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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Background

The role of interuniversity athletic programs within higher education has been and continues to be a subject of interest, study, and debate. Interuniversity athletic programs operating during the twentieth century have undergone considerable change including increased participation and length of seasons and commitment to practice and increased consequences for failure and success. These changes exaggerate the issue of control and governance. Questions such as for whom does the program exist, what goals direct the program, what goals do the various individuals within the athletic program hold, what are the governance structures, and who is controlling athletics, are relevant and timely questions if an accurate, comprehensive understanding of the programs is to be achieved.

Historically, attention to interuniversity athletic programs by university presidents, researchers in the area and faculty in general has been in response to abuse and controversy which has tormented men's athletics in the United States. Over the past two
decades attention to and the examination of men's and women's intercollegiate programs in Canada and the United States has increased. Athletic programs operating in Canada have not been associated with major scandals nor persistent scrutiny; however, recent growth of the programs and changes have raised concerns regarding the control and governance of the programs.

While recognizing the problems associated with broad generalizations it is important to present a general distinction that can be made between programs operating in Canada and those operating in the United States. Interuniversity athletic programs in Canada subscribe to the educational model of athletics (Scott, 1951) in which the primary beneficiary of the program is the student-athlete. Many programs do not have a high profile on campus, in the community or in the nation. Many programs operate with small operating budgets, full-time head coaches are most prevalent in only a few sports in the men's and women's programs and these appointments generally include other teaching or administrative responsibilities. Fewer influences from the environment outside of the athletic program are evident. While many Division III schools in the United States may be similar to universities in Canada there are a number of athletic programs in the United States that follow what has been termed the business or corporate model of athletics (Broyles and Hay, 1979). The objectives of athletic programs subscribing to this model are to
win, to entertain, and to attract students, prestige and money with the prime beneficiaries being the universities and the coaches (Sack, 1982).

Two observations can be made of Canadian athletic programs. First, there is a general decline of available resources for operating athletic programs resulting in a move toward the securing of resources from outside the university. This has resulted in an increase in the commercialization of some aspects of the program. Second, recent task forces, conferences and studies indicate increased attention by Chief Executive Officers and faculty to organize and run well-founded, well-operated athletic programs.

This present research examines selected governance questions. The literature related to organizational theory and behavior offers variables that are useful to the development of a framework for the examination of the governance of interuniversity athletic programs. The areas of goals and structure, of both a formal and informal nature, as well as the identification of key constituents and the activities undertaken by these individuals form a framework in which this study can be placed. It is believed that the research is of interest and value to the constituents within the population under study, and the research questions proposed are applicable to other athletic programs in many parts of North America. In addition the outcomes
of this research will be of value in a broad context in the reporting on a plausible approach to the study of complex human service organizational activity. Too little is known of athletic programs. This study will advance the description and understanding of governance factors.

In the past twenty years, Canadian athletic programs have been the focus of a few studies, conferences and special committees. In Canada there has been an increase in the athletic opportunities provided for student-athletes, performance levels of the athlete have increased, knowledge of coaching has increased and programs continue to seek increased visibility and funding from on and off-campus sources. Regional differences within Canada have been accentuated. Issues such as high performance sport, the offering of student-athlete scholarships and re-alignments to former university competitive arrangements have recently been the focus of attention.

In March of 1986 the Canadian Council of University Physical Education Administrators (CCUPEA) hosted a one-day conference entitled "Interuniversity Athletics: A Canadian Perspective". This conference brought various authoritative levels of University and Government together and facilitated the presentation of ideas on topics such as the roles, structures, and financing of interuniversity athletics and levels of government involvement. The conference generally raised the issues, accentuated the
regional differences within Canada but did not provide any unified direction for the athletic programs.

The province of Ontario hosts two of the six athletic conferences comprising the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU). These two associations, the Ontario University Athletic Association (OUAA) and the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA) govern men's and women's athletic programs respectively and provide and supervise interuniversity competition for Ontario student-athletes. In 1985 a special committee on interuniversity athletics formed by the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) reviewed the athletic programs operating at the seventeen Ontario universities and proposed a number of changes. The recommendations included greater involvement by the Chief Executive Officers, a statement of philosophy including specific principles to be prepared by each institution and approved by the Senate or Board of Governors, an administrative structure operating in support of women's athletics, the formation of a Commission on Interuniversity Athletics with a part-time Executive Secretary and an external auditor of student-athlete eligibility.

While university presidents in Ontario are paying relatively more attention to athletics, as reflected in their support of new structures at the league level; too little is known of the structures operating at the institutional level. The governance of athletic
programs within universities is not known in areas such as: decision-making processes and committee structures, formal goal statements, operative goal activities, perception of individual's influence, and how these governance areas may be related to institutional variables such as the size of the institution and size of the athletic program and the location of the interuniversity athletic program with respect to other academic or non-academic units. This study examines these areas.

Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

The statement of the problem guiding this research can be expressed as: the examination of the governance of interuniversity athletics in Ontario universities. This research can be classified as using a comparative descriptive survey method.

The focus of the study is on describing the governance of the interuniversity athletic programs in the seventeen universities in the province of Ontario, Canada. The description will emphasize the similarities and dissimilarities in the following.

1. What are the formal structures of the athletic programs within each university? This includes structural arrangements of athletics with respect to academic and non-academic units.
2. What are the organizational characteristics of athletic boards/committees operating in Ontario universities?

3. Are there formal mission/goal statements for the athletic programs within each university?

4. Who are the key actors in the governance of athletics (i.e., the critical positions in the overall governance of the athletic programs)?

5. What are the demographic characteristics of the universities?

While the foregoing focuses on the formal/espoused structures and goals of the universities, the operative or actual goals and structures (which may be different from the stated goals and structures) are of concern and are addressed in the following.

6. What are the perceptions key actors have of the operative goals of athletics?

7. What are the perceptions key actors have of their influence in decision-making areas? What degree of influence do external agencies exert?
The proposed research will also investigate the following relationships.

8. What are the relationships between the informal goals and the structures?

9. What are the relationships between selected institutional variables and the informal goals?

Definition of Terms
Athletic board/committee - the campus group with representation from various constituent groups which assumes a formally recognized role in the governance of the interuniversity athletic program.

Athletic board chair - the appointed or elected individual who while serving on the athletic board chairs the activities of the board.
Governance - the general ruling of; to influence the action of.

Influence - the process whereby an individual or group is able to change the behavior of another individual or group (Provan 1980b).

Interuniversity athletics - those sport programs organized and supervised by a recognized legislative body that involve competition between two or more universities. Used synonymously with intercollegiate athletics and athletics.

Regulatory authority - "exerting or exercising a controlling influence over the decision-making process. It does not mean to imply that the athletic board would be the sole or ultimate decision-making body. It is recognized that many of these decisions may be made in concert with or under guidance and recommendation from other individuals or groups..." (Karner 1984, p. 64).

See Appendix A for a summary of acronyms of selected athletic related governing associations.
Assumptions and Limitations of the Study

In this study it was assumed that:

1. Names of university presidents, and athletic administrators, and information regarding the size of athletic programs and universities were as listed in The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-1988. The names were verified by two athletic administrators with several years of experience in the leagues.

2. University presidents, athletic board chairs and athletic administrators were knowledgeable about the nature of intercollegiate athletics in their respective universities and would provide as accurate responses as possible to the questions posed.

This study was limited to:

1. Ontario universities in the OUAA and OWIAA athletic conferences.

2. Information as provided to the investigator by university presidents, athletic board chairs, athletic administrators as well as written documentation provided to the investigator by the universities under study.

3. The scope and the breadth of the surveys.
In summary, this chapter provided background information regarding the governance of interuniversity athletic programs. Rationale for the study and research questions related to the examination of interuniversity athletics in Ontario universities as well as definition of terms, assumptions and limitations were presented.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the involvement of athletic committees and faculty control in the governance of university athletics in the United States and Canada. As well, a framework for the study is reviewed. The headings used in this review include: historical developments in the control of men's and women's athletics in the United States and Canada, studies and inquiries contributing to the understanding of the governance of university athletic programs, faculty involvement in the governance of athletics, university presidential involvement in intercollegiate athletics and a description of how the study of goals, influence and structure can help examine governance issues.

While it was the abuses and controversies occurring in men's athletics that prompted faculty involvement in the late 1800's and early 1900's, women's athletics, strictly governed from the beginning by Physical Education faculty followed a unique pattern of development. Differences between Canada and the United States are also noteworthy. These differing patterns of
development of athletics and associated organizations will aid in the provision of as accurate description as possible of how present day governance of athletics has evolved.

**Historical Developments in the Control of Men's Athletics in the United States**

The governance of athletic programs for men in the United States transferred from students to alumni to faculty and administrators (Hardy and Berryman, 1982). The student governed athletic contests for men in the mid to late 1800's is well documented (Smith, 1983; Hardy and Berryman, 1982; Savage, 1929; Karner, 1984; Scott, 1951). These student controlled athletic programs were vertical in structure with each sport and it's affiliated student leaders assuming responsibilities for sponsorship and competition criteria and the playing rules and eligibility criteria. The shift from student governance to alumni governance as recorded by Hardy and Berryman (1982) occurred in part because of the success of the athletic programs and the increased finances related to the sports. Alumni involvement in the late 1800's diminished the student control as alumni assumed a governance role in return for financial support they were willing to inject into the programs. As the athletic programs continued to grow, various groups of university faculty and administrators working from
within their respective institutions and between various groupings of institutions expressed concern and need for greater institutional involvement to curb the abuses they felt were rampant within athletic programs (Hardy and Berryman, 1982; Smith, 1983). Unlike the governance provided by the students, this new institutional governance was horizontal in structure (Hardy and Berryman, 1982) as university personnel were concerned with introducing reform that would affect all sports.

Princeton and Harvard were two of the earliest institutions to establish faculty committees (Smith, 1983). These early committees were viewed as decreasing the excessive amount of time that faculty members as a whole were spending on athletic matters. Jurisdiction of control for these two universities as reported by Smith (1983) grew from decisions on time and place of competition to rules relating to medicals, examinations, and the banning of professionals and gambling, as well as the appointment of trainers and coaches. The latter areas of responsibility had previously been assumed by the students.

By the 1900’s most campuses had athletic committees comprised of faculty, alumni and student representatives (Smith, 1983). According to the Carnegie Study (Savage et al., 1929) the most popular type of campus athletic board which emerged in the 1900’s to govern men’s athletics had representation from a number of groups including faculty,
alumni, and students who were appointed either by the president of the university or by the Senate of the university. Savage et al., (1929) also describe other committees such as those comprised of faculty members and undergraduates, those such as Yale that believed in student governance and others that had absolute alumni control. Harvard, it was reported emphasized control by faculty but management by students; this led to tension in the governance of athletics (Smith, 1983).

The main athletic related issues that aroused the concern and involvement by faculty as recorded by both Savage et al., (1929) and Lucas and Smith (1978) as cited in Frey (ed, 1982b) include the following: the diminishing amateur status and growing degree of professionalism common to athletics which included the recruitment and payment of athletes as well as the hiring of coaches, the increased financial involvement and often misappropriation of or lack of financial reporting, disorderly conduct of athletes and team personnel on and off the playing fields, the emphasis of athletics over academics as evidenced by the undue proportion of time devoted to training, the onset of gambling associated with athletics, and the publicity given to athletic programs.

While the appearance of campus committees to control athletics became the norm, forms of inter-institutional control were slower in forming (Smith, 1983). The formation of the Big
Ten Conference in 1884 and the Brown Conference in 1898 comprised of seven institutions of the Ivy League, excluding Yale who had winning teams and believed in student control, led the way for other forms of inter-institutional governance that followed (Smith, 1983).

"In general, the Brown Conference Report of 1898 came out strongly in favor of faculty and athletic committee control of truly amateur contests in which the athletes would be bona fide students within a restricted commercial atmosphere." (Smith, 1983, p. 379)

The crisis of the growing number of injuries and deaths related to university football was the catalyst that forced institutions to collectively look at controlling athletics (Hanford, 1979; Smith, 1983). With pressure from the President of the United States, Chancellor MacCracken of New York University invited representatives from the eastern colleges to look at the problems in football. The year was 1905. This meeting of sixty institutions formed the basis of what was to become the National Colleges Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1906 (Smith, 1983).

Since the inception of the NCAA in 1906 a number of studies and reports have investigated problems surrounding men's athletics. Hanford (1979) described the three most prominent inquiries undertaken in the United States during the twentieth
century. The 1929 Carnegie Study was a three year study which examined and described a number of areas related to athletics. The study took a strong position against recruitment and financial assistance given to athletes (Savage et al., 1929). The study indicated that in many instances the existence of faculty control was in name only. Two inquiries under the auspices of the American Council on Education (ACE) have been conducted (Hanford, 1979). The first ACE inquiry in 1951-52 comprised of university presidents was prompted by the basketball scandals of the early 1950's. Like the Savage Report of 1929 the recommendations forthcoming from the presidents were largely ignored (Hanford, 1979). Again in 1977, following a feasibility study that had examined the need for a national study on athletics, a Commission on Collegiate Athletics with funding from the Ford Foundation examined financial, ethical and the clarification of athletics in relation to higher education. The issues plaguing interuniversity sport today suggests the inquiries have not been successful in ridding the athletic programs of the problems which have continued to be evident in American sport.

Statements made by Scott (1951) appear to be as true today as they were three decades ago. While faculty initially ignored athletics, then tolerated them and then attempted to minimize or curb undesirable activities, faculty have not been successful
in introducing reform that will eliminate problems associated with competitive sports (Scott, 1951). Karner (1984) described the reactionary nature of faculty involvement as faculty attempt to bring athletics in line with higher education.

As athletic programs have become more involved in commercial, profit-making activities the influence by groups outside of the university has greatly increased. The capabilities of faculty to exert influence that would restrain undesirable athletic practices diminishes as athletic programming enters a 'big-time' or business model of athletics. Frey (1985a) writes of the minimization of the impact of the educational side of the equation compared to the influence of involvement by external forces from the other side. Frey (1985a) makes the following point regarding involvement of alumni and boosters in athletics.

"Faculties will never be effective in controlling large-scale athletic programs because they do not operate at the same political and economic levels as boosters/alumni." (p. 119)

The emergence of athletic associations with faculty representation in the late 1800's and the inception of the NCAA in 1906 were efforts to control athletics and bring them in line with faculty expectations. Whereas many associations acted in an advisory capacity offering guidelines for institutional adherence, the NCAA is one such association that changed from
an advisory capacity to an enforcing capacity in 1949 (Scott, 1951; Davenport, 1985; and Stern, 1985). Control in this latter sense comes from penalties and the costs associated with the contravention of rules.

Within the NCAA member institutions today the Constitution stipulates:

"(a) Administrative control or faculty control, or a combination of the two, shall constitute institutional control. Administration and/or faculty staff members shall constitute at least a majority of the board in control of intercollegiate athletics or of the athletics advisory board; and if either board has a parliamentary requirement necessitating more than a simple majority to transact some or all of its business, then the administrative and/or faculty members of the board shall be of at least sufficient number to constitute that majority" (NCAA Manual 1985-86 3-2 (a) p. 17).

According to Scott (1951) institutional control implies financial support. His model for athletics is often termed the educational model. Funding for athletic programs following this model he believed should come, as with other campus programs, from the university.
Historical Developments in the Control of Men's Athletics in Canada

The Mathews Report (1974) outlines the purposes and roles of athletic programs in Canada from the late 1800's to the 1970's. The Mathews Report was the culmination of a study undertaken in the early 1970's that was sponsored by the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU) and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (AUCC). The report included an examination of athletic programs in Canadian universities. The role of athletics, structural relationships, the scope of programming and the personnel involved in athletics were key areas of investigation in the study (Mathews, 1974). Following the British model of sport it was common that Canadian universities followed what Mathews (1974) called "the faculty-student-sponsored sports outside the formal structure of education" (p. 5).

Students at Canadian campuses engaged in cricket and track and field during the 1800's. While cricket slowly became less popular, track and field remained a popular sport well into the 1900's (Mathews, 1974). The varieties of football, namely soccer, rugby and football; basketball and ice hockey were all played and often rule changes and competition with schools in the United States promoted the popularity of these sports (Mathews, 1974).
Similar to the development of university sport on American campuses, the introduction of sports and competition on Canadian campuses was "as a result of student initiative and control, rather than institutional sanction or support" (Mathews 1974, p. 23). Roxborough (1966) in Mathews (1974) explains that problems such as unethical practices and excessive recruiting related to athletics resulted in educational authorities demanding appropriate controls be instituted.

The Carnegie Report (Savage et al., 1929) described Canadian athletics from 1886-1900.

"...At the English-speaking Canadian universities, such as Dalhousie, McGill, Queen's and Toronto, and even at the newly opened University of British Columbia (1894), a natural adherence to the English tradition of games and sports, the recollection on the part of members of staff of undergraduate days at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, or some other of the older British universities, and, apparently, a predilection for scholarship on the part of undergraduates, all served to keep athletics in a position different from that which they were coming to occupy in the United States." (Savage et al., 1929, p. 25)

Smith (1983) referred to this British sport model as portrayed through upper class schools of Oxford and Cambridge "where a gentlemanly game of enjoyable competition transcended victory-at-all-costs" (p. 378). The Carnegie Study (Savage et al., 1929) reported that none of the eight Canadian
universities included in the study provided any type of assistance to the athletes. In the early 1900's the study noted, Canada had a tradition of "playing games for games sake".

Athletic committees with university personnel and student representation were established to control the athletic activities (Mathews, 1974). Inter-institutional associations also emerged. The Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union Central was formed in 1906, the Maritime Intercollegiate Athletic Union was formed in 1910 and the Western Canada Intercollegiate Athletic Union was formed in 1920. Savage et al., (1929) noted the association CIAU Central had with the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada. On at least two occasions Canadian National associations recommended the formation of athletic committees to play a role in the governance of university programs. In 1923 the athletics committee of the National Conference of Canadian Universities recommended:

"... that the athletic policy be a university policy and that the ultimate control of athletics be in the hands of the faculty, said control to be exercised chiefly in the way of cooperation, advice, and, suggestion." (Mathews 1974, p. 24)

In 1966 the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, standing committee for Physical Education and Athletics recommended:
"... the athletic program should be directed by a director of athletics. An advisory committee with both faculty and student representation should advise on policy; " (Mathews 1974, p. 25).

The number of institutions reporting athletic committees in the Mathews Report were thirty nine out of forty four (eighty seven percent). Although the study included other colleges in addition to the forty four present-day universities in the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) from their total sample thirty two of fifty four (fifty nine percent) of responding institutions indicated the athletic committee was advisory in nature while twenty two of fifty four (forty one percent) of the institutions indicated the athletic committee acted in a policy-making capacity. The representation on the athletic committees was varied and included faculty from within the physical education and athletic departments as well as from other academic departments, university administrators and student representation from teams, physical education and students-at-large. Only in a few institutions were the board of governors, alumni and general public represented (Mathews, 1974). Support by thirty five of forty three (eighty one percent) of the university presidents was given to the principle that athletic programs should be governed by a policy-making committee and that such a committee be similar in membership to other
institutional policy-making boards. According to the Mathews Report, implementation of such a principle would necessitate major re-structuring of the athletic committees as they were found in 1972-73. A recommendation to this effect was not put forward by the Report (Mathews, 1974).

