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A COMPARISON OF THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE OF THE PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETIC PROGRAMS OF SELECTED PREDOMINANTLY BLACK AND WHITE NCAA DIVISION II COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

CHAPTER I

Introduction

The growth in size and complexity of the modern college and university has made the tasks of overall institutional administration increasingly more difficult to accomplish. The growth in enrollment alone has forced the university to increase its program and curriculum offerings; to identify vocational needs, and to seek solutions to social problems.

The governance structure of colleges and universities in America is different from any other formal organization within our society. Corson states that:

"The primary differences between the college or university and other forms of enterprise, so far as administration is concerned, lies in the authority and responsibility placed in the faculty as a body by tradition, by custom, or by formal bylaw or regulation. A second difference lies in the freedom of speech and of thought accorded the faculty member as an individual."1

Together these two factors have organizational and administrative meaning that are unparalleled in business or governmental enterprise.

---

While it is not the purpose of this study to attempt to justify athletic programs in higher education or to describe in any detail the various administrative units observed by the various colleges and universities in operating their athletic programs, it is necessary to give some background information in these areas. Colleges and universities throughout the country were established and founded for the primary purpose of providing an equal opportunity for all youth to receive an education and to promote the general welfare of society. It would appear, therefore, that everything that takes place in an institution of higher learning should in some way, either through teaching, research or services, make a positive contribution to the educational development of its students and of society. In as much as physical education and athletics are considered to be integral parts of the total educational process they are expected to contribute toward the development of the entire student physically, mentally, socially and emotionally; hence, both athletics and physical education are included within the program of most of the colleges and universities in the United States. Resick states that "the educational values derived from intercollegiate athletics affects the individual participant in terms of its contribution to the intellectual... cultural and vocational growth and development of the person who competes."2

Athletics, therefore, should be educational to the point in colleges and universities that they provide a laboratory of experiences that reflects an outgrowth of the institution's physical education, recreation, and intramural programs.

Colleges are non-profit organizations. They are not, nor were they ever intended to be, commercial institutions. All programs in operation in American colleges and universities, which includes athletics, can only be justified if they meet the educational standards and philosophies of the institutions they service. This would only mean that in order to justify the presence of athletics in higher education one would need to identify the goals, objectives, aims, and philosophies of the program in terms of its relationship with general education. Scott states that:

"Lack of acceptance of athletics as an educational enterprise by the majority of educational institutions... resulted in perpetuation of a financial structure for the conduct of the program... If the program of competitive sports is to be educational in nature rather than a commercial amusement for the masses, it must be freed of the necessity of operating as a business enterprise. Where it continues to be necessary to conduct athletics as a commercial venture, it is not likely that any athletic conference or federation, nor the National Collegiate Athletic Association will ever be able to regulate the program effectively so that it conforms to sound educational practices."

---

3 Ibid.

In as much as colleges and universities are non-profit organizations, athletics can only exist in their programs provided they make continuous contributions to the goals of education and to the improvement of society.

Athletic and physical education administration has taken on many forms since the turn of the century in terms of their relationship one with the other. In many instances, new administrative units have been created due largely to increased student enrollment, faculty participation in the decision-making process, curriculum and program changes and the acquisition of newer, more modern facilities. In this study it may be discovered that among the variables surveyed, the various styles in administrative structures observed by White and Black colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA will highlight the major differences between these two types of institutions.

Since the dawn of the twentieth century, the administration of physical education and intercollegiate athletic programs in the colleges and universities in America has experienced many changes, resulting in conflicts of ideals, philosophies, and objectives. In some institutions, both physical education and intercollegiate athletics are organized and managed as a uniform program under one director. But in others, especially the so called multiversities, the two divisions are run separately with the results that the intercollegiate athletic program as well as the physical education program, function as autonomous units.

One of the trends consequent to this system has been the inroad
of interest groups in the intercollegiate athletic program of the large colleges and universities in the United States, hence the pattern of administration of such programs tends to digress from the educational framework of these institutions. In recent times opinions have been expressed on what people regard as commercialization of the intercollegiate athletic programs of various colleges and universities. While there may not be any concerted attempts by these institutions towards commercialization, the amount of emphasis placed on profit making through gate receipts, television coverage, commercial advertisement, and alumni contributions, in an effort to help support the entire athletic programs of these institutions, may be a contributory factor to this charge. Over the years, charges and counter charges have been made against the method of administration of athletics in colleges and universities. Intercollegiate athletics have been associated with commercialization, economic motives and other malpractices that tend to divorce it from the total educational framework of the schools. For example, Williams stated the following:

"...all are ready to admit that the college athletic situation is chaotic because of gambling, commercialism, and subsidization which mark its course, and that it will remain so until individuals acquire a new and finer ethical viewpoint, simply reverses the true state of affairs. The proselything, the subsidizing, the exploiting, the bribing, the buying and selling are true exact portrayals of the culture in which we live."5

---

Dimock believes that "institutions largely determine the kind of life style society is going to have and that administrators as a class largely determine the quality of the institution."^6

Voltmer states that:

"Administration is mainly concerned with guiding human behavior in the service of some goal. Whatever the nature of the organization it is through human behavior that necessary tasks are accomplished. The crux of administration is managing human behavior."^7

Katz defines three skills that are essential for effective administration: (1) technical skill, (2) human skill, and (3) conceptual skill. He describes them as follows:

1. Technical skill. "...an understanding of an proficiency in, a specific kind of activity, particularly one involving methods, processes, procedures, or techniques. Technical skill involves specialized knowledge, analytical ability within that specialty, and facility in the use of the tools and techniques of the specific discipline."

2. Human skill. "The executive's ability to work effectively as a group member and to build cooperative effort within the team he leads." This involves understanding other people and being able to work effectively with them. As the term implies, it signifies skill in human relations. Implicit in this skill is a realistic understanding of self.

---


3. Conceptual skill. "The ability to see the enterprise as a whole; it includes recognizing how the various functions of the organization depend on one another, and how changes in any one part affect all the others."8

It is hoped that the results of this study will provide sufficient data that will enable athletic and physical education administrators in NCAA Division II colleges and universities to adopt a more meaningful philosophy of administration which will enable them to structure a more effective and efficient organization.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Although the major concern of this research is not the origin or history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), yet it is necessary to give a brief account of its development and involvement in intercollegiate athletics. Prior to the twentieth century, when the organization of college athletics in the United States was an exclusive responsibility of the students, the problems associated with them were so complex that it became imperative to either control or ban competitive athletics in colleges and universities from campus activities. It was at the initiative of the college presidents, in an effort to solve the growing problems in college athletics, that the first move was

made which gave birth to the organization we know today as the NCAA. According to Scott, the organization was first named the "Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States", and later changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association with the stated objective of:

"The regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States in order that the athletic activities of the colleges and universities of the United States may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with dignity and high purpose of education." 9

The role of the NCAA in this regard was supervisory while the obligation for the control of student athletic sports was that of the individual member institutions registered in this association, thus the association represented faculty control on a national level.

In a bid to improve the amateur status of intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA deviated from its role as:

"A passive adviser and consultant in matters pertaining to intercollegiate athletics and entered upon a program designed to force member institutions to adhere to the democratically formulated principles of the organization under threat of probation, expulsion from membership and ostracism if found guilty of noncompliance." 10

---

9 Scott, op. cit., p. 33.

10 Ibid, p. 34.
The following statements are excerpts taken from the Constitution of the NCAA which will provide a description of the purposes, fundamental policies, membership eligibility requirements, and administrative structure of this organization:

**Article I** states that the name of this organization shall be "The National Collegiate Athletic Association."

**Article II** covers the purposes and fundamental policy of the NCAA which are:

1) The stimulation and improvement of programs to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness...and athletic excellence through competitive intramural and intercollegiate programs.

2) The upholding of the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all collegiate sports...

3) ...the adoption by its constituent members of strict eligibility rules to comply with satisfactory standards of scholarship, amateur standing and good sportsmanship.

The fundamental policy of the NCAA is that:

"Legislation governing the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic programs of member institutions shall apply to basic athletic issues such as admissions, financial aid, eligibility and recruiting; and that the member institutions shall be obligated to apply and enforce this legislation..."

**Article III** defines an amateur student-athlete as one who engages in athletics for the physical, mental, social and educational benefits he derives therefrom, and to whom athletics is an avocation.
Article IV states that colleges, universities and other institutions of learning in the United States, its territories or possessions, with acceptable academic standards which accept and observe the principals set forth in the Constitution and By-laws of the association are eligible for membership in this association. There are four membership classifications in the NCAA. They include:

1) Active - four-year colleges and universities duly elected to active membership under the provisions of the by-laws...

2) Allied - athletic conferences or associations of colleges and universities, all of the members of which are active members of the NCAA.

3) Associate - educational institutions or groups or associations of such institutions, not eligible for active membership...

4) Affiliated - other groups and associations, intimately related to intercollegiate athletics in their functioning...

Article V states that the administrative structure of the NCAA shall consist of a council of eight members whose purpose is to establish and give direction for the general policy of the association during the interim between conventions. An executive committee which consists of ten members including the president, vice president at-large and the secretary-treasurer who are ex-officio members. Their functions are to transact the business and administer the affairs of the association, and to carry out the policies of the association and the council... The final segment of the administrative structure of the NCAA includes the officers which consists of a president, eight district vice presidents (one from each geographic district, each of
whom shall be a member of the faculty of a member institution in the
district from which he is elected), a vice-president at-large and a
secretary-treasurer. The officers' responsibilities include presiding
over meetings, rendering reports from respective districts, the for­
mailion of policies, the collection of dues and the maintenance of the
records of the association.\textsuperscript{11}

In 1973 during a special convention,\textsuperscript{12} NCAA delegates voted to
divide the membership of their organization into three legislative
and competitive divisions. Certain criteria were set for each mem­
ber institution to meet in order to be eligible for divisional status.
There are two major classifications for membership in the NCAA. They
are University Division and College Division. Division I is the only
sub-division for University Division colleges and universities, usually
referred to as "major" institutions. Division II and III are sub­
divisions for institutions holding membership in the NCAA College Divi­
sion, usually referred to as "small" institutions. An institution
applying for membership in the association may designate any division,
through self determination, for which it meets the applicable criteria.

\textsuperscript{11}1963-1964 Yearbook of the National Collegiate Ath­
letic Association (Kansas City, Missouri: The National Collegiate

\textsuperscript{12}1976-77 Manual of the National Collegiate Athletic
Association (Shawnee Mission, Kansas: The National Collegiate Athletic
It was also made mandatory by revision in August 1976 that each member institution must continue to meet the criteria of its division in order to remain a member of that division when any grace period expires, (adopted: 3/1/76). During the time of application for membership to any one of the three divisions in the NCAA, the prospective member institution would be required to designate the membership division it desires along with its preferred football classification. The membership application, however, would be considered by a special classification committee which would also determine the division for which the prospective member institution qualifies under the applicable criteria. Resick and Erickson stated that "their constitution, even though they have different classifications, remains a single document, but the reorganization in 1973 allowed for each divisions to adopt amendments to the by-laws applicable only to that division, without the approval of any other division, unless delegates at the regular convention object by a two-thirds majority in unicameral session." An institution with membership in Division II may petition to participate in Division I in any one sport, other than football or basketball prior to January 1977, however, since that time a Division II institution may petition under the terms of the constitution and by-laws to compete in Division I in any sport area for which it qualifies.

The NCAA allows each prospective member institution the opportunity to request participation and eligibility in more than one division. This request must be made at the time of the initial

---

13Resick, op. cit., p. 71.
application and it must be made by the "chief executive officer of the petitioning institution." Other criteria considered for divisional membership whether singular or multiple are as follows:

1. The institution's future scheduling patterns in the sport of football, including at least four seasons subsequent to the effective date desired. (adopted: 8/1/76)

2. The financial aid program for students participating in the sport of football. (adopted: 8/1/76)

3. The number of sports sponsored by the institution on an intercollegiate basis, and the financial aid provided participants in sports other than football. (adopted: 8/1/76).

4. The available athletic facilities. (adopted: 8/1/76).

5. Past performance by the institution against opponents in the division in which membership is being sought. (adopted: 8/1/76).

Post season championships are held annually by the NCAA. In order for each member institution to be eligible for competition in those events it must comply with all rules and regulations set forth in the constitution and by-laws of the NCAA. If for any reason a member institution has been placed on probation for any given period of time it may in no way participate in post season championships or be eligible for television coverage until the period of probation has expired.

---

Statement of the Problem

This research is an attempt to analyze and compare the governance of physical education and athletics in selected predominantly Black colleges and universities and predominantly White colleges and universities which compete in NCAA Division II sports programs in an effort to point out differences in administrative structures and patterns of governance.

In view of the various structures and patterns of administration mentioned earlier (i.e., intercollegiate athletics administered as a responsibility of the physical education department with the same individual directing both programs; athletics organized as a function of the physical education department with separate directors; or with athletics organized as an autonomous department which may or may not operate with some degree of coordination with physical education) there are other internal as well as external influences that may also play a significant role in the administration of athletics in American small colleges and universities. These organizations may include the NCAA, NAIA, AIAW, individual college conferences, commissioners, accrediting agencies, the federal government (with its Title IX legislation), the alumni, and various campus student organizations.

There are basically three types of administration:
(1) autocratic, (2) democratic, and (3) laissez-faire. Getzels

and Resick\textsuperscript{16} parallel in their views of these types of administration. They state that the autocratic or authoritarian leader determines all of the policy statements used in the total operation of his organization. The autocratic administrator generally feels that he was chosen because he was the best candidate available that qualified for the position and as a result he proceeds to rule with an iron hand. He usually dictates the particular work tasks and enforces regulations without regard for circumstances. He generally ignores the human elements of the organization in that he tends to be "personal" in his praise and criticism of the work of each member of his work unit. He normally dictates techniques and activities to his constituents one step at a time so that future steps are always uncertain to the group.

The democratic leader differs from the autocratic leader in that he normally provides and encourages total group participation in all matters concerning policy for the organization. He usually acts to coordinate the efforts of the total group throughout the decision-making process. As the administrator, he is "objective" or "fact minded" in his praise and criticism and tries to be a regular member of the group in spirit. He allows opportunities for the group to decide matters that relate to task division. And finally, he may suggest techniques and activities to his constituents for program

operations but will ultimately provide ample opportunity for individual and group input as to the procedures they feel they must follow in order to reach the formally approved goals of the organization.

The laissez-faire or anarchist leader, they report, is the type of administrator who allows complete freedom for individual as well as group input into the decision-making process with very little leadership participation or interference. He basically does not get involved in work load or other task decisions for the group. He distributes materials and supplies to members of his organization only when asked and he makes it clear that he will supply policy statements and other information to the group only when approached. 17 Getzel concludes that more work as well as good quality work is done by members of an organization ruled by an autocrat only during his presence. Discontent, hostility and overt rebellion may also occur within the organization. Under the democratic leader the organization tends to operate more efficiently with or without the leader's presence. With the laissez-faire leader less work as well as a poorer quality of work is done by members of the organization.

Instrument Criteria

In an effort to understand more about the various administrative styles utilized by athletic and physical education directors in NCAA

Division II colleges and universities, this study will take a close look at the following variables:

1. The role of the chairperson of the physical education department, the director of athletics, the chairperson of the athletic committee and the president of the college or university in the administration of physical education and athletics.

2. The role of outside influences such as the NCAA, the alumni, college conferences, conference commissioners, and other such organizations and individuals involved in the administration of physical education and athletics in higher education.

3. The role of the faculty and coaches in the decision-making process, i.e. appointment, promotion and tenure of faculty and staff, curriculum planning and change, allocation of workload for faculty and staff, budgeting, equipment and supplies.

4. The type of governance styles used in NCAA Division II athletics and physical education programs, e.g. whether or not they are autocratic, democratic, or laissez-faire.

Significance of the Problem

A study of the administration and organization of physical education and athletic programs in selected NCAA Division II predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities was significant for the following reasons:

1. To make available to the field information concerning the organization and administration of physical education and athletic programs in small colleges and universities in America.

2. The need to determine whether or not there are significant differences between the governance structures of physical education and athletics in NCAA Division II predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities.
Delimitation of the Problem

1. This study will cover thirty colleges and universities, fifteen predominantly Black and fifteen predominantly White, within four of the eight districts which are registered to compete in athletics in the NCAA Division II. They may, however, participate in Division I or III sports programs in no more than two areas.

2. They must offer a major in physical education for men and women leading to a bachelor of arts or science degree.

3. They must have a competitive intercollegiate athletic program which includes a minimum of six sports.

4. They must be a public, state supported institution.

5. They must have an enrollment of 10,000 or less.

Limitations of the Problem

1. Some of the respondents may have given information which they felt should have been the correct answers, and not necessarily what actually happens at their institution.

2. Some of the policies related to the control of athletics varied from state to state.

Definition of Terms

1. Governance structure - this term refers to the organizational and administrative processes in physical education and athletics in NCAA Division II colleges and universities.

2. Predominantly Black colleges - those colleges where a greater percentage of students enrolled is Black.

3. Predominantly White colleges - those colleges where a greater percentage of students enrolled is White.

4. NCAA - a voluntary organization in the United States established to uphold the principles of institutional control and responsibility for all intercollegiate athletics in conformity with the association's constitution and by-laws.
A review of the literature reveals that several works have been completed that relate to the organization and administration of physical education and athletics in higher education. Most of the research found in this area, however, dealt with the organizational relationship that exist between athletics and physical education or with the establishment of administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics in colleges and universities. No research is available that analyzes or compares the administrative structure or process as it relates to models or styles of operation such as the autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire types of administration. The researcher conducted an online search of dissertation abstracts completed between 1861 and 1977 (October) at the Mechanized Information Center at The Ohio State University where no studies were found. In addition, a manual search was conducted through the use of the Research Quarterly and volumes of Completed Research in Physical Education, very few studies were found that related to this study. The purpose of this chapter, therefore is to draw together some of the studies that have been done and/or statements that have been made by researchers in higher education administration in an effort to provide data that will augment this treatment.
**Administrative Theory**

In recent years there have been a number of theories of administration proposed for institutions in higher education. March and Simon took those theories and categorized them into the following three groups:

1. **Theories of conflict**, i.e. role conflict, personality conflict, and role-personality conflict

2. **Theories of motivation**, i.e. individual needs, drives, and motives

3. **Theories of decision-making**, e.g. to consider man as a rational being with certain limitations

Additional theories of concern include Weber's bureaucratic model; the open-systems; and Likert's theory of interaction-influence on organizational behavior. Weber states that a bureaucratic organization has the following characteristics:

1. Fixed and official jurisdictional areas ... regularly ordered by rules, policies, regulations, and by-laws

---


4Presthus, *loc. cit.*
2. Principles of office hierarchy and levels of graded authority that ensure a firmly ordered system of super and subordination in which higher offices supervise lower ones.

