

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

9-7-2011

The Prof versus the Owl: faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University

Robert Baumgartner

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Baumgartner, Robert, "The Prof versus the Owl: faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations*. 201.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/201>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

THE PROF VERSUS THE OWL: FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARDS
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AT
ROWAN UNIVERSITY

by

Robert C. Baumgartner

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements of the
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
June 23, 2011

Thesis Chair: Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.

© Robert C. Baumgartner

ABSTRACT

Robert C. Baumgartner

THE PROF VERSUS THE OWL: FACULTY ATTITUDES TOWARDS INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS AT ROWAN UNIVERSITY

2010/11

Burton R. Sisco, Ed.D.

Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

This study analyzed faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at a NCAA Division III institution, specifically Rowan University. A survey instrument was used to collect demographic information about the subjects including age, gender, and academic discipline plus data focused on five factor groupings pertaining to the student-athlete, financing for athletics, athletic governance/eligibility, athletics on campus and general athletics issues. Findings suggest generally positive attitudes of the faculty towards intercollegiate athletics. Moreover, Rowan faculty reported lacking specific information about intercollegiate athletics on campus to give informed opinions. Data analysis demonstrated strong support of intercollegiate athletics in general but the origin of support is unclear. Many Rowan faculty completed academic training at Division I schools and this exposure may have contributed to their views of intercollegiate athletics. Exposure to athletics at Rowan suggests more limited awareness and could have influenced the high level of uncertainty about the current condition of athletics on campus. Recommendations include having faculty and athletic administrators and coaches work together to increase awareness of athletics on campus, providing more information about the academic and athletic performance of student athletes, and hosting joint campus events such as open houses, class presentations, and guest faculty coaches.

Acknowledgments

First, I'd like to thank my masters in higher education cohort here at Rowan University. Without their support and constant listening to my venting, I do not know how I would have maintained my sanity during the undertaking of this project. Secondly, I would like to thank the Athletics department at Rowan University. My gratitude to Joy Solomen, Juan Ranero, Dan Gilmore, Scott Leacott, Gabby Lisella, "Ringo" Adamson, Jay Accorsi, Lindsey Delaney, Penny Kempf, Libby Ranero, Joe Cassidy, Patty Raube-Keller, Tom Doddy, Pat Lancetta and all of the great assistant coaches in the athletics program at Rowan University. I am deeply indebted to my track coach, Bill Fritz, for his four years of coaching me at Rowan in track and field. I salute the "Big B" in his 50th year of coaching.

I would also like to thank the professors in my higher education program at Rowan: MaryBeth Walpole, Dave Hespe, Kit Holder, Gini Doolittle, and of course, my thesis advisor Burt Sisco. I owe this project to Dr. Sisco's thorough hand and eye that made this paper sound and look much better than a master's thesis. He is truly a great mentor in research and writing and I will try my best to apply all he has taught me as I continue on in education.

Last but certainly not least, I am deeply indebted to my family. My parents, Bob and Betty, who for the last 26 years have constantly supported me in life and education regardless of where or what I was doing. I would like to thank my little sister Melissa and her fiancé Jason for their constant support. I wish the two of you the absolute best as you head down the road to marriage.

DEDICATIONS

I would like to dedicate this project to the memory of my maternal grandparents, Bob and Betty Hunt. I was lucky to have their support for the first 20 years of my life and I miss them each day. I would also like to dedicate this to the memory of my paternal grandfather John Baumgartner. He saw me begin this program but unfortunately passed away with one year left. I hope this project would meet his approval. Lastly, I want to dedicate this to my paternal grandmother, Irene Baumgartner, who is still with us and will watch my graduation on John Page Field in May. I was lucky enough to know all of my grandparents and I miss them each day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgments	ii
Dedications	iii
List of Tables	v
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Purpose of the Study	4
Need for the Study	4
Assumptions and Limitations	5
Operational Definitions	5
Research Questions	6
Overview of the Study	7
II. Literature Review	8
National Collegiate Athletic Association	8
Historical Background of Faculty Involvement	13
Attitudes	15
Faculty Involvement	17
The Drake Group	20
The Student Athlete	23

	Conceptual Framework	26
	Summary of Literature Review	27
III.	Methodology	29
	Context of the Study	29
	Population and Sample	30
	Instrumentation	31
	Data Collection	32
	Data Analysis	33
IV.	Findings	34
	Profile of the Sample	34
	Analysis of the Data	36
	Research Question 1	36
	Research Question 2	46
V.	Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations	47
	Summary of the Study	47
	Discussion of the Findings	47
	Conclusions	52
	Recommendations for Practice	53
	Recommendations for Further Research	55
	REFERENCES	57

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter	61
Appendix B: Email Sent Out to Participants/Consent	63
Appendix C: Survey Instrument	65

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.1	Demographics	34
4.2	Athletics on Campus	37
4.3	Student-Athletes	39
4.4	Governance and Eligibility	41
4.5	Finances and Athletics	44
4.6	General Athletics Issues	45

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

In 2010, the Florida State University (FSU) was penalized for cheating. The offense, receiving improper help in the classroom, implicated 61 student-athletes. The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) forced FSU to forfeit all games in which those students participated.

The university president, T.K. Wetherell, appealed to the NCAA not to force forfeits in football. This action would allow Bobby Bowden to compete for the all-time coaching wins in college football. The appeal was lost and Bowden lost 12 games previously won. The school lost 3 NCAA championships and places in many conference championships (tomahawknation.com 2010).

Cheating scandals are an example of academics against athletics. A professor has stated that if the athletic team brings home a championship, they can do no wrong. If they fail, then they will be held accountable (Sander, 2007). In the case of FSU, the football team won the Emerald Bowl Championship, a non-national title game. The president reported the academic impropriety to the NCAA and the championship was revoked.

When college athletics began, some faculty felt that the student-athletes should not be considered real students. Special admissions policies designated to athletics became an issue. Coaches could get an athlete admitted without a strong academic background (Ferris, Finster, & McDonald, 2004). Odenkirk (1981) recounted a story from the president of the University of Chicago, Robert Hutchins. He did not trust the Big Ten athletic conference and withdrew his athletics teams in 1939. He dropped football from athletics stating that, "to be successful you must cheat. Everyone is cheating and I refuse to cheat" (Odenkirk, 1981, p.65).

Arizona State University football coach Frank Kush blamed the pressure placed on athletes to win. However, scholars suggested college presidents need to take away the autonomy that big-time coaches enjoy. If the coach's power is unchecked, the administration will struggle to keep academia first in student-athletes priorities (Odenkirk, 1981).

Faculties are no strangers to conflicts between campus groups. Colleges and universities are organized around principles of shared governance, which means power and decision-making are shared with campus stakeholders such as the central administration and a board of trustees. This governance system helps keep a watch over the faculty and makes decisions regarding their concerns. Athletics deals with sporting events. Central administration confronts issues of day- to- day operations. The trustees make decisions on hiring and issues of the university as a whole. These three entities must balance out to prevent autonomy. A coach, a provost, and a trustee

must converse and analyze campus issues to reach an agreement for the good of the institution.

The trustees, as Birnbaum (1988) points out, are often business people.

Oppositions with the faculty do not lie solely with the board of trustees.

Administration has become more specialized. In the past, faculties were able to hold administrative posts while teaching. With legal precedents, federal regulations, and ever-changing student federal aid regulations, administration has become a full time, specialized job. As the faculty and administration divided, a polarity was formed that promotes a tension between the faculty and administration (Birnbaum, 1988).

Faculty began to feel that administrators were more concerned with their issues rather than those confronting faculty. "Because of these changes, administrators become identified in the faculty mind with red tape, constraints, and outside pressures that seek to alter instruction" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 7).

Statement of the Problem

Previous research by Noble (2004), Ferris, Finster, and McDonald (2004) and Gerdy (2002) primarily focused on Division I athletics. Feezell (2005) compared Division I to Division III. Studies have not solely examined Division III. This demonstrates a gap in the knowledge base. This study sought to close that gap. The study also tried to locate correlations in demographics and attitudes among Division III faculty, which has not been previously studied. There also has not been a study of this type done at Rowan University.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze faculty attitudes towards athletics at Rowan University. Faculty attitudes regarding academic backing, leadership, budgetary disbursement, educational goals, as well as student-athletes academic performance were examined. Demographics studied included: age, department, gender, previous athletic participation, previous academic institutions, and current professorial rank.

Need for the Study

Many studies have been done regarding the interplay of college athletics and faculty at the Division I level. Division I sports are often perceived as a business enterprise since a correlation has been discovered between the number of enrollment applications and athletic program successes (Toma & Cross, 1998). While this correlation may hold true at the Division I level, this is less likely at the Division III level.

In Division III, there is less public exposure. If a student competes at the Division III level, they will be subjected to the same admission standards as a non-athlete. Moreover, Division III administrators believe the impact of athletics is not limited to the fields. Division III makes an effort to minimize conflicts between athletic contests and practices with the student-athletes academic work (Division III, 2010). The core values of the NCAA promote the pursuit of athletics and academics with championship intensity (Core Values, 2010). However, the exposure given to Division I athletes could cause a jaded view of Division III athletics by faculty.

Assumptions and Limitations

There are several assumptions in this study. The first suggests there will be faculty who dislike athletics. Plant (1961) demonstrates some faculty does not see athletics as a part of college life. Literature also suggests those faculty members would like to see college athletics abolished. The second suggests there may be a correlation between athletic participation and faculty attitudes. A third assumption is that the faculty would answer honestly and truthfully. The final assumption regards participation. It is assumed that 70% of faculty would respond to the approved study.

The limitations in this study are numerous. The potential sample size was limited in hopes of reaching a 70% response rate. The actual sample size achieved a 48% response rate. The sample's make-up contained three ranks of full-time faculty: assistant, associate, and full professor. Researcher bias was a concern as I collected the data and was a former collegiate athlete.