Historical Developments in the Control of Women's Athletics in the United States

Excerpts from Inglis (1988) provides a description of the philosophical and organizational changes in women's university sport.

"In the United States the predominant forms of early women's university sport were playdays and sportdays (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; Gerber, 1975). During these sport experiences, teams would arrive by bus at a campus; playdays involved teams chosen at random, resulting in women from various universities on each team. During sportdays the teams from each university remained intact and generally played round-robin formats of competition. It was not uncommon for women to play different sports during these days. Gerber (1975) notes the conscious decisions made during the 1920s by women as well as men to curtail competition for women. A national philosophy of "a sport for every girl and a girl for every sport" and the relationship between physical education and athletics were strengthened by the fact that the same women who were responsible for teacher preparation were also responsible for general physical education class instruction and extracurricular activities."
From Gerber (1975) and Acosta and Carpenter (1985) we gain an appreciation of the tight rein women physical educators held on the development and guidance of women's programs. Women were able to guide the programs in the directions desired through various organizations that were established by women for women's sport. The associations were prominent forces until significant changes occurred in the 1970s and 1980s.

In the United States the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER) played a significant role in the formation of specific organizations for women's sport. The organizations that were the forerunners to the Division of Girls' and Women's in Sport (DGWS) of the 1950s are outlined by Acosta and Carpenter (1985). These associations included the Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA), which was part of AAHPER, the National Association for Physical Education for College Women (NAPECW), and the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF). It was not until the 1950s that the DGWS of AAHPER expressed support for women's involvement in competitive sport, including greater involvement in Olympic activities. In 1966 the Commission of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) was formed, and it was this association that preceded the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). Generally, these associations were comprised of women physical educators, promoted women's participation and attempted to "protect women and girls from the negative connotations of sport activities" (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985, p. 314).

In the United States the formation of the AIAW, Title IX of the Education Amendment, and the provision of women's national championships by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) were signposts of philosophical, administrative and organizational change. The AIAW was formed in 1971 (Uhlir, 1982) under the aegis of AAHPER, by women in physical education who were able to design a governance model that reflected their philosophy. The
philosophy of the early 1970s was an outgrowth of the 1920s and 1930s which emphasized educational values and enhancement of the individual's potential in sport regardless of commercial appeal. The passage of Title IX of the Education Amendment in 1972 without question has resulted in profound philosophical, organizational and administrative changes in women's sport. Title IX legislation, which was an attempt to alter discrimination based on sex, has in many ways been responsible for the drastic change in the complexion of women's sport. As a result of Title IX, women's programs began operating with larger budgets at both the institutional and the association level. "By 1980-81 AIAW offered a program of 39 national championships in 17 different sports to more than 6,000 women's teams in 960 member colleges and universities" (Uhlir, 1982, p. 173). In the same year, however, women held only 75% of the voting positions in the AIAW. Uhlir also reported a decrease in involvement by women in the coaching of women's sport. "Title IX has had far-reaching negative effects on design, autonomy, and governance structures of women's intercollegiate athletics" (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985 p. 318).

A number of writers have described AIAW and NCAA differences (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; Grant, 1984; Hult, 1980; Lopiano, 1984; Santomier, 1979). Hult (1980) noted that both the NCAA and the AIAW recognized the significance of Title IX but from different perspectives. Hult's article provides a very thorough description of the philosophical conflicts between the AIAW and the NCAA. Although both the AIAW and NCAA shared common beliefs, the ways in which the associations and respective programs have evolved have resulted in basic philosophical commitments. In 1980 the NCAA decided to establish 10 women's championships. With the NCAA involved in women's athletics, alternative governing structures for women's athletics that the AIAW were striving for were abandoned. The emergence of the NCAA in women's athletics resulted in losses in AIAW membership, financial
resources, organizational stability, and ultimately a 4-year court battle and the eventual death of the AIAW (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985).

It would appear that, without the AIAW, there now exists but one direction to and major influence on intercollegiate sport. Past beliefs held by the AIAW such as not offering scholarships and restricting recruitment are now ideals of the past. In 1987, the existence of NCAA championship packages, rules, and regulations, as well as associations such as the Big Ten, make it difficult to believe that only 15 years ago the programs for women were largely coached and administered by women according to a dramatically different philosophy. In his insightful description of distinctions between the AIAW and the NCAA, Santomier (1979) describes the increased rationalization and bureaucratization of women's sport as resulting from both a loss of position and control and a functioning of women's sport according to values and goals of men's sport. The result, Santomier believes, is a monolithic administrative totality that does more to usurp women's sport than legitimize it."

(Inglis, 1988, pp. 15-17)

**Historical Developments in the Control of Women's Athletics in Canada**

"In Canada the 1920s and 1930s were prosperous times for women in sport (Hall and Richardson, 1982). Activities and prominence ranged from speedskating to basketball and a strong domination in track and field at the 1928 Olympics in Amsterdam. Spectators were common, as were an abundant number of women journalists. One can speculate how differently sport for university women may have developed in Canada if the women physical educators had not ventured to the United States to further their education. Canadian physical educators soon endorsed the views held by the American women physical educators. Playdays and sportdays were a common form of intercollegiate sport and continued to be so into the 1960s.
National Associations guiding the development of girls' and women's sport in Canada have been described by Keyes (1980). Such groups included the Women's Athletic Committee (WAC), which according to Keyes played a significant role, the University Women's Physical Education Committee (UWPEC) and the Canadian Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CWIAU). At the regional level, conferences emerged that governed men's and women's sports: for example, the Quebec University Athletic Association (QUAA) and the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC). In addition, regional associations that governed women's sport were formed, namely the Atlantic Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Association (AWIAA) and the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA). In the early 1970s the AWIAA merged with the Atlantic Interuniversity Athletic Association (AIAA) to form the Atlantic University Athletic Association (AUAA, Mathews, 1974). At the regional level the OWIAA, formed in 1971 as an outgrowth of two previous women's associations, remains the only association in Canada (and perhaps North America) whose sole purpose is the governance of women's sport. Major organizations in Canada influencing women's sport include the WAC (1940-1973) and the CWIAU, which was formed in 1969.

Canada did not experience any legislation comparable to Title IX (Hall, 1984). In Canada, institutions receive provincial not federal funds. There are aspects of Canadian sport that are quite different from those in the United States. Hall and Richardson (1982) describe these differences as including the following: In Canada, high degrees of commercialism and professionalism do not exist, careers in professional sport are not as common, there are some athletic scholarships but more regulations, and the emphasis on sport in elementary and secondary schools is not as great. In 1977 the CWIAU amalgamated with the men's Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU). The circumstances surrounding the mergers (or submergers, to borrow Hoferek's (1980) terminology) of
the CWIAU to the CIAU in Canada and the AIAW to the NCAA in the United States appear to be quite different. A full description of both situations is beyond the scope of this paper; however, although both mergers have resulted in some growth in women's sports, there have been many situations of lost autonomy and governing influence for women in women's intercollegiate athletics. In the United States and Canada the decline of the opportunities and the involvement of women in many aspects of athletics have become the focus of both scholars and athletic administrators (Inglis, 1988, pp. 17-18).

Studies and Inquiries Contributing to the Understanding of the Governance of University Athletic Programs

In addition to the studies and inquiries undertaken in the United States and Canada as already mentioned in this chapter additional studies contribute to the understanding of control of university athletic programs. These studies, including two dissertations completed in the United States, a study by Campbell and Slack (1982) and a recent commission examining Ontario athletics in Canada will be reviewed.

Smith's (1973) dissertation surveyed National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic Colleges and Universities (NAIA) in the United States. The various groups surveyed within the NAIA supported faculty athletic committees for each institution, with representatives from athletic administration, faculty from within physical education as well as other departments and students. Smith (1973) documents the support provided for the
establishment of athletic committee/boards by various associations in the United States. According to Smith, at the time of his writing in the early 1970's the NAIA, NCAA and NADA indicated support for faculty athletic committees. Other findings common to all groups surveyed included the athletic director assuming a position on the athletic committee for an indefinite length of time, the purposes and functions of the committee should be in writing, the committee serving in an advisory capacity with respect to the addition and deletion of sports and programs related to conference affiliation as well as others. As area of indecision for both committee chairpersons and the faculty athletic representatives was the decision of whether or not the athletic director should be directly responsible to the president of the university (Smith, 1973).

Karner's (1984) doctoral dissertation surveyed a sample of NCAA institutions. The athletic director and chairperson of the athletic committee responded to an instrument which was designed to measure "actual" and "ideal" practices relating to the control of athletic programs. Karner chose not to survey University presidents as he felt they were too removed from the program. Two main and applicable conclusions reached by Karner include:
"1. Both the athletic directors and chairpersons perceive there to be little regulatory authority by athletic committees over intercollegiate athletics. Chairpersons perceive there to be more regulatory authority than do the athletic directors.

2. Both the athletic directors and the chairpersons agree that the amount of regulatory authority by athletic committees should be increased. Chairpersons responded in favor of a higher level of regulatory authority than did athletic directors."

(Karner, 1984, pp. 197-198)

Karner (1984) included a number of recommendations for the structure and function of athletic committees. The recommendations were a compilation of prescriptive practices gleaned from the study as well as from his experience and professional biases with athletic committees. A summary of his recommendations for practice are as follows.

1. Committee size to be between 8-10 members.
2. Faculty members should comprise the largest voting groups on the committee.
3. Committee members should be selected or appointed to the board by the groups they represent.
4. Athletic administrators should be on the committee but should not be voting members.
5. Individuals' tenure on the committee including chairpersons should be for terms of three years and appointments should be staggered to allow for continuity.
6. Meetings should be called regularly.
7. Clear, and formally defined roles for athletic committees need to exist.

8. Committee's should assume policy-making rather than strictly advisory roles. Policy-making by the committee will permit the athletic administrator to assume responsibility for the administration of the program.

(Karner, 1984, pp. 198-201)

Two additional and related areas from Karner's work include one, his recommendation that the chief executive officer of each institution as well as other groups such as faculty and alumni be surveyed in future studies. Second, the various approaches used in the study of control do have a relationship with structures. "The structural variations among our institutions of high learning are factors that must be taken into account whenever the issue of the control of intercollegiate athletics presents itself" (Karner, 1983, p. 48).

Campbell and Slack in their 1982 study examined trends in Canadian interuniversity athletic programs relative to structure, funding and staffing. While the response rate of 57% of the universities in the sample was not encouraging, and limits the completeness of the study, the results for the responding institutions did provide some insight to the trends. Campbell and Slack reported a trend toward independence of structural relations of athletics to academic units, operating budgets were provided mainly by the university but with a noticeable decline
in funding compared to costs, and a decrease in the number of coaches with academic status. These trends, the authors suggest, reflect the shift of athletics away from the educational model of athletics as was supported by Mathews (1974).

A Special Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics of the Council of Ontario Universities (COU) was struck in December 1984 to examine institutional philosophy, structure, eligibility, and admission guidelines, breadth and quality of programming and financial aspects of men's and women's athletic programs in the province of Ontario, Canada. The committee was formed in response to a proposal by three universities in Ontario and one Quebec university who had given notice to the CIAU regarding their intentions to form a new athletic league. The proposed league was of concern to executive heads and athletic administrators in Ontario. The report of the commission is often referred to as the Rickerd Report (1985) and it includes both indirect and direct descriptions and recommendations regarding the issue of governance and control.

Ontario is the largest representative group in the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU) with seventeen member institutions of the forty four comprising the CIAU. Lakehead University, who has membership in the Great Plains Athletic Conference (GPAC) as well as in Ontario, was included in the COU study of seventeen institutions. The Ontario University
Athletic Association (OUAA) and the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA) leagues in Ontario are two of the six university athletic conferences in Canada.

The Rickerd Report put forward a number of recommendations to the executive heads of the Ontario Universities and their consequent endorsement and implementation are noteworthy as they demonstrate the desire on the part of Ontario Universities for greater institutional and academic control of athletics.

At the institutional level the report recommended the need for involved, informed executive heads with strong support for the principle of housing athletics under academic authorities. It was recommended that the group responsible for interuniversity athletics, whether a Senate Committee, Presidential advisory committee or some other campus group prepare an annual report to Senate. The commission recognized the under-representation of women as participants, coaches and administrators and stressed the formal commitment be made by each institution to the equality of opportunity. It was further stressed that the structure on each campus must function in support of women's as well as men's athletics.

At the league level the report recommended representation from both executive heads and faculty sit on the proposed COU commission. This commission with a part-time executive
secretary and auditor of eligibility reflect the commitment of Ontario to institutional control of athletics.
Faculty Involvement in the Governance of Athletics

Throughout the years a number of writers have presented arguments for and against the involvement of faculty in the governance of athletics. While it is generally agreed that athletic programs are part of the university and should be under the purview of institutional governance, prevailing characteristics of athletic programs often set it visibly apart from any other university offering, thus at times bringing into question the effectiveness of faculty involvement. Who controls athletics? and who should control athletics? are two questions frequently raised by various campus and community groups including faculty. From the historical accounts it appears that faculty involvement becomes an issue and increased faculty attention to athletics occurs when the credibility of the athletic program and in turn the credibility of the university is in jeopardy.

Smith, (1973) presented the literature related to support of athletic committees with faculty representation as well as the literature which expressed opposition to faculty athletic committees. The primary reason in favor of faculty involvement appears to be the desire, by faculty, to have the athletic program operate in accordance with the overall educational mission of the institution. Marco's (1960) assertion is representative of the supporters of faculty involvement in athletic governance. He
writes that faculty along with campus administrators and athletic directors have a responsibility for athletics when the "...concept of intercollegiate athletics as a proper part of the general educational scheme, and the importance of the intellectual, physical, moral and spiritual welfare of the participants, make this a responsibility of academic faculties" (p. 424). The supporters of faculty involvement project the perception that lack of faculty representation could result in the athletic program operating in ways detrimental to the academic integrity of the institution.

The dissenters to faculty involvement, as reviewed by Smith (1973) cite a number of reasons including faculty members' lack of time and information, faculty like any other representative group may not be truly representative, previous incidences of ineffective faculty involvement in athletics as well as those who believe in the principle that athletics should operate like any other university unit and thus should not have additional structures of governance and reporting.

While more recent literary contributions continue to acknowledge the issue of faculty involvement the focus of writings seem to offer support for faculty representation as well as the role faculty may serve in the re-gaining of institutional control of athletics. Writers such as Grant (1979) and Frey (1982a, 1985a) recognize the relationship between the
ambition level of a university's athletic program and the consequent dependence of that athletic program on external groups which results in the relinquishing of academic control. Grant (1979) notes the role of the media and spectators in intensifying the universities involvement in marketing and commercial activities. Frey (1982a, p.228) is explicit; the greater the ambitions of a university for winning and big-time athletic programming, the less feasible the ideal of academic control will be.

Observing the transfer of institutional control of athletics to other groups, Grant (1979) identified boards of control with faculty involvement as a safeguard of athletics within the educational domain. While it is clear that Grant does not believe boards have been effective in protecting the institutional assets, support is given to institutions through involvement of chief executive officers, as well as measures to stabilize budgets and guarantee the welfare of the student-athlete in regaining a position whereby the institution does become a major shareholder in athletics.

Control of athletic operations by faculty has been espoused over the years (Savage et al., 1929; Plant, 1961; Sack, 1982; Frey 1985a). Athletic programs following the educational model of athletics (Scott, 1951) with governance structures for athletics including faculty, administrators and students many be
according to Sack (1982) quite effective as long as a high priority is given to ensuring the educational needs of the student are met and that athletic competition with 'like philosophy' schools is maintained.

Plant (1961) felt that faculty as a whole were in control of athletics when the faculty controlled admission standards, set the academic standards for eligibility to compete in athletics and when faculty had full control over the grading of students in their academic work.

Miller (1982) suggests that shared governance by athletic directors, a faculty athletic representative (who could assume chair responsibilities) and an academic counsellor (other that the athletic director) enhances intercollegiate sport.

Control of athletic operations by faculty as suggested by Frey (1985a), is attainable when faculty assert "... themselves in such areas as admission standards, academic counselling and eligibility reviews " (p. 120).

The suggestions for the composition of athletic boards with regards to who should hold membership varies within the literature on athletic governance. Varying numbers of representatives from groups including students-at-large, students in physical education, student-athletes, faculty and staff-at-large, faculty and staff from physical education, coaches, athletic administrators, senior university
administrators and alumni are many of the groups suggested by a sampling of the writers (Savage et al., 1929; Scott, 1951; Marco, 1960; Plant, 1961; Smith, 1973; Mathews, 1974; Miller, 1982; Karner, 1984).

The roles that athletic boards can assume are wide ranging. While Frey (1982a) notes the role by faculties in the governance of athletics has been a reactive role of calling for change and investigations, others suggest more specific roles for board activities. Davis (1979, p. 428) suggested boards could help by trying to find financial support for athletics, this he argued would reduce the pressure on winning as an economic necessity. Further, he felt boards had a role to play in the provision of multi-year contracts and security for coaches as well as the establishment of reasonable standards for performance evaluation. Grant (1979) feels boards of control safeguard the educational goals of the university, and Boyer (1985) suggests "...governing boards have an absolutely critical role to play in stopping the corruption of big-time sports" (p. 409). Miller (1982) suggests the role as being one of setting the guidelines for the athletic administrators to follow. Areas for board involvement have been suggested to include the development of program philosophy, determination of breadth of program offerings, rules regarding academic performance such as eligibility and financial aid, budget, staff appointments,
fundraising, ensuring equality of opportunity for men and women, and the monitoring of athletic programs (Scott, 1951; Frederick, 1983; Karner, 1984; Rickerd, 1985).

The growth of athletic programs and the lack of financial resources brings two distinct groups into focus in athletic control. Faculty become involved to keep the program within acceptable university guidelines and sponsors and other individuals and groups outside the university become prominent as they represent potential sources of income. Faculty control is diminished as outside groups become more involved. Frey (1985a) offers a likely outcome of the dual forces. Coalitions formed between athletic directors, alumni and boosters will be more prominent than other represented groups such as faculty, students and university presidents in the tapping of political and economic resources which may ultimately determine the survival of athletic programs.

Whether athletic boards should be advisory (Scott, 1951) or policy-making (Mathews, 1974; Miller, 1982; Karner, 1984) in nature is still a relevant question when determining the amount of control held by a board. The former implies recommendations or advice would be forthcoming from the board to some other individual or group on campus that may or may not endorse the advice. Policy-making boards, on the other hand, imply that the governing board would hold the right to establish policy. These
policies in turn would be conveyed to the appropriate campus groups for the implementation of the policy. Scott (1951) believed very strongly that athletic committees should be advisory in nature. Miller (1982) on the other hand stressed that athletic committees must have the power to establish policy. Others (Karner, 1984; Mathews, 1974) would support Miller.

