Masters Theses                                                        Graduate School

5-2008

# The Impact of Collegiate Athletic Department Structure on Female Athlete Satisfaction

Nicole J. Turner
*University of Tennessee - Knoxville*

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_gradthes

## Recommended Citation

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Nicole J. Turner entitled "The Impact of Collegiate Athletic Department Structure on Female Athlete Satisfaction." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Sport Studies.

Damon Andrew, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Rob Hardin, Dennie Kelley

Accepted for the Council:
Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Counsel:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Nicole Joan Turner entitled "The Impact of Collegiate Athletic Department Structure on Female Athlete Satisfaction." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Sport Studies.

_____

Damon Andrew, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

_____

Rob Hardin

_____

Dennie Kelley

Accepted for the Council:

_____

Carolyn R. Hodges, Vice Provost
and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original Signatures are on file with official student records.)

**The Impact of Collegiate Athletic Department Structure on Female Athlete Satisfaction.**

A Thesis Presented for the

Master of Science Degree

in Sport Studies

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Nicole Joan Turner

May 2008

Copyright 2008 by
Nicole Joan Turner

ii

# DEDICATION

To my parents, for all the sacrifices, support, and love. 'Thank you' is not enough.


To my husband, Jonathan, who has endured as much as I have in this journey.

Thank you for reminding me to breathe.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

# ABSTRACT

There are few Division I universities in the country that separate their men's and women's athletic departments. The reasons for separating or not separating are different and complex for each institution. Although the reasons may be different, one of the main goals of an athletic department is to put the athlete first (Rice, 1990) and understand what factors affect athlete satisfaction. Though independent studies have been conducted to determine methods of measuring athlete satisfaction, and explore organizational structure, the two components have rarely been studied simultaneously to determine how they affect each other. This study investigates and compares the relative levels of satisfaction among female athletes amid athletic departments with merged versus those with divided athletic departments. Female athletes from four Division I NCAA universities, two with divided departments and two with merged departments, participated in the study. Results showed that female athletes at divided athletic departments had higher levels of satisfaction than did female athletes at merged athletic departments. These results are not surprising when the structure of the athletic department is considered. Female athletes at divided athletic departments have a single group of individuals that work to cater to the female athlete and their needs, apart from their male counterparts. This study outlines how the structure of the athletic department contributes to female athlete satisfaction, and gives ideas about how to better the college athletic experience for all female athletes.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

vii

# LIST OF TABLES

## Chapter 1: Introduction

**Introduction**

College athletics is arguably one of the leading entertainment industries in the country and that success would not be attainable without the organization of college athletic departments and the athletes that represent those departments through their athletic abilities. Although college athletics have been around for many years, some athletes are just beginning to reap the benefits of its existence. Until the passage of Title IX in 1972, there was no guarantee that female athletes would be allowed to actively participate and compete in college athletics, and since its inception, Title IX has helped to catapult women's athletics. Since athletes are the prime beneficiaries of an athletic program (Knight Foundation, 1991), the main goal of the athletic department should be to put the athlete first in all the department does (Rice, 1990). A select few Division-I National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) college athletic departments have incorporated this element by separating their men's and women's athletic departments, allowing female athletes to have a department devoted to advancing and understanding the world of women's athletics. While the athlete is the most important component of college athletics, the athletic department is also important because it oversees and coordinates the teams and functions. Huber and Glick (1993) note that the "design of an organization is central to what an organization is" (p.11). Without the existence of both the college athletic department and the talents of the college athlete, neither element would be able to perform, and for that reason it is important to understand what elements help an athletic department effectively satisfy their athletes and what elements cause the athlete to feel satisfied with their college athletic experience.

**Statement of the Problem**

While there have been many studies examining college athletes' satisfaction levels, and likewise, organizational structure of business, there are currently no studies that examine the

1

relationship between a college athlete's perceived satisfaction level and what organizational structure their respective athletic department demonstrates. There are currently published studies that examine what elements affect athlete satisfaction; however, many studies group athletes as a whole unit, instead of recognizing them as two distinct, separate groups: men and women. If women are to be recognized as their own athlete, then there needs to be an element of understanding designed and strictly focused on understanding the female athlete separate from their male counterparts.

**Statement of the Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the organizational structure of an athletic department, specifically a division between men's and women's departments, and the perceived level of satisfaction reported by female athletes of those respective departments. An analysis of the reported findings will show if there is any difference in the reported satisfaction levels of female athletes that are a part of a divided athletic program compared to female athletes that are a part of a merged department.

**Significance of the Study**

Previous research of athlete satisfaction has been beneficial in many ways; however, this research has done little to understand female athletes apart from their male counterparts. While both parties are college athletes, female athletics continues to be an area of hot debate with constant efforts to promote, advance and educate people about both the benefits and importance of women's athletics. Furthermore, the study of athletic department structures in NCAA Division-I athletic departments is limited and, therefore, a lack of literature exists about the functionality and structure of these departments. Many people consider an athletic department to be equivalent to a business structure, and while this may be true in some aspects, it is necessary to recognize these departments exist to cater to a specifically unique clientele, and, therefore, understanding that clientele is essential.

2

**Research Question and Hypothesis**

*Question #1*:  Do female athletes in divided athletic departments report higher levels of overall satisfaction with their athletic department programs as compared to female athletes in merged departments according to the Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (MASQ)?

H1:  Female athletes in divided departments will report a higher level of satisfaction with their athletic department compared to female athletes at merged athletic departments, according to the Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (MASQ).

**Variables**

The present study possesses both independent and dependent variables.  The dependant variables in this study related to athlete satisfaction include two Processes (Team and Individual) of nine facets of satisfaction grouped into seven categories.  These are categorized and grouped below (the parentheses explain which category of the MASQ addressed that specific facet variable, see Appendix B for MASQ):

- Team Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction

    - Ethics (Category 2: Enforcement of Rules and Regulations)

    - Facilities/Equipment, Budget, and Ancillary Support  (Categories 3, 4, 5, & 6: Facilities, Budget, Medical Personnel, Academic Support Services)

    - Community Support  (Category 7: External Agents)

- Individual-Oriented Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction

    - Positive Feedback  (Category 1: Personal Treatment)

    - Recognition  (Category 1: Personal Treatment)

    - Financial Support  (Category 3: Budget)

    - Social Support  (Category 7: External Agents)

3

Each dependent variable will be analyzed to determine the relationship with the independent variable, NCAA D-I athletic department structure, specifically comparing the responses of female athletes participating in divided versus merged athletic departments.

**Definition of Terms**

*Non-Traditional Terms*:

Divided Athletic Departments:  Describes Division-I NCAA Universities that have an Athletic Director and administrative staff that oversee women's athletic teams, and a separate Athletic Director and administrative staff that oversee men's athletic teams.

Merged Athletic Departments:  Describes Division-I NCAA Universities that have a single Athletic Director and administrative staff that oversee both men's and women's athletic teams.

*Athlete and Athlete Satisfaction Facets Defined:*

Athlete:  Describes any person at the included universities that participates in a university sanctioned sport, varsity or club; not including recreational activities or intramurals that the university may sponsor.

Satisfaction:  A positive affective state resulting from complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997, p. 135).

Enforcement of Rules and Regulations (Ethics):  Includes such issues as recruiting violations, abuse and use of pain killers and other drugs, unsportsmanlike conduct, cheating and violence among athletes (Eitzen, 1989; Lumpkin, et. al, 1994).  Looks not at 'What is ethical behavior?', but rather, 'How does the athletic department handle issues deemed unethical?'.

Facilities/Equipment:  Providing athletic teams with facilities comparable to those of like programs and providing equipment that is up-to-date and advanced for the sport.

Budget:  Providing athletic teams with sufficient budget allocations for travel, meals, recruiting, advertising, and promoting teams.

4

Ancillary Support:  Providing athletic teams with proper medical support, academic support, and game management support.

Community Support:  the extent to which the community is involved in supporting or rejecting the team.

Positive Feedback:  The provision of reinforcements for successful performance of tasks assigned to individual athletes during games and practice sessions (Chelladurai, 1997, p. 148).

Recognition:  In, essence, a specific form of positive feedback given to athletes.

Financial Support:  Monetary allocations provided to the team/coach for scholarships.

Social Support:  describes the comfort, assistance and/or information one receives through formal or informal contacts with individuals or groups (Wallston, et al., 1983, p. 369).

*Organizational Structures Defined*:

Specialization:  The extent to which roles are differential according to a particular task or purpose (Kikulis, et al., 1995, p.142).

Formalization:  The extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written down (Schminke, et. al, 2000, p. 296).

Centralization:  Whether authority to make decisions resides in top-level positions (centralized decision making) or is distributed to lower positions in the organization (decentralized decision making) (Chelladurai, 2001, p. 222).

**Delimitations:**

Although there are several studies that outline and analyze athlete satisfaction, differing aspects of women's athletics, and organizational structure, there are currently no studies that combine all these elements in a single study.  For this reason, the university athletic departments participating in the study and the direct nature of the questionnaire is to allow for an adequate and purposeful analysis of specific areas of satisfaction related to organization structures of collegiate athletic departments.  There will be four universities included in the present study, two with

5

divided athletic departments and two with merged departments. Participating universities will be matched as closely as possible by the following elements: conference affiliation, athletic budget for the women's teams (each varsity team budget examined separately, and the collective budget of all teams combined), number of female athletes in the department (according to online rosters), number and type of women's athletic teams, population of the respective university (including both undergraduate and graduate students), cost of attending the university (included in-state tuition and room and board costs), and number of undergraduate degree programs offered at the university (some reported numbers include degree concentrations).  The nature of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) lends itself to ask several questions outside the scope of this particular study and therefore only specific facets and questions regarding these facets will be examined.  This method of specifically limiting the type and number of questions asked is congruent with the method used by Riemer and Toon (2001) in their article/study, *Leadership and Satisfaction in Tennis: Examination of Congruence, Gender, and Ability*.  Asking only specific questions will not only allow the number of questions to be limited (and less time consuming for participants, making them more apt to participate) but also ensure that all questions focus on the athlete's satisfaction with their respective athletic department.

**Limitations:**

Although every effort was made to be thorough, there are certain limitations to the current study.  The questionnaires for the study were sent and received electronically, which may pose a weakness based upon the nature of computer access available to each athlete, and their willingness to respond to an unknown individual.  Electronically sending and receiving questionnaires poses another weakness and issue involving privacy.  All contact information for female athletes was obtained through online resources; however, some athletes had no contact information listed with these resources.  This conflict eliminated any female athlete who may have potentially wished to participate, but was unable to be contacted because of a lack of contact

6

information.  Another potentially limiting factor was the timing of delivery of the questionnaires. Questionnaires were delivered electronically at the same time to all participating universities and asked to be returned by a certain date.  Due to this method of timing, it is possible that there were athletes who were new to the department and have not yet experienced the nature of the athletic department.  In some cases, this lack of experience could pose a threat to the study.  A new athlete may not be as aware of the workings of the athletic department and therefore, perceive they are satisfied with the job done, rather than realizing there are faults they are not satisfied with or have not experienced.

