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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to evaluate the activities of the NCAA as a representative body of member institutions. The participants were 234 (males=126, females = 108) second level administrators (associate or assistant athletic directors) of Division I universities. The guiding principles published by the NCAA as a reflection of its mandate formed one set of targets for evaluation. Accordingly, a scale was developed to measure NCAA effectiveness in upholding those principles. In addition, the literature on inter-organizational networks suggest that the impact of the NCAA on member institutions could be transactional (enhanced resource acquisition or gains in performance) or transformational in nature (i.e., changes in ways of thinking, action, or both). Thus, the instrument also included items to tap into these "network" functions of the NCAA.

The respondents rated both the "importance" they attached to the activity indicated by each item as well as their "perceptions" of the extent to which the NCAA carried out the activity. The final set of items in the instrument elicited respondents' feelings of satisfaction with NCAA. Through Principal component analyses with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization, six factors reflecting the principles and five factors reflecting the "network" functions were selected for further analyses.
The results showed that the respondents placed great importance on all the factors (the mean being greater than 7 on a 9-point scale). However, they perceived the NCAA to carry out the activities at a lower level than the importance (the mean being less than 7). Further, the respondents were moderately satisfied with the NCAA (the mean being 5.83). There were no gender differences in importance attached to, or perceptions of any of the six factors associated with principles or the three factors of network functions. Further, the genders did not differ in their satisfaction with the NCAA.

Correlational analyses showed that the perceptions of four of the principles factors ($r > .3$) and all the network factors ($r > .4$) were significantly correlated with satisfaction with the NCAA. Subsequent regression analyses showed that the factors of Image Protection (Beta = .439) and Marketing and Development (Beta = .180), and the factor of Student-athlete Status (Beta = .219) contributed uniquely to the total explained 25.7% of the variance in Satisfaction with the NCAA. These results and their implications were discussed.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The place of sports in American society is unparalleled anywhere in the world. Sport receives constant media attention in the newspaper, on the television and radio. "Today, daily newspapers allocate a high percentage of their pages to sports news; in some cases, more coverage is provided for sporting events than for politics, the economy, or any other single event" (Parks, Zanger & Quarterman, 1998). The highest television ratings each year are typically associated with sport: the Super Bowl, the NCAA Final Four, and the Masters Golf to name a few.

In 1990, sport was a $63.1 billion a year business, ranking 22nd among 400 plus industries in the United States (Comete & Stogel, 1990). This figure is expected to increase to $121 billion a year by the year 2000 (Rosner, 1989). This is greater than the gross national product of many countries including some of the western countries. While several factors can be identified for the growth of the sport industry in America, the most prominent among them would be the promotion of competitive athletics in educational institutions, particularly in universities and colleges.

The significance of university sports is evidenced in the media coverage, the extent of fan support for individual university teams, and the economic impact of intercollegiate
athletics. Intercollegiate sports has been part of prime time television coverage (i.e. football bowl games) and it has been front-page stories in national and local papers. The NCAA Division I men's basketball Final Four has not been played in an arena that can support less than 20,000 people since 1983 when it was played at the University of New Mexico because of the demand for tickets. In 1995, the NCAA began a 10-year, $1-billion television contract for the men's Division I basketball tournament which illustrates the level of popularity and economic impact of intercollegiate sports. In the 1995-96 school year, the University of Connecticut women's basketball program reported nearly $1.4 million in revenues (Park et al., 1998).

The growth and success of intercollegiate athletics in America is largely due to the governing structure the universities have established for proper of intercollegiate competitions among themselves. This structure is the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). From its early beginning in 1905 as the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) with 62 members, it (IAAUS) officially was constituted March 31, 1906, and took its present name NCAA in 1910.

Today, the NCAA is an organization of more than 1,200 colleges and universities that govern both men's and women's intercollegiate sports programs at its member institutions. These universities and colleges are classified into Division I, II, III based on several criteria including the size of financial base and the number and types of sports offered (Park et al., 1998). Division I institutions are further divided into Divisions I-A, I-AA, and I-AAA, each of which has specific classification criteria. The Executive
Committee of the NCAA (comprised of institutional chief executive officers, i.e., CEOs) oversees Association-wide issues and "shall ensure that each division operates with the basic purposes, fundamental policies and general principles of the Association" (NCAA Division I, II, III Manuals, 1997, p. 21).

In addition, each division is "empowered to set forth the policies, rules and regulations for operating the division, and to make recommendations to the division's body of institutional CEOs and to handle responsibilities delegated to it" (NCAA Division I, II, III Manuals, 1996, p. 21).

Research on the NCAA has been sporadic at best. The general themes that have been highlighted in journal publications have studied the NCAA as a cartel, role of women, and athletic reform. General interest books such as *Unsportsmanlike Conduct: Exploiting College Athletics* (Byers, 1995), and *College Sports Inc. - The Athletic Department vs The University* (Sperber, 1990) are two examples of books that give an overview of intercollegiate athletics in respect to history, reform, economic implications and interpretations of the role of the NCAA in intercollegiate athletics.

There are several books on the sociology of sport that highlight the NCAA. Academic titles such as *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics* (Frey, 1982), *Sport and Higher Education* (Chu, Segrave, & Becker, 1985), *Power and Ideology in American Sport-A Critical Perspective* (Sage, 1998) provide a chapter or two dedicated to the history of the NCAA and its current status. These materials have been written to appeal to the academic orientation of university courses.