Given the complexity of varying governance structures and the difficulties in accurately distinguishing advisory from policy-making activities, Karner (1984), used the terminology regulatory authority. Karner defined regulatory authority as "exerting or exercising a controlling influence over the decision-making process. It does not mean to imply that the athletic board would be the sole or ultimate decision-making body. It is recognized that many of these decisions may be made in concert with or under guidance and recommendation from other individuals or groups . . . " (p. 64). The degree of regulatory authority held by a board would reflect the amount of policy-making authority as well as control in the decision-making process. Little regulatory authority would infer a more advisory role rather than a policy-making role. For the present study, regulatory authority was deemed an appropriate term to use.
University Presidential Involvement in Intercollegiate Athletics

One of the research questions guiding this study is the examination of university presidential involvement in intercollegiate athletics. Involvement in this instance was broadly defined and explored the formal reporting structures in place on campuses and with governing associations as well as the attitudes and perceptions held by the chief executive officer regarding intercollegiate athletics.

University presidential involvement in athletics in the late 1800's and early 1900's was an attempt to curb the ills plaguing men's university sport. In the struggle for control of men's athletic programs in the United States the university president was often the character caught between the outcry of his faculty for complete institutional control and the ever-strong pressures by alumni and students for higher profile athletic programs. The resultant visibility and prestige accorded the institution from successful programs served to accent the potential value of athletic programs (Hardy and Berryman, 1982).

The Savage Report of 1929 identified the university president as the one responsible (along with faculty) to uproot the evils of athletics and "... bring athletics into a sincere relation to the intellectual life of the college" (p. 21). University presidents, according to Savage et al., (1929) should
be the coordinators of general policy. Three years later in 1931, Bulletin #26 of The Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement Of Teaching (Savage et al., 1931) reported the information that had been gathered from the president of each institution. While some presidents, including two of the Dominion of Canada schools namely the University of Toronto and the University of Saskatchewan, reported no change in athletics since the 1929 report. Savage et al., (1931) indicated that over the past two to three years their had been a "quickening of interest" in athletics by presidents. Presidents seemed to be supportive of the ideal of university ownership of the administration of college sport.

University presidents were aware of the positive impact a successful athletic program (and in particular football) could have in the promotion of the university. Prestige, revenue and increased student enrolments were possible when athletic teams were winning (Frey, 1985a; Chu, 1985a). Some presidents, such as Hannah at Michigan State College and Byrd at the University of Maryland were very supportive of football while Hutchins of Chicago was successful in eliminating football from the campus (Nelson, 1982). Hutchins denounced the "service station" university approach whereby the university offered programs to suit the community's interests (Chu, 1985b).
The areas in which the presidents can be involved to cope more successfully with athletics were identified by Scott in 1956 and reprinted in Frey (1982b). These areas seem as relevant in the 1980's as they did at the original time of writing. The president and board of trustees, Scott maintained, are ultimately responsible for policy-making. The president can determine the role athletics plays within the philosophy and objectives of the institution, ensure issues are identified and understood, establish institutional control channels, appoint professionally qualified physical educators (including athletic administrators) with faculty status, evaluate these professionals according to educational rather than commercial criteria, seek financing for the athletic program from the same sources as other university programs, and ensure all students are held accountable to the same entrance, eligibility and academic standards (Scott, 1982).

Handford (1982) believed the ACE inquiry of 1974, like the recommendations of Savage et al., (1929) revealed that university sport was "suffering from presidential inattention" (p. 45). The way for presidents to get more involved in athletics, Hanford believes, is not to try to run them through NCAA but to ensure that policy regarding athletics is in place on campus from which athletic directors can work. Hanford, like Nyquist (1985)
felt that university sport could be part of the institutional accreditation review. Hanford also recommended that financial aid be re-located to the financial aid office of the university, and that the separation of football from the other sports may be advantageous. Frey (1985b) like Hanford, agreed that direct presidential involvement in the NCAA would not be the answer to improved athletic governance. Frey, however, believes it will be court actions not NCAA legislation or presidential involvement that will bring about change in athletics.

Involvement by university presidents in the NCAA is advocated by some writers (Tow, 1985; Nyquist, 1985; and Atwell, 1985). Atwell (1985) noted the increased attendance by university presidents to the NCAA conventions as well as president initiated motions on critical legislation in his support for presidential involvement in athletics. Institutional control in the NCAA is described by Tow (1985) as coming directly or indirectly from the president through a board, athletic administrator or faculty representative. The president is also responsible, he points out, for the declaration of the institution's voting delegates (Tow, 1985). Nyquist (1985) feels that a change in the structure of the NCAA that would give the presidents a greater role would be beneficial.
Recent activities by an ad hoc group of university presidents operating under the auspices of the American Council on Education (ACE) has been effective according to Bok (1985) in stiffening academic standards. Proposition #35, put forward to the NCAA called for a board of presidents, elected by presidents, that would control policy relating to academic standards. The NCAA's counter proposal #36 was approved. Proposal #36 gave the presidents an advisory capacity with diminished authority from what proposition #35 had intended (Bok, 1985).

Miller (1982) sees the relationship of the president and athletics in the following way.

"A president will normally charge a faculty-controlled committee to give scope and direction to a given athletic program, and this group will generally set policy. . . The most meaningful relationship is to have the president become reasonably knowledgeable about intercollegiate sport but give the AD the responsibility and the authority to operate the program in accord with well established guidelines and policies" (pp. 92,93).

Further, Miller emphasizes that in a Division I program the athletic director needs direct access to the president and therefore could be given vice-presidential status while Division II and III programs the structure could include the athletic director reporting through another individual to the president.
According to Massengale and Merriman (1985), institutions desiring greater presidential involvement should have the athletic director in a direct reporting structural relationship with the institution's president. They further recommend that given this direct relationship between the athletic director and the president, the athletic department should be completely independent of any other academic department.

The reasons given for greater presidential involvement and the roles presidents could assume in athletic governance vary. Generally though, it can be stated and supported that the majority of individuals writing on presidential involvement consider the involvement as beneficial to the effective governance of athletics in higher education.

Davis (1979) like many others, insists that governing boards and presidents must be concerned with the conduct of athletic programs. The lines of authority in athletics are often not as clear as with other campus areas and interference with decision-making occurs with the involvement of groups such as students, alumni, booster and media, but, the president is and must be in control.

"In athletics, as in other sectors of the university, someone has to be in charge - that someone is the president. He must have the backing of his governing board in athletics as well as in other university operations, and
he must have the responsibility and the power to act" (Davis, p. 426).

Grant (1979) believes change needs to be addressed by university presidents and senior administrators at institutional and national levels. Grant does however consider presidents and athletic personnel as captives of the system. It is, Grant believes difficult for university presidents to acknowledge the problems in athletics due to the public attitude and revenue held for athletics by alumni, community members and politicians.

The role of the university president in raising ethical standards in athletic programming is advocated by Santomier and Cantilli (1985). Stressing the reinforcement of ethical values in all levels of intercollegiate operation they outline a number of strategies including the key role of the president and the responsibility of all associated with athletics from athletes, to athletic personnel, alumni, and media to engage in open dialogue, discussions and workshops on ethical and moral considerations in athletics. Evaluation of the athletic program in terms of ethics should also be completed.

The most recent nation-wide examination of Canadian Interuniversity Athletics was a conference held in March, 1986 sponsored by the Canadian Council of University Physical Education Administrators. The published proceedings The Role of
Interuniversity Athletics: A Canadian Perspective edited by A.W. Taylor (1986) reflect a variety of issues and suggested reform as presented by university presidents, faculty and staff, students and sport governing body association representatives. Contributions referring to presidential involvement were supportive of the university president gaining a greater awareness and understanding of athletic programs and related issues (MacIntosh, 1986; McKinnon, 1986; Chard, 1986; Pomfret, 1986). Suggestions for involvement by university presidents ranged from the selection of CIAU representatives and a role of observer at CIAU meetings (Dewar, 1986), to actions from the president's office for the establishment of the university position on athletic philosophy, policy, integrity and funding (Pomfret, 1986). In general the writers favored increased university president involvement and felt it would aid in the advancement of the positive role athletics can play in higher education.

Four studies related to presidential involvement in athletics are worthy of inclusion in this section. A study conducted on presidents as reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education January 15, 1986 indicated the president's ranking of sports as fourth in issues. Finance, internal governance, and external governance issues were ranked higher than sports.
The **Rickerd Report** (1985) referred to in the previous section, recommended chief executive officers assume a stronger leadership role in athletics. Presidents need to be involved and informed and need to ensure the institution's policy on athletics be firmly established and communicated. It was further recommended that the campus governing body responsible for athletics present a formal report annually to the Senate of the university. The report should be comprehensive enough to assess how the institution is applying the policies and regulations. University presidents in Ontario, Canada now assume positions on the newly created COU (Council of Ontario Universities) Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics.

Mason's (1969) dissertation was an examination of a sample of college and university presidents and their perceptions held in a number of categories relating to intercollegiate athletics.

"The perceptions of the college and university presidents are important as their responses should serve to synthesize contemporary thought and in turn provide criteria which will enable educators to plan more effective programs for the future" (p. 10).

Using a 47-item questionnaire with a Yes - No response format, presidents responded to categories of administration and control of the intercollegiate athletic program, athletic staff members,
responsibility and qualifications, financial considerations, intercollegiate competition for women, outside agencies, and publicity and public relations (Mason, 1969, p. 12). Conclusions reached in his study included the agreement between the presidents of private and public schools of the role athletics plays in higher education. Respondents indicated agreement with the idea of athletic budgets being controlled as with other university programs, faculty members establishing athletic policy and board members selected by the faculty, as well as other items. Mason concluded that given the number of responses and the evident time given to the completion of the instrument that presidents were concerned with athletics and its role in higher education. One of Mason's recommendations was that future study compare the present state of athletics to what ought to be.

Felder's (1982) dissertation was a description of the perceptions held by a sample of community college presidents and athletic directors in the United States regarding the role of the athletic director. Felder argued that an understanding of the perceptions held by these two groups could lead to an increase in role clarity and decrease conflict that may occur between presidents and athletic administrators as well as between other staff. In the five areas of questioning including, athletic
director's responsibilities in administrative, public, business management and evaluation as well as athletic-director-athlete relationships, there were no significant differences reported (chi square at .05 level of significance) between athletic directors' and presidents' perceptions.

From this section it is apparent that greater involvement by university presidents in the governance of athletics for effective change is desired and deemed imperative by many writers.
The Framework - Goals, Influence and Structure

The three organizational variables of goals, influence and structure form the framework for this study. The formally articulated goals, opinions held regarding goals by administrators, the influence exerted by various individuals and groups and the prescribed and merging structural arrangements form a framework which allows for an examination and understanding of athletic programs. Valuable direction for the study of goals and power and structural arrangements in organizations is provided by a number of writers (Perrow, 1961; Mintzberg, 1983; and Hasenfeld, 1983).

Goals

Tracing the recent shift in management theory from a focus on goals to a focus on power Mintzberg (1983, p. 7) is persistent that in-depth study of organizational actions i.e. the translation of goals to action and the examination of how individuals influence organizational decisions and outcomes is necessary to gain accurate insights of the dynamic equilibrium relationship between goals and power. Completion of survey instruments, while providing responses from identified individuals is not sufficient. Mintzberg urges for the
examination beyond the goal statements to the examination of intentions and activities.

Goals are "... the intentions behind decisions or actions " Mintzberg (1983, p. 5). Two important aspects of Mintzberg's conceptualization of goals are that of intendedness and consistency. Intendedness of action and the consistency of that action are relevant in goal formulation as well as in the assessment of the fulfillment of behaviors and actions which reflect the goals. Hasenfeld (1983) describes human service organizations as those organizations "... whose principle function is to protect, maintain, or enhance the personal well-being of individuals by defining, shaping, or altering their personal attributes..." (p. 1). Goals within human service organizations "... serve as guides for the formulation of programs and services" (p. 99). The link between goals and formal structures is described by Hasenfeld (1983). "The goals become criteria by which an organization is evaluated, and thus they pose additional constraints on the ability of different units in the organization to structure its service delivery patterns. In general, each unit will have to structure its service delivery patterns in order to score well on the evaluative criteria used by the monitoring and legitimating groups" (pp. 99-100).
A number of writers have distinguished goals from mission statements and objectives (e.g., Perrow, 1961; Mintzberg, 1983; and Chelladurai et al., 1984). Mintzberg considers the measurement of action as the distinguishing factor between mission statements, goals, operational goals and objectives. In a hierarchical fashion from general to specific, mission statements are viewed as an expression of the organization's basic function in terms of products or services in society (Mintzberg, 1983, p. 6). For example the mission of a university can be stated as the education of individuals. Operational goals lend themselves to measurement, for example, to increase the number of sport programs for university students. Objectives are further defined and as Mintzberg suggests objectives are "... a goal expressed in a form by which its attainment can be measured" (p. 6). An objective of the operational goal of increased sport programs becomes further defined by the objective statement 'to increase the number of sport programs offered to female university students in 1990-91 by 25% over the previous year'.

Recent research by Chelladurai et al. (1984) uses similar distinctions between goals and operative goals in their development of the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP) which consists of nine operative goals associated with university
athletic programs. The distinction between operative and official goals (Perrow, 1961) was used in the development of the criterion statements referring to activities that reflect the "real" goals pursued by an organization. These "real" goals are conceptually distinguished from the "official", general, more formally proclaimed goals that appear in the official documentation of the organization.

Content validity of the Scale of Athletic Priorities was established through the use of a panel of experts in the development of the scale items and through a literature review. This panel of experts included university administrators and faculty who examined the proposed criterion statements for clarity and cogency, and the conceptual distinctiveness of the operative goals in athletics. The experts were asked to propose additional criterion statements. The internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha) has been reported as ranging from .75 to .89 (M = .82) for administrators and for students from a range of .66 to .89 (M = .78) (Chelladurai et al., 1984). The internal consistency reported by Chelladurai and Danylchuk (1984) ranged from .75 to .89 (M = .82) for administrators, and Inglis and Chelladurai (1984) reported a range from .68 to .82 (M = .77) for a student sample.
The test-retest reliability coefficients of the objective scores ranged from .62 for the objective Public Relations to .83 for the objective Athlete's Personal Growth. The average reliability coefficient for the nine objectives was .73 (Chelladurai et al., 1984).

The question of ownership of goals is addressed by Mintzberg (1983). Organizations as well as individuals and groups within the organization and within the environment of the organization possess goals that impinge and influence the operation of the organization. Daft (1983) identifies the top managers of an organization as the appropriate individuals to report the real goals of the organization. In organizations where goals may not be measured quantitatively (i.e. profit); the top managers' values form the goals and actions pursued by the organization.

In this study the official goal statements of the athletic programs were examined as well as the importance given to various operative goals (called objectives) as measured by SAP were determined.

Influence

The degree of influence an individual perceives themself to have in various aspects of their work reflects the amount of
power and control they have over the various activities. The question of Who is controlling athletics? is in part answered through the examination of perceptions of influence in activities.

Mintzberg (1983) uses the words power and influence interchangeably. Power is "... the capacity to effect (or affect) organizational outcomes" (p. 4). How various goals and values are translated into organizational decisions and actions is the operationalization of power. Mintzberg's (1983) work embodies Raven's power bases (1959) and includes the following. How an individual influences organizational behavior is dependent upon the will and the skill of the influencer as well as five power bases. Three bases include the acquisition or possession of resources, technical skill, and information that is needed by the organization. Dependencies, whereby one part of the organization relies on another for resources, skill or information are created and are of greatest influence when the bases are essential to the mission of the organization, concentrated within the organization and are non-substitutable (p. 24). A fourth power base is that of the legal position and the right to hire and fire individuals. The fifth power base is described by Mintzberg (1983) as access by the influencer to those who have the other four power bases.
Understanding that power exists in and around the organization assists in the identification of influencers, i.e., those who have power or the ability to control the organization's decisions and actions (Mintzberg, 1983, p. 23), who are both internal and external to the organization. Internal influencers, for example, the CEO, operators, support staff, and line managers, are full-time employees, while external influencers, for example, the owners, employee associations, and various governments, are non-employees. Each internal and external influence group seeks to gain power and influence the organization's decisions and actions (Mintzberg, 1983, p. 30). In this study, external groups such as the CIAU and alumni were identified as having the potential to exert influence on the athletic programs.

The relationship of goals and power as one of dynamic equilibrium is fundamental to Mintzberg's work. The state of stability or equilibrium is desired by the various groups of influencers called dominant coalitions or power groups. Equilibrium is maintained by the organization's ideology (whereby tradition dampens change), by the system of control, i.e., a budget as a control, by the conscious creation and use of slack (excess resources), as well as by the chief executive officer. Generally, the coalitions with power want to remain stable. The reality of organizational life, however, is that goals and power
relationships are in a constant state of change. As Mintzberg describes the situation, from a close-up or the micro viewpoint the organization will be seen as a constant state of movement but viewed from a distance or the macro perspective the organization will tend to give the appearance of organizational stability. When macro changes do occur the system of goals and power is drastically altered and will require major shifts in goals and power arrangements until a state of equilibrium is once again reached (p. 289). In this study, respondents were asked to identify areas of change they felt were important for athletics.

Structure

The area of organizational behavior and organizational theory entails the formal as well as the informal structures of organizations. The importance of formal and informal structures as they may appear to exist independent of each other and as they relate to each other needs to be addressed by the researcher if an accurate depiction of organizational life is to be represented. The informal structures are critical to the satisfaction of the employees. Personal goals and satisfaction gained from the social contacts are often derived from the work
environment, the informal structures are very important to individuals in the organization.

The relationship between goals and structure is described by Hasenfeld (1983) and is of relevance to this study. The various theoretical approaches to human service organizations, for example bureaucratization, human relations and political economy present various ways theorists have examined or written about organizational behavior and organizational theory. These approaches address goals, power and structure in different ways. One particular theory will not be the sole 'boiler plate' for the examination of a particular type of organization. Rather, a combination of various approaches will provide the most relevant beginning to the study of intercollegiate athletic programs.

A common starting point for the various theoretical approaches is with bureaucracies. This theoretical conceptualization was advanced by Max Weber, a german sociologist who's writings are considered to be the foundation of the sociological analysis of organizations. Within a bureaucratic framework the base of power lies in the legal authority positions within the formal structure of the organization. Goals could be considered as part of the power base with formal rules and regulations outlined for the accomplishment of the goals.
Goals and power when viewed from a bureaucratic perspective align themselves with the formal structure of the organization. As Hazenfeld (1983) points out, there are degrees of bureaucratization in human service organizations. Within athletic programs some elements of bureaucratization will be evident, highly routine tasks will be suited to a bureaucratic form, and situations involving influences from the environment will result in a more formal reporting structure to deal efficiently and effectively with the external influence. Other program tasks such as the relationship of a professional staff member to a client i.e. a coach and athlete or administrator to volunteers will be non-routine in nature and require greater freedom, and flexibility (Hazenfeld, 1983, p. 16). The goals pursued by the program will be carried out by routine and non-routine tasks. The degree of 'routineness' should be a consideration in the determination of the most appropriate structures for the various organizational tasks.

Other theoretical approaches reviewed by Hazenfeld (1983) that are applicable to the study of human service organizations include Scientific Management, the Human Relations School, Decision-Making Theory, Contingency Theory, Natural Systems Theory, Neo-Marxian Theory and Political Economy Theory. The
Political Economy Theory is a framework which includes many elements of the previously developed frameworks.