Operational Definitions

1. Attitudes: Refers to “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1998, p. 218).

2. Division I: A classification of the NCAA to which any institution may apply.

Institutions that become a part of Division I must distribute a minimum while not exceeding the maximum amount of financial aid. Each institution must offer a total of 14 sports. They can be separated as 7 for men and 7 for women or 6 for men and 8 for women at the institution's discretion. The sports in fall, spring, and summer must also

have male and female participants during each season to maintain Division I status. As of 2010, there are a total of 335 member institutions in Division I broken down into 66% being public and 34% being private (Division I, 2010).

3. Division III: NCAA sponsored classification without athletic scholarships. The sports teams at Division III average 8 for both men and women. Division III currently has 447 members with 20% of members being public and 80% being private. The mission of this division is for the student-athlete to have balance between academics and athletics. The athlete is playing for the “love of the game and not for financial aid” (Division III, 2010, p. 1).

4. Faculty: Refers to full-time faculty in rank of assistant, associate, and full professor from a Division III institution of higher education in the Eastern United States.

5. NCAA: Founded in 1906 to protect student-athletes from exploitative athletic practices, the NCAA has grown to be the governing body for monitoring academic standards and eligibility for college athletes and college administration (NCAA, 2010).

6. Student-Athletes: College students who participate in athletics at the intercollegiate level at Rowan University during the time of this study.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the attitudes of selected faculty at Rowan University towards the factor groupings of presence of athletics on campus, student-athletes, governance/eligibility, financing of athletics, and general athletics issues?

2. Is there a significant relationship between demographics and faculty attitudes?

Overview of the Study

Chapter II reviews literature relative to the study. This information outlines the history and changes of faculty governance over athletics. The literature also demonstrates the debate over athletics and academics. Chapter II also provides a look at a faculty initiated group working to reform intercollegiate athletics. The student-athlete is also discussed in regards to campus involvement. There is also a brief psychological discussion on attitudes. The conceptual framework places this study in the context of college student development.

Chapter III presents the methodology of the study. The population and sample is discussed. The chapter also discusses the instrumentation and the data collection process used. The analyses of the collected data are broken down into several different categories.

Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. The information is broken down according to the aforementioned research questions. The chapter showed the findings in factor groups and demographics.

Chapter V presents the summary of the study, discusses the findings of the study, and offers conclusions. Recommendations for practice and further research are also presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Faculty perceptions of student-athletes at the collegiate level have been analyzed for several decades. Research discusses the background of the issues, faculty involvement, the student-athlete, the conceptual framework, and reform patterns in the NCAA.

National Collegiate Athletic Association

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was founded in 1906. Prior to its formation, colleges and universities were responsible for governing the sports they provided (Crowley, 2006). American football started in 1869 with a game between Rutgers University and Princeton University. Between 1873 and 1880, colleges began sending representatives to rules meetings to make a standard set of rules. The game would begin to take its modern shape in 1876 with the ideas of Yale football player Walter Camp. Camp made the line of scrimmage and the quarterback-center exchange rules that are still currently used today amongst many others.

Football was starting to become Americanized (History of American Football, 2010).

In 1905, there were 19 deaths nationwide from playing football. It was not uncommon to hear of serious injury or death in football. From 1894-1897, Harvard and Yale did not play each other for fear of a repeat of the game known as the “Hampden Park Blood Bath” (History of American Football, 2010). As a result of

that game, 4 players were crippled. The following year, a conference would be called at the White House in attempts to make the game safer.

Theodore Roosevelt mandated that changes be made to the game or he would eliminate it (History of American Football, 2010). The goal of the White House meeting was to institute reform in collegiate football. New York University Chancellor, Henry M. McCracken, attended the White House conference. McCracken called a meeting in New York City to amend the rules of football after the conference. Thirteen institutions attended that meeting. At year's end, 62 colleges and universities met in New York City to charter the Intercollegiate Athletics Association of the United States (IAAUS) (Crowley, 2006).

The IAAUS would officially accept the constitution of its organization on March 31, 1906. Four years later it became the NCAA. The function of the NCAA is that of a governing body in charge of the rules that were to be followed in certain athletics contests. The NCAA would also evaluate athletic programs for any changes that may have to be made (Crowley, 2006).

Changes were made at the NCAA level in 1921 with the organization of the first NCAA national championship in the sport of Track and Field. As time advanced, several rule committees were added thus creating more national championship contests including a basketball championship that was inaugurated in 1939 (Crowley, 2006).

After the Second World War, the NCAA faced several different tribulations that brought about increased administrative control. In 1948, the "Sanity Code" was adopted at the 42nd annual convention. Under this code, a three person Compliance

Committee would interpret the constitution of the NCAA and look for possible violations by institutions. The Fact-Finding Committee would then investigate the possible violations. If a violation was found, a two-thirds vote by the membership would decide if that member institution should be allowed to stay in the NCAA. The membership deemed the expulsion punishment as too extreme in some cases and they also had failed to reach a majority on at least one occasion. As a result, the "Sanity Code" was repealed (Crowley, 2006).

With the repeal of the "Sanity Code," a probe was convened by The Court of General Sessions in New York in response to claims of point shaving and gambling scandals where several athletes were arrested. Judge Saul Streit stated that commercialism in football and basketball was "rampant" (Crowley, 2006, p. 31). Streit asserted that they were "no longer amateur sports," the players are "bought and paid for," violations in recruiting at "almost universal," and academic requirements are circumvented through "trickery, devices, frauds, and forgery" (Crowley, 2006, pp. 31-32). Streit also felt that responsibility "must be shared not only by the crooked fixers and the corrupt players, but also by the college administrators, coaches, and alumni groups who participate in this evil system." (Crowley, 2006, p. 32). Walter Byers became the executive director of the NCAA one month before Streit took pen to paper.

Byers exerted his authority by utilizing the annual national convention to make members aware of the powers of the association's Executive Council in regards to the enforcement of athletic policies. Postseason football was also given regulations

to ensure that postseason games would not grow exponentially each year (NCAA History, 2010).

During the 1960s and 1970s, athletic competition grew exponentially. The NCAA broke college sports into three separate divisions in 1973. The levels are named Division I, II, and III respectively. Football administrators at Division I would further break down Division I into Division I-A and Division I-AA five years after the formation of the three legislative and competitive divisions.

These competitive divisions would then become involved with women's athletics in the 1980s. The NCAA became the administrative body for women's sports. It would be at the 1983 NCAA Convention that women's athletics would become officially included in the NCAA governance and representation pattern (Crowley, 2006).

During the 1980s, questions were raised about academic standards for student-athletes. The association proposed stricter academic standards for the NCAA and its membership. In 1983, Convention Proposal 48 was adopted. The NCAA and its membership then raised their academic standards. Academics were not the sole issue in the 1980s. The United States Supreme Court ruled against the association on an anti-trust case dealing with the television rights (Crowley, 2006). The association was found to have raised fees and reduce output of college football with no consumer preference. The NCAA was found to be protecting ticket sales for games that were not going to be televised that weekend. The decision allowed for institutions to seek their own deals and not go through the association for television rights (Flygare, 1984). The NCAA then formed a Presidents' Commission. It would be comprised of

a group of college presidents from each of the three legislative and competitive divisions to establish an agenda of issues facing the NCAA for the next annual convention (NCAA History, 2010).

After Byers retired in 1987, the executive director of the NCAA did not see the same stability as it had under the 36 year reign of Byers. He was replaced by Richard Schultz from the University of Virginia. Schultz would resign in 1993 and was replaced by Cedric Dempsey, the athletic director at the University of Arizona. Dempsey performed an overhaul on the governance of the NCAA allowing each division to have more autonomy to make their own decisions, as none of the three are identical to each other. He also utilized institutional presidents to control each of their respective divisions and the NCAA itself (NCAA History, 2010).

Dempsey would leave in December of 2002 ushering in the Myles Brand era the following month. Brand was the president of the University of Indiana when there was much controversy over fiery basketball coach Bobby Knight. Brand continued academic reforms at the levels of Divisions I and II and continued to demonstrate the effectiveness of presidential leadership at each division level. Brand was also known for his project to increase diversity and inclusion in college athletics. His death in 2009 from cancer brought in an interim president, James Isch (NCAA History, 2010). Most recently, Mark Emmert, president of the University of Washington, was elected as president in April 2010 and assumed the office effective, November 1, 2010 (NCAA History, 2010).

Historical Background of Faculty Involvement

The background of faculty involvement in collegiate athletics demonstrates a history of differences between the students and faculty. Faculty attitudes in the early 1900s appeared to be unsupportive of college athletics. Oberteuffer (1936) detailed a college president, who proposed a program to govern athletics at his school and in the conference the school was a member. The president of the University of North Carolina deemed any student who received “preferential consideration in the matter of tuition, fees, room, board, clothes, books, charge accounts, job, loan, scholarship or any other financial aid or material whatever” ineligible for athletic participation (Oberteuffer, 1936, p. 437).

This was a response to the Southeastern Athletic Conference decision to allow student-athletes to receive financial support while competing for their institution (Oberteuffer, 1936). The statement also outlined that scholarships would be open to all “non-athletes on the basis of character, scholarship, financial need, competence for any specific task, and general merit” (Oberteuffer, 1936, p. 437). In the event that a student-athlete had an off-campus job the institution was required to investigate. If the institution did not approve of the job, the student-athlete was ruled ineligible. The student-athlete also had to declare any monetary gains or assets he received within the past year that did not include parental support. The proviso also stated that normal academic ineligibility rules also applied. Any student who was suspected of violating the academic ineligibility rules had to appeal for his eligibility in writing at the end of each academic year (Oberteuffer, 1936).

The administrative control Oberteuffer (1936) describes demonstrates an issue of indifference. According to Plant (1961), “The idea is that if individual students or teams of students purport to represent an institution of higher learning in intercollegiate athletic competition, the control of that activity and the responsibility for it ought to be vested in the institution itself” (p.1). In his article, Plant (1961) discusses a meeting he had with a vice-president of an institution. He made note that the administrator established there were serious athletic problems. Plant (1961) asked for the faculty viewpoint on the issue. The administrator felt that the faculty had no place in resolving the issue. The faculty did not voice any opinion on the issue, nor was there a plan to invite them to do so.