7

## Chapter II: Literature Review

### Introduction

One of the largest and most exciting aspects of college is the sports arena, where even the "athletically challenged" have the chance to participate and be involved in an integral part of the college experience. While many people will never have their name appear on elite college team rosters, there are those few who possess the skills to make the cut. Even though the number of athletes participating in the college athletic experience is continually on the rise, there is still a deficit in the number of women participating when compared to male counterparts. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) reports that the number of women athletes in NCAA schools for the 1993-1994 season numbered 102,994. This number had risen to 164,998 by the 2004-2005 season, but men's participation for the 1993-1994 season was 186,939 and 219,744 in the 2004-2005 season (NCAA fact sheet, 2006). Clearly there are more opportunities and availability for male athletes. It is important to realize, however, that women have made great advances in the world of sports, especially since the passage of Title IX in 1972. This does not mean, however, that women can be grouped into the same realm as men in all sports research. Female athletes are unique, and as such, should be given the opportunity to be understood on an individual basis, separate from their male counterparts.

### Discussion

#### Importance of the College Athlete

It is reasonable to conclude that college athletics would not exist without the interest and talents of the college athlete. Athletes are the prime beneficiaries of an athletic program (Knight Foundation, 1991) and, as such, the main goal of the athletic department should be to put the athlete first in all the department does (Rice, 1990). Some have argued that if the focus of the athletic department was returned to the athlete, many of the shortcomings and struggles of a department would resolve themselves (Knight Foundation, 1991). Others have challenged this

8

reasoning by suggesting that the athlete is present to produce entertainment, prestige, and revenue for the department and school (Broyles & Hay, 1979). It is justifiable to think of college athletics as entertainment, however, the main focus of a department should not be generating revenue by the use of college student athletes, but rather on the athletes' college experience and success. While college athletics is perceived by many as 'entertainment', it is essential to recognize that athletes could not produce entertainment without the direction of a coach, and a coach could not produce without the skill and participation of the athlete. For this reason, "athletes are the most essential human resource in any athletic department" (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997).

### Importance of the Collegiate Athletic Department

While the athlete is the most important component of college athletics, the athletic department is also important because it oversees and coordinates the teams and functions. Huber and Glick (1993) note that the "design of an organization is central to what an organization is" (p.11). While the focus of the department should be the athlete first, there are elements of business that must be considered and employed for the athletic department to be successful and grow. In order to continue being competitive in recruiting, retaining, and winning, departments must be aware of new and evolving trends in college athletics. In a recent publication, William Barnett (2006), Stanford Graduate School of Business faculty member, stated, "Organizations that are in a constant state of reaction are simply not as profitable" (p.1). He also held that staying ahead of the curve and avoiding a state of equilibrium will prevent an organization from viewing change as something "that happens to you", and rather as a way to extend the reach and productivity of an organization (p.1). Even with all the attention focused on college athletics, there is little research that examines the functioning and advancement of collegiate athletic departments. The sporting industry, including college athletics, in general was worth an estimated $213 billion dollars in 1999, making it the 6th largest industry in the United States

9

(Sport Business Journal, 1999).  In seeking to understand these functions of advancement however, there needs to be more research.

<div align="center">**Organizational Structures**</div>

In his article *Organizational Structure* (1987), John Jackson asserts that one of the major problems with modern organization is finding how to faction individuals into groupings that are as rational as possible while producing as few undesired effects as possible.  In an effort to achieve the desired effects, there are several forms to organizational structure that help to both regulate and advance the collegiate athletic department.  In the article, *Structural Designs within American Intercollegiate Athletic Departments*, Cunningham and Rivera (2001) have suggested the following dimensions of structure: Specialization, Formalization, and Centralization.

*Specialization.*  Specialization is defined as "the extent to which roles are differential according to a particular task or purpose" (Kikulis, et al., 1995, p. 142).  Specialization is concerned with the differentiation within the organization or program.  Inside NCAA athletic departments, there are two forms of differentiation: vertical and horizontal (Cunningham & Rivera, 2001).  The most commonly recognized model of organization in collegiate athletic departments is the four tiered model referred to as vertical differentiation. At the top of the model are the executives of the department (i.e., athletic director, university president), followed by top administrators (i.e., associate and assistant athletic directors), then coaches in the department, and lastly, the athletes themselves.  While this model recognizes there are several other individuals that contribute to the functioning of the department (e.g., personal assistants, sports medicine staff, etc.), they are not included in the four tiers of the specialization structure.  Another consideration when examining specialization and differentiation of an athletic department is that the size and exact functions of these vertical tiers may differ between universities depending on the size of the department and outside support provided.  While vertical differentiation is relatively consistent for all NCAA athletic departments, the horizontal differentiation model is not as consistent.  Horizontal

<div align="center">10</div>

differentiation focuses on assigning persons to certain tasks according to where their specific talents and strengths lie (Slack & Hinings, 1992). Such a model is employed frequently by highly specialized sporting organizations and has a greater chance of differing among departments (Cunningham & Rivera, 2001).

*Formalization.* Formalization is defined as the "extent to which rules, procedures, instructions, and communications are written down" (Schminke, et al., 2000, p. 296). Mintzberg (1984) refers to organizations that have a formal written standard as more "bureaucratic" (p. 72), which would include formal elements such as written job descriptions, written performance evaluations for employees, and formal orientation for new employees (Schminke, et al., 2000). Organizations that follow a less stringent formal approach would be referred to as "organic" (Mintzberg, 1984, p. 72).

*Centralization.* Centralization refers to "whether authority to make decisions resides in top-level positions (centralized decision making) or is distributed to lower level positions in the organization (decentralized decision making)" (Chelladurai, 2001, p. 222). The concept of centralized decision making focuses on the level of participation in decision making as well as the hierarchy of authority inside the organization (Hage & Aiken, 1967). For example, a centralized decision making model in a NCAA athletic department would be when a majority of the pertinent decisions were made by an executive board, whereas a more decentralized department would allow assistant athletic directors, coaches and volunteers to make decisions without prior consent.

While the main focus of this study is to examine athlete satisfaction, it is also important to understand the organizational structures and models employed by NCAA member programs since these models may have an impact on the female athletes' satisfaction, specifically the differences seen in divided and merged departments. While it is hard to fully critique the participating schools under the design and main purpose of this study, having a general idea of

11

the structures, methods and theories of organizational structure is pertinent to understanding how the structure of an athletic department affects the satisfaction of female athletes.

## Athlete Satisfaction

In order to understand athlete satisfaction there must a general consensus on the definition of athlete satisfaction. For this study, the definition set forth by Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) was used: "A positive affective state resulting from complex evaluation of the structures, processes, and outcomes associated with the athletic experience" (p. 135). Chelladurai and Riemer go on to explain that satisfaction is based on an evaluation of what is wanted and what is received within the domains of psychological, physical, and environment factors along with the reaction to one's personal standards. In addition, athlete satisfaction should be considered self-regulating and independent of other organizational outcomes and issues (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997), and for this reason it is important to recognize that athlete satisfaction is an area of understanding that needs to be examined in order to maximize the college athletic experience.

When evaluating satisfaction and performance, there must be recognition that there can be contamination by various factors, including opponent performance (opponent had an unexpected outstanding performance), referee mistakes, etc. (Courneya & Chelladurai, 1991). As a result of these factors, performance and satisfaction cannot be measured by merely looking at wins and losses. While a team or athlete may lose a competition, they may be satisfied with their performance, effort, support, and coaching (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997). If it is necessary to look beyond a win-loss record when evaluating performance and satisfaction, other components must be identified to measure and evaluate athlete satisfaction. These measurements can be analyzed by examining the Facets of Athlete Satisfaction laid out by Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) in their article, *A Classification of Facets of Athlete Satisfaction*. In their article, Chelladurai and Riemer identify facets of satisfaction that pertain to both the individual and the

12

team, as the two may be correlated, but may not (i.e., athlete is pleased with individual performance, but not with team performance, and visa-versa). These areas of individual and team are applied to the topics of "outcomes" and "processes" contributing to athlete satisfaction, which include the components of "task" and "social" areas.

The present study of female athlete satisfaction focused on a limited and select number of facets that deal with both athletic department structure and behavior, and athlete satisfaction. While Chelladurai and Riemer's (1997) work focused on four areas: team outcomes, individual outcomes, team processes and individual-oriented processes, with facets under each topic, the current study focused on selected facets under the two topics of team process and individual-oriented processes. This method of selecting only certain facets for examination is parallel to the method employed by Riemer and Toon (2001) in their article *Leadership and Satisfaction in Tennis: Examination of Congruence, Gender, and Ability*.

Recently there have been many attempts made by researchers to examine what determines athlete satisfaction. These ideas have, as Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) point out, been founded mainly on adapting the satisfaction scales developed for employees and rating job satisfaction among paid employees. Chelladurai and Riemer lay out other possible comparisons such as using scales developed for the (1) environment of management and organization, (2) service customer/client satisfaction, and (3) volunteers. Many of the facets of athlete satisfaction found in these studies are relevant to athletics but still fail to include many other factors that may or may not contribute to, or be detrimental to, athlete satisfaction. Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) explain that these schemes related to organizations in general are concerned with employee satisfaction, not athlete satisfaction. These schemes of satisfaction become controversial if collegiate athletes are considered clients or employees (Chelladurai, 1992). If athletic departments and universities begin to view and treat collegiate level athletes as employees, it takes the college athletic department to a new dimension where athletes are seen as subordinates

13

of the Athletic Director and administrative staff, are entitled to bonuses (a practice strictly prohibited by the NCAA), and where athletes would be entitled to worker compensation style benefits to compensate for injuries sustained during activity. The practice of viewing athletes as an employee of the athletic department or the university is detrimental to the integrity of what college athletics has come to be about: the pursuit of excellence. This pursuit of excellence is what sets athletics apart from other forms of service and management with employees (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997).

Research in the field of business indicates several areas of observation that affect employee satisfaction, mood, and behavior. In Cummings' and Berger's (1976) study, *Organizational Structure, How does it Influence Attitudes and Performance?,* the research noted that there are seven areas of organizational structure that affect an employee's mood and performance. While not all areas addressed in the research are comparable to college athletics, there are some that can be applied to help understand what affects an athlete's mood and satisfaction with their college athletic experience. These comparable elements include: (1) the size of an organizational sub-unit (the athletic department is a sub-unit of the university system), (2) the size of the total organization (the university system is the total organization), and (3) the vertical level of the position held by an organizational member (the importance, prestige, or popularity of the sport that an athlete participates in). Although these comparisons can be made, collegiate athletes still do not equate to being equal or comparable to employees when evaluated at the college level. The original facets of athlete satisfaction founded in Chelldurai and Riemer's (1997) article *A Classification of Facets of Athlete Satisfaction*, are unique and different because they focus on the two distinct variables that make athletics different from general organizations: the exclusive nature of focusing on the current task (i.e. learning skills in practice, or winning a championship, both of which take dedication, concentration and an undying effort; elements which may not be expected of an individual in a business setting), and the pursuit of excellence

14

(never being satisfied with their current level of performance) (Keating, 1964; Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997).

