletic programs are demanding more money. This adds to an already tenuous relationship between academics and athletics. Institutional mission and philosophy must continually be protected and reinforced through appropriate action and decision-making. Who makes these decisions? How are faculties involved in the governing process of intercollegiate athletics? Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) hold the position of authority in title at NCAA Division III institutions in providing an accountability structure to ensure that athletic programs fit within the educational mission of the institution. It is important to understand the role faculty play in the development and governance of intercollegiate athletics. Even though these positions exist for faculty as Faculty Athletic Representatives, the intentions and goals of intercollegiate athletic programs must be continually scrutinized and monitored to ensure a balance exists between athletic and academic expectations. All faculty must take an active part to incorporate this culture for student athletes in ensuring that the mission of the college is realized.

Institutions exist to provide students with educational experiences defined by broad institutional missions. Intercollegiate athletics subsist to provide students with learning opportunities while being defined as part of the mission of the college or university. In reality, many argue that these programs serve the interest of the marketplace rather than the student athlete or the university. Division I football and basketball programs are the most visible examples of such a case. If current practices continue, more college athletic departments will mirror the world of professional, market-driven athletics (Knight Foundation, 2001). Faculty possess an incredibly difficult but important job in establishing and maintaining academic standards. Intercollegiate athletics threaten to diminish the

integrity of higher education. Faculty must work to effectively control athletic programs that are answering to the whims and pressures of the marketplace (Knight Foundation, 2001).

The focal point for individual faculty members and for the entire enterprise of higher education should be preserving academic integrity (Brand, 2006).

For as much corruption and commercialism that is perceived to exist in college athletics, it appears as though most of the problems are connected with Division I football and basketball. It is still possible that college sports can be reformed to “fit” within the culture of the university. In sports other than football and basketball, for the most part, the prescribed culture still prevails. Athletes are recruited honestly and achieve academically as student athletes. The joys of college sport in these examples can still be celebrated (Knight Foundation, 2001). Shulman and Bowen (2001) conducted a few of the studies associated with Division III athletics and revealed similar results. Even though Division III athletic programs operate much smaller budgets and generate less visible media exposure and commercialization, some of the same concerns and problems have been noted. Issues and concerns at the Division III level exist in minor detail in comparison to their Division I counterparts.

As the Knight Foundation (2001) concluded, many Division I sports excluding football and basketball are operating in the intended fashion as providing students with an educational experience as part of their education in line with the mission of the institution. Shulman and Bowen (2001) also stated that many athletic programs, especially those at small, private institutions (Division III), seem to be doing a good job of adhering to the university mission. This finding is also similar to what Sperber (2000) concluded in his research. “Big-time” college athletic programs at the Division I level have become corrupt

due to commercialism and the need to raise money. Small colleges or Division III athletic programs function in an environment that protects the ideals of higher education and the interests of student athletes (Sperber, 2000). There appears to be a common theme with regard to the destructive nature of commercialism that exists in college athletics.

### **History of Intercollegiate Athletics and Faculty Governance**

As faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics is investigated, it's important to look at a brief history of the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and faculty governance. Faculty have a history of being involved in the governing structure of college sports. The first intercollegiate athletic contest took place in 1852 when Harvard and Yale competed in a rowing race (as cited in Benford, 2007). Baseball was the next sport to hold intercollegiate competition as a contest was held between Amherst and Williams College (as cited in Masteralexis et al., 2009). One of the most interesting aspects of early college sports is that they were organized and administered by students. Since that time, more people have gotten involved and brought with them their own interests, and the shift away from amateurism has followed. By the late 1800s, there were already a number of concerns about the commercialization, professionalization, and corruption which led to early reform movements (as cited in Benford, 2007).

Colleges and universities soon realized that these competitions were very popular, and the prestige could significantly impact publicity, admissions, and fundraising. The pressure to win increased, and students began to realize they needed help. The first "coach" was hired in 1864 to coach the Yale crew team (Masteralexis et al., 2009). Early on, the predominant theme prevented these activities from being accepted as part of the educational



sphere of the institution. A great deal of mayhem took place in these early competitions, with virtually no rules and governing organization. The lack of rules and safety concerns caused faculty and administrators to get involved (Masteralexis et al.). In 1881, Princeton University was the first to form a faculty athletics committee to oversee football. The committee had two choices: either make the game safer or ban the sport all together. From its inception, intercollegiate athletics were under the control and regulation of faculty. Harvard's Board of Overseers instructed the Harvard faculty to ban football in 1887. The influence of many alumni on faculty caused the university to keep the game intact (as cited in Masteralexis et al.). These examples provide insight into the significance of faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. In 1895, the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives, known today as the Big Ten Conference, was formed to assemble eligibility rules for students (as cited in Masteralexis et al.). The popularity and attention that these early athletic contests attained from students, alumni, and college administrators contributed to the continued growth in the years ahead. Football drew most of the attention because of considerable safety hazards as student athletes were dying as they were participating. As a result, several college presidents took action led by the Chancellor of New York University, Henry Mitchell MacCracken. This movement established the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS), which later became known as the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (as cited in Masteralexis et al., 2009).

From a brief review of history, faculty have influenced intercollegiate athletics. The main issues involve the appropriate amount of faculty engagement, governance, and satisfaction with athletics while protecting the mission of higher education. Some would argue that faculty governance in athletics is alive and well while others would say that

intercollegiate athletics fall victim to the control of the marketplace. The market has produced some glaring problems with regard to academic progress for athletes, a financial arms race, and commercialization of intercollegiate athletics (Knight Foundation, 2001). For all practical purposes, the faculty must assume a similar historical role to influence the preservation of the academic integrity and ideals of higher education within intercollegiate athletics (Brand, 2006). Institutions differ and how faculty are involved in governance depends on their NCAA and conference affiliation.

Consistent with faculty involvement in previous years, present day faculty governance in intercollegiate athletics assumes the role of protecting students and promoting the ideals of being a student athlete. Faculty priorities today in governance include ensuring academic integrity, facilitating the integration of athletics and academics, while also promoting institutional control of athletics (FARA, n.d.). These governing responsibilities by faculty are consistent across all institutions in the NCAA. The difficulty arises in that faculty at each school interpret their responsibilities differently and initiate control of intercollegiate athletics in a diverse fashion. Conferences within the NCAA also interpret policy and decision-making by faculty in an assortment of ways. Nevertheless, faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics has been a hot button issue for years since faculty must help preserve the consistency or “fit” between the institutional mission and the athletic mission.

### **NCAA Division III**

The classification system for NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics was created in 1973, when the NCAA adopted its current, three-division format to replace the former

College and University Division structure (NCAA, 2009). This structure had existed since 1957. Institutions that joined Division III played a key role in the development and approval of a three-division model, maintaining that the philosophy and competitive nature of certain institutions justified a separate membership division (NCAA, 2009).

Division III has added 120 member schools since 1990; current active membership is 429 and is expected to grow to 464 by 2016 with the potential for 480 members by 2020. This is the largest membership among the three NCAA divisions (NCAA, 2009). As the membership in Division III has grown, institutions have become more diverse in terms of sports sponsorship, enrollment, institutional mission, academic offerings and legislative perspectives. However, results of a February 2008 membership survey clearly indicated a lack of support for any structural change to Division III (NCAA, 2009). Discussions and research are now focused on addressing the growth and diversity within the membership and current framework.

Leadership groups in Division III athletics including the Division III Presidents Council and Presidents Advisory Group has led a series of discussions to achieve a new level of excellence as the division evolves and changes during the next decade. Of primary importance in this process is the development of a Division III philosophy and identity that is collectively endorsed by all membership.

The Division III Philosophy Statement was initially adopted in 1983 and based on practices and ideas at that time. The statement ultimately binds the division's diverse and growing membership. The statement is a unique document that clearly distinguishes Division III member schools from their colleagues in Divisions I and II. The basis of the division's legislative standards and administrative requirements are formed from this

philosophy statement (NCAA, 2009). As a result of the growing and diverse membership within Division III, it becomes even more important to establish a better understanding and appreciation of the Division III model, philosophy, and identity. Division III leadership has initiated a comprehensive effort to define and promote the Division III identity. The effort and intention is expected to emphasize the division's holistic educational approach and the integration of athletics into the educational experience (NCAA, 2009).

As a result to better understand the identity of Division III institutions, leadership partnered with Relish, a strategic branding and marketing agency to develop a clear articulation of the Division III philosophy. The objective of the research was to understand current perceptions of the NCAA Division III philosophy and student-athlete experience among key constituents including Presidents, Athletic Administrators, Faculty, and Student-Athletes. Overwhelmingly, these constituents believed that member institutions were fulfilling the Division III philosophy of athletics within the Division. More than 9 out of 10 surveyed agreed that Division III fulfills the following (from the Division III Philosophy Statement) (NCAA, 2009):

Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete's athletic activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athletes educational experience. (NCAA, 2009, p. 6)

However, there were important differences in agreement among key constituents, specifically Faculty perceptions. Overall, Faculty agreed that Division III adhered to or fulfilled the Division III philosophy (based on the above statement), but their agreement was

noticeably less than Presidents, Athletic Directors, Coaches, and Student-Athletes (NCAA, 2009).

The research question for further study was developed from this finding. It was the intent of this research to ascertain a better understanding of faculty satisfaction with regard to NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics.

While adhering to the Division III Philosophy Statement, institutions and athletic departments place the highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and student's completion of their academic degree (NCAA, n.d.). Institutions aim to provide an environment in which a student-athlete's athletic activities are conducted as an integral part of the educational experience (NCAA, n.d.). To provide this type of environment and achieve these results, Division III institutions:

- (a) Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (e.g., students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs;
- (b) Shall not award financial aid to any student on the basis of athletics leadership, ability, participation or performance;
- (c) Encourage the development of sportsmanship and positive societal attitudes in all constituents, including student-athletes, coaches, administrative personnel and spectators;
- (d) Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students;
- (e) Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;
- (f) Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body;
- (g) Assure that athletics programs support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. Further, the administration of an institution's athletics program (e.g., hiring, compensation, professional development, certification of coaches) should be integrated into the campus culture and educational mission;

- (h) Assure that athletics recruitment complies with established institutional policies and procedures applicable to the admission process;
- (i) Assure that academic performance of student-athletes is, at a minimum, consistent with that of the general student body;
- (j) Assure that admission policies for student-athletes comply with policies and procedures applicable to the general student body;
- (k) Provide equitable athletics opportunities for males and females and give equal emphasis to men's and women's sports;
- (l) Support ethnic and gender diversity for all constituents;
- (m) Give primary emphasis to regional in-season competition and conference championships; and
- (n) Support student-athletes in their efforts to reach high levels of athletics performance, which may include opportunities for participation in national championships, by providing all teams with adequate facilities, competent coaching and appropriate competitive opportunities. (NCAA, n.d.)

### **Role of Institutional Mission and Intercollegiate Athletics**

One of the challenges with academics and athletics is ensuring that these programs fit within the mission of the institution. As institutions support and sponsor more and more organizations and extracurricular activities, it becomes increasingly difficult to ascertain which programs fully assimilate the intentions of the institutional mission. Gross and Grambsch (as cited in Birnbaum, 1990) stated:

As colleges and universities become more diverse, fragmented, specialized, and connected with other social systems, institutional missions do not become clearer; rather, they multiply and become sources of stress and conflict rather than integration. The problem is not that institutions cannot identify their goals but rather that they simultaneously embrace a large number of conflicting goals. (p. 11)

Faculty perceptions of alignment between institutional mission and the athletic department mission influences faculty satisfaction. When faculty view athletics as an auxiliary enterprise where a disconnect occurs between athletics and the mission of the institution, faculty are less satisfied with athletics. A sense of control, responsibility, and

consistency between the educational mission and athletic mission promotes a sense of faculty satisfaction (Trail et al., 2000; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al, 2009). Cockley and Roswal (1994) indicated feelings of empowerment and the ability to make changes cause faculty to be more satisfied with athletics. Similarly, Lawrence (2009) asserted that faculty who believe academic issues are resolved through collaborative decision making also feel a sense of shared governance is in place with intercollegiate athletics. Faculty satisfaction with athletics appears to have an association with feelings of shared governance and ‘fit’ between institutional and athletic mission.

How is it that athletic programs are part of higher education? Shulman and Bowen (2001) attempted to answer this question and make a reference as to how has the “fit” between the mission of institutions and athletic programs changed over time? As discussed previously, students played a major part in athletic programming as it was founded, but faculty and external forces soon played an increased role in decision-making. Institutional missions are vague, broad, and lengthy to encompass a large variety of learning opportunities (Shulman & Bowen). This description allows for the inclusion of a wide variety of extracurricular activities. Institutions accept the notion that their mission is to mimic some general idea (as cited in Davies, 1986). Most institutions do not define their mission precisely as they prescribe to a more garden-variety idealism (Davies). This general definition enables colleges and universities to include many types of extracurricular activities as part of their “curriculum” for students—one of which is athletics. This line of thinking would seem to exist as rationale for the inclusion of athletics in higher education. A vague, general mission provides support for coaches and athletic administrators to convince faculty that athletic programming has a place in higher education.

The specific goals for higher education may be considered in the context of several widely accepted assumptions. Woodrow Wilson (as cited in Bowen, 1997) expressed the idea that learning takes place outside the classroom with dialogue and interaction between students in many activities: “The real intellectual life of a body of undergraduates, if there be any, manifests itself not in the classroom, but in what they do and talk of and set before themselves as their favorite objects between classes and lectures” (p. 33).

This focus on learning outside the classroom would further support extracurricular activities as part of the curriculum. Colleges and universities have long supported learning opportunities that occur outside the classroom in a variety of activities such as music, theatre, internships, student government, and study abroad. Athletics can be seen as a natural companion to these activities.

Another way of thinking is that missions should be specific and articulated in fine detail. The specifications should include the goals and expectations of athletic participation. Much of the literature advises that a key to success is to outline a distinctive mission that supports a specific purpose to all constituents (as cited in Thelin, 1985). Some believe that in order to sustain successful college operation, it is important to cultivate a sense of heritage as a distinctive institution and to “stand for something special” (as cited in Thelin, p. 103). In supporting Thelin’s thoughts, it would seem necessary that in order to promote athletics as part of higher education, there needs to be a more specific mission with goals and expectations outlining the outcomes for students involved in intercollegiate athletics.

A well-known advocate for improved efficiency and effectiveness within higher education, Richard Vedder (2007) adhered to the notion that institutions need to comply more closely with their intended mission. Too often, colleges and universities are spending



money on “frills that do little to promote either education or economic growth—fancy recreation facilities, larger university bureaucracies, more elaborate intercollegiate athletic programs, and higher salaries for university personnel” (p. 8). This thinking articulates the need for more specific institutional missions and improved accountability in supporting these missions. The difficulty with more specific mission statements is that most are already very vague and broad and significant change would need to take place in order to incorporate more focused models.

In contemplating the intended purpose of athletics and how it adheres to the mission of the university, there appears to be various ways to draft a mission to include intercollegiate athletics as part of the purpose of the university. Missions can be all encompassing to include a wide range of activities that take place on a college campus or narrow in focus to streamline the intentions of higher education. From these thoughts, it remains a theoretical question as to how athletics “fits” within the mission of an institution. Faculty must help determine the role athletic programs play in the overall institutional mission.

### **Intercollegiate Athletics and Academics as Loosely Coupled Systems**

Imagine for a moment that you are a student in a math class with two instructors. One professor teaches on Monday, Wednesday, Friday while the other on Tuesday and Thursday. Each instructor is teaching the same math content area but each has very different expectations and delivery. One instructor preaches learning fundamentals, theories, and gives a test every Friday. The other instructor has a different philosophy and promotes students learning from each other, class discussion, and gives no tests. At the end of the semester, each instructor gives you a grade. How do you think you did? Is this a good

process? This is an example of how academics and athletics may have conflicting interests when it comes to student outcomes. While each instructor may have the same intended outcomes, it is difficult to measure what is learned because each has a different style, goals, and expectations. Athletics and academics differ much the same as in this example.