Plant (1961) noted, however, that there are certain institutions that believed the faculty should have input in athletics. Those institutions believed that athletics should be considered part of education as a whole, thus the faculty should have input. One issue relates to how the faculty would have input. Plant (1961) asserts that the specificity of the role of faculty in athletics governance is unclear. Plant (1961) notes that “sterling character and a high order of mental ability” are in excess at the university level, but that is not enough (p. 3).

He suggests that the faculty control should be given to one faculty member who has an interest in athletics. Also, he suggests that if there is no interest, the faculty member would not take the job seriously. Plant (1961) maintains that faculty members may have prejudice towards athletics. Plant (1961) notes that some faculty do not hesitate to make an offhand assumption at the expense of athletics. He recalls a faculty meeting on athletic issues where a colleague stood and stated, “I do not come

here to expose myself to persuasion; I come to see that my prejudices are enacted into law!" (p. 4). Plant (1961) asserts that the "evangelistic reformer" would not work very well as a faculty controller due to their sensitivity to the issue. A faculty controller must be able to withstand public pressure and pressure from alumni as well. Plant (1961) believes that if the faculty controller notes the importance of the welfare of intercollegiate athletics, then the public onslaught will not faze him or her.

The public pressure is not the only pressure facing the faculty controller. Time is a commodity. Plant (1961) states that time demonstrates why an entire faculty, with the exception of a small college faculty with many meeting dates, cannot govern athletics as it would be unable to devote the appropriate amount of time to athletics. The selection of a faculty controller, whether by president or faculty election, gives that person autonomy. Plant (1961) denotes the importance of the controller having power and not having to clear decisions with faculty. If the faculty had to approve the decision, there would rarely be agreement. The faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics make faculty involvement in athletics a maelstrom of personalities.

Attitudes

Allport (1935) defined an attitude as the time at which an individual's mental catalog can have an influence over a stimulus that they are being exposed. The mind is molded through experience. Allport (1935) suggests the human mind can be affected by personal experience. Thus, humans catalog experiences and condition a response to that experience. Allport (1935) refers to this as "readiness" (p. 810).

When a person reaches this stage, he/she then attribute that conditioned response to that same stimulus. That response can be characterized as an attitude.

Recent academic works on attitudes have proposed that the ability to evaluate fosters attitudes. Eagly and Chaiken (1993) suggest that someone can believe a thought based off of their own particular attitude. If a person thinks about an object or thought that they have an attitude towards, then that becomes what is referred to as a belief (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

When an attitude continuously returns after a stimulus has been revealed, people tend to believe that attitude will return with consistency. The attitude then becomes a belief to that person. People then find it difficult to make a change in beliefs quickly (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

Opinions are slightly different than beliefs. Aronson (1992) suggests that a person's opinion is something that is believed can be proven given the correct information. By Aronson's (1992) definition, if a person is presented with information contradictory to what is believed to be correct, the opinion then can be changed. Comparing Aronson (1992) to Eagly and Chaiken (1993) demonstrates openness to change. The attitudes as outlined by Allport (1935) are the building blocks to which beliefs and opinions are made. Opinions and beliefs are very similar as they are born of attitudes, however, opinions can change whereas beliefs do not. As Plant (1961) showed, many faculties have beliefs about athletics being detrimental to education. The person for faculty controller would be someone with an opinion about athletics that they can change with evidence. It is necessary to keep a balance between beliefs and opinions as a way of remaining objective.

Pratkanis (1989) discussed a theory on attitude formation known as the balance theory. In the theory, balance is inclination given to a psychological object based off of the evaluation of that object. Thus, if an evaluation suggests a positive feeling, then the attitude towards the object is more positive and vice versa. Heider (1959) surmised that people's attitudes are more likely to be directed towards a state of equilibrium rather than a state of disequilibrium. In this case, if a faculty member stresses education over athletics, then that faculty member may have a negative attitude towards the athletic program and student-athletes. The attitudes of a faculty member can lead to opinions and beliefs that may be negative toward athletics and student-athletes.

Faculty Involvement

Weistart (1987) asked the question "Where Are The Faculty?" in discussing athletic reforms (Weistart,1987). He posed this question when student-athletes graduation rates were very low. For example, Memphis State did not graduate a single African-American basketball player in a 10 year period (Weistart, 1987). Weistart (1987) asserts the faculties do not recognize academic issues with the athletics program. This suggests Memphis State faculty took a hands off approach to academic issues with student-athletes during this 10 year period. Thus, the faculty had no basis for an argument against academic qualifications for student-athletes.

Gerdy (2002) calls faculty members "guardians of academic integrity" (p. 33). While Weistart (1987) asserts that faculty are indifferent, Gerdy (2002) claims that the faculty must become directly involved with athletics. In his article, *Athletic Victories, Educational Defeats*, Gerdy (2002) explains that reform in higher education

athletics programs will only come when the surrounding community leads the reform movement. Regardless of their indifference towards athletics, faculties would be a perfect group to lead athletic reform (Gerdy, 2002).

In the past, faculties have shied away from involvement in athletics as they feel their academic discipline deserved more attention. This perspective is supported by many scholars (Gerdy, 2002; Weistart, 1987). Gerdy (2002) specifically makes note of the problem of authoritative administration. He alludes to the fact that the administration and board of trustees have to be involved in this issue as well. Administration enjoys autonomy that may be too powerful for athletic decisions. The board of trustees do not have the campus presence to be aware of athletic issues. Faculty members are present with students each day. The faculty have a better vantage point making them a logical choice to aid the administration in identifying issues (Gerdy 2002).

Sander (2007) illustrates an issue with the very balance that Gerdy discusses. Sander (2007) finds many faculty members are unaware of issues facing student-athletes. A 2007 survey demonstrated that 50% of faculty believe all campus sports decisions are based on entertainment. This may reinforce Weistart's (1987) question as half of the faculty assert that sports is entertainment and not part of the educational mission of the university.

Noble (2004) compared faculty attitudes towards athletics at successful and non-successful Division III universities. The study found that faculty attitudes were similar at the universities even though one had more athletic success than the other. Faculties noted that they can agree with athletics being part of the educational

mission of the university. Noble (2004) generally found a positive response in regards to the image of the university. Faculties surveyed believed that athletics did enhance the image of the institution. This indicates that faculty at Division III universities do view athletics favorably. The faculty also believe institutional control by the president is adequate for the program accountability.

The discrepancies found by Noble (2004) surfaced in the image of athletics at the university. The schools with unsuccessful athletic programs were looked upon negatively by the community and alumni. The faculty at these institutions also agreed that the community surrounding the college and alumni notice athletic programs more than academic programs. Winning programs are seen as having a better image. There is a greater likelihood that alumni and boosters will donate to a winning program (Noble 2004).

Age did not show a significant difference between successful and non-successful athletic programs. The measurable difference was that of difference on athletics issues between the successful and non-successful school. Age did not seem to impact interest in athletics. The experience in higher education relative to age demonstrates a difference in athletic interest. Faculty members with more than 21 years experience were less likely to be influenced by athletics than a faculty member with less than 20 years experience in higher education (Noble, 2004).

Noble (2004) indicates that regardless of the success level athletically in Division III schools, the faculty believe that athletics is part of academics. Noble (2004) notes that Division III is known for the emphasis of the benefits of athletic participation as part of the education, thus demonstrating at this level of competition

the faculty are not as against athletics as in the higher divisions. Reform in athletics could in effect be run by the faculty if they so desired. The Drake Group would become the mouthpiece for faculty who wish to reform athletics.

The Drake Group

The Drake Group has the motto, “defending academic integrity in the face of commercialized sport” (The Drake Group, 2010, p. 1). The group consists of faculty, academic provosts, and other administrators from colleges and universities who are trying to reform intercollegiate athletics. In Des Moines, Iowa in 1999 the Drake Group held a conference entitled, “College Sports Corruption: The Way Out” (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010). The topics of the conference included: why faculty are rationalizing and evading the issue of athletics interfering with academics, the exploitation of black athletes, and the threat to the academic integrity by the use of tutors hired by the athletic department for the student-athletes (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010).

Jon Ericson, a former provost at Drake University, initiated the conference and introduced a controversial proposal. Ericson called for a “public disclosure” (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010, p. 1) measure that would make a list available to the public of the classes and professors taken by student-athletes on athletic scholarships at the Division 1-AA level (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 2010). The “Real Student” (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010, p. 1) proposal suggested that all student-athletes should have at least the combined SAT score average of the freshmen class they enter with (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010).

The NCAA has historically involved athletics personnel in its governance. William Dowling proposed that the NCAA should be reformed as a group composed of university deans, faculty, and academic provosts prohibiting any athletics personnel. Dowling, a Rutgers University professor, is also head of a group known as Rutgers 1000. Rutgers 1000 is comprised of students, faculty, and alumni who are trying to get Rutgers to move down to a non-scholarship level, where student-athletes cannot receive financial aid based on athletic prowess (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010). Dowling noted that the proceedings sought the formation of a permanent faculty organization against athletic corruption. Dowling deemed the purpose “to be to the NCAA what anti-matter is to matter” (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010, p. 2).

The Drake Group reconvened the next year to develop a plan of reform. The group suggested five reforms. The proposals are as follows:

1. Discontinue the use of the term student-athlete. Students who participate in athletics would be referred to as either a student or an athlete, not both.
2. Faculty senates should oversee and have control over support programs and counseling for students involved in athletics. The athletics department should not have any bearing on those programs. Universities should provide academic support for the entire student body and not just students involved in athletics.

3. Universities publicly disclose academic major, academic advisor, courses by academic major, general education requirements, and electives including course GPA and instructor for all students. No individual grades will be disclosed. The university will disclose to the intercollegiate athletics teams the courses enrolled in by their team members, the average of grades given in the course, and the instructor of the course at the end of the semester.
4. Universities reduce the number of intercollegiate athletic contests.
5. Universities eliminate “athletic-scholarships” and expand the availability of need based aid. Until said scholarships are eliminated, faculty senates are to monitor students who may face a contradictory situation between a coach and faculty member. The senate should defer to the faculty member and ensure that the athlete will not lose financial aid by not deferring to the coach.