It is this pursuit of excellence that contributes to the formation of an athletic department. There are only few universities in the country that employ the divided athletic department structure, while all other universities and colleges demonstrate a merged department structure. Although, only a few universities utilize a divided department structure, it could be argued that those university's female athletes have a great advantage over other female athletes involved in merged departments. In a merged department there is a single Athletic Director who is required to divide their time between men's and women's athletics, while in a divided department there is an Athletic Director to oversee men's athletics and a separate, equal, Athletic Director to oversee women's athletics. Although there are several additional individuals in an athletic department that contribute to the functioning and advancement of college athletics, it is imperative to women's athletics that there be a dedicated group of people who work for the advancement and advocacy of women's athletics, a specialization of sorts. Having a divided department focused on women's athletics accomplishes this goal. The individuals that work for a divided department are allowed to focus on promoting, advancing, advertising, encouraging, and training a specific clientele, whether that be men's or women's athletics. The idea of specialization, according to Cunningham and Rivera (2001), is that each individual in an organization has a specific job which allows individuals to utilize specific talents and personal strengths. These aspects of specialization are contributory to the success of a department catering to its athletes and in turn producing athletes that are satisfied with their athletic experience.

## Team Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction

*Enforcement of Rules and Regulations (Ethics).* For the purposes of this study, the meaning of Ethics was altered from its originally given description by Chelladurai and Riemer (1997). Chelladurai and Riemer's focus on ethics encompassed aspects of 'fairplay' and 'sportsmanlike

15

conduct' among the players of a given team.  While the current study had a focal point of ethical

issues, the examination of ethics was approached not from, 'What is ethical behavior?', but

rather, 'How well does the athletic department handle issues that are deemed unethical?'.  Several

aspects of ethics can affect whether or not a female athlete is satisfied with their college athletic

experience.  One area many are beginning to consider an ethical issue is the use of alcohol among

college athletes.  Moulton, Moulton, Gallien, and Roach (1999) found in their study, *Generic*

*Alcoholism: Are College Athletes at Risk?*, that despite historical beliefs and studies, college

female athletes are at the same risk for developing alcoholic dependence as their male

counterparts.  Other issues such as recruiting violations, abuse and use of pain killers and other

drugs, unsportsmanlike conduct, cheating, violence among athletes (Eitzen, 1989; Lumpkin, et.

al, 1994) and player violations, all effect the satisfaction of the athletic experience.  While all

athletic departments have a responsibility to help enforce and regulate these areas of college

athletics, institutions that have a specialized structure of attention to women's athletics may be

more likely to both monitor and effectively enforce specific regulations concerning unethical

behavior.  Undocumented and untreated behavior that embodies a means of unethical behavior

can have dire consequences to individual teams, athletes and the athletic department as a whole.

Consequences of unacknowledged or ignored ethical violations can result in punishment from the

university's affiliated athletic conference, the NCAA, federal government, and the university

trustees' board which can impose sanctions on teams, coaches, individual athletes, or entire

athletic departments. Furthermore, these regulating bodies can enforce monetary fines, playoff

suspensions, athletic team or athletic department probation, and retractions of past wins.

Universities that embody a divided athletic department structure may be more likely to closely

monitor and rectify unethical situations of their department; possibly a result of having fewer

athletes to monitor than those departments that characterize a less specialized structure.  This is

an area of college athletics that could use further research to determine if a more specialized

16

structure ensures a more compliant or enforceful environment.  This facet of Enforcement of Rules and Regulations (ethics) examined how satisfied female athletes are with how the athletic department handles issues that are deemed unethical.

*Facilities/Equipment, Budget, and Ancillary Support Services*.  These three facets are concerned with the extent to which the athletic administration extends support in the forms of competitive facilities (as compared to like programs) and equipment (replacing old and outdated equipment with updated and more advanced equipment); budget (ensuring the women's athletic department receives not only fair but equitable amounts of financial resources for travel, meals, and recruiting); and academic support services (ensuring female athletes have access to available counseling for personal and academic reasons); and medical personnel (ensuring that female athletes have access to certified individuals to meet medical and rehabilitation needs).  These actions are all emblematic of what has become a standard in the modern athletic department, however, the extent to which the athletic department ensures these services are not only provided, but effective and equitable, may vary.  In a specialized structure, there are individuals responsible for specific tasks based upon where personal strengths lie (Slack & Hinings, 1992), and therefore schools that utilize a divided department, where the strength and interest is female athletes, may have a more detailed scrutiny in ensuring the equal and effective treatment of athletes.   In the present study, athletes will be asked to determine if they are pleased with the amount of support they receive in these areas.

*Community Support*.  Community support is the extent to which the community is involved in supporting, or rejecting, the team.  The community is of significant importance because, despite the fact that the community has no direct involvement in the affairs of the team, they have a large impact on the atmosphere of competition, a phenomenon known as "home court advantage" (Courneya & Carron, 1992).  Community support is demonstrated many ways; one obvious means is game attendance.  The NCAA has reported that for the 2005-2006 season, NCAA

17

women's basketball attendance neared ten million fans for the season, which is the fourth highest number since the NCAA began tracking attendance in 1982 (Bloomberg, 2006).  It is possible that an athlete may feel more satisfied with their college athletic experience knowing that the surrounding community supports them in the forms of monetary donations, game attendance, and team representation.  While some divided athletic departments may share certain facets of operations, the specialized structure of divided athletic departments creates a feasible possibility that specific individuals in the department focus solely on advertising, marketing, revenue generating, and advancement of the university's female athletic teams.  This exclusive practice may result in a more effective measure to reach a target group of supporters, and in turn, enhance the level of attention and support given to the female athletic teams. It is notable that there are other various factors that affect community support for a team such as, multiple institutions in the area, professional teams in the area, and the economics of the community.  The study examined if there was a difference in the perceived community support between female athletes in divided and merged departments

### Individual-Oriented Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction

*Positive feedback.*  Chelladurai and Riemer define positive feedback as "the provision of reinforcements for successful performance of tasks assigned to individual athletes during games and practice sessions" (1997, p. 148).  Early studies in positive feedback found that positive reinforcement in women decreased intrinsic motivation, whereas it boosted intrinsic motivation in males (Deci, 1975).  Recent studies have begun to contradict the earlier findings, showing that positive feedback improves intrinsic motivation in both men and women, as opposed to those who received negative feedback (Vallerand & Reid, 1988).  The concept of positive feedback to athletes from a higher authority, in this case, the athletic department, can easily become the idea that athletes only need positive reinforcement from their immediate coaches.  However, as discussed earlier, the role of the modern athletic department should be to put the athlete first

18

(Rice, 1990), and if this is truly the goal and concept of an effective athletic department, the department should be the first to convey messages of positive feedback to the athlete. Furthermore, if the department is solely focused on women's athletics, they should be a constant force of positive reinforcement for their female athletes; it is because of the female athlete that the department exists and for this reason, the department must be an affirmative pillar to the female athlete. In part, this study examined if there was a difference reported in the amount of perceived positive feedback female athletes received from top administration in divided and merged athletic departments.

*Recognition.* This facet centers on the amount of recognition that the female athlete receives from coaches, other team members, and the administrative staff. As is with the previous facet, it is reasonable to assume that when a player is recognized for their hard work, efforts and accomplishments, an elevated amount of satisfaction is experienced. Recognition is, in essence, a form of positive feedback. The present study will explore if there is a difference in the amount of recognition given to female athletes if they are part of a divided or merged athletic department.

*Financial Support.* This facet can be compared to the pay satisfaction scales used for employees, but may also be important for those athletes who receive financial support in the form of scholarships. As noted before, it is estimated that 41.5 % of all NCAA athletes are female, but in the 1999-2000 academic year only 36.2% of all NCAA Division I athletic department budget allocations went to women's athletics or female athletes for scholarship dispersement (Chronicle for Higher Education, 2001). An athlete may not be satisfied with the amount of financial support they have received or are offered from a program, and therefore, creates a desire to look for other opportunities with greater monetary value. While every athletic department raises funds for teams in different ways, with some utilizing several methods, a department focused on raising funds and bettering female athletics might have a more focused goal and staff that work to exclusively obtain funds for female athletes through marketing, fund raising, and endorsement of

19

private donations. Departments with a less specialized model may still have staff who work to acquire scholarship money, but it may be emphasized in different areas or teams, giving less attention to equal teams, such as men's and women's basketball. Other factors outside of departmental structure that may influence the amount of monetary support relayed to the athlete could be economic stability of the area, win-loss record for a team, and championship titles won by specific teams. While each athlete is awarded a scholarship for different reasons, the present study will look to examine if there is a difference in the number of female scholarshiped athletes, both full and partial, and whether the level of reported satisfaction differs.

*Social Support.*  Social support, as an individual-oriented facet, "describes the comfort, assistance and/or information one receives through formal or informal contacts with individuals or groups" (Wallston, et. al, 1983, p. 369).  While athletes can receive social support from many areas, this facet will focus on whether the athlete feels they are receiving the support they need from the coach and those immediately involved in the functions of the team, including teammates and administrative staff.  The study examined whether there was a difference in the amount of perceived social support dependant upon whether the female athlete was part of a divided or merged athletic department.

**Summary**

While many advances have been made in the realm of women's athletics, there are still several areas that remain under-researched and misunderstood.  In order to continue to advance women's athletics it is important that particular attention be paid to the female athlete themselves and a greater understanding of what makes for both a successful and satisfying college athletic experience.  In order to understand these elements however, there must be more research done that centers on the satisfaction of the female athlete alone, and not a generalization of college athletes as whole. This study aims to investigate and compare the relative levels of satisfaction

20

among female athletes in athletic departments with merged athletic departments versus those with

divided athletic departments.

**Chapter III: Methodology**

**Research Design**

The purpose of the study was to quantitatively employ the use of numerical analysis in evaluating female athletes' perceived satisfaction levels with their respective athletic departments.  A modified version of the Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) (Chelladurai & Riemer, 1997) was distributed electronically through a survey database to the sample athlete population at four specifically chosen NCAA D-I universities.

Surveys have several advantages and disadvantages. The advantages include the following: 1) Surveys are particularly useful in describing the characteristics of a large population; 2) Surveys make large samples feasible; 3) Surveys are flexible, and 4) Standardized questionnaires ask exactly the same questions of all subjects and must impute the same intent to all respondents giving a particular response, thus strengthening the measurement quality (Babbie, 2001).

Although surveys are efficient, Babbie (2001) also outlines the disadvantages of survey research: 1) The requirement of standardization forces standardized questionnaire items to often represent the least common denominator in assessing people's attitudes, orientations, circumstances, and experiences; 2) Surveys can be inflexible in the respect that initial survey designs typically must remain unchanged through the research study; and 3) Surveys are subject to artificiality in the respect that the topic of study may not be amenable to measurement through questionnaires or the act of studying that topic (i.e., an attitude) may actually affect it.  It is also important to note that the survey design for the current study was cross-sectional and reflected the satisfaction level of participants at one point in time and therefore reported satisfaction levels may change depending upon the time the questionnaire is answered.