Intercollegiate athletic programs function in an environment where alumni, students, fans, donors, and market forces have considerable influence. These manipulating factors dictate cost of tickets, the need to win, money spent on facilities, coaches hired and fired, media exposure, and profits attained. This influence causes a considerable amount of disconnect between academic expectations and athletic programming. How should faculty be expected to govern in such an environment with these influential factors? Faculty members have different expectations of athletic programs than alumni, fans, donors, and many other constituents. Meanwhile, the athletic department is still viewed to supposedly “fit” within the confines of the mission of the institution. Those from the academic arena and faculty remain attuned to issues of graduation rates, learning outcomes for students, communication and writing skills, and language proficiencies as defining success. These different expectations and goals for athletics and academics construct a very difficult job for faculty in attempting to govern such an entity with conflicting goals from the rest of the institution. Faculty must adhere to the mission of the academic arena while also respecting the wishes and goals of the athletic department. Athletics and academics function as loosely coupled systems because they have distinctively different goals and expectations (Weick, 1976).

One unique feature of intercollegiate athletics is that it exists as an autonomous entity separate from other departments and offices of the university (Weick, 1976). This is not

necessarily by design, but differing goals and expectations have caused this loose coupling effect. Birnbaum (1989) also acknowledged this loose coupling effect which is prevalent in higher education, and accentuated this culture as an organized anarchy where individuals and departments within an organization make autonomous decisions. The activities of the institution and these separate entities, such as athletic departments, often result in only modestly-related activities and outcomes for students which are neither planned nor predictable. Shulman and Bowen (2001) agreed with this concept that control of athletic departments has changed greatly over time and the semi-autonomous structure of these athletic programs has been given its own place on campus. In most situations, athletics is still just a small part of the university budget (about 4%), but it is perceived to considerably influence the mission of the institution (Earl, 2004). Athletics is an auxiliary department but exists as the face of the institution. Spectator sports and athletic departments are commonly viewed as the front door to the university (Toma, 1999). This “front door” mentality awards these athletic programs a disproportionate amount of money, prestige, and influence in directing some of the decisions made by the university. Again, this causes the question to be asked, “How does this programming contribute to the goals of student development and institutional mission?” Well, some would argue that increased fundraising, prestige, alumni support, and media exposure would be some of the benefits of a successful athletic program. Shulman and Bowen (2005) found no evidence to support the notion that successful athletic programs improve fundraising over the long term.

Imagine trying to control personnel or a department that functions under different rules and guidelines than the rest of the university. This is the challenge faculty face in governing and controlling intercollegiate athletics. In many facets of education and

university governance, administrators are asked to lead programs or departments with little knowledge or expertise. It is consistent with what Birnbaum (1990) described as administrative authority. Faculty members may be asked to oversee athletic programming while having little knowledge or expertise in the area while someone such as an Athletic Director may have the professional authority or knowledge in the field. This distinction of authority and expertise makes the job of the faculty in governing athletics quite cumbersome. Faculty may possess the formal authority to make decisions but lack the expertise and respect of athletic personnel to accommodate the decision-making process.

To compound this problem, these athletic programs function in an environment that is subject to market forces and influence that is somewhat different than the issues faced by academic departments (Weick, 1976). For example, alumni, fans, spectators, and donors wish to see their athletic team win and have success whereas the chemistry department does not see the same scrutiny from these constituents if their test scores, placement rates, and educational outcomes do not “measure up”. This is a great example of two entities within education that supposedly function to serve the same mission while possessing significantly different goals and expectations and interests from society and the market. This dichotomy of expectations between academics and athletics causes a great deal of difficulty for faculty governance in such a delicate situation.

### **Who’s in Charge of Intercollegiate Athletics-Market Forces vs. Faculty Governance?**

Faculty involvement in decision-making and governance typically exemplifies colleges and universities that fit the norm for classifying themselves as a “real” college (Birnbaum, 1989). This claim reinforces the idea that faculty are at the heart of many

decisions made in higher education. Since intercollegiate athletics “fit” within the broad spectrum of institutional mission, it seems appropriate that faculty have a voice in making decisions concerning athletics. If this is the case, faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics is increasingly important. From the increased commercialization and exposure of intercollegiate athletics, some would argue that market forces control college athletic departments. People with a more traditional view may feel that faculty and the decision-making processes in academia still maintain control. The thought of who is in charge and who makes decisions in intercollegiate athletics is a highly controversial topic in higher education. Obviously, they have looked at the mission of higher education and how athletic participation is a part of its mission. This in and of itself can be debated. If athletic programming is part of higher education and its mission, then should not it be governed by faculty and the ideals of academia? In reality, most athletic programs have become susceptible to the influence of alumni, fans, donors, and the wishes of the public instead of the principles of higher education (Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

An example of market forces impacting college athletics includes the television schedule on a football Saturday, which is dictated by what time of day will generate the most viewers. In small college athletics this isn't even a consideration since very few games are televised. Larger stadiums are often built to accommodate more fans and generate more money at Division I institutions. These are just a few examples of market forces controlling intercollegiate athletics.

Institutions remain highly vulnerable to powerful external forces such as demographic, economic, and political conditions; yet they are also very responsive to internal directives (Tierney, 1988). The influence of market forces on higher education is quite

evident, although varying degrees of influence exist on various departments and constituencies. Athletic departments often succumb to the mounting pressures and persuasion of alumni, donors, and fans. The fragmentation that exists with most athletic departments develops from the need to become self-supporting in generating revenue. In turn, it shifts control from central administration to a more autonomous unit, therefore, diminishing the adherence to the university mission (Zusman, 2005). This loose coupling effect exemplifies many athletic departments in higher education and significantly impacts the ability of faculty to govern and influence these programs in upholding the integrity of higher education. The difficulty exists with the high amount of control that external forces seem to exhibit within intercollegiate athletics. There is no doubt that external forces are present in higher education, but these forces seem to exert considerably more influence in athletics than other areas or departments of the university.

James Earl (2004) stated his concern in that if faculty do not intervene and set standards and institute policy in intercollegiate athletics, “Someone else will-or something else, by which I mean money and the marketplace – and those standards won’t be ones we’ll want to defend” (p. 3). Faculty involvement in decision making related to athletic issues ensures adherence to institutional mission. Many in higher education would agree that college athletics in this country is in crisis mode (AAUP, 1989).

The failure of higher education to attain a high level of integrity with regard to athletics adhering to the institutional mission has been attributed to commercialization.

The heart of the problem facing college sports was commercialization: an interlocking network that included expanded press coverage, public interest, alumni involvement and recruiting abuses. The victim was the student-athlete in particular, the diminishing of educational and intellectual values in general.

Also, students (including non-athletes) were the losers because they had been denied their rightful involvement in sports. (as cited in Benford, 2007, p. 9)

This compounds the issue of market forces and its influence on intercollegiate athletics. Faculty governance becomes increasingly difficult in an environment where athletic programs respond to external forces. Giamatti (1988) voiced concern about intercollegiate athletics by asking, Does the commercialization of “students” in athletics to make money really serve as a purpose of the college or university? Historically, education has been viewed as a means to become a productive member of society and useful citizen. It would seem a contradiction that a student would enroll as a student athlete to assist the university in generating revenue and attracting fans to an athletic contest. Slaughter and Rhoades (2005) depicted higher education as becoming increasingly commercialized similar to a corporation. As the influences of society have impacted higher education, intercollegiate athletics seem to have yielded the most. The Knight Foundation (2001) conferred a similar finding with regard to big-time college sports in that they more closely resemble the commercialized model of a professional sports team than they do the academic model. These viewpoints are voiced by others in their concern for the ideals of higher education and the effect of commercialization (Brand, 2006; Earl, 2004).

Industry-based research at the university has exhibited similar responsiveness to market forces and commercialization as intercollegiate athletics. Institutions become consumed with ways to advance their curriculum and research in order to generate revenue (Giamatti, 1988). In conducting research, universities receive large sums of money from industry and, in return, industries expect to obtain full rights to the discovered knowledge. External forces have motivated these initiatives in obtaining knowledge. This information

after discovery has been protected from the public since it is proprietary in nature and worth lots of money. Concealing this information and revealing it at the opportune time will enhance and maximize profit. This commercialization of knowledge and submission to market forces puts industry funded university research and athletics in similar company. Both succumb to the influences of market forces and threaten to violate the integrity of higher education.

Giamatti (1988) viewed financial incentives in higher education as irrelevant.

Making money is not a motivator or part of the mission for colleges and universities.

A college or university is an institution where financial incentives to excellence are absent, where the product line is not a unit or an object but rather a value-laden and life-long process; where the goal of the enterprise is not growth or market share but intellectual excellence; not profit or proprietary rights but the free good of knowledge. (Giamatti, 1988, p. 36)

Giamatti's statement would remain consistent with what the reformers are encouraging within higher education and intercollegiate athletics:

Sports as big business is suitable for the marketplace and has proven to be a profitable way to tap into the national psyche. Sports as big business for colleges and universities, however, is in direct conflict with nearly every value that should matter for higher education. In the year 2001, the big business of big-time sports all but swamps those values, making a mockery of those professing to uphold them. (Knight Foundation, 2001, p. 21)

Shulman and Bowen (2001) took somewhat of a different stance with regard to commercialization in small-college athletics (NCAA Division III). They viewed small-college athletics as functioning in an environment much less impacted by commercialism and more focused on the needs of the student athlete. Sperber (2000) echoed these feelings when remarking that small college athletic programs epitomize the nature of what intercollegiate athletics should look like in higher education. These programs do not exist to attract large



crowds, media exposure, or excessive revenue streams. Division III athletic programs serve the educational needs of students; therefore, they do not fall victim to the commercialism that exists in athletic departments at larger institutions (Sperber, 2000). This perspective enables presidents, athletic directors, coaches, and faculty at Division III institutions to take charge to make decisions that support the best wishes of the student athletes while being less responsive to external market forces. These forces seem to diminish in Division III athletics as compared to “big-time” college athletics.

### **Reform Movement in Intercollegiate Athletics and Faculty Governance**

Faculty governance in NCAA Division III athletics has been an issue of debate in recent years. Some feel faculty possess too much control while the traditionalists feel they should make all decisions in intercollegiate athletics. The most visible, formal role faculty play in governing or overseeing intercollegiate athletics rests with the Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) (FARA, n.d.). This individual is a member of the institution’s faculty who is appointed to represent the faculty and institution on matters related to academics and athletics with the conference and NCAA (as cited in Masteralexis et al., 2009). This position is unique in the fact that it provides faculty a voice on matters concerning academics and athletics. Institutions obviously differ on the range of authority provided to these individuals when addressing concerns and making decisions with regard to intercollegiate athletics. Some conferences delegate decision-making authority to institutional Faculty Athletic Representatives (FARs) on matters relating to intercollegiate athletics (IIAC, 2005). The IIAC (Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference), a Division III conference, is unique in the fact that it provides substantial control to FARs on matters relating to athletics. The

Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (MIAC), which is another Division III conference, relinquishes some of the control held by Faculty Athletic Representatives and passes that authority over to the President's and Athletic Directors (MIAC, 2006). Faculty Athletic Representatives main authority involves issues of academics and budgets (MIAC, 2006). In most situations, faculty surrender their formal decision-making authority on issues concerning intercollegiate athletics to the Athletic Director or President (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Faculty aspire to have more control and authority in athletics, but lack the expertise and knowledge to effectively manage change (Earl, 2004, Kuga, 1996). Faculties at many large universities seem to lack the administrative or professional authority in athletics to effectively manipulate change while faculties at some of the smaller colleges have been very effective in maintaining the ideals of higher education. In order to protect the integrity of higher education, the faculty must take charge.

In order to provide corrective action and reform in intercollegiate athletics, faculty involvement is critical to establishing an environment where athletics "fit" in a manner appropriate to an institution of higher education (Brand, 2006). The role of faculty governance has drifted away from its earlier inclusion in the oversight of intercollegiate athletics. With the commercialization and interest of the public, alumni, fans, and government officials, schools set expectations that may be unrealistic to accomplish and may encourage outsiders or external forces to take a much more active role in decision making than is normally found in academia (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The difficulty with athletics is that it exists as an auxiliary department often times away from faculty observation and involvement. Many professors have a total disconnect with the idea of athletics (Earl, 2004). They believe that, if reform in intercollegiate athletics is to be successful, it will have to

occur through the channel of faculty governance and the NCAA. This would cause many faculty to take a more active role in governance and oversight of intercollegiate athletics. Faculty members are responsible for creating the academic culture that exists on a college campus and ensuring those principles are endured (Brand, 2006). University professors do not view themselves as employees of the institution but rather the essence of the place and the heart of higher education. It is their responsibility to protect the integrity of higher education (Giamatti, 1988). This allegiance that faculty feel toward their profession needs to assist those faculty in power in defending the ideals of higher education. Faculty belong to a profession with a shared mission and ideals, no matter where they work (Earl, 2004). Faculties possess the unique position to advocate the adherence to academic standards and expectations for athletes and non-athletes. Faculty must understand that the goal of reforming governance in college sports is to more fully integrate athletics into the educational mission of institutions (AAUP, 1989; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009).

The main event on a college campus is the educational component and learning for students. This is the traditional mission, and faculty must realize they are the stakeholders and must protect their claim (Earl, 2004). Faculty indifference is an issue and must be corrected. They must stand to protect the integrity and academic values of higher education. Too few faculty speak out against meaningless courses and degrees for athletes specifically designed to keep them eligible. Faculty have a critical role to play if the values of higher education are to be protected and must restore their control in monitoring the educational experiences for student athletes (Knight Foundation, 2001). The goal of this effort should be to offset the pressures in college sports that would undermine the athlete's educational effort.

“Such balance can be achieved only by removing all decision making that relates to academic matters from the commercial incentives that otherwise affect the daily functioning of the athletic department” (AAUP, 1989, p. 8). In other words, faculty can serve to protect student athletes from the outside influences that exist in intercollegiate athletics. Higher education should operate in a manner that promotes the best interests of the student athletes. Faculty governance is crucial to maintaining academic integrity in higher education (Brand, 2006).

As reformation of athletic programs occurs, it is important that these departments function similar to other parts of the university. Previously, it was discussed how athletic programs operate as auxiliary services. Myles Brand (2006) articulated that athletic departments should function as integral parts of the university and not as free-standing, autonomous structures. These departments should be governed in the same way as other campus units such as business schools. Too often athletic departments are treated like auxiliary services rather than academic units.

It is not unusual for SAT scores for football or basketball players to be considerably lower than the general student body (AAUP, 1989). Coaches are often influential in the admission decisions for athletes (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Faculty need to ensure that all students receive equal treatment. This correlates to the need for appropriate faculty involvement in decision-making (Brand, 2006). Problems persist when athletic departments make their own decisions that are controlled by the market and free from intended ideals of higher education. The faculty must reassert and maintain a system of shared governance if reform in college athletics will persist. Otherwise, the problems will continue to grow as commercialization prospers, budgets exceed revenues, and salaries for coaches grow out of control, thus creating a self-perpetuating cycle.

### Summary

Faculty involvement in intercollegiate athletics began in the late 1800s to help protect students and ensure policies were developed to promote fair play. From the beginning, these extracurricular programs were viewed as an important part of a student's personal development within their educational experience. As intercollegiate athletics have evolved and become more commercialized and competitive, faculty governance has become less evident, and athletic programs have functioned as a separate, autonomous entity, free from the same regulations as other academic components within the university. As a free standing or auxiliary department, many athletic programs have maintained an operation that appears to have lost sight of the educational outcomes designed for the students as a result of their college experience. Many athletic teams have neglected to provide students with the desired academic experience due to the fact that they have spent much of their time on athletic pursuits. With this in mind, faculty must take command and reestablish the mission of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. Understanding faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics will help institute change and improvement in educating student athletes.

Much available literature is devoted to Division I athletics, but Division III athletics face some of the same problems while also exhibiting some of the aspiring qualities that are essential to establishing athletic programs that "fit" the philosophy and mission of intercollegiate athletics as part of higher education. The issues of academic performance for athletes, selective admissions, budgets, salaries for coaches, and money spent on facilities all continue to be concerns at Division's I, II, and III but on different scales. In order for accommodations to be made in reforming college athletics, faculty must lead the charge in

assuring that intercollegiate athletics function in a manner that is consistent with the mission of higher education. From this perspective, it is increasingly important to understand faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics.

## CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

### Overview

The purpose of this study was to develop a deeper understanding of the relationship between faculty satisfaction and NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics. This chapter explains the research design of this study. A description of the research design, population and sample, instrumentation, data collection, results, data analysis, and ethical issues related to the study are presented.

At the completion of this study, all data were kept on a secure server with password protection. Additional data were stored on a hard drive in the researcher's possession that was also password protected. This survey is believed to be one of the few studies investigating faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics. The principal investigator intended to use much of the information collected as it related to exploring the research questions.