3. Management of the modern office is based upon written documents, which are preserved in their original form.

4. The management of the office follows general rules.

Katz and Kahn states that:

"The open-system theory is designed to counteract the tendency which has led to a disregard of differing organizational environments and the nature of organizational dependency on environment... it is designed to guard against an overconcentration of principles of internal functioning, with consequent failure to develop and understand the process of feedback which is essential for survival."6

Likert's theory of interaction-influence involves:

"A linking process of supportive relationships whereby the individual, in all interaction and relationships with the organization, in light of his background, values, and expectations, will view the experience as supportive and one which builds and maintains his sense of personal worth and importance."7

Of these theories Griffith stated that:

"An adequate theory must be concerned with the dynamics of human activity, not the mechanics of organization. While administrators must take


6Katz and Kahn, loc. cit.

account of finance, buildings, busses, and the like, these must be considered in their proper perspective; they are of secondary importance in determining how people behave in the educational system.\(^8\)

Simon stated:

"Individuals are willing to accept organization membership when their activity in the organization contributes, directly or indirectly, to their own personal goals. . . . The members of any organization . . . contribute to the organization in return for inducements that the organization survives and grows; otherwise, it shrinks and ultimately disappears unless an equilibrium is reached."\(^9\)

Likert stated that "people interested in other kinds of institutions . . . should experience no difficulty in applying the general principles of the theory (interaction-influence theory) to their organization."\(^10\) He further stated that

"Every organization is a human enterprise whose success depends upon the coordinated efforts of its members . . . it has a structure; it has observational and measurement processes; it has communication processes; it has action sources to carry out decisions; and it has attitudinal dimensions and motivational characteristics."\(^11\)

---


\(^10\)Likert, op. cit., p. V.

\(^11\)Ibid., pp. 178-179.
Administration, therefore, is viewed in the literature as a broad term used over a general spectrum, which may also include school administration, public administration, business administration, hospital administration and athletic and physical education administration.

Administration in Education

The administrative process in educational institutions, however, may differ somewhat from the process evidenced in other types of organizations. Campbell states that in education the administrator may be faced with the following tasks: decision-making, programming, stimulating, coordinating, and appraising.12 Gulick states that in other organizations the administrative process may include planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting.13 The size and type of the university or other business organization may determine to a large extent the types of governance patterns each may observe. In either case, however, studies of administration both in and out of the field of education during the past decades have emphasized that the basic features of administration in different organizational structures are more common than unique.

12Roald F. Campbell, et. al., Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 189.

Gross identified the common relationships involved in administrative practices when he stated that "effective communication between people from different organizations is next to impossible unless they have a common language which is adequate to deal with the complexities of the problems they face."14

Very little emphasis has been placed on understanding administrative and management theory in athletic and physical education administration. Spaeth pointed out that administrative research in physical education and athletics was geared more toward the gathering of information for the purpose of solving immediate and localized problems than toward the systematic evaluation of a body of knowledge rooted in theory and research. She recommended that:

"The behavioral approach to administrative research should be used . . . to study the administration of physical education and athletics (e.g. through the replication of studies involving leader behavior, organizational climates, and role expectations) in order to develop a more scientific basis for professional preparation and practice."15

Allen designed a study to compare educational administration with business administration in an effort to discover whether or not there was a common process of administration equally applicable in both fields. The bibliography for part of his study


was given direction by deans of the nation's colleges of education and of business, who supplied on request the names of books that they thought best described the administrative process. He spent one year observing the administration of six school systems and six business enterprises. An attempt was made to analyze the administration process in terms of its structural-functional relationship. Recurring phenomena in both business and educational administration was recorded from extensive observations. He reached the following conclusions:

1. There is a basic universal process of administration which is applicable in both fields;

2. The principles/integrants of administration may be defined or delimited;

3. These integrants of administration are consistent and tenable regardless of the area of administration;

4. Obvious dissimilarities between education and business administration are a result of structural or situational expediency and not a difference in the process.\(^{16}\)

**Power, Leadership...Decision-Making**

There have been several works completed in the field of educational administration that devote considerable attention to the sharing of power in university governance. Among them are

---

studies by the AAUP Bulletin, Ikenberry, and Pfeffer. It is appropriate here, therefore, to examine the usage and meaning of the word power since many authors vary in their interpretations and usage of this word. Goldhamer and Shils state that "a person may have power to the extent that the person influences the behavior of others in accordance with their own intentions." Dahl suggests that "A has power over B to do something that B would not otherwise do." Burkhardt suggested that "real administrative power is so often the power of persuasion." Lawson states that "power encompasses the ability or potential of one party in a relationship to influence the behavior of the other party." According to Simon

authority (power) involves the assumption that when an individual joins an organization he voluntarily relinquishes a part of his decision-making autonomy, including delegation of the right to the organization to designate someone to make further decisions for him.\(^{24}\) Lawson further states that:

"An individual can exert power if the individual is perceived to have the means or ability to employ coercion, penalties, rewards or incentives to get something done...power seems to stem from the formal authority that goes with the position (manager or administrator), and this involves formal or official power."\(^{25}\)

Richman and Farmer suggest that power is not endemic to managers and administrators, e.g. it is not just a hierarchical concept related to formal authority or one's official position. They say for example,

"A professor can exert considerable informal power with regard to some decisions...hiring or promoting...because he or she has or is perceived to have the ability either to use or to determine that others use coercion, penalties, rewards and the like."\(^{26}\)

Again, for example Lawson argues that professors tend to manifest a tremendous amount of power regarding many decisions (hiring or promoting other faculty members, granting tenure,


\(^{25}\)Lawson, op. cit., p. 233.

developing curricula and courses) because the person is perceived to have the ability either to use or to determine that others use rewards, penalties, coercion and other reinforcements. Dixon states that faculty members are professionals... final authority is vested with the group rather than with the individual.

Jenks says that:

"Authority cannot serve as the basis for institutional decision-making in the absence of a consensus about the effective limits of such authority... the inappropriate use of authority in an attempt to resolve conflict tends to escalate tensions, prolonging rather than reducing the crisis." He recommends as an alternative to authority, the concept of interdependency which he defines as follows: "No group can act unilaterally or arbitrarily in a matter of common concern... each group must accept the need for cooperation with other groups in the achievement of goals and must in turn be prepared to offer its cooperation."

Corson states that the decision-making process is one in which "the ideas, analysis and factual contributions of many individuals may be assembled for final approval or decision by an executive."

30Ibid.
The benefits of broad participation in university decisions are considerable. In reviewing the literature on the affects of participation in education, Ratsoy argues strongly that participative managerial styles lead to increased supervisor affectiveness, teacher satisfaction, decreased student alienation, and improved student achievement.\textsuperscript{32} Pollay states that:

"One of the positive features of participatory decision-making (power sharing) is its ability to reduce complexity by synthesizing the contributions of individuals with various organizational perspectives."\textsuperscript{33}

Studies by Kates,\textsuperscript{34} Katona,\textsuperscript{35} Lindblom,\textsuperscript{36} and Wohlstetter\textsuperscript{37} demonstrate that decision-makers find complexity a major barrier to


\textsuperscript{34}R. W. Kates, \textit{Hazard and Choice Perception in Flood Plain Management} (Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Geography, 1962).


effective decision-making. They advocate the use of simple strategies and devices such as appeals to authority, expert opinion, rumors, common sense, stereotypes or cultural biases. Again, Pollay states that "participation can be instrumental in democratizing a rigidly hierarchical organization and providing all levels of employees with some element of control over their own fates, especially when participation is used to establish goals." 38 Daniel states that:

"Administration is a social process of directing organizational resources toward established goals... one of the most important problems in the administrative process as it relates to the life of formal organizations is the fact that there are basic incongruencies often found between the goals of the organization and the needs of the individuals within it." 39

Foxworthy's study suggests that faculty committees have been established in American colleges as a result of a widespread response to institutional problems. He found that the primary motive for instituting faculty committee systems was a mixture of a concern for democratizing decision-making in institutions as well as a recognition of the need for more broadly based decision-making

38 Pollay, et. al., op. cit., p. 144
as colleges have become more complex. He further argues that as faculty committees have been established as units of organization they have also acquired complex roles as decision-making bodies and as units of organizational hierarchies.

Foxworthy initiated his study to attempt to identify the actual functions that a committee system has developed in one college and to discover how such functions developed. The study was directed at discovering the major consequences that the committees have had for the organization and administration of the college. The methods used for collecting data in his study included an investigation of one college in depth in order to understand the roles of the committees in the total organization and to understand the attitudes of individuals in the college toward the committees. He collected data by examining the record books of the institution, by observing the participants and by non-directive interviews scattered throughout a full academic year in order to observe the committee activities in their full annual cycle. His study concluded that the committee system was developed in colleges in order to provide a system of formal communications after the basis of informal communications has been destroyed due to the rapid growth in the size of the faculty, the loss of key personnel central to informal communications, the reduction of power of some of the officers at the college, and the
need for more effective communications.  

Houston devised a study to examine the problem of decision-making in industry and to relate the findings to the problems of decision-making in centralized and decentralized school units. He hypothesized that decentralized administration brings the decision-making process closer to an actual need and thereby betters the organization. He reviewed the literature in business, industry, education, psychology, human relations and group dynamics on the basis that industrial trends and the assumption that a similarity of administrator-personnel problems exists between industry and education. The problem of the proper use of professional personnel was examined in relationship to moral, productivity and the decision-making process...fundamental to his basic concern was the identification of autocratic and democratic personalities in administrators. He reached the following conclusions:

1. Decentralized administration leads to the improvement of teachers, pupils and administrators...it leads to the improvement of industrial decisions which subsequently leads to the improvement of the operation.

2. Decentralized administration brings a decision closer to an actual need and thereby betters the organization.

3. The greater the teacher variable influencing teacher professionalism the greater the need for increased democratic administration.41

Departmental Administration

One of the aims of this study is to point out that the techniques, tools, skills and insights developed by an administrator in any given area are appropriate for dealing with the administrative process in highly competitive programs of physical education and athletics in colleges and universities. Bolton and Boyer state "that universities and colleges are under increasing pressure to reexamine the ways in which they are structured and governed."42 They say that the cost of higher education has risen sharply, the availability of money is severely limited and rapid growth in student enrollments has ceased. They further feel that since the department continues to be the basic organizational unit of the university, the adaptive success of the larger institution is largely contingent upon the ability of the department to adapt


creatively to the forces for change...and in the process see themselves as an integral part of the larger institution and the community. They define the department as a staff unit serving a variety of organizational needs within the university. They define the department head and his tasks as follows:

1. He is the educational and managerial leader of the unit
2. He is a pivotal person in the organization
3. Change and innovation require his active involvement...
4. The kind of leadership in the department affects what happens or can happen...
5. There should be periodic reexamination of the unit

Voltmer states that "organizations are created when a group of people come together to accomplish certain objectives that as individuals they could not do for themselves...they do not automatically function smoothly and efficiently." He feels that their success depends largely upon a specialized type of leadership known as administration. He further states that the administrator makes the difference between a successful and

---

43 Ibid.  
Dimock argues that:

"Administration is outstanding individuals. Individuals who in their personalities and character exhibit an integration of universal values, such as wisdom and reverence, honesty and integrity, devotion to human interests, as well as those traditions which are favored in the cultural stream of a particular civilization..."

Daniel pointed out that as part of a formal organization the administrator meets a variety of situations, relationships, tasks, pressures, interactions and expectations which tap his potential and affect his need disposition. He states that

"The characteristics of these social processes may range from relative incongruency with certain of his needs (and, therefore, frustration and dissatisfaction) to relative congruency with most of his needs (and, therefore, frustration and dissatisfaction) to relative congruency with most of his needs (and, therefore, satisfaction, high moral and self-actualization)."

Andrews feels that "no matter what other abilities an administrator may have, it is widely recognized that if he does not show leadership he cannot be an effective administrator." He concluded that it was apparent that skill in leadership was considered to be one of the most important ingredients of the

---

45 Ibid.


Nash outlined three levels of authority in higher education. Dependence, independence, and interdependence. He concluded that the dependence mode of authority encompassed "puritanism" where individuals within organizations are viewed as faithful servants; "ideology" where the needs of the masses are met; hierarchical" where the decision-making process proceeds downward (from superior to inferior); and "productive efficient" where individuals within the organizations are not considered valued for what they are but for what they can produce. The independence mode of authority was classified as tolerant and noninterference where the individual within an organization is impatient with those who commanded his actions or controlled his thoughts...he wants to be free from dominance by others. And finally, the interdependence mode of authority which operates out of the assumption that human resources become greater if shared. He feels that in organizations that operate out of the interdependence mode concept each person will contribute to the unit according to his talent, ability and energy and that each individual will receive from the organization according to his needs and desires.

Peabody argues that:

"The bases for formal authority...legitimacy, position and the sanctions inherent in office...need to be distinguished from the sources of functional authority, most notably professional competence, experience and human relations skills, which support or compete with formal authority."51

Richman and Farmer states:

"The president must often be a negotiator and a mediator, jockeying among power blocs...he should not be either an autocrat or bureaucrat or merely an administrator. He should be a professional manager, an active leader understanding and effectively using both bureaucratic and informal expert and participative structures and processes. He must maintain channels of communication and influence between the formal and informal structures."52

According to Sundre, sub-groups of the institution (faculty) may bargain for power and status with little or no regard for the welfare of the whole institution.53 Thompson writes "...one suspects that redefinition of organizational goals is non-hierarchical; that it is generated internally, or that it results from severe external pressures of various power structures..."54 With the


52Richman and Farmer, op. cit., p. 23.


Implication of political power within the academic community, Baldridge argues that examining university organization as a political process is an accurate description of how university sub-groups operate.\textsuperscript{55}

Bennis contends that bureaucratic forms of organization are becoming less effective and that democratic forms are becoming more effective. He feels that the democratic form of governance is not permissive or laissez-faire but rather a system of values. These values he states may include:

1. Full and free communication, regardless of rank and power.

2. A reliance on consensus, rather than on the more customary forms of coercion or compromise, to manage conflict.

3. The idea that influence is based on technical competence and knowledge rather than on the vagaries of personal whims or prerogatives of power.

4. An atmosphere that permits and even encourages emotional expression as well as task-oriented acts.

5. A basically human bias, one which accepts the inevitability of conflict between the organization and the individual but which is willing to come with and mediate this conflict on rational grounds.\textsuperscript{56}


Further literature on the status of the department chairperson by Leslie reveals that "...authority represents a kind of relationship in which we assume the elements of control to be present, but in which the actual exercise of control may be dependent upon a complex interaction of factors." He says that there are basically two types of authority, one functional (not transferrable by heredity -- it is earned by individuals through their own behavior); and the other formal (inherited -- not earned through individual behavior). This, he argues, is the dilemma of institutional management in higher education -- simultaneous and conflicting operation of both forms of authority.57

Simon states that the university administrator must operate in severely restricted "zones of acceptance."58 Mooney argues that:

"Administrators feel they cannot take command for... another reason, i.e., it is the faculty and not the administrators to whom tradition has granted ultimate authority to shape the basic affairs of the institution. Administrators can take responsibility for the management of enterprises already agreed upon in the university community, but they cannot presume to take the prerogatives of final academic authority."59


Ryan defined three levels of departmental characteristics within a given institution which identified the department chairman:

1. Dictatorship - where the primary decision authority rested with the chairman

2. Oligarchies - where the chairman and some kind of power group within the department dominated the decision-making process

3. Collegial - where departments were characterized by the operation of committees with relatively high general faculty influence on decisions.

Other studies by Caplow and McGee, Murray, Hill and French, and Gross and Grambsch reveal similar descriptions of the department chairman's power position in higher education. Leslie tends to argue, however, that even though "autocratic, dictatorial, and powerful department chairmen have been found...a general tendency seems to exist for chairmen to possess relatively

little unilateral power (at least in the minds of others around them).”

He goes on to say that where departmental chairmen do exercise unilateral authority, it is because it is "earned" (functional) authority rather than "ascribed" (formal) authority. He concluded that:

"In describing the role of the department chairman, in terms of the nature and scope of his authority, one should consider the following variables: formal delegation of responsibility to him, the interests which he defends, the relationship he has to faculty, and the scope of issues in which he engages in one form of decision making or another.""