Twenty seven years ago, Tate (1971) concluded that intercollegiate athletics
could be viewed as a cartel arrangement; the numerous rules and regulations made intercollegiate market very unique; “big-time” programs generated a surplus of revenues; and, the NCAA’s actions would lead to greater strength at the regional and national levels. As the NCAA grew in numbers enforcement of their rules and regulations became prominent. Stern (1981) examined the interorganizational coordination exercised through the surveillance and sanctioning activity of the NCAA.

“The NCAA imposes penalties for violations of its interorganizational agreement on the rules of amateurism. These penalties put some members of the association at a disadvantage, and are administered in spite of the importance of competitive position for each of the members of the association” (Stern, 1981, p. 16).

Cullen, Latessa and Byrne (1990) about scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics. This seems to be a recurring theme in the literature written about intercollegiate athletics. Cull et al., (1990) focused on four areas-(a) coaches’ views on the prevalence of, causes of violations of NCAA regulations, and proposed strategies to control them; (b) coaches’ views on the prevalence causes, and control of drug abuse among college athletes; (c) coaches’ views on academic reforms within collegiate athletics; and (d) coaches’ views on reforming NCAA regulations.

Pickle (1994) gave an overview of the 88th NCAA convention. The highlights of this convention were non-legislative activities such as gender equity, playoff format and a variety of financial considerations. Even though Title IX was enacted back in 1972, it has just become a vocal point for the NCAA. Lovett and Lowery (1995a,b) presented a
historical overview of the role of women in the NCAA since the demise of the Association of Intercollegiate Athletic Association (AIAW). Their second study examined the success of liberal feminism in providing equal opportunity for women in the NCAA.

The issue of the NCAA being a cartel is still very prominent in today’s literature. DeSchriver and Stotlar (1996) analyzed such behavior. While Fizel and Bennett (1996) provided a specific example of this when they researched the NCAA Television Plan and its effect on recruiting. The Kansas City Star put together a six part series on the NCAA in October 1997. This series titled “Money Games-Inside the NCAA” featured articles on money, amateurism, enforcement, safety, women and classroom. Each story puts a negative spin on the NCAA as an organization.

While the foregoing literature is incisive and insightful in addressing the issues associated with intercollegiate athletics, they were not directed at evaluating the effectiveness of the NCAA per se. Most of the studies on intercollegiate athletics have been focused on the affairs of member institutions rather than on the NCAA itself. Those studies and writings that dealt with the NCAA have generally been historical descriptions of the evolution of the NCAA or restricted to one aspect such as the NCAA being a cartel. The proposed study is expected to fill the void to some extent by examining the effectiveness of NCAA governance activities on a broader basis.

Organizational effectiveness itself has been a nebulous concept defying a precise definition and/or measurement. Various authors have advanced different frameworks to conceptualize and measure organizational effectiveness. These perspectives can be
categorized based on whether they emphasize the input, throughput, or output
dimensions of an organizational system.

In the goals model, goal attainment is the critical defining variable of
organizational effectiveness. In the system resource model, the ability of the organization
to secure its resources is the measure of organizational effectiveness. Finally, in the
internal process model, the structure and processes of an organization are the criteria by
which organizational effectiveness is evaluated.

While the goals model appears to be the most rational and straightforward it is
plagued by the ambiguity of goals and multiplicity of goals (Chelladurai, 1987; Slack,
1997). The system resources model focuses on the ability of an organization to
effectively interact with its environment and secure the necessary resources from the
environment. But the model can not be applied to public and third sector organizations
as these organizations are funded by tax monies (Chelladurai, 1987; Slack, 1997). The
internal process model suggests that the structure and process within an organization
would be an indication of its effectiveness. That is, if the structure and processes are
consistent with each other and provide a motivational basis for its members, it is said to
be effective. Thus, different organizations with different processes may achieve similar
ends. The problem is that the focus on internal processes may lead to deification of the
process (Chelladurai, 1985). Further, an organization with smooth and frictionless
processes may still fail to achieve its goals. By the same token, an organization with
several internal problems may achieve it ends (Chelladurai, 1985; Slack, 1997). It must
be noted that as these three approaches are derived from a systems view of organizations
the three models of effectiveness are integrally linked (Chelladurai, 1987).

Given the difficulty in exclusively applying either goal, the system resource or the process models, it may be necessary to assess the effectiveness of an organization from the multidimensional perspective (i.e., at the three stages of the input-throughput-output cycle).

While the foregoing discussion of organizational effectiveness relate to what should be evaluated (i.e., the multidimensionality of effectiveness), there is another issue that needs to be addressed. That is, who should be the evaluators. In so far an organization has multiple constituencies (stakeholders), the organization and its administrators need to be concerned with the relative primacy of the views of these constituent groups (Chelladurai, 1987; Connelly et al., Slack, 1997; Zammuto, 1984). Connelly et al., (1980) noted that the perspective of all constituents are legitimate, and therefore, it is not possible to rate them. Thus, the organization needs to satisfy all constituents. Their suggestion is that we need to think of “effectiveness” (i.e., satisfying the expectations of several constituents) rather than effectiveness in a singular form. Zammuto (1984) presented two other approaches to address the issue of primacy of stakeholder views. First, the views of those who provide the greatest support to the organization should be held supreme (i.e., the power approach). Another view holds that the perspective of the least advantaged should be the guiding force in evaluating organizational effectiveness (i.e., the social justice perspective). Chelladurai (1987) basing his arguments on Blau and Scott’s (1962) concept of prime beneficiary suggested that every organization has a prime beneficiary. That is, the organization exists
primarily for the benefit of one specific constituent group. Thus, the perspective of the prime beneficiary should be held in sight in evaluating the effectiveness of an organization.