### Research Design

The purpose of conducting the study was to examine a sample of current NCAA Division III faculty members to determine their overall satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. From this information, further analysis was conducted to enable inferences to be made regarding what relationship exists between faculty and their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. The researcher created an online survey instrument to address the research questions among the target population. Following a review of literature, the principal investigator developed the original survey with help from the program of study

(POS) committee. An original survey was created in an effort to gather new data from faculty at 25 NCAA Division III institutions to expand on the existing body of research.

Experts in research design were consulted in the final stages of survey design. Internal experts consulted included: Dr. Stephen Porter, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University; Dr. Larry Ebbers, University Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Iowa State University. Following the internal review, drafts of the survey instrument were externally reviewed and interviews conducted with: Dr. Ed Willis, Professor of Psychology, Central College; Dr. John Epperson, Professor of Political Science, Simpson College; Dr. Chris Hulleman, Assistant Professor of Graduate Psychology and Assistant Assessment Specialist, James Madison University; and Dr. Keith Jones, Associate Professor of Psychology, Central College.

A pilot study was conducted by the principal investigator next. A link to the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction Survey was e-mailed to a group of 135 faculty members at NCAA Division III institutions in Iowa. The online survey link was sent via e-mail on September 7, 2010 with a letter attached inviting participation in the survey along with specific instructions on how to complete the survey and contact information for participants who had questions and concerns. Forty-nine participants completed the survey and submitted it for review, which resulted in a response rate of 36.3%.

The purpose of the pilot was to: collect constructive feedback regarding the format and content of the survey; determine if questions were clear; establish an estimated time of completion; and ensure each survey item was understood by participants. The information obtained was used to guide the revisions included in the final draft of the survey.



Recommendations from the internal and external experts and the pilot participants were incorporated into the final draft prior to e-mail distribution of the survey.

Then the principal investigator applied to the Iowa State Institutional Review Board to conduct the study. Approval was granted on October 28, 2010.

### **Population and Sample**

The population of faculty members targeted for this study included all faculty members employed at the 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions during the 2009-2010 Academic Year. The institution selected, conference affiliation, and number of faculty at each institution are provided in Table 3.1.

Faculty members were considered anyone who taught a class or classes at the university or college selected with titles of professor, instructor, or adjunct. The term “faculty” was considered to be inclusive of anyone who taught a class. The principal investigator obtained faculty first names and e-mail addresses from each of the institution’s websites during the 2009-10 Academic Year. The final population list included first names and e-mail addresses for 7,786 faculty at 25 NCAA Division III institutions.

### **Instrumentation**

Data were gathered using an original survey instrument: NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. The survey was developed using Qualtrics software. Formulation of the survey was a result of previous studies in the area (Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; NCAA, 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). The literature reviewed was used to study the relationship between faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by faculty age, tenure status, academic rank,

Table 3.1. NCAA Division III faculty who participated in the study by institution

Institution Selected	Conference Affiliation	<i>N</i>
Austin College	Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	138
Bryn Mawr College	Centennial Conference	162
Buffalo State College	State University of New York Athletic Conf.	772
Dallas, University of	Independent	167
Dickinson College	Centennial Conference	305
Elizabethtown College	Middle Atlantic Conferences	247
Emory and Henry College	Old Dominion Athletic Conference	89
Greensboro College	USA South Athletic Conference	113
Hampden-Sydney College	Old Dominion Athletic Conference	113
Heidelberg College	Ohio Athletic Conference	136
Hunter College	City University of New York Athletic Conf.	1,112
Linfield College	Northwest Conference	217
Maryville College (TN)	Great South Athletic Conference	79
Monmouth College (IL)	Midwest Conference	183
Nebraska Wesleyan University	Independent	305
Notre Dame, College of (MD)	Colonial States Athletic Conference	188
Plattsburgh State University (NY)	State University of New York Athletic Conf.	669
Randolph-Macon College	Old Dominion Athletic Conference	166
Rivier College	Great Northeast Athletic Conference	278
Roger Williams University	The Commonwealth Coast Conference	263
Sage Colleges, The	Skyline Conference	435
St. John Fisher College	Empire 8	600
Webster University	St. Louis Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	206
Wentworth Instituted of Tech.	The Commonwealth Coast Conference	179
Wisconsin LaCrosse, Univ. of	Wisconsin Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	664
Total		7,786

length of service, contact with athletes, gender, NCAA affiliation of faculty undergraduate school attended, faculty participation in athletics, and faculty perceptions of academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. The survey instrument utilized dichotomous responses (i.e., “yes” and “no”), multiple choice responses (i.e., “professor, instructor, adjunct, or other”), and Likert-type rating scales (e.g., “very dissatisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, somewhat satisfied, or very satisfied”). A complete copy of the survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.

The 33-item survey is organized into five sections: (1) overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics; (2) faculty satisfaction level concerning academic oversight; (3) faculty satisfaction level concerning governance issues; (4) faculty satisfaction level regarding fiscal oversight; and (5) demographic characteristics of faculty respondents. The following provides a description of each section.

### ***1. Overall Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics***

This component of the survey contains the variable at the center of this study. What relationship exists between faculty satisfaction and intercollegiate athletics? This is the main research question for this study. This is the dependent variable for this study.

### ***2. Faculty Satisfaction Level Concerning Academic Oversight***

This component of the survey contained variables involved with academic oversight. The section was intended to produce data that would provide insight into the perceptions of faculty members related to their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics and their influence with regard to student athlete academic issues, such as: admission; academic performance; academic support (e.g., tutoring, advising, counseling, etc.); program of study (e.g., classes taken), graduation rates; and integration of student athletes into the academic experiences

(e.g., athletes participating in academic programming such as going to class, joining clubs and organizations, internships, etc.). Six items were included in this section seeking to expand upon the body of knowledge in the area of faculty perceptions of academic oversight for student athletes.

### ***3. Faculty Satisfaction Level Concerning Athletic Governance***

This section of the survey involved issues of faculty governance in intercollegiate athletics. It was intended that this component of the survey would indicate faculty satisfaction levels with their shared governance in athletics. Six items were included in this section to ascertain faculty satisfaction levels with their influence regarding shared governance with athletics: (1) Do faculty members feel they have influence over the governing process of intercollegiate athletics? (2) Do faculty members have the ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics? (3) Do faculty members have influence over the mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics? (4) Do faculty have contact with faculty athletic representatives (FARs) to impact the governance of intercollegiate athletics? (5) Do faculty have control and responsibility to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics? and (6) Do faculty possess control and governance over intercollegiate athletics?

### ***4. Faculty Satisfaction Level Regarding Fiscal Oversight***

This component of the survey contained questions involved with fiscal oversight. The section was intended to provide data that would offer perspective into faculty feelings and satisfaction with regard to fiscal activities in athletics. More specifically, faculty satisfaction with regard to their influence over six items concerning fiscal oversight: (1) issues involving

budgets; (2) facilities; (3) recruiting expenses; (4) coach's salaries; and (5) financial "need" and (6) "merit"-based aid for student athletes.

### **5. Demographic Characteristics of Faculty Respondents**

This component of the survey asked faculty to provide background information. The following variables were used in the descriptive analysis: length of service, academic rank, tenure status, experience in athletic governance, participation in high school or college athletics, gender, ethnicity, athletic events attended, NCAA Division III knowledge, interaction with student athletes, age, and undergraduate institution attended.

### **Data Collection**

Qualtrics Survey Software was used to create and distribute the survey as well as collect the data for this research. The electronic survey instrument link was e-mailed to faculty members on October 29, 2010. Faculty members were given the deadline of November 28, 2010 to complete and submit the survey. The link to the instrument was accompanied by a cover letter (see Appendix B) from the principal investigator inviting NCAA Division III faculty to participate in the study. The e-mail also included instructions on how to access the survey and contact information for the principal investigator and Iowa State University supervising faculty members, Larry Ebberts, Ph.D. and Steve Porter, Ph.D.

In an effort to facilitate a high response rate, four reminder e-mails (see Appendix C) were sent to non-respondents at intervals over the next four weeks. The contact dates were:

October 29, 2010	Original Survey Mailing
November 3, 2010	E-mail reminder 1
November 9, 2010	E-mail reminder 2

November 16, 2010 E-mail reminder 3

November 22, 2010 E-mail reminder 4

Surveys were completed from October 29, 2010 through November 28, 2010. There were 1,350 surveys started and 963 completed. Survey data were then exported from Qualtrics Survey Software to Stata Software and stored on a secure server.

### **Population**

Twenty-five randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions were identified to be included in this study. From these institutions, 7,786 faculty were selected as the target population. The complete list of NCAA Division III institutions was obtained from the NCAA website. E-mail addresses and names of faculty were collected from institutional websites. Upon arrival of the survey completion deadline, 1,350 participants logged into the survey and started to complete it. Of the 1,350 participants who started to complete the survey, only 963 completed and clicked the submit button at the end of the survey. Any respondents identifying their current faculty status as professor, instructor, or adjunct were included as faculty members. Faculty who identified their faculty status as 'other' were included in the sample if they indicated that teaching was part of their job responsibilities.

For the purpose of this survey, respondents who did not complete any of the questions on the survey were eliminated from the sample. A final population of 911 participants was included in the data set. The response rate is provided in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2. Sample and response rate for the survey

	<i>Cases</i>
<i>Eligible Sample</i>	7,786.0
Started the Survey	1,350.0
Final Sample Size	911.0
<i>Response Rate</i>	11.7

### **Data Analysis Procedures**

The data analysis procedures used in this study included descriptive statistics that produced frequency and cross tabulation data describing the population, and multiple regression analyses designed to assess the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables included in the data analysis.

#### **Descriptive statistics**

Stata software was used to calculate the statistical analysis for this study. Stata is a comprehensive system of analyzing data and provides information on descriptive statistics and complicated statistical analyses. In an effort to address Research Question 1, descriptive statistics were conducted to examine overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics and then further broken down by multiple demographic characteristics such as faculty age, tenure status, academic rank, length of service, contact with athletes, gender, NCAA affiliation of faculty alma mater, participation in athletics, and faculty perceptions of academic oversight, governance, and fiscal oversight.

### **Multiple regression analysis**

To address Research Questions 2-4, multiple regression analysis was used to assess the relationship between dependent and independent variables. More specifically, the relationship between faculty satisfaction with athletics (dependent variable) and faculty age, tenure status, academic rank, length of service, contact with athletes, gender, participation in athletics (high school and college), NCAA affiliation of faculty undergrad institution, perceptions of academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight in intercollegiate athletics (independent variables).

Nine independent variables were coded to create comparisons in the regression analysis. Four of these independent variables were coded to create multiple dummy variable comparisons (faculty status, years at current institution, contact with athletes, and NCAA affiliation of faculty alma mater). Faculty status of respondents was used to compare those with “professor” (reference category) status with each of the other faculty status categories. For example, ‘professors’ were compared with “instructors”, “professors” with “adjuncts”, and “professors” with “other”.

Length of service (years at current institution) compared faculty with “more than 8 years” (reference category) of service with each of the other response categories (“less than 3 years”, “3-5 years”, and “6-8 years”).

Faculty were also compared by their contact and interaction with student athletes. Faculty with “no interaction” (reference category) were compared with each of the other response categories including: “some interaction”, “frequent interaction”, and “constant interaction”.



The fourth variable using multiple dummy comparisons was NCAA affiliation of faculty undergraduate alma mater. If faculty obtained their undergraduate degree from an “NCAA Division III” (reference category) institution, they were compared against each of the other response categories. For example, faculty graduates from an “NCAA Division III” institution were compared with faculty who graduated from an “NCAA Division I” institution, “NCAA Division II” institution, “none of the above”, and “I don’t know” categorical responses.

Four variables were also coded to create binary outcome comparisons (tenure status, gender, participation in high school athletics, and participation in college athletics). Faculty with tenure were compared against those without tenure. Gender was used to compare male and female faculty. Final binary comparisons were made between faculty who participated in high school or college athletics and those who did not. Age was also used in the regression equation as an independent continuous variable.

Eighteen independent variables were included in the regression analysis which was used to obtain faculty perceptions about academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight in intercollegiate athletics. Each conceptual area for academic oversight, governance, and fiscal oversight included six questions assessing faculty perceptions. For each variable, a Likert-type rating scale was used (e.g., “very dissatisfied”, “somewhat dissatisfied”, “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”, “somewhat satisfied”, or “very satisfied”) to assess faculty satisfaction.

Exploratory factor analysis was used to reduce these variables into three construct areas related to academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal control. Variables were created by averaging the six responses for each respondent in each of the three construct

areas (academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal control) coming up with one score in each of the three construct areas for each respondent. As a result, each respondent had one score for academic oversight, one score for faculty governance, and one score for fiscal oversight. These generated scores were then used to conduct linear regression analysis examining the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

According to Stock and Watson (2007), multiple regression analysis enables the researcher to assess the relationship between one dependent variable (overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics) and several independent variables. The intent of this type of analysis is assessing and determining a relationship between the dependent and independent variables.

Inclusion of variables in the model was determined by a collection of previous research (Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; NCAA, 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000) and theories from the investigator. The significance level established for this regression was  $p < .05$ .

Independent variables were entered into one overall regression model for all respondents ( $N=719$ ) (Model 1). The independent variables were comprised of demographic variables age, tenure status, faculty status, years at current institution, gender, NCAA affiliation of undergrad school attended, contact with athletes, and participation in high school and/or college athletics. Additional independent variables included faculty perceptions of satisfaction concerning academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight.

Modeling by subgroups was also included in the comparison of data. Model 3 and Model 4 included regression analysis for “Professors” only while Model 5 and Model 6

included only “Instructor, Adjunct, and Other” faculty. Respondents who were “Not very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics were included in Model 7 and Model 8 while respondents who were “Somewhat knowledgeable, Knowledgeable, or Very knowledgeable” were included in Model 9 and Model 10. Only men were included in regression Model 11 and regression Model 12 while only women were included in Model 13 and Model 14.

### **Ethical Issues**

Participation in this study was voluntary, and willingness to participate had no effect on faculty status at their respective college or university. Faculty names and responses were kept confidential. Results of responses were provided in summary form only so individual data was not revealed. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, both the survey and the data were stored on a secure server and on a password-protected hard drive.

## CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

This chapter provides a comprehensive overview of the results of this study. The chapter is organized into five sections. The first section reports the demographic characteristics of faculty members at the 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions. The second section provides a breakdown of overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by demographic characteristics. The third section displays faculty satisfaction related to academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. The fourth section shows the factor loadings of variables from the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. The fifth section reports the results of the multiple regression analysis designed to explain the relationship between dependent and independent variables.

### Demographic Characteristics

#### NCAA Division III faculty

***Research Question 1: How do faculty members rate their satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics?***

Frequency analyses were conducted to gain a better understanding of the general demographics of the 911 faculty members who completed the survey. Listwise deletion was used in developing the descriptive statistics and regression analysis for this study.

Respondents who didn't answer questions on the survey were dropped from the analysis. It should be noted that, the Iowa State University Institutional Review Board, on October 28, 2010, required respondents to have the option of not answering questions, thus the sample size of 719 was reported in descriptive statistics and for the regression analysis.

Participants were asked to provide demographic information about their length of service, faculty status, tenure status, Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) experience, participation in high school or college athletics, gender, ethnicity, athletic events attended, athletic knowledge, interaction and contact with student athletes, age, and NCAA affiliation of faculty alma mater. A detailed description of demographic information provided by participants is presented in Table 4.1. By length of service at their respective institution, a majority of faculty in the study had been at their institution more than eight years, 55.5% ( $n=399$ ). Faculty with three to five years experience were next with 17.9% ( $n=129$ ) while faculty with six to eight years and less than three years made up 13.6% ( $n=98$ ) and 12.9% ( $n=93$ ) of the sample, respectively.

Of the 719 faculty members responding to the question regarding faculty status, 78.4% ( $n=564$ ) were Professors. Respondents also had faculty status of Instructor, 12.2% ( $n=88$ ), Adjunct 7.9% ( $n=57$ ), and Other 1.4% ( $n=10$ ).

Among the 719 participants responding to the question regarding tenure status, 55.4% ( $n=398$ ) reported having tenure status while 44.7% ( $n=321$ ) did not have tenure status.

Experience as a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) was limited. Of the 719 respondents, only 7.1% ( $n=51$ ) serve or have served as a FAR. The majority, 92.9% ( $n=668$ ) had no experience as a FAR.