The necessary prerequisites for a comprehensive theory for human service organizations, according to Hasenfeld (1983) are in part met by the political economy theory; his definition is as follows. The political refers to the way in which power is attained and distributed, the determination of operative goals and the tasks of the organization and the control of the tasks by individuals. The economy refers to resource acquisition and distribution, the specification of the division of labor and the maintenance of the organization's outputs. Hasenfeld (1983) acknowledges the lack of clear distinction between the political and economic factors but considers the theory as providing a useful framework.

Major aspects of the political economy theory that are particularly relevant to the proposed research include the following main points. First, political economy theory examines the organization as a whole including the internal processes and the external processes from the environment impacting on the organization. For many human service organizations the role of the environment (as viewed from an open systems perspective) is important. The environment can shape operative goals, influence decisions and actions as well as have an impact on the
structure. Second, political economy examines the interplay of power and goals held by organizational members. What occurs within an organization is a result of the exchange relations between different internal and external interest groups and the power and values (reflected by the goals they pursue) they exhibit. Third, within a political economy perspective there is an emphasis on the role of the client. Clients influence both political and economic resources, indeed they often are a key resource, establish goals and are key power holders who influence the programs and structures of the organization. The political economy model does not provide a clear measurement of power, it does however suggest that through the study of organizational changes the power of various individuals and groups in the organization can be inferred.

Summary
This chapter has reviewed the historical developments in men's and women's university athletic programs in both Canada and the United States. It is clear that the present state of athletics in Canada differs from the United States in aspects of the degree of commercialism and the largeness of athletic operations on many Division I campuses in the United States. In Canada, athletic programs have been the topic of inquiry by a
number of administrators and writers. Within Ontario a comprehensive description of the programs has not occurred and it is appropriate that such a study be conducted. The literature related to goals, influence and structure offer valuable starting points for this study.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

Introduction
The descriptive method of research design utilizing the survey technique was used in this study. Mintzberg's (1979) contributions to studies of organizational theory and behavior provide the framework for the study and design described herein. Descriptive studies can provide valuable information; including prescriptions. To Mintzberg an accurate representation of organizational life requires careful inductive examination of both formal and informal structures. Mintzberg views the relationship of the formal and informal structures as interdependent "... the formal appears to shape the informal, while the informal greatly influence what works in the formal, and sometimes even reflects its shape to come" (p. 53). Both formal and informal aspects are important to the governance questions guiding this research.

The study included three groups of respondents, athletic administrators, university presidents and chairs of the athletic boards. These respondents were identified as making significant contributors in the governance of interuniversity athletics. Their perceptions of i) their own influence in athletics; ii) the
influence of others; and iii) the importance of operative goals pursued in athletics represent the informal aspects of organizational life that are intertwined with the formally espoused structures and goals. This chapter describes: the four phases of the study, the instruments and surveys and procedures established to collect data, and the treatment of the data.

Phase I:

In Phase I specific documentation and information were requested from each of the seventeen institutions comprising the population in this study. These submissions from each institution were the basis for the description of the governance of interuniversity athletics. The information requested included:

1. the organizational structure (including positions, reporting structures and committees) of the interuniversity athletic program;

2. a statement regarding the administrative relationship of the athletic program to academic and non-academic units on campus (i.e., is the athletic program affiliated or independent from other units?);

3. the constitution of the athletic board/committee; and

4. the statement of philosophy and goals of the athletic program as approved by the University Senate, Board or other governing council.
Letters were sent to either the Dean, Director or top athletic administrator. A sample of the letter sent to the institutions can be found in Appendix B.

In Phase I, various institutional data were also collected. Institutional measures of university size as measured by full-time undergraduate and graduate enrolment figures, and interuniversity athletic program size as measured by number of sport teams supported were gained from The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-88 and from records of the Commission of Interuniversity Athletics.

Phase II

Phase II of this study involved the survey of the athletic board/committee chairs of the Ontario universities. A copy of the Athletic Board/Committee Characteristic Data Survey and accompanying cover letter and follow-up letter can be found in Appendix C. The first section of the survey requested information pertaining to the status of the respondent (faculty or student); department affiliation and highest degree held; number of years associated with the university; and employment classification. This section also sought information on respondents' membership on other university and community boards and standing committees (athletic and others). This last question was included because of the interest generated for the
investigator by Provan's (1980a) work that suggests the existence of interorganizational linkages may result in strong representation and visibility among important, influential community groups. Thus, it seems relevant to examine possible linkages that the chair of the board may have with other groups on and off campus.

The second section of this survey included twenty-one questions seeking information on the board itself. These open-ended, yes-no and choice questions were derived on the basis of i) related literature (Smith 1973, Sparks 1983, and Karner 1984); ii) the investigator's personal experience with three different university athletic boards in Canada and the United States; and iii) from insights gained and questions raised from the documents collected during Phase I.

The first eleven questions under committee/board information requested board title, authority of the board, voting membership and gender, determination of chair and length of office for the chair, frequency of meetings, maintaining and distributing the minutes of meetings and the availability of fringe benefits. Questions #12-14 requested the identification of standing subcommittees, areas of responsibility for the board, and in what areas if any the board was involved in hiring decisions. Questions #15 and #16 asked if an annual report was prepared and if yes, to whom it was presented. These two
questions were included as a follow-up to the recommendations put forward in the Rickerd Report of 1985 to the Council of Ontario Universities. Using an open-ended format, Question #17 asked for the description of where decisions by the board go. This question was asked as a follow-up to the formal role the board assumes within the structure of the university as provided during Phase I of the study. Questions # 18-20 sought information regarding the chairs' perceptions of the role of the board in the governance of athletics, the degree of regulatory authority held by the board and whether or not there was a desire for change for the athletic board. If yes to the latter question, #21 using an open-ended format asked for the identification of areas for change.

Earlier drafts of the survey were reviewed by selected university personnel for clarity, meaningfulness, and relevancy of the questions. Based on their feedback and the documentation submitted during Phase I of the study, the survey was suitably modified for final administration.

Phase II in summary then, surveyed the chairs of athletic boards to document the structure, function and perceptions the chairs of these boards held on a variety of governance areas.

Phase III

Phase III of this study involved the survey of the athletic administrators of the Ontario Universities. Respondents were the
top athletic administrators; their assistants if such positions prevailed; and chairs, co-ordinators or supervisors of the men's or women's athletic programs. These athletic administrators were those individuals identified in The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-88, and verified in Phase I of the study. As well, two experienced athletic administrators in Ontario verified the list. A copy of the Athletic Governance - Athletic Administrators' Survey and accompanying cover letter and follow-up letter can be found in Appendix D.

There are three parts to this survey in addition to an initial section on respondent information. This survey used open-ended, yes-no, choice and 9 point Likert-type questions.

Part A investigated respondent's perceptions regarding how much influence they feel they have in the governance of interuniversity athletics at their institution, Part B examined respondent's perceptions of operative goals of interuniversity athletics and Part C asked for respondent's perceptions of selected governance areas.

The initial section on respondent information included university position, number of years associated with the university, employment classification, and boards and permanent standing committees of which the athletic administrators hold membership. The last question requested respondent gender.
Part A included twenty three items related to critical decision-making areas in athletics. An individual's involvement in a decision-making process and the degree of influence in that process is conceptually related to the question of control. Individuals perceiving a high degree of influence in many decision-making areas can be viewed as being more central to the control and governance structures and patterns. Of interest in this study was the degree of influence perceived by the athletic administrators. Respondents were asked to indicate the degree of influence they felt they had over twenty-three activities. A 9 point Likert-type response format was used. The items were derived from contributions in the literature, particularly Spark's (1983) dissertation; and supplemented by the investigator and the panel of judges who reviewed the items for clarity and conceptual appropriateness. The last item in this series of questions on perceived influence in decision-making asked for the respondent's perception of the overall degree of relative influence they feel they have in the governance of the interuniversity athletic program. This type of global question in addition to the dimensional approach as represented by questions #1-22 has been recommended by Price and Mueller (1986). The global approach is particularly useful, they suggest, for exploring new areas.
Part B included nine statements reflecting operative goals that an athletic program may pursue and were derived from the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP) (Chelladurai, Inglis, Danylchuk, 1984). The SAP instrument includes thirty-six criterion statements that reflect nine operative goals (objectives). The nine operative goals can be found in Appendix D, Part B. In this present study each of these nine goals were represented by a single statement. Respondents used a 9 point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 "not important" to 9 "very important" to indicate the relative importance they attached to each of the nine objectives. Given the length of the surveys and the exploration of goals as only one aspect of the survey it was deemed appropriate to have the respondents respond to the nine objectives rather than the thirty-six items.

Part C consisted of eleven questions pertaining to the governance of interuniversity athletics. The first question in Part C asked the athletic administrators for their perceptions of the degree of influence exerted by a number of groups; the OUAA, OWIAA and the Alumni as examples, on the interuniversity athletic program at their institution. This question was included because it probes the degree and range of influence groups may be having on athletic programs. The degree of influence of these groups is not known. Questions #2 and #3 are directed at the actual and preferred degree of leadership (respectively), the
respondents would like to see their university president take in athletic governance, and question #4 asked how close to the decision-making process regarding major athletic decisions the respondents feel they are. Question #5 asked for the identification of individuals most frequently communicated with (formally and informally) concerning interuniversity matters. Questions # 6-8 were related to the athletic board, and included the type of role assumed, the actual degree of regulatory authority and the preferred degree of regulatory authority. Question #9 asked if the athletic administrator(s) should have greater access to the university president. This question has been raised in the literature (Felder, 1982; Miller, 1982; Massengale and Merriman, 1985). Many contributors feel that direct access is most effective for athletics and accurately positions the importance of athletic programs with respect to other units on campus. Question #10 asked what level of financial commitment the institution has given to the interuniversity athletic program. Question #11 was an open-ended format and requests what changes the athletic administrators would like to see in the future.

The Athletic Governance - Athletic Administrators' Survey was field tested for clarity of wording, survey consistency, utility and presentation and time required to complete, by a selected group of university and college athletic and recreation
administrators. The average time to complete the survey was estimated to be twenty minutes and only a few minor wording changes were made as a result of the field test.

In addition, Part A of the survey, the perceived influence of respondents to decision-making activities was sent to twenty individuals listed in *The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-88*. These individuals, employed as business managers, sport information directors and promotions personnel were deemed to be informed and involved in athletic business and would be appropriate to respond for purposes of increasing the sample size required for the factor analysis.

In summary, the Athletic Governance - Athletic Administrators' Survey was administered to the athletic administrators in Ontario universities. Three aspects of the survey including influence in decision-making, importance attached to operative goals and other selected governance questions were asked of these key individuals to further the description and understanding of the governance of interuniversity athletics.

**Phase IV**

Phase IV of this study involved the survey of the university presidents of the Ontario Universities. A copy of the Athletic Governance - University Presidents' Survey and accompanying
cover letter and follow-up letter can be found in Appendix E. The university presidents were those individuals listed in *The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-88* and verified through inquiries with the President's office at the investigator's institution.

Part A of this survey included the same eleven questions as in Part C of the Athletic Administrators' Survey with the exception of question #4 which asks for the president's perception of the overall degree of relative influence the athletic administrators have in the governance of the interuniversity athletic program and slight wording changes to some of the questions to ensure the appropriateness of the question for the group of respondents. The meaning of the questions were not altered.

Part B of the University Presidents' Survey is the same as Part B of the Athletic Administrators' Survey and includes the nine operative goals of athletics as derived from the Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP) (Chelladurai, Inglis, Danylchuk, 1984).

In summary, as Chief Executive Officers of their respective institutions university presidents are recognized as important individuals in the governance of athletics and have been challenged to assume a more involved role in athletics (Davis 1979, Rikerd 1985). This survey was developed to assess the President's perceptions on a number of governance issues including the relative degree of importance they place on
operative goals of athletics and the role they assume relative to the interuniversity athletic program on their campus.

**Treatment of the Data**

Data collected during the four phases of the study were analyzed through selected descriptive, non-parametric and parametric statistics. Demographic profiles of the athletic administrators and university presidents, and the characteristics of the institutions and the athletic boards as indicated in research questions #1-#5 in Chapter I were examined and reported in tables using frequencies, valid percents and measures of association (Cramer's V and phi coefficients).

Research question #6 What are the perceptions key actors have of the operative goals of athletics? was analyzed with a repeated measure ANOVA with the Administrative Level as the grouping variable and the nine objectives as the repeated measures. When main effects or interaction effects were significant, Scheffe post hoc analyses were carried out to identify the significant differences in the ranking of the objectives by the university presidents and the athletic administrators.

In answering research question #7 What are the perceptions key actors have of their influence in decision-making areas and
what degree of influence do external agencies exert? the following analyses were conducted.

Responses to the series of questions in the Athletic Governance - Administrators' Survey on perceived influence in decision-making activities were submitted to factor analysis (varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization) in which varying numbers of factors were extracted. For these analyses the athletic administrators' responses and responses provided by the additional athletic personnel surveyed were used. The intention was to select the factor solution that was conceptually meaningful. The three factor solution was deemed most appropriate. These factor scores were then utilized as dependent measures in a repeated measures ANOVA with Administrative Level as the grouping level and the three decision-making types as the dependent measures. When main effects or the interaction effects were significant, Scheffe post hoc analyses were performed to identify the significant differences in the ranking of the decision types by the top athletic administrators, men's coordinators and women's coordinators. Since Scheffe procedures are very stringent (Furguson, 1976), resulting in fewer significant results, an alpha level of .10 was used for all post hoc analyses.

Paired t-tests to examine the Administrative Level and governance issues of actual and preferred leadership of the university president and institutional financial commitment to
athletics were conducted. An ANOVA to determine the relationship of the athletic administrators and how close they feel to the decision-making process was carried out. Also related to research question #7 a repeated measures ANOVA was performed with the Administrative Level as the independent variable and the six external agencies as the repeated measures. Subsequent Scheffe post hoc analyses were carried out when main effects or interaction effects were significant. The post hoc analyses indicated the significant differences in the degree of influence exerted by the external agencies as perceived by the university presidents and the athletic administrators. Paired t-tests to examine the presidents perceptions of the influence of the athletic administrators on their campus was carried out.

In answering research question #8 What are the relationships between informal goals and formal structures? a repeated measures ANOVA was performed with the Structure of Athletics as the independent variable and the nine objectives as the dependent variables. Subsequent Scheffe post hoc analyses were carried out when main effects or interaction effects were significant. The post hoc analyses indicated the significant differences in the ranking of the objectives by the affiliated and the independent structural patterns of the athletic programs.

A repeated measures ANOVA was performed with the Institutional Measures as the independent variable and the
objectives as the dependent measures in the analyses of research question #9 What are the relationships between selected institutional variables and informal goals?. Scheffe post hoc analyses were performed when main effects or interaction effects were significant. The post hoc analyses indicated the significant differences in the ranking of the objectives by the size of the institution (small, medium, large).

The degrees of freedom varied from analysis to analysis due to missing responses. The n's are noted for each statistical procedure.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

Introduction

The results of this study are reported under the four headings of people and structure, perceptions of the athletic boards, objectives and decision-making activities of athletics, and additional governance areas.

People and Structure

The groups of respondents and response rates for the study are presented in Table 1. Three groups of respondents including university presidents, chairs of the athletic boards and athletic administrators from the seventeen Ontario universities were surveyed on selected areas regarding the governance of interuniversity athletics. Sixteen of the presidents responded for a response rate of 94.1%. Twelve of the universities have an athletic board or committee (with representation from a number of university areas) that is part of the formal structure of the university. All of the chairs of the athletic boards responded to the survey for a 100% response rate. The forty-four athletic administrators who assume the positions of Director, Chair,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Groups and Response Rates</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Response Rate Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Presidents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs of Athletic Boards</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administrators</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(includes Athletic Directors, Assistants and Coordinator/Chairs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coordinators, and Assistants were surveyed. Forty-two of these administrators responded for a response rate of 95.5%.

Tables 2-4 report respondent data for the athletic administrators and board chairs. Table 2 reports the years of association with the university of the board chairs and athletic administrators. Eight of the board chairs have been involved with the university for sixteen years or more. The years of association with the university by the athletic administrators is distributed throughout the range of years with fifty percent (n=21) serving sixteen years or more. The Cramer's V ($\phi' = .37$) represents a moderate correlation (Davis, 1971) between the respondent groups and the years of university association.

The employment classification for the board chairs and athletic administrators as reported in Table 3 reflects differences between the two groups. For the board chairs there is similar representation at the two highest levels of academic rank (associate and full professor) and in the professional management category. These three categories account for 9 of the board chairs. The majority of athletic administrators (n=62%) hold a staff/professional management appointment. Those athletic administrators who do hold an academic rank are distributed at the four levels of instructor/lecturer (n=5), assistant (n=2), associate (n=5) and full professor (n=4). The
Table 2

Years of University Association of Board Chairs and Athletic Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of University Association</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer’s $V(\theta') = .37$
Table 3

Employment Classification of Board Chairs and Athletic Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Classification</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor/Lecturer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V (\theta) = .37$
Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Board Chairs and Athletic Administrators</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Chairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Athletic Director</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator/Chairs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Assistants)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\theta = .23$
chairs of the athletic boards included ten full-time employees and two students. The chairs represent a wide range of department/unit affiliations. Academic areas included Environmental and Resource Studies, Epidemiology, Civil Engineering, International Development, Physical Education, Psychology, Sociology, and Administrative units included the President's Office, a Health Centre and other administrative units. The breakdown of the highest degree held as reported by the board chairs included five Ph.Ds, two M.D.s, two M.A./M.Sc.s, and one B.A. The Cramer's V ($\phi' = .37$) represents a moderate association (Davis, 1971) between the board chairs and athletic administrators and the employment classification. It should be noted that in Tables 2 and 3 the student status of two of the board chairs has not been included.

Table 4 reports the gender of the board chairs and athletic administrators. Males outnumber the females in the positions of chair of athletic boards (11 males, 1 female) and top athletic director (14 males, 0 females). There are 13 females and 11 males in the coordinator/chair position and 3 males and 1 female in an assistant capacity. The total gender breakdown includes 39 men and 15 women. The phi coefficient indicates a low positive relationship ($\phi = .23$) between gender and respondent
group. The gender of the sixteen Ontario university presidents is male.

Men outnumber the women in membership on the twelve athletic boards. The percentage of men on the boards ranges from 50% (6) to 80% (23) while for women the range is 20% (2) to a high of 50% (11). The average number of men per board is 10.5 (60%) and the average number of women per board is 5.5 (34%).

Table 5 reports the number of university and community boards and standing committees in which the athletic administrators (reported by gender) hold membership. The table indicates a similar breakdown for males and females and the number of university committees of which they are members. Twenty-three (55%) of the athletic administrators are involved in 1-4 committees with 12 or 28.6% of the athletic administrators serving on more than five committees.

Service on community boards was reported as greater for the women than for the men. Fifty percent of the male athletic administrators did not indicate any community committee membership. Sixty-five percent of the women, compared to 32% of the male athletic administrators were involved in 1-4 community committees. Five men (17.9%) and one woman (7.1%) reported involvement in five or more community committees.
Table 5

Athletic Administrators' Membership on University and Community Boards and Standing Committees

**UNIVERSITY Boards/Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1-4 Committees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5 --&gt; Committees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY Boards/Committees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1-4 Committees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5 --&gt; Committees</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The breakdown of board chairs and their involvement in university and community boards/committees included the following. Seven board chairs indicated 1-4 university committees, three chairs indicated more than five university committees and one chair indicated many university committees. Seven board chairs indicated 1-4 community boards and committees.