In addition to the difficulty of arising from the various, and at times, conflicting approaches to the study of organizational effectiveness (i.e., multiple dimensions and multiple constituents), there is the added issue of whether any of those perspectives would be relevant to an organization like the NCAA. The traditional models were developed to assess the effectiveness of self-contained entities that compete with similar other entities. Thus, the notions of system resources, internal throughout processes, and outputs (and the associated models of effectiveness) are more relevant to such organizations. In contrast, the NCAA is an entity envisioned by and composed of member institutions similar to industry and trade associations. That is, the inter-organizational network of universities have established the NCAA and provided it with a mandate to implement the policies sanctioned by member institutions, and monitor and control any infringement by member institutions. From this perspective, the greater emphasis is on fulfilling the mandate assigned to the NCAA rather than on its internal processes or the capacity to secure resources for itself. That is, it is the impact that the NCAA has as a representative body on its own member institutions that should be the central focus of evaluation.

Given the above thrust on the mandate of the NCAA, the guiding principles listed in Table 1 become a target for analysis and evaluation. First, these principles guide the development of policies and practices of the NCAA. Second, these principles have been
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Control Responsibility</td>
<td>Each member institution to be responsible and control its intercollegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Athletics program in compliance with the rules and regulations of the NCAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>To protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equity</td>
<td>The activities of the NCAA should be conducted in a manner free of gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sportsmanship-Ethical Conduct</td>
<td>Each member institution to establish policies for sportsmanship and ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conduct consistent with the educational mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Academic Standards</td>
<td>Each student-athlete be an integral part of the student body and academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>progress be consistent with the policies and standards adopted for student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>body in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondiscrimination</td>
<td>The NCAA to refrain from discrimination with respect to governance policies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational programs, activities and employment policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity within Governance Structure</td>
<td>To promote diversity of representation within its various divisional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>governance structures and substructures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules Compliance</td>
<td>The NCAA to assist the institution in effort to achieve full compliance with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all the rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateursm</td>
<td>Student-athletes shall be amateurs and protected from exploitation by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional and commercial enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Equity</td>
<td>To promote opportunity for equity in competition to assure individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>student-athletes and institutions compete on a level playing field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Recruiting</td>
<td>To balance the interests of student-athletes, their educational institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and member institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Eligibility</td>
<td>To assure proper emphasis on educational objectives, competitive equity and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prevention of exploitation of student-athletes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Financial Aid</td>
<td>Student-athlete may receive financial aid as long as it does not exceed the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cost of education authorized by the NCAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Playing Practice Seasons</td>
<td>Shall have time to acquire a quality education that is consistent with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>general student body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Post-season Competition</td>
<td>To control and protect student-athletes from contests sponsored by non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collegiate organizations, and exploitation by professional and commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enterprises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing the Economy of Athletics</td>
<td>To keep prudent management and fiscal practices of program operations to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assure the financial stability for student-athletes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

Description of Principles for Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics
individually and collectively approved by member institutions through their representatives. Thus, the extent to which the NCAA upholds and enforces these principles would be a valid indication of its effectiveness. Accordingly, one purpose of the study was to assess the extent to which the NCAA has achieved what it set out to do (i.e., implement and monitor the principles).

While the principles are some of the mandate of the NCAA, there are other unwritten elements in the mandate of organizations such as the NCAA and what it should do as an inter-organizational network or an industry association. The literature on interorganizational networks and industry/trade organizations, suggests that such organizations create greater access to resources for member organizations, and help increase the financial performance of members (Human & Provan, 1997). In addition, the interorganizational network is expected to facilitate innovation and sharing of knowledge and learning among member institutions (Goes & Park, 1997). Provan (1983) notes that a federation (a form of interorganizational network) contributes to the coordination of interdependent activities among member institutions. The impact of the NCAA on member institutions can be transactional (enhanced resource acquisition or gains in performance) or transformational in nature (changes in ways of thinking, acting or both). Thus, another purpose of the study was to assess the extent to which the NCAA achieved these “Network” functions.

While the foregoing emphasis on the NCAA mandate and associated principles and its “Network” functions makes the issue of organizational effectiveness simple and straightforward, the issue of selecting one set of evaluators over another becomes
complex. As noted before, this is the central theme in the literature dealing with multiple constituencies (e.g., Chelladurai, 1987; Connolly, Conlon & Deutsch, 1980; Zammuto, 1984). In our context, the stakeholders in the activities of the NCAA are manifold. They can be identified as the athletes, the general student body and faculty/staff in each member institution, society at large, the media, and of course the administrators of athletics in member institutions (including the presidents and vice-presidents). For the purposes of the present study, the athletic administrators of athletic programs were requested to provide the evaluation. These are the stakeholders who have the most first-hand information about the NCAA and its activities. Further, they are also the direct recipients of NCAA service (advise, guidance, and/or reprimands as the case may be). Thus the choice of this set of stakeholders was appropriate. The Chief Executive Officers of the athletic (i.e., the Athletic Directors or ADs) of member institutions were not included as evaluators for two reasons. First, they serve as a linking pin between the member institutions and the NCAA. Thus, it would not be fair to ask them to evaluate the operation they themselves sanction and oversee. Second, these ADs are not likely to have time to respond to the ever-flowing questionnaires.

Although the NCAA is a governing body encompassing the institutions belonging to Divisions I, II, III the present study will be confined to the assessment by athletic Administrators in Division I institutions. This is necessitated by the fact that most of the principles outlined earlier and the activities thereof are directed toward high level athletics in Division I institutions. On a more practical level, an in-depth investigation of one division which involves most of the administrators in that division is more worthwhile
than investigating all three divisions involving fewer respondents from each division. 
Involving all administrators from all divisions would not be financially feasible in the present investigation.