Respondents were asked to indicate their experience participating in high school or college athletics. More than half the total number of respondents ( $n=719$ ) indicated they had participated in high school athletics 61.1% ( $n=439$ ), while only 24.9% ( $n=179$ ) participated in college athletics. Less than half of the respondents, 38.9% ( $n=280$ ) did not participate in high school athletics while 75.1% ( $n=540$ ) did not participate in athletics while in college.

Table 4.1. Demographics of participants by years at current institution, faculty status, tenure, FAR experience, and participation in high school and/or college athletics

Variable	N	Percent
<i>How many years have you been at your current institution? (Years at current institution)</i>		
Less than 3 years	93	12.9
3-5 years	129	17.9
6-8 years	98	13.6
More than 8 years	399	55.5
<i>What is your current faculty status? (Faculty status)</i>		
Professor (e.g. full, associate, or assistant professor)	564	78.4
Instructor (e.g. full-time employee but not tenured faculty member)	88	12.2
Adjunct (e.g. teach courses on a part-time basis)	57	7.9
Other	10	1.4
<i>Do you currently have tenure status? (Tenure status)</i>		
Yes	398	55.4
No	321	44.7
<i>Do you serve, or have you served as Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR)? (FAR experience)</i>		
Yes	51	7.1
No	668	92.9
<i>Did you participate in high school athletics? (Athletic participation—high school)</i>		
Yes	439	61.1
No	280	38.9
<i>Did you participate in college athletics? (Athletic participation—college)</i>		
Yes	179	24.9
No	540	75.1

Table 4.2 provides demographic data on gender, ethnicity, number of athletic events attended, and knowledge and understanding of NCAA Division III athletics. By gender, the majority of respondents in the study were male, 56.2% ( $n=404$ ). Females represented 43.8% ( $n=315$ ).

Of the 719 participants responding to the question regarding ethnicity, 92.2% ( $n=663$ ) were White. Among other race/ethnicity groups, Asian faculty members 1.3% ( $n=9$ ),

Table 4.2. Demographics of participants by gender, ethnicity, and athletic events/competitions attended per semester

Variable	N	Percent
<i>What is your gender? (Gender)</i>		
Male	404	56.2
Female	315	43.8
<i>What is your ethnicity? (Ethnicity)</i>		
White	663	92.2
African-American	11	1.5
Asian	9	1.3
Hispanic/Latino	15	2.1
Pacific Islander	1	.1
Other	20	2.8
<i>How many athletic events/competitions do you attend in a semester? (Athletic events attended)</i>		
None	200	27.8
Less than 3	281	39.1
3-6	132	18.4
More than 6	106	14.7
<i>How would you rate your knowledge and understanding of NCAA Division III athletics? (Athletic knowledge)</i>		
Not very knowledgeable	242	33.7
Somewhat knowledgeable	269	37.4
Knowledgeable	131	18.2
Very knowledgeable	77	10.7

African-Americans 1.5% ( $n=11$ ), Hispanic/Latinos 2.1% ( $n=15$ ), Pacific Islanders .1% ( $n=1$ ), and Other ethnic groups comprised the final 2.8% ( $n=20$ ).

Faculty were asked to indicate the number of athletic events or competitions they attend in a semester. The majority (39.1%) indicated attending less than 3 events per semester. Almost one-third (27.8%) did not attend any athletic events or competitions while 18.4% ( $n=132$ ) attended anywhere from three to six events and 14.7% ( $n=106$ ) attended more than six events.

A question was asked to determine the level of knowledge and understanding about NCAA Division III athletics. A total of 719 participants responded to this question while

33.7% ( $n=242$ ) reported that they were “not very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics. The majority (37.4%) of faculty expressed that they were “somewhat knowledgeable” and 18.2% ( $n=131$ ) viewed themselves as “knowledgeable” about intercollegiate athletics. Only 10.7% ( $n=77$ ) of those that completed the survey classified themselves as “very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics.

Results shown in Table 4.3 reveal that, of the 719 participants who responded to the question about interaction and contact with student athletes, 40.1% ( $n=288$ ) had “some interaction” and 35.2% ( $n=253$ ) had “frequent interaction”. Only 6.8% ( $n=49$ ) had “no interaction” with student athletes while 17.9% ( $n=155$ ) had “constant interaction”. The mean age of those participants who responded ( $n=719$ ) to the survey question regarding age was 49.2 years of age. Respondents were asked to indicate the NCAA affiliation of the institution where they obtained their undergraduate degree. The majority of faculty (39.8%) attended an institution affiliated with NCAA Division III while 36.0% ( $n=259$ ) attended a Division I school. Only 5.8% ( $n=42$ ) received their degree from a Division II institution. Almost one-fifth of the faculty didn't know the NCAA affiliation of their undergraduate institution or the institution was not affiliated with the NCAA.

### **Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics**

The focus of this study was to study and better understand the relationship between faculty satisfaction and intercollegiate athletics. Participants were asked to rate their level of overall satisfaction with the intercollegiate athletic program at their institution. Values assigned to the responses were: (1) very dissatisfied; (2) somewhat dissatisfied; (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; (4) somewhat satisfied; and (5) very satisfied. The overall mean



Table 4.3. Demographics of participants by contact with athletes, age and NCAA affiliation

Variable	N	Percent
<i>How would you describe your interaction and contact with student-athletes on campus? (Contact with athletes)</i>		
No interaction (e.g., never talk to or have contact with student athletes on campus).	49	6.8
Some interaction (e.g., talk to and interact with student athletes 1-3 times per week).	288	40.1
Frequent interaction (e.g., talk to and interact with student athletes 4-10 times per week).	253	35.2
Constant interaction (e.g., talk to and interact with student athletes more than 10 times per week).	129	17.9
<i>What is your current age? (Age)</i>		
22-29	14	2.0
30-39	153	21.3
40-49	201	28.0
50-59	193	26.8
60 and older	158	22.0
Mean age		49.2
<i>With regard to the institution where you obtained your undergraduate degree, to which NCAA athletic affiliation or division did the institution belong? (NCAA affiliation)</i>		
NCAA Division I	259	36.0
NCAA Division II	42	5.8
NCAA Division III	286	39.8
None of the above	51	7.09
I don't know	81	11.3

score for overall faculty satisfaction with athletics was  $M=3.8$ . Results are provided in Table 4.4. Almost two thirds of the respondents (62.5%) indicated being somewhat satisfied or very satisfied in the athletic program at their institution. Of the 719 faculty responding to this question, 24.9% ( $n=179$ ) were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with the athletic program. Only 3.8% ( $n=27$ ) were very dissatisfied with the athletic program and 8.9% ( $n=64$ ) were somewhat dissatisfied.

Table 4.4. Faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics

Variable	Percentage					N	Mean
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
<i>How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the intercollegiate athletic program at your institution?</i>	3.8	8.9	24.9	32.7	29.8	719	3.8

Faculty satisfaction with athletics is detailed by demographic characteristics in Table 4.5. The highest overall faculty satisfaction score  $M=3.9$  was seen with faculty with more than eight years experience at their respective institution. Satisfaction scores decreased as years experience at their institution declined. Faculty with six to eight years experience had the next highest satisfaction scores  $M=3.7$ , followed by those with three to five years experience  $M=3.6$ , and those with less than three years experience  $M=3.5$ .

Respondents with “Professor” status had a mean faculty satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$  but also the largest number of respondents ( $n=564$ ). “Instructors” and “adjuncts” had mean scores of  $M=3.7$ . Respondents in the “Other” category had the highest mean scores with an average of  $M=4.4$  while also having the fewest number of respondents ( $n=10$ ).

Faculty with tenure status had higher satisfaction scores  $M = 3.9$  than those without tenure  $M=3.6$ . Experience as a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) produced higher satisfaction scores for faculty  $M=4.2$  compared to faculty who had no background as a Faculty Athletic Representative  $M=3.7$ .

Mean satisfaction scores for faculty are shown in Table 4.6 according to participation in high school or college athletics, gender, and ethnicity. Faculty who participated in high school athletics ( $n=439$ ) had slightly higher mean satisfaction scores  $M=3.8$  compared to

Table 4.5. Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by years at current institution, faculty status, tenure, and FAR experience

Variable	Percentage					N	Mean
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
<i>How many years have you been at your current institution? (Years at current institution)</i>							
Less than 3 years	3.2	10.8	38.7	28.0	19.4	93	3.5
3-5 years	3.1	10.6	33.3	28.7	24.0	129	3.6
6-8 years	1.0	13.3	23.5	38.8	23.5	98	3.7
More than 8 years	4.8	6.8	19.3	33.6	35.6	399	3.9
<i>What is your current faculty status? (Faculty status)</i>							
Professor	3.4	9.2	24.5	34.0	28.9	564	3.8
Instructor	3.4	11.4	26.1	30.7	28.4	88	3.7
Adjunct	8.8	3.5	28.1	24.6	35.1	57	3.7
Other	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	60.0	10	4.4
<i>Do you currently have tenure status? (Tenure status)</i>							
Yes	3.8	8.0	19.4	35.7	33.2	398	3.9
No	3.7	10.0	31.8	29.0	25.6	321	3.6
<i>Do you serve, or have you served as Faculty Athletic Representative? (FAR experience)</i>							
Yes	2.0	7.8	11.8	29.4	49.0	51	4.2
No	3.9	9.0	25.9	32.9	28.3	668	3.7

faculty who did not participate  $M=3.7$  in high school athletics ( $n=370$ ). Satisfaction scores for faculty who participated in college athletics were very similar. Faculty who did participate in college athletics had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$  ( $n=179$ ) while faculty who did not participate had a mean score of  $M=3.8$  ( $n=540$ ).

Satisfaction of faculty seemed to be influenced by gender. Of the 404 males who responded to the survey, 66.6% were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” in the

Table 4.6. Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by athletic participation in high school or college, gender, and ethnicity

Variable	Percentage					N	Mean
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
<i>Did you participate in high school athletics? (Athletic participation—high school)</i>							
Yes	3.4	9.1	23.2	35.3	28.9	439	3.8
No	4.3	8.6	27.5	28.6	31.1	280	3.7
<i>Did you participate in college athletics? (Athletic participation—college)</i>							
Yes	3.9	11.7	18.4	34.1	31.8	179	3.8
No	3.7	8.0	27.0	32.2	29.1	540	3.8
<i>What is your gender? (Gender)</i>							
Male	3.5	8.7	21.3	31.2	35.4	404	3.9
Female	4.1	9.2	29.5	34.6	22.5	315	3.6
<i>What is your ethnicity? (Ethnicity)</i>							
White	3.9	8.5	24.7	33.0	29.9	663	3.8
African-American	0.0	18.2	45.5	18.2	18.2	11	3.4
Asian	0.0	11.1	22.2	33.3	33.3	9	3.9
Hispanic/Latino	0.0	0.0	33.3	46.7	20.0	15	3.9
Pacific Islander	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	5.0
Other	5.0	25.0	15.0	20.0	35.0	20	3.6

athletic program at their institution. Overall males had a satisfaction score of  $M=3.9$ .

Females had a mean score of 3.6.

Of the 719 participants who provided their ethnicity or race, the majority were white ( $n=663$ ) with a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$ . Asians ( $n=9$ ) had a slightly higher satisfaction score  $M=3.9$ , with one Pacific Islander having the highest score of  $M=5.00$ . Hispanic/Latinos had a mean score of  $M=3.9$ , followed by African-Americans with a mean score of  $M=3.4$ . Respondents in the “Other” category had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.6$ .

Table 4.7 reveals faculty satisfaction scores for additional demographic characteristics pertaining to athletic event attendance, knowledge of athletics, and interaction with student athletes. The more faculty attend athletic events, the higher their satisfaction with athletics. Faculty who did not attend any athletic events or competitions had the lowest mean satisfaction scores  $M=3.3$ . Those that attended less than three events or competitions  $M=3.8$ , three to six events or competitions  $M=4.1$ , and more than six events or competitions  $M=4.1$ . As faculty attendance at athletic events increased so did their overall satisfaction with athletics.

An expected result was found with regard to athletic knowledge. As faculty knowledge about athletics increased, mean satisfaction scores increased. Faculty who identified themselves as “not very knowledgeable” about athletics ( $n=242$ ) had the lowest mean satisfaction scores  $M=3.5$ . Faculty classified as “somewhat knowledgeable” about athletics had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.7$  ( $n=269$ ) while those identified as “very knowledgeable” had a mean score of  $M=4.1$  ( $n=77$ ). Faculty who were “knowledgeable” had the highest mean score of  $M=4.2$  ( $n=131$ ).

The more faculty interact and come into contact with student athletes, the higher their satisfaction with athletics. Faculty with “frequent interaction” ( $n=253$ ) with student athletes had the highest overall satisfaction with athletics  $M=4.0$ , followed by those with “constant interaction”  $M=3.9$  ( $n=129$ ), “some interaction”  $M=3.6$  ( $n=288$ ), and “no interaction”  $M=3.1$ , ( $n=49$ ).

Faculty provided demographic information such as their age and NCAA affiliation of their undergraduate alma mater. Table 4.8 illustrates overall faculty satisfaction with

Table 4.7. Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by athletic events attended, athletic knowledge, and contact with athletes

Variable	Percentage					N	Mean
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
<i>How many athletic events/competitions do you attend in a semester? (Athletic events attended)</i>							
None	5.0	11.0	47.5	22.0	14.5	200	3.3
Less than 3	3.2	9.3	21.7	34.9	31.0	281	3.8
3-6	2.3	7.6	9.9	42.4	37.9	132	4.1
More than 6	4.7	5.7	9.4	34.9	45.3	106	4.1
<i>How would you rate your knowledge and understanding of NCAA Division III athletics? (Athletic knowledge)</i>							
Not very knowledgeable	2.1	8.7	47.1	24.8	17.4	242	3.5
Somewhat knowledgeable	5.2	10.0	17.8	40.5	26.4	269	3.7
Knowledgeable	2.3	7.6	10.7	28.2	51.2	131	4.2
Very knowledgeable	6.5	7.8	3.9	37.7	44.2	77	4.1
<i>How would you describe your interaction and contact with student-athletes on campus? (Contact with athletes)</i>							
No interaction	2.0	4.1	75.5	14.3	4.1	49	3.1
Some interaction	3.8	9.0	33.3	28.1	25.7	288	3.6
Frequent interaction	2.8	9.1	14.6	37.2	36.4	253	4.0
Constant interaction	6.2	10.1	7.0	41.1	35.7	129	3.9

athletics for each of these demographics. As faculty age increased so did their satisfaction with athletics. From the age of 30 to 39, faculty satisfaction scores  $M=3.5$  ( $n=167$ ) increase as faculty age to a high of  $M=3.9$  for faculty age 50 and older. Faculty in the 40 to 49 age range had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.6$  ( $n=224$ ). Faculty in the 22 to 29 age range were a bit of an outlier with a mean score of  $M=3.8$  ( $n=17$ ).

Faculty who obtained their undergraduate degree from an NCAA Division II institution had the highest mean satisfaction scores  $M=3.9$  ( $n=42$ ), followed by those who attended an NCAA Division I school  $M=3.8$  ( $n=259$ ), and those who attended an NCAA

Table 4.8. Overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics by age and NCAA affiliation

Variable	Percentage					N	Mean
	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
<i>What is your current age? (Age)</i>							
22-29	0.0	5.9	29.4	47.1	17.7	17	3.8
30-39	1.8	12.6	37.7	32.9	15.0	167	3.5
40-49	3.1	13.0	24.1	37.5	22.3	224	3.6
50-59	5.1	3.7	24.0	31.3	35.9	217	3.9
60 and older	5.6	7.8	15.1	29.6	41.9	179	3.9
<i>With regard to the institution where you obtained your undergraduate degree, to which NCAA athletic affiliation or division did the institution belong? (NCAA affiliation)</i>							
NCAA Division I	3.1	8.5	22.8	34.4	31.3	259	3.8
NCAA Division II	0.0	4.8	23.8	47.6	23.8	42	3.9
NCAA Division III	5.2	9.1	21.3	30.8	33.6	286	3.8
None of the above	3.9	15.7	31.4	27.5	21.6	51	3.5
I don't know	2.5	7.4	40.7	29.6	19.8	81	3.6

Division III school  $M=3.8$  ( $n=286$ ). For those faculty who did not know the NCAA affiliation of their alma mater, their mean satisfaction score was  $M=3.6$  ( $n=81$ ). Some faculty attended institutions not affiliated with the NCAA, their mean satisfaction score was  $M=3.5$  ( $n=51$ ).