Gardner conducted a study which investigated the faculties role in departmental activities. The purpose of his study was to determine the extent to which faculties were satisfied with their participation in departmental administrative activities as related to the academic area and size of the department, the organizational structure of the administrative activities and the management style of the department chairperson. He collected his data by means of a questionnaire which he mailed to 595 faculty members along with a personal interview with each of 25 department chairpersons in the liberal arts and sciences college of a large public university. After mean scores were computed, the F-ratio method of analysis of variance and the Pearson product moment correlation

65 Leslie, op.cit., p. 423
66 Ibid., p. 425.
coefficients were computed to reveal the influence of selected faculty members in the university. The results of his study shows that faculty perception of the department chairperson's management style is strongly and positively related to their satisfaction with participation in administrative activities, to what faculty desire, and to what they experience in influence and involvement. Faculty, in this study expressed considerable concern for personal and interpersonal aspects of management and little or no concern for organizational factors of administration. Faculty also report they desire more influence than actual involvement in administrative activities and the higher the rank of a faculty member the greater his actual influence and involvement in administrative activities. 67

**External Regulatory Organizations**

Institutions that sponsor intercollegiate athletic programs in higher education are affected in some way or another by organizations outside the educational community. Without the cooperative efforts of coaches, athletic directors, athletic councils, college presidents, and other external regulatory organizations, there would be no uniform rules for the playing of athletic games, guidelines for the recruiting

---

and eligibility of athletes, controls over the conduct of various athletic meets and tournaments, or the establishment of acceptable academic standards for participation in sports. Of primary concern for this study are those organizations which conduct the regional and national championships in the various sport areas and establish the rules and regulations to which their members must subscribe in order to compete. Among these organizations are: 1) The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), 2) The Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), 3) The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), 4) The Federal Government, and 5) Individual college conferences. In addition to these regulatory organizations, there are alumni associations, accrediting agencies, and student government associations (SGA) which also play vital roles in influencing policy and practice in college athletics.

Resick and Erickson state that:

"In 1940 a number of small colleges banded together to discuss common problems such as financing, eligibility, and tournament play...out of this meeting derived the NAIA which conducts its affairs similar to the NCAA."\(^{68}\)

According to Steitz:

"The NAIA seeks membership only in institutions which subscribe to its aims, and to aid in the solution of problems of intercollegiate athletics within the "small college" or college of moderate enrollment...the

---

primary consideration, however, shall be educational emphasis rather than merely upon size of enrollment."69

Steltz further lists the objectives of the NAIA, excerpts of which follows:

1. To establish a code of ethics and standards for the best interest of athletics
2. To cooperate with other national or state organizations in standardizing rules
3. To establish an eligibility code which is in conformity with the best interest of intercollegiate athletics
4. To establish and use every means possible for the improvement of public relations between NAIA, the general public, and other sports groups
5. To establish a financial structure which will be sound for future growth, which will allow full expenses to all participating teams and an added amount for activities necessary to the development of NAIA and intercollegiate sports70

The NAIA membership is divided into thirty-two regions throughout the country. Each region is represented by a district chairman. The administration of each district is made up of elected representatives, one for each three member institutions in the district. This district committee controls the activities within the district, subject to NAIA policies as set forth in the NAIA constitution and by-laws.

70Ibid, pp. 330-331.
The Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was conceived out of the concerted efforts of professional women with membership in the American Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER) in 1958. For seven years under the title of Division for Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS), these women developed, reviewed and codified rules for sports participation for women, set up officiating standards and established a general philosophy which was to serve as a guideline for program development. In 1965, due to DGWS' improper organizational structure to coordinate athletic programs, a new agency was conceived known as the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW). The first intercollegiate National Championships for women were held in gymnastics, track and field and golf in 1969.

In 1971 the Commission was replaced by the AIAW. The Association is comprised of institutional memberships which support the policies as established by DGWS, CIAW, and AIAW. The officers of AIAW are elected by member institutions and representatives from each of nine region member schools.71

A description of the NCAA was given earlier in Chapter I of this study, however, this description did not include duel membership by division in the NCAA or a definition of districts. An NCAA member institution may participate in football and in one other sport in a division other than the one in which it is a member, as follows:

71Resick, op. cit., pp. 17-18
1. A member of Division II or Division III may petition to participate in Division I in any one sport, other than football or basketball.

2. A member of Division I may petition to participate in Division II or Division III in football, and a member of Division II may petition to participate in Division III in football.

3. A member, in petitioning under the terms of one and two, shall submit its request to the association's executive director in writing not later than June 1.

The NCAA is divided into eight geographic districts throughout the country for university division institutions and for college division institutions. The purpose of the districts is to facilitate the workload of the NCAA. The four NCAA Division II geographic districts involved in this study are as follows:

District 2 - Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, and West Virginia

District 3 - Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia

District 5 - Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Oklahoma, and South Dakota

District 6 - Arkansas, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming

The constitution of the NCAA states that:

"Eight members of the eighteen member council, which conducts the affairs of the association in the interim between conventions, shall consist of the eight district vice presidents of this association"

---


(each of whom shall be a member of the faculty of a member institution in the district from which he is elected)." (Article Five, Section 1, 2 and Section 3, a).74

The Educational Amendments Act of 1972, known as Title IX, created quite an impact on institutions in higher education. The basic provisions of Title IX are as follows:

"No person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance."75

Title IX is essentially a "Civil Rights law prohibiting sexual discrimination in education and employment in federally assisted educational activities."76 From the initial Title IX draft of January, 1974, the proposed regulations concerning athletics generated the greatest controversy. Directors of athletics throughout the country conducted letter writing campaigns, pressing for the exemption of athletics from the Title IX guidelines. The NCAA, in its response to the Title IX draft guidelines states that:

"The regulations exceed the statutory authority...," as "...in the case of most athletic programs; they


neither receive nor directly benefit from federal financial assistance."  

The NCAA stated further that even if an athletic program is found to be discriminatory, how can The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) "enforce the law by withholding nonexistent funds... to the particular program, or part thereof..."?  Responses were: 1) the athletic program is not the only program on campus which does not directly receive federal funds, and 2) at most institutions athletic programs are not self sustaining and must obtain funds from general institution revenues.

Institutional responses to HEW's Title IX regulations included the following statements, all of which were reported in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges periodical:

1. "There are inherent and unavoidable differences between the sexes with respect to physical capabilities and function"

2. "Athletic opportunities for all will be reduced, not increased" and "fielding separate men's and women's teams in intercollegiate athletics could result in the dissolution of some programs or the curtailment of some minor sports programs"

3. "There are differences between intercollegiate, intramural and recreational sports," and that "different procedures must be developed for each level of athletics"

---

77 NASULGC, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
78 Ibid, p. 6
79 loc. cit.
4. "It is easier to expand athletic opportunities for women in intramurals" and institutions must now offer "a broad range...some athletic, some not requiring great skill or little; highly competitive or only a personal challenge" the idea that "separate athletic teams where selection is based upon competitive skill" since certain sports are better adapted to members of one sex than the other."80

The NCAA filed suit against HEW claiming that Title IX represents a clear and unlawful attempt by HEW to broaden the application of this law to include all, or virtually all, the activities within an institution, rather than limiting its application to education programs or activities for which financial assistance is actually received, as was intended by Congress.81 The NCAA specifically challenged HEW's guidelines on the following issues:

1. That (athletics) requires members to make substantial changes in the organization, operation, and budgeting of...individual intercollegiate athletic programs

2. That (scholarships) requires "NCAA member institutions to award athletic scholarships in accordance with arbitrary quota standards... thus placed restrictions on the rights of individual institutions to choose, free from Government restraint, the recipients..., it establishes sex-based quota system...

3. That inasmuch as there is no federal assistance authorized to support intercollegiate athletics, HEW does not even have available an authorizing statute to which it can tie the restrictions

80 loc. cit.

and requirements imposed by Title IX\(^{82}\)

Presently, many institutions in higher education are putting forth great efforts to comply with HEW's Title IX regulations. It would seem apparent, however, that these changes would have eventually occurred during the natural evolution of the women's sports programs; it was only a matter of time. As of January 1975 when the final Title IX document was prepared for the President's signature the following three segments of the document were apparent:

1. A recipient who operates or sponsors teams shall make an affirmative effort to provide equal opportunities for athletic participation for both sexes

2. Separate teams for sexes are to be provided equal opportunities through provision of equipment and supplies

3. It does not require aggregate expenditures for athletics for members of each sex\(^{83}\)

Individual college conferences also play significant roles in the conduct of institutional level athletic programs. The purposes of these conferences are manifold. Resick gives the following:

1. Conferences serve as points of referrals when problems develop concerning the relationship between institutions

2. Conferences tie together schools which have the same basic philosophy toward athletics and are willing to abide by the same rules and policies

\(^{82}\text{Ibid, pp. 12-13.}\)

\(^{83}\text{Resick, op. cit., p. 20.}\)
3. Conferences provide the opportunity for playing against opponents of equal size and potential, although abilities may vary from year to year.

4. Conferences allow for automatic scheduling of member institutions for a period of from one to ten years.84

Athletic conferences possess a great deal of power and influence in the decision-making process at the regional levels. The strength of the conference may vary according to its leadership and philosophy. The conference commissioner may provide loose or rigid leadership for his constituents, in either case Williams and Hughes suggest the following list of duties a commissioner should observe:

1. To assist in the enforcement of eligibility requirements

2. To serve as a clearing house for reports for violations of rules and as an agent for investigation of such cases

3. To effectively screen charges and to provide assurances of impartial investigation85

They further suggest that:

"The commissioner may or may not be given power to make rulings...the best plan leaves him without authority on matters of eligibility and requires him to refer such matters to an appropriate committee."86

Article Seven, Section 2 (2) of the By-laws on membership of the NCAA states:

"The Secretary shall determine whether the applying institution is accredited by its regional accrediting

84Ibid, p. 87
86Ibid, p. 300.
agency. If the institution is not so accredited, the application shall be disapproved. If, however, the institution is so accredited, it shall be deemed to have satisfied the Association's requirement of acceptable academic standards...87

According to Selden, "accreditation is the process whereby an organization or agency recognizes a college or university or a program of study as having met certain pre-determined qualifications or standards."88

Intercollegiate athletic programs are considered to be an integral phase of the total educational process, hence the NCAA in its bid to keep its standards high accepts only those institutions to membership which have been approved by their regional accrediting agencies. The entire accrediting process is based on the assumption that institutions differ in their educational excellence. Russell and Reeves stated that "it is a function of the accrediting agency to set up and administer a plan of evaluation that accurately and fairly differentiates the institutions according to their degree of excellence."89

Institutions not meeting the associations eligibility standards of acceptable accreditation may apply for associate membership into the NCAA provided they receive a majority vote of the delegates present at the annual convention.

Summary

In this treatment of the literature an effort has been made to highlight the democratic or collegial style of administration at the department and institutional levels. It is generally felt throughout the literature that departmental and other such personnel should have the opportunity to share in the decision-making process in matters that concern them—especially where they show a specialized expertise. It cannot go without saying, however, that there may be certain other outside agencies that play a major role in the decision-making process that affect institutions of higher education. These agencies may include Board of Regents, State Legislatures, Labor Unions, professional associations, and other such local, state and national organizations that affect policy for American colleges and universities. In the final analysis, however, a better understanding as to how key administrators (department chairpersons) perceive the "power hierarchy" will allow the academic community to better understand how decisions and policies are developed as they attempt to strive toward the mission of the institution.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF STUDY

This chapter includes a general overview of the methods and procedures employed throughout this study which is designed to compare the governance structure of the physical education and athletic programs of selected predominantly Black and predominantly White NCAA Division II colleges and universities.

Following a review of textbooks by Clarke and Clarke, Best, and Scott describing the construction of a questionnaire, a semi-closed form instrument was developed for this investigation. The questionnaire method was utilized in order to collect the necessary data needed for this treatment. An extensive review was made of some of the completed thesis and dissertations, along with bulletins and journal articles, on different aspects of the administration of physical education and athletics at the college and university level.
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for the purpose of gathering more information on the materials to be included in the questionnaire. The literature review produced a number of factors that were considered important to the overall governance process in physical education and athletics in higher education. The areas of particular concern during the data collection phase were as follows: administrator roles, duties, responsibilities, and patterns and styles of operation. This information was gathered and condensed to include only those areas that were related to this study.

The following aspects of this study are included in this overview:

1. Development of the questionnaire
2. The criteria used in the questionnaire
3. Administration of the pilot study
4. Selection of the population
5. Administration of the questionnaire
6. Statistical treatment

The completed questionnaire was divided into the following five sections:

1. General information: This section contained such items as administrative title, academic title and status, years of experience and academic preparation for the position.
2. Philosophy: This section dealt with academic credit for student athletes, recruiting, and equal opportunity for total student body participation in intercollegiate athletics.
3. Organization and administration: This section consisted of roles, responsibilities and influences of program administrators, coaches and teachers as they relate to the total program.
4. Personnel: This section involved methods of hiring, promotion and tenure, workload distribution and scheduling.
5. Budgeting: This section dealt with such items as sources of funds to the athletic programs, influences of central administrative staff in the total budgeting process, the amount of input of coaches in budgeting, and the financial status of women in fund allocation.

Four copies of the instrument, along with four copies of the approved project proposal, were submitted to the human subjects review committee at The Ohio State University research center for approval.

The Criteria

The questionnaire used for the collection of data in this study was designed by the researcher with input from various administrative areas found in the literature. The instrument in its five part design (containing a combination of one hundred possible responses) was constructed from the following format:

1. Forty-one statements on the questionnaire were selection type items where the participant was asked to respond to the question by checking the response or responses that related to his particular situation. As an example:

   What is your present (academic) title? (please check)
   A. Instructor ( ) D. Professor ( )
   B. Assistant Professor ( ) E. Other __________________
   C. Associate Professor ( )

2. Twenty-nine statements on the instrument required a yes/no response from the participant. As an example:

   In addition to your administrative position do you also teach academic courses? (yes ___ no __)

3. Eight statements were presented in the instrument requiring a response from the participant using a Likert type scale ranging from a great deal to none, and very often to never. The criterion of importance was subdivided into the following components: 1) great deal, 2) substantial, 3) very little, 4) none; or 1) very often, 2) often, 3) rarely, and 4) never.
As an example: Indicate the degree of influence exercised by the following organizations in matters pertaining to the decision-making process in intercollegiate athletics at your institution.

A. NCAA  
B. NAIA  
C. AIAW  

great deal substantial very little none

4. Twenty-two statements were fill-in type questions where the respondent was asked to write in the response that applied to his administration. As an example:

Number of students enrolled in your institution:
A. undergraduate: men ___ women ___ Black ___ White ___
B. graduate: men ___ women ___ Black ___ White ___

The questionnaire was then sent on a pilot study to four directors of athletics and one director of physical education in five NCAA member institutions in the State of Ohio in order to test for reliability. The panel of directors were asked to critically examine the instrument, complete it, and make constructive comments. The following areas were to be considered by the panel in their review of the questionnaire:

1. Were the items on the instrument clear and understandable?
2. Did the items covered belong on the instrument?
3. Should additional items be added to the instrument?

After receiving their replies the questionnaire was again revised.

The final draft of the questionnaire contained thirteen general information items, four on philosophy, twenty-eight on organization and administration, sixteen on personnel, and twenty-six on budget.
Selection of Population

The population for this study consisted of the predominantly Black and the predominantly White colleges and universities with membership in Division II of the NCAA. Of particular concern as a sample of this total population were those institutions in districts 2, 3, 5, and 6. The criteria used to determine whether or not a particular district would be used as a part of the sample population for this study were as follows: 1) race, i.e. institutions within selected districts must be traditionally predominantly Black or traditionally predominantly White; 2) public or state controlled i.e. institutions within selected districts must be affiliated with the state Board of Regents and not controlled by private concerns; and 3) Division II football, i.e. institutions within selected districts must play football in Division II of the NCAA.

A list of all the colleges and universities in the selected districts was compiled from the NCAA Manual. These institutions were arranged into two separate groups, one predominantly Black and the other predominantly White. The grouping method was used to make certain that an equal number of predominantly Black and predominantly White institutions would be sampled. For each of these institutions to have an equal opportunity to be surveyed, the method of random
sampling was employed in order to draw fifteen of the predominantly Black institutions and fifteen of the predominantly White institutions from each of the previously stated lists. In selecting the sampled population, the colleges and universities in each list were numbered serially so that proper selection would be accomplished. Each group was placed separately into two cardboard boxes where they were thoroughly mixed. Five graduate administrative associates from The Ohio University (University College) were each asked to draw three names from the box labeled predominantly Black colleges and three names from the box labeled predominantly White colleges. All names drawn were recorded and used in the sampled population for this study.

Some of the colleges and universities assigned membership to Division II of the NCAA also participated in Division I in one or more sport areas. They also belonged to the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics in one or more of its sport classifications. However, for the purpose of this study, the institutions with dual memberships were grouped into the NCAA's Division II due to its 1976-77 football membership classification.

**Administration of the Questionnaire**

The names and addresses of the directors of athletics in the institutions selected for this study were taken from the *Blue Book of College Athletics*. A complete printed questionnaire was then

---

mailed to each of these individuals accompanied by a self-addressed stamped envelope. Also enclosed in the packet was a cover letter explaining the reasons for wanting the information as well as the nature of the study (for cover letter see Appendix C; for questionnaire see Appendix F). Although the primary concern of this project was to survey directors of athletics only; it was found in several cases that the director of athletics was also the director of physical education within the same institution, which added considerably to the study in terms of its objectivity.

The cover letter, questionnaire and return envelope were mailed on Saturday, October 29, 1977 with a request that the instrument be completed and returned at the subject's earliest convenience. Within one month, six (6) predominantly White institutions had reported and three (3) predominantly Black institutions had reported. At this point in time, for purposes of obtaining additional responses, a follow-up letter (a copy appears in Appendix D) containing a self-addressed stamped post card with the following items was sent to the institutions that had not responded:

1. The questionnaire is in the process of being completed and will be mailed shortly.

2. The questionnaire was never received. Please send another.

3. The questionnaire was misplaced. Please send another.

4. I cannot complete the questionnaire. I am sending it back to you in order to cut your printing and copying costs.
Of the seven post cards returned, two administrators checked item two. The remaining five checked item one. The two questionnaires were remailed. Within two weeks after receiving six (6) additional questionnaires from the predominantly White colleges, and three (3) from the predominantly Black colleges, a phone call was placed to nine (9) directors of athletics in the predominantly Black colleges. A request was made that the subjects complete the instrument as soon as possible. Seven (7) directors responded favorably over the telephone and two (2) could not be reached. No calls were made to the directors of athletics in the predominantly White institutions because twelve (12) returns were sufficient for the validity of the study.

On December 1, 1977, a second follow-up letter containing a self-addressed stamped envelope along with the questionnaire was again sent to the directors of athletics in the predominantly Black institutions that had not responded. On January 3, 1978, a third follow-up was made by telephone.