Within this broader thrust, the effects of gender of respondents on their evaluation of the NCAA were also investigated. Given the serious concerns regarding gender equity and gender based employment practices (e.g., Lovett & Lowry, 1995; Pastore, 1992), it was felt that the women administrators might have different views on the extent to which the NCAA acts to uphold its principles. This speculation was empirically verified. Accordingly, this study included men and women respondents in equal proportions. Similarly, it was also the intent to verify the differences, if any, among the respondents grouped by race.

The contributions of this study can be divided into three areas. The staff of the NCAA would benefit from this study because highlights how effective the Association is in upholding its principles, and highlights areas of strength and weakness of the Association as perceived by a specific constituent group. The results of the study could guide other comparable sport organizations that are interested in enhancing their effectiveness. Finally, this research adds to the increasing literature in the field of sport management.

**Need for the Study and Statement of the Problem**

The NCAA governs such a wide constituency, it is important that it is held accountable for its activities and their effectiveness. To date, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the NCAA has not been completed. While several other constituents
may be enrolled for the purpose of evaluation, the most critical constituents are the administrators of intercollegiate athletics in member institutions. It is expected that the results of the study will provide some insights and guidelines for enhancing the effectiveness of the NCAA. In addition, the study lays out a prototype for the study of similar other governing bodies of sport. For example, the framework developed in this study can be applied to other national and regional umbrella organizations governing at the high school level, at the amateur level, and professional level. From different perspectives, the evaluation of the implementation and enforcement of the principles of NCAA is tantamount to evaluation of its programs.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. The data collected in this study were obtained through self-administered mail survey questionnaires. No direct control was exercised over the athletic administrators' responses.

2. This research study relied on perceptions of athletic administrators regarding effectiveness of the NCAA which may not reflect reality in its entirety.

3. The study was limited by the restrictions imposed by the validity and reliability measures of the data collection instrument.

**Delimitations of the Study**

1. This study was limited to perceptions of athletic administrators of the member institutions. There was no effort to evaluate the NCAA activities through any other means.

2. The study was limited to Division I institutions. Therefore, the results might not be generalizable to the other two Divisions of the NCAA.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter is divided into two parts: a historical context of the NCAA and a literature review on organizational effectiveness. The following sections are featured: (a) the beginning of NCAA, (b) the Carnegie foundation report, (c) the commercialization of the NCAA, (d) the Sanity Code, (e) women sports join NCAA, (f) reform of the NCAA, (g) organizational effectiveness, (h) effectiveness ideas and definitions, (i) goal model approach, (j) system resource, (k) internal process, (l) multiple constituency, and (m) external sport research.

The Beginning of the NCAA

The beginning of intercollegiate sport was a crew race between Harvard and Yale in 1852. It was seen as a tool to publicize the college and, thus, aid admission (Chu, Segrave & Becker, 1985). In the second intercollegiate contest (the 1855 Harvard-Yale boat race) the eligibility of a Harvard coxswain became an issue making there a need for some form of governance.

Following the English model of sports in the private secondary schools, the early American intercollegiate governing bodies were student-initiated and student-run (Sage, 1990). At that time, the intercollegiate affairs were supervised by an athletic committee council. It controlled the travel, finances, field, equipment, and other athletic necessities.
This initial step was followed by some form of faculty involvement through an athletic committee or council.

During the late 1870's, a gradual transformation began in the governance of intercollegiate sports, one that led to the diminution and defacto elimination of student control. University administrators, and faculty sought increased participation in the management of college athletics. This group all felt the job of running intercollegiate athletics had become too large for students to handle (Frey, 1982; Sage, 1990). It was felt that college students were pursuing goals incongruent with those higher education: mismanaging finances, and glorifying athletics over academics (Sage, 1990). The alumni too, were more intent on the pursuit of gate receipts and winning championships than they were on educational standards (Sage, 1990).

The Intercollegiate Football Association had been established by 1876 and the college game of football spread quickly throughout the country. In these early days, money was already an influence (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). On college campuses during the 1890's, sports had become a small business enterprise (Chu et al., 1985, p.7). An example was Yale, a leading national power in 1903, made more than $150,000 on football (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989).

President Smart of Purdue University was instrumental in forming in 1895 what was known as the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (Sage, 1990). This conference later changed its name to the Big Ten. "Their general insistence on faculty control and their consideration of eligibility in terms of educational standards rather than notions of competitive fairness clearly make them as a
significant development in the evolution of athletic governance” (Frey, 1982, p.22).

In its early years, the NCAA lacked both the power and prestige to have regulatory control or an enforcement mechanism (Chu et al., 1985; Thelin, 1994). The NCAA originally confined itself to standardizing the rules of various sports, particularly those of controlling violence in football (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). Over the years, the NCAA expanded its role much farther, to the point of dominance over most aspects of intercollegiate athletics. Built on the notion of institutional control, the NCAA has two approaches to college sport. In one approach athletics as an integral part of student life and physical education as codified in NCAA Division III athletics. In the second approach, collegiate sport as an entertainment business and a training ground for professional and elite amateur athletes; this is currently codified in NCAA Division I athletics. Division II is a hybrid of the other two (Sage, 1998).