(The Drake Group: Des Moines, 2000, 2010)

Currently, The Drake Group has divided their proposals into a three phase plan. The first phase calls for academic transparency. This phase is designed to keep all the trustees, administrators, and faculty accountable by providing students major, courses for the major, general education courses, electives, and the instructor of the course to the public. This will be directed at the institution itself allowing it to circumvent FERPA regulations and the courses will be listed by grade received.

The second phase is academic priority. The Drake Group feels that a grade point average of 2.0 should be the cut off for athletic participation. The tutoring

center for athletes should be the same for the athletes and students. The group notes the argument that athletics are an integral part of education. The Drake Group feels athletes and students should share the same tutoring center and not have them separate. They also propose to make university policies that will prohibit athletic events or practices from conflicting with scheduled class times. The group feels that this would protect the athlete's right to have equal educational opportunities the same as other students.

The final phase is academic-based participation. The Drake Group proposed to replace one year renewable scholarships with a multi-year scholarship extended to graduation with a 5 year maximum or a need-based scholarship. They believe that with the coaches having the ability to renew a scholarship each year, the student is forced to make sports their priority. To offer a transition to college life, they propose all students stay on campus their first year without participating in sports (The Drake Group, *Proposals*, 2010).

The Student Athlete

The Drake Group feels the term student-athlete should be discontinued. The student would be denoted as either an athlete or student. Sperber (1990) quoted A. Bartlett Giamatti, as saying, "what was allowed to become a circus, college sports, threatens to become the means by which the public believes the entire enterprise (higher education) is a sideshow" (Sperber, 1990, p. K1). Sperber (1990) notes that college sports has become a commercial enterprise. He also affirms that college athletics is making their own "myths" to try and make the college sports world seem part of the educational realm (Sperber, 1990).

Kilbourne (2003) discusses the gap in reform in college athletics as ignoring the individual athlete. Procedural issues are often resolved quicker and are more important than the learning of the athlete. He defines the problem as the ignorance of the athlete as a student. Kilbourne (2003) asserts that student-athletes should be taught issues that may affect student-athletes such as gambling, eating disorders, or sexual abuse. He suggests that the absence of these courses as a requirement for athletes defeats the argument that athletics are part of the educational mission of the university (Kilbourne, 2003).

Pennington (2005) studied Haverford College's admissions process in reference to athletics. Mark Gould, a faculty member at Haverford, stated "I want us as an institution to pursue academically and intellectually intense students who come here to work very, very hard. Athletics gets in the way of that" (Pennington, 2005, p. 1). The board of trustees believes athletics should not overshadow other extracurricular activities. Faculty members question preferential treatment to athletics. Administrators state that it is necessary to recruit to be competitive. They believe a newspaper score when the school loses is far more humiliating than a bad recital given by the music department. "But if you play a basketball game and lose, 87-42, everybody sees that in the newspaper the next day. There's no way around it. Your peers, your faculty, your students, and your alumni all know the score. You lost, 87-42" (Pennington, 2005, p. 2).

If a university happens to lose a basketball game, the impact on the students is a moment of defeat and dejection. When the university feels they are losing people who fear they will not be treated equitably with the student-athletes, the moment of

dejection is longer. The people who want athletics recruiting to remain status quo would make a case for the several student-athletes who are tops not only in their sport but in the classroom. Sperber (1990) does acknowledge that there are a few scholar-athletes who are excellent students who are also excellent athletes.

Lovaglia and Lucas have ascertained that there is no correlation between academic success and athletic success (as cited in Suggs, 2005). The two sociologists remarked that the University of Oklahoma was considered one of the top schools for athletes to go to who wanted to achieve both academic and athletic success. Their football players may not have the best graduation rate (40% over 6 years) but the degree from that school had more clout due to their high profile football program.

There are people who believe sports can turn around someone's life both academically and professionally. "College sports provide an excellent opportunity for black youngsters to get out of the ghetto and to contribute to American society" (Sperber, 1990, p. K 6). Sperber (1990) asserts the stereotype that African-Americans are brought to college solely to play sports. The NCAA introduced a proposition in the 1980s, which would try to emphasize the student portion of the term student-athlete. There were opponents of this proposition as they felt it constituted racism on the part of the NCAA due to the fact that low socioeconomic status areas were being slighted. Clark, Horton, and Alford (1985) asserted that this proposition was needed to keep college students on track to graduate, especially African-American students.

Adler and Adler (1985) discuss how college athletes view their academic livelihood upon entering the college ranks. "The athletes accepted the rhetoric of these sports personnel, but they never really considered what a college education

entailed” (Adler & Adler, 1985, p. 243). Many students enter college with the intention of graduating, however athletics they participate in can change their view. Some coaches enrolled students in majors that were deemed easier to complete. The athlete then lost control of their educational choices.

Student-athletes today can achieve academic success without a coach who tells them what to do. Rishe (2003) asserts that all student-athletes have the ability to have high graduation rates due to the “higher standard” (Rishe, 2003) to which they are held. The standard he references includes mandatory study halls, athletic eligibility maintenance, and special academic advising that the athletes must participate. Rishe (2003) states the view of the “dumb jock” (Rishe 2003) is in existence due to the sports that are heavily covered by the media. Football and men’s basketball have historically been where the lower graduation rates take place. Rishe states that there is little proof those student-athletes who have high athletic achievement have low academic achievement (Rishe, 2003).

Conceptual Framework

Clark (1963), in his work on faculty organization in higher education, points out authority is often conditioned by the environment in which it is being used. Clark (1963) illustrates how complex the university has become.

The use of clusters, Clark (1963) asserts, leads to representative governance causing apathy. Clark (1963) divides the faculty into three different groups: “Actives participate a great deal; a considerably larger group constitutes an alert and informed public and participates a modest amount; the largest group consists of those who are not very interested or informed and who participate very little” (Clark, 1963, p. 121).

He also links the participative framework at the university to that of the larger democratic society. Clark (1963) also believes that the participation deficiency also is similar to a representative society as a whole. Clark's (1963) article demonstrates that faculty needs to be involved in the university community to make the reforms work.

Astin (1999) defines student involvement as, "the amount physical and psychological energy that the student devotes to the academic experience" (Astin, 1999, p. 520). He analyzes both the student who has high involvement and the student that has a low sense of involvement. Astin (1999) looks at the highly involved student as one who spends time and energy studying, participating in student activities, and interacting with faculty members regularly. According to Astin (1999), students who spend large amounts of energy to be involved on campus are less likely to drop out. He mentions intercollegiate athletics as having an especially noticeable impact on the persistence of students on campus. Astin (1999) asserts that students who become vigorously involved in athletics are less likely to increase in liberalism, changes in religious principles, and artistic interests. Astin (1999) also illustrated that student-athletes are less likely to lose interest in business pursuits. This would assert that student-athletes set goals and are less likely to stray from those goals thus making it easier to obtain.

Summary of the Literature Review

The literature on the relationship between the faculty and athletics in higher education is not new. While the literature discusses how the faculty see athletics as a detriment to education, it also illustrates how the role of the faculty has changed over time.

The research problem relates to faculty attitudes towards athletics. The attitudes of faculty may have a relationship to past athletic experiences, gender, age, years at Rowan University, athletic programs observed as a student, academic discipline, or their tenure status. Feezell (2005) found a correlation does not exist between demographics and attitudes. He also examined attitudes on governance, athletics on campus, financing athletics, and general athletics issues. Feezell (2005) examined similar literature in analyzing the work of Noble (2004), who previously discussed faculty attitudes at the Division III level.

The attitudes demonstrate the possibility of a pre-disposition to collegiate athletics that may be linked to the research problem. The literature reviewed demonstrates many attitudes towards collegiate athletics and plausible remedies recommended by faculty. More research is needed on the attitudes of faculty towards intercollegiate athletics, particularly at the Division III level which forms the basis of this study.

CHAPTER III

Methodology

Context of the Study

The study was conducted at Rowan University. The institution began as a normal school in the 1920s for training teachers. It opened in one building in September of 1923. The school expanded its teaching program from two years to four years during the 1930s.

During the 1950s, the college began to expand to several buildings and became a state college to discover its educational goals. With the fourth president, this college began to highlight diversity of instruction. The 1970s saw the first of 11 national championships being awarded to the athletics program. This would be the beginning of a nationally reputable athletics program.

In the 1990s, the college became the first of state institutions to hold doctoral classes. It would also see the founding of the colleges of engineering and communication. The current library on campus was also constructed during the tenure of the fifth president.

Towards the end of the last millennium, a gift was bestowed upon the college which, at the time, was the largest gift in public higher education. The 100 million dollars enabled the school to obtain university status in 1997.

The sixth president of the university built new science and education buildings while developing a partnership between the university and the town wherein it resides.

There are 80 undergraduate majors and 55 master's degree programs at the university. The doctoral program is in educational leadership. The college is divided into six different academic colleges which include: Business, Communication, Education, Engineering, Fine and Performing Arts, and Liberal Arts and Sciences. Currently, the university is developing a medical school with a nearby hospital (Rowan University, 2011)

Population and Sample

The population is comprised of faculty members at Rowan University. The population contains assistant, associate, and full professors who are full-time. Part-time faculty was not asked to participate. The sample was proportional based on rank and gender.

The sample consisted of faculty members who fit the profile of full-time and rank at assistant, associate, or full. As a whole, the university had 430 full-time faculty members as of Fall 2010 matching that description. The study utilized half of the faculty leaving a sample size of 215. The participants in the survey were selected at random. There were one third of assistant, one third of associate, and one third of full rank chosen. This was achieved by separating the names of the faculty into three conglomerations. The names of the faculty were then picked at random until the number of 215 was reached.

The same formula was used in checking the distribution of gender. Each sampling of rank was then split into halves. The researcher pulled names at random for each gender until half of each rank was met. The second half would match the other gender. Names of faculty members from overseas were cross-checked on the

university web site to ensure the correct number of each gender was selected for the sample. The participants in this sample signified their willingness to participate by taking the survey and returning them. An incentive was provided by having each participant's name placed in a drawing for a Barnes and Noble gift card.