Two weeks after the third follow-up was made, the collection of data for this study was concluded with a 73% return from the predominantly Black institutions and a 86% return from the predominantly White institutions.

Coding sheets were then devised for tabulating and processing the data collected from the instrument. All data were then recorded on the coding sheets and key punched onto program cards. The cards were then submitted to a computer for statistical analyses.
Statistical Treatment

The data collected for this study was taken to The Ohio State University Statistics Laboratory where they were coded, punched onto IBM cards, and placed on computer. An initial computer run was made on the IBM cards, followed by a card check to determine whether or not there were any missing numbers. Two additional preliminary runs were made as additional data were received. Once a sufficient number of questionnaires were returned a final computer run was made and all data statistically analyzed.

The statistical procedures used to consider possible significance for the variables taken from the questionnaires were as follows:

1. Frequency distribution analysis: Means and standard deviations

2. Chi-square test: Used to determine if a significant relationship existed between the responses of predominantly Black colleges and predominantly White colleges in Division II of the National Collegiate Intercollegiate Athletic Association Association (NCAA), (used only where possible).
The purpose of this chapter is to present and discuss the data collected for this study from the use of a questionnaire utilized in an attempt to gain information from the directors of athletics in predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in Division II of the NCAA regarding the administrative differences that may exist between these two types of institutions. This presentation of the data will confine itself to the following five areas:

1. General background information, i.e. is there a relationship between the size and type of institution, the type of academic preparation by administrators, non-administrative duties, and actual administrative styles observed by Black and White college athletic directors in small institutions?

2. Philosophy, i.e. is there a significant relationship between academic and recruiting practices observed by Black and White college athletic departments?

3. Organization and administration, i.e. is there a significant association between perceived administrative channels and policy making units observed by Black and White college athletic directors?

4. Personnel, i.e. is there a significant relationship between administrative styles observed by Black and White college athletic directors as they relate to personnel matters such as hiring, promotion, tenure, scheduling workloads, etc.?
5. Budget, i.e. is there a significant relationship between Black and White athletic directors as they involve staff in matters pertaining to the athletic budgets in their respective institutions?

Thirty institutions in Districts 2, 3, 5, and 6 of Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) were randomly selected from among sixty-four institutions within those districts to participate in this study. The total population in Division II of the NCAA includes one hundred-ninety three institution in a total of eight districts. Fifteen institutions selected were traditionally predominantly Black and fifteen were traditionally predominantly White. Among those thirty institutions participating, twenty-four athletic directors responded amounting to a total return of 80 percent. Thirteen athletic directors responded from predominantly White institutions for a total of 86 percent, and eleven athletic directors responded from predominantly Black institutions for a total of 73 percent. Table 1 indicates the sample size, as well as the number and percentage of questionnaires returned by the two designated categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total Returned (n)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information resulting from the thirteen questionnaires returned from the athletic directors in predominantly White institutions were compared to the eleven questionnaires returned by athletic directors in predominantly Black institutions. Chi square and frequency distribution analysis were employed as the methods of statistical analysis, and where results reached "interesting" levels of significance (.10 or lower), the data were interpreted and reported.

**General Information: Enrollment**

Of the thirteen predominantly White institutions reporting, all fell within the acceptable range of 10,000 or less student body enrollment which was originally assigned as the accepted limit for this study. The lowest enrollment was 2,385 students and the highest was 10,000 students with a mean of 6,448 students. Of the eleven predominantly Black institutions reporting, all were accepted for this study. The lowest enrollment was 2,277 students and the highest was 9,000 students with a mean of 5,580 students. The difference of 868 students would imply that these institutions should operate relatively the same administratively in their athletic programs.

**Administrative Title**

Among the thirteen predominantly White colleges and universities reporting, nine administrators answering the questionnaire were athletic directors, four were directors of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics. Among the eleven Black colleges and universities reporting ten administrators answering the questionnaire
were athletic directors and one was a director of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Athletics. There appears to be somewhat less emphasis placed on having separate directors for athletics and physical education in predominantly White colleges and more emphasis placed on having separate directors for both areas in predominantly Black colleges.

Length of Time in Administrative Position

Twenty-two percent of all respondents had served as an athletic administrator for ten years (three in predominantly White institutions and two in predominantly Black institutions). Thirty percent of all respondents had served between three and seven years (five from predominantly White institutions and three from predominantly Black institutions). Nine percent had served between eight and nine years (two from predominantly Black institutions). Nine percent has served between eleven and fifteen years (two from predominantly White institutions). Athletic administrators in predominantly White colleges and universities appear to remain in their positions over a longer period of time when compared with administrators in predominantly Black colleges and universities.

Academic Title

Thirty-nine percent of the respondents reporting were full professors (five from predominantly White colleges and four from predominantly Black colleges). Twenty-six percent were associate
professors (three from White colleges and three from Black colleges). Twenty-two percent were assistant professors (two from White colleges and three from Black colleges). Five percent were instructors (one from predominantly White college). Nine percent were adjunct professors (two from White colleges), and ten percent did not respond to the question. Academic titles appear to be relatively equal in both institutions, neither has a monopoly over the other.

**Academic Status**

Seventy percent of all respondents were tenured (nine from predominantly White colleges and eight from predominantly Black colleges). Sixteen percent were non-tenured (four from White colleges). Eight percent were not tenured but were in a tenure track (two from Black colleges). Six percent did not respond to the question. There are no differences between Black and White colleges as they relate to academic status of athletic administrators.

Twenty-three of the respondents reported their position as a regular appointment. One individual did not respond to the question. All directors in both groups reported having regular appointments. Fifty-two percent of the directors in both groups has served in their institutions between seven and sixteen years.

Eighty-three percent of all reporting directors teach in the physical education department (ten of thirteen or seventy-six percent were directors in predominantly White colleges and ten of eleven or ninety-one percent were directors in predominantly Black colleges).
Among those who teach, fifty percent of their time was spent in the service program, eleven percent in physical education theory courses, thirty-six percent in physical education graduate level courses, and three percent in other academic areas. Only thirty percent of the White college directors teach graduate courses, while forty-five percent of the Black college directors teach in other academic areas of their institutions.

Fifty percent of the reporting directors advise undergraduate physical education major students. (Six or forty-six percent were directors from predominantly White colleges and six or fifty-four percent were directors of predominantly Black colleges). Twenty-five percent advised graduate physical education majors (four or thirty percent were White college directors and two or eighteen percent were Black college directors). There are no significant differences between Black and White college or university athletic directors in terms of time spent teaching and advising undergraduate level and graduate level physical education majors.

Coaching Responsibilities

Fifty percent of all reporting directors coach an intercollegiate sport while fifty percent do not coach. (Six or fifty-four percent are directors in predominantly Black institutions). Seven or fifty-three percent of the directors in predominantly White institutions said that they did not coach a sport, while five or forty-five percent of the Black college directors do not coach), (see Table 2). Two directors in predominantly White institutions were head football coaches; one was
head basketball coach; one was head baseball coach; and one was head track coach. One director from a predominantly White institution was an assistant football coach. One predominantly Black college director was head football and head track coach; one was head basketball coach; one was head track and field coach; one was head golf coach; and two were assistant football coaches. Those athletic directors who coach spend between fifteen and twenty hours per week fulfilling their coaching assignments; sixteen percent spend between three and ten hours per week; while, thirty-four percent devote between twenty-four and fifty hours per week coaching their sport area(s). Fifty-eight percent of the directors reported that their academic load was decreased during their season of sport competition. Forty-two percent responded that their academic load did not decrease during their season.

Twenty-nine percent of all directors reported that administrative duties were shared with other staff personnel during their season of competition. Six or fifty-five percent were directors from predominantly Black institutions and one or seven percent were from White
colleges, (see Table 3). There is a great deal of difference between predominantly White and predominantly Black institutions in regard to their philosophy on sharing administrative duties with other staff personnel. Black institutions appear to allow more staff involvement in administrative function than do White institutions. The athletic director in predominantly White institutions tend not to share their administrative duties which appears to disallow total staff input into the administrative process.

**TABLE 3: The number and percentage of athletic directors who share or do not share administrative duties during their season of competition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Share duties</th>
<th>percentage</th>
<th>do not</th>
<th>Share duties</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black 15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White 15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decision as to whether or not the director of athletics in White institutions would also coach was made by the president. Eight or sixty-one percent of the predominantly White college directors responded that the president made that decision. One or eight percent replied that the director of physical education made that decision, while one or eight percent stated that the dean of students made that decision in his institution. Black college athletic directors, on the other hand, tended to report that the decision as to whether or
not they would also coach was made on occasion by more than one person. Two or eighteen percent reported that the president alone made the decision. Four or thirty-six percent report that the director of athletics alone made the decision. Two or eighteen percent stated that the president and the dean of the college made the decision, while four or thirty-six percent said that the physical education director and the dean of the college made the decision. Again, two or eighteen percent stated that the physical education director alone decided, while three or twenty-seven percent said that the dean of the college alone made the decision as to whether or not he would also coach. The assumption can still be made that Black colleges are allowing more staff and administrative input into the decision-making process of their respective institutions.

Professional Preparation

Among the reporting directors, fifty-four percent stated that their professional preparation was geared toward administration. Five or forty-five percent were Black college directors and seven or sixty-three percent were White college directors, (see Table 4).

It would appear that there are no significant differences between predominantly Black and White college athletic administrators in terms of their professional preparation.

Sixty-seven percent of all reporting directors have masters degrees. Nine or eighty-two percent are from predominantly Black institutions and seven or fifty-four percent are from White
Table 4: Number and percentage of directors whose professional preparation was geared toward administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

colleges. Twenty-nine percent have earned doctorate degrees. Two or eighteen percent are from Black institutions and five or thirty-eight percent are from White institutions, (see Table 5).

Table 5: Professional degrees held by athletic administrators in sampled predominantly Black and White colleges in NCAA Division II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>Percent MS/MA</th>
<th>Percent Ph.D.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, White college directors appear to be better prepared academically to perform their administrative tasks, yet they tend not to allow as much total administrative involvement as do Black college directors. There seems to be a trend developing toward more departmental participation by Black college athletic personnel and less by
White college personnel. This trend may continue or it may reverse itself in subsequent sections.

Philosophy

Division II colleges and universities by and large do not give academic credit to students who participate in intercollegiate athletics. Twenty directors or eighty-three percent reported that their institutions do not award academic credit to their athletes. Nine of eleven reporting or eighty-two percent were Black college directors and eleven of thirteen reporting or eighty-five percent were White college directors. Among the four institutions reporting or seventeen percent that offer academic credit to their students who participate in intercollegiate athletics, two are Black colleges and two are predominantly White colleges. Academic credit is obtained in each of these cases through the physical education service program. There are no significant differences between Black and White colleges in terms of offering academic credit to student athletes.

There appears to be a definite recruiting effort made to bring in student athletes at both Black and White institutions in Division II of the NCAA. All directors (eleven from Black institutions and thirteen from White institutions) reported that they recruited student athletes at their colleges. Again, all directors (twenty-four or one-hundred percent) reported providing an equal opportunity for participation in intercollegiate athletics to all students regularly enrolled at their institutions. Twenty of twenty-four directors or eighty-three percent
reported that they provided a grant-in-aid fund exclusively reserved for students of special athletic ability. Ten or ninety percent were Black institutions, and ten or seventy-six percent were White institutions. Chi square ($X^2$) tests were run in each of these areas, i.e. recruiting; equal opportunity for participation in sports for non-recruits; and grant-in-aid awarded to student athletes of special athletic ability; and no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges were found.

Organization and Administration

One of the stated criteria for institutional acceptance for this study was the fact that the colleges and universities used as samples must offer a program for preparing teachers in physical education and/or recreation. All reporting directors stated that their institutions offered a degree in one of these areas. Among the eleven Black institutions reporting, six or fifty-five percent offer a bachelors degree; four or thirty-six percent offer a masters degree; and one or nine percent offer a specialist degree. Among the thirteen White institutions reporting, four or thirty percent offer a bachelors degree; eight or sixty-two percent offer a masters degree; and one or eight percent offer a specialist degree. There are no significant differences between Black and White colleges relating to the types of degrees offered, however, a higher percentage of predominantly White colleges appear to offer a masters degree when compared with predominantly Black colleges.
Chain of Command

The director of physical education in both predominantly Black and White colleges reports directly to the dean of the college of education. There are, however, several combinations in both groups as to the methods and procedures they utilize to select the director of physical education. In Black colleges the eleven directors reporting, fifty-four percent, stated that the president appointed the director of physical education in their institutions. Within this group, two or eighteen percent report that the president and the dean together make this appointment. Also, two or eighteen percent report that the president makes the appointment of the physical education director following a recommendation from the physical education department's search committee. Two of the eleven reporting or eighteen percent state that the dean of the college of education alone selected the physical education director, and one or nine percent state that the physical education faculty made this appointment.

Among the predominantly White college directors reporting, six or forty-six percent stated that the president appointed the director of physical education. Five or thirty-eight percent stated that the dean of the college of education made this appointment. However, in each of these categories one director, or eight percent of the total sample, reported that the director of physical education was appointed by the college president and the dean of the college. One director, or eight percent of the sample, stated that the faculty senate made this appointment. Two or fifteen percent reported that the physical education faculty appointed the physical education director at their institutions.
The director of athletics in four or thirty-six percent of the Black colleges reporting is responsible to the athletic committee, and the college president for matters that pertain to the conduct of intercollegiate athletics at their institutions. Three or twenty-seven percent are directly responsible to the president. Two or eighteen percent are responsible directly to the athletic committee, and one or nine percent is responsible to the dean of the college of education.

Eight or sixty-one percent of the White college directors reporting stated that the director of athletics at their institutions was responsible directly to the college president. Two or fifteen percent were responsible to the director of physical education, and two or fifteen percent were responsible to the athletic committee. One or eight percent stated that the director of athletics was responsible to the athletic committee and the college president.

Among the eleven Black college directors reporting, ten or ninety-one percent stated that the president of the college was solely responsible for appointing the director of athletics at their institutions. One or nine percent said that the president and the athletic committee made this appointment at his institution. Of the White college directors reporting, eleven or eighty-four percent stated the president made the appointment of director of athletics at their institutions while one or eight percent said that the president and the director of physical education made this appointment at their colleges. Also, one or eight percent stated that the president and the athletic committee made this appointment at his institution.
There are no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in terms of how the director of physical education and the director of athletics are appointed at their respective institutions. It appears that both Black and White colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA adhere to similar methods and procedures of communicating throughout the administrative phase of their individual organizations.

Both Black and White colleges appear to have some type of athletic advisory or policy-making board. All of the sampled directors or one-hundred percent reported having an athletic committee or council at their institutions. Table 6, which follows, demonstrates the status of the athletic committee or council in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA:

**Table 6: Status of athletic committee or council in predominantly Black and predominantly White Division II colleges and universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>(1) advisory</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>(2) policy-making</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The athletic committee or council in Division II colleges and universities serves primarily as an advisory board to the athletic department. There are no significant differences between
predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in terms of the primary functions of the board. The composition of membership to the athletic committee or council, however, may vary somewhat in different categories from Black to White colleges. This composition may also vary from institution to institution within groups. Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations of the membership composition of both sampled groups. The table will show that there are no significant differences between the two athletic committees or councils as they relate in size. The size of the standard deviation also indicates that each sampled group appears homogeneous, in that sixty-eight percent of the membership on the predominantly Black college athletic board falls between zero \( (0+) \) membership and 25.6; while sixty-eight percent of the membership on the predominantly White college athletic board falls between zero \( (0+) \) membership and 31.5. The range for the Black college athletic board was fifty-two (52) The lowest category to show membership was "other". Other referred to general citizenry, which produced a total of three members out of the eleven reporting. The highest category to show membership was "other departments in the college or university," which produced a total of fifty-five (55) members out of the eleven directors reporting.

The range for the predominantly White college athletic board membership was forty-three (43). The lowest categories to show membership were "student teams" and "physical education majors" with one each. The highest category was "other departments in the college or university," which produced a total of forty-four (44) members out of
the thirteen directors reporting.

Table 7: Means and standard deviations of the membership composition for both Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Membership to the athletic committee or council is achieved in predominantly Black institutions in the following ways: Seven or sixty-four percent of the eleven reporting directors stated that the president of their institutions appointed individuals to the athletic committee or council. Two or eighteen percent are appointed by a special faculty committee; and the remaining two directors or eighteen percent reported that the president along with a faculty committee made this decision.

In predominantly White colleges, nine or fifty-two percent of the cases reported the president solely responsible for membership appointment to the athletic committee or council. Four or thirty-one percent of the thirteen reporting directors stated that the faculty alone made this decision. Two or fifteen percent of the directors reported that a combination of the president, a special faculty committee, and a committee from the student government association decided membership to the council. There are no
significant differences between these two groups of institutions in regard to selecting or appointing members to the athletic committee or council.

So far as selecting or appointing a chairperson to the athletic committee or council is concerned, Black college presidents in ninety-one percent of the cases dominate this procedure. One director or nine percent of the cases reported that the athletic committee or council was responsible for making this appointment at his institution.

In White colleges, four or thirty-one percent of the directors reported that the athletic committee or council appointed their chairperson and eight or sixty-two percent stated that the president made the appointment for this position. One or eight percent stated that the chairperson to the athletic committee or council was nominated and elected by the faculty. The major difference between these two groups is that the president dominates the appointment process in predominantly Black colleges and the faculty as a decision-making body is allowed more input in predominantly White colleges.

Organizational Structure

Nine Black college directors or eighty-two percent report that the responsibility for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic programs at their institutions was separate from the physical education department, but operate with some coordination with physical education in the area of facilities and staffing. Nine or sixty-nine percent of
the directors in predominantly White colleges reporting stated that they operate in this same manner. Three or twenty-three percent of the predominantly White college directors stated that the athletic programs at their institutions were assigned to the physical education department with separate directors, and one of eight percent stated that physical education and athletics were together with one director. Among the twenty-four directors reporting, one of the eleven predominantly Black college directors, or nine percent of those sampled, stated that the athletic program at his institution was separate from the physical education department and located in a separate unit having no administrative relationship with physical education. One predominantly Black college director, or nine percent of the sample, stated that the athletic program at his institution was assigned to the physical education department but with separate directors. Basically there are no main differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White college athletic programs in terms of how they are organized and structured.