The Carnegie Foundation Report

Colleges and universities in an effort to field winning and financially successful teams ignored the NCAA regulations (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). In an attempt to evaluate the situation, the NCAA called for an independent commission between 1916 to 1926 to investigate college sport, an undertaking finally accepted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This report underscored the weakness of the NCAA (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989; Thelin, 1994). Recruiting, coaching and administration were aspects of the athletic department that were reviewed over the next 13 years by the foundation as they went to over a hundred colleges.
In 1929, the Report documented the rampant professionalism, commercialization and exploitation. An interlocking network that included: expanded press coverage, public interest, alumni involvement and recruiting abuses were all major aspects of intercollegiate athletics and urged the college administrators to take charge and clean up the situation (Frey, 1982; Chu et al., 1985; Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989; Thelin, 1994). Despite the widespread attention that was paid to the report at the time of its publication, the NCAA did little to correct the situation. “The association was admitting there was a problem, but it shied away from solutions” (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989, p. 8).

**Commercialization of NCAA**

As many programs were threatened because of the rising costs of sport, they were driven to win competitions and make more money. “Within the university, athletics became more influential, businesslike and digression from the rules more common (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989, p. 8). The NCAA’s annual convention in 1934 adopted a code of behavior to govern recruiting of athletes and to prevent payments to college athletes. However, these lacked any severe penalties for their violation, and therefore the colleges tended to circumvent and ignore them. “In 1941, a new NCAA constitution was ratified that called for the expulsion of members who refused to adhere to association policy” (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989, p. 9).

In the 1930’s the NCAA started to exhibit the behavior of what economists call a cartel, that is, an organization preoccupied with control of markets and competition. During this period finances of radio broadcasts were a source of concern for the NCAA. The NCAA was concerned with the loss of gate receipts and attendance at games.
To the contrary, radio broadcasts enhanced the popularity of the college game. What had been feared as an intrusion turned out by 1940 to be an unexpected source of publicity and income as intercollegiate athletics became increasingly commercialized" (Thelin, 1995, p. 60).

An indication of the growing interest in collective solutions was the increase in NCAA membership, following World War II, which grew from 216 in 1945 to 317 in 1949. During the period between World Wars, one of the most significant organizational developments in college athletics was the incorporation and refinement of the campus-based athletic association. Intercollegiate sports had acquired both an infrastructure and super structure with the emergence of the NCAA and maturation of the various athletic conferences (Thelin, 1994).

The Sanity Code

The historic "Conference on Conferences" resulted in the passing of the Principals for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics (Wiggins, 1995). It was a concise declaration of: 1. principles of amateurism, 2. institutional control and responsibility, 3. sound academic standards, 4. financial aid, and 5. athletic recruitment. Its intent was to state in general language for all member institutions that varsity athletes were genuine students. Institutions objected to the Principles because they transferred authority to the NCAA, and away from the institution or conference. This resistance caused the NCAA to forfeit an opportunity to be ahead of abuses, rather than to respond to offenses (Thelin, 1994).

The Sanity Code adopted scholarships to athletics based on financial need or
academic excellence, not athletic ability. This was done in an attempt to curb illegal payments to players (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989; Roberts & Olson, 1989; Yaeger, 1991; Thelin, 1994). To enforce this code, a Constitutional Compliance Committee and a Fact Finding Committee were founded to investigate all reported violations (Yaeger, 1991; Thelin, 1994; Wiggins, 1995). The committee had reported to the NCAA membership that the code had been a failure as six schools had been found by the committee to have violated the code (Yaeger, 1991). Expulsion from the NCAA was the only penalty the code allowed which the membership refused to mete out (Yaeger, 1991). Two years later, the NCAA dropped the Sanity Code and based scholarships on athletic prowess. Members of the NCAA gave the association additional power to penalize institutions which violated rules (Chu et al., 1985; Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989; Olson & Roberts, 1989). "Despite its limits, the Sanity Code was a landmark in NCAA enforcement. It set a precedent for the NCAA to punish individual student violators and to suspend institutions that did not comply" (Thelin, 1994, p. 103).

The NCAA flexed its muscles, and established the association as the power behind college sport and as the defender of ethical behavior by leveling sanctions against Kentucky (point shaving and gambling) and Bradley (point shaving and under-the-table payments). This was the first time the NCAA put institutions on probation when it put canceled the men's Kentucky basketball program for a year (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989; Thelin, 1994). This marked the time when the NCAA changed from an advisory body to a governing body with full power to police and penalize (Chu et al., 1985). These sanctions were the most important factors in stepping up the stature of the NCAA (Yaeger, 1991).
“The structure of the NCAA and the source of its power are specified in the Constitution of the NCAA, the Bylaws, including “Official Interpretations”, the Executive Regulations, the Recommended Policies and Practices, and the Procedures concerning Enforcement, which are all found in the NCAA manual. The members of the NCAA are bound by these documents, and their adherence to such documents makes the intercollegiate athletic market openly imperfect and collusive in nature” (Frey, 1982, p. 118). “The NCAA’s regulatory function, as it is known today, had begun” (Frey, 1982, p. 109).

By 1960 the NCAA had two power sources: 1. it acquired license to police athletic programs; and 2. it benefited financially as a promoter and protector of commercial interests, whether it be in television contracts or in bowl games (Thelin, 1994).

The revenue generated by these commercial interests reinforced the NCAA's economic priorities and made educational emphasis in athletics even more difficult (Wiggins, 1995).