### **Faculty Satisfaction Related to Academic Oversight, Faculty Governance, and Fiscal Oversight**

This study was conducted to better understand the relationship between overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics and academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. Participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the

amount of influence they possess concerning academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight for student athletes at their institution. As a result, faculty indicated their level of satisfaction for academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight by responding to six items related to each area. Values assigned to the responses were: (1) very dissatisfied; (2) somewhat dissatisfied; (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied; (4) somewhat satisfied; and (5) very satisfied.

Faculty satisfaction with academic oversight is displayed in Table 4.9. Faculty were most satisfied with the amount of influence they possess over classes student athletes take while enrolled  $M=3.8$  ( $n=719$ ) and with graduation rates of student athletes  $M=3.8$ . The

Table 4.9. Faculty oversight of academics and satisfaction with the amount of influence in oversight of academics in: the admission process, academic performance, academic support, classes, graduation rate, and academic experience\*

Variable	Oversight of Academics	Percentage					N	Mean
		Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied		
The admission process for student-athletes.	Admission Process	4.6	11.8	51.5	17.8	14.3	719	3.3
The academic performance of enrolled student-athletes.	Academic Performance	2.1	16.1	20.9	36.7	24.2	719	3.6
The academic support (e.g., tutoring, advising, counseling, etc.) provided to student-athletes.	Academic Support	1.1	10.3	35.9	28.5	24.2	719	3.6
The classes student athletes take while enrolled.	Classes	1.1	8.6	33.1	24.8	32.4	719	3.8
The graduation rate of student-athletes.	Graduation Rate	1.5	8.6	32.3	23.1	34.5	719	3.8
The integration of student-athletes into academic experiences.	Academic Experience	4.3	12.66	24.1	26.6	32.4	719	3.7

\*Participation by athletes in academic programming such as going to class, joining clubs and organizations, internships, etc.



integration of student athletes into academic experiences had a mean score of  $M=3.7$  followed by academic support  $M=3.6$ , academic performance of student athletes  $M=3.6$ , and the admission process for student athletes  $M=3.3$ .

With regard to satisfaction levels, 60.9% of respondents were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the amount of influence they possess regarding the academic performance of student athletes, followed by 59.0% for the integration of student athletes into academic experiences, 57.6% for the graduation rate of student athletes, 57.2% for the classes student athletes take while enrolled, 52.7% for academic support, and 32.1% for the admission process of student athletes.

Satisfaction with faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics is reported in Table 4.10. Mean scores concerning faculty governance of athletics were lower compared to scores for academic oversight. Of the 719 that responded to the question concerning their ability to contact and interact with Faculty Athletic Representatives, 43.3% were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with a mean score of  $M=3.5$ . The mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M=3.4$  with 44.8% being “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied”. The mean score for the governing process of intercollegiate athletics was 3.1 with 25.9% of the respondents being satisfied. The ability to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M = 3.0$  with 20.9% of the respondents being satisfied. The ability to control and govern intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M=3.0$  with 18.5% of respondents being satisfied while the ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics had mean score of  $M=2.9$  while 19.5% of the participants were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied”.

Table 4.10. Faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics and satisfaction with the amount of influence in: athletic governance, policies-procedures, mission-goals, FARs, role of athletics, and athletic control

Variable	Faculty Governance	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	<i>N</i>	Mean
The governing process of intercollegiate athletics.	Athletic Governance	4.5	12.8	56.9	16.6	9.3	719	3.1
The ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics.	Policies-Procedures	6.8	18.1	55.6	13.4	6.1	719	2.9
The mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics.	Mission-Goals	4.7	11.5	39.5	24.1	20.7	719	3.4
The ability to contact and interact with faculty athletic representatives (FARs) to impact the governance of intercollegiate athletics.	FARs	3.3	8.5	44.9	23.5	19.8	719	3.5
The ability to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics.	Role of Athletics	5.6	18.1	55.5	14.5	6.4	719	3.0
The ability to control and govern intercollegiate athletics.	Athletic Control	6.0	15.7	59.8	12.1	6.4	719	3.0

Faculty satisfaction with fiscal oversight of athletics is provided in Table 4.11.

Faculty were most satisfied with the amount of influence they possess over financial “merit based” aid  $M=3.2$  ( $n=719$ ) and with financial “need based” aid  $M=3.2$ . The coach’s salaries and money spent recruiting student athletes both had mean scores of  $M=2.9$ . The budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics  $M=2.8$  and the money spent on facilities  $M=2.7$  had the lowest mean scores, respectively.

Of the 719 participants that responded to the question concerning financial “merit based” aid, 28.4% were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the amount of

Table 4.11. Faculty oversight of fiscal activities and satisfaction with the amount of influence in: athletic budget, money spent, recruiting budget, need based aid, coach's salaries, and merit based aid.

Variable	Fiscal Activities	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied	N	Mean
The budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics.	Athletic Budget	12.4	18.1	53.4	10.7	5.4	719	2.8
The money spent on athletic facilities.	Money Spent	14.9	26.3	34.8	17.3	6.8	719	2.7
The money spent on recruiting student-athletes.	Recruiting Budget	10.2	17.0	54.5	12.2	6.1	719	2.9
The financial 'need based' aid (e.g.-Pell Grant, SEOG, etc.) awarded to student-athletes.	Need based aid	4.2	8.3	61.3	16.8	9.3	719	3.2
The coach's salaries.	Coach's salaries	8.8	12.5	59.9	13.1	5.7	719	2.9
The financial 'merit based' aid (e.g.-academic, art, or music scholarship, etc.) awarded to student-athletes.	Merit based aid	4.7	9.2	57.7	18.2	10.2	719	3.2

influence they possess, followed by 26.1% for financial "need based" aid, 24.1% for the money spent on athletic facilities, 18.8% for coach's salaries, 18.3% for money spent recruiting student athletes, and 16.1% for the budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics.

### **Factor Loadings of NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with the Intercollegiate Athletics Survey**

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted on 18 survey items using principal component factoring from the 719 respondents. The purpose of the exploratory factor analysis was to reduce the variables into groups that were measuring the same dimension.

Three constructs or factors were identified as a result of using the exploratory factor analysis

and all three constructs loaded as expected by academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. Table 4.12 shows the proportion of the total variance explained by each of the factors as well as the cumulative variance explained. Factor 1-Faculty Governance explains 25.0% of the total variance while Factor 2-Academic Oversight and Factor 3-Fiscal Oversight each explain 22.0% of the total variance. In total, the three factors explain 69.0% of the total variance for Academic Oversight, Faculty Governance, and Fiscal Oversight.

Six items from the survey loaded with academic oversight, six items with faculty governance, and six items with fiscal oversight. These loadings or correlations confirmed previous assumptions about the relationship between independent variables and overall faculty satisfaction. The results of the loadings of variables on factors are shown in Table 4.13.

Cronbach's alpha ( $\alpha$ ) was used to determine the internal consistency of responses from each of the areas concerning academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. An alpha ( $\alpha$ ) value of 0.9 was revealed for academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight.

Following the exploratory factor analysis, independent variables were generated for each respondent in each of the construct areas (academic oversight, faculty governance, and

Table 4.12. Factor analysis correlation

Factor (N=719)	Eigenvalue	Variance	Proportion	Cumulative
1 – Faculty Governance	9.27	4.50	0.25	0.25
2 – Academic Oversight	1.83	4.00	0.22	0.47
3 – Fiscal Oversight	1.33	3.93	0.22	0.69

Table 4.13. Summary of factor loadings

Variables (N=719)	Factor Loadings
<i>Academic Oversight (<math>\alpha=.89</math>)</i>	
The admission process for student-athletes.	0.52
The academic performance of enrolled student-athletes.	0.77
The academic support (e.g., tutoring, advising, counseling, etc.) provided to student-athletes.	0.66
The classes student-athletes take while enrolled.	0.80
The graduation rate of student-athletes.	0.82
The integration of student-athletes into academic experiences (e.g., athletes participating in academic programming such as going to class, joining clubs and organizations, internships, etc.).	0.76
<i>Faculty Governance (<math>\alpha=.92</math>)</i>	
The governing process of intercollegiate athletics.	0.79
The ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics.	0.82
The mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics.	0.60
The ability to contact and interact with faculty athletic representatives (FARs) to impact the governance of intercollegiate athletics.	0.66
The ability to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics.	0.82
The ability to control and govern intercollegiate athletics.	0.86
<i>Fiscal Oversight (<math>\alpha=.90</math>)</i>	
The budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics.	0.71
The money spent on athletic facilities.	0.76
The money spent on recruiting student-athletes.	0.79
The financial 'need based' aid (e.g., Pell Grant, SEOG, etc.) awarded to student-athletes.	0.70
The coach's salaries.	0.73
The financial 'merit based' aid (e.g., academic, art, or music scholarship, etc.) awarded to student-athletes.	0.69

fiscal oversight). Variables were created by averaging the six responses for each respondent in each of the three construct areas coming up with one score in each of the three construct areas. As a result, each respondent had one score for academic oversight, one score for faculty governance, and one score for fiscal oversight. These generated scores were then used to conduct linear regression analysis examining the relationship between independent and dependent variables.

### Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was performed to assess the relationship between dependent and independent variables and the following Research Questions:

***Research Question 2: How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty age, tenure, academic rank, length of service, contact with athletes, NCAA affiliation, or gender?***

***Research Question 3: How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty participation in high school or college athletics?***

***Research Question 4: How does faculty satisfaction with NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletics relate to faculty perceptions of academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight in intercollegiate athletics?***

To conduct a robust regression analysis, respondents who did not answer questions on the survey were excluded resulting in a final sample of 719. Listwise deletion was used in developing the regression model.

Concerns about simultaneity between variables existed so multiple models were developed to serve as a robustness check. More specifically, it was theorized that overall faculty satisfaction could be driving contact with athletes and likewise contact with athletes could be influencing overall faculty satisfaction. For each of the following models, a robustness check was done by dropping the variable “contact with athletes” from the model.

Multicollinearity was also a concern. It was theorized that two or more of the independent variables could be highly correlated or redundant. This makes it difficult to know how important each of them is in its relationship with overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics (dependent variable). A variance inflation factor (VIF) was computed for each independent variable in each of the regression models. This calculation determined if multicollinearity was a problem in the regression analysis. None of the tests revealed issues or concerns with multicollinearity for the independent variables that were statistically significant.

Regression models were developed including various respondents and variables. In total, fourteen regression models were developed. Independent variables for each model are presented in Table 4.14 – 4.17. The dependent variable for all models is overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Model 1 includes all respondents ( $N=719$ ). With concerns about simultaneity between overall faculty satisfaction and contact with athletes, Model 2 was developed with all respondents ( $N=719$ ) while dropping the variable for contact with athletes. A  $p$ -value of  $< .05$  was established for statistical significance.

Model 3, Model 4, Model 5, and Model 6 were differentiated by faculty status. Model 3 and Model 4 included “Professors” only while Model 4 discarded the variable for contact with athletes. Model 5 and Model 6 included “Instructor”, “Adjunct”, and “Other” faculty members while Model 6 did not include the variable for contact with athletes.

Model 7, Model 8, Model 9, and Model 10 were developed according to faculty knowledge of NCAA Division III athletics. Model 7 and Model 8 included respondents that were “Not very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics while Model 8 dropped the “contact with athletes” variable. Respondents included in Model 9 and Model 10 were

“Somewhat knowledgeable”, “Knowledgeable”, or “Very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics. Model 10 dropped the variable for contact with athletes.

The final four models (Model 11 – 14) were differentiated by gender. Model 11 included all men while Model 12 was for all men while dropping the variable for contact with athletes. All women were included in Model 13 and Model 14 included all women but did not include the variable for contact with athletes.

The results of Model 1 (Table 4.14) included all respondents and showed statistical significance for independent variables academic oversight and faculty governance. As faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by over half a point ( $B=0.539, p<.001$ ). Likewise, faculty governance had a similar impact on overall faculty satisfaction. As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost one-third of a point ( $B=0.306, p<.001$ ).

Table 4.14 presents the results of regression Model 2. Included in the model were all 719 respondents. Due to concerns about simultaneity between overall faculty satisfaction and contact with athletes, the independent variable “contact with athletes” was dropped from the model. The results of Model 2 were very similar to Model 1. Academic oversight and faculty governance displayed regression coefficients that were both positive and statistically significant. This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members’ satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by a little over half a point ( $B=0.564, p<.001$ ). As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point,



Table 4.14. Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction for all respondents

Independent Variables	Regular regression coefficients ( <i>B</i> )	
	Model 1	Model 2
Academic oversight	0.539*	0.564*
Faculty governance	0.306*	0.299*
Fiscal oversight	0.086	0.080
Tenure status	0.158	0.162
Athletic participation-high school	0.065	0.069
Athletic participation-college	-0.041	-0.047
Gender	0.118	0.120
Age	0.005	0.004
Faculty status-instructor	-0.035	-0.052
Faculty status-adjunct	0.088	0.079
Faculty status-other	0.275	0.305
Years at current institution-6 to 8 years	0.077	0.078
Years at current institution-3 to 5 years	0.023	0.014
Years at current institution-less than 3 years	0.046	0.027
Contact with athletes-some interaction	0.115	---
Contact with athletes-frequent interaction	0.251	---
Contact with athletes-constant interaction	0.143	---
NCAA affiliation-Division I	0.046	0.039
NCAA affiliation-Division II	0.129	0.127
NCAA affiliation-none	-0.007	-0.023
NCAA affiliation-I don't know	-0.031	-0.030
Adjusted R Squared	0.438	0.436

\* $p < .001$ 

overall faculty satisfaction with athletics increased by almost one-third of a point ( $B=0.299$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

Respondents differentiated by “Faculty Status” are displayed in Table 4.15. Model 3 and Model 4 included “Professors” only while Model 4 discarded the variable for contact with athletes. Coefficients for academic oversight and faculty governance revealed statistical significance in Model 3. In Model 3 as faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight

Table 4.15. Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by faculty status

Independent Variables	Regular regression coefficients ( <i>B</i> )			
	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
	Professors		Instructor, adjunct, & other	
Academic oversight	0.564***	0.588***	0.324*	0.410**
Faculty governance	0.304***	0.302***	0.356*	0.281
Fiscal oversight	0.082	0.074	0.148	0.145
Tenure status	0.157	0.166	0.399	0.554
Athletic participation-high school	0.101	0.105	-0.113	-0.133
Athletic participation-college	-0.042	-0.041	0.110	0.022
Gender	0.119	0.123	0.084	0.058
Age	0.005	0.004	0.001	0.003
Years at current institution-6 to 8 years	0.021	0.020	0.370	0.330
Years at current institution-3 to 5 years	-0.057	-0.072	0.259	0.296
Years at current institution-less than 3 years	0.176	0.152	-0.266	-0.289
Contact with athletes-some interaction	0.167	---	0.096	---
Contact with athletes-frequent interaction	0.272	---	0.407	---
Contact with athletes-constant interaction	0.249	---	-0.132	---
NCAA affiliation-Division I	0.098	0.089	-0.198	-0.227
NCAA affiliation-Division II	0.123	0.117	-0.116	-0.090
NCAA affiliation-none	-0.010	-0.023	-0.059	-0.102
NCAA affiliation-I don't know	0.025	0.021	-0.259	-0.256
Adjusted R Squared	0.474	0.473	0.339	0.328

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by over one-half a point ( $B = .564$ ,  $p < .001$ ). An increase in one point in faculty satisfaction with regard to faculty governance produced almost one-third of a point increase in overall faculty satisfaction ( $B = .304$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

After dropping the variable for “contact with athletes”, similar results were found in Model 4. A one point increase in faculty satisfaction with academic oversight produced a 0.6 ( $B = .588$ ,  $p < .001$ ) point increase in overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics.

Faculty governance also displayed a coefficient that was positive and statistically significant ( $B=.302, p<.001$ ). This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members' satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost one-third of a point.