Sports Sponsored at NCAA Division II Institutions

Table 8, which follows, lists the types of sports offered in each institution sampled and the percentage of institutions in each category that sponsors the particular sport indicated.

The table shows there are no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in terms of the types of sports offered in their respective athletic programs.
Table 8: The type of sports sponsored in each institution sampled and the percentage of institutions sponsoring the sport indicated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predominantly Black Colleges</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Predominantly White Colleges</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The types of sports offered in Division II colleges and universities are decided upon primarily by the athletic committee or council in each institution. Six of eleven Black college directors or fifty-five percent stated that the athletic board made this decision at their institutions. Seven of thirteen White college directors or fifty-four percent also made this statement from their institutions. Athletic directors at these institution also play a
vital role in deciding what sports will or will not be offered by their colleges. Thirty-six percent or four of the Black college directors made this decision, while thirty-one percent or four White college directors also made this decision at their institutions. The remaining nine percent in Black colleges was spread between the president's office, the conference and the student body. The remaining fifteen percent in predominantly White colleges was also spread between the president's office, the conference and the student body. There are no significant differences between Black and White colleges as to how decisions are made to sponsor certain sports at their institutions.

The decision as to the number of participants each squad could carry in Division II predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges was made by a wide range of individuals and organizations. Nine of the directors from Black colleges or eighty-two percent stated that the conference, the NCAA, the NAIA and the head coach of each sport made these decision. Ten of the directors from White colleges or seventy-seven percent stated that this decision was made at their institutions by the conference, the NCAA, the NAIA, the AIAW (Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women) and the head coach of each sport. There are no significant differences between Black and White colleges in deciding the number of participants in each sport.
Decision as to the number of games played during the season by each sport in predominantly Black colleges were made in twenty-seven percent of the reporting cases by the conference. Eighteen percent of the directors stated that they made those decisions. One director reported that he and the president of the college made this decision. Another stated that the president and the head coach of each sport decided the number of games he/she would play. Still another stated that the president and the athletic committee decided. A final combination by one director involved the conference and the athletic committee in this decision.

In predominantly White colleges the decision as to the number of games played by each sport during the season was made twenty-three percent of the time by the conference and twenty-three percent of the time by the director of athletics. One director stated that the conference, the coach, the physical education director and the director of athletics in consultation made this decision. Another stated that the conference and the athletic committee decided. Still another stated that the conference, the coach and the NCAA (regulations) made this decision. Finally, with all possible combinations, the conference took an active role in thirty-seven percent of the Black colleges reporting and fifty-four percent of the time in White colleges. It would appear that outside agencies, such as the conference, the NCAA, the NAIA, and the AIAW play a significant role in the decision-making process in both predominantly Black and White colleges. It should also be noted that the director of athletics and the
athletic committee within each institution also play a vital role in
deciding the scope of their institution's sports programs. To­
gether, outside and inside influences decide not only the number of
games played by each sport, but whether or not they will also be
allowed to participate in post season games. The conference, the
NCAA, the athletic committee and the athletic director as a group
constitute greater than ninety percent of the decision-making in­
fluence in these areas. There are, however, no significant dif­
ferences between predominantly Black and predominantly White
colleges and universities in this regard.

Coaches Academic Responsibilities

Twenty-three of the twenty-four directors reporting, for a total
of ninety-six percent, stated that all head coaches and all assistant
coaches teach academic courses at their institutions. In five Black
college departments all coaches teach an average of seven credit hours
in the physical education service program during their season of com­
petition. It was also stated that all department personnel were hired
to teach, none are hired for the express purpose of coaching. Hours
taught may also vary according to the type of sport coached. Coaches
of four other Black college departments also teach an average of seven
credit hours per quarter in physical education theory courses during
their season of competition. In five White college departments coaches
teach an average of five credit hours in the physical education service
program during their season of competition. In four other reporting
college departments coaches may teach up to four credit hours per
quarter in physical education theory courses. Three other directors reported that coaches also teach in their physical education service and theory courses, but did not indicate the number of credit hours taught by each coach.

Among those institutions where full-time teachers are also assigned coaching responsibilities, a certain portion of their full-time teaching load is relinquished for coaching purposes. Table 9 will indicate the percentage of a full-time teaching load a coaching assignment constitutes among those institutions. The table will show that being a head coach releases the coach of a large block of teaching time in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges.

Table 9: Percentage of a full-time teaching load a coaching assignment constitutes among NCAA Division II predominantly Black and Predominantly White institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Predominantly Black Colleges Percentage</th>
<th>Predominantly White Colleges Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men Football</td>
<td>459 (9) 51%</td>
<td>271 (11) 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>523 (10) 52%</td>
<td>281 (11) 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>333 (8) 42%</td>
<td>418 (11) 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>373 (9) 41%</td>
<td>485 (12) 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>190 (4) 48%</td>
<td>483 (9) 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>50 (2) 25%</td>
<td>355 (7) 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>100 (2) 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no significant differences in teaching and coaching times between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges.

Teaching assignments for head coaches and their assistants are determined by three administrative levels in both Black and White colleges. Two of the eleven reporting predominantly Black college directors or eighteen percent state that the director of athletics at their institutions is responsible for making this decision. Five or forty-five percent state that the president alone decides, and four or thirty-six percent state that the physical education director determines whether or not a head coach or his assistants will also teach at their institutions.

In predominantly White colleges the decision as to whether or not head coaches or their assistants will also teach is made thirty-one percent of the time (four directors reporting) by the physical education director. Two directors or fifteen percent of the thirteen reporting stated that the college president alone decided, while one or eight percent said that the director of athletics made this decision.
There were cases among predominantly White colleges where the director of athletics, the physical education director and the college president, in conference, decided which coaches would teach and which coaches would not teach. These conferences, however, it would appear, came prior to making coaching appointments at the institutions due to the fact that all directors responded that all coaches were given teaching as well as coaching duties. There are no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in the methods used to assign teaching responsibilities to coaches in the colleges and universities surveyed.

The teaching load distribution for head coaches and their assistants was determined in both groups primarily by the physical education director. Six of the White college directors reporting or forty-six percent made this statement and seven of the eleven Black college directors reporting or sixty-four percent also made this statement. Five White college directors (thirty-eight percent) and three Black college directors (twenty-seven percent) stated that the director of athletics along with the director of physical education decided the teaching load distribution for all coaches at their institutions. There are no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in terms of which administrator is responsible for assigning teaching loads to coaches at their respective institutions.
Head coaches are required to coach more than one sport in seven of the thirteen (fifty-four percent) predominantly White colleges reporting and in seven of the eleven (sixty-four percent) predominantly Black colleges reporting. The remaining six (forty-six percent) White college directors state that the head coach of a particular sport is not required to coach another sport at their institution, while the remaining four (thirty-six percent) Black college directors make this same statement. These differences are not significant. There is an average of 1.7 of the head coaches in predominantly Black colleges, and 3.3 of the head coaches in predominantly White colleges who are actually coaching in a second sport area.

Outside Organizational Influences

There are several organizations outside the college and university community that play a vital role in the decision-making and policy-making process in its intercollegiate athletic programs. Among these organizations are the following: 1) NCAA, 2) the NAIA, 3) the AIAW, and 4) the federal government. Among the institutions reporting, the NCAA, in eight of thirteen cases (sixty-two percent) in predominantly White colleges and in ten of eleven cases (ninety-one percent) in predominantly Black colleges, exercised a "great deal" more influence in the decision-making process in their athletic programs than any other organization. The second ranked organization that exercised a "great deal" of influence in intercollegiate athletics was the AIAW. Eight White college directors or sixty-two percent
and eight predominantly Black college directors or seventy-three percent made these statements. The NAIA only exercised a "great deal" of influence in two or fifteen percent of the predominantly White colleges, but maintained a very high level of influence in predominantly Black colleges with seven directors reporting for sixty-four percent.

Directors reported that the NCAA carried a "substantial" amount of influence in four or thirty-one percent of the predominantly White colleges and one or nine percent of the predominantly Black colleges. The AIAW carried a "substantial" amount of influence in five or thirty-eight percent of the predominantly White colleges and in two or eight percent of the predominantly Black colleges. The NAIA carried a "substantial" amount of influence in one or eight percent of the predominantly White colleges and one or nine percent of the predominantly Black colleges. One director in predominantly Black colleges (nine percent) stated the NAIA and the AIAW exercised "very little" influence in the decision-making process in the intercollegiate athletic program at his institution. Two directors (fifteen percent) in predominantly White colleges stated that the NAIA exercised no influence in the decision process in athletics at their institutions.

The influence exercised by the conference commissioner in most of the institutions reporting varied between a "great deal" (five or thirteen White colleges or thirty-eight percent and seven of eleven Black colleges or sixty-four percent); "substantial" (four of thirteen White
colleges or thirty-one percent and four of eleven Black colleges or thirty-six percent); "very little" (two or fifteen percent of the White colleges); and "none" (two or fifteen percent of the White colleges). One of the two reporting predominantly White colleges stated that they were independent having no conference affiliation.

The athletic directors who participated in this study were asked if they felt that the NCAA and other such regulatory organizations were a hindrance to the development of an athletic program at their institutions. Table 10 shows that there were significant differences at the .10 level of confidence between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in their responses. The four variables tested, with the use of Chi Square ($X^2$) statistic, were as follows: 1) White colleges; 2) Black colleges; 3) yes; and 4) no.

Table 10: Regulatory organizations as a hindrance to intercollegiate athletic programs in predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>84.62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>64.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 2.61$  \(\text{DF} = 1\)  
Probability = .10
Table 10 indicates that two or 28.57 percent of all respondents who said yes were from predominantly White colleges and five or 71.43 percent were from predominantly Black colleges; and eleven or 64.71 percent of all respondents who said no were from predominantly White colleges and six or 35.29 percent were from predominantly Black colleges. It also indicates that two of the thirteen directors (15.38 percent) reporting from predominantly White colleges said yes, while eleven (84.62 percent) said no. Five (71.43) of the eleven Black college directors reported yes and six (54.55 percent) said no. It would appear that predominantly Black colleges in Division II of the NCAA found outside regulatory organizations more of a hindrance to the development of an athletic program more suited to meeting student needs and interests than do predominantly White institutions.

The federal government has issued Title IX legislation which makes it mandatory for colleges and universities receiving federal aid in any form to provide intercollegiate athletic programs for women. Predominantly White colleges were divided greatly among their responses as to whom they felt benefited the most from Title IX at their institutions. Five of the thirteen directors reporting or thirty-eight percent stated that the women's sports programs and the institution itself benefited the most from Title IX. Four or thirty-one percent said the institution alone, while three or twenty-three percent said the women alone benefited. And, one or eight percent stated no one group or the institution benefited from Title IX legislation at his college due to the fact that they had an exceptionally strong women's program prior
to the Title IX legislation. Predominantly Black college directors were not so divided. Five or forty-five percent of the eleven directors reporting stated that the women's sports program benefited the most at their institutions, while five or forty-five percent stated that the entire institution benefited the most from Title IX. The remaining director (one or nine percent) stated that the women's sports program as well as the entire institution benefited from Title IX legislation.

Title IX legislation may or may not have created administrative positions for more women in college athletics throughout Division II of the NCAA. Directors in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges were asked if their institutions employed a separate director of athletics for women sports. Table II will show that there is a significance difference at the .04 level of confidence between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities in terms of their hiring practices of women athletic directors.

Data included in Table II indicated that seven or 77.78 percent of all respondents who said yes to having a separate director of athletics for women's sports were from predominantly White colleges and two or 22.22 percent were from predominantly Black colleges; and five or 35.71 percent of all respondents who said no were from predominantly White colleges and nine or 64.29 percent were from predominantly Black colleges. They further indicate that seven of the twelve directors (58.33 percent) reporting from predominantly White colleges said yes, while five (41.67 percent) said no. Two of eleven or 18.18 percent from predominantly Black
Table 11: Hiring practices of women athletic directors in NCAA Division II predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>White Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>41.67</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>77.78</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>81.82</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>64.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 3.88 \quad DF = 1\]

There is a significantly stronger tendency at the .04 level of confidence for predominantly White colleges in Division II of the NCAA to have separate athletic directors or coordinators for women's sports programs than for predominantly Black colleges in the same division.

Among the seven predominantly White colleges employing separate athletic directors or coordinators for women's sports, three or forty-three percent stated that she/he reported directly to the director of athletics for men's sports programs. Two directors or twenty-nine percent of the seven reported that the director/coordinator of women's sports reported to the director for men's sports and the athletic committee or council. One director or fourteen percent of
the seven stated that the women's sports director/coordinator reported directly to the college president. The final director or fourteen percent of the seven reporting stated that she/he reported directly to the physical education director. From the two predominantly Black colleges employing separate athletic directors or coordinators for women's sports programs, both directors stated that she/he reported directly to the director of athletics for men's sports. There are no significant differences between Black and White colleges, who hire separate directors/coordinators for women's sports, with regard to whom these individuals reported. With a combination of up to five of the seven directors (71.42 percent) from predominantly White colleges and two of two (100 percent) from predominantly Black colleges reporting directly to the director of athletics for the men's sports programs the difference of 28.58 percent is not significant.

Personnel

Status of physical education and athletic personnel

The directors taking part in this survey were asked to identify the status of their departmental personnel in terms of their teaching/coaching assignments. Among the combination reported, nine of the thirteen directors from predominantly White colleges (69 percent) stated that they employed a total of 86 full-time faculty that do not coach for a 9.6 average per institution. Six (55 percent) of the directors from predominantly Black colleges hire 42 faculty in the same category for an average of seven per institution. Ten directors from
predominantly White colleges (seventy-seven percent) report hiring 111 full-time faculty that also coach an intercollegiate sport for an average of 11.1 per institution. Six (fifty-five percent) of the directors from predominantly Black colleges hire 48 faculty/coaches in the same classification for an average of eight per institution. Four (thirty-one percent) of the directors from predominantly White colleges hire 21 part-time faculty that do not coach for an average of 5.3 per institution. Three (twenty-seven percent) of the directors from predominantly Black colleges hire three faculty members with the same classification for an average of one per institution.

Five (thirty-eight percent) of the directors from the predominantly White colleges reporting hire twenty part-time faculty that also coach for an average of four per institution and two (eighteen percent) of the eleven directors reporting from predominantly Black colleges stated they hire four faculty in the same category for an average of two per institution. Three (twenty-three percent) of the predominantly White colleges hire twenty-six.

Where athletic department personnel were separate from physical education personnel, three (twenty-three percent) of the directors from predominantly White institutions reported hiring 25 full-time coaches that also teach for an average of 8.7 per institution. Two (eighteen percent) of the directors from predominantly Black colleges reported hiring ten coaches that also teach for an average of five per institution. Two (fifteen percent) of the thirteen directors from predominantly White colleges hire three full-time coaches that do not
teach for an average of 1.5 per institution and two (eighteen percent) directors from predominantly Black colleges hire five coaches in this same category for an average of 2.5 per institution. In a final classification, one (eight percent) of the directors from the predominantly White colleges hire two part-time coaches that do not teach for an average of four per institution.

There are no significant differences between predominantly White colleges and predominantly Black colleges among the various employment classifications observed by each of these institutions.

Among the institutions hiring coaches on split contract where a portion of their salaries are paid by physical education and a portion paid by athletics, six (forty-six percent) are predominantly White and four (forty-one percent) are predominantly Black. Seven (fifty-four percent) of the predominantly White colleges do not hire coaches on split contract and seven (fifty-nine percent) of the predominantly Black colleges also state that they do not hire coaches on split contract, (see table 12).

Table 12: Predominantly Black and Predominantly White institutions that hire and institutions that do not hire coaches on split contract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Predominantly Black</th>
<th>Predominantly White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N (n)</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N (n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split Contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6 46%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4 41%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10 41%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are no significant differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in terms of their hiring practices of staff personnel on split contract.

Nineteen of all directors reporting stated that they utilized other college or university personnel employed in the department of physical education or athletics to assist with coaching responsibilities. Nine or sixty-nine percent were from predominantly White colleges and ten or ninety-one percent were from predominantly Black colleges. The remaining five directors stated that they did not use other college or university personnel not employed by the physical education or athletic department to assist with coaching responsibilities. Four or thirty-one percent were from predominantly White colleges and one (or nine percent) was from predominantly Black colleges.

The nine predominantly White institutions that utilize other university personnel to assist in coaching report selecting those individuals from the following departments: 1) education, 2) mathematics, 3) recreation, 4) social science, 5) geology, 6) counseling, 7) driver education and 8) the student affairs office. The ten predominantly Black colleges that use other university personnel select them from among the following departments: 1) student personnel, 2) counseling, 3) art, 4) math, 5) industrial education, 6) arts and sciences, 7) education, 8) mathematics, 9) recreation and 10) dormitory counselors.

Faculty utilized from other departments to coach an
intercollegiate sport are paid either by the physical education department or the athletic department. Five directors (thirty-eight percent) from predominantly White colleges stated that they pay these faculty from other departments from the physical education budget. Four directors (thirty-one percent) pay these faculty from athletics and two (fifteen percent) state that they are not paid at their institutions but receive compensatory time for their services. However, seven directors (fifty-four percent) from predominantly White colleges stated that dual appointments (split contracts) were not desired at their institutions. Three directors (twenty-three percent) stated that dual appointments were desired at their institutions.

Three directors (twenty-seven percent) from predominantly Black colleges state that faculty utilized from other academic areas at their institutions were paid from the athletic budget. One director (nine percent) stated that other faculty are paid by physical education and two (eighteen percent) do not pay their faculty from other areas to coach, the institution instead provides compensatory time for their services. At two institutions (eighteen percent) directors report that they pay faculty from other areas to coach from the physical education and the athletic budgets. Seven directors (seventy-three percent) stated that dual appointments were not desired at their institutions.