Instrumentation

The instrument used in the study is a survey from Feezell (2005). The validity was determined by Feezell's (2005) conclusions. External and internal validity demonstrated correlation between demographics and faculty attitudes. The study also indicated differences in Division III faculty to those at Division I. This study was also conducted at the Division III level as a pilot. Feezell (2005) was able to achieve success with this survey in Colorado. This is a replication in New Jersey. This study is reliable as it was previously administered at several Division I and Division III universities in the completion of Feezell's (2005) study.

The background of the respondents including age, previous institutions attended, athletic experience, gender, tenure, academic rank, length of employment at Rowan University and academic discipline was placed in a section analyzing demographics in the findings chapter. This section demonstrates the plausibility of personal characteristics having an impact on faculty attitudes.

The second section presents the attitudes of faculty towards intercollegiate athletics in general. They were required to respond to questions dealing with student-athletes possible advantages as well as athletic scholarships. The faculty also were asked their attitudes on student-athlete requirements for admission, the pressures

athletes face, the place of intercollegiate athletics on campus, and if the student-athletes graduate as often as non-athletes.

The third section discusses Rowan faculty and their attitudes about intercollegiate athletics on their own campus. The questions that were answered in this section discuss Rowan student-athletes graduation rates, the possibility of special treatment, their purpose of going to college, and the equality of the men's and women's athletics programs. The faculty was also asked to present their attitudes on the possibility of academic impropriety, monetary compensation being purposely directed to athletics, and the governance of athletics at Rowan.

The reliability of the Feezell (2005) instrument was determined using Cronbach's Alpha data. The measure of reliability was .969 indicating consistent reliability. Scores above .700 are considered consistently reliable. Feezell (2005) utilized part of Noble's (2004) study, which scored .9326 with Cronbach's Alpha.

The face validity of Feezell's (2005) instrument is noted from Noble (2004). Noble (2004) patterned his study after Armenta (1986) and Norman (1995). The content and construct validity was determined as all previous studies measured faculty attitudes.

Data Collection

The surveys were constructed on-line. An internet link was then e-mailed to the sample population. The e-mail addresses were located on the on-line Rowan faculty directory. Those e-mails were placed in a research group address book. The e-mail surveys were sent en masse on March 3rd 2011. The e-mail outlined the purpose of the survey and those involved.

The subjects were allowed a week before a reminder e-mail was sent. This process continued for three weeks. The data were collected and placed in a table for use in the following chapter.

Data Analysis

The independent variables focused on faculty demographics. Survey items sought age, gender, professorial rank, tenure status, time at Rowan, athletic participation, NCAA division of previously attended institutions, academic discipline, and athletic events attended.

The dependent variables focused on faculty attitudes. Survey items focused on athletic financing, athletic presence on campus, governance and eligibility, and general faculty attitudes towards athletics.

The descriptive statistics utilized for this study include frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The statistics were separated into factor groups to analyze the dependent and independent variables. The relationship between variables was analyzed using the Pearson product moment correlation. All of the statistics were calculated using Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) 18.0.

CHAPTER IV

Findings

Profile of the Sample

The subjects for this study were faculty members at Rowan University in Glassboro, New Jersey during the 2010-2011 academic year. Of the 215 surveys distributed, 104 were returned for a response rate of 48%. Table 4.1 shows the demographics for surveyed faculty.

Table 4.1

Demographics (N=104)

Variable	<i>f</i>	%
Age		
35 or under	11	10.6
36-45	31	29.8
46-55	31	29.8
55-65	26	25
66 +	5	4.8
Gender		
Female	56	53.8
Male	48	46.2
Rank		
Assistant	28	26.9
Associate	41	39.4
Full	35	33.7
Tenure		
Tenured	87	83.7
Non-Tenured	17	16.3
Institution		
Experience	16	15.4
1-5	24	23.1
6-10	27	26
11-15	37	35.6
16+		

Undergraduate		
<i>n</i> =91		
D-I	49	47.1
D-IAA	5	4.8
D-II	8	7.7
D-III	29	27.9
Graduate		
<i>n</i> =99		
D-I	95	91.3
D-IAA	0	0
D-II	1	1
D-III	3	2.9
Academic		
Discipline		
Natural Science	16	15.4
Social Science	20	19.2
Humanities	29	27.9
Professional	18	17.3
Other	21	20.2
Athletics		
Participation		
None	38	36.5
Little League	4	3.8
Jr. High	9	8.7
High School	25	24
College	25	24
Semi-Pro	3	2.9
Olympics	0	0
Undergraduate		
Observation		
None	22	21.2
1-10	36	34.6
11-20	8	7.7
21-30	13	12.5
31+	25	24
Graduate		
Observation		
None	43	41.3
1-10	45	43.3
11-20	8	7.7
21-30	2	1.9
31+	6	5.8

A total of 47% chose to attend D-I as an undergraduate and 91% chose D-I for graduate school. Division III ranked second at 28% for undergraduate and 3% for graduate institutions. Table 4.1 also shows the academic discipline of surveyed

faculty. Humanities (28%) faculty responded highest followed by faculty members declaring other (20%), indicating their field was not listed.

The table demonstrates faculty athletic participation and observation. A total of 36% of surveyed faculty had no athletics experience. However, 24% of faculty had high school or collegiate athletic experience. Only 3% of faculty reached the semi-professional level. Table 4.1 indicated 35% of surveyed faculty attended 1-10 athletic events as an undergraduate with 24% attending more than 31. Moreover, 43% of faculty attended 1-10 athletic events as a graduate student where 41% attended none during graduate studies. Only 6% attended more than 31 events during graduate school.

Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of selected faculty at Rowan University towards the factor groupings of presence of athletics on campus, student-athletes, governance/eligibility, financing of athletics, and general athletics issues?

Table 4.2 provides information regarding the presence of athletics on campus. The table shows the level of agreement by the faculty on each item. Surveyed faculty were asked particularly to answer items in regards to athletics on campus. The respondents were given the option to answer: "Strongly Agree," "Agree," "Undecided," "Disagree," or "Strongly Disagree." The table is ranked from highest to lowest level of agreement.

Table 4.2 provides responses to survey items regarding athletics on campus. A total of 79.8% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, "There is justification for intercollegiate athletics on college campuses." Additionally, 74% agreed or strongly

agreed with the statement, "In general, an athletics program helps students identify with their institution." Moreover, 72.1% strongly agree or agreed with the statement, "If the athletics program at Rowan University were abolished, it would have an overall negative effect on the college/university." Finally, 68.2% strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, "Intercollegiate athletics benefits Rowan University."

Table 4.2

Athletics on Campus (N=104)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
There is justification for intercollegiate athletics on college campuses <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 3.625, <i>SD</i> =1.28	32	30.8	51	49	10	9.6	1	1	5	4.8
In general, an athletics program helps students identify with their institution <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 3.557, <i>SD</i> = 1.44	20	19.2	57	54.8	12	11.5	2	1.9	2	1.9
If the athletics program at Rowan University were abolished, it would have an overall negative effect on the college/university <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 3.500, <i>SD</i> = 1.52	24	23.1	51	49	7	6.7	8	7.7	3	2.9
Intercollegiate athletics benefits Rowan University <i>n</i> =92, <i>M</i> = 3.471, <i>SD</i> = 1.42	17	16.3	54	51.9	18	17.3	3	2.9	0	0

In general, a winning athletics program generates additional financial contributions to college/universities from alumni <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 3.442, <i>SD</i> = 1.23	10	9.6	58	55.8	20	19.2	8	7.7	0	0
In general, a winning athletics program helps unify the college/university <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 3.269, <i>SD</i> = 1.27	8	7.7	32	30.8	24	23.1	11	10.6	2	1.9
The reputation of the athletics program at Rowan University draws students to the college/university <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 2.826, <i>SD</i> = 1.29	3	2.9	35	33.7	31	29.8	22	21.2	2	1.9

The information in Table 4.3 also treats student-athletes. The faculty surveyed were asked to indicate levels of agreement on questions regarding student-athletes. The respondents were given the option to answer: “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Undecided,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.” The table is ranked from highest to lowest level of agreement. Firstly, 82.7% of surveyed faculty members strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, “In general, athletes should meet the same admissions requirements as the general student.” Only 4.8% of faculty either disagreed or strongly disagreed with that statement. Also, 72.1% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “In general, athletes face pressures not experienced by non-athletes in college.” A total of 13.5% stated they were undecided in regards to the previous statement. Also, 61.5% of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “A majority of athletes at Rowan University are here to

participate in athletics, not to pursue a degree program.” Additionally, 52.9% of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “Athletes are exploited here at Rowan University.”

Table 4.3

Student-Athletes (N=104)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
In general, athletes should meet the same admissions requirements as the general student <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 3.884, <i>SD</i> = 1.36	36	34.6	50	48.1	5	4.8	4	3.8	1	1
In general, athletes face pressures not experienced by non-athletes in college <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 3.625, <i>SD</i> = 1.16	16	15.4	59	56.7	14	13.5	9	8.7	1	1
In general, freshmen should be allowed to participate in college sports <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 3.605, <i>SD</i> = 1.30	18	17.3	50	48.1	15	14.4	3	2.9	2	1.9
In general, a college/university should provide special tutoring/counseling to help athletes <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 3.000, <i>SD</i> = 1.48	10	9.6	45	43.3	11	10.6	22	21.2	5	4.8
In general, athletes are exploited in athletics programs throughout the country <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 3.019, <i>SD</i> = 1.41	8	7.7	40	38.5	30	28.8	10	9.6	4	3.8

In general, athletes receive special privileges not granted to other students <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 2.894, <i>SD</i> = 1.29	6	5.8	35	33.7	25	24	26	25	4	3.8
In general, unrealistic time demands are placed on athletes by coaches <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 2.807, <i>SD</i> = 1.27	5	4.8	24	23.1	45	43.3	18	17.3	0	0
The grade point averages of athletes at Rowan University is lower than that of the general student body <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 2.750, <i>SD</i> = .962	2	1.9	15	14.4	54	51.9	26	25	2	1.9
The graduation rates of athletes at Rowan University are lower than that of the general student body <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 2.692, <i>SD</i> = .825	0	0	7	6.7	70	67.3	20	19.2	2	1.9
A majority of athletes at Rowan University are here to participate in athletics, not to pursue a degree program <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 2.096, <i>SD</i> = 1.02	2	1.9	5	4.8	25	24	49	47.1	15	14.4
Athletes are exploited at Rowan University <i>n</i> =92, <i>M</i> = 2.057, <i>SD</i> = 1.09	2	1.9	3	2.9	32	30.8	41	39.4	14	13.5

Table 4.4 contains information on governance and eligibility. The respondents were given the option to answer: “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Undecided,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.” The table is ranked from highest to lowest level of agreement.