Model 5 and Model 6 included "Instructor", "Adjunct", and "Other" faculty members while Model 6 did not include the variable for contact with athletes. The variable "contact with athletes" was dropped due to concerns about simultaneity. In Model 5, independent variables for academic oversight and faculty governance displayed statistical significance. The coefficient for academic oversight was a little smaller in Model 5 compared to the previous models while the coefficient for faculty governance was about the same as previous models. As faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost one-third of a point ( $B=.324, p<.05$ ). Faculty governance also had a positive impact on overall faculty satisfaction. As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by over one-third of a point ( $B=.356, p<.05$ ).

Academic oversight produced the only statistically significant coefficient in Model 6. This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members' satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by 0.4 ( $B=.410, p<.01$ ).

Respondents differentiated by "NCAA Division III Athletic Knowledge" are displayed in Table 4.16. Model 7 and Model 8 included respondents that were "Not very

Table 4.16. Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by NCAA Division III athletic knowledge

Independent Variables	Regular regression coefficients ( <i>B</i> )			
	Model 7	Model 8	Model 9	Model 10
	Not very knowledgeable		Some knowledge	
Academic oversight	0.707***	0.725***	0.485***	0.499***
Faculty governance	0.219	0.214	0.335***	0.330***
Fiscal oversight	-0.055	-0.050	0.121	0.116
Tenure status	0.192	0.188	0.090	0.098
Athletic participation-high school	-0.125	-0.108	0.117	0.117
Athletic participation-college	-0.066	-0.092	-0.038	-0.044
Gender	0.149	0.144	0.127	0.121
Age	0.012*	0.011*	0.001	0.001
Faculty status-instructor	0.119	0.122	-0.188	-0.202
Faculty status-adjunct	0.227	0.207	0.007	0.025
Faculty status-other	0.095	0.113	0.462	0.499
Years at current institution-6 to 8 years	0.082	0.062	0.088	0.104
Years at current institution-3 to 5 years	0.242	0.219	-0.082	-0.082
Years at current institution-less than 3 years	0.301	0.254	-0.074	-0.080
Contact with athletes-some interaction	0.156	---	-0.010	---
Contact with athletes-frequent interaction	0.191	---	0.156	---
Contact with athletes-constant interaction	-0.126	---	0.046	---
NCAA affiliation-Division I	0.033	-0.046	0.072	0.071
NCAA affiliation-Division II	-0.449	-0.499	0.233	0.230
NCAA affiliation-none	-0.178	-0.184	0.050	0.033
NCAA affiliation-I don't know	-0.210	-0.209	0.173	0.190
Adjusted R Squared	0.381	0.382	0.431	0.431

\* $p < .05$ , \*\* $p < .01$ , \*\*\* $p < .001$

knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics. Respondents included in Model 9 and Model 10 were “Somewhat knowledgeable”, “Knowledgeable”, or “Very knowledgeable” about NCAA Division III athletics. Model 8 and Model 10 dropped the variable for contact with athletes due to concerns about simultaneity.

Coefficients for academic oversight and age revealed statistical significance in Model 7. In Model 7 as faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost three-fourths of a point ( $B=.707, p<.001$ ). Aging by faculty also produced an increase in overall faculty satisfaction. An increase in faculty age by ten years revealed an increase in overall faculty satisfaction by about one-tenth of a point ( $B=.012, p<.05$ ). By comparing a faculty member 30 years of age to a faculty member 60 years of age would reveal the elder faculty member having an overall satisfaction about three tenths higher than the younger faculty member.

After dropping the variable for “contact with athletes”, similar results were found in Model 8. A one point increase in faculty satisfaction with academic oversight produced a 0.7 ( $B=.725, p<.001$ ) point increase in overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Age also displayed a coefficient that was positive and statistically significant ( $B=.011, p<.05$ ). This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty age they become more satisfied with intercollegiate athletics. A ten-year increase in age produces about one tenth of a point increase in satisfaction with athletics.

The results of Model 9 showed statistical significance for independent variables academic oversight and faculty governance. Respondents in Model 9 and Model 10 were at least ‘somewhat knowledgeable’ about NCAA Division III athletics. In Model 9 as faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by about one-half a point ( $B=.485, p<.001$ ). Likewise, faculty governance had a similar impact on overall faculty satisfaction

with athletics. An increase in one point of faculty satisfaction with regard to faculty governance produced an increase in overall faculty satisfaction of 0.3 ( $B=.335, p<.001$ ).

Table 4.16 presents the results of regression Model 10. Due to concerns about simultaneity between overall faculty satisfaction and contact with athletes, the independent variable ‘contact with athletes’ was dropped from the model. The results of Model 10 were very similar to Model 9. Academic oversight and faculty governance displayed regression coefficients that were both positive and statistically significant. This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members’ satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by half a point ( $B=.499, p<.001$ ). As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with athletics increased by one-third of a point ( $B=.330, p<.001$ ).

Table 4.17 displays regression results by gender. Model 11 and Model 12 included all men. All women were included in Model 13 and Model 14. Model 12 and Model 14 didn’t include the variable for contact with athletes. Coefficients for academic oversight and faculty governance revealed statistical significance in Model 11. In Model 11 as faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost three-fourths of a point ( $B=.718, p<.001$ ). An increase in one point in faculty satisfaction with regard to faculty governance produced almost one-fifth of a point increase in overall faculty satisfaction ( $B=.184, p<.01$ ).

After dropping the variable for “contact with athletes”, similar results were found in Model 12. A one point increase in faculty satisfaction with academic oversight produced a

Table 4.17. Summary of regression analysis for overall faculty satisfaction by gender

Independent Variables	Regular regression coefficients ( <i>B</i> )			
	Model 11	Model 12	Model 13	Model 14
	Men		Women	
Academic oversight	0.718**	0.730**	0.323**	0.372**
Faculty governance	0.184*	0.181*	0.519**	0.499**
Fiscal oversight	0.094	0.093	0.015	-0.003
Tenure status	0.064	0.059	0.172	0.186
Athletic participation-high school	0.071	0.076	0.013	0.019
Athletic participation-college	-0.066	-0.067	-0.007	-0.031
Gender	---	---	---	---
Age	0.006	0.006	0.002	0.002
Faculty status-instructor	-0.194	-0.205	0.102	0.070
Faculty status-adjunct	0.014	0.000	0.105	0.106
Faculty status-other	0.367	0.419	0.090	0.133
Years at current institution-6 to 8 years	0.141	0.140	-0.012	0.000
Years at current institution-3 to 5 years	0.016	0.004	-0.047	-0.049
Years at current institution-less than 3 years	-0.034	-0.047	0.051	0.028
Contact with athletes-some interaction	0.077	---	0.146	---
Contact with athletes-frequent interaction	0.175	---	0.358	---
Contact with athletes-constant interaction	0.101	---	0.145	---
NCAA affiliation-Division I	0.074	0.074	0.004	-0.015
NCAA affiliation-Division II	0.038	0.044	0.113	0.101
NCAA affiliation-none	0.258	0.251	-0.297	-0.329
NCAA affiliation-I don't know	-0.021	-0.020	-0.107	-0.099
Adjusted R Squared	0.504	0.506	0.341	0.336

\* $p < .01$ , \*\* $p < .001$ 

0.7 ( $B = .730$ ,  $p < .001$ ) point increase in overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Faculty governance also displayed a coefficient that was positive and statistically significant ( $B = .181$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members' satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost one fifth of a point.

The results of Model 13 (Table 4.17) included all women and showed statistical significance for independent variables academic oversight and faculty governance. As faculty satisfaction with regard to academic oversight increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by almost one-third of a point ( $B=.323$ ,  $p<.001$ ). Faculty governance had a similar impact on overall faculty satisfaction. As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by over one-half a point ( $B=.519$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

The final regression model is for all women and is displayed as Model 14. Due to concerns about simultaneity between overall faculty satisfaction and contact with athletes, the independent variable ‘contact with athletes’ was dropped from the model. The results of Model 14 were very similar to Model 13. Academic oversight and faculty governance displayed regression coefficients that were both positive and statistically significant. This can be interpreted to suggest that as faculty members’ satisfaction with the amount of influence they possess with academic oversight increases by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics increased by a little over one-third of a point ( $B=.372$ ,  $p<.001$ ). As faculty satisfaction with faculty governance increased by one point, overall faculty satisfaction with athletics increased by one-half a point ( $B=.499$ ,  $p<.001$ ).

For the other models, the coefficients for academic oversight were commonly larger than the coefficients for faculty governance but with ‘women’ (Model 13 and Model 14) the faculty governance coefficients were larger than the coefficients for academic oversight.

Also, when comparing coefficients for males and females from Model 11 and Model 12 with Model 13 and Model 14, males had higher coefficients for academic oversight while women had higher coefficients for faculty governance.



### Summary

In summary and in response to Research Question 1, descriptive statistics revealed that NCAA Division III faculty are generally satisfied with intercollegiate athletics at their respective institutions. Faculty with “more than 8 years” experience had the highest satisfaction mean scores while those with tenure had higher satisfaction scores than those without tenure. Experience as a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) prompted higher satisfaction scores when compared to faculty with no FAR experience. Participation in high school or college athletics did not produce a difference in overall satisfaction among faculty. Men were typically more satisfied than women with athletics while faculty who attended more athletic events or were more knowledgeable about athletics had higher satisfaction scores. Older faculty had higher satisfaction scores and those faculty who had more interaction and contact with athletes also had higher mean satisfaction scores.

In response to Research Questions 2 – 4, faculty satisfaction with athletics seems to be related to academic oversight, faculty governance, and age. In all, fourteen regression models were developed to address these research questions. In eleven of the fourteen models, academic oversight and faculty governance were revealed to possess a positive and statistically significant relationship with overall faculty satisfaction. This indicates that as faculty are more satisfied with their influence over academic oversight and faculty governance of athletics, their overall satisfaction with athletics increases. In the other three models, academic oversight displayed a positive relationship with overall faculty satisfaction while age also had a similar relationship in two of the models.

Consistently, academic oversight was more influential on overall faculty satisfaction with athletics than perceptions of faculty governance. Women displayed a different pattern of

influence with regard to overall satisfaction with athletics. Women's perceptions of overall satisfaction with athletics were more influenced by faculty governance issues than academic oversight. This was a unique characteristic of faculty governance and academic oversight involving women that was different from the other models.

From the collection of data and all the inquiry, perceptions of academic oversight and faculty governance seem to possess considerable influence over faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. This seemed to be a consistent finding in the results of this study.

## CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

### Summary

The NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey was developed to gather information pertaining to faculty members overall satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. This study used the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey to study 911 faculty members at 25 randomly selected NCAA Division III institutions. Results provided further understanding about overall faculty satisfaction with athletics, faculty demographics, faculty oversight of academics, faculty governance of athletics, and faculty oversight of fiscal matters concerning intercollegiate athletics. Ultimately, a better understanding of faculty satisfaction with athletics was attained. This survey was one of the few attempts to collect data on NCAA Division III faculty perceptions of athletics. It was designed to assess faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics.

For the purpose of this survey, respondents who did not complete any questions regarding faculty satisfaction were eliminated from the sample. A total of 911 participants representing 25 NCAA Division III institutions remained in the sample, for a 11.7% return rate.

Listwise deletion was used in developing the descriptive statistics and regression analysis for this study. Respondents who didn't answer questions on the survey were dropped from the analysis thus the sample size of 719 was reported in descriptive statistics and for the regression analysis.

After the data were cleaned, descriptive statistics and multiple regression analyses were conducted in an effort to gain new insight into the variables affecting faculty satisfaction with athletics. Participants were asked to respond to 14 demographic questions and 19 questions related to faculty satisfaction with athletics, including overall faculty satisfaction.

This research assists in developing a more accurate understanding of faculty perceptions of NCAA Division III athletics and builds upon previous work in an attempt to further explain faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Finally, this study sought to identify the relationship between faculty satisfaction with athletics and variables identified in the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey.

These findings and conclusions are intended to inform policymakers, administrators, and individuals who work directly with intercollegiate athletics. The findings of this study provide insight into factors that influence faculty satisfaction with athletics. The data collected by the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey spans far beyond the scope of this study and many opportunities for future research. This chapter is organized into five sections: (a) Discussion; (b) Limitations; (c) Implications; (d) Future Research; and (e) Final Thoughts.

### **Discussion**

To establish a general demographic profile of the 719 participants, the study began by exploring the background characteristics of the respondents. In terms of length of service, results from the survey indicate almost 55.5% of the participants have worked at their current institution more than eight years. Overall satisfaction with athletics' mean scores increased

with years of service at an institution. This finding supports the research of Cockley et al. (1994), Kuga (1996), and Lawrence et al. (2009) whose findings revealed past experiences to influence feelings of satisfaction for faculty.

Of the 719 respondents, 78.4% were Professors. The majority of respondents did possess tenure (55.4%) while only 7.1% had experience as a Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR). Respondents with tenure status did have a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.9$  compared to  $M=3.6$  for respondents without tenure. Faculty with experience as a FAR had a mean score of  $M=4.2$  whereas those without FAR experience had a mean overall satisfaction score of  $M=3.7$ . This again supports the work of Cockley et al. (1994), Kuga (1996), and Lawrence et al. (2009) where past experiences tend to influence feelings of satisfaction for faculty.

Participation in high school athletics was common for respondents with 61.1% participating while only 24.9% participated in college athletics. Satisfaction scores for those who participated in high school athletics  $M=3.8$  were higher than those who did not participate  $M=3.7$ . Those who participated in college athletics had a satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$  while those who did not participate also had a mean score of  $M=3.8$ . Kuga (1996) found results where faculty who previously participated in athletics were more satisfied with athletics than those who had not participated. The results of the current study would seem to contradict the results of Kuga (1996).

In terms of gender, 56.2% of respondents were male while 43.8% were female. Contradicting previous research (Kuga, 1996), males ( $M=3.9$ ) were found to be more satisfied with athletics than women ( $M=3.6$ ). Of the 719 respondents who reported their ethnicity, 663 were "White" (92.2%) with a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$ .

Majority of respondents (39.1%) attended less than 3 athletic events per semester while 27.8% of respondents didn't attend any athletic events. Cockley and Roswal (1994) revealed faculty who were more connected with athletics exhibit higher satisfaction scores. This study would support these findings as respondents attended more events or competitions, the higher their overall satisfaction with athletics. Faculty who did not attend any athletic events had a mean score of  $M=3.3$ , while those who attended less than three events per semester had a mean score of  $M=3.8$ . Mean satisfaction scores continued to increase for participants who attended three to six events per semester  $M=4.1$  and for those who attended more than six events  $M=4.1$ .

Knowledge and understanding of NCAA Division III athletics varied among respondents. Most participants (37.4%) rated themselves as "somewhat knowledgeable" about Division III athletics while 33.7% were "not very knowledgeable". It would seem to make sense that knowledge and understanding about athletics would impact overall satisfaction with athletic programming. There seemed to be a positive relationship between athletic knowledge and overall satisfaction with athletics. Respondents that rated themselves as 'not very knowledgeable' about athletics had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.5$ . The other three knowledge ratings for respondents all had higher satisfaction scores. Faculty who were "somewhat knowledgeable" had an overall satisfaction score of  $M=3.7$ . Faculty who were "knowledgeable" had a satisfaction score of  $M=4.2$  while those who were 'very knowledgeable' had a overall satisfaction score of  $M=4.1$ . This would again support the research of Cockley et al. (1994), Kuga (1996), and Lawrence et al. (2009) where past experiences tend to influence feelings of satisfaction for faculty.

Cockley and Roswal (1994) found that faculty who had athletes in class had positive perceptions or were more satisfied with athletic programming. Contact and interaction with athletes was expected to impact overall faculty satisfaction with athletics. Most respondents indicated that they had “some interaction” (40.1%,  $M=3.6$ ) with student athletes followed by those who had ‘frequent interaction’ (35.2%,  $M=4.0$ ). Mean scores for overall satisfaction with athletics seemed to increase as respondents had more contact and interaction with student athletes. Low scores were seen for respondents who had “no interaction” with student athletes  $M=3.1$  and higher scores were reported for those participants who had constant interaction with student athletes  $M=3.9$ .

The mean age for respondents was 49.2 years old, with most of the respondents age 40 to 49. Satisfaction scores increased consistently for respondents from age 30 to 39 ( $M=3.5$ ) to those age 60 and older ( $M=3.9$ ). For respondents age 30 and older, their satisfaction with athletics seemed to increase with age.