22

This study utilized the internet to administer the survey to a large number of collegiate female athletes across the country. Internet surveys have several specific advantages and disadvantages when compared to traditional paper surveys. Advantages of internet surveys include: (1) ease of access to a large number of demographically and culturally diverse participants as well as (2) ease of access to very rare, specific participant populations; (3) a certain justification for generalization of findings in internet experiments to the general population; (4) generalizability of findings to more settings and situations, as there are reasons to believe that external validity in internet experiments is high; (5) avoidance of time constraints; (6) avoidance of organizational problems, such as scheduling difficulties, as thousands of participants may participate simultaneously; (7) completely voluntary participation; (8) ease of acquisition of just the optimal number of participants for achieving high statistical power while being able to draw meaningful conclusions from the experiment; (9) detectability of motivational confounding; (10) reduction of experimenter effects; (11) reduction of demand characteristics; (12) cost savings of lab space, person hours, equipment, administration; (13) greater openness of the research process; (14) ability to assess the number of nonparticipants; (15) ease of comparing results with results from a locally tested sample; (16) greater external validity through greater technical variance; (17) ease of access for participants (bringing the experiment to the participant instead of the opposite); and (18) public control of ethical standards (Reips, 2000).

Reips (2000) also outlined several disadvantages of internet surveys along with suggestions for possible solutions. These disadvantages and solution suggestions include: (1) Possible multiple submissions can be avoided or controlled by collecting personal

23

identification items, by checking internal consistency as well as date and time consistency of answers, and by using techniques such as subsampling, participant pools, or handing out passwords; (2) Experimental control may be an issue in some experimental designs, but it is less of an issue when using a between-subjects design with random distribution of participants to experimental conditions; (3) Self- selection can be controlled by using the multiple site entry technique; (4) Dropout is high in internet experiments, especially if no financial incentives are given for participation; (5) The reduced or absent interaction with participants during an internet experiment creates problems if instructions are misunderstood; (6) The comparative basis for the internet experiment method is low; and (7) External validity of internet experiments may be limited by their dependence on computers and networks.

**Sample**

The study included four specifically chosen universities, two NCAA D-I universities with divided athletic departments, and two NCAA D-I universities with merged athletic departments. The two divided departments served as a base for choosing two merged departments. Merged departments were chosen by matching the metrics of the divided departments to the merged departments as closely as possible. Selection criteria included matching the metrics of both the athletic department and the representative university. The athletic department metrics used to establish comparability included: comparable numbers of female athletes, number of women's athletic team opportunities, comparable budgets for the women's athletic teams, and NCAA conference affiliation. Other demographic aspects of the representative universities were also analyzed, including: population of school (including both undergraduate and graduate students), number of undergraduate degrees offered, along with tuition, room/board for in-state undergraduate students (see Appendix D, Tables 1-4). Contact information for the female

24

student athletes was obtained through online databases maintained by their respective university. There was an initial 526 informative emails sent to female athletes at the four chosen universities inviting them to participate in the study (See Appendix C). As expected, there were returned emails with non-valid email addresses or mailboxes. Upon removal of these addressees, there were a total of 474 possible respondents whose contact information was available and valid. A reminder email was sent to each valid email address twice to increase the possible response rate. This method of multiple reminder emails has reported to increase response rates for internet based surveys (Mehta & Sivadas, 1995; Smith, 1997). Removal of an invalid survey from the sample was determined by any respondent stating not to be a female athlete, or an incomplete survey. After the removal of these surveys, a total of 67 surveys were completed and valid for use in the data analysis; a response rate of 14.13%. A total of 34 completed surveys were received from female athletes at divided athletic departments and a total of 33 completed surveys were received from female athletes at merged athletic departments. The highest response rate came from female athletes at the University of Texas, Austin (34.3%), followed by Texas A & M (28.4%), the University of South Carolina, Columbia (20.9%), and lastly the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (16.4%). This sample size is representative of the amount of contact information obtained from each school; the most contact information for female athletes was available from the University of Texas, Austin and the least contact information was available from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (see Appendix E, Table 5).

The sport most largely represented from divided athletic departments in the survey was Rowing (23.5%), followed by Swimming/Diving (20.6%), Soccer (17.6%), Track/Field (14.7%), Softball (11.8%), Basketball (5.9%), and lastly Volleyball (2.9%) and Golf (2.9%). Equestrian was the most largely represented sport among female athletes from merged athletic departments with a response rate of 30.3%, followed by Swimming/Diving (18.2%), Track/Field (12.1%), Golf (9.1%), Cross Country (9.1%), Basketball (6.1%), Softball (6.1%), Soccer (6.1%), and

25

Volleyball (3.0%) (See Appendix E, Table 6).  Examination of the sample showed an interesting trend in responses form both department types; merged athletic departments did not offer Rowing as a varsity sport, and divided departments did not offer Equestrian as a varsity sport, yet in the results, the largest response for divided athletic departments came from Rowing, and from merged departments the highest response rate came from Equestrian.

In addition to the response rates of represented sports, athletes' academic classification was also calculated for the represented sample.  Of the divided athletic departments, the largest representation was female athletes reporting an academic classification of 'Junior' (38.2%), followed by 'Sophomore' and 'Senior' each with (20.6%), 'Freshman' (17.6%), and finally, '5th year Senior' (2.9%) (See Appendix E, Table 7).

Comparatively, female athletes at merged athletic departments reported the most representation from the academic classification of 'Sophomore' (27.3%), followed by 'Junior' (24.2%), 'Freshman' (21.2%), 'Senior' (18.2%), '5th year Senior' (6.1%), and 'Other' (3.0%) (See Appendix E, Table 7).

A majority of the participating respondents were scholarship athletes at both divided and merged departments.  Female athletes at divided athletic departments reported a rate of 85.3% currently on scholarship, while female athletes at merged departments reported slightly less at 78.8% currently on scholarship. Of the female athletes at divided athletic departments, 11.8% reported as having never received an athletic scholarship, and 21.2% of female athletes at merged departments reported having never received athletic scholarship.  2.9% of respondents at divided athletic departments reported previously receiving athletic scholarship (see Appendix E, Table 8).

 Initially, the sample size for the study included six schools: three universities with divided athletic departments and three universities with merged athletic departments.  However, the two schools which had been determined to be comparable to one another were dropped because of a merger of the initially divided athletic department.  While the loss of a potential

26

sampling opportunity affects the size and number of respondents of the study, the integrity of the study is maintain by dropping both affected universities and effectively matching the remaining schools as closely as possible.

**Instrumentation**

The elements of satisfaction included in the study were adapted from the Facets of Athlete Satisfaction outlined by Chelladurai and Riemer (1997) in their article, *A Classification of Facets of Athlete Satisfaction*. The Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire, originally developed by Chelladurai and Riemer, was modified to fit the scope of the current study and used to measure respondents' level of satisfaction with the chosen fields of examination. A Likert scale of 1 (Very Unsatisfied) to 7 (Very Satisfied) was used for respondents to rate their level of satisfaction with their respective athletic department. The selected facets in the questionnaire, discussed earlier, include:

- Team Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction
    - Ethics  (Category 2: Enforcement of Rules and Regulations, 3 questions)
    - Facilities/Equipment, Budget, and Ancillary Support (Category 3, 4, 5, & 6: Budget, Medical Personnel, Academic Support Service, Facilities/Equipment, 12 questions)
    - Community Support  (Category 7: External Agents, 4 questions)
- Individual-Oriented Processes Contributing to Athlete Satisfaction
    - Positive Feedback  (Category 1: Personal Treatment, 3 questions)
    - Recognition  (Category 1: Personal Treatment, 3 questions)
    - Financial Support  (Category 3: Budget, 3 questions)
    - Social Support  (Category 7: External Agents, 4 questions)
- Biographical Questions
    - Includes questions about the athlete themselves (5 questions)

27

The questionnaire includes elements of both sections of Chelladurai and Riemer's (1997) Facets of Athlete Satisfaction: Team Processes and Individual-Oriented Processes. When applied to the Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (MASQ), some facets and groups of facets fall under the same collection of questions. For example, questions regarding an athlete's satisfaction with the amount of community support their department receives, and questions regarding the amount of social support their athletic department receives fit into the collection of questions Riemer refers to as "External Agents" which has a total of four questions in Category 7 of the MASQ. The original Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire has, in total, 56 questions that fall into 15 collections of questions. For the purposes of this study, the modified questionnaire distributed to female athletes included a total of 28 questions that fall into a total of eight sections: seven sections of satisfaction questions and one section of demographic questions (see Appendix B).

Although Riemer's original Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (ASQ) included several facets of athlete satisfaction, there are two elements that, for the purposes of this study, have been altered or added. In the Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire (MASQ), the facet of "Facilities/Equipment" has been added to assess whether female athletes at merged or divided departments report a difference in the satisfaction level of the facilities made available to their team. The elements included in the questionnaire are:

*Facilities/ Equipment*

I am satisfied with…

- The practice facilities available to my team
- The competition facilities available to my team
- The weight/strength training facilities available to my team

One facet adapted from the original ASQ and used in the MASQ is the facet of Ethics, however, the meaning and naming was altered for the purposes of this study. While it is still an Ethical issue, the meaning being used for the present study focused on whether female athletes were satisfied with the way the athletic department handles issues deemed to be unethical, instead of

28

determining what is ethical behavior.  A list of the original Ethics questions can be found in

Appendix A, for the purposes of this study, Ethics was renamed "Enforcement of Rules and

Regulations".  The questions included in the MASQ are:

*Enforcement of Rules and Regulations*

I am satisfied with…

- The extent to which the athletic department enforces recruiting regulations
- The way the athletic department handles athletes who violate NCAA policies
- The way the athletic department handles athletes who violate University and/or Athletic Department policies

These two elements have been tailored to better fit the scope and purpose of the current study.  It

is the goal of this study to investigate whether female athletes at divided and merged departments

report different levels of satisfaction for issues over which the athletic department has control.

The athletic departments, both divided and merged, have the ability to control and influence these

two elements in monumental ways, so addressing these issues was pertinent to the integrity of the

present study.

In addition to the two elements discussed above, some wordings of the original Athlete

Satisfaction Questionnaire were irrelevant to the current study.  Therefore, in order to make the

questionnaire relevant to the elements being examined, some wording was changed. For example,

questions that asked about the actions of the *coach*, were replaced with *athletic department* (See

Appendix A and B for specific word changes).

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data collected for this study was obtained electronically since the universities involved

are located in different areas across the country. After obtaining approval from the University of

Tennessee Institutional Review Board, an informational email was sent to each female athlete for

which valid contact information could be obtained, with an explanation of what the purposes of

29

the study were, how information would be reported, and a link to the survey (see Appendix C).
Since questionnaires were distributed to female athletes through an online survey database, this
may have posed a threat to the study depending on availability of computer usage and willingness
to correspond with an unknown individual.  All participants were asked to complete the
questionnaire if they were interested in participating.  Data collection lasted approximately two
weeks.  All questionnaires that reported to be anyone other than a female athlete and any
incomplete surveys were excluded from the study.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

For the purposes of this study, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was
used to analyze the collected data.  The mean and standard deviation was found for each of the
facets scaled on a seven-point Likert Scale, which utilized descriptive statistics.  A Cronbach's
Alpha was also determined for each facet to ensure each item was consistently measuring the
same.  An outcome of .70 or higher is an acceptable alpha reliability (Nunally & Burstein, 1994).
Each facet's outcome was above the acceptable .70 (see Appendix E, Table 9).