Women Sports Join NCAA

The NCAA became involved with women's athletics because schools wanted to provide alternative competition for women as well as to represent women's programs. The NCAA solely governed men’s college sport and so engaged in dialogue with the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) to coordinate the governance of all intercollegiate athletics (Frey, 1982). Continued AIAW efforts to enforce federal Title IX legislation, which stated, "Title IX, a provision in the 1972 Education Amendments that mandated equal access and opportunities for women in education. With prodding from the federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare,
colleges and universities also applied the law to women's athletics and began funding them generously to move them toward parity with men's athletic programs" (Sperber, 1990, p. 323). In spite of this effort by the AIAW, the NCAA at its 1980 convention voted to offer women championships.

Given the inducement of expenses-paid competitions, 150 of the major powers in women's sport dropped out of the AIAW and affiliated with the NCAA, which required membership and adherence to its rules. After the loss of an antitrust suit in February 1983, the AIAW all but ceased to exist, having had its responsibility and membership taken over by the more financially powerful NCAA (Frey, 1982; Sperber, 1990).

Reform

The growing number of schools involved in sporting competitions increased the need for standardizing rules, communications and coordination. The NCAA gained recognition as the official spokesperson for college athletics by staging championship events which became very important to schools with big-time athletic programs (Chu, 1989).

The growth of the NCAA is an example of bureaucratic evolution. Its development involved the growth of a complex administrative network with its own rules, justice, laws and bureaucrats (Frey, 1982). One of the NCAA’s coup was that it had defused external financial threats while increasing its internal authority over member institutions by controlling the selection of games to be televised. The move into television packages also gave the NCAA mass exposure as the "voice of college sports" during pre-game and halftime shows. The television contracts provided revenues for running NCAA
championship events and meeting NCAA operational expenses (Thelin, 1994).

The NCAA developed more and more rules regarding the recruitment and subsidization of college athletes, but this did not decrease institutions from cheating. The NCAA put more than 150 schools on probation for illegal recruiting, payments to athletes, or illegal benefits to them during the decades of the 1960’s, 70’s and early 80’s (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989).

The NCAA adopted in 1983 what is commonly called Proposition 48, which required that high school students who wanted to play intercollegiate sports as freshmen meet minimum academic standards in high school. This standard went into effect in 1986 (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). In 1985, with abuses at an all time high, presidents of member institutions started to regain control (Thelin, 1994). The NCAA adopted harsher sanctions against institutions who continued to break rules/regulations with the “death penalty”, which called for the suspension of an athletic program (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989). The NCAA forced institutions and their presidents and chancellors to be more accountable for their sport programs, a measure that many think has been needed for years and that will hopefully lead to the prevention of future problems.

The basis for much of the NCAA’s legislation is the issue of integrity. It is virtually impossible to legislate integrity, and one of the reasons the NCAA finds itself entangled in legislative snarls today is the fact that for more than 50 years it has tried to do just that (Lapchick & Slaughter, 1989).

The NCAA has labeled student-athletes as the major cause of the continuing problems suffered by collegiate sports, instead of addressing structural issues. To prove
this point, legislation had been passed that were designed to convince the public that the
NCAA is right. "Fostering individualism (the student athlete, in this case) as the source of
the problem is a tactic frequently used by dominant groups seeking to divert attention
from group grievances, thus undercutting their legitimacy" (Sage, 1990, p. 184).

By fostering this individualism as a problem source, the NCAA has attempted to
make the appearance of problem solving with college sports. However, in actuality, the
NCAA has used student-athletes as a scapegoat for their failure to address the real causes
of corruption, cheating and unethical behavior that are now well documented. Meanwhile,
student-athletes continue to be exploited and victimized. "Far from desiring to change the
basic commercial and exploitative structure of major college sports, the NCAA and
member universities seem to be striving for a change in social and conditions by means of
which existing patterns will be made as tolerable and comfortable as possible while
meaningful reform remains largely a false promise" (Sage, 1990, p. 187).

Organizational Effectiveness

Scholars agree that organizational effectiveness is important for applied,
experimental and functional reasons, but there are little consensus regarding the definition
and appropriate means of measurement (Coulter, 1979; Cameron & Whetten, 1983; Hoy,
Van Fleet & Yetley, 1984; Zammuto, 1984; Kerr, 1991). It is extremely difficult to define
and measure effectiveness as a concept. For many years researchers have struggled with
the decision of what exactly this term means. Theoretically, organizational effectiveness
exists at the core of all conceptual models of organizations (Bennett, 1986). "Efficiency
and effectiveness are performance domains that have been clearly distinguished (Ostroff &
Schmitt, 1993, p. 1345). Efficiency refers to an input-output ratio or comparison, whereas effectiveness refers to an absolute level of either input acquisition or outcome attainment (Pennings & Goodman, 1977; Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993). Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) originally proposed the systems resource model that focused on the acquisition of scarce and valued resources whereas, goal theorists accentuate goal attainment as the determinant of effectiveness (Price, 1972; Cameron, 1981; Chelladurai, 1985, 1987; Kerr, 1991).

In fact, some researchers (Goodman, Atkin, & Schoorman, 1983; Hannan & Freeman, 1977a) have even suggested abandoning "effectiveness" as a scientific concept. In a similar vein, Connolly, Conlon, & Deutsch (1980) criticized the research literature on effectiveness for being in a state of "conceptual disarray". Nord (1983) suggested the area is in a "chaotic state of affairs"; and Quinn & Cameron (1983) describe effectiveness as a paradoxical concept.

Experimentally, effectiveness is the utmost dependent variable in organizational research (Bennett, 1986). To confirm that one system is better or more desirable than another, terms such as prolific, adaptiveness, achievement, efficiency, and betterment are used as alternatives for effectiveness (Cameron and Whetten, 1983). Functionally, effectiveness is used as a determinant of individual responsibility. These decisions include either stopping interaction, enforcing certain demands, or altering the quality of interaction with the organization (Zammuto, 1982).