A total of 58.6% of faculty respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, “In general, an institution should have a faculty athletics board that establishes athletic policies for the school.” In addition, 51.9% agreed or strongly agreed with the item stating, “In general, members of the faculty athletics board should be elected by the faculty at large and not appointed by the college/university administration.” Also, 50% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “In general, the academic advisor for the athletics program should report to the vice president for academic affairs and not to the athletic director.” Moreover, 50% of surveyed faculty also disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement “Too much emphasis is placed on the athletics program at Rowan University by the college/university administration.”

Table 4.4

Governance and Eligibility (N=104)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
In general, an institution should have a faculty athletics board that establishes athletic policies for the school <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 3.403, <i>SD</i> = 1.11	7	6.7	54	51.9	30	28.8	5	4.8	3	2.9

In general, the members of the faculty athletics board should be elected by the faculty at large and not appointed by the college/university administration <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 3.336, <i>SD</i> = 1.17	12	11.5	42	40.4	30	28.8	14	13.5	1	1
In general, the academic advisor for the athletics program should report to the vice president for academic affairs not to the athletic director <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 3.134, <i>SD</i> = 1.38	10	9.6	42	40.4	28	26.9	11	10.6	2	1.9
In general, eligibility requirements for athletes should be more strict <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 3.009, <i>SD</i> = 1.08	3	2.9	34	32.7	41	39.4	18	17.3	3	2.9
In general, members of the athletics coaching staff should also be members of the teaching faculty of the college/university <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 2.605, <i>SD</i> = 1.33	2	1.9	32	30.8	23	22.1	28	26.9	8	7.7
Athletic directors should report directly to the president of their institution <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 2.855, <i>SD</i> = 1.12	6	5.8	22	21.2	41	39.4	26	25	4	3.8
The athletics program should be under closer scrutiny of the administration <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 2.740, <i>SD</i> = 1.18	1	1	24	23.1	50	48.1	16	15.4	2	1.9

Athletes at Rowan University often remain eligible via unethical means <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 2.355, <i>SD</i> = 1.07	1	1	5	4.8	53	51.0	27	26	7	6.7
Too much emphasis is placed on the athletics program at Rowan University by the college/university administration <i>n</i> = 93, <i>M</i> = 2.153, <i>SD</i> = 1.02	1	1	3	2.9	37	35.6	44	42.3	8	7.7

Table 4.5 demonstrates respondent’s answers to questions regarding finances and athletics. The respondents were given the option to answer: “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Undecided,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.” The table is ranked from highest to lowest level of agreement.

A total of 17.3% of faculty respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, “Intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University receive revenues that should go to other departments on campus.” Additionally, 41.3% are undecided on the previous statement. Moreover, 45.2% of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “In general, the financing of the athletics program should be subsidized by charging an activity fee to each student even if those students do not plan on attending athletic events.” In addition, 59.6% of surveyed faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “In general, athletic scholarships should be awarded solely on the basis of need, not the basis of athletic prowess.” Moreover, 62.5% are undecided on the statement, “The athletics program at Rowan University pays for itself.”

Table 4.5

Finances and Athletics (N=104)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University receive revenues that should go to other departments on campus <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 2.586, <i>SD</i> = 1.15	4	3.8	14	13.5	43	41.3	29	27.9	6	5.8
In general, the financing of the athletics program should be subsidized by charging an activity fee to each student even if those students do not plan on attending athletic events <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 2.269, <i>SD</i> = 1.19	0	0	17	16.3	28	26.9	37	35.6	10	9.6
In general, athletic scholarships should be awarded solely on the basis of need, not the basis of athletic prowess <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 2.423, <i>SD</i> = 1.10	6	5.8	11	10.6	20	19.2	56	53.8	6	5.8
In general, athletic scholarships at colleges/universities should be limited to athletes who graduate from local in-state schools <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 2.038, <i>SD</i> = 1.09	2	1.9	7	6.7	19	18.3	53	51	11	10.6

The athletics program at Rowan University pays for itself <i>n</i> = 99, <i>M</i> = 2.519, <i>SD</i> = .824	0	0	2	1.9	65	62.5	27	26	5	4.8
---	---	---	---	-----	----	------	----	----	---	-----

Table 4.6 focuses on faculty opinions in regards to general athletics issues. The respondents were given the option to answer: “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Undecided,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree.” The table is ranked from highest to lowest level of agreement.

Initially, 60.6% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “In general, colleges/universities in the NCAA should be allowed to offer multi-year contracts to head coaches.” Additionally, 17.3% agreed with the statement, “The women’s athletics program at Rowan University receives equal treatment by the university administration.” Also, 72.5% of the faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, “The faculty, in general, resent athletics at Rowan University.” Moreover, 65.4% of the surveyed faculty was undecided on the statement, “The athletics program at Rowan University is influenced too much by outside sources.”

Table 4.6

General Athletics Issues (N=104)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
In general, colleges/universities in the NCAA should be allowed to offer multi-year contracts to head coaches <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 3.365, <i>SD</i> = 1.18	5	4.8	58	55.8	28	26.9	4	3.8	1	1

The women's athletics program at Rowan University receives equal treatment by the university administration <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 2.663, <i>SD</i> = 1.22	4	3.8	14	13.5	57	54.8	13	12.5	4	3.8
In general, tenure for coaches would eliminate the pressure to win <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 2.384, <i>SD</i> = 1.03	1	1	12	11.5	33	31.7	46	44.2	4	3.8
Intercollegiate athletics should be replaced by intramural athletics at Rowan University <i>n</i> = 96, <i>M</i> = 2.000, <i>SD</i> = 1.06	2	1.9	5	4.8	23	22.1	43	41.3	43	41.3
The faculty, in general, resent athletics at Rowan University <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 1.990, <i>SD</i> = 1.07	2	1.9	5	4.8	20	19.2	52	50	13	12.5
The athletics program at Rowan University is influenced too much by outside sources <i>n</i> = 92, <i>M</i> = 2.519, <i>SD</i> = 1.01	0	0	5	4.8	68	65.4	18	17.3	2	1.9

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between demographics and faculty attitudes?

Using the Pearson product-moment correlation with PASW, it was determined that there were no significant relationships between demographics and faculty attitudes towards athletics at Rowan University.

CHAPTER V

Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary of the Study

This study focused on Rowan University faculty attitudes. Previous research studies looked at Division III institutions located in the western part of the United States. Feezell (2005) examined and compared faculty at both Division I and Division III institutions. This study utilized his instrument for use at Rowan University.

Data collection took place during March 2011. The survey contained items formatted using a Likert scale and were distributed via computer program known as surveymonkey.com. The demographics section included data such as gender, age, rank, tenure status, years at institution, athletics participation, undergraduate/graduate institution, academic discipline, athletic events attended. The survey section contained 40 items regarding faculty attitudes towards athletics. A total of 250 surveys were distributed with 104 faculty members responding for a response rate of 42%.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data. Predictive Analytic Software (PASW) was used to calculate frequencies, percentages means, and standard deviations. PASW was also used to calculate the Pearson product-moment correlation to measure the strength of relationships between demographics and faculty attitudes.

Discussion of the Findings

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of selected faculty at Rowan

University towards the factor groupings of presence of athletics on campus, student-athletes, governance/eligibility, financing of athletics, and general athletics issues?

The first factor grouping discussed the presence of athletics on a college campus. A total of 79.8% agreed that athletics has a place on college campuses, whereas 38.5% agreed that a winning athletics program unifies the university. The students, according to 74% of faculty, better identify with their institution through their sports teams. Noble (2004) found faculty responded positively when questioned about the image of the university through athletics. Noble (2004) also found that winning programs are better for the institution's image than non-winning teams. Feezell (2005) reiterated Noble (2004) that faculty viewed athletics positively. The study by Feezell (2005) suggested that faculty members believe athletics belongs on campus.

The second factor grouping dealt with student-athletes. A total of 82.7% of faculty at Rowan agreed with the statement, "In general, athletes should meet the same admissions requirements as the general student." Faculty agreed at 39.5% that student-athletes are given privileges not given to other students. Only 6.7% agreed that Rowan graduation rates are lower than that of the general student body. The Drake Group made a proposal they termed, the "Real Student" (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 1999, 2010, p. 1). This proposal suggested incoming student-athletes must have the combined SAT score average of their freshmen class. Pennington (2005) noted Haverford College being permeated with fear that they were losing academically stellar students, who felt they could not receive equal treatment because of the treatment that was being given to student-athletes. Weistart (1987) suggested

that faculty members were absent minded of the fact not a single African-American basketball player graduated from Memphis State in a 10 year span. He felt faculty do not necessarily notice academic issues in athletic programs as they often choose to take a laissez-faire approach. Feezell (2005) concluded that faculty agreed student-athletes must meet the same admissions standards as their incoming class. He also concluded faculty feel student-athletes receive special privileges, but they agree that special tutoring for student-athletes is necessary.

The third factor grouping analyzed governance and eligibility. A total of 58.7% of Rowan faculty agreed strongly that a faculty athletics board should be established on campus. Additionally, 51.9% also agreed that the members of said board should be elected by the faculty and not appointed by administration. Also, 50% of faculty agreed with the statement, "In general, the academic advisor for the athletics program should report to the vice president for academic affairs and not the athletic director." Gerdy (2002) described faculty members as "guardians of academic integrity" (p. 33). Gerdy (2002) states that faculty have the best vantage point to lead academic reform. The Drake Group believes that faculty should control the academic support programs for athletics. They feel that administration distances students and student-athletes when what is needed is unanimity (The Drake Group: Des Moines, 2000, 2010.) Plant (1961) stated that autonomy in athletic governance is needed. If every decision must be cleared with faculty, agreement would never be reached. This situation is why a faculty controller was sought out in the 1960s (Plant, 1961). Feezell (2005) found that faculty did not have a strong opinion on governance. He noted that faculty were undecided on who the athletic director should report to.