The decision as to whether or not a coach would be hired on split contract was made by the physical education director in three (twenty-three percent) predominantly White colleges reporting. Two directors (fifteen percent) state that the president is responsible for making
this decision while two others (fifteen percent) state that the athletic director made this decision. One director (eight percent) stated that this was a joint decision made by the president of the college, the director of athletics and the physical education director. One director (eight percent) said that this decision was made by the athletic committee or council and the director of athletics. One (eight percent) said that the physical education director and the director of athletics made this decision, and one (eight percent) stated that the state determines whether or not a coach would be hired on split contract at his institution.

In predominantly Black colleges, eight directors (seventy-three percent) report that dual appointments were not desired at their institutions while three (twenty-seven percent) stated that they were desired at their institutions. The decision as to whether or not a coach would be hired on split contract was made in predominantly Black colleges sixty-four percent of the time (seven directors reporting) by the college or university president. One director (nine percent) stated that the physical education director and the athletic director made this decision, while one other director (nine percent) stated that the college president and the athletic director decided whether or not coaches would be hired on split-contract at his institution.

The college president and the director of athletics made the decision regarding coaches salaries when they were hired on split contract eighty-six percent of the time (eleven directors
reporting) in predominantly White colleges and eighty-two percent of the time (nine directors reporting) in predominantly Black colleges. If an appointee on split contract proved highly competent in one area but incompetent in the other area, decisions as to whether or not he/she would be retained were made jointly by the college or university president, the director of athletics and the physical education director. Ten (seventy-seven percent) of the thirteen directors in predominantly White colleges made this report and nine (eighty-two percent) of the directors in predominantly Black colleges made the same report.

Head coaches in NCAA Division II colleges and universities have a substantial amount of influence on hiring athletic personnel in both predominantly Black and predominantly White institutions. This appears to be the case in eight (sixty-two percent) of the predominantly White colleges reporting and in nine (eighty-two percent) of the predominantly Black colleges reporting.

Academic Status of Athletic Personnel in NCAA Division II Colleges and Universities

Athletic directors in eight (sixty-two percent) predominantly White colleges report that coaches at their institutions are not promoted and tenured in the same manner as other faculty in other departments. The same is not true for predominantly Black colleges where nine (eighty-two percent) of the eleven directors reporting stated that coaches and other athletic personnel at their colleges
and universities are promoted and tenured as other academic faculty. Decisions on matters regarding promotion and tenure of athletic personnel in predominantly White colleges and universities were made forty-six percent of the time (six directors reporting) through regular channels as for other faculty, and seven directors (fifty-four percent) report that these decisions are made by the physical education director and the director of athletics. (It is assumed that these individuals make recommendations for promotion and tenure appointments without departmental faculty and staff input to the dean for academic affairs. This assumption is made primarily because the the physical education director's office and the director of athletics' office are not normally granted the authority to make final decisions regarding promotion and tenure). In predominantly Black colleges, eight directors (seventy-three percent) state that promotion and tenure decisions of athletic personnel are made solely through regular channels as for other faculty.

Workload distribution, scheduling for classes and defining overall departmental duties for physical education personnel in predominantly White and predominantly Black colleges are sole responsibilities of the physical education director. This statement was made by eleven (eighty-five percent) directors from predominantly White colleges and nine (eighty-two percent) directors from predominantly Black colleges, however, thirteen directors (100%) and ten directors (ninety-one percent) respectively, report that scheduling for competitive athletic events is done (with recommendations) by the head
coach of each specific sport area. The coach, in either case, submits his/her schedule request directly to the director of athletics for approval. This is reported by twelve (ninety-two percent) directors from predominantly White colleges and ten (ninety-one percent) directors from predominantly Black colleges. It is assumed that the athletic committee or council also plays a vital role in the decision-making process where scheduling athletic events is concerned in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges. This assumption, however, is supported by only four directors (thirty-one percent) from predominantly White colleges who suggest that the athletic board, at their institutions, does have input in these matters.

Although head coaches are given the privilege of drawing up their competitive schedules, alterations in these schedules are quite often made by higher authorities. Six directors (forty-six percent) from predominantly White colleges stated that these alterations are made only some of the times, four (thirty-one percent) stated that they are made very often, and three (twenty-three percent) stated that they are not made at all at their institutions. In predominantly Black colleges, seven directors (sixty-four percent) stated that decisions to alter schedules of athletic events submitted by head coaches at their institutions were made very often, three (twenty-seven percent) stated that they were made some of the times, and one (nine percent) stated that alternations of schedules were made all of the time at his institution. Directors at both predominantly White and predominantly Black institutions (ten or seventy-seven percent
and eight or seventy-three percent respectively) stated that when a head coach's schedule had been altered by higher authorities the coach had very little recourse in the matter at their institutions. There were provisions at one predominantly White college (eight percent) for coaches whose schedules had been altered to request a hearing at the athletic board of control and at one predominantly Black college (nine percent) coaches could request a conference with the director of athletics and the athletic committee.

**Budget**

There are several sources of funding for athletic programs in colleges and universities. Reporting directors were asked to identify some of these sources as they related to their particular institutions, and designate the appropriate percentage of funds each source provided their programs. Table 13 will illustrate these fund sources and give the percentages and means ($\bar{X}$) for all institutions reporting.

Directors at seven predominantly White colleges (fifty-four percent) stated that these funds were paid back into the general fund of their institutions and one (eight percent) stated that all monies accrued from athletic events at his institution were submitted to the student government association as a part of its operating budget. It should be noted that the student fees allocation to the athletic budget at this one particular institution came from the student government association's budget. Seven directors (sixty-four percent) from
Table 13: Sources, percentages and means of all funds allocated to athletic programs in NCAA Division IIA colleges and universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
<th>( \Sigma )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gate receipts</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gate receipts</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student fees</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Revenue accrued at the race track in one state amounted to .1 of a percent of the total athletic budget in a predominantly Black college.

Predominantly Black colleges stated that accrued funds from athletic events at their institutions were retained by the department of athletics as part of its operating budget. Four (thirty-six percent) stated that these funds were paid back into the general fund at their institutions. Final decisions as to which budgets would receive monies derived from athletic events in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges were made by the college president with recommendations from the athletic council, the director of athletics.
Twelve directors (ninety-two percent) in predominantly White colleges and all directors in predominantly Black colleges (100%) reported that the athletic budgets at their institutions were separate from all other budgets including physical education. Decisions as to the amount of monies allocated to the athletic budgets in predominantly White colleges were made by the president (as reported by seven or fifty-four percent of the directors). In predominantly Black colleges these decisions were made by the athletic committee, the director of athletics, and the college president (eight or seventy-three percent of the directors reporting). Six directors (forty-six percent) in predominantly White colleges and four directors (thirty-six percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that their presidents exercised a great deal of influence over the decision-making process in matters that pertained to the athletic budgets at their institutions. Four (thirty-one percent) in predominantly White colleges and four (thirty-six percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that the president's influence was substantial, while three (twenty-three percent) in predominantly White colleges and two (eighteen percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that their presidents had very little influence over budget matters in the athletic programs at their institutions. Eight directors (sixty-two percent) in predominantly White colleges and nine (eight-two percent) in predominantly Black colleges reported that the college finance officer exercised a substantial amount of influence over budget matters in athletics at their institutions, while five
thirty-eight percent) in predominantly White colleges and one (nine percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that their college finance officer exercised very little influence over budget matters in athletics at their institutions.

After all monies have been received by the athletic department as part of its total operating budget, decisions are made as to the amount of funds each sport area would be allocated. In predominantly White colleges all directors reporting (thirteen or one-hundred percent) stated that individual budgets were prepared at their institutions by the director of athletics with some input from head coaches from each sport area. In predominantly Black colleges the same statement was made by ten directors reporting (ninety-one percent). In both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges the men's athletic program received the highest percentage of the total budget allocated to the athletic departments from their various sources.

Table 14 indicates the average percentage of the total budgets paid into men's and women's sports programs from all colleges reporting.

Eight directors in predominantly White colleges (sixty-two percent) and five (forty-five percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that budget allocations per sport area (including men's and women's programs) were spread equitably throughout their institution's athletic programs. Four directors (thirty-one percent) in predominantly White colleges and six (fifty-five percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that monies were not spread equitably throughout the athletic programs at their institutions. In twelve
Table 14: The percentage of the athletic budget allocated to men's and women's sports programs in predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Σ Percentage</th>
<th>Mean (X)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>582%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>248%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1100%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>970%</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>330%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

predominantly White colleges (ninety-two percent) the directors stated that the women's sports programs at their institutions required less money to operate than the men's programs. Seven directors (fifty-four percent) stated that the women coaches were satisfied with their budget allocations at their institutions. Six directors (forty-six percent) stated however, that the women coaches were not satisfied with their budgets at their institutions.

In predominantly Black colleges, six directors (fifty-five percent) stated that budget allocations were not spread equitably throughout their athletic programs, while five directors (forty-five percent) stated that they were at their institutions. Seven directors (sixty-four percent) stated that the women were not satisfied with
their budgets, while four (thirty-six percent) stated that they were satisfied with budgets at their institutions. Seven directors (sixty-four percent) reported that the women's sports programs at their institutions required less money to operate than the men's programs, while four (thirty-six percent) stated that their programs did not require less money to operate than the men's programs.

Budget Decision-Making

Process

There are several occasions in college athletic programs when coaches acquire additional expenses over and above their originally approved budgets. Some of these expenses may be due to error in computation and some may be due to emergencies that were unforeseen during the planning process. Decisions as to how these problems may be solved are made sixty-two percent of the time in predominantly White colleges by the president and fifty-five percent of the time by the athletic committee in predominantly Black colleges. Four directors in predominantly White colleges (thirty-one percent) stated that at their institutions these decisions were made jointly by the athletic committee, the director of athletics and the college finance officer. Three directors in predominantly Black colleges (twenty-seven percent) reported that the president, the athletic committee, and the director of athletics made all decisions involving additional funds for individual accounts which were over and above their allocated budgets.
Seven directors in predominantly White colleges (fifty-four percent) and nine (eighty-two percent) in predominantly Black colleges reported that head coaches at their institutions were actively involved in the decision-making process in the formation of the athletic budgets at their institutions. Ten directors (seventy-seven percent) in predominantly White colleges and nine (eighty-two percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that in addition to equipment and supplies, uniforms, and grants-in-aid, the following items were considered a part of a head coach's budget: 1) travel, 2) food and lodging and 3) officials fees. Items not considered a part of the coaches actual budget were: 1) insurance for athletes, and 2) jobs for athletes. There were no comments as to how funds for these items were made available to the coach for the total operation of his program. All directors in predominantly White colleges and ten (ninety-one percent) in predominantly Black colleges stated that head coaches at their institutions were given the opportunity to submit budget requests for their specific sport areas. All budget requests were submitted to the director of athletics in 100 percent of the cases at both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges. After all budget requests have been received by the director of athletics, reviewed and considered by the athletic committee or council, they were then returned to the head coach of each sport by the director of athletics (procedure reported by eighty-five percent of the directors in predominantly White colleges and ninety-one percent of the directors in predominantly Black colleges).
Directors report that in predominantly White colleges, ninety-two percent of the time budget requests submitted by head coaches to the administration were usually honored within reasonable limits of the initial request. In predominantly Black colleges this fact is true only seventy-three percent of the time. If a coach is not satisfied with the administrative decisions made on his/her budget request in predominantly White colleges, thirty-eight percent of the time they can negotiate for a budget change, thirty-one percent of the time they can appeal to the higher authorities, and twenty-three percent of the time they can agree to a compromise with the director of athletics. In predominantly Black colleges a dissatisfied coach can appeal to higher authorities fifty-three percent of the time, compromise with the director of athletics thirty-six percent of the time, or negotiate for a budget change nine-percent of the time (negotiate was defined by one director as resubmitting a revised budget request through the proper administrative channels). In sixty-nine percent of the cases in predominantly White colleges and eighty-two percent of the cases in predominantly Black colleges, the director of athletics was the initial contact for a head coach's appeals, compromises, or negotiations. Thirty-one percent of the time they made initial contact with the athletic committee or council in predominantly White colleges, while eighteen percent of the time in predominantly Black colleges a dissatisfied head coach would go directly to the college president to lodge an appeal, negotiate or compromise for a budget change.
Expense items such as equipment and supplies and uniforms were determined sixty-two percent of the time in predominantly White colleges, and seventy-three percent of the time in predominantly Black colleges by the head coach of each sport and the director of athletics. Thirty-eight percent of the time in predominantly White colleges and twenty-seven percent of the time in predominantly Black colleges the purchase of these expense items were determined by the college or systems (state) bid sheet. Ninety-two percent of the directors reporting from predominantly White colleges and ninety-one percent from predominantly Black colleges stated that the head coaches in each sport area at their institutions were responsible or accountable to the director of athletics for all funds used from their individual budgets. One director in predominantly White colleges (eight percent) stated that all coaches were accountable to the athletic committee and one director in predominantly Black colleges (nine percent) stated that coaches at his institution were accountable to the college finance officer for funds used from their budgets.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an attempt to compare the governance structure of the physical education and athletic programs of predominantly Black and predominantly White National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II colleges and universities. Factual information was gathered from directors of athletics in predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities regarding possible structural relationships that may exist between the administration of athletic and physical education departments in these institutions.

The data used in this investigation were provided by a questionnaire which was completed and returned by eighty percent of the thirty athletic directors sampled from among a total population of one hundred ninety three institutions in Division II of the NCAA. The questionnaire produced information describing the role of the chairpersons of the physical education department, the director of athletics, the athletic committee or council and the president of the college or university in the administration of physical education and athletics. The questionnaire also attempted to provide data concerning the type of governance styles used by administrators in NCAA Division II athletic and physical education programs, e.g. whether or not they were autocratic, democratic or laissez-faire.
The line of authority for the athletic directors reporting from ninety-five percent of the institutions (both predominantly Black and predominantly White) was through the athletic committee or council and/or the college president. The literature that deals with the control of intercollegiate athletics supports this arrangement in that it advocates faculty and administrative representation in the decision-making process in athletic affairs in higher education. The entire process for making decisions concerning athletics in colleges and universities is greatly influenced by national and local bodies such as the NCAA, NAIA, AIAW and individual conferences.

Contrary to much of the literature that would suggest the need for legislative athletic councils to control athletic programs in higher education, all reporting directors stated that the athletic committee or council at their institutions served as advisory boards. Throughout the survey instrument, however, they reported that their athletic council played significant roles in deciding such legislative and policy matters as: 1) appointing the director of athletics to his post; 2) selecting the chairperson for the council; 3) approving the types of sports programs offered at their institutions, 4) approving the number of games played during the season of competition; 5) approving the hiring of coaches on split contract; 6) the approval of schedule and budget request; and 7) deciding into which budget(s) accrued funds from athletic events would be placed. There appears to be some contradiction as to how reporting directors actually perceive the function of their athletic councils and what actually happens at their institutions. It is
interesting to note that directors from predominantly Black as well as those from predominantly White colleges and universities failed to view the overall function of their councils as policy-making or legislative when in fact they are.¹

The most represented group to show membership to the athletic committee or council among those institutions reporting were: 1) faculty from other departments in the college or university; 2) representatives from institutional level administration; 3) representatives from the student body; and 4) representatives from the physical education department. The membership composition of the athletic council further supports the literature that advocates institutional responsibility for controlling athletics in higher education.

The college president in NCAA Division II institutions appears to be highly influential in determining the direction their athletic programs will follow. The majority of the directors reporting stated that the presidents at their institutions played the following roles in controlling their athletic programs: 1) appointing individuals to membership to the athletic committee; 2) selecting a chairperson for the committee; 3) appointing the directors of athletics and physical education; 4) influencing the types of sports programs their institutions would offer; 5) deciding whether coaches would be hired on split contracts;

making final approval of athletic schedules and budgets; 7) making final decisions as to where funds accrued from athletic events would go; and 8) deciding whether or not a head coach of a particular sport or the director of athletics would also teach. The literature in educational administration concerning administrative theory tends to deal extensively with the hierarchy of graded authority wherein the president, from his central position, supervises the individuals at lower levels. There appears to be a trend in small college athletics toward the development of vertical lines of authority. Input into the decision-making process is provided at lower levels, however in many instances final approval or disapproval concerning policy matters in intercollegiate athletics is made at the central administrative level.

In some of the cases reporting, especially in predominantly Black colleges, the president showed a slight tendency for dominating the decision-making process in the appointment of athletic committee members, the selection of the athletic committee chairperson, appointing the director of athletics, influencing budgets, schedules, hiring coaches and deciding where accrued funds from athletic events would be placed. Presidents from predominantly Black colleges when compared with presidents from predominantly White colleges tend to be influenced by the bureaucratic theory of management where official jurisdictional areas appear to be fixed and orderly. Presidents from predominantly White colleges tend to combine the use of two theories in the management of their institutions: 1) the bureaucratic theory (which provides
a solid structure for communicating through the organization); and 2) the theory of interaction-influence whereby levels of communication within the framework of the organizational structure are linked together more cohesively which allows more input into the decision-making process from organizational constituents at lower levels. Presidents, however, from both the predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges tended not to disregard organizational structure and management styles and look at the dynamics of human activity, but rather influenced in some way or another all phases of the decision-making process in athletics at their institutions.

Profile of Athletic Administrators

The athletic directors surveyed in this study were employed to conduct the administrative affairs of the departments of athletics in NCAA Division II predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities. The average student enrollment for predominantly Black colleges was 5,580, and for predominantly White colleges, 6,448. These figures alone would imply that a close relationship existed between the administrative structures of the departments of athletics and physical education as well as the administrative styles of the directors conducting the programs in all NCAA Division II colleges and universities.