Table 6 reports selected institutional measures for the seventeen Ontario universities. Information for this table was derived from i) The Directory of Ontario University Athletics 1987-88 ii) from the COU and iii) from institutions' responses during Phase I of the study. The size of institutions based on full-time student enrolment reflects six small, seven medium and four large institutions. These categories are the same as used by Chelladurai and Danylichuk (1984).

The number of sport teams supported in the men's and women's programs showed six institutions supporting small (less than one half of the sports offered by the OUAA and OWIAA) programs, four schools supporting medium size programs (51-70% of the sports offered by the OUAA and OWIAA) and seven institutions supporting large programs (71-100% of the total possible).
Table 6

Institutional Measures for the Seventeen Ontario Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full-time Enrolment</th>
<th>Number of Institutions</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small ( &lt; 5,000)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (9,500 - 12,500)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt; 17,500)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Sports Supported (Men and Women)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (&lt; 50% of total possible)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (51 - 70% of total possible)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (71 - 100% of total possible)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Arrangement of Athletic Program</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The structure of the athletic program reflects the administrative alignment of the athletic program with academic units. Eight institutions (47.1%) have an administrative affiliation with an academic unit and nine institutions (52.9%) are independent from academic units. All the nine independent athletic programs have athletic boards while only three of the eight affiliated programs have functioning athletic boards.

Of the seventeen universities, fourteen have a top athletic position which oversees men's and women's athletic programs, and three institutions have coordinators or chairs of the respective men's and women's programs. In the athletic programs that are administratively associated with an academic unit the athletic administrators report within that academic unit to a Dean/Director. Athletic administrators in the athletic programs that are independent from academic units generally report to an Associate Vice-President (related to student services) or Dean/Director of Student Services.

Table 7 provides a summary of the principles included in each institution's statement of philosophy. The statement of philosophy which incorporated five principles was requested of each Ontario institution by the COU following the approval of Rickerd Report in June of 1985. Each of the seventeen institutions submitted statements. The nature of the
Table 7

University Statements – Embodied Principles and Submission to Senate/Board of Governors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 N-17 Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principles Expressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Academic authorities responsible for athletics policy via:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) academic control embodied in philosophy, policies and regulations, statements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) annual report to Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Indicated</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Same academic standards should apply to all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Equal opportunity for men and women in athletics via:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) explicit commitment in philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7 (continued)

b) commitment to a structure operating in support of women's athletics

4. Institutional commitment to interuniversity athletic program via:

a) philosophical statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
<th>94.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Statement included re: institution not offering first party awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>x</th>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>64.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
submissions varied. The statements varied from one or two page statements to more comprehensive reports; in some instances the submissions reflected the work of "officially called" formal reviews, and in some, submissions had been approved and forwarded through a number of university committees and channels. It is important to note that in situations where the principle has not been explicitly included in a university's submission that 1) it may be due to the institution already having on record with Senate or a high order governing body their intent of the principle or 2) does not necessarily reflect a lack of commitment to the principle. What the table reports is the degree to which each institution responded to the five principles endorsed by the COU and whether or not the principles were committed in writing by incorporating them into an official statement.

Twelve of seventeen institutions (70.6%) indicated that academic authorities must be responsible for the control of athletics policy. Another measure of academic control is the annual reporting of Athletics to Senate. Three institutions (17.6%) indicated an Annual Report was submitted to Senate, ten (58.8%) indicated an Annual Report was not submitted and for four institutions (23.6%) it was not clarified if a report was submitted. With reference to student-athletes being held
accountable to the same academic standards as other students, eleven or 64.7% of the universities clearly and explicitly indicated support for this principle.

Two aspects of the principle examining equal opportunity for men and women in athletics were reported in Table 7. First, in response to whether or not each institution was explicit in their commitment to the provision of equal opportunity for men and women, fifteen of the seventeen institutions (88.2%) were explicit. Some institutions identified various aspects of athletics while others referred only to equality with respect to opportunities for athletes. Six or 35.3% of the institutions endorsed their commitment in their statement of philosophy to the provision of an internal athletic administrative structure that operates in support of women's athletics.

Institutions commitment to the support of the athletic program was included by sixteen of the seventeen institutions' (94.1%) statement of philosophy. This support refers to the provision of appropriate coaching, leadership, schedules, facilities, and other resources to sustain a competitive program within the OUAA and/or OWIAA. Information regarding the athletic administrators' (n=41) perceptions of the commitment their institution makes to the athletic program was gleaned from the surveys completed during Phase III of the study. To the
categories of low, medium and high support the administrators reputed approximately 20%, 50% and 30% respectively. Eleven of the seventeen institutions (64.7%) incorporated the rejection of first party athletic awards into their statement of philosophy. From the statements submitted to the investigator it was clear that nine or 52.9% of the institutions had forwarded their statement to Senate or a high level authority while for 8 or 47.1% of the submissions it was not indicated whether the statement was forwarded or not.

Tables 8 and 9 report characteristic data of the athletic boards operating at the twelve Ontario universities. Table 8 indicates that ten of the twelve boards (83.3%) are responsible for more than just interuniversity athletics. In response to the frequency of board meetings six of the boards meet three to four times a year and six of the boards indicated they meet five to nine times a year.

Table 9 reports the number of the athletic boards that are involved in various governance areas. As indicated in the Table none of the athletic boards are involved in decisions of hiring. Policy, philosophy and budget development are areas of involvement by most of the twelve boards, with a number of boards involved in various evaluative functions, team and fee selections and voting in the leagues. In response to an open-
Table 8

Selected Board Characteristic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Board Representation</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interuniversity athletics only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interuniversity athletics and intramurals including campus recreation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Board Meetings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - 4 times/year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 times/year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of Board Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Board Involvement</th>
<th>Number of Boards Reporting Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - in decisions of hiring of athletic personal</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - developing policy</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - developing philosophy</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - developing budget</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E - evaluating the program</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - directing the votes of the CIAU/OWIAA/OUAA representatives on major athletic issues</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G - ensuring budgets and facilities are equitably distributed between interuniversity teams and male/female divisions</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H - establishing athletic fees</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I - determining which teams will be financially supported by the university in interuniversity athletic competition</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J - OTHER - awards system (ensuring equality)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - OTHER - adding and dropping programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L - OTHER - monitoring skills and instruction programs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - OTHER - receiving information from student run councils</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ended question of other areas of board involvement four additional areas were noted.

Board information regarding constitutions, standing committees, reporting structure of the athletic board, and fringe benefits for board members included the following. Nine of the twelve institutions (75%) with athletic boards have constitutions. The standing committees for the athletic boards under investigation were requested from the board chair. This information was reviewed along with the formal materials (i.e. the constitutions) as submitted by the Dean or Director in an early phase (I) of the study. Generally (ten out of twelve institutions) the reporting by the chairs was consistent with the formal documentation. In two situations, committees (building, budget) were identified by the chairs but were not reported in the formal documentation. Two respondents indicated ad hoc committees were formed as required. Five of twelve institutions (41.7%) reported not having standing subcommittees of the athletic board. Seven institutions (58.3%) reported subcommittees. Committees included executive, finance, awards, striking, planning, and constitution committees, sport specific committees, men's and women's intramural and intercollegiate recreation/fitness/instruction committees as well as a committee from a specific campus of the institution.
In response to the question requesting a description of who the athletic board reports to and where the decisions made by the committee go, nine of the twelve committees (75%) indicated that the board reports to the president (in an advisory role) of the university or to Senate or one of Senate's subcommittees. Two institutions reported the board advises an intra-unit council or program area and one institution's board reports to a middle management university committee. Six board chairs reported that in addition decisions and information from the board go to the Athletic Director.

It was reported that there were no fringe benefits provided to any of the athletic board members in any of the twelve institutions. The twelve university athletic boards included in this study have representation from a number of areas. Most of the boards have representation from a high level of university administration including the president's, vice-president's or director of student service's office, from faculty, the top athletic director, and students (general student representation as well as from student athletic committees). More that half the boards also include representation from staff, alumni, and athletic personnel and four or less boards also include representation from the student union, graduate student society, the community, physical education faculty and campus
recreation division. While it was difficult to verify the breakdown of student to non-student membership on the boards, for ten of the twelve committees the constitutions indicated a similar number (within one or two positions) of students to non-student voting members.

Table 10 reports the number of athletic administrators and number of presidents desiring greater direct access of the athletic administrators to the presidents. Sixty-three percent of the athletic administrators did not feel greater access was desired, 37% desired greater access while 81% of the presidents did not feel greater access was desired and 19% felt greater access was desired. The phi coefficient (φ=.17) represents a low association between respondents and access to the president.

Perceptions of the Athletic Boards

Tables 11 and 12 report the perceptions of the three groups of respondents concerning the role of the athletic board on their campus and the actual and preferred degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board.

For the twelve universities in Ontario in which there is an athletic board, eight or 73% of the presidents, seven or 58% of the board chairs and twelve or 40% of athletic administrators (Table 11) perceive the board to play a leading role in the
Table 10

Access to the University President

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater Access Desired</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
<th>University Presidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a = .17\)
Table 11

Perceived Role of the Athletic Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of Board</th>
<th>University Presidents</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactionary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V (o') = .25$
Table 12
Perceived Regulatory Authority of the Athletic Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Degree of Regulatory Authority</th>
<th>University Presidents</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V (\rho') = .25$

Preferred Degree of Regulatory Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University Presidents</th>
<th>Board Chairs</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cramer's $V (\rho') = .09$
governance of athletics on their respective campuses. One half of the athletic administrators perceive the board to play a reactionary role. Less than 10% of the presidents and athletic administrators feel the board is inactive. The Cramer's V ($\phi^* = .25$) represents a low association between the three subgroups and the role of the athletic board.

Table 12 indicates that three university presidents felt the athletic board had a high degree of regulatory authority, five felt it was moderate and three felt the regulatory authority was low. Among the board chairs six or 55% felt the board had a moderate degree of regulatory authority with one expressing high, two expressing low and two chairs expressing no regulatory authority. Twenty or 67% of athletic administrators felt the board had a moderate degree of regulatory authority with two expressing high, six expressing low and two expressing no regulatory authority. The Cramer's V ($\phi^* = .25$) represents a low association.

Table 12 also reports the preferred degree of regulatory authority as expressed by the presidents and the athletic administrators. For the presidents ten or 67% preferred a moderate degree of regulatory authority, three or 20% preferred high, one preferred low and one preferred no degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board. Similar results by
the athletic administrators included twenty-seven or 66% preferring a moderate degree, seven or 17% preferring a high degree, five preferring a low degree and two preferring no degree of regulatory authority. The Cramer's V ($\phi = .09$) reflects a negligible association between groups and preferred degree of athletic board regulatory authority.
Objectives and Decision-Making Activities of Athletics

Ratings of Objectives

The descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the Objectives by Administrative Levels and Structure are presented in Table 13.

The results of the repeated measures ANOVA for Administrative Level are presented in Table 14. The effects of Administrative Level (F (1,53) = 9.65, p < .01), the Objectives (F (8,424) = 42.11, p < .001), and their interaction (F (8,424) = 2.97, p < .01) were all significant. Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10), indicated the presidents ranked the objectives Athletes' Personal Growth and Transmission of Culture as the highest, these ratings did not differ significantly from each other (Table 13). The second grouping of objectives indicated in Table 13 as rated by the presidents ranged from a mean of 5.80 for University Community Relations to National Sport Development (M= 4.13). This grouping of objectives did not statistically differ from one another. The presidents rated Career Opportunities as low on the nine point scale with a mean of 3.87, and the Financial objective as the lowest with a mean of 1.93. These two objectives were two and three critical difference groupings removed from the highest ranked objective of Athletes' Personal Growth. The Scheffe post hoc analyses
Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>Structure of Athletics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidents ( (n=15) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes' Personal Growth</td>
<td>7.93 (^1) (^a) (1.16) (^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Community Relations</td>
<td>5.80 (^2) (1.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>5.27 (^2) (1.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.27 (^2) (2.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission of Culture</td>
<td>6.07 (^1) (2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved Excellence</td>
<td>4.60 (^2) (2.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sport Development</td>
<td>4.13 (^2) (1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Opportunities</td>
<td>3.87 (^3) (2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>1.93 (^4) (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheffe Critical Value(s)(.10)</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) - mean
\(b\) - standard deviation
\(^1\) - within group rankings of objectives
### Table 14

**Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA—Objectives By Administrative Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.44</td>
<td>108.44</td>
<td>9.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>595.83</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>738.13</td>
<td>92.27</td>
<td>42.11***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Level x Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52.10</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>928.97</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
indicated the athletic administrators ranked the objective Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.35) as significantly higher than the other objectives. The next highest ranked set of objectives by the administrators included the four objectives of Achieved Excellence (M=7.00), University Community Relations (M=6.63), Prestige (M=6.55) and Transmission of Culture (M=6.48). Entertainment (M=5.28), Career Opportunities (M=5.18), and National Sport Development (M=4.98) did not differ significantly from each other and were the third set of objectives followed by the rating of 3.90 for the Financial objective. The Spearman rank order correlation of .79 indicated a strong relationship in the similarity of ranking of the objectives by the presidents and the athletic administrators.

The results of the repeated measures ANOVA for the rating of objectives by respondents according to the Structure of Athletics are reported in Table 15. The effects of Structure of Athletics (F (1,52) = 1357.99, p < .001), and the Objectives (F (8, 416) = 46.26, p < .001) were significant. The Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10) showed three groupings of objectives for the respondents from the affiliated programs. The highest rated group of objectives included Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.32), Achieved Excellence (M=7.28), and University Community Relations (M=7.08), these ratings did not differ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Athletics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>71.35</td>
<td>1357.99***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>622.17</td>
<td>11.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>819.16</td>
<td>102.39</td>
<td>46.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure of Athletics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30.12</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>920.73</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
significantly from one another. Four objectives were contained in the second set of objectives and the objectives of Career Opportunities (M=5.00) and Financial (M=3.80) were in the lowest grouping. Respondents from the independent schools rated Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.21) significantly higher than the other objectives, and the Financial objective was rated significantly lower (M=3.07) than the other objectives. The Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10) showed Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.21) rated significantly higher than the other objectives and the Financial objective as rated the lowest (M=3.07). The Spearman rank order correlation between affiliated and independent program structure rating of objectives was .80. This reflects a strong association or similarity in the rating of objectives by the two groups.

The descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) for the Objectives, Institution Size and Athletic Program Size are presented in Table 16.

The results of the repeated measures ANOVA Objectives by Size of Institution are presented in Table 17. The effects of the Objectives (F (8,408) = 44.57, p < .001) and the interaction of Objectives and Size of Institution (F (16,408) = 1.75, p < .05) were significant. Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10) indicated that respondents from small institutions rated three
Table 16

Rating of Objectives By Size of Institution and Size of Athletic Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Size</th>
<th>Athletics Program Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small (n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes' Personal Growth</td>
<td>8.11 1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02) b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved Excellence</td>
<td>5.33 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Community Relations</td>
<td>6.50 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission of Culture</td>
<td>6.00 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige</td>
<td>6.44 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>5.28 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Opportunities</td>
<td>5.39 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Sport Development</td>
<td>4.33 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>3.44 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaeffe Critical Value(s)(.10)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a - mean
b - standard deviation
1 - within group ranking of objectives
Table 17

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA—Objectives By Size of Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>688.98</td>
<td>13.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>777.67</td>
<td>97.21</td>
<td>44.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Institution x Objectives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60.97</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>889.88</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
objectives Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.11), University Community Relations (M=6.50) and Prestige (M=6.44) as the highest set of objectives. Respondents from medium size institutions rated the two objectives of Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.59) and Achieved Excellence (M=7.09) as the highest set of objectives and respondents from the large institutions rated five of the objectives including Athletes' Personal Growth (M=7.93), Achieved Excellence (M=6.86), Transmission of Culture (M=6.43) University Community Relations (M=6.36) and Prestige (M=6.00) as the highest group of objectives. They did not differ significantly from one another. The rank order correlations between every pair of subgroups were high (small to medium and small to large = .70, medium to large = .99) and therefore homogeneity in the rating of the objectives existed.

The relative rankings of the Objectives by the Athletic Program Size (as categorized by the percentage of sports supported by the institution of those offered by the OUAA and OWIAA) are presented in Table 16. The repeated measures ANOVA Objectives by Athletic Program Size did not indicate main effects for Athletic Program Size, nor was there an interaction effect with Objectives. Further analyses were not carried out.
Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations for the governance areas of Leadership (actual and preferred) of the university president and the Institution's Financial Commitment to Athletics. The means reflect the responses to a nine point scale. T-tests were carried out to identify if any significant differences were evident between the two administrative levels of presidents and athletic administrators on the ratings of leadership of the university president and the institutional financial commitment to athletics. No significant differences were reported from the t-tests. Both university presidents and athletic administrators rate the actual and preferred degree of presidential leadership in the five to six range on the nine point scale. While the preferred degree of leadership may be slightly higher for both groups it is not statistically significant from the actual degree of leadership. The presidents and administrators consider their institutions to be making a moderate financial commitment to their athletic programs.

The responses by the athletic administrators to the twenty-two questions relating to influence in decision-making activities were submitted to factor analyses (varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization). Based on Cattell's scree criterion three factors were extracted which explained 78.5% of the variance. The selected items and their factor loadings are
Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>University Presidents (n=16)</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual leadership of University President</td>
<td>5.56&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (1.90)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5.33 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred leadership of University President</td>
<td>5.88 (1.89)</td>
<td>6.18 (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Financial Commitment to Athletics</td>
<td>5.75 (1.92)</td>
<td>5.68 (2.04)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> - mean  
<sup>b</sup> - standard deviation
presented in Table 19. These items had a minimum loading of .58 or higher on one factor and at least .10 lower loadings on the other factors.

The thirteen items in factor I refer to decision-making activities that focused on what Mintzberg (1979) described as administrative decisions and included developing policy, selecting sports, establishing practice and competitive schedules, directing the institutions vote, taking action in areas of improper conduct or eligibility and recruitment violations, developing the budget and ensuring equitable budget and facility allocation between female and male programs. Accordingly, this factor was labelled Administrative Decisions. The six items in the second factor referred to staffing decisions (establishing positions and recruiting full-time personnel to the positions), developing philosophy for the athletic program, and financial decisions (establishing student fees, approving the athletic budget, and deciding on capital expenditures). The second factor labelled Strategic Decisions, follows Mintzberg's (1979) conceptualization. The third factor included two items related to establishing policy on sponsorship and generating revenues from off-campus sources. Since these items refer to boundary spanning activities focused on marketing the athletic program, this factor was labelled Marketing Decisions.
Table 19  

Three Factor Solution of Influence in Decision-Making Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factors I</th>
<th>Factors II</th>
<th>Factors III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing policy for the governance of interuniversity athletics</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring academic status and progression of student athletes</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting sports to be supported</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing athletic competition schedules</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the maximum number of athletic practices</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the institution's votes on major athletic issues in the O U A A or OW I A A</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directing the institution's votes on major athletic issues in the CIAU</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action on violations of recruitment or eligibility</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking action when athletes do not conduct themselves properly</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the ratio of budgets for male and female programs</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the relative allocation of facilities for male and female programs</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the athletic budget</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on the number of sports to be supported</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing new full-time coaching or administrative positions in interuniversity athletics</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring of full-time athletic coaches or athletic administrators</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing the philosophy of the interuniversity athletic program</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing the student athletic fees</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approving the athletic budget</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on capital expenditures</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing policy on sponsorship</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating revenues from off-campus sources</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The subscale Administrative Decisions had an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of .97. The subscale Strategic Decisions had an internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of .92. For the subscale identified as Marketing Decisions with only two items it was not possible to compute Cronbach's Alpha; the correlation between these two items was .46 (p < .001). The intercorrelations among the three subscales were Administrative - Strategic = .83 (p < .001); Administrative - Marketing = .14 (p > .05); and Strategic - Marketing = .27 (p < .05).