However, Feezell (2005) concluded that a faculty athletics board would be a welcome addition to the campuses in his study.

The fourth factor grouping regarded issues with financing in athletics. Rowan faculty members are largely undecided with financial issues in regards to athletics at Rowan. A total of 41.3% were undecided on the statement, "Intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University receive revenue that should go to other departments on campus." Additionally, 62.5% are also undecided if the athletics program at Rowan pays for itself. However, the faculty do not show partiality to changes in current financing. Also, 59.6% disagree that athletic scholarships should be based solely on need. There are 61.6% who do not believe athletic scholarships should be limited to in-state students. Sperber (1990) discussed the African-American student-athlete stereotype. He stated there are those who believe that African-Americans are brought to college only to play a sport. Sperber (1990) also stated that the athletic scholarship may give that young athlete a chance at a college education they may not have otherwise been able to receive. Adler and Adler (1985) warned even though this can lead to a college education, athletics can also cause a student's downfall if not carefully monitored. Feezell (2005) found that many faculty members believed the athletics program at their university did not pay for itself. He also noted that there were some faculty members who felt the revenues for athletics belonged to other departments on campus.

The final factor grouping demonstrated the attitudes of Rowan faculty towards general athletics issues. Faculty members agreed that there is pressure to win in intercollegiate athletics. Moreover, 48% of faculty members disagreed that tenure for

coaches would eliminate that pressure to win. However, 62.5% disagreed that the faculty in general resent athletics at Rowan, despite said pressure. Feezell (2005) concluded that faculty members believe there is pressure on coaches and athletes to win. He also stated that tenure would not relieve that pressure. Despite this, Feezell (2005) has concluded that faculty do not resent athletics. They merely resent the issues from placing athletics above academics.

Oberteuffer (1936) and Plant (1961) asserted that athletics in and of itself is not the issue that was present. The issue was how to control athletics on campuses. Sperber (1990) quoted A. Bartlett Giamatti as saying that college sports became a circus. He went further as to say it threatened to make higher education become the show off to the side of the main circus. Sperber (1990) noted that “myths” were being constructed to link college sports with higher education. Feezell (2005) suggests that at Division III, faculty members are much more positive about athletics than their Division I counterparts. He also states that friction at the Division I level often comes between football and men’s basketball in regards to the other sports. This is primarily due to the revenue the two sports produce. At the Division III level, there is not one sport that produces revenue with such a discrepancy.

Research Question 2: Is there a significant relationship between demographic factors of gender, age, rank, tenure status, years at institution, athletics participation, undergraduate/graduate institution, academic discipline, athletic events attended and faculty attitudes?

There were no significant relationships found between the demographic factors of gender, age, rank, tenure status, years at institution, athletics participation,

undergraduate/graduate institution, academic discipline, athletic events attended, and faculty attitudes. Noble (2004) stated demographics had little impact on faculty attitudes. Eagly and Chaiken (1993) suggest that an attitude can become a belief; however that attitude is based off of a previous opinion, not demographics.

Conclusions

It can be concluded based on the findings of the study that no significant relationships exist between demographics and faculty attitudes towards athletics, which confirms Feezell's (2005) findings. It can also be concluded that faculty members at Rowan University have generally positive attitudes towards athletics. A majority of Rowan faculty stated they do not resent athletics. Thus, it can be concluded from the findings that the faculty at Rowan University in general are positive towards athletics.

In contrast, the results demonstrated that Rowan faculty do not have as strong opinions about the Rowan athletics program. More than half of faculty were undecided if the athletics program at Rowan paid for itself. They also were undecided if Rowan athletics receives revenue that belongs to other departments on campus. They did state, however, athletes are not exploited at Rowan, but are exploited in athletic programs in general.

From the findings of this study, it can be concluded that Rowan faculty are lacking information on the athletics department. With half of the faculty being indecisive, the findings demonstrate a need for more transparency by either the athletics department members or athletics administration. In regards to athletics financing, faculty members could conceivably be losing funds to the athletics

program and not be aware of it. In general, faculty members may not be aware of the events that are taking place on campus due to lack of communication. For example, more than half of Rowan faculty members are indecisive if Rowan student-athletes have a lower graduate rate than the regular student body.

This indecisiveness is possibly the result of low transparency and high apathy. Many faculty members are under pressure to contribute to the scholarship of their field, thus their work schedule may cause an apathetic attitude towards athletics and other extra-curricular pursuits.

The low transparency issue could be a result of poor inter-departmental relations. The athletics department may advertise athletic events and pep rallies amongst themselves very well, but the lack of information that is being given to the faculty suggests events are not advertised across campus thoroughly. By initiating better practice, faculty attitudes could improve.

Recommendations for Practice

Based upon the research and findings, the following recommendations are made for practice.

1. Have a faculty athletics open house day. The faculty would be allowed to meet with all the coaches and the athletic directors. The event would culminate with a football game in the fall, basketball in the winter, and baseball in the spring.
2. Have a faculty liaison for each athletic team. The faculty liaison would be at the games with the team they are working with for tutoring and giving exams

if the teams are away during an athlete's scheduled exam. That faculty member would also be a member of the faculty athletics board.

3. Establish a faculty athletics board. This board would have faculty members on it, but the assistant athletic director would chair the board in order to make sure the issues with athletics are given by someone close to the issues to eliminate the chance for miscommunication.
4. Have a faculty specialty coach. Each team would have a different faculty member as a specialty coach at each sporting event. They would be on the bench with the team and be privy to game planning and strategy just as an assistant coach would be.
5. Have an open house for coaches to build relationships with faculty. The faculty members would host an open house where the coaches could meet the faculty in their element. The coaches would be allowed to sit in on classes their players are in to observe their behavior in the classroom to keep a high standard of academics.
6. Invite the faculty to practices. By allowing the faculty to observe practices, they will see how hard the students work outside of the classroom as well as inside the classroom.
7. Allow faculty participation. By allowing the faculty to either run the scoreboard or announce at games, it may open up their mind to athletics and they may enjoy it enough to continually come out.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the research and conclusions of the findings, the following are recommendations for further research.

1. Conduct a longitudinal study. Find an institution that has a class of incoming freshmen student-athletes. The study would require them to report in during pre-season, in-season, and off-season. It would focus on how the student-athletes are treated by faculty at different points of the academic year. This study would be repeated each year the student is still an athlete and enrolled in school. This would allow data to be collected on how the student's athletic accomplishments may affect their schooling.
2. Replication studies. The replications should be done at different intervals. By replicating a study in the same geographic area, the researcher will see the possible changes in faculty attitudes. The different intervals should depend on the success of the athletic program. Does athletic success influence faculty attitudes? This will enable the researcher to ascertain how much impact a sports season has on the faculty.
3. Participant Observation. Allow a researcher to serve as a visiting faculty member at two institutions. The first of which would be an institution that takes great pride in their athletics program. The second would be the opposite. The researchers would participate themselves in the atmosphere and observe how athletics has an effect on the campus. This can also be done similar to the longitudinal study mentioned above.

4. Faculty focus groups. By forming a faculty focus group based off of their previous institutions, other faculty members can get an inside view of other institutions. Many faculty members attended a Division I institution for graduate school as they often have scholarly research programs. There are some who have only attended Division II or Division III schools. By interacting with fellow academics about their past experiences at different schools, researchers may be able to find a common thread on how athletics and academics should intertwine on all three levels.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P., & Adler P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The Academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58, 241-250.
- Allport, G. W. (1935). Attitudes. In C. Murchison (Ed.). *Handbook of social psychology* (pp. 798-844). Worcester, MA: Clark University Press.
- Armenta, A. D. (1986). *Faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at Arizona's state sponsored institutions*. Doctoral Dissertation. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff, AZ.
- Aronson, E. (1992). *The social animal* (6th ed.). New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Astin, A. W. (1999). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 518-529.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clark, B. R. (1963). Faculty organization and authority. In M. Christopher Brown III (Ed.), *Organization and governance in higher education* (pp. 119-127). Boston: Pearson.
- Clark, V., Horton, F., & Alford, R. (1985). NCAA rule 48: Racism or reform? *The Journal of Negro Education*, 55, 162-170.
- Core Values. (2010). *Core Values*. Available online at:
<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About+the+NCAA/who+We+Are/Core+Values+landing+page>
- Crowley, J. (2006). *The NCAA's first century: In the arena*. Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.
- Division I. (2010). *Differences among the three divisions: Division I*. Available online at:

<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About+the+NCAA/who+We+Are/Differences+Among+the+Divisions>

Division III. (2010). *Differences among the three divisions: Division III*. Available online at:

<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About+the+NCAA/Who+We+Are/Differences+Among+the+Divisions/Information+for+prospective+students+athletes+and+parents>

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1993). *The psychology of attitudes*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Eagly, A. H., & Chaiken, S. (1998). Attitude structure and function. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.). *The handbook of social psychology* (4th edition) (pp. 269-322) New York: McGraw-Hill.

Feezell, T. (2005). *Faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Division I and Division III institutions*. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Idaho, Moscow, ID.

Ferris, E., Finster, M., & Mc Donald, D. (2004). Academic fit of student-athletes: An analysis of NCAA division I-a graduation rates. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 555-575.

Flygare, T. (1983). Legal battles over television rights to college football. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64, 433-434.

Gerdy, J. (2002). Athletic victories: Educational defeats. *Academe*, 88, 32-36.

Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

History of American Football. (2010). *Wikipedia* available online at:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_american_football

Kilbourne, J. (2003). College athletics as a college education. *The Chronicle of*

Higher Education, 50(15), B-20.

NCAA History. (2010). *Who we are: History*. Available online at:

<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/who+we+are/about+the+ncaa+history>

Noble, J. S. (2004). *Faculty attitudes toward NCAA Division III athletic programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO.