Each category was evaluated to determine the likelihood of the apparent relationship
between athletic department structure and a female athlete's perceived satisfaction level.  Any
relationship found to have a p-value of 0.05 or smaller ($p < .05$) was considered significant.  A
Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was calculated to determine if there was a
significant difference of satisfaction for any of the facets addressed in the questionnaire.  If the
results of the MANOVA determined at least one facet with a significant difference, individual
Analysis of Variances (ANOVAs) were calculated to identify which facet(s) showed significant
differences. Questions in the "Biographic" section were analyzed to determine the percentage of
representation in each category under the respective questions to give an understanding of the
sample population.

30

**Chapter IV: Results**

**Overall Satisfaction Results**

The means for each facet of satisfaction were calculated to gain an understanding of the overall satisfaction of female athletes at both department types. The highest mean of satisfaction reported for overall satisfaction was 'Academic Support Services' (M = 6.0846), followed by 'Facilities/Equipment' (M = 6.0398), 'Medical Personnel (M = 5.8010), 'Enforcement of Rules and Regulations' (M = 5.4527, 'Budget' (M = 5.0647), 'Personal Treatment' (M = 5.0299), and the lowest overall satisfaction reported for 'External Agents' (M = 4.6828). This combined view of satisfaction levels shows as whole, female athletes, regardless of the structure of their athletic department, were most satisfied with the 'Academic Support Services' and the 'Facilities/ Equipment' available to their teams. On the other hand, female athletes as a whole reported being much less satisfied with the 'External Agents' of their teams (see Appendix E, Table 10).

**Satisfaction by Department Type Results**

To give an overall idea of the differences reported in satisfaction levels between female athletes at the department types, an Independent T-Test was calculated and results showed [t(65) = 2.773; p = .007] a significant difference in satisfaction between the female athletes at the two department types. The overall satisfaction of female athletes in divided had a higher reported a mean satisfaction of (M = 5.7259) than did female athletes at merged departments (M = 5.0964) (see Appendix E, Table 11).

A MANOVA was calculated to determine if a significant difference existed between department types and reported satisfaction levels for each of the individual facets. The MANOVA indicated a significant difference [F(7,59) = 4.281; p = .001]

31

among the facets.  To determine which facet(s) held a significant difference, individual

ANOVAs were run on all satisfaction facets.  Individual ANOVAs indicated three facets

with significant differences in satisfaction levels: 'Personal Treatment' $[F(1,66) = 5.912;$

$p = .018]$, 'Budget' $[F(1,66) = 24.659; p < .001]$, and 'Facilities/Equipment' $[F(1,66) =$

$9.198; p = .003]$.  Reported levels of satisfaction on 'Personal Treatment' had a mean of

5.431 at divided athletic departments and a mean of 4.616 at merged athletic departments,

with a significance of $p = .018$.  Satisfaction levels with 'Budget' allocations were

notably different between the divided departments $(M = 5.951)$ and merged departments

$(M = 4.152)$, with a significant difference of $p < .001$.  The third facet,

'Facilities/Equipment' also showed a significant difference in satisfaction levels between

the two department types where divided departments reported a mean of 6.510 and

merged departments reported a mean of 5.556, with a significant difference of $p = .003$.

While no other facets showed significant differences in the reported levels of satisfaction,

it is important to note that the only facet in which the merged athletic departments

received a higher satisfaction mean than divided athletic departments is the facet of

'Enforcement of Rules and Regulations' which divided departments reported a mean of

5.304 and merged departments reported a mean of 5.606 (see Appendix E, Table 12).

**Other Responses**

Eight participants chose to add additional comments at the end of the survey, two of these

responses came from female athletes at divided departments, and six of the comments came from

female athletes at merged athletic departments.  Most frequently mentioned was disappointment

in the amount of recognition their respective team/sport was given $(n = 4)$, followed by a love for

their team and university $(n = 3)$, and a lack of social life $(n = 1)$ (see Appendix E for comments).

32

**Differences in Overall Satisfaction**

Inspection of the means and outcomes of the facets indicates that female athletes at both divided and merged athletic departments have the highest rate of satisfaction with the 'Academic Support Services' provided to their team. Outcomes also showed that female athletes at both department types tend to be very satisfied with the 'Facilities and Equipment' allocation to their teams. The facets of 'Medical Personnel', 'Enforcement of Rules and Regulations', and 'Budget' all elicited moderate satisfaction responses. Female athletes reported being the least satisfied with the 'External Agents' of their team. Among the comments stated by the female athletes in the survey, four of the eight were comments about external agents; most notably a lack or recognition by the local media, school community and newspaper, lack of fan support, and lack of noticeable recognition from the athletic department. These comments from female athletes, especially about a lack of media coverage, are congruent with findings in other studies that showed male athletes and their sport populated more of the media coverage than their female counterparts, even in major events such as the Olympics (Bishop, 2003; Capranica, et al., 2005). The lack of fan support noted by the participants is also backed by numbers published by the NCAA, that showed men's Division I basketball attendance for the 2006-2007 season recorded numbers over 27.8 million (NCAA[a], 2007), whereas women's Division I basketball (arguably the most noted and watched women's sport at the college level) for the same season was just over 7.8 million spectators (NCAA[b], 2007).

33

**Differences in Satisfaction by Department Type**

It is not surprising that results showed female athletes at divided athletic departments reported a higher level of satisfaction overall ($M = 5.7259$, $M = 5.0964$) and among most facets addressed in the questionnaire. Although only three facets showed significant results, 'Personal Treatment', 'Budget' and 'Facilities/Equipment', female athletes at divided departments reported higher mean levels of satisfaction in all but one facet, 'Enforcement of Rules and Regulations'. These results are not surprising because the model of a divided department is an interpretation of specialization, which is "the extent to which roles are differential according to a particular task or purpose" (Kikulis et al., 1995, p. 142). Female athletes who are part of a divided athletic department are immersed in an environment where those who cater to them, the administration, have roles which are particularly poised to meet the needs of female athletes. Although some roles or positions may be combined or work in conjunction with another athletic department (most seemingly a men's athletic department), the concept of a divided athletic department is to meet the needs of female athletes, independently from the needs of the male athlete. This separation enables the administration to focus on catering to a single demographic, the female athlete, whose needs and requirements may be different from those of their male counterparts. The reported results seem to indicate divided athletic departments are meeting these needs, in most cases, more successfully than merged athletic departments.

*Personal Treatment.* The facet of 'Personal Treatment' showed significant differences in satisfaction between female athletes at divided and merged departments. This facet focused on how the athletic department treated their female athletes on a personal level; including elements of recognition, appreciation, and loyalty exhibited by the athletic department. It is not surprising that the responses were different for the two department types. Female athletes who are a part of

34

divided athletic departments have an exact group of individuals who provide services based on the needs of the female athletes of their programs, this type of focus is a loyalty of the athletic department.  Divided athletic departments have a loyalty to a single group, female athletes, whereas at merged departments the loyalty lies in two areas, men's athletics and women's athletics.  When athletic departments and their staff are put in the position of having to divided their loyalties among two distinct groups, it becomes a forced nature of choosing who gets what loyalties, and the outcome is rarely an even split between the groups.  It is difficult for those forced to divide their loyalties to keep an even balance not only between male and female athletes, but also between the sports in those groups.

The loyalties of a department also help to ascertain who gets what recognition, when they get it, and how they get it.  When an athletic department looks to publicize their programs or athletes, they point to and advertise their 'big' sports such as football and men's basketball, and in some rare occasions a women's sport will be noted.  However, female athletes in divided athletic departments have a greater chance of receiving recognition from the athletic department because the administration is focused on bringing the women's athletic teams and individual athletes the greatest amount of publicity as possible, there is no divided loyalty.  This means the accomplishments and success of female athletes are better known, and the better known these accomplishments are, the more likely teams and individual athletes are to be publicly acknowledged.

*Enforcement of Rules and Regulations.*  The facet of 'Enforcement of Rules and Regulations' showed no significant differences between the two department types, however, interesting to note is the fact that this facet was the only facet that received a higher mean of satisfaction in merged departments than in divided departments. One reason for this may be contamination from men's sports. This facet was concerned with how the athletic department handled issues that were deemed unethical including everything from recruiting violations, to NCAA violations and

35

university/ and or athletic department violations. It is possible that while processing the question, men's sports and male athletes became part of the equation. One comment made by a female athlete at the end of the survey expressed the notion that football and basketball players "get away with everything" (see Appendix E for comments). This expressed reflection plays a major role in how an athlete responds to questions regarding the enforcement of rules and regulations. However, it is still surprising that female athletes at merged departments are more satisfied with the enforcement measures than female athletes at divided departments, for the reason that female athletes at divided departments can separate themselves from the actions and retributions of the male athletes at the university. Because female athletes at divided departments are disciplined and ultimately held accountable for their actions by an entity that does not deal with the male athletes of the university, the female athlete at divided departments should be able to remove the male athlete from the equation when process their satisfaction level with the enforcement measures of their respective athletic department. Female athletes at merged departments may report higher levels of satisfaction with this facet because they do experience and hear of disciplinary action amongst the male athletes of the department. This experience may prompt a female athlete to realize the full force of the enforcement practices, giving better light to the overall disciplinary practices of the athletic department. This may be an interesting area of future research.

*Budget.* The 'Budget' facet showed the most significant difference in satisfaction responses between female athletes at divided and merged departments. This however, is not surprising considering that divided athletic departments had larger budgets for both individual teams and as an overall department to begin. There are several reasons schools have differing budgets, but when examining why budgets differ among organizational structures, the most obvious reason comes back to the idea that divided athletic departments are working with and advocating for a single demographic. When trying to illicit monetary support for an athletic department, having an

36

individual who is skilled at marketing and lobbying collegiate athletics is not enough; marketing and lobbying women's sports and men's sports is different, they appeal to different audiences, and therefore the individual must understand how to draw support for that specific sport or group of athletes. Having a divided athletic department provides the freedom to hire individuals skilled at selling support for women's athletics, as a stand alone task, where there is no need to divide time between men's and women's sports, making the success of drawing monetary support for women's athletic highly feasible.

Even with the division of men's and women's athletics, there is no guarantee that women's athletics receives equitable allowances as compared to men's budgets. Men's budgets still tend to be larger than women's budgets, partially because men's athletics stills dominates the world of collegiate athletics, and that domination contributes to greater monetary support of their teams; the idea that the best and most profitable teams get the biggest budgets. This idea can be detrimental to the existence of women's collegiate athletics, for the sole reason that there are very few women's collegiate athletic teams that are profitable. While most women's teams will only break even, or may even lose money, it is not an excuse to make women's teams 'pinch pennies'. In an effort to avoid pinching budgets, women's athletics must have someone dedicated to advocating and drawing support for the elite female athletes at the college level. Not only does this show a desire to grow women's athletics, it allows the female athlete to have the best college athletic experience possible.