Rating of Influence in Decision-Making Activities

Table 20 presents the means and standard deviations for the Influence in Decision-Making Activities of the athletic administrators. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA for Influence in Decision-Making Activities by Athletic Administrators are presented in Table 21. The effects of Athletic Administrators (F(2,31) = 5.74, p < .01), Influence in Decision-Making Activities (F(2,62) = 36.04, p < .001) and their interaction (F(4,62) = 4.90, p < .01) were all significant. Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10) indicated the Administrative, Strategic and Marketing Decisions to be rated similarly by the top athletic administrators and the men's
Table 20

Influence in Decision-Making Activities By Athletic Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Activities</th>
<th>Top Athletic Administrator (n=12)</th>
<th>Men's Coordinator (n=11)</th>
<th>Women's Coordinator (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Decisions</td>
<td>7.38 (^1) (a) (0.84) (b)</td>
<td>6.37 (^1) (1.03)</td>
<td>7.57 (^1) (0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Decisions</td>
<td>6.93 (^1) (0.67)</td>
<td>5.32 (^1) (1.21)</td>
<td>5.46 (^2) (1.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Decisions</td>
<td>6.42 (^1) (1.06)</td>
<td>5.18 (^1) (1.63)</td>
<td>4.77 (^2) (1.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scheffe Critical Value(s) (0.10) 1.49 1.53 1.53

\(a\) - mean
\(b\) - standard deviation
1 - within group ranking of decision-making activities
Table 21

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA—Influence in Decision-Making Activities By Athletic Administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administrators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>15.68</td>
<td>5.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>84.76</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence in Decision-Making Activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.36</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>36.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Administrators x Influence in Decision-Making Activities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.46</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
coordinators. The women's coordinators reported their influence in Administrative Decisions to be significantly higher than the influence in the Strategic or Marketing Decisions (Table 20). The Scheffe post hoc critical value for between group differences was calculated to be 1.09. Examining the means from Table 20 it is evident that for the Marketing Decisions the top athletic administrators rated their influence significantly higher than the men's or women's coordinators. The women's coordinators rated their influence in the Administrative decision type significantly higher than did the men's coordinators. The top athletic administrators rated their influence in Strategic Decisions significantly higher than the men's coordinators. The men and women coordinators did not differ significantly in their ratings of influence in Strategic Decisions or Marketing Decisions.
Additional Governance Areas

Table 22 indicates that for the thirteen athletic administrators that occupy the top athletic position the mean of their response to how close they feel they are to the decision-making process was 8.00 on a 9.00 scale with a standard deviation of .71. The twelve administrators occupying the men's coordinator position reported a mean of 6.50 with a standard deviation of 1.62 and the twelve women's coordinators had a mean of 7.25 and standard deviation of 1.14. The one way ANOVA (alpha = .05) was computed to test for differences between the group means. The F ratio (4.85), as shown in Table 22 reported a significant difference and the subsequent Scheffe post hoc analysis (alpha = .05) indicated that it was the top athletic administrators and men's coordinators that differed significantly from each other.

Table 23 presents the means and standard deviations for the Influence Exerted by External Agencies as perceived by the university presidents and athletic administrators. The repeated measures ANOVA Influence of External Agencies by Administrative Level is presented in Table 24. The effect of Influence of External Agencies (F (5,250) = 88.33, p < .001) was significant. Scheffe post hoc analyses (alpha = .10) indicated that the university presidents rated OWIAA and OUAA influence
### Table 22

**Closeness to the Decision-Making Process of Athletic Administrators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>4.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total variance</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Athletic Administrator</th>
<th>Men's Coordinator</th>
<th>Women's Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 23

**Rating of Influence of External Agencies by Administrative Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Level</th>
<th>University Presidents (n=15)</th>
<th>Athletic Administrators (n=37)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COU Influence</td>
<td>5.33 2 (1.99)</td>
<td>5.35 2 (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUAA Influence</td>
<td>7.07 1 (1.28)</td>
<td>7.08 1 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWIAA Influence</td>
<td>7.20 1 (1.27)</td>
<td>7.03 1 (1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAU Influence</td>
<td>5.47 2 (1.25)</td>
<td>6.78 1 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Influence</td>
<td>3.00 3 (1.20)</td>
<td>3.57 4 (1.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsor</td>
<td>2.33 4 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.49 5 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaeffe Critical Value(s) (.10)</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* - mean  
*b* - standard deviation  
1 - within group ranking of external agencies
Table 24

Summary of Repeated Measures ANOVA—Influence of External Agencies By Administrative Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>223.22</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of External Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>832.59</td>
<td>166.52</td>
<td>88.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Level x Influence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Agencies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.13</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>471.27</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
as the greatest followed by the grouping of COU and CIAU influence then Alumni influence with Corporate Sponsor influence as the lowest and in the fourth critical difference grouping. The ratings of the degree of Influence External Agencies Exert by the athletic administrators included five critical value groupings. The OUAA, the OWIAA and the CIAU were in the grouping reflecting the greatest amount of influence, followed by the COU, then Alumni and Corporate Sponsor influence. Additional external agencies identified by the respondents (frequency of response noted in parenthesis) included Military Ethos (1) Sport Canada(2), and Provincial Sport Governing Bodies (1) with medium influence and Local Media (1) with low influence.

Table 25 presents the means and standard deviations of the university presidents' perceptions of the degree of influence held by the various athletic administrators in their respective athletic programs. T-tests for the pairs including the top athletic administrators, men's coordinators and women's coordinators were carried out to identify if any significant differences were evident. The t-tests indicated that the presidents perceive the top athletic administrators (M=8.00) to have significantly greater influence than the men's coordinators (M=7.08) and the women's coordinators (M=7.08). The means
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Presidents (n=16)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean (Standard Deviation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Athletic Administrator</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Coordinator</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Coordinator</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reflect the responses to a nine point scale. Presidents viewed the administrators as having high levels of influence.

Table 26 reports the frequency of changes suggested by the athletic administrators. The responses of the top athletic administrators were focused on external issues. There were no women in Ontario occupying a top Athletic Director’s position and therefore no responses in the female category. Suggestions by the coordinators for change identified both internal and external ideas; the men tended to identify external changes while the women identified internal change. Ideas for change presented by the athletic administrators and the frequency of the suggestions can be found in Appendix F.

When asked what governance changes the university presidents would like to see in interuniversity athletics of the sixteen presidents responding ten (62.5%) did not indicate any changes. Six (37.5%) presidents indicated change. Four institutions identified areas of on-campus re-structuring of athletics, athletic board review, provincial issues of stronger working relationships with COU and the OUAA/OWIAA, less ‘footdragging’ by the OUAA, and a tougher policy against sponsorship from ‘booze’ companies as areas for change. Two presidents indicated concern with the CIAU in areas of structure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Position</th>
<th>Top Athletic Administrator (n=14)</th>
<th>Coordinators (n=28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (n=11)</td>
<td>Yes (n=20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and the focus on high performance sport and national championships.

Eleven of the twelve interuniversity athletic board chairs reported no felt need for change for the athletic board on their campus. One institution indicated a need for the board to get more involved at the policy level and for the board to address user needs and the demands for improved and additional facilities.
Summary

This study examined selected governance areas of the interuniversity athletic programs operating in the seventeen Ontario universities. The study was conducted in four phases. Phase I included collection of university documents related to athletic structure, athletic positions, formal goal statements, and constitutions of the athletic board (where such a board/committee was functioning). Phase II through Phase IV included the survey of three respondent groups identified as key contributors in the governance of interuniversity athletic programs.

Athletic administrators, university presidents and chairs of the twelve boards operating in Ontario were asked to respond to questionnaires which surveyed areas relating to respondent's perceptions of the importance they attach to operative goals of athletics as measured by the Scale of Athletic Priorities (Chelladurai et al., 1984), the degree of influence they feel they have in various administrative areas of athletic governance,
additional governance areas and issues, and respondent and board characteristic data. Each survey was designed specifically to the respondent group in question. Surveys were mailed during April and May of 1988 with follow-up letters in May of 1988. The response rates were encouragingly high with 100% of the twelve board chairs responding, 94% of the university presidents and 95% of the athletic administrators responding. The theoretical concepts guiding this study were drawn from the organizational behavior and theory literature and included the areas of formal and informal goals and structures, and the influence individuals have in the governance process.

This chapter includes the summary of findings (presented under the research question headings and under the heading of additional governance areas), a discussion of the results as they relate to the literature and to the perceived present state of athletics, and recommendations for future study.

Summary of the Findings

#1 What are the formal structures of the athletic programs within each university? This includes structural arrangements of athletics with respect to academic and non-academic units.
Eight institutions (47.1%) have an administrative affiliation with an academic unit and nine institutions (52.9%) are independent from academic units. Twelve institutions (70.6%) have an athletic board that is formally recognized as part of the structure of the university and is comprised of representatives from a number of university areas. The nine athletic programs whose structural pattern is independent of academic units all have athletic boards. Of the eight athletic programs with an administrative affiliation to an academic unit only three of the institutions have an athletic board.

#2 What are the organizational characteristics of the athletic boards/committees operating in Ontario universities?

Ten of the twelve boards (83.3%) are responsible for more than interuniversity athletics. Six of the boards meet three or four times a year and six of the boards meet five to nine times a year. The areas of athletic board involvement include: most boards involved in policy, philosophy and budget, with a number of boards also involved in various evaluative functions, team and fee selections and directing the voting in the leagues. In response to an open-ended question, the area of ensuring gender equality in the awards system, monitoring the skills and
instruction program and receiving information from students and councils were identified.

Seven of the twelve institutions (58.3%) reported subcommittees of the athletic board. These committees included executive, finance, awards, constitution, sport specific, program specific i.e. intramurals or intercollegiate to name the most frequently occurring. Nine of the twelve boards (75%) indicated the board reports to the president or the senate or a subcommittee of senate. Two boards report to an intra-unit council or program area, and one board reports to a middle management university committee. Six board chairs reported that in addition, decisions and information from the board goes to the athletic director. Nine of twelve (75%) boards have constitutions. Fringe benefits are not provided to board members.

Men outnumber the women in membership on the twelve athletic boards. The percentage of men on the boards ranges from 50% (6) to 80% (23) while for women the range is 20% (2) to a high of 50% (11). The average number of men per board is 10.5 (66%) and for women 5.4 (34%).

The boards have representation from a variety of areas including the presidents office or other senior administrative positions, faculty, staff, athletic administrators, students
(student union, graduate students, student athletic/recreation committee representatives), alumni, community, and physical education faculty. Only two universities (affiliated structural patterns) have representation from the physical education faculty. Generally, there is a balance of student to non-student membership on the athletic boards.

# 3 Are there formal mission/goal statements for the athletic programs within each university?

Each of the seventeen universities submitted formal statements which addressed athletics at their institution. The nature of the submissions varied from single page statements to committee reports; approval at varying administrative levels was also noted.

The statements of philosophy submitted by the universities were assessed to see if the five principles of the Rickerd Report were contained in the university statements.

Twelve of seventeen institutions (70.6%) indicated that academic authorities must be responsible for the control of athletic policy. Another measure of academic control is the annual reporting of Athletics to Senate. Three institutions (17.6%) indicated an Annual Report was submitted to Senate, ten
(58.8%) indicated an Annual Report was not submitted and for four institutions (23.6%) it was not clarified if a report was submitted. With reference to student-athletes being held accountable to the same academic standards as other students eleven or 64.7% of the universities clearly and explicitly indicated support for this principle.

Two aspects of the principle examining equal opportunity for men and women in athletics were noted. First, in response to whether or not each institution was explicit in their commitment to the provision of equal opportunity for men and women, fifteen of the seventeen institutions (88.2%) were explicit. Some institutions identified various aspects of athletics while others referred only to equality with respect to opportunities for athletes. Six or 35.3% of the institutions endorsed their commitment in their statement of philosophy to the provision of an internal athletic administrative structure that operates in support of women's athletics.

Institutions' commitment to the support of the athletic program was included by sixteen (94.1%) of the seventeen institutions' statement of philosophy. This support refers to the provision of appropriate coaching, leadership, schedules, facilities, and other resources to sustain a competitive program within the OUAA and/or OWIAA. Information regarding the
athletic administrators' (n=41) perceptions of the commitment their institution makes to the athletic program was gleaned from the surveys completed during Phase III of the study. To the categories of low, medium and high support the administrators reported approximately 20%, 50% and 30% respectively. Eleven of the seventeen institutions (64.7%) incorporated the rejection of first party athletic awards into their statement of philosophy. From the statements submitted to the investigator it was clear that nine or 52.9% of the institutions had forwarded their statement to Senate or a high level authority while for eight or 47.1% of the submissions it was not indicated whether the statement was forwarded.

#4 Who are the key actors in the governance of athletics (i.e., the critical positions in the overall governance of the athletic programs)?

Individuals identified as making significant contributions in the governance of athletics included university presidents, individuals who hold the top athletic position in the universities where a single position exists, coordinators/chairs of men's and women's athletic programs, assistant athletic directors, and chairs of the athletic boards.
Of the seventeen universities, fourteen have a top athletic position which oversees men's and women's athletic programs, three institutions have coordinators or chairs of the respective men's and women's programs. In the athletic programs that are administratively associated with an academic unit the athletic administrators report within that academic unit to a Dean/Director. Athletic administrators in the athletic programs that are independent from academic units generally report to an Associate Vice-President (related to student services) or Dean/Director of Student Services.

Generally the chairs of the boards had more years of association with the university and higher academic ranks than did the athletic administrators. Approximately sixty percent of the athletic administrators hold a non-academic classification of employment compared to thirty percent of the board chairs. Board chairs were in the associate and professor academic ranks and the athletic administrators were spread across the academic ranks. The gender breakdown for board chairs was eleven males and one female. Two of the board chairs were students. All of the top athletic administrative positions (14) are filled by men. In the coordinators/chair category there are eleven men and thirteen women and in the assistants category there are three men and one woman.
Five What are the demographic characteristics of the universities?

Six of the universities have a full-time enrolment of less than five thousand students and were categorized as small, seven institutions had enrolment figures of nine thousand five hundred to twelve thousand five hundred and four institutions had enrolment figures of more than seventeen thousand five hundred and were categorized as large. Institutions were also categorized as small, medium, and large depending upon the number of sport teams they supported. Six institutions had small programs with less than 50% of the teams recognized by the OUAA and OWIAA supported, four institutions supported 51-70% of the total possible and seven of the universities supported 71-100% of the total possible sport teams and were considered large.

Six What are the perceptions key actors have of the operative goals of athletics?

The presidents and the athletic administrators were homogeneous in their ratings of the objectives; i.e. the relative
rankings of the objectives were similar. For both groups of respondents the within group ratings of the objectives revealed significant differences. Athletes' Personal Growth was rated the highest by both groups. For the athletic administrators the importance they attributed to the Athletes' Personal Growth was significantly higher than their ratings of all other objectives. The presidents gave greater importance to the objectives of Entertainment and National Sport Development than did the athletic administrators. The Financial objective was given the lowest rating by the presidents and the athletic administrators.

#7 What are the perceptions key actors have of their influence in decision-making areas and what degree of influence do external agencies exert?

The top athletic administrators and the men's coordinators rated their influence in the three decision types, Administrative, Strategic and Marketing, in a consistent manner. The three decision types were rated fairly high on the nine point scale and did not differ statistically in the ratings. The women's coordinators reported their influence in Administrative Decisions to be significantly higher than influence in Strategic or Marketing Decisions.
Between group differences revealed the top athletic administrators rated the Marketing Decisions significantly higher than the men's or women's coordinators, the top athletic administrators rated the Strategic Decisions significantly higher than the men's coordinators and the women's coordinators rated the Administrative Decisions significantly higher than the men's coordinators.

The university presidents and athletic administrators reported a wide range of influence on the athletic programs by external agencies. There were no significant differences with respect to how the presidents and administrators rated the external agencies. OUAA and OWIAA influence was rated the highest by the respondents followed by CIAU and COU influence. Alumni influence was rated low by both groups and corporate sponsor influence was rated the lowest (less than three on the nine point scale).

#8 What are the relationships between the informal goals and the formal structures?

Respondents from the affiliated and independent athletic programs were homogeneous in their ratings of the objectives; i.e. the relative rankings of the objectives were similar. The
within group ratings revealed significant differences. The set of objectives rated the highest by the respondents from the affiliated programs included Athletes' Personal Growth, University Community Relations and Achieved Excellence. Career Opportunities and the Financial objectives were rated the lowest. Respondents from the independent athletic programs rated Athletes' Personal Growth significantly higher than the other objectives and the Financial objective was rated significantly lower than the other objectives. The objective Entertainment received a mean of 5.48 (nine point scale) for the affiliated programs and 5.07 for the independent schools.

#9 What are the relationships between selected institutional variables and the informal goals?

Respondents from the small, medium and large institutions were similar in their rankings of the objectives. Within group differences revealed significant differences in the ratings of the objectives. Respondents from small institutions rated three objectives Athletes' Personal Growth (M=8.11), University Community Relations (M=6.50) and Prestige (M=6.44) as the highest set of objectives. Respondents from medium size institutions rated the two objectives of Athletes' Personal
Growth (M=8.59) and Achieved Excellence (M=7.09) as the highest set of objectives and respondents for the large institutions rated five of the objectives including Athletes' Personal Growth (M=7.93), Achieved Excellence (M=6.86), Transmission of Culture (M=6.43) University Community Relations (M=6.36) and Prestige (M=6.00) as the highest group of objectives.

When respondents were categorized with respect to athletic program size (determined by the percentage of sports supported by the institution compared to the total possible as offered by the OUAA and the OWIAA) there were no significant main effects revealed.

#10 What are the main findings related to the other governance areas under investigation in this study?

Similar percentages of the male and female athletic administrators hold membership on university committees. Service on community boards was reported as greater for the women than for the men. Fifty percent of the men and twenty-nine percent of the women did not indicate any community committee membership. Of the chairs of the athletic boards seven reported one to four university committees, seven
indicated more that five university committees and one chair indicated many university committees.

For the twelve universities in Ontario in which there is an athletic board, eight or 73% of the presidents, seven or 58% of the board chairs and 12 or 40% of athletic administrators perceive the board to play a leading role in the governance of athletics on their respective campuses. One half of the athletic administrators perceive the board to play a reactionary role. Less than 10% of the presidents and athletic administrators feel the board is inactive.