The controversy surrounding organizational effectiveness is reflected in that there is no universal agreement about what the term effectiveness means, in either a practical or theoretical sense. Effectiveness is the product of what an individual or organization
prefers or the values they want to emphasize. This "openness" makes it difficult to formulate the best criteria for assessing effectiveness. "An alternate approach would be to study one governing body, preferably a successful one, with the intention of identifying those organizational factors and management practices that contribute to its success" (Chelladurai & Morrow, 1992, p. 134). Various researchers have emphasized the importance of including the constituents' in any organizational analysis. For example, Zammuto (1984) noted the usefulness of multiple evaluations of the performance of a single organization from different value perspective. In a 1990 review (Robbins) of the organizational effectiveness studies completed in the 1960s and 1970s, 30 different criteria were identified which purported to measure effectiveness. These included concepts such as: "productivity, profit, growth, goal consensus, and stability" (Slack, p. 18).

Cameron (1981) stated the effectiveness of an organization is seen by the degree in which the needs of certain constituencies are met by the organization. The environment by which the organization functions determines the various constituencies. These constituencies will have various points of view as to what should be the organizational goals. In an organization, not all the constituencies need to be satisfied at the same time, it all depends upon the circumstance. In some cases when one constituent is satisfied, the organization could be termed a success.

Quinn and Cameron's (1983) applied the concept of an organization having a life cycle. The life cycle model states that a consistent pattern of development seems to occur in organizations over time. The four stages are entrepreneurial (open system), collectivity (human relations), formalization and control (goal setting/attainment) and structural
elaboration and adaptation (expansion). This model suggests the nature of the dominant constituency is likely to change, making it necessary for the criteria to evaluate effectiveness to change from each of the stages. Other constituencies are likely to become more dominant at these different stages. These four stages exist for all organizations and the type of model used (goals, process, systems resources) will vary in each organization (Quinn and Cameron, 1983).

Hitt (1988) studied the variance in effectiveness of subunits in an organization. Each subunit would emphasize different effectiveness domains and measurements of effectiveness should be placed on the individual units instead of attempting only to measure the effectiveness of the total organization. First, the identification of the domains and then the measurement of the organizations performance must be established. Smaller firms would be measured at the organizational level while larger, more complex business would focus on department levels. Hitt (1988) adopted the Thompson model of "fitness for the future." Corporations must recognize multiple effectiveness domains and multiple constituencies.

The interaction of domains and constituencies affect the type of measures necessary to assess effectiveness. The organization can forsee the cause/effect relationships and refine standards. Where the domains are external and constituents are internal, social comparisons on internal process measures should be the most dominant form of effectiveness measurement with instrumental also being weighted heavily.

"Cameron and Whetten (1983) concluded that there could not be a universalist model of effectiveness and that it would be more worthwhile to develop frameworks for
assessing effectiveness than to try to develop theories of effectiveness (Bennett, 1986). There has been, however, research on many types of organizations to decide the relative effectiveness of universities (Cameron, 1981b), volunteer organizations, hospitals, government agencies and public education. A central problem common to these studies was the lack of inclusion of a broad perspective that accounted for behavioral responses of all constituents involved, mainly because these studies had only used a goal and/or systems model. If research could be conducted using a multiple constituency model then, it would be possible to develop mechanisms that incorporated into the decision making process information about these behavioral responses (Zammuto, 1982).

In sport organizations, effectiveness has usually been operationalized in terms of win/loss records and in terms of meeting specific objectives. Frisby (1986) research was the relationship between goal and systems model in Canadian National Sport Governing Bodies. The author feels the two models could be combined too more adequately represent the complexes of organizational effectiveness in a sport setting. Chelladurai and Haggerty (1991) determined the dominant patterns of task differentiation among Canadian national sport organizations. Chelladurai, Haggerty, Campbell, and Wall (1981) identified 11 criteria of effectiveness that occur in intercollegiate athletic programs. These included achieved excellence, spectator interest, career opportunities, student recruitment potential, competitive opportunities, sharing of costs by team, operating costs, activity as a life sport fitness, satisfaction of athletes, and sport characteristics (Slack, 1997). Most federally funded organizations, however, been evaluated using a goal evaluated using a goal-based
model and in federally funded sport organizations it is the goal of performance excellence that has been the center of focus.

Assessment based on the inner values of the constituent groups as opposed to an external focus of goals of performance excellence raised the ethical questions of benefit for either individuals or society and change for the benefit of one group over another. As the NCAA grows, the impact of change has affected more and more individuals. To meet expenses an increased amount of resources has brought new problems to the administration of sport. As sport became more business-like and more bureaucratic, some sports are having trouble in this new environment. In this turbulent environment, survival is paramount for universities/colleges because effective organizations will survive if the demand to satisfy all constituents is met. Thus, the situation was that models of effectiveness did not give the complete information necessary for sport organizations to make decisions that accounted for the preferences of all the constituents.

**Effectiveness Ideas and Definitions**

A concern of many administrators and organizations is how effective they are, which is known as organizational effectiveness (Chelladurai, 1987). Due to the diverse theoretical models of effectiveness has lead to problems in defining and assessing the criteria of effectiveness have been encountered. Although there are problems associated with the idea of organizational effectiveness, the central focus of a manager is to create an effective organization. The use of different models within organizations have caused relationships to dissipated, escalated, became impertinent or completely reversed (Bennett, 1986). Consequently, defining several models of organizational effectiveness
and their strengths, weaknesses and how they intertwine is essential. By applying multiple models of effectiveness, the dilemma of using an exclusive viewpoint is hindered because of its inability to define effectiveness totally. Every model is significant because it consists of relationships and characteristics that other models bypass. The problem with single models of effectiveness is that the results offer a constricted viewpoint.