Faculty background in Division III athletics may influence feelings of satisfaction. Cockley and Roswal (1994) and Lawrence et al. (2009) found that faculty background or association with Division III institutions may impact overall satisfaction with athletics. The majority of respondents (39.8%) obtained their undergraduate degree from an NCAA Division III institution while 36.0% graduated from a Division I school. Faculty who obtained their undergraduate degree from a Division II institution had the highest satisfaction scores  $M = 3.9$  while respondents who attended a Division I school had a mean score of  $M=3.8$ . Graduates of Division III schools also had a mean satisfaction score of  $M=3.8$ .

The mean score for overall faculty satisfaction with athletics was  $M=3.8$  while almost two-thirds of the respondents (62.5%) indicated being somewhat satisfied or very satisfied in

the athletic program at their institution. This displays a general sense of satisfaction among faculty toward intercollegiate athletics.

This study supports the notion that perceptions and past experiences of faculty play a critical role in their satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Lawrence et al. (2009) found that faculty led reform of intercollegiate athletics focused on three areas: academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight. Faculty perceptions of influence over admissions, academic support, academic achievement, and program of studies promotes feelings of satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000). As faculty feel control and a sense of responsibility over student-athlete's academic endeavors, satisfaction with athletics increases.

Faculty were most satisfied with the amount of influence they possess over classes student athletes take while enrolled  $M=3.8$  and with graduation rates of student athletes  $M=3.8$  (see Table 4.9). The integration of student athletes into academic experiences had a mean score of  $M=3.7$  followed by academic support  $M=3.6$ , academic performance of student athletes  $M=3.6$ , and the admission process for student athletes  $M=3.3$ .

With regard to satisfaction levels, 60.9% of respondents were either 'somewhat satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the amount of influence they possess regarding the academic performance of student athletes, followed by 59.0% for the integration of student athletes into academic experiences, 57.6% for the graduation rate of student athletes, 57.2% for the classes student athletes take while enrolled, 52.7% for academic support, and 32.1% for the admission process of student athletes.

Faculty perceptions of governance and control over athletics also relates to satisfaction. When faculty view athletics as an auxiliary enterprise where a disconnect



occurs between athletics and the mission of the institution, faculty are less satisfied with athletics. A sense of control, responsibility, and consistency between the educational mission and athletic mission promotes a sense of faculty satisfaction (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; Trail et al., 2000). Cockley and Roswal (1994) indicated feelings of empowerment and the ability to make changes result in faculty who are more satisfied with athletics. Lawrence (2009) also asserted that faculty who believe academic issues are resolved through collaborative decision making also feel a sense of shared governance is in place with intercollegiate athletics. Faculty satisfaction with athletics appears to have an association with feelings of shared governance.

Satisfaction with faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics is reported in Table 4.10. Mean scores concerning faculty governance of athletics were lower compared to scores for academic oversight. Of the 719 that responded to the question concerning their ability to contact and interact with Faculty Athletic Representatives, 43.3% were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with a mean score of  $M=3.5$ . The mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M=3.4$  with 44.8% being ‘somewhat satisfied or “very satisfied”. The mean score for the governing process of intercollegiate athletics was 3.1 with 25.9% of the respondents being satisfied. The ability to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M=3.0$  with 20.9% of the respondents being satisfied. The ability to control and govern intercollegiate athletics had a mean score of  $M=3.0$  with 18.5% of respondents being satisfied while the ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics had mean score of  $M=2.9$  while 19.5% of the participants were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied”.

The control of money also influences perceptions of faculty. Lawrence et al. (2009) indicated that faculty who feel involved and responsible in the budgeting process for athletics are more satisfied. Also, the perception of transparency in the athletic department concerning issues of finance results in faculty being more satisfied with athletics. From this finding, fiscal oversight also contributes to faculty satisfaction with athletics.

Faculty satisfaction with fiscal oversight of athletics is provided in Table 4.11. Faculty were most satisfied with the amount of influence they possess over financial “merit based” aid  $M=3.2$  and with financial “need based” aid  $M=3.2$ . The coach’s salaries had a mean score of  $M = 2.9$  while money spent recruiting student athletes also had a mean score of  $M=2.9$ , followed by the budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics  $M=2.8$ , and the money spent on facilities  $M=2.7$ .

Of the 719 participants that responded to the question concerning financial ‘merit based’ aid, 28.4% were either “somewhat satisfied” or “very satisfied” with the amount of influence they possess, followed by 26.1% for financial “need based” aid, 24.1% for the money spent on athletic facilities, 18.8% for coach’s salaries, 18.3% for money spent recruiting student athletes, and 16.1% for the budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics.

Similar to previous research, perceptions of faculty were found to relate to satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. To better understand faculty satisfaction with athletics, several regression analyses were conducted. As a result, a relationship was found between dependent and independent variables. Consistently, a relationship was found to exist between faculty satisfaction with athletics (dependent variable) and academic oversight and faculty governance (independent variables). In two of the regression models age influenced faculty satisfaction.

Faculty oversight and feelings of satisfaction with academics typically produced the greatest influence on overall faculty satisfaction with athletics. When all respondents were considered, academic oversight was more influential on overall faculty satisfaction than faculty governance (Model 1 and Model 2). When only “Professors” were included in the model (Model 3 and Model 4), academic oversight was still more influential on faculty satisfaction with athletics than faculty governance. As “Professors” were excluded from the analysis (Model 5 and Model 6), the influence of academic oversight and faculty governance on overall faculty satisfaction became very comparable. This indicates the influence of faculty empowerment and the ability faculty have to make decisions concerning academic oversight. “Professors” appear to be more influenced by feelings of academic oversight than “Instructors”, “Adjuncts”, and “Others”. The more “Professors” are satisfied with their amount of academic oversight, the greater their increase in their overall satisfaction with athletics. This would seem to make sense that “Professors” protect the ideals of higher education and as a result greatly influence the academic performance, admission process, academic support, classes offered, graduation rate, and integration of student-athletes into the academic experience. Professors more so than instructors and adjuncts feel compelled that they should possess academic oversight. This finding supports previous research regarding faculty perceptions of influence over academic issues (Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000).

Knowledge about NCAA Division III athletics seems to influence how academic oversight, faculty governance, and age relate to overall faculty satisfaction with athletics. Faculty with the least amount of knowledge about NCAA Division III athletics (Model 7 and Model 8) are most influenced by academic oversight. Faculty governance was not found to

influence their overall satisfaction with athletics but as they age their overall satisfaction with athletics improved. Faculty with little knowledge of intercollegiate athletics most likely do not understand the governing process; therefore, faculty governance does not contribute to their overall satisfaction with athletics. This would again support the research of Lawrence et al. (2009); Cockley et al. (1994); and Kuga (1996) where past experiences tend to influence feelings of satisfaction for faculty.

Faculty with knowledge of NCAA Division III athletics were influenced by perceptions of academic oversight and faculty governance (Model 9 and Model 10). As faculty understand the governing process of athletics, the policies and procedures, the mission and goals, interact with FARs, and how to influence the role of athletics; their overall satisfaction with athletics was more influenced by academic oversight than faculty governance. Faculty background and knowledge of Division III athletics may influence feelings of satisfaction or what perceptions influence satisfaction. Cockley and Roswal (1994), and Lawrence et al. (2009) found that faculty background or association with Division III institutions may impact overall satisfaction with athletics.

Gender seemed to influence the results of the regression analysis (Model 11 – 14). Male faculty perceptions of academic oversight were more influential on overall satisfaction with athletics than perceptions of academic oversight for women. On the other hand, women faculty were more influenced by perceptions of faculty governance than men. Women were more influenced than men in their overall satisfaction with athletics by perceptions of satisfaction with faculty governance. As a result, men and women and their overall satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics were differentiated by their perceptions of influence

and satisfaction with regard to academic oversight and faculty governance. Men were more influenced by academic oversight and women were more influenced by faculty governance.

This was a unique characteristic of the data in that for most of the regression models academic oversight was more influential on overall faculty satisfaction than faculty governance. For women, faculty governance was more influential than academic oversight.

In this study, perceptions of faculty satisfaction concerning academic oversight and faculty governance consistently revealed a positive relationship with overall faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. This indicates that as faculty are more satisfied with their influence over academic oversight and faculty governance of athletics, their overall satisfaction with athletics increases. In the interest of improving faculty satisfaction with athletics, it would benefit institutions and athletic departments alike to proactively include faculty in the academic oversight of student-athletes and the faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics.

### **Limitations**

There are several limitations from the results of this study that should be addressed:

1. The data gathering procedure entailed utilizing an electronic survey instrument, the willingness, interest, and ability of the individuals to respond to all questions, to respond within the timeline of the survey, and to respond accurately cannot be controlled by the researcher.
2. This study was further limited in that it does not provide information about the faculty members who chose not to respond to the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. Perhaps the length of the survey, interest in the

- study, or knowledge of the topic caused individuals to not complete and submit the survey.
3. The study relied on voluntary participation from those who received the survey via e-mail.
  4. This study was limited to participants who self-reported on the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey.
  5. Participants in this study had various knowledge levels about NCAA Division III athletics.
  6. Participants in this study had various knowledge levels about issues related to academic oversight, faculty governance, and fiscal oversight.
  7. The study relied on e-mail addresses from institutional websites which could not be confirmed to be 100% accurate. The principal investigator searched institutional websites to obtain e-mail addresses for faculty.
  8. This study did not enable the researcher to measure change in satisfaction over time.
  9. The study included 25 institutions due to the feasibility of obtaining faculty e-mail addresses.

### **Implications**

Faculty satisfaction with athletics continues to be a topic of discussion at the institutional level as well as within conferences and across the landscape of the NCAA. Students, faculty, and staff can all benefit from a better understanding and knowledge of faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. Students, faculty, conferences, institutions, and Division III membership can all benefit from reviewing the data collected in this study.

Results from this study raised numerous questions for researchers to consider. These findings have implications at the institutional level, conference level, and for the NCAA.

### **Division III institutions**

1. Institutions need to strive to provide faculty with sole authority to influence the academic performance of student athletes. Faculty must be involved to influence all areas concerning academics.

At the institutional level, faculty must monitor, influence, and control the academic pursuits of student athletes. Often as the influence of intercollegiate athletics and competing at a high level can create differing goals for athletic officials and those in academia, it is important that faculty protect the integrity of higher education. The intent of attending college and participating as a student athlete is to complete a degree.

Faculty must ensure and involve themselves in the admission process and oversee that academic support is provided to student athletes. Classes taken by student athletes must be continually monitored and through this oversight, hopefully graduation rates improve. The academic experience of student athletes can be greatly affected through class attendance, internships, and joining clubs and organizations. Faculty must possess oversight of these activities as well.

2. Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) currently possess the authority to help govern and regulate athletics at the institutional level. Institutions need to include FARs and faculty in the governing process of athletics through developing the mission and goals of athletics.

As faculty obtain more influence and are more satisfied with their role in the development of the athletic mission, the more satisfied they are with the overall athletic program. This only makes sense as faculty serve to educate students in the classroom, they should also have input how all facets of instruction operate, including athletics. The role of the FAR varies greatly among institutions and across conferences. Some FARs control and vote for policies and procedures that govern athletics while others have very little decision making authority. In order to improve faculty satisfaction with athletics and protect the integrity of higher education, it would seem imperative that faculty involvement in athletic decision making would be necessary and important.

In order to involve faculty in the governing process of athletics, they need to have a voice in developing policies and procedures that govern athletics. They need to feel that they can influence change and impact the role of athletics. FARs and faculty need to be in contact and understand each other's role in the governing process. As a result with faculty more involved in the governing process of athletics, faculty should be more satisfied with athletics and institutions should be better serving student athletes.

3. Knowledge of athletics seems to be a deterrent for faculty in fully understanding the role of NCAA Division III athletics. Also, understanding how intercollegiate athletics function and its mission may be helpful. Better understanding of the role of athletics may be helpful for faculty, student athletes, coaches, administrators, and FARs as well.

Student athletes, coaches, administrators, FARs, and faculty need to continually work together to fully understand and educate each other on the role of intercollegiate athletics.



The intent of Division III athletics is to collaborate with the educational mission of the institution to provide student athletes growth and learning opportunities.

The NCAA Division III Identity Initiative Quantitative Research Report identified that faculty agreed that Division III institutions adhered to or fulfilled the Division III philosophy but their agreement was noticeably less than Presidents, Athletic Directors, Coaches, and Student-Athletes (NCAA, 2009). While overall, most faculty strongly believed members schools were fulfilling the philosophy of Division III, faculty opinions were noticeably lower than other constituents. Ninety-nine percent of Presidents and Athletic Directors felt institutions were fulfilling the Division III philosophy whereas seventy-nine percent of faculty possessed the same view (NCAA, 2009). From this research, it seems more information and knowledge about intercollegiate athletics is needed.

4. The current status of state and federal budgets suggests an increase use of institutional funds to support college programming. Whether an institution is public or private, the economic crisis has generated considerable thought for how institutions spend their money. More specifically, how institutions spend money on athletics.

Many Division III institutions are private while some are also public but all share concerns about budgets and spending. Considerable scrutiny has led many to believe that less money should be spent on intercollegiate athletics. Institutional leaders need to develop policies that provide faculty oversight of fiscal matters and how institutions spend their money.

5. Institutions must address factors that lead to faculty satisfaction with athletics.

In addition to providing faculty with academic oversight over student athletes, governance over athletics, and oversight of fiscal matters, the researcher suggests that each

institution assess their own faculty to determine institutional needs concerning faculty satisfaction with athletics. This study found that as faculty age, obtain tenure, and serve as a FAR, their satisfaction with athletics increases. Likewise for faculty who participated in athletics, attended athletic events on campus, and were more knowledgeable about athletics, they were more satisfied with the athletic program at their institution. Also, men were more satisfied with athletics than women and faculty who had more contact with student athletes were more satisfied than those with less contact or interaction. And finally, as faculty age they seem to be more satisfied with athletics.

As institutions better understand faculty satisfaction with athletics, the culture on campus will improve and provide for a better environment for student athletes and faculty. Professional development activities for faculty can be scheduled to address issues dealing with faculty perceptions of athletics. At many Division III institutions, a large percentage of the student body consists of student athletes so understanding faculty satisfaction with athletics can greatly impact the environment and culture on campus.

### **Athletic conferences**

At the conference level, some Faculty Athletic Representatives (FAR) possess the authority to make many decisions concerning policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics.

1. It is the recommendation by the researcher that all Division III conferences develop a plan for incorporating FARs into the decision making processes for policies and procedures that govern athletics.

Conferences have therefore provided a voice for faculty to influence intercollegiate athletics and protect the integrity of higher education. Responsibility lies within each institution to connect FARs with faculty to communicate the happenings and information about intercollegiate athletics. From the perspective of faculty, they have the ability to influence and govern intercollegiate athletics through the voice of the FAR. The difficulty lies in the fact that many faculty do not understand the role of the FAR or how to work through the appropriate channels to influence change in athletics or simply do not have an interest.

2. Issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics involve perceptions that faculty and academia no longer influence or control athletic programming.

Faculty need a voice to influence and control intercollegiate athletics. Reports have described the problems that exist in intercollegiate sports and have offered recommendations to improve the educational experiences for student-athletes. The Association has been called out to protect and preserve the traditional educational values and academic standards and demand more active faculty engagement and oversight of intercollegiate athletics. Reforms are needed in admissions and financial aid practices, closer faculty monitoring of college athletes and their academic progress, and better management of financial operations of the athletics program (AAUP, 1989, 1991; Kuga, 1996; Lawrence, 2009; Lawrence et al., 2009). As conferences, administrators, and faculty get more involved and further regulate athletics, the end result will further benefit student athletes and the educational system as a whole.

## NCAA

1. Continued support for faculty involvement in intercollegiate athletics will facilitate positive change. Faculty need to be involved in the decision making process for policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics. Faculty also need to be involved at the institutional level with athletic departments being held accountable.

Currently there is a good deal of support through the Faculty Athletic Representative Association and the NCAA for redefining the role of FARs. There is also talk about more accountability for FARs in their oversight of intercollegiate athletics. In the future FARs may serve as more of a compliance officer in holding athletic departments accountable to their intended mission and goals.

2. At the institutional level, the NCAA can help develop assessment tools or surveys to monitor faculty satisfaction with athletics. This survey or assessment could be completed on an annual basis at all Division III schools.

Institutions and the NCAA can use the information collected to benchmark current faculty satisfaction with athletics and track changes over time. This information should be publicly reported and become a part of the continuous improvement process. In addition, this research allows institutions to compare locally collected data with a statewide and national data set. The NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey can be used as a guide for the development of a survey instrument.