The organizational structure as well as the lines of communication and authority in the departments of athletic and physical education did not vary in their relationship between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges. The responsibility for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic programs at the majority of the institutions surveyed
was separate from the physical education department, but operated with some degree of coordination with the physical education program in the area of staffing and the use of facilities. Some of the directors reporting stated that the programs at their institutions were assigned to the physical education department, but with one director. The director of physical education in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges was responsible to the dean of the college of education for the conduct of the physical education programs at their institutions.

**Administrative Title**

The majority of all directors reporting were athletic administrators only, while twenty-one percent were directors of health, physical education, recreation and athletics. From the data, there appeared to be somewhat less emphasis placed on having separate directors for athletics and physical education in predominantly White colleges, while predominantly Black colleges tended to place more emphasis on having separate directors for both areas. This trend could be influenced by several factors: One, the organizational structural relationship that exists between physical education and athletics in some of the predominantly White colleges show combined programs with one director. This implies a desire by those institutions to justify athletics as an integral part of the total educational process. Two, the educational qualifications of the physical education and athletic administrators, i.e. a larger percentage of the directors reporting with doctorate degrees with administrative training were from predominantly White colleges, which tends to make them more academically qualified to serve as athletic and physical
education administrators than the directors in predominantly Black colleges. Three, methods and procedures for obtaining tenure, i.e. what did directors in predominantly Black colleges have to do differently from directors in predominantly White colleges to be promoted to tenure status? Although a smaller percentage of directors in predominantly White colleges report having tenure than directors in predominantly Black colleges, a larger percentage are in a tenure track, show longevity in terms of years of service, and have higher academic rank. There would appear to be different criteria established in predominantly White colleges for advancement than for directors in predominantly Black colleges. One could consider management styles, types of performance, visibility to the academic and local community, levels of responsibility, and the ability to produce with the resources available. Four, the systematic relationships for budding administrators in predominantly White colleges, i.e. novice athletic and physical education administrators may tend to strive toward and receive directorship of both areas for status, prestige, higher salaries or for more political clout. Directors in predominantly White colleges may also utilize more interorganizational contacts in horizontal as well as in vertical positions in order to achieve personal progress.

Nearly all of the directors reporting had served in their institutions ten years or less in their present administrative positions, while only a very few had served eleven or more years. There were no significant differences found between the number of years of service as an athletic administrator in predominantly Black colleges when
compared with the number of years of service in the same position in predominantly White colleges. Athletic administrators in predominantly White institutions, however, appeared to remain in their administrative positions over a longer period of time than directors in predominantly Black colleges. Reasons were not given for this trend, but campus reorganization and student demands of the sixties could be among the list of possible causes.

Philosophy

All directors reporting stated that all students regularly enrolled at their institutions were given an equal opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics regardless of whether or not they had previously been recruited for athletic purposes. Further, most of the directors reported that their institutions did not provide academic credit for their student athletes. Where academic credit was provided, it was given through the physical education service programs.

Organization and Administration

There were no significant differences observed between perceived administrative channels of communication and the policy-making units in predominantly Black college athletic and physical education programs when compared with those in predominantly White colleges. In all cases reporting the director of physical education was responsible to the dean of the college of education, while the director of athletics was responsible to the athletic committee or council and the college president. Both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in Division II
of the NCAA appear to adhere to similar methods of communicating through their organizations. The literature on athletic and physical education administration supports this model of communicating through the various administrative levels.

External Regulatory Organizations

Colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA are heavily influenced in the operation of their athletic programs by external regulatory agencies such as the NCAA, the NAIA, the AIAW and the individual conferences to which they hold membership. These agencies strive to uphold the philosophy that the responsibility for the control of intercollegiate athletics rests with the institutions themselves. The literature on athletic administration and the NCAA tends to reveal that administrative control of athletics within institutions or faculty control are synonymous with institutional control. Faculties speak to athletic issues through their athletic councils or elected conference faculty representatives. These individuals or groups are given the responsibility for setting policy for their institution's athletic programs that are in line with the constitution and by-laws of their national governing bodies. Some of the policies may include setting standards for athletic recruitment, hiring athletic personnel, giving athletic awards, setting academic eligibility standards, establishing criteria for in-season and post-season athletic events, awarding grant-in-aid to athletes, and setting standards concerning ethical conduct of athletic personnel at their respective institutions. External agencies
are responsible for governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs of their member institutions and to initiate, promote, stimulate and improve the image of intercollegiate athletics through America.

Directors were asked to indicate whether or not the NCAA and other external regulatory organizations were a hindrance to the development of an athletic program that met student needs, demands, and interests at their institution. The majority of all respondents who said yes were from predominantly Black colleges and less than one half who said no were from predominantly White colleges. There were significant differences found at the .10 level of confidence between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in their responses.

Coaches Academic Responsibilities

Nearly all directors reporting stated that head coaches and their assistant coaches teach academic courses at their institutions. Faculty and staff personnel in all NCAA Division II colleges and universities surveyed were hired to teach and not to coach. However, past events have shown that the hiring of a successful head coach in major revenue accruing areas such as football and basketball, were not always done with the individual's teaching record in mind. It was also stated throughout the survey that the teaching load of a head coach during his season of competition differed greatly from other non-coaching academic personnel in the department. Courses taught during these competitive seasons were primarily physical education service classes. The teaching of academic courses by coaches, however, were not always confined to the physical education department. Some of the coaches taught
mathematics, social sciences, geology, driver education, public recreation and elementary education. Some were academic counselors, and others worked as directors of student affairs.

The teaching load distribution for coaches during their competitive season was determined in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges by the physical education director or the director of the department hiring the coach as a teacher. Studies have shown that workload distributions are administered by department directors with some degree of input from individual faculty or from departmental faculty committees on curriculum development. Further, it is generally felt that faculty should have and in most cases are given the opportunity to voice their opinion in matters that directly concern them. Faculties in higher education are considered to be professionals and/or experts. They, therefore, are given the opportunity to teach and to make decisions in their areas of strength.

This survey also revealed that the women's sports programs in predominantly White colleges were conducted by a coordinator or director separate from the men's program. In predominantly Black colleges this situation did not exist. There is a stronger tendency for predominantly White colleges in Division II of the NCAA to utilize separate athletic directors or coordinators for women's sports programs than for predominantly Black colleges in the same division.

Again, it may appear that some of the directors from predominantly Black colleges may have reported what they felt was the appropriate situation at their institutions but not what actually happened within
their departments. From past experience in predominantly Black colleges, it has been noticed that prior to Title IX women were hired as separate coordinators for their phase of the program in departments of physical education. It would appear that in light of Title IX legislation these administrators would also have been in charge of women's sports programs as well as the women's physical education program. Directors in predominantly Black colleges may have viewed the situation as having a separate director for women sports with no relationship with the men's program. It could also be true that there are no women coordinators or directors for their sports programs. There have been reports in the literature over the past few years (prior to Title IX legislation) that women are constantly losing administrative positions of responsibility in athletic programs in higher education.

**Personnel**

Some of the directors reporting stated that they do not hire athletic personnel at their institutions on split contract with other departments. They do, however, utilize college and university personnel hired in other departments to assist with coaching responsibilities. These individuals from other departments were not all paid for their coaching duties by athletics or physical education, some were given compensatory time off for their services. Among those coaches hired with dual arrangements with other departments, all were paid a portion of their full salaries out of the athletic budget. If these dual arrangements were not profitable to the institution in terms of total
competency in both areas of the assignment, decisions as to whether or not the individual would be retained in his/her area of competency or dismissed altogether were made jointly by the college president, the physical education director, and the director of athletics. In cases where appointees were assigned in other academic areas the director of that particular department submitted recommendations as to whether or not he/she should be retained or dismissed.

**Academic Status of Athletic Personnel in NCAA Division II Colleges and Universities**

Promotion and tenure for coaches in NCAA Division II colleges and universities by in large are obtained through regular channels as for other faculty. There were, however, cases where directors stated that athletic personnel at their institutions were not awarded promotion and tenure in the same manner as other faculty. These directors were from predominantly White colleges where, as they report, decisions regarding promotion and tenure of coaches are made jointly by the director of physical education and the director of athletics.

Normal channels for obtaining promotion and tenure by faculty in higher education may come as a result of peer evaluations, years of service to the institution, teaching competency, service to the academic community, research and publication, departmental recommendations, evaluations by the academic dean's office and presidential approval. In small colleges similar to those in Division II of the NCAA, promotion and tenure may be obtained in slightly different ways. For example, one may not be required to do research or publish, perform services to the
academic community, or be granted the privilege of peer evaluation. Often these decisions are made by the respective department chairperson to the office of academic affairs, without consideration from others. In view of the number of years of service held by directors in predominantly White colleges when compared with directors in predominantly Black colleges, one should be concerned about the systematic differences between these institutions relative to the methods and procedures used to obtain tenure. It would appear that directors in predominantly Black colleges have had to be different from their colleagues in predominantly White colleges in performance, production and role responsibility in order to be promoted to tenured positions.

**Budget**

Colleges and universities in Division II of the NCAA report the utilization of several external and internal sources for funding their intercollegiate athletic programs. These sources are as follows: 1) gate receipts, 2) general fund of the institution, 3) student fees, 4) alumni, 5) contributions, and 6) television coverage. These sources are listed according to their level of importance to predominantly Black as well as predominantly White college athletic programs. One director reported that one tenth of one percent of all monies earned at the State race track in one day of a given year was placed into his athletic budget. Funds that are accrued as a result of athletic events were paid back into the institution's general fund, they were retained in the athletic department's budget. Final decisions as to where accrued
funds from athletic events would go in both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges were made with recommendations from the athletic council, the director of athletics, and the college finance officer.

All athletic budgets in the Division II colleges and universities surveyed were separate from other budgets in the university. Individual sports budgets were prepared by the director of athletics with input from head coaches. The women's sports programs received only 22.5 percent of the total budget in predominantly Black institutions and 25.4 percent of the budget in predominantly White colleges. Some of the directors stated that the women at their institutions were not satisfied with their athletic budget allocations, when compared with the budgets for the men's program, while others stated that the women's athletic programs required less money to operate than the men's, therefore, the women were satisfied with their budgets. It was stated that if coaches were not satisfied with their budgets they were allowed to appeal to higher authorities by requesting a hearing from the director of athletics, the athletic committee and the college president.

According to literature sources the finance procedures for athletic programs in higher education are similar to those in other educationally related programs. It requires the support and assistance of all parties concerned in order to develop an adequate financial base to enhance smooth operation. Studies have shown that the chief sources of funds for college athletics are ticket sales (gate receipts), alumni contributions, television receipts, concession income, and student fees generated from
the general fund of the institution. In recent years directors of athletics in colleges and universities throughout the United States have had to develop and/or create newer methods of obtaining funds for their sports programs. In light of Title IX and the demands for additional monies to operate a broader program, directors have been plagued with the inadequacies of traditional means of raising funds for their programs. In some cases they have altered their sports offerings for men in order to accommodate the women's program. In other cases they have maintained adequate programs for both men and women by utilizing funds from non-traditional sources. In either case, athletic directors in the future must be able to respond intelligently to the "why" and "how" queries that will be made of them in order to win support for the financial requests for their sports programs.

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the administrative structure of the athletic and physical education programs in NCAA Division II institutions in an effort to determine whether or not there were differences between predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges in the administration of their respective athletic programs. Areas of concern were administrative styles, organizational structure, staffing procedures, departmental philosophy, and budgeting procedures.

As a result of the survey conducted among the twenty-four predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, it was
apparent that there were no major significant differences between these two types of institutions.

The majority of the institutions surveyed organized their athletic programs separate from their physical education program, but maintained a high level of coordination between these programs in the area of staffing and facilities. The coaching staff at all institutions were hired as personnel of the physical education department or as staff in other academic departments within the college or university community.

Most of the directors responding appear to be academically qualified for their positions in terms of academic preparation and degrees earned. Staff personnel in some of the athletic and physical education departments were able to gain faculty status, advancement in rank and tenure. They were also teachers in the academic curriculum of their respective institutions with student advisement responsibilities.

In every case surveyed the director reported having an athletic committee or council which served as an advisory, policy making body for the institution's athletic program. Both predominantly Black and predominantly White colleges and universities utilized gate receipts, student fees and monies from the institution's general fund to finance their programs.

The hierarchical structures between predominantly Black and White colleges were identical in the majority of the cases. The administrative styles of the athletic directors in these institutions were different only in that predominantly White college directors did not share their administrative duties with other staff during their season of
competition. Predominantly White colleges also provided separate directors or coordinators for the women's sports programs as opposed to directors in predominantly Black colleges.

College presidents appear to be the single most dominating figure in both predominantly Black and predominantly White athletic programs in Division II of the NCAA. This trend may occur as a result of a completely autocratic desire by presidents to control their athletic programs or as a result of a bureaucratic structural process where presidents are required by their boards of trustees to approve or disapprove matters pertaining to athletics at their institutions just as they would ordinarily for other educationally related areas.

Directors of athletics and physical education in predominantly Black and White colleges and universities appear to follow democratic operational procedures where they strive, for the most part, to allow some faculty and staff input into the decision-making process in college athletic departments. It can be concluded, therefore, that NCAA Division II college presidents and athletic directors are neither totally autocratic or democratic but are supporters of systematic bureaucratic processes of organizational management.

**IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Implications for the practicing administrator in physical education and athletics in higher education include getting involved in the study of the latest trends in administrative concepts and associated behavioral sciences, especially where those concepts relate to administrative
theory and research. It would be unrealistic to indicate that course experiences in teacher education and professional preparation in physical education and athletics alone would provide the final answer for action in administration. It would be more realistic to recommend to individuals interested in an understanding of administrative theory to pursue course experiences in educational and or business administration. It is also necessary for the practicing administrator to seek ways of improving the human relations aspect of his organization in terms of improving lines of communication, encouraging better cooperation among staff personnel both vertically as well as horizontally, and by clearly defining to his constituents the appropriate lines of authority within the organization.

Directors of physical education and athletics in educational institutions must show particular concern for the human as well as the technical elements of administration. An administrator must quickly realize that he or she must rely heavily on the members of the organization for the achievement of the organization's goals and objectives. It is the responsibility of the administration to stimulate creativity and innovation within the department in order to promote or develop productivity. Departmental faculty and staff (as well as administrators) should become more actively involved in workshops, in-service training programs, retraining program and staff development programs. This concern for setting the stage for adequate human interaction within departments of physical education and athletics, consistent with the beliefs, skills, and understanding of those involved, should be
viewed by the administration as a functional aspect of the administrative process.

Recommendations for further research are as follows:

1. That a study be conducted in small colleges to determine the administrative role and function of the athletic committee or council.

2. That a parallel study be conducted to determine the administrative style and patterns of operation of the directors or coordinators of athletics and physical education for women in small colleges.

3. A study should be attempted to determine whether or not practicing administrators viewed administrative theory obtained from professional preparation different from administrative theory obtained from having a number of years in a practical administrative position without professional training.

4. That a study be conducted to determine the degree to which colleges and universities are actively engaged in non-traditional procedures for raising funds for their athletic programs.
APPENDICES
Dear Director:

I am presently at the dissertation stage of my work toward the Doctor of Philosophy Degree at The Ohio State University. Enclosed is a questionnaire designed to analyze and compare the governance structure of Departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Colleges and Universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

In order to complete this investigation and test for reliability, I am required to administer a pilot study of the instrument being used to active administrators in physical education and athletics. I would like your assistance in providing valuable feedback relevant to the following areas:

1. Are the items on the instrument clear and understandable?
2. Do the items covered belong on the instrument?
3. Should additional items be added to the instrument?

Your participation in this pilot study will be greatly appreciated. Please complete the instrument and include any notations you wish by the items in question. You can be assured your responses will be kept strictly confidential.

I wish to report these findings to my advisory committee by the end of August, therefore if at all possible I would like to collect the completed instrument by August 20, 1977.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Joe B. Brown, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate

JBBJr/cmb

Enclosure
APPENDIX B: THANK YOU LETTER FOR PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS
Dear Director:

Thank you very much for taking part in the pilot study associated with my investigation designed to analyze and compare the governance structure of Departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Colleges and Universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). As a result of your input the instrument has been greatly improved.

It is hoped that the data collected will prove beneficial to other administrators of athletics and physical education in higher education.

Again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Joe B. Brown, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate

JBBJr/cmb
APPENDIX C: COVER LETTER FOR RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
Dear Director:

As a doctoral candidate in athletic and physical education administration at The Ohio State University I am attempting a study that will analyze and compare the governance structure of departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Colleges and Universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA).

An effort is being made to identify the various types of organizational structures and leadership practices employed in division II athletics in order to determine which practices result in the most effective and efficient organizational performance. This study will attempt to provide information that is of concern to many persons in our profession.

You can be instrumental in enabling me to obtain the data for this study by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope at your earliest convenience.

In participating, you have my assurance that all information will be kept strictly confidential and the names of individuals and institutions will remain anonymous. Your willingness to participate in this study is vital to its success and will be greatly appreciated.

I shall look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Joe B. Brown, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate

JBBJr/cmb

Enclosure
Dear Director:

This letter is written as a follow-up to the questionnaire that I mailed to you during the week of October 25, 1977.

The response to this mailing has been most encouraging, however there are still a few questionnaires which have not been returned.

I am pleased to have your institution participating in this study designed to analyze and compare the governance structure of Departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Colleges and Universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). However, if the study is to be successful, it necessitates a maximum return of the research instruments.

Please complete and return the enclosed stamped, self-addressed post card which will indicate the status of your questionnaire.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Joe B. Brown, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate

JBBJr/cmb

Enclosure
Dear Director:

Thank you for taking part in my research associated with an investigation designed to analyze and compare the governance structure of Departments of Physical Education and Athletics in Colleges and Universities in Division II of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Your input has strongly helped to increase the validity of this study.

It is hoped that the data collected will prove beneficial to other administrators of athletics and physical education in higher education.