*Medical Personnel.* While medical personnel did not have significant differences between the two department types, the female athletes at divided departments did report a higher mean of satisfaction with their medical staff. This can possibly be attributed to the fact that treating female athletes is different than treating and rehabilitating male athletes. Attention must be given to more than just the physical aspects of an injury, such as the emotional and psychological implications of athletic injury and rehabilitation. Many universities at the Division I level now

37

have single trainers who specialize in working with a single team.  This practice is a major advantage to athletes because they can form a bond with an individual they trust to take care of them.  This enables and encourages the athlete to be open and honest about an injury, as well as provide comfort to the athlete knowing that the person treating them has their best interest and health in mind.  Although the mean of satisfaction was higher for divided departments, it is encouraging to know that no matter what structure of the athletic department, female athletes feel they are receiving adequate medical attention, a crucial part of being bodily able to compete.

*Academic Support Services.*  Academic Support Services was the facet with the highest mean of satisfaction among both department types.  While there was not a significant difference between the department types, it is promising to know that the university system and athletic departments are working together to help student athletes excel in the classroom.  Because the time demands required to be an athlete at the college level are so great, it is hard for some athletes to find the time necessary to devote to studying. While these demands can be difficult for athletes to deal with on their own, having access to a group of individuals dedicated to guiding and counseling athletes, these issues can be recognized and addressed before they result in more severe problems.

Another complex aspect of mixing academics and athletics is the relationship between the university academic system and the athletics department.  As stated before, the demands of being an athlete in college often cut into class time for travel and game times, and this can result in a sour relationship between the two entities.  Even though this may occur, the results of this study show that female athletes are extremely pleased with the amount of academic assistance available to them outside of the classroom.  The availability of these services is crucial to many female athletes who are unable to spend the same amount of time in the traditional classroom setting as their academic counterparts.  Knowing and utilizing the academic resources available to them ensures that not only will female athletes continue to advance in the arena but also in their academic endeavors.

38

*Facilities/Equipment.* A unique aspect of the current study was the added facet of Facilities/ Equipment', a facet not included in the original Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire. The facet was added to the Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire to examine if female athletes at divided athletic departments had higher levels of satisfactions with their facilities than did female athletes at merged departments. While examining budget allocations for athletic departments at both department types, it was evident that divided athletic departments had substantially larger budgets, and therefore the base for adding this new facet was the assumption that if a department had larger budget to work from, that would translate into 'better' facilities, and equipment available to the athletes of those departments. While this may not always be the case, this study showed that female athletes at departments with larger budgets, divided departments, had higher levels of satisfaction with these areas than did female athletes at merged departments.

Once again, this difference can be attributed to the fact that female athletes at divided departments have an advantage over female athletes at merged departments, strictly because female athletes at divided departments have an entire administration lobbying for their best interests. With the number of female collegiate athletes growing each year, the recruiting market for female athletes is increasingly more competitive and in an effort for departments and teams to keep up, there is an ever evolving need for state-of-art facilities and equipment. With men's sports the focus of many of athletic departments, many female athletes feel the men are the beneficiaries of the efforts of the department while they, as female athletes, are handed the leftovers. This anomaly can be greatly reduced by having not just an individual (i.e., Senior women's advisor in a merged athletic department) but an entire group of administration that is dedicated to interests of the female athlete, and making sure that they receive the same opportunities to experience the greatness of college athletics in the most state-of-the-art ways as possible.

39

*External Agents.*  As noted earlier, there were no significant differences in satisfaction levels between the two department types in 'External Agents', however, it was the facet with the lowest satisfaction levels for both department types.  The facet specifically dealt with media coverage, support from the university community and fans, and support from the outside community.  The low satisfaction results are not surprising, and are congruent with recent findings in other studies concerning the low media coverage and community recognition for female athletes (Bishop, 2003; Capranica, et al., 2005).  While women's athletics continues to increase in fan attendance, it still lacks the same numbers compared to men's athletics.  The NCAA reported that the 2006-2007 basketball season saw one of its largest crowds for women's Division I basketball with just over 7.8 million  spectators (NCAA[b], 2007), however, men's Division I basketball reported just over 27.8 million spectators (NCAA[a], 2007). It is clear that although women's college basketball is the third most watched and followed college sport (behind college football and men's basketball) there is still a lack of fan and community support.

While neither department reported high levels of satisfaction in this area, the structure of a divided athletic department lends itself to be better equipped to rectify this weak spot.  Instead of a conglomerate effort by a single individual to provide marketing and promotion for men's and women's athletics, divided departments are more apt to hire and utilize a single individual or group to provide marketing services for women's athletics.  This process would provide women's athletics not only with a stronger fan base, but also potentially increase the donor base for the women's athletic department as a whole (this can also be tied back to the facet of 'Budget').  This method of division could prove to be not only extremely beneficial to merged departments, but also an easy area of athletics to potentially divide within a merged department.  Although some merged departments may utilize a slight division in marketing of sports, any department structure could utilize the same format by dividing the tasks of marketing to focus on either men's or women's athletics.  Instead of needing to divide a marketing or promotional focus on two

40

separate strategies, the spotlight would turn to a single group.  In turn, this process would allow for specialized marketing and promotion strategies to a specific audience, and as a result increase both fan base and community support for women's collegiate athletics, while remaining a merged department.

*Other comments.*  Upon examination of the qualitative comments, it was surprising to find that female athletes at merged athletic departments qualitatively reported higher levels of satisfaction more frequently than did female athletes at divided athletic departments.  There were two responses from female athletes at divided departments.  One response was a praise of the athletic department, the other a response of general disappointment about the facilities available to their respective team as compared to other teams at the university.  These qualitative comparisons are skewed due to the larger amount of comments from female athletes at merged departments and only two responses from female athletes at divided departments.

**History of Divided Athletic Departments**

In an effort to understand the history and reasons for employing a divided athletic department for female college athletes, questions concerning the history and reasons were sent electronically to all Division I NCAA universities that exhibit a divided model.  Unfortunately, there was only one responses to the request for information and was determined that the methods of one institution could not be universally applied to all divided athletic departments; furthermore, it is not the place of this study to speculate the reasonings for universities to employ the divided model.  This may be an area of study for future research to examine the reasons and history of instituting a divided versus merged department for college athletics.

**Possible Covariates and Future Research**

Every effort was made to eliminate covariates from the current study by matching the universities and athletic departments as closely as possible (see Appendix D for tables).  However, there are several other factors that contribute to an athlete's perceived satisfaction level

41

that were not specifically addressed in this study.  Factors of the university such as institutional size, conference affiliation, degree programs offered at the respective institution,  and geographical location of the institution were all matched as closely as possible but where not specifically questioned; leadership style of coaching staff, social atmosphere (Greek life) opportunities available/allowable, reputation of the respective institution, and many other aspects were not directly asked or considered.  This study is an initial study aimed at examining only one area that may possibly effect athlete satisfaction; organizational structure of the athletic department.

There are several other factors that could influence an athletes' satisfaction.  The number of years the athlete has been a part of the team could impact their satisfaction level in many ways. For example, if an athlete is in their first year of participation under their respective athletic department, they may not have a clear vision of how the department portrays, treats, advertises, supports or controls their athletes.  Due to the limited amount of time they have spent under the direction of the athletic department they may feel satisfied because they do realize these factors, whereas an athlete that has been under the direction of a athletic department for three or four years may have a better understanding of these inner workings, causing a different reaction to their perceived satisfaction level.

Another area of high anticipation for many athletes is financial aide/ scholarship money. Female athletes who receive scholarship money may possess a differing level of satisfaction with their athletic department than do female athletes who do not receive monetary support. Social attitude can convey that an athlete who receives an athletic scholarship is a "better" athlete than an athlete who does not receive a scholarship, which may be translated that athletes who are on athletic scholarship, since they are "better", receive more support from the athletic department than non-scholarship athletes.  It may also be possible that female athletes who receive multiple

42

scholarship offers chose the school or team that offers the most money, which in turn may be a good or bad outcome.  The money may be good, but the experience may be bad.

It is reasonable to assume that not all decisions for athletes are based solely on the athletic opportunity presented to the athlete.  If the athlete prefers to stay close to their home town so friends and family can attend games, then they have made the decision to reject schools outside of the target radius, possibly also rejecting a better, larger, or more respected athletic team or department. An athlete could also decide they have a particular degree program they desire and therefore, reject a school and team (athletic department) based on the academic availability of degrees offered through the respective university. Future areas, and expanded studies, may look to examine if any of these additional factors affect athlete satisfaction, or possibly helped an athlete to choose or reject an institution or athletic opportunity.

**Conclusion**

This initial study examine whether the structure of the athletic department, being divided or merged, affected the perceived satisfaction level of female athletes at their universities. Results showed significant differences in some of the facets, but not all, indicating there are certain facets that may not be affected by the structure of the athletic department.  Cronbach's alpha for the current study showed a sufficient reliability for each of the measured facets, however, due to the small sample size of the current study, it is possible that some of the reported satisfactions may change with future studies due to number of respondents at each department type, representation of each sport, and the length of time the respondents have been part of their respective department.  The current study gives light into how the structure of the athletic department may help to better the college athletic experience for female athletes; giving female athletes the attention and interest they need to be successful college athletes and enjoy the time they spend as a collegiate athlete.

43

# REFERENCES

Babbie, E. R. (2001). *The practice of social research* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Barnett, W. (2006). Stanford business school finds that competition improves organizational performance. *M2 Wireless News*, November 16, 2006.

Bishop, R. (2003).Missing in action: Feature coverage of women's sports in Sports Illustrated. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 27*, 184.

Bloomberg, J. (2006). Women's basketball attendance hovers near 10 million mark. *NCAA News, 43*, 16, 9.

Broyles, J. F., & Hay, R. D. (1979). *Administration of athletic programs: A managerial approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Capranica, L.; Minganti, C.; Billat, V.; Hanghoj, S.; Piacentini, M. F.; Cumps, E.; Meeusen, R. (2005). Newspaper coverage of women's sports during the 2000 Sydney Olympic Games: Belgium, Denmark, France, and Italy. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport,76*, 2, 212-223.

Chelladurai, P. (1992). A classification of sport and physical activity services: Implications for sport management. *Journal of Sport Management, 6*, 38-51.

Chelladurai, P. (2001). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity: A systems perspective*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.

Chelladurai, P., & Riemer, H. A. (1997). A classification of facets of athlete satisfaction. *Journal of Sport Management, 11*, 133-159.

Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sports. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 3*, 85-92.

Chronicle for Higher Education, The (2001). *Operating budgets*. Retrieved from www.chronicle.com, April 2007.

45

Courneya, K. S., & Carron, A. V. (1992). The home court advantage in sport competitions: A

 literature review. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14*, 13-27.