### Future Research

Faculty are part of every institution in the country. This study attempted to better understand faculty satisfaction with athletics. Collecting data from a greater number faculty

at more institutions using an online instrument is logical for the future. This study did not explore all variables collected by the NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics Survey. In addition to faculty satisfaction with athletics, several other areas may be studied in the future. Perspectives of student athletes, athletic directors, coaches, and presidents may be interesting to compare.

Results from this research raise numerous issues that warrant future research. For example, further research should be conducted to explore faculty satisfaction with athletics as it pertains more specifically to academic oversight. Interviewing and talking with faculty members may be an interesting process of research and collecting data.

It would be helpful to work in collaboration with a conference or the NCAA in collecting and analyzing data to include more institutions and subjects in the research. NCAA Division III includes over 400 institutions so a wide array of research options exist.

This research did not address the group of individuals who did not respond to the survey. It would be interesting to know more about this group of non respondents and who they were and why they didn't respond.

Finally, in addition to the quantitative components of this study, incorporating qualitative components in future research would yield valuable information from faculty members. Interviewing faculty members would allow the researcher to collect data that was not asked or easily accessible from the survey. Information collected from qualitative methods would provide valuable information that could add to the findings of this research.

### **Final Thoughts**

The societal interest in college athletics has never been higher. With this escalating interest, has the educational component of the athletic experience improved for student athletes? This is a question that I think is very important for those with authority in higher education to answer. Faculty serve as the catalyst in educating students and ensuring that classroom instruction prepares students. On top of classroom instruction, extracurricular activities also provide students with great learning opportunities. These activities may include internships, job shadowing, student government, music, and intercollegiate athletics.

In recent years, intercollegiate athletics have begun to expend more and more resources causing some to question its role in higher education. Millions of dollars are spent on facilities, coach's salaries, and recruiting budgets. Faculty have been ones to raise some very important questions. As a result, it is important to get the perspective of faculty and find out what they think about the current state of intercollegiate athletics and their satisfaction. Because of the interest in athletics and the questions faculty raise, it is imperative to better understand faculty satisfaction with athletics.

The challenges faced by faculty and institutions are many, but if intercollegiate athletics and higher education are to coexist, some things may need to be done to keep faculty satisfied and protect the integrity of higher education. It is necessary to keep faculty involved in the decision making process for intercollegiate athletics. This can be accomplished through the Faculty Athletic Representative but also all faculty need to feel they have a voice in how decisions are made. It is especially important to include faculty with decisions involving academic oversight but also decisions regarding athletic governance. It is also important to understand that satisfaction with athletics may vary for

men and women or for those with or without tenure status. Other factors such as length of service, experience with athletics, participation in athletics, athletic events attended, athletic knowledge, interaction with athletes, and age may all influence satisfaction with athletics.

As institutions look for answers to improve faculty satisfaction with athletics, the top priority would include providing greater faculty involvement in issues concerning academic oversight of student athletes. In addition, communication and information regarding issues of faculty governance and explanation of how athletic decisions are made will help faculty obtain the knowledge they need to be more aware of the athletic governance structure and improve satisfaction.

Satisfaction with any entity or group can depend on many factors. With athletics and faculty, it seems as though communication and influence can make a difference.

Communication and information allows for faculty to better understand the role of intercollegiate athletics while the more they feel influential over academic issues and athletic governance, the more satisfied they will be with intercollegiate athletics.

APPENDIX A. NCAA DIVISION III FACULTY SATISFACTION WITH  
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS SURVEY

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with  
Intercollegiate Athletics Survey**

The future of higher education relies on many important decisions in the years ahead. Some of these decisions involve intercollegiate athletics. This survey is intended to obtain a better understanding of faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Division III institutions. These faculty perspectives will hopefully guide administrators in making decisions that are in the best interests of higher education. Please answer the following questions and statements as they pertain to the NCAA Division III intercollegiate athletic program at your institution.

This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. There are minimal risks involved in taking this survey. Your responses will be kept confidential and will be available only to the researcher for analysis and reporting purposes. This is done to ensure your responses remain confidential and encourage you to respond as freely as possible. Participation is voluntary.

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this survey of faculty at NCAA Division III institutions.



**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**Faculty Perspectives and Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics**

**How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the intercollegiate athletic program at your institution?**

Very Dissatisfied      Somewhat Dissatisfied      Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied      Somewhat Satisfied      Very Satisfied

## IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**In this section of questions, we are interested in how you feel about the amount of influence you possess with the athletics program at your institution.**

**Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following statements concerning faculty oversight of academics for student-athletes at your institution.**

**How satisfied are you with the amount of influence you possess in the following areas?**

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The admission process for student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The academic performance of enrolled student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The academic support (e.g.-tutoring, advising, counseling, etc.) provided to student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The classes student-athletes take while enrolled.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The graduation rate of student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The integration of student-athletes into academic experiences (e.g.-athletes participating in academic programming such as going to class, joining clubs and organizations, internships, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**In this section of questions, we are interested in how you feel about the amount of influence you possess with the athletics program at your institution.**

**Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following statements concerning faculty governance of intercollegiate athletics at your institution.**

**How satisfied are you with the amount of influence you possess in the following areas?**

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The governing process of intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ability to influence change in policies and procedures that govern intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The mission and goals of intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ability to contact and interact with faculty athletic representatives (FARs) to impact the governance of intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ability to influence the role of intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The ability to control and govern intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**In this section of questions, we are interested in how you feel about the amount of influence you possess with the athletics program at your institution.**

**Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following statements concerning faculty oversight of fiscal activities involving intercollegiate athletics at your institution.**

**How satisfied are you with the amount of influence you possess in the following areas?**

	Very Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
The budgeting process for intercollegiate athletics.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The money spent on athletic facilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The money spent recruiting student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The financial 'need based' aid (e.g.-Pell Grant, SEOG, etc.) awarded to student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The coach's salaries.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The financial 'merit based' aid (e.g.-academic, art, or music scholarship, etc.)awarded to student-athletes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### **Demographic Information**

**How many years have you been at your current institution?**

- Less than 3 years  
 3-5 years  
 6-8 years  
 More than 8 years

**What is your current faculty status?**

- Professor (e.g. full, associate, or assistant professor)  
 Instructor (e.g. full-time employee but not tenured faculty member)  
 Adjunct (e.g. teach courses on a part-time basis)  
 Other: (please explain)

**Do you currently have tenure status?**

- Yes  
 No

**Do you serve, or have you served as Faculty Athletic Representative?**

- Yes  
 No

**Did you participate in high school athletics?**

- Yes  
 No

**Did you participate in college athletics?**

- Yes  
 No

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**What is your gender?**

- Male
- Female

**What is your ethnicity?**

- White
- African-American
- Asian
- Hispanic/Latino
- Pacific Islander
- Other

**How many athletic events/competitions do you attend in a semester?**

- None
- Less than 3
- 3-6
- More than 6

**How would you rate your knowledge and understanding of NCAA Division III athletics?**

- Not very knowledgeable    Somewhat knowledgeable    Knowledgeable    Very knowledgeable
- 

**How would you describe your interaction and contact with student-athletes on campus?**

- No interaction (e.g.--never talk to or have contact with student athletes on campus).
- Some interaction (e.g.--talk to and interact with student athletes 1-3 times per week).
- Frequent interaction (e.g.--talk to and interact with student athletes 4-10 times per week).
- Constant interaction (e.g.--talk to and interact with student athletes more than 10 times per week).

**IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY**  
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

**What is your current age?**

**From what institution did you obtain your undergraduate degree?**

**With regard to the institution where you obtained your undergraduate degree, to which NCAA athletic affiliation or division did the institution belong?**

- NCAA Division I
- NCAA Division II
- NCAA Division III
- None of the above
- I don't know

## APPENDIX B. PARTICIPANT LETTER

Dear (First Name):

Currently, higher education is facing many critical issues and concerns. One of those issues or concerns involves intercollegiate athletics. My name is Kevin Sanger and I am a doctoral student at Iowa State University. As part of my program of study, I am conducting research on **NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics**. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding with regard to faculty satisfaction and intercollegiate athletics. I would like to ask for your participation in my study. Please click on the link below to access the survey.

(Survey link)

As an instructor and/or faculty member, your feedback is an important part of efforts to improve educational experiences for student-athletes. This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. The survey is designed to obtain your perspective about faculty satisfaction, intercollegiate athletics, and higher education. Your participation is important because survey results will help administrators and governing officials further understand changes that need to be made within higher education and intercollegiate athletics.

There are minimal risks involved in taking this survey. Your survey responses will be kept confidential and will be available only to the researcher for analysis and reporting purposes. Results of responses will be provided in summary form only so individual data will not be revealed. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, both the survey and the data will be stored on a secure server and on a hard drive that is password protected. This is done to ensure your responses remain confidential and encourage you to respond as freely as possible.

Participation is voluntary. If you agree to take this survey, but later change your mind, you may end the survey at any time. You may skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do not want to participate.

Thanks for your time and please feel free to contact me or my supervising professors Dr. Larry Ebberts at [lebberts@iastate.edu](mailto:lebberts@iastate.edu) or Dr. Steve Porter at [srporter@iastate.edu](mailto:srporter@iastate.edu) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kevin Sanger  
Iowa State University Doctoral Student  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011  
[sangerk@iastate.edu](mailto:sangerk@iastate.edu)  
515-341-2151



**APPENDIX C. REMINDER PARTICIPANT LETTER**

Dear (First Name):

This is a reminder email asking for your participation in improving higher education. Currently, higher education is facing many critical issues and concerns. One of those issues or concerns involves intercollegiate athletics. My name is Kevin Sanger and I am a doctoral student at Iowa State University. As part of my program of study, I am conducting research on **NCAA Division III Faculty Satisfaction with Intercollegiate Athletics**. The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding with regard to faculty satisfaction and intercollegiate athletics. I would like to ask for your participation in my study. Please click on the link below to access the survey.

(Link to the survey)

As an instructor and/or faculty member, your feedback is an important part of efforts to improve educational experiences for student-athletes. This survey should take about 10 minutes to complete. The survey is designed to obtain your perspective about faculty satisfaction, intercollegiate athletics, and higher education. Your participation is important because survey results will help administrators and NCAA officials further understand changes that need to be made within higher education and intercollegiate athletics.

There are minimal risks involved in taking this survey. Your survey responses will be kept confidential and will be available only to the researcher for analysis and reporting purposes. Results of responses will be provided in summary form only so individual data will not be revealed. To ensure the integrity of the survey and its results, both the survey and the data will be stored on a secure server and on a hard drive that is password protected. This is done to ensure your responses remain confidential and encourage you to respond as freely as possible.

Participation is voluntary. If you agree to take this survey, but later change your mind, you may end the survey at any time. You may skip any question you do not feel comfortable answering. There are no penalties or consequences of any kind if you decide that you do not want to participate.

Thanks for your time and please feel free to contact me or my supervising professors Dr. Larry Ebbers at [lebbers@iastate.edu](mailto:lebbers@iastate.edu) or Dr. Steve Porter at [srporter@iastate.edu](mailto:srporter@iastate.edu) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Kevin Sanger  
Iowa State University Doctoral Student  
Iowa State University  
Ames, IA 50011  
[sangerk@iastate.edu](mailto:sangerk@iastate.edu)  
515-341-2151

## REFERENCES

- American Association of University Professors. (1989, December). *The role of the faculty in the governance of college athletics*. Retrieved February 12, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/>
- American Association of University Professors. (1991, June). *Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics*, Retrieved May 3, 2010, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/>
- Atwell, R. H. (1991). Sports reform: Where is the faculty? *Academe*, 77(1), 10-12.
- Benford, R. (2007). The college sports reform movement: Reframing the “Edutainment” industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48, 1-28.
- Birnbaum, R. (1990). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1989). The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(4), 423-443.
- Bowen, H. R. (1997). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Brand, M. (2006). Faculty members’ constructive engagement in intercollegiate athletics. *The Montana Professor*, 1-8.
- Cockley, W., & Roswal, G. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members’ perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17(4), 217-223.
- Davies, G. R. (1986). The importance of being general: Philosophy, politics, and the institutional mission statement. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 85-102). New York: Agathon.
- Earl, J. (2004). The faculty’s role in reforming college sports. *Academe*. Retrieved February 12, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/SO/Feat/>
- Faculty Athletics Representatives Association. (n.d.). *Faculty athletics representatives handbook*. Retrieved February 12, 2009, from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2004/SO/Feat/>
- Giamatti, A. B. (1988). *A free and ordered space: The real world of the university*. New York: W. W. Norton.

- Groves, R. M., Fowler, F. J. J., Couper, M. P., Lepkowski, J. M., Singer, E., & Tourangeau, R. (2004). *Survey methodology*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Interscience.
- Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, (2005, June). *Constitution and rules*. Retrieved February 12, 2009, from <http://www.iowaconference.com/general/conference/Constitution.pdf>
- Knight Foundation Commission On Intercollegiate Athletics. ( 2001, June). *A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Retrieved March 20, 2009, from [http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=64&Itemid=9](http://www.knightcommission.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=64&Itemid=9)
- Kuga, D. (1996). Governance of intercollegiate athletics: Perceptions of faculty members. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 149-168.
- Lawrence, J. (2009). Faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 144*, 103-112.
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Hendricks, L. (2009). Athletics reform and faculty perceptions. *New Directions for Higher Education, 148*, 73-81.
- Masteralexis, L. P., Barr, C. A., & Hums, M. A. (2009). *Principles and practice of sport management*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Minnesota Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. (2006, June). *Constitution and bylaws*. Retrieved April 28, 2009, from <http://www.miaconline.org/Pdfs/MIAC/2008/8/15/Bylaws0809.pdf>
- NCAA. (n.d.). Division III Philosophy Statement. Retrieved April 16, 2010, from [http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/ncaa/NCAA/Legislation+and+Governance/Committees/Division+III/General+Information/d3\\_philosophy\\_stmt?pageDesign=Printer+Friendly+General+Content+Layout](http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/ncaa/NCAA/Legislation+and+Governance/Committees/Division+III/General+Information/d3_philosophy_stmt?pageDesign=Printer+Friendly+General+Content+Layout)
- NCAA. (2009, July). NCAA Division III Identity Initiative Quantitative Research Report. Retrieved September 3, 2009, from [http://web1.ncaa.org/web\\_files/DIII\\_MC\\_PC/Misc/DIII\\_survey\\_2009.pdf](http://web1.ncaa.org/web_files/DIII_MC_PC/Misc/DIII_survey_2009.pdf)
- Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2005). Markets in higher education. In P. Altbach, R. Berdahl, & P. Gumport, (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 486-516). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Stock, J., & Watson, M. (2007). *Introduction to Econometrics* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pearson Education Inc.
- Thelin, J. (1996). *Games college play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thelin, J. (1985). The campus as chameleon: Rethinking organizational behavior and public policy. In J. Smart, (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp. 103-108). New York: Agathon.
- Tierney, W. G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.
- Toma, J. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions For Higher Education*, 105, 81-90.
- Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2000). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 154-178.
- Vedder, R. (2007, Nov.). Over Invested and Over Priced American Higher Education Today. *Center for College Affordability and Productivity*. Retrieved January 18, 2009 from [http://www.centerforcollegeaffordability.org/pages/page.asp?page\\_id=45600](http://www.centerforcollegeaffordability.org/pages/page.asp?page_id=45600)
- Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Willis, G. B. (2005). *Cognitive interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century. In P. Altbach, R. Berdahl, & P. Gumpert, (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political, and economic challenges* (pp. 115-160). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The process of completing the doctoral program of study has been a long journey. I have been very fortunate to work with great people. I am grateful to each of these individuals who have inspired and encouraged me along the way.

I am sincerely thankful to my co-major professors, Drs. Stephen Porter and Larry Ebbers. Thanks also to my committee members who have supported me throughout this process: Drs. Barb Licklider, Ann Gansemer-Topf, and Dean Anderson. I have found the faculty, staff, and people at Iowa State University to be incredibly supportive and helpful.

Most importantly, I would like to thank my family. My wife, Kathy, has provided support and encouragement to me personally, professionally, and emotionally throughout this process. My parents, Bob and Linda, have been a source of inspiration to me to complete this degree. As educators in Iowa for over 40 years, they have enabled me to fully understand what it means to inspire others and lead a life of unselfishness. The love and support of my family has enabled me to fulfill this academic journey of completing my PhD.