Three university presidents felt the athletic board had a high degree of regulatory authority, five felt it was moderate and three felt the regulatory authority was low. Among the board chairs six or 55% felt the board had a moderate degree of regulatory authority with one expressing high, two expressing low and two chairs expressing no regulatory authority. Twenty or 67% of athletic administrators felt the board had a moderate degree of regulatory authority with two expressing high, six expressing low and two expressing no regulatory authority. For the presidents ten or 67% preferred a moderate degree of regulatory authority, three or 20% preferred high, one preferred low and one preferred no degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board. Similar results by the athletic administrators
included twenty-seven or 66% preferring a moderate degree, seven or 17% preferring a high degree, five preferring a low degree and two preferring no degree of regulatory authority.

Sixty-three percent of athletic administrators and 81% of presidents did not desire greater access to the president by the athletic administrators.

University presidents and athletic administrators rated the actual and preferred degree of presidential leadership in the five to six range on the nine point scale. The preferred degree of leadership was slightly higher than the perceptions of the actual leadership for both groups of respondents but was not statistically significant. The presidents and the administrators consider their institutions to be making a moderate financial commitment to their athletic programs.

University presidents view the athletic administrators as having high levels of influence and they perceive the top athletic administrators to have significantly greater influence than the men's or women's coordinators.

A three factor solution reflecting Administrative, Strategic and Marketing Decisions was derived from twenty-two questions relating to influence in decision-making activities.

The top athletic administrators reported a high level of closeness to the decision-making process, their closeness was
significantly higher than the closeness reported by the men's coordinators. The women's coordinators reported levels of closeness between the top athletic administrators and men's coordinators' ratings.

Six (37.5%) university presidents, one athletic board chair and seventy-four percent of the athletic administrators indicated areas for change in the governance of athletics. The male athletic administrators identified external changes while the female athletic administrators focused more on changes to the athletic program within the institution.
Discussion

Five main headings including presidents and athletic administrators share similar perceptions, decision-making activities, faculty involvement, the housing of athletics, and athletic boards are the focus of the discussion.

Presidents and Athletic Administrators Share Similar Perceptions

The high response rate of the university presidents and the athletic administrators as reported for this study is one indication of the interest these individuals have in the athletic programs and the importance they attach to university athletics. One key finding of this study was the degree of congruence that exists between the administrators and the presidents in various governance areas. A strong relationship (.79) existed between the presidents and the athletic administrators in their relative rankings of the objectives. The objective Athletes' Personal Growth was rated the highest and a similar four sets of objectives were evident in the post hoc analysis for both groups. In one respect these findings are encouraging as the more similar the presidents and administrators are in the goals they hold for the athletic program the less likely there will be conflicts over program goals and directions. However, conflict
in many situations is viewed as necessary for organizational change and growth and a relevant question raised is Under what conditions is conflict needed to facilitate change?

In assessing the degree of influence and leadership the athletic administrators and presidents have in athletics the balancing of the roles they assume becomes important. Many writers (for example, Davis 1979; Handford 1982; Miller 1982; Massengale and Merriman 1985; Santomier and Cantelli 1985; MacIntosh 1986; and Pomfret 1986) have written in support of greater presidential involvement and indeed the COU Rickerd Report (1985) was very supportive of the presidents taking a greater interest in university sport, understanding the issues and providing the necessary responsibility and authority to the administrators who conduct the programs. The presidents and athletic administrators were similar in their responses to the actual and preferred degree of leadership provided by the university presidents, as well the presidents attributed a high level of influence to the various athletic administrators. At the present time there seems to be a satisfactory and acceptable balance between the amount of leadership provided by the presidents and the amount of influence provided by the administrators.
Presidents and administrators also were in agreement with the moderate financial commitment their institutions were making to the athletic programs. It was expected that the athletic administrators would suggest there was low financial commitment by the institution; particularly as the increase in operating costs and desired program expansions on many campuses exceeds the operating allotments from the university. An explanation is that with the increased revenues and products from corporate sponsors the athletic administrators may have accepted the current levels of funding from the universities. If this is true the responsibility for funding has shifted away from the universities resulting in the athletic programs being viewed more as an ancillary service and more vulnerable to external control. Reliance on external agencies for funding has been cautioned by Frey (1982) and Grant (1979) as academic control is relinquished to the groups providing the resources.

Decision-Making Activities

As one way of examining control in athletics this study explored the degree of influence the athletic administrators felt they had in various decision-making activities. The factor analyses procedure derived three statistically and conceptually meaningful decision types that were used in further analyses. The Administrative and Strategic Decision types are similar to
those discussed by Mintzberg (1979). Administrative Decisions involve coordinating and guiding decisions at lower levels in the organization, and are relatively routine. Administrative Decisions, according to Mintzberg, can also be exceptional type decisions but have a minor impact on the organization. Strategic Decisions are viewed as less routine than the administrative decisions, have major consequences and result in major changes, and are therefore considered to have greater importance to the organization.

The Marketing Decision type (considered to be a decision type based on function) includes decisions that involve a working relationship with individuals and groups in what J. D. Thompson (1967) refers to as the task environment, i.e. those parts of the community that are relevant to the athletic program in order for the athletic program to accomplish its goals. As athletic programs increase their marketing activities the openness of the program and the university to the community and corporate sectors will be increased and the issue of whose goals are directing the program will be more pronounced. While it must be remembered that a simple classification such as the decision types does not fully capture the complexity of the situation, the classification does offer a suitable beginning for describing and exploring some of the relationships involved in the
organizational activities. Mintzberg (1979) supports the study of how the decision processes flow through the organization. Future study could examine who is recognizing a decision needs to be made, who is diagnosing the situation, and who is responsible for the other various phases or activities of the decision-making process.

When the influence in the various decision-making activities by the athletic administrators was examined it was evident that the top athletic administrators have a moderate to high (M= 6.42-7.38 on the nine point scale) degree of influence. The reported lower levels of influence by the coordinators' positions would be expected and were reported. A significantly greater influence was reported by the women's coordinators compared to the men's coordinators in the Administrative Decisions. An explanation may be that the administrative decisions are more operational day to day type decisions that the women's coordinators, through roles and various socialization patterns, may have a greater predisposition towards. For some of the women's coordinators their philosophy of athletics may not hold marketing activities in high regard. These administrative decisions are internal to the athletic program in comparison to the Marketing Decisions that place the administrator into the community. Also, the men's sports of
football, basketball and hockey have made some noted progress into the procurement of sport specific sponsorship. Women's programs have in some instances (e.g. women's basketball) received products but generally market their program as a general women's athletic entity. A number of factors then such as philosophical questions regarding marketing activities, past successes, expertise, and experience in marketing may not be as evident in the women's programs as in the men's programs. As a result the administrators in turn may feel varying levels of influence which are in part, evident in the data presented in this study.

It is clear from this study that the athletic administrators and presidents feel that corporate sponsors exert a very low level of influence (less than three on the nine point scale). As athletic programs become more successful with securing outside sponsorship the issue of control (from within the institution or from other groups) will be accentuated. As well, as programs continue to secure resources from off-campus sources the training of administrators with appropriate marketing skills will be necessary.
Faculty Involvement

The degree of influence exerted on the athletic program from external groups is related to the distinction made in the literature between educational and corporate models of athletics (Scott 1951; Mathews 1974; Broyles and Hay 1979 and Sack 1982). Campbell and Slack (1982) suggested from their study that athletic programs in Canada were moving away from the educational model as evidenced by programs relying less on funding from the universities, as coaching appointments were not filled by full-time university faculty appointments and as the structural patterns of the interuniversity athletic programs became more independent from academic units. While the structural patterns of athletic programs in Ontario were evenly distributed with eight affiliated and nine independent institutions it appears that in the former it is more of an administrative affiliation rather than an integrated program with a connecting philosophy between athletics and the more 'scholarly' aspects of an academic program related to human movement studies. Athletic programs that are affiliated with an academic unit do not appear to have any greater degree of faculty influence than independent programs. One way of having faculty input into the governance of the athletic program is through the athletic board. Recalling that all nine of the
independent athletic programs have boards while only three of the affiliated programs have boards it is the independent programs to a much greater extent that have formally incorporated faculty involvement into the governance of athletics on their campuses through membership on athletic boards. As well, only two of the three affiliated programs have faculty representation from the academic unit with which they are affiliated. Grant (1979) identified faculty involvement in the athletic boards as one way of keeping athletics within the educational domain.

It appears that while athletic programs in Ontario are moving toward a more commercial model of athletics they are maintaining significant characteristics of the educational model. Students comprise close to one half of the voting membership on the athletic boards which suggests a commitment by the universities to the involvement of the students in a program that is conducted with the student athletes' welfare as a prime consideration. The student as the primary beneficiary in the educational model (Sack 1982) was also supported by the high rating of the objective Athletes' Personal Growth by the administrators and the presidents in this study. Respondents in this study also identified institutional goals such as Prestige as important, i.e. the sport brings prestige
to the university. The chairs of the athletic boards did not identify involvement in fundraising, or booster club and marketing activities that would be associated with a corporate model of athletics.

The activities of the board are primarily internally focused (Provan (1980a) as distinguished from an external focus on attracting scarce resources. Interorganizational linkages that may exist with the athletic administrators and board chairs were probed. Provan (1980a, p.228) suggests that the existence of many interorganizational linkages result in strong representation and visibility among important community power groups. This study reported only frequencies of such linkages and indicated approximately one half of athletic administrators and board chairs to be involved in community committees. For future study it seems relevant to examine other possible linkages that members of the athletic programs may have with other political, sport and service groups. One source of contacts does come from the students whose relatives and friends often offer a valuable source of business contacts.

The Housing of Athletics

The housing of athletics refers to the structural location of the interuniversity athletic program within the institution. This
study has presented some data and discussion related to affiliated and independent structural arrangements. It seems critical that the decisions related to the housing of the athletic program consider the questions such as ensuring competent appointments, i.e. administrative leadership in the program from well-educated, experienced professionals; and the appointment of athletic personnel including coaches, athletic trainers, marketing and public relations personnel and others who will provide a well-conducted program that holds the student-athletes' well-being in the highest of regard. Decisions regarding the structure and location of athletics must also consider the goals held by the key constituents (including the students) and the role of athletics within the institution, the question of academic control through administrative and coaching appointments, reporting structures and faculty representation on various committees including the athletic board.

The growth of athletics over the past decade in terms of the increase in marketing activities (publicity, fund-raising and promotions), in formal documentation (eligibility and legal affairs) and the increase in student-athlete recruitment activities has increased the boundary spanning activities of athletic personnel. Athletic administrators, coaches and other
staff are now in constant contact with on and off-campus offices. On campus contacts include high school liaison offices, residences, students' union, bookstores, publicity offices, legal areas, food services, registrar's office, senior administration and alumni to name a few. An argument could be made for considering a structure that recognizes the diversity of the activities within athletics and functions to maximize the efficiency of these campus activities. An ideal situation may be to have an athletic program with suitably educated and trained professionals and appropriate academic control that is located within the middle management area of the university. The ownership of the athletic program i.e. who is assuming the responsibility for the program may be broadened when it is removed from the auspices of one particular academic unit. Issues such as high performance initiatives, equity (gender and other) within athletics, and funding may take on a stronger commitment by the institution when removed from an academic affiliation. Input from various areas (including academic areas) on campus could be incorporated. There are no easy solutions and further study is needed to delve into the issue of the housing of athletics.
Athletic Boards

This study provided a description of the athletic boards in Ontario universities. While the athletic boards surveyed indicated a moderate to leading role in the governance of athletics, for many boards the roles appear to be ones of representation and monitoring rather than on-going active roles. The literature on boards provides a number of distinctions that would assist in future examination of similarities and differences between athletic boards and other boards that function in human service organizations and not-for-profit organizations.

Provan (1980b) differentiates between potential power and enacted power. Potential power is viewed as the capacity to influence whereas enacted power acknowledges the influence has occurred. The distinction, Provan argues, is important as different measures of power assess potential and enacted power differently. In this present study static measures of potential power based on objective measures for the most part were utilized. The membership of the boards, the reporting structures and areas of responsibility suggest the conditions under which enacted power may occur.

Communication within boards is important and has been the topic of study by recent investigations in human service
organizations (for example, Leduc and Block 1985; McAdam and Gies 1985; and Herman and Tulipana 1985). Their work offers suggestions for effective board management. Board members need to meet often enough to establish a feeling of being informed, active individuals in the information exchange process. Informal meetings may help individuals learn more of each others' backgrounds and strengths. Information will help prevent organizational dysfunction that occurs when a board does not understand the mission and the changing role of the mission within changing environmental conditions.

One study which surveyed athletic boards in the United States was valuable in the preparation of question areas for this present study. Sparks (1983) study of athletic boards in the Big Ten Conference and a sample of NCAA I-A institutions provided an extensive examination of the areas of responsibility and authority of athletic boards. The summary of the descriptive data revealed highly involved boards in numerous areas of athletic management. The areas of decision-making, for example hiring of athletic administrators and coaches, monitoring of academic progress of student-athletes, and directing votes to various league levels were reported as areas of involvement by well over three quarters of the respondents. The boards responding in Sparks' study were more involved in decision-
making areas than the areas of involvement reported by the boards in Ontario. One distinction may be that board activities in Ontario may be primarily initiated by the athletic administrators rather than through the board structure and mandate. For example, in athletic boards in the Big Ten Conference the extensive committee structures and faculty representation to the conference levels results in matters of business being brought to the meetings regardless of athletic administrator involvement. This does not appear to be the case in Ontario.

There are a number of questions and guidelines that the universities in Ontario may want to consider in the establishment of a board or in the developing of a more effective board. The following are summarized from the literature on athletic boards, from the information provided to the investigator during this research and from the observation of boards in action.

-A clear articulation of the structure and function of the board in the form of a constitution should exist. By-laws should exist where appropriate. A date should appear on the documents.
- The constitution should include areas such as name, purpose, responsibilities and duties, membership and term of office, officers and duties, voting procedures, reporting structures, committees and duties, and meetings.

- The constitution should be approved by the Senate or comparable administrative level and should be amended as required.

- The program areas covered by the board i.e. interuniversity athletics only, athletics and recreational activities etc. need to be addressed and appropriately dealt with in the constitution and in the business of the board.

- Decisions regarding the role of the board in the governance of athletics must be addressed. Is the board to assume an active role? Is it desirable to have a high degree of regulatory authority through policy making and advisory functions? Are there areas such as program areas or management areas in which a subcommittee structure could be of benefit?
The representation on the board should include a wide university and community (to a lesser extent) membership. Individuals should be appointed or elected for strengths and viewpoints they can bring to the board. A question to be addressed is Can the board be helpful in the bringing of resources (information, expertise, financial, contacts) to the athletic program? Is this an area the university would like to develop?

Consider subcommittees or ad hoc committees that function in an active role to the benefit of the board and the athletic administrators.

Effective communication within the board through properly prepared and distributed agendas, minutes and reports as well as the frequency of the meetings and the management of the meeting itself are important areas to address.

Evaluations of the athletic program to ensure the board activities are in line with the mandate, and a board self-evaluation process may be beneficial.
Future Study

Recommendations for future study include the following.

1. Measures of operative goals of athletics, influence in decision-making areas as perceived by key individuals in the governance of athletics, and structures of athletic programs from the other athletic conferences in Canada would contribute to a more comprehensive description of Canadian athletics. Selected goals in athletics could be operationalized and treated as independent variables to determine what effect they have on structure.

2. The Scale of Athletic Priorities (SAP) could be administered to a representative sample of respondents (university presidents, athletic administrators, athletic board chairs and board members to be considered) from the various divisions in the NCAA to ascertain the importance these constituents give to the various goals.

3. The housing of athletics i.e., the most appropriate location for interuniversity athletic programs for effective integration with other units and within the university governance structures is an important and timely topic for further study.
4. Methodology to explore the decision-making processes in organizations would help to describe the influence/power relationships that exist and to explain the formal and informal structures to a greater degree than presently exists.

5. A political analysis perspective could be used to examine change and conflict-resolution strategies around issues such as high performance sport and government involvement in sport.

6. Further study of athletic boards to examine various measures of potential and enacted power using objective and subjective measures will help to advance the understanding of the role the boards assume in controlling athletics. The areas of how board members become part of the culture of the organization, what they understand of the structure, management and the people in the organization could add to the understanding of the effectiveness of boards in athletics as well as contribute to the study of control by boards in other service organizations.
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Acronyms For Selected Athletic Related Governing Associations
APPENDIX A
ACRONYMS FOR SELECTED ATHLETIC RELATED GOVERNING ASSOCIATIONS

Canada

AUAA Atlantic Universities Athletic Association
AUCC Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
CAHPER Canadian Association for Health Physical Education and Recreation
CIAU Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union
CIAUC Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union Central
COU Council of Ontario Universities
CWIAU Canadian Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Union
CWUAA Canada West University Athletic Association
GPAC Great Plains Athletic Conference
MIAU Maritime Intercollegiate Athletic Union
OWIAA Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association
OUAA Ontario University Athletic Association
QUAA Quebec University Athletic Association
UWPEC University Women's Physical Education Committee
WCIAU Western Canada Intercollegiate Athletic Union
WAC Women's Athletic Committee
United States

ACE  American Council on Education
AIAW  Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women
AAHPER  American Association for Health Physical Education and Recreation
AAHPERD  American Association for Health Physical Education Recreation and Dance
CIAW  Commission of Intercollegiate Athletics For Women
CWA  Committee on Women's Athletics
DGWS  Division of Girls and Women in Sport
NAIA  National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic Colleges and Universities
NAAAF  National Amateur Athletic Federation
NAPECW  National Association for Physical Education for College Women
NCAA  National Collegiate Athletic Association
Appendix B

Phase I Letters To The Institutions
November 30, 1987

Dr. David Ng, Dean
School of Physical Education and Recreation
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario
L2S 3A1

Dear Dr. Ng:

I am presently collecting information for my dissertation which I am completing through The Ohio State University under the supervision of Dr. C. Hard. My dissertation topic is the governance of Ontario interuniversity athletics with a focus on the structures and goals of these programs.

I am writing to you with a specific request. To assist me with the first part of my study would you kindly forward to me the following:

1. the organizational structure (including positions, reporting structures, and committees) of the interuniversity athletic programme at your institution.

2. a statement regarding the administrative relationship of the athletic programme to academic and non-academic units on campus. i.e. is your athletic programme affiliated with or independent from other units.

3. the constitution of the athletic board/committee.

4. the statement of philosophy and goals of your athletic programme as approved by your university Senate, Board or other governing council.

This is an important stage in my research as the information I receive from you will help to determine the direction for the following parts of the study. If there is additional documentation or information which you feel will be useful in the understanding and description of your university interuniversity athletic programme I would appreciate receiving that as well. It would be helpful if the information could be mailed to me on or before Friday, December 18, 1987.

Thank you very much for helping me with this study.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Inglis
Assistant Professor.

SEI:gl
January 8, 1988

Mr. Paul Wilson  
Intercollegiate Coordinator  
Trent University  
Peterborough, Ontario  
K9J 7B8

Dear Paul:

I haven't heard from you regarding my letter of November 30, 1987 in which I requested information about Trent's interuniversity athletic programme. If the materials have been forwarded and it's just a matter of them being in the mail—thank you.