Courneya, K. S., & Chelladurai, P. (1991). A model of performance measures in baseball.

 *Journal of Sport Psychology, 13*, 16-25.

Courneya, K.S., & Carron, A. V. (1992). The home curt advantage in sport competitions: A

 literature review. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14*, 13-27.

Cummings, L.L., & Berger C.J. (1976).  Organizational structure. How does it influence attitudes

 and performance? *Organizational Dynamics, Autumn*, 34-49.

Cunningham, G. B., & Rivera, C. A. (2001). Structural designs within American intercollegiate

 athletic departments. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 9*, 369-390.

Deci, E.L.(1975). Intrinsic motivation. New York: Plenum.

Donaldson, L., & Warner, M. (1974). Structure of organizations in occupational interest

 associations. *Human Relations, 27*. 721-738.

Eitzen, D. S. (1989). Ethical dilemmas in sport. In D.S. Eitzen (Ed), *Sport in contemporary*

 *society* (3rd ed.) New York : St. Martin's.

Huber, G. P., & Glick, W. H. (1993). Sources and forms of organizational change (pp. 3-15). In

 G.P. Huber & W. H. Glick (Eds.), *Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and*

 *insights for improving performance*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, J. J. (1987). Organizational Structure. *Journal of Sport Management, 1*, 74-81.

Keating, J.W. (1964). Sportsmanship as a moral category. *Ethics, 75,* 25-35.

Kikulis, L. M., Slack, T., & Hinings, C. R. (1995). Toward an understanding of the role of agency

 and choice in the changing structure of Canada's national sport organizations. *Journal of*

 *Sport Management, 9*, 135-152.

Knight Foundation. (1991). *Keeping faith with the student athlete: A new model for*

 *intercollegiate athletics*. Charlotte, NC: Knight Foundation.

46

Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (1994). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play*. St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Mehta, R., & Sivadas, E. (1995). Comparing response rates and response content in mail versus electronic mail surveys. *Journal of the Market Research Society, 37*, 429-493.

Mintzberg, H. (1984). A typology of organizational structure. In D. Miller & P. Friesen, *Organizations: A quantum view* (pp. 68-86). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Moulton, M., Moulton, P., Gallien, T., & Roach, S. (1999). Generic alcoholism: Are female athletes at risk? *The Sport Journal, Published By United States Sports Academy Sport Journal, 2,* 1, 1-5.

NCAA Fact Sheet (March 26, 2006). Retrieved from www.ncaa.org, April 2007.

NCAA[a] (2007). National college basketball attendance for all NCAA men's varsity teams. Retrieved from www.ncaa.org, March 2008.

NCAA[b] (2007). Women's basketball attendance. Retrieved from www.ncaa.org, March 2008.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reips, U.-D. (2000). Web experiment method. In M. H. Birnbaum (Ed.), *Psychological experiments on the internet* (pp. 89-117). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Rice, H. L. (1990). Responsibilities to the student athletes and goal challenges. In T.M. Kinder (Ed), *Organization, management, administration for athletic programs* (2nd ed., pp. 29-42). Dubuque, IA: Eddie Bowers Publishing.

Riemer, H.A., & Toon, K. (2001). Leadership and satisfaction in tennis: Examination of congruence, gender, and ability. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 72*, 243-256.

47

Schminke, E. H., Ambrose, M. L., & Cropanzano, R. S. (2000). The effect of organizational structure on perceptions of procedural fairness. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 294-304.

Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1992). Understanding change in national sport organizations: An integration of theoretical perspectives. *Journal of Sport Management, 6*, 114-132.

Smith, C. B. (1997). Casting the net: Surveying an internet population. *Journal of Communication Mediated by Computers*,

http://www.usc.edu/dept/annenberg/vol3/issue1/.

Street, & Smith. (1999, December). The answer is. *Sports Business Journal*, pp. 20-26,23-29.

Vallerand, R.J. & Reid, G. (1988). On the relative effects of positive and negative verbal feedback on males' and females' intrinsic motivation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 20*, 239-250.

Wallston, B. S., Alagna, S. W., DeVellis, B. M., & DeVellis, R. F. (1983). Social support and physical health. *Health Psychology, 2*, 367-391.

**APPENDICES**

49

I am satisfied with…
*Individual Performance*
The degree to which I have reached my performance goals during the season.
The improvement in my performance over the previous season.
The improvement in my skill level.

*Team Performance*
The team's win/loss record this season.
The team's overall performance this season
The extent to which the team is meeting its goals for the season.

*Ability Utilization*
The degree to which my abilities are used.
The level to which my talents are employed.
The extent to which my role matches my potential.
The amount of time I play during competitions.
The degree to which my role on the team matches my preferred role.

*Strategy*
The coach's choice of plays during competitions.
The tactics used during games.
Coach's choice of strategies during games.
How the coach makes adjustments during competitions.
Coach's game plans.
The manner in which coach combines the available talent.

*Personal Treatment*
The recognition I receive from my coach.
The friendliness of the coach towards me.
The level of appreciation my coach shows when I do well.
My cache's loyalty towards me.
The extent to which the coach is behind me.

*Training and Instruction*
The training I receive from the coach during the season.
The instruction I have received from the coach this season.
The coach's teaching of the tactics and techniques of my position.

*Team Task Contribution*
The extent to which teammates provide me with instruction.
The guidance I receive from my teammates.
The constructive feedback I receive from my teammates.

*Team Social Contribution*
My social status on the team.

50

The role I play in the social life of the team.
The degree to which my teammates accept me on a social level.

*Ethics*
The extent to which all team members are ethical.
My teammates' sense of fair play.
My teammates' 'sportsmanlike' behavior.

*Team Integration*
How the team works to be the best.
The degree to which teammates share the same goal.
Team member's dedication to work together toward team goals.
The extent to which teammates play as a team.

*Personal Dedication*
The degree to which I do my best for the team.
My dedication during practices.
My enthusiasm during competitions.
My commitment to the team.

*Budget*
The funding provided to my team.
 The amount of money spent on my team.
The fairness of the team's budget.

*Medical Personnel*
The competence of the medical personnel.
The fairness with which the medical personnel treats all players.
The medical personnel's interest in the athletes.
The promptness of medical attention.

*Academic Support Services*
The tutoring I receive.
The academic support services provided.
The personnel of the academic support services (i.e. tutors, counselors).

*External Agents*
The media's support of our program.
The support from the university community.
The supportiveness of the fans.
The local community's support.

51

### Modified Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire
Modified from Riemer and Chelladurai's (1997) "Athlete Satisfaction Questionnaire"

_____

*This questionnaire is designed to report your level of satisfaction with your respective athletic department. All answers and information obtained through this questionnaire are confidentially used only for the purposes of this study, and will be reported in a group format. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate.*

*The completed return of this questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate in this study. This study is voluntary and you may quit at any time with no penalty.*

_____

**Please choose your response from the scale, rating your responses from 1 (Very Unsatisfied) to 7 (Very Satisfied) in the space provided.**

**Personal Treatment**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The recognition I receive from the athletic department
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The level of appreciation the athletic department shows when I do well
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The amount of loyalty that the athletic department demonstrates
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

**Enforcement of Rules and Regulations**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The extent to which the athletic department enforces recruiting regulations
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The way the athletic department handles athletes who violate NCAA policies
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The way the athletic department handles athletes who violate University and/or Athletic Dept. policies
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

**Budget**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The funding provided to my team
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The amount of money spent on my team
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The fairness of allocation of funds from the athletic department
__1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

52

**Medical Personnel**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The fairness to which the medical personnel treats all players
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The medical personnel's interest in the athletes
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The promptness of medical attention
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

**Academic Support Services**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The tutoring I receive
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The academic support services provided/ promoted by the athletic department (including but not limited to: tutoring, career guidance, & advising)
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The academic support personnel provided/ promoted by the athletic department
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

**Facilities**
*I am satisfied with….*
The practice facilities available to my team
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The competition facilities available to my team
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The weight /strength training facilities available to my team
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

**External Agents**
*I am satisfied with…..*
The media's support of our program
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The support from the university community
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The supportiveness of the fans
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

The local community's support
          __1 __2 __3 __4 __5 __6 __7

53

**Demographics**

Are you a female athlete?

_____Yes    _____No

What sport do you participate in? (if you participate in more than one sport please indicate your priority sport)

Basketball
Softball
Cross Country
Track/Field
Volleyball
Rowing
Equestrian
Golf
Soccer
Swimming/Diving
Tennis
Other

What is your academic classification?

_____ Freshman
_____ Sophomore
_____ Junior
_____ Senior
_____ 5$^{th}$ year Senior
_____ Other

How many years have you been on the roster for your current team?

_____Years

Have you red-shirted for your current team? If yes, please indicate number of seasons

_____ No        _____Yes      _____ Years

Are you, or have you been at any time, on any kind of athletic scholarship for your current team?

_____Currently on scholarship
_____ Previously on scholarship
_____ No scholarship ever received

54

# APPENDIX C
## Informational Invitation
This informational invitation was sent to female athletes at the participating
universities inviting them to participate in the study.

Hi, my name is Niki Turner and I am a Graduate Student at the University of Tennessee, working on my Masters degree in Sport Management.

I am currently collecting data for my thesis study and am inviting female college athletes at your university to participate and report about your college athletic experience.  My topic revolves around women's college athletics and female athlete satisfaction.

Below you will find a link to a survey that asks about your level of satisfaction with your college athletic experience.  The survey takes only about ten minutes, is completely anonymous, and all answers will be reported in a group format.

Please consider participating to help better the female college athletic experience for all women!

**Link to survey appeared here

-Niki Turner
Graduate Student, Sport Management
University of Tennessee

# APPENDIX D
## University Metric Tables
Information supplied upon request by participating universities and obtained
from participating universities' official school and athletic websites.