Again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely yours,

Joe B. Brown, Jr.
Doctoral Candidate

JBBJr/cmb
APPENDIX F: DIRECTORS QUESTIONNAIRE
DIRECTORS QUESTIONNAIRE

General Information

1. Name of your institution _______________________________________

2. Number of students enrolled in your institution
   A. Undergraduate: Men ___ Women ___ Black ___ White ___
   B. Graduate: Men ___ Women ___ Black ___ White ___

3. Your administrative title ________________________

4. How long have you held your present administrative position?_____________________

5. What is your present (academic) title? (please check)
   A. Instructor ( ) D. Professor ( )
   B. Assistant Professor ( ) E. Other __________________
   C. Associate Professor ( )

6. What is your present academic status? (please check)
   A. Tenured ( ) C. Not tenured but in a tenure track ( )
   B. Non-Tenured ( )
   D. __________________

7. Which of the following best describes your administrative position (please check)
   A. Interim ( )
   B. Regular appointment ( )

8. The length of time you have served in your institution in any capacity __________________
9. In addition to your administrative position, do you also teach academic courses? (Yes ___ No ___)

If yes, how many academic semester/quarter credit hours do you teach per year in the following areas: (please use numbers)

A. Service program _____________
B. Physical education theory courses ______
C. Graduate courses ________
D. Other academic areas ______

10. In addition to your administrative position do you also advise students? (please check) (Yes ___ No ___)

A. Undergraduate _______
B. Graduate ______

11. In addition to your administrative position do you also coach intercollegiate sports (Yes ___ No ___)

A. If yes, what sport(s) do you coach?
   Head coach ...........................................
   Assistant coach .............................................................
B. How many hours per week do you devote to your coaching responsibilities? __________________
C. Is your academic load decreased during your season of competition? (Yes ___ No ___)
D. Are administrative duties shared with other staff personnel during your season of competition? (Yes ___ No ___)
E. Who determines whether you as an administrator may or may not coach intercollegiate sports? (please check)
   1. The college president  ( )
2. The athletic director ( )
3. The physical education director ( )
4. The dean of the college ( )
5. The athletic committee or council ( )
6. Other ............................................................

12. Was your professional preparation geared toward administration?
   (Yes ____ No ____)

13. What degree do you presently hold? (please check)
   A. Bachelors ( ) D. Doctorate ( )
   B. Masters ( ) E. Other ________________

   Philosophy

1. Does your institution give academic credit to students who participate in intercollegiate athletics?
   (Yes ____ No ____)
   A. If yes, how is academic credit obtained? (i.e. through physical education, humanities, social studies or other basic education requirement areas)? (Please list)
      ________________  ________________
      ________________  ________________
   B. How many academic credits derived from athletics may an athlete receive during his college career? ____________

2. Is there a definite recruiting effort made to bring athletes to your institution? (Yes ____ No ____)

3. Does your institution provide an equal opportunity for participation in intercollegiate athletics to all students regularly enrolled? (Yes ____ No ____)
4. Does your institution provide a scholarship or grant-in-aid fund exclusively reserved for students of special athletic ability? (Yes ___ No ___)

Organization and Administration

1. Does your institution have a program for preparing teachers in physical education and/or recreation? (Yes ___ No ___)

2. If yes, what is the highest degree offered in physical education and/or recreation? ________________________________

3. To whom is the Director of Physical Education responsible for the conduct of the physical education program? (Please check)
   A. The college president ( ) D. The faculty/senate ( )
   B. The athletic director ( ) E. The dean of the college ( )
   C. The athletic committee or council ( ) F. Other __________________

4. How is the Director of Physical Education selected in your institution? (please check)
   A. Appointed by the college president ( ) D. Selected by the faculty senate ( )
   B. Selected by the athletic director ( ) E. Selected by the physical education faculty ( )
   C. Selected by the college dean ( ) F. Other __________________

5. To whom is the Athletic Director responsible for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic program? (please check)
   A. The college president ( ) C. The athletic committee or council ( )
   B. The director of physical education ( ) D. The dean of the college ( )
6. Who appoints the Athletic Director in your institution?  
(please check)  
A. The president ( )  
B. The physical education director ( )  
C. The athletic committee or council ( )  
D. The dean of the college ( )  

7. Do you have an athletic committee or council in your institution?  
(Yes ___ No ___)  

8. If you have an athletic committee or council, please indicate the composition of its membership as follows:  
(please use numbers)  
A. Members of the faculty from  
   -physical education department _________  
   -athletic department _________  
   -other departments _________  
B. Students from  
   -athletic teams _________  
   -professional physical education _________  
   -general student body _________  
C. Central administration of the university or college _________  
D. Alumni _________  
E. Any other _________  

9. Which of the following is the status of your athletic committee or council?  
(please check)  
A. Advisory ( )  
B. Policy-making ( )  
C. Regulatory for national organizations ( )  
D. Other _________
10. How is membership to the athletic committee or council achieved?

A. Appointed by the president
   ( )
B. Appointed by the athletic council
   ( )
C. Nominated/elected by the faculty
   ( )
D. Other ___________________

11. How is the chairperson of the athletic committee or council selected? (please check)

A. Appointed by the president
   ( )
B. Appointed by the athletic council
   ( )
C. Nominated/elected by the faculty
   ( )
D. Nominated/elected by the athletic committee or council
   ( )
E. Appointed by the physical education director
   ( )
F. Other ___________________

12. Which of the following organizational structures best describe the type of physical education and intercollegiate athletic programs in your institution? (please check)

A. The responsibility for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic program is assigned to the physical education department with separate directors
   ( )
B. The responsibility for the conduct of the intercollegiate program is separate from the physical education department and located in a separate unit having no administrative relationship with physical education
   ( )
C. The responsibility for the conduct of the intercollegiate athletic program is separate from the physical education department but may or may not operate with some cooperation with the physical education department in the area of facilities and staffing
   ( )
D. Other types of organization patterns (please indicate)

13. Which of the following sports do you sponsor in your intercollegiate athletic program? (please check)

A. Men

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Football</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>5. Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basketball</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>6. Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Baseball</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>7. Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Track and Field</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>8. All of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Women

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basketball</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>5. Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Field Hockey</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>6. Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tennis</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>7. Track &amp; Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Volleyball</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>8. All of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Who decides on the types of sports that are sponsored by your institution? (please check)

A. The athletic director ( ) C. Conference ( )
B. The athletic committee or council ( ) D. Other ________

15. Who determines the number of participants on each squad in each sports area in your institution? (i.e. in football, softball, basketball, volleyball, etc.) (please check)
16. Who decides the number of games played during the season in each sport in your institution? (please check)

A. The athletic director
B. The college president
C. The physical education director
D. Conference
E. The head coach
F. The athletic committee or council
G. Other

17. Who determines whether or not a team may or may not participate in post season games? (please check)

A. The athletic director
B. The college president
C. The athletic committee or council
D. The coach
E. The team
F. NCAA
G. NAIA
H. Conference
I. Other
18. Do head coaches and assistant coaches also teach in your institution? (Yes ___ No ___)

If yes, how many credit hours per year do they teach in the following areas during their season of competition? (please check)

A. Elective or required service program ( )
B. Physical education theory courses for teacher preparation ( )
C. Graduate courses ( )
D. Other academic areas ________________________________

19. What per cent of a full teaching load does the head coaching assignment constitute in your institution? (please check)

A. Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Football ( )</td>
<td>5. Tennis ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Basketball ( )</td>
<td>6. Swimming ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Baseball ( )</td>
<td>7. Soccer ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Track and Field ( )</td>
<td>8. Other ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Basketball ( )</td>
<td>5. Softball ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Field Hockey ( )</td>
<td>6. Swimming ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tennis ( )</td>
<td>7. Track ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Volleyball ( )</td>
<td>8. Other ________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Who determines whether or not a head coach or his assistant will also teach? (please check)

A. The athletic director ( )
B. The college president ( )
C. The physical education director ( )
D. The athletic committee or council ( )
21. Who determines the teaching load distribution for head coaches and assistant coaches? (please check)

A. The athletic director ( )
B. The physical education director ( )
C. The athletic committee or council ( )
D. The faculty senate ( )
E. The head coach ( )
F. Other _____________________

22. Are some head coaches required to coach more than one sport in your institution? (Yes _ No ___)

A. If yes, how many of the head coaches coach more than one sport? _________

B. Please list additional coaching assignments held by the head coaches as follows: (men and women sports)

1. Head football ____________________________
2. Head basketball ____________________________
3. Head baseball ____________________________
4. Head track and field ____________________________
5. Head tennis ____________________________
6. Head swimming ____________________________
7. Other ____________________________

23. Indicate the degree of influence exercised by the following organizations in matters pertaining to the decision-making process in intercollegiate athletics in your institution: (please check)
24. Indicate the degree of influence exercised by your conference commissioner over matters pertaining to athletics in your institution. (please check)
   A. great deal ( )   C. very little ( )
   B. substantial ( )   D. none ( )

25. Do you find that compliance with NCAA and other such organizational regulations in your institution can be a hindrance to the development of a program which might better meet the needs and interest of the students in your college or university?
   (Yes ___ No ___)

26. Who benefits from Title IX? (please check)
   A. The women ( )  C. The institution ( )
   B. The men ( )    D. Other __________

27. Is there a separate athletic director for women sports in your institution?
   (Yes ___ No ___)

28. If yes, to whom does he/she report? (please check)
   A. The college president ( )  D. The physical education director ( )
   B. The athletic director ( )  E. Other __________
   C. The athletic committee or council ( )
Personnel

1. If physical education and athletic personnel are together in one department, please indicate their status as follows:
   (please use numbers)
   A. Full-time faculty (no coaching) (  )
   B. Full-time faculty that also coach (  )
   C. Part-time faculty (no coaching) (  )
   D. Part-time faculty that also coach (  )
   E. Full-time faculty that coach only (paid by P.E.) (  )
   F. Part-time faculty that coach only (paid by P.E.) (  )
   G. Other ________________________________

2. If athletic department personnel are separate from physical education personnel, please indicate their status as follows:
   (please use numbers)
   A. Full-time coach (no teaching) (  )
   B. Full-time coach that also teaches (  )
   C. Part-time coach (no teaching) (  )
   D. Part-time coach that also teaches (  )
   E. Part-time coach employed jointly with other departments on campus (  )
   F. Other ________________________________

3. Are any of the coaches hired on split contract where a portion of their salary comes from physical education and a portion from athletics? (Yes ___ No ___)
4. Do other college or university personnel not employed in the
department of physical education or athletics also assist
with coaching responsibilities? (Yes ___ No ___)
A. How many are available to your program ( )
B. What are their assignments in the university or college
other than coaching? _________________________________
C. How are they paid for coaching? (please check)
   1. physical education ( )
   2. athletics ( )
D. If they are not paid for coaching through physical
   education or athletics, how are they paid? __________

5. Are dual appointments (split contracts) desired at your in­
stitution? (Yes ___ No ___)

6. Who makes the decisions as to whether or not a coach should
be hired on split contract? (please check)
A. The college president ( )
B. The athletic director ( )
C. The athletic committee or council ( )
D. The physical education director ( )
E. Other ________________________________

7. Who makes the final decision regarding coaches salaries (i.e.
full-time or part-time) in your institution? (please check)
A. The college president ( )
B. The athletic director ( )
C. The athletic committee or council ( )
D. Combination of the above (please indicate) _______
E. Other _________
8. If an appointee on split contract proves highly competent in one area but incompetent in the other who decides whether or not he will be terminated or retained? (please check)

A. The president ( )
B. The athletic director ( )
C. Physical education director ( )
D. Other _________________

9. Indicate the amount of influence the coaching staff has on hiring personnel (please check)

A. A great deal ( )
B. Substantial ( )
C. Very little ( )
D. None ( )

10. Are coaches in your athletic program promoted and tenured as other academic faculty? (Yes ___ No ___)

11. Who decides on matters regarding promotion and tenure of coaches in your institution? (please check)

A. The athletic director ( )
B. The athletic committee or council ( )
C. The director of physical education ( )
D. Regular channels (as for other faculty) ( )
E. Other _________________

12. Who is responsible for setting up the workload, scheduling for classes and defining the overall duties of your faculty and staff in physical education? (please check)

A. The director of physical education ( )
B. The faculty of physical education ( )
C. Jointly by director of physical education and faculty committee ( )
D. Other _________________

13. Are coaches allowed the opportunity to draw up schedule of competition for their specific sports area? (Yes ___ No ___)
14. To whom does the coach submit his/her schedule request? (please check)
   A. Athletic director ( )
   B. Physical education director ( )
   C. Athletic committee or council ( )
   D. Other ________________

15. How often is the coach's schedule accepted with alterations by higher authorities? (please check)
   A. All the time ( )
   B. Very often ( )
   C. Sometimes ( )
   D. Never ( )

16. What recourse does the coach have if his/her requested schedule has been altered by higher authorities? (please check)
   A. Very little ( )
   B. None

Budget

1. The following are some of the sources of funding the intercollegiate athletic programs in some colleges and universities in the United States. Please check those sources of financing the program in your institution, and indicate beside each the appropriate percentage (please check)
   A. General fund of the institution ( )
   B. Alumni contributions ( )
   C. Gate receipts ( )
   D. Television receipts ( )
   E. Contributions from business & industry ( )
   F. Other sources ________________
2. The revenues accruing from the intercollegiate athletic program of your institution are: (please check one)
   A. Paid into the general funds of the institution ( )
   B. Retained by the athletic department as part of its operating funds ( )
   C. Retained by the physical education department as part of its operating funds ( )
   D. Other (please indicate) ______________________________

3. Who decides into which funds monies accruing from your intercollegiate athletic programs are paid? (please check)
   A. The college/university president ( )
   C. The athletic director ( )
   B. The athletic committee or council ( )
   D. The college finance officer ( )

4. Is the athletic budget at your institution separate from your physical education department's budget? (Yes __ No ___)

5. If the athletic budget in your institution separate from other university budgets? (Yes__ No ___)
   A. If no, what are the other budget sources? ______________________________

   B. Who decides how much monies athletics may receive? (please check)
     1. The president ( )
     2. The athletic director ( )
     3. The college finance officer ( )
     4. The athletic committee or council ( )
     5. The physical education director ( )
     6. Other ______________________________
6. What percentage of the athletic budget is allocated to the following?
A. Men's intercollegiate athletics ( )
B. Women's intercollegiate athletics ( )

7. Is the budget for the intercollegiate athletic program in your institution considered as: (please check)
A. Separate budget administered by the athletic director ( )
B. A separate budget administered by the athletic committee or council ( )
C. A separate budget administered by the central administration ( )
D. Other (please indicate) _________________________________

8. Who prepares the budget for athletics in your institution?
A. Head coaches ( ) D. The physical education director ( )
B. Athletic director ( ) E. The athletic committee or council ( )
C. The president ( ) F. Other _____________________

9. Indicate the degree of influence exercised by the president over decision-making in your athletic budget (please check)
A. A great deal ( ) C. Very little ( )
B. Substantial ( ) D. None ( )

10. Indicate the degree of influence exercised by the college or university finance officer over decision-making in your athletic budget (please check)
A. A great deal ( ) C. Very little ( )
B. Substantial ( ) D. None ( )
11. How often does your athletic director make decisions on matters pertaining to the athletic budget? (please check)
   A. Very often ( )                  C. Rarely ( )
   B. Often ( )                      D. Never ( )

12. Who decides on emergencies involving additional expenses over and above the allocated budget? (please check)
   A. The college president ( )       C. The athletic director ( )
   B. The athletic committee or council ( )   D. Other __________________

13. Are the coaches involved in matters pertaining to decision-making in the athletic budget in your institution? (Yes ___ No ___)

14. Are coaches allowed the opportunity to submit a budget request for their specific sports area? (Yes ___ No ___)

15. Are the following items considered to be a part of the head coaches actual budget? A. travel, b. food and lodging, c. official fees, d. insurance for athletes, e. jobs for athletes (Yes ___ No ___)

16. If no, who is responsible for making the final decisions regarding the budget items mentioned in question 15? (please check)
   A. The college president ( )        D. The athletic committee or council ( )
   B. The athletic director ( )        E. The college finance officer ( )
   C. The physical education director ( ) F. Other __________________
17. To whom does the coach submit his/her budget request? (please check)
   A. The athletic director ( )
   B. The physical education director ( )
   C. The athletic committee or council ( )
   D. Other ________________

18. From whom does the coach receive his/her budget allocation? (please check)
   A. The athletic director ( )
   B. The physical education director ( )
   C. The athletic committee or council ( )
   D. Other ________________

19. Are budget requests submitted by coaches to the administration usually honored within reasonable limits of the initial request? (Yes __ No __)

20. What can a coach do if he/she is not satisfied with the administrative decisions made on his/her budget request? (please check)
   A. Appeal ( )
   B. Compromise ( )
   C. Negotiate ( )
   D. Other ________________

21. To whom may the coach appeal, compromise or negotiate matters concerning his/her budgets? (please check)
   A. The president ( )
   B. The athletic director ( )
   C. The physical education director ( )
   D. Other ________________
   C. The athletic committee or council ( )

22. How are expense items in equipment and supplies determined? (please check)
A. By the coach  (  )
B. By the athletic director  (  )
C. By the athletic committee or council  (  )
D. By the college or systems bid sheet  (  )
E. Other ___________________

23. To whom is the head coach accountable for funds used from his/her budget? (please check)

A. The athletic director  (  )
B. The physical education director  (  )
C. The athletic committee or council  (  )
D. The college finance officer  (  )
E. Other ___________________

24. Are budget allocations spread equitably through your institution's athletic programs? (Yes ___ No ___)

25. Are the women coaches satisfied with their budget allocations when compared with the men's budget? (Yes ___ No ___)

26. Does the women's sports program require less money to run than the men's program? (Yes ___ No ___)
BIBLIOGRAPHY
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


Periodicals

Andrews, J. H. M. "Recent Research in Leadership." Canadian Education and Research Digest, 13 (September, 1958)


Goldhamer, H. and B. A. Shils, "Types of Power and Status," American Journal of Sociology, 45 (1939)


**Unpublished Material**