The information you could provide on athletics at Trent will be very helpful for a complete description of athletics in Ontario. I have attached a copy of my previous letter to you with the humble request that you will be willing and have the time to forward the materials to me.

Any comments you wish to make regarding the structure or any other other aspect of the governance of athletics would be appreciated. Many thanks again Paul.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Inglis  
Assistant Professor  
SEI
Appendix C

ATHLETIC BOARD/COMMITTEE CHARACTERISTIC DATA SURVEY AND COVER LETTERS
This survey has been designed to collect information regarding the athletic board/committee at your university. In your position of chair of the committee your responses to the following questions are important to my study of the governance of interuniversity athletics in Ontario. Individual responses will not be identified; all reporting will be on a collective basis. Information should be based on the 1987-88 academic year.

Chair Information

1. What is your present department affiliation and highest degree held. If you are a student indicate student and program of study.

2. How many years in total have you been associated with this university as a faculty/staff member/administrator?
   - a. 1-5 years
   - b. 6-10 years
   - c. 11-15 years
   - d. 16-20 years
   - e. 21-25 years
   - f. more than 25 years

3. Indicate your professorial rank or other position, i.e. employment classification.
   - a. Instructor
   - b. Assistant Professor
   - c. Associate Professor
   - d. Professor
   - e. Other

4. Indicate boards and permanent standing committees (athletic and others) of which you are presently a member.
   University committees:
   Community boards and committees:

Committee/Board Information

1. Confirmation that the official title of your athletic board/committee is:

2. What areas does the athletic board/committee at your university represent?
   - a. interuniversity athletics only
   - b. interuniversity athletics and intramural programs, including campus recreation
   - c. other (specify)
3. How many voting members are on the athletic board/committee? _____________

4. How many of the board/committee members (1967-68 year) are male ___ female ___?

5. How is the chair of the athletic board/committee determined?


6. What is the length of term of the office for the chair of your athletic board/committee?

   a. 1 year            b. 2 years
   c. other _____________

7. How often does the athletic board/committee meet?

   a. one or two times a year
   b. three or four times a year
   c. five to nine times a year
   d. ten or more times a year
   e. other (specify) __________________________________________

8. Are minutes of the board/committee meetings kept?

   a. yes           b. no

9. If yes to the previous question, are the minutes distributed to board/committee members?

   a. yes           b. no

10. Do athletic board/committee members receive fringe benefits for serving on the board/committee?

    a. yes           b. no

11. If your response to the previous question was yes, please indicate representative fringe benefits provided to the athletic board/committee members.


12. Identify the standing subcommittees that exist within your athletic board/committee.
13. Indicate the areas the athletic board/committee is involved: (if appropriate check more than one response).

   a. in decisions of hiring of athletic personnel
   b. developing policy
   c. developing philosophy
   d. developing budget
   e. evaluating the program
   f. directing the votes of the CIAU/CWIAA/OUAA representatives on major athletic issues.
   g. ensuring budgets and facilities are equitably distributed between interuniversity teams and male/female divisions.
   h. establishing athletic fees
   i. determining which teams will be financially supported by the university in interuniversity athletic competition.
   j. other ______________________________________________________
   k. other ______________________________________________________

14. If your board/committee is involved in hiring decisions please indicate for which positions the board/committee would be involved.

   a. athletic administrators
   b. on-campus, i.e. full-time coaches
   c. off-campus, i.e. part-time coaches
   d. other (specify) ____________________________________________

15. Is an annual report of the athletic board/committee prepared? If you respond no please proceed to question #17.

   a. yes  b. no

16. If yes to the previous question, is the annual report presented to the Senate/Board of Governors?

   a. yes  b. no

17. Describe the authority of the athletic board/committee by outlining who the board/committee reports to and where the decisions made by the board/committee go.

18. Would you consider the athletic board/committee on your campus to be:

   a. one which plays a leading role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   b. one which plays a reactionary role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   c. one which plays an inactive role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
19. Regulatory authority for athletic boards/committees can be viewed as the exertion or exercise of a controlling influence over the decision-making process. It does not mean to imply that the board/committee would be the sole or ultimate decision-making body. Decisions could be made in concert with other individuals and groups.

What would you perceive to be the degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board/committee on your campus?

_____ a. high degree of regulatory authority
_____ b. moderate degree of regulatory authority
_____ c. low degree of regulatory authority
_____ d. no degree of regulatory authority

20. Do you feel that change is needed for the athletic board/committee on your campus?

_____ yes  ____ no

21. If yes to the previous question, what areas of change for the athletic board/committee do you feel are appropriate and why?

Institution Reporting: (for record keeping purposes only) __________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE.
Please use the addressed return envelope or mail to: Sue Inglis, School of Physical Education and Athletics, McMaster University, 1280 Main St. West Hamilton Ontario L8S 4K1.
April 11, 1988

Professor Robbie Keith  
Environmental Studies  
E51 - 202  
University of Waterloo  
Waterloo, Ontario  
N2L 3G1  

Dear Professor Keith:

I am writing to you in your capacity as chair of the Athletic Advisory Board at the University of Waterloo. I am presently collecting information for my dissertation which I am completing at The Ohio State University under the supervision of Dr. C. Manid. My topic is the governance of interuniversity athletics and in this phase of my study I am focusing on athletic boards/committees.

Your response to the enclosed survey is important to the development of a description of interuniversity athletic programs in Ontario and I am hoping you will take the time to respond.

Your time and efforts in helping me with this study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Ingills  
Assistant Professor.

/seq
encl.
May 5, 1988

Dr. Jarrett
Civil Engineering Department
Royal Military College of Canada
Kingston, Ontario
K7K 5L0

Dear Dr. Jarrett:

This letter is a follow-up to my letter of April 11, 1988 in which I requested your assistance with a research project on athletic board/committees of interuniversity athletics in Ontario Universities. If you have completed and returned the survey thank you.

If the survey has not been completed I want to assure you that the response from RMC is very important to the study and I hope you will be able to take the estimated fifteen minutes to respond.

I hope you will help.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Inglis
Assistant Professor

/sgf
encl.
Appendix D

Athletic Governance—Athletic Administrators' Survey and Cover Letter
Athletic Governance - Athletic Administrators' Survey

There are three parts to this survey. Part A asks for your perceptions regarding how much influence you feel you have in the governance of interuniversity athletics at your institution. Part B solicits information about your perception of operative goals of interuniversity athletics and Part C asks for your perceptions of selected aspects of the governance of interuniversity athletic programs.

Reporting will be done on a collective basis both within the institution and between institutions, individual names or institutions will not be identified.

***** Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire *****

Respondent Information

1. What is your position?
   ___ a. athletic director
   ___ b. men's coordinator
   ___ c. women's coordinator
   ___ d. other _______________________________

2. How many years in total have you been associated with this university as a faculty/staff member/administrator?
   ___ a. 1-5 years
   ___ b. 6-10 years
   ___ c. 11-15 years
   ___ d. 16-20 years
   ___ e. 21-25 years
   ___ f. more than 25 years

3. Indicate your professorial rank or other position, ie. employment classification.
   ___ a. Instructor
   ___ b. Assistant Professor
   ___ c. Associate Professor
   ___ d. Professor
   ___ e. Other _______________________________

4. Indicate boards and permanent standing committees (athletic and others) of which you are presently a member.
   University committees:

   Community boards and committees:

5. Gender
   ___ a. male
   ___ b. female
Part A - Perceived Influence

This section of the questionnaire contains items related to critical areas of decision making in athletics. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the degree of influence you feel you have over the following activities. Circle the appropriate number using the scale of 1 "little influence" to 9 "much influence".

The degree of influence I have over:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Little influence</th>
<th>Much Influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing policy for the governance of interuniversity athletics.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ensuring that the athletic program is being in accordance with the philosophy of the University.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ensuring the academic status and progression of student-athletes.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting the sports to be supported by the athletic program.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Establishing athletic competition schedules.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishing the maximum number of athletic practices.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Directing the institution's votes on major athletic issues in the OUA or OWIAA.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Directing the institution's votes on major athletic issues in the CIAU.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Taking action on violations of recruitment or eligibility.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Taking action when athletes do not conduct themselves properly.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Establishing new full-time coaching or administrative positions in interuniversity athletics.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Hiring of full-time athletic coaches or athletic administrators.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The degree of influence I have over:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little influence</th>
<th>Much influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Deciding on the ratio of budgets for male and female programs.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Deciding on the relative allocation of facilities for male and female programs.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Developing the philosophy of the interuniversity athletic program.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Establishing the student athletic fees.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Establishing policy on sponsorship.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Generating revenues from off-campus sources.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing the athletic budget.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Approving the athletic budget.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Deciding on capital expenditures.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Deciding on the number of sports to be supported.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. And finally, your perception of the overall degree of relative influence you have in the administration of the interuniversity athletic program.</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part C - Perceptions of the Governance of Interuniversity Athletics

1. Indicate the degree of influence each of the groups exert on the interuniversity athletic program at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Little influence</th>
<th>Much influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COU Commission</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUAA</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWIAA</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAU</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsors</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indicate the degree of leadership provided by your University President in the governance of interuniversity athletics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little leadership</th>
<th>Much leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Indicate the degree of leadership you would like to see your University President take in the governance of interuniversity athletics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little leadership</th>
<th>Much leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what degree do you feel you are close to the decision-making process regarding major athletic decisions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distant</th>
<th>Close</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Identify the individuals with whom you most frequently discuss (formally and informally) interuniversity athletic matters.

1. __________________________________________
2. __________________________________________
3. __________________________________________
4. __________________________________________
5. __________________________________________
6. __________________________________________
6. Would you consider the athletic board/committee on your campus to be:
   ___ a. one which plays a leading role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ___ b. one which plays a reactionary role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ___ c. one which plays an inactive role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ___ d. non-existent

7. Regulatory authority for athletic boards/committees can be viewed as the exertion or exercise of controlling influence over the decision-making process. It does not mean to imply that the board/committee would be the sole or ultimate decision-making body. Decisions could be made in concert with other individuals and groups. What would you perceive to be the degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board/committee on your campus?
   ___ a. high degree of regulatory authority
   ___ b. moderate degree of regulatory authority
   ___ c. low degree of regulatory authority
   ___ d. no degree of regulatory authority

8. What degree of regulatory authority would you prefer to see for the athletic board/committee on your campus?
   ___ a. high degree of regulatory authority
   ___ b. moderate degree of regulatory authority
   ___ c. low degree of regulatory authority
   ___ d. no degree of regulatory authority

9. Given the present structure of interuniversity athletics on your campus do you feel the athletic administrator(s) should have greater direct access to the University President?
   ___ yes   ___ no

10. What level of financial commitment do you feel your institution has given to the interuniversity athletic program at your university?
    
    low commitment  high commitment
    1........2........3........4........5........6........7........8........9

11. What are some of the governance changes or any other changes you would like to see in interuniversity athletics in the future?

Institution Reporting (for record keeping purposes): ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. Please use the addressed return envelope or mail to Sue Inglis, School of Physical Education and Athletics, McMaster University, 1280 Main St. West Hamilton Ontario L8S 4K1.
April 28, 1988

Pat Murray
Men's Co-ordinator
Tait McKenzie Building
York University
Downsview, Ontario
M3J 1P3

Dear Pat:

I am writing to you in your capacity as Men's Co-ordinator at York University. I am presently collecting data for my dissertation which I am completing at The Ohio State University under the supervision of Dr. C. Hand. My topic is the governance of interuniversity athletics and in this phase of my study I am focusing on Athletic Administrators.

I consider your response to the enclosed survey as vital to a fuller understanding of the governance of interuniversity athletics in Ontario and I am hoping you will take the estimated 15 minutes required to respond.

Your time and efforts in helping me with this study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Inglis
Assistant Professor

encl.
Appendix E

Athletic Governance - University Presidents’ Survey and Cover Letters
Athletic Governance – University Presidents' Survey

There are two parts to this survey. **Part A** asks for your perceptions of selected aspects of the governance of interuniversity athletic programs and **Part B** solicits information about your perception of operative goals of interuniversity athletics. All reporting will be done on a collective basis both within the institution and between institutions, individual names or institutions will not be identified.

***** Thank you for taking time to complete this questionnaire *****

**Part A - Perceptions of the Governance of Interuniversity Athletics**

1. Indicate the degree of influence each of the groups exert on the interuniversity athletic program at your institution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Little influence</th>
<th>Much influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COU Commission</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUAA</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWIATAA</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAU</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Sponsors</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Indicate the degree of leadership you provide in the governance of interuniversity athletics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little leadership</th>
<th>Much leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Indicate the degree of leadership you would like to take in the governance of interuniversity athletics?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little leadership</th>
<th>Much leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What is your perception of the overall degree of relative influence each of the individuals has in the governance of the interuniversity athletic program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not applicable</th>
<th>Little influence</th>
<th>Much influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top athletic administrator</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Coordinator</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Coordinator</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1...2...3...4...5...6...7...8...9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Identify the individuals with whom you most frequently discuss (formally and informally) interuniversity athletic matters.

1. ___________________________  4. ___________________________
2. ___________________________  5. ___________________________
3. ___________________________  6. ___________________________

6. Would you consider the athletic board/committee on your campus to be:
   ______ a. one which plays a leading role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ______ b. one which plays a reactionary role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ______ c. one which plays an inactive role in the governance of athletics on your campus.
   ______ d. non-existent

7. Regulatory authority for athletic boards/committees can be viewed as the exertion or exercise of a controlling influence over the decision-making process. It does not mean to imply that the board/committee would be the sole or ultimate decision-making body. Decisions could be made in concert with other individuals and groups. What would you perceive to be the degree of regulatory authority for the athletic board/committee on your campus?
   ______ a. high degree of regulatory authority
   ______ b. moderate degree of regulatory authority
   ______ c. low degree of regulatory authority
   ______ d. no degree of regulatory authority

8. What degree of regulatory authority would you prefer to see for the athletic board/committee on your campus?
   ______ a. high degree of regulatory authority
   ______ b. moderate degree of regulatory authority
   ______ c. low degree of regulatory authority
   ______ d. no degree of regulatory authority

9. Given the present structure of interuniversity athletics on your campus do you feel the athletic administrator(s) should have greater direct access to the University President?
   ______ yes    ______ no

10. What level of financial commitment do you feel your institution has given to the interuniversity athletic program at your university?
    low commitment  high commitment
    1.....2......3........4.........5........6........7........8........9

11. What are some of the governance changes or any other changes you would like to see in interuniversity athletics in the future?
Part B- Perceived Operative Goals

This section of the questionnaire contains nine statements reflecting operative goals that an athletic program may pursue. Please read each statement carefully and indicate the relative importance you as an individual place on each of the nine objectives. Indicate your response by circling a number on the scale ranging from 1 "not important" to 9 "very important".

The degree of importance I place on each of the objectives is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To provide entertainment to the student body, faculty/staff, alumni and community.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To contribute to the national sport development.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To generate revenue for the University.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To transmit the culture and tradition of the University and society.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To provide those athletic experiences that will increase career opportunities for the athletes.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To enhance the University-Community relations.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To promote the athlete's personal growth and health (physical, mental, and emotional).</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To enhance the prestige of the University</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To support those athletes performing at a high level of excellence.</td>
<td>1....2....3....4....5....6....7....8....9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey completed by: ___ President ___ Other Institution Reporting (for record keeping purposes only) ____________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. Please use the addressed return envelope or mail to Sue Inglis, School of Physical Education and Athletics, McMaster University, 1280 Main St. West Hamilton Ontario L8S 4K1.
May 3, 1988

Dr. A. J. Earp
Office of the President
Brock University
Merrittville Highway
St. Catharines, Ontario
L2S 3A1

Dear Dr. Earp:

I am writing to you in your capacity as President of Brock University.
I am presently collecting data for my dissertation which I am completing at The Ohio State University under the supervision of Dr. C. Mand. My topic is the governance of interuniversity athletics and in this phase of my study I am focusing on University Presidents.

I believe the establishment of the Ontario Commission On Interuniversity Athletics by the COU is one indicator of increased involvement by Chief Executive Officers in athletics and I believe that it is an appropriate time to survey the President’s perceptions of and reactions to various areas within the governance of interuniversity athletics. Your response to the enclosed survey is important to the development of a description of interuniversity athletic programs in Ontario and to the advanced understanding of the governance structures. I am hoping you will take the estimated 10 minutes required to respond.

Your time and efforts in helping me with this study are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Susan E. Inglis
Assistant Professor

encl.
May 30, 1988

Dr. David C. Smith
Office of the Principal and Vice-Chancellor
Queen's University
Kingston, Ontario
K7L 3N6

Dear Dr. Smith:

This letter is a follow-up to my letter of May 3, 1988 in which I requested your assistance with my research project on the governance of interuniversity athletics in Ontario Universities. If you have completed and returned the survey thank you.

If the survey has not been completed I want to assure you that your response is very important to the study and I hope you will be able to take the estimated 10 minutes required to respond.

I hope you will help.

Sincerely,

Susan Inglis
Assistant Professor

/sep
encl.
Appendix F

Athletic Administrators' Ideas For Change
Appendix F
Athletic Administrators’ Ideas For Change

Internal Changes

Institute athletic fees
Greater moral and financial help
Greater input from the women's coordinator
Staffing and facility support needed
Need additional facilities
Need to re-structure to give women greater access, and exposure
Need more facilities and full-time coaches in the women's program
Need to increase alumni support and awareness
Need increased support by administration
Need for a five year Senate supported plan
Increase facility upgrading
Increase official university decisions
Greater access to senior administration
More control for the athletic department
Greater financial commitment required
Need personal changes
Full work load for athletic director
Increase control athletic director has
Greater scrutiny of coaches by athletic administrators
Increase funding from new sources
Clarification of status of athletic personnel in the university

External Changes

Increase the profile of the OUAA, OWIAA, and CIAU
Greater media attention
Resolve scholarship issue
Decrease the emphasis on high performance initiatives
Provide more autonomy to the COU on policy issues of scholarships, fees, eligibility
COU should assist with corporate financing of conferences
External Changes (continued)

- Get rid of government decision-making in CIAU
- Central office for OWIAA
- Structure OWIAA meetings to remove day to day activities
- Need proactive leadership
- Regulate the increasing competitiveness of sport
- Tiering
- Remove COU
- League fundraising
- Realistic grouping by philosophy
- Computerization
- League decisions based on benefits to entire league
- Professional marketing
- Increase student involvement
- More control over recruitment of athletes
- Tiering by philosophy of broad base versus high performance
- Re-structure OUAA to east-west divisions
- Gain commitment by every President for increased profile of sport and recreation
- Need full-time commissioner for OUAA and OWIAA
- Financial assistance for student-athletes
- Break up old guard 1960's mentality
- Less dependence on Sport Canada
- Increase control at provincial level
- Improve recruiting regulations and promotional programs
- Re-structure league meetings to allow presidents to attend
- OCIA should be more advisory
- Consistency between OUAA, OWIAA and CIAU rules and regulations
- Increase the Sport Canada and CIAU relations for high performance initiatives
- Tiering of competition
- Breakdown of OUAA for common groupings
- Decrease Sport Canada influence
- Need scheduling and programming stability
- Gender equality
- Increase financial and administrative support from Province
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