Norman, G. (1995). *Faculty attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics at colleges and universities belonging to Division I of the National Collegiate Athletic Association and National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. Published doctoral dissertation. North Texas State University, Denton, TX.

Oberteuffer, D. (1936). The athlete and his college. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 7, 437-442.

Odenkirk, J. (1981). Intercollegiate athletics: Big business or sport? *Academe*, 67(2), 62-66.

Pennington, B. (2005, December 4). Books and bouncing balls in a delicate balancing act. *The New York Times*, 87.

Plant, M. (1961). The place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education: Faculty control. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 32, 1-8.

Pratkanis, A. R. (1989). The cognitive representation of attitudes. In A. R. Pratkanis, S. J. Breckler, & A. G. Greenwald (Eds.), *Attitude structure and function* (pp. 71-98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rishe, P. (2003). A reexamination of how athletic success impacts graduation rates: Comparing student-athletes to all other undergraduates. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 62, 407-427.

- Rowan University. (2011). *From normal to extraordinary: The history of Rowan University*. Available online at:
<http://www.rowan.edu/open/subpages/about/history/>
- Sander, L. (2007). Faculty members feel 'disconnected' from college athletics, report says. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(8), A32.
- Sperber, M. (1990). College sports inc: The athletic department vs. the university. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 72, K1-K12.
- Sperber, M. (1991). Why the NCAA can't reform college athletics. *Academe*, 77 13-20.
- Suggs, W. (2005). Sociology professors rate colleges for athletes who care about classes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(43), A24.
- The Drake Group. (2010). *Des Moines 1999*. Available online at:
<http://www.thedrakegroup.org/desmoines1999.html>
- The Drake Group. (2010). *Des Moines 2000*. Available online at:
<http://www.thedrakegroup.org/desmoines2000.html>
- The Drake Group. (2010). *Proposals*. Available online at:
<http://www.thedrakegroup.org/proposals.html>
- Toma, J., & Cross, M. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 663-661.
- Tomahawk Nation. (2010). *FSU's academic fraud scandal finally comes to an end*. Available online at <http://www.tomahawknation.com/2010/2/7/1299742/fsus-academic-fraud-scandal>
- Weistart, J. (1987). College sports reform: Where are the faculty? *Academe*, 73, 12-17.

APPENDIX A:
Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



February 23, 2011

Robert C. Baumgartner
125 7th Avenue
Mt. Ephraim, NJ 08059

Dear Robert C. Baumgartner:

In accordance with the University's IRB policies and 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to inform you that the Rowan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your project:

IRB application number: 2011-108

Project Title: The prof vs. The Owl: Faculty Attitudes Towards Intercollegiate Athletics at a Division III Institution

In accordance with federal law, this approval is effective for **one calendar year** from the date of this letter. If your research project extends beyond that date or if you need to make significant modifications to your study, you must notify the IRB immediately. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with our office regarding this research.

Please retain copies of consent forms for this research for three years after completion of the research.

If, during your research, you encounter any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, you must report this immediately to Dr. Harriet Hartman (hartman@rowan.edu or call 856-256-4500, ext. 3787) or contact Dr. Gautam Pillay, Associate Provost for Research (pillay@rowan.edu or call 856-256-5150).

If you have any administrative questions, please contact Karen Heiser (heiser@rowan.edu or 856-256-5150).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Harriet Hartman".

Harriet Hartman, Ph.D.
Chair, Rowan University IRB

c: Burton Sisco, Educational Leadership, Education Hall

Office of Research
Bole Hall Annex
201 Mullica Hill Road
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

856-256-5150
856-256-4425 fax

APPENDIX B:

Email Sent Out to Participants/Consent

Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Robert Baumgartner and I am a graduate student in the Higher Education Administration and Instruction program here at Rowan University. The survey that is being distributed to you seeks to examine faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics here at Rowan University. While your participation in this survey is voluntary and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of this project and greatly appreciated. Please be aware that all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential. If you have any questions concerning your participation in this study, you may contact myself, Robert Baumgartner, by telephone at 609-314-2694 or by e-mail at baumga02@students.rowan.edu or project advisor Dr. Burton Sisco by phone at 856-256-4500 Ext. 3717 or by e-mail at sisco@rowan.edu.

By completing this survey, you are automatically entered into a drawing to win a Barnes and Noble gift card. The survey can be accessed at the link below:

<https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/CDJBFR3>

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert C. Baumgartner
Graduate Student
Educational Leadership Dept.

APPENDIX C:
Survey Instrument

Rowan Faculty Attitudes Toward Intercollegiate Athletics

While your participation in this survey is voluntary and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of the project and greatly appreciated. The following survey is being conducted to fulfill thesis requirements for the M.A in Higher Education program. The purpose of this research is to examine faculty attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University. Please be aware that all responses will be kept anonymous and confidential. If I have any questions or problems concerning my participation in this study, I may contact Robert Baumgartner by phone at (609) 314-2694 or by e-mail at baumga02@students.rowan.edu or Dr. Burton Sisco by phone at (856) 256-4500 Ext. 3717 or by e-mail at Sisco@rowan.edu.

I. Background Information

Please select then answer to each question that best describes you or your institution

1. What age are you currently?

35 or under

36-45

46-55

56-65

66 or over

2. What is your gender?

Male

Female

3. What is your current academic rank?

Assistant Professor

Associate Professor

Professor

4. What is your tenure status?

Tenured

Non-Tenured

5. Years at current institution:

- 1-5
- 6-10
- 11-15
- 16 or more

6. What is your highest level of athletics participation?

- None
- Little League
- Junior High School
- High School
- College
- Semi- Professional
- Olympics

7. Undergraduate Institution Attended: _____

8 Graduate Institution Attended: _____

9. Academic Discipline

- Natural Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Humanities
- Professional
- Other

10. Number of athletic events attended at undergraduate

institution:

- None
- 1-10
- 11-20
- 21-30
- 31+

11. Number of athletic events

attended at graduate institution:

() None

() 1-10

() 11-20

() 21-30

() 31+

II. Faculty Attitudes Towards Athletics

Instructions: Following are statements regarding intercollegiate athletics at your institution and throughout the nation. Please read each question carefully to determine if it is asking about the athletics program at your institution OR about athletics programs in general. Please indicate your opinion of the particular statement by circling the appropriate number.

1= Strongly Disagree

2= Disagree

3= Undecided

4= Agree

5= Strongly Agree

ALL RESPONSES WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL

1. In general, eligibility requirements for athletes should be more strict.	1	2	3	4	5
2. There is justification for intercollegiate athletics on college campuses.	1	2	3	4	5
3. In general, athletes face pressures not experienced by non-athletes in college.	1	2	3	4	5
4. The graduation rates for athletes at Rowan University is lower than that of the general student body	1	2	3	4	5
5. In general, athletic scholarships should be awarded solely on the basis of need, not the basis of	1	2	3	4	5

athletic prowess.					
6. Athletics directors should report directly to the president of their institution	1	2	3	4	5
7. The athletics program at Rowan University pays for itself.	1	2	3	4	5
8. In general, an institution should have a faculty athletics board that establishes athletics policies for the school.	1	2	3	4	5
9. In general, members of a faculty athletics board should be elected by the faculty at large, not appointed by the college/university administration.	1	2	3	4	5
10. The grade point averages of athletes at Rowan University is lower than that of the general student body.	1	2	3	4	5
11. In general, tenure for coaches would eliminate the pressure to win.	1	2	3	4	5
12. In general, a winning athletics program generates additional financial contributions to colleges/universities from alumni.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Intercollegiate athletics should be replaced by intramural athletics at Rowan University.	1	2	3	4	5
14. In general, colleges/universities in the NCAA should be allowed to offer multi-year contracts to head coaches.	1	2	3	4	5
15. In general, athletes should meet the same admissions requirements as the general student body.	1	2	3	4	5
16. In general, freshmen should be allowed to participate in college athletics	1	2	3	4	5
17. Intercollegiate athletics at Rowan University receives revenues that should go to other departments on campus.	1	2	3	4	5
18. In general, athletes receive special privileges not granted to other students.	1	2	3	4	5
19. In general, a winning athletics program helps unify the college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
20. A majority of athletes at Rowan University are here to participate in athletics, not to pursue a degree program.	1	2	3	4	5
21. The athletics program at Rowan University should be under closer scrutiny of the administration.	1	2	3	4	5
22. In general, members of the athletics coaching staff should also be members of the teaching faculty of the college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
23. The athletics program at Rowan University is influenced too much by outside sources.	1	2	3	4	5
24. Too much emphasis is placed on the athletics program at Rowan University by the college/university administration.	1	2	3	4	5

25. Athletes at Rowan University often remain eligible via unethical means.	1	2	3	4	5
26. The reputation of the athletics program at Rowan University draws students to the college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
27. In general, a college/university should provide special tutoring/counseling to help athletes.	1	2	3	4	5
28. In general, the academic advisor for the athletics program should report to the vice president for academic affairs, not to the athletics director.	1	2	3	4	5
29. If the athletics program at Rowan University were abolished, it would have an overall negative effect on the college/university.	1	2	3	4	5
30. In general, an athletics programs help student identify with their institution	1	2	3	4	5
31. In general, participation in athletics helps the athlete prepare for life.	1	2	3	4	5
32. Intercollegiate athletics benefits Rowan University.	1	2	3	4	5
33. In general, athletic scholarships at colleges/universities should be limited to athletes who graduated from local in-state schools.	1	2	3	4	5
34. In general, unrealistic time demands are placed on athletes by coaches.	1	2	3	4	5
35. The faculty, in general, resents athletics at Rowan University.	1	2	3	4	5
36. Athletes are exploited at Rowan University.	1	2	3	4	5
37. In general, athletes are exploited in athletics programs throughout the United States.	1	2	3	4	5
38. In general, the financing of the athletics program should be subsidized by charging an activity fee to each student, even if those students do not plan on attending athletic events.	1	2	3	4	5
39. The women's athletics program at Rowan University receives equal treatment by the university administration.	1	2	3	4	5
40. In general, coaches should be retained primarily upon their ability to field winning teams consistently.	1	2	3	4	5