_____

**Table 1:** University of Tennessee, Knoxville

| Conference Affiliation | Southeastern Conference (SEC) | |
|---|---|---|
| **School Population**<br>(undergraduate & graduate students<br>at main campus) | 26,400 | |
| **Tuition**<br>(in-state undergraduate tuition & room/board) | $18,584 | |
| **Undergraduate Degrees Offered**<br>(reported number may include<br>concentrations with in majors) | 300+ | |
| **Varsity women's sports** | *Sport* | *Budget 2007-2008* |
| | Basketball | $3,232,501.00 |
| | Swimming &Diving | $886,091.00 |
| | Rowing | $1,180,261.00 |
| | Softball | $967,350.00 |
| | Golf | $460,051.00 |
| | Cross Country | Included in T&F budget |
| | Track &Field<br>(indoor & outdoor) | $1,311,800.00 |
| | Soccer | $798,174.00 |
| | Tennis | $636,484.00 |
| | Volleyball | $963,997.00 |
| | *Total sports*:<br>10 | *Total budget*:<br>$10,436,709.00 |
| **Total of varsity female athletes**<br>(according to online rosters, athletes in multiple<br>sports counted only once) | 183 | |

56

**Table 2:** University of South Carolina, Columbia

| Conference Affiliation | Southeastern Conference (SEC) | |
|---|---|---|
| **School Population**<br>(undergraduate & graduate students at main campus) | 27,390 | |
| **Tuition**<br>(in-state undergraduate tuition & room/board) | $8,346 (tuition only) | |
| **Undergraduate Degrees Offered**<br>(reported number may include concentrations with in majors) | 350+ | |
| **Varsity women's sports** | *Sport* | *Budget 2007-2008* |
| | Basketball | $1,981,030.00 |
| | Swimming &Diving | $718,924.92 |
| | Softball | $773,943.00 |
| | Golf | $418,848.00 |
| | Equestrian | $838,373.00 |
| | Cross Country | Included in T&F budget |
| | Track & Field (indoor & outdoor) | $1,095,570.98 |
| | Soccer | $732,666.00 |
| | Tennis | $561,703.00 |
| | Volleyball | $885,524.00 |
| | *Total sports*:<br>10 | *Total Budget*:<br>$8,006,582.90<br>$8,006,582.90 |
| **Total of varsity female athletes**<br>(According to online rosters, athletes in multiple sports counted once) | 206 | |

الﻤﻨـﺎرة للاستشارات

www.manaraa.com

**Table 3:** University of Texas, Austin

| Conference Affiliation | Big 12 | |
|---|---|---|
| **School population**<br>(both undergraduate & graduate students at main campus) | 48,00 | |
| **Tuition**<br>(in-state undergraduate tuition & room/board) | $18,400 | |
| **Undergraduate Degrees Offered**<br>(reported number may include concentrations with in majors) | 270+ | |
| **Varsity women's sports** | *Sport* | *Budget 2007-2008* |
| | Basketball | $4,399,681.00 |
| | Swimming &Diving | $1,145,747.00 |
| | Rowing | $1,175,550.00 |
| | Softball | $971,643.00 |
| | Golf | $585,839.00 |
| | Cross Country | Included in T&F budget |
| | Track & Field (indoor & outdoor) | $1,300,305.00 |
| | Soccer | $1,108,009.00 |
| | Tennis | $671,228.00 |
| | Volleyball | $1,284,165.00 |
| | *Total sports:* 10 | *Total budget*: $12,642,167.00 |
| **Total of varsity female athletes**<br>(according to online rosters, athletes in multiple sports counted once) | 188 | |

58

**Table 4:** Texas A&M University

| Conference Affiliation | Big 12 | |
|---|---|---|
| **School population**<br>(both undergraduate & graduate students at main campus) | 45,380 | |
| **Tuition**<br>(in-state undergraduate tuition & room/board) | $14, 966 | |
| **Undergraduate Degrees Offered**<br>(reported number may include concentrations with in majors) | 150+ ("courses of study") | |
| **Varsity women's sports** | *Sport* | *Budget 2007-2008* |
| | Basketball | $2,910,326.00 |
| | Swimming | $1,021,379.00 |
| | Diving | $197,301.00 |
| | Equestrian | $1,119,203.00 |
| | Softball | $905,842.00 |
| | Golf | $522,915.00 |
| | Volleyball | $990,319.00 |
| | Track | $1,126,565.00 |
| | Cross Country | $93,572.00 |
| | Soccer | $1,275,425.00 |
| | Tennis | $579,014.00 |
| | *Total sports:*<br>11 | *Total Budget:*<br>$8,997,516.00 |
| **Total of varsity female athletes**<br>(according to online rosters, athletes in multiple sports counted once) | 166 | |

59

_____

**Table 5:** Participation by University

| University | Frequency | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Texas A&M | 19 | 28.4 |
| Univ. South Carolina, Columbia | 15 | 20.9 |
| Univ. Tennessee, Knoxville | 12 | 16.4 |
| Univ. Texas, Austin | 23 | 34.3 |
| Total | 67 | 100.0 |

**Table 6:** Sport Frequency by Department Type

*Facet Question*:  What sport do you participate in? (if you participate in more than one sport, please indicate your priority sport)

| Sport | 'Divided' Frequency | 'Divided' Percent | 'Merged' Frequency | 'Merged' Percent | Overall Frequency | Overall Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Basketball | 2 | 5.9 | 2 | 6.1 | 4 | 6.0 |
| Cross Country | - | - | 3 | 9.1 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Track/Field | 5 | 14.7 | 4 | 12.1 | 9 | 13.4 |
| Golf | 1 | 2.9 | 3 | 9.1 | 4 | 6.0 |
| Softball | 4 | 11.8 | 2 | 6.1 | 6 | 9.0 |
| Soccer | 6 | 17.6 | 2 | 6.1 | 8 | 11.9 |
| Rowing | 8 | 23.5 | - | - | 8 | 11.9 |
| Swimming/ Diving | 7 | 20.6 | 6 | 18.2 | 13 | 19.4 |
| Volleyball | 1 | 2.9 | 1 | 3.0 | 2 | 3.0 |
| Equestrian | - | - | 10 | 30.3 | 10 | 14.9 |
| Tennis | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 34 | 100.00 | 33 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.00 |

**Table 7:** Academic Classification by Department Type

*Facet Question*:  What is your academic classification?

| Classification | 'Divided' Frequency | 'Divided' Percent | 'Merged' Frequency | 'Merged' Percent | Overall Frequency | Overall Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Freshman | 6 | 17.6 | 7 | 21.2 | 13 | 19.4 |
| Sophomore | 7 | 20.6 | 9 | 27.3 | 16 | 23.9 |
| Junior | 13 | 38.2 | 8 | 24.2 | 21 | 31.3 |
| Senior | 7 | 20.6 | 6 | 18.2 | 13 | 19.4 |
| 5th year Senior | 1 | 2.9 | 2 | 6.1 | 3 | 4.5 |
| Other | - | - | 1 | 3.0 | 1 | 1.5 |
| Total | 34 | 100.0 | 33 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.00 |

61

**Table 8:** Athletic Scholarship by Department Type

*Facet Question*: Are you, or have you been at any time, on any kind of athletic scholarship for your current team?

| Scholarship Status | 'Divided' Frequency | 'Divided' Percent | 'Merged' Frequency | 'Merged' Percent | Overall Frequency | Overall Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Currently receiving scholarship | 29 | 85.3 | 26 | 78.8 | 55 | 82.1 |
| Previously received scholarship | 1 | 2.9 | - | - | 1 | 1.5 |
| No Scholarship ever received | 4 | 11.8 | 7 | 21.2 | 11 | 16.4 |
| Total | 34 | 100.0 | 33 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.0 |

62

**Table 9:** Cronbach's Alpha for Individual Facets

| Facet | Cronbach's Alpha | Number of measured items |
|---|---|---|
| Personal Treatment | .905 | 3 |
| Enforcement of Rules & Regulations | .886 | 3 |
| Budget | .954 | 3 |
| Medical Personnel | .930 | 3 |
| Ancillary Support Services | .933 | 3 |
| Facilities/ Equipment | .888 | 3 |
| External Agents | .884 | 4 |
| Total Overall Satisfaction | .922 | 22 |

**Table 10:** Means of Overall Satisfaction by Facet

| Facet | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Academic Support Services | 6.0846 | 1.21348 |
| Facilities/ Equipment | 6.0398 | 1.36518 |
| Medical Personnel | 5.8010 | 1.45766 |
| Enforcement of Rules & Regulations | 5.4527 | 1.43278 |
| Budget | 5.0647 | 1.72839 |
| Personal Treatment | 5.0299 | 1.42220 |
| External Agents | 4.6828 | 1.46395 |

**Table 11:** Means of Overall Satisfaction by Department Type

| Department Type | Mean | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Divided | 5.7259 | .84213 |
| Merged | 5.0964 | 1.01109 |

63

**Table 12:** Means of Individual Facet Satisfaction by Department Type

| Facet | 'Divided' Mean | 'Merged' Mean | Significance (p value) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Personal Treatment | 5.431 | 4.616 | .018* |
| Enforcement of Rules & Regulations | 5.304 | 5.606 | .392 |
| Budget | 5.951 | 4.152 | <.001* |
| Medical Personnel | 6.029 | 5.566 | .195 |
| Ancillary Support Services | 6.196 | 5.970 | .449 |
| Facilities/ Equipment | 6.510 | 5.556 | .003* |
| External Agents | 4.926 | 4.432 | .169 |

*indicates significant difference

**Table 13:** Red Shirt Years

*Facet Question*:  Have you red shirted for your current team?

| Response | 'Divided' Frequency | 'Divided' Percent | 'Merged' Frequency | 'Merged' Percent | Overall Frequency | Overall Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 5 | 14.7 | 10 | 30.3 | 15 | 22.4 |
| No | 29 | 85.3 | 23 | 69.7 | 52 | 77.6 |
| Total | 34 | 100.0 | 33 | 100.0 | 67 | 100.00 |

*Facet Question Continued*:  How many seasons?

| Seasons | 'Divided' Frequency | 'Divided' Percent | 'Merged' Frequency | 'Merged' Percent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4 | 11.8 | 6 | 18.2 |
| 2 | 1 | 2.9 | 4 | 12.1 |

64

**Additional Comments from Questionnaire**
*comments were taken directly from survey responses without alteration

*University of South Carolina, Columbia*

- I do realize that my sport is a low profile, non-profit generating one, but I do get disturbed when an athlete in a low profile sport as mine is punished more serverely than one in a bigger sport such as football or basketball.

- it sucked............no social life!!!!

*Texas A&M University*

- I love my team :] hope this survey helped you out

- I think as a whole the athletic department is great and fair....equestrian as a sport just isn't quite as popular so its more difficult to feel the support

- Texas A&M is the most amazing university as far as support, funding, and recognition. I was blown away by the level of community and fan interest. The coaches and the facilities are top of the line and never have I felt inferior or ashamed to play for the Aggies.

- The TAMU Women's Swim Team is currently ranked 6th in the nation. Our men's swim team is ranked much lower in the teens or 20s. However, I men's swim team appears much more in the school newspaper, and more people show up to their meets than ours! It is very frustrating. As far as athletic trainers, etc though, I feel VERY well taken care of.

*University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

- No one ever pays attention to the track and field team, or gives us reconition. we do very well in everything, ranked top 5 in NCAA for many years and we still do not have nice new facilities like every other sports team does.

*University of Texas, Austin*

- The University of Texas treats its female athletes extremely well.

## Vita

Nicole 'Niki' Joan Turner was born in New Orleans, Louisiana on February 16, 1984. She graduated with honors from North Forsyth High School in Cumming, Georgia in May 2002. Niki attended Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, Missouri where she majored in Athletic Training, and graduated with a Bachelors of Science Degree in May 2006. In August 2006, she started graduate studies at the University of Tennessee in Sport Studies with a concentration in Sport Management. In April 2007, Niki was inducted into The National Scholars Honor Society, and that same year obtained a Certified Fitness Trainer license from the International Fitness Professionals Association, both of which she continues to be a member. Niki intends to graduate from the University of Tennessee with a Masters of Science Degree in Sport Studies with a concentration in Sport Management in May 2008.