Thus, using only the goal model of organization effectiveness is deficient because organizations can be assessed effective even if all their goals are not reached. On the other hand, an organization can use all its resources and may be considered ineffective because of different factors not incorporated in the goal model.

As administrators of corporations regularly utilize information on employee performance; coaches, directors and others affiliated with athletic programs may also benefit from the knowledge of what enhances or inhibits the success of their programs. In contemporary research, a multitude of positive and negative factors that may have a significant influence on effectiveness are considered in order to stimulate optimal performance. Knowledge of these factors is as important to sport organizations as it is to multi-national companies (Rawlings, 1988, p.2).

Yuchtman & Seashore (1967), Coulter (1979), Cameron (1981), Chelladurai (1985, 1987) and Kerr (1991) have suggested that most definitions can be categorized into one of four different models of effectiveness: goals, systems resource, process and multiple constituency. To be evaluated as a system, the organization with its various inputs, throughputs and outputs all must be measured. To exclusively use a single framework to measure organizational effectiveness (i.e., goals model) will not be enough. "As Cameron
(1986, p. 540) notes, all theories of organizations rely on some conception of the
difference between high-quality (effective) performance and poor-quality (ineffective
performance)". Hence, effectiveness is inherently tied to all theory on organizations.
“Benson (1977) makes a similar argument when he suggests that, within the field of
organizational analysis, a great deal of attention has been given to studies of organizational
effectiveness; and that even studies which do not focus on effectiveness deal with it
implicity, as a background orientation" (Slack, 1997, p. 19).

The four major approaches identified by Cameron (1980) in evaluating effectiveness
are: the goal model approach, the system resource approach, internal process approach
and the multiple constituency approach. Quinn & Rohrbaugh (1981, 1983) developed an
approach they termed “competing values”.

**Goal Model Approach**

The most widely used and recognized approach in organizational effectiveness is the
goal model approach. The goal model approach identifies goals and how organizations
work to towards achieving their stated goals. To be considered effective with this
approach, one must look at the end results not the means used to reach these results. It
was the focus of early researchers who studied effectiveness. This approach had its roots
in the Weberian idea of functional rationality. Organizations are viewed as formal, rational
instruments set up to attain specific, identifiable organizational goals (Williams, 1988).

This model describes effectiveness as the extent to which an organization
Operative goals indicate what the organization aims to actually achieve in spite of what the
official goals indicate are the aims. These operative goals are the most important goals to focus on when using this approach to organization effectiveness. For this model to be workable, the sport organization that is being studied must have goals that are clearly identifiable, consensual, measurable, and time-bounded (Chelladurai, 1985; Slack, 1997).

There is an assumption that organizations have identifiable goals and any progress toward those goals can be measured. For example, a basketball team that had its sights on reaching the first round of the play-offs would be considered effective if this task is accomplished. Similarly, a fitness firm has established its goal as making a certain amount of profit during the fiscal year. If successful, it can be described as an effective organization (Chelladurai, 1985).

The nucleus of this model is on outputs. The most closely effective the outputs achieve its goals, the more effective the organization is. The goal notion is applicable to all organizations although goals may vary from organization to organization that result in diverse operating criteria of effectiveness (Williams, 1988). "There must be general consensus or agreement on the goals and there must be a small enough number of them to be manageable" (Slack, 1997, p. 24).

Campbell (1977) suggests the Management By Objectives (MBO) represents the ultimate in a goal-oriented model of effectiveness. A plan is developed a plan to attain the goals and set time frames. The second stage is implementation, where progress toward the goal is carefully monitored, making corrections as needed. The third stage is evaluating whether or not the goal/goals were reached. If yes, set new goals, if no, develop new plan. This approach does not solve the problem of conflicting preferences and goals among
different organizational groups.

The NCAA consists of and deals with multiple constituencies, and application of the goal model of effectiveness must somehow consider the various groups in its environment—administrators, coaches, players and alumni (Williams, 1988). Since there is friction that remain in the surroundings of the organization, the use of goal model cannot be carried out to an organization as a whole. Friendlander and Pickle (1968) said that evaluation by one interest group may be the opposite of other groups. There often is an inability to identify organizational goals with so many constituents as part as the environment; they are often too broad (non-specific) and many (often differing) constricts can be used in evaluation (Price, 1972).

"(Frisby, 1986, a, p. 95) states goals are most often measured in a sport context reflect an emphasis on performance outcomes and have been operationalized in terms of win/loss records or performance rankings in comparison to other teams" (Slack, 1997, p. 24). "For example, Chelladurai, Szyszlo, and Haggerty (1987) in their study of national sport organizations used the number of medals won at major competitions and number of victories at dual international events as indicators of effectiveness"(Slack, 1997, p. 24). "They suggest that the goal model may be useful for evaluating the effectiveness of elite sport programs, but they reject the use of this approach for mass sport programs, since goal attainment is not easily measured in the latter" (Slack, 1997, p. 24). Organizations can be effective in the win/loss record but not by the bottom line of profit/loss. Also, the goals of an organization can be inconsistent, contradictory and/or incoherent in what units the goal should be measured.
The goal models of effectiveness have failed to differentiate adequately between the goals and non-goals of an organization (Keeley, 1978). "Hannan and Freeman (1977a, p. 111) state most substantive of these problems arises because of the likely multiplicity of organizational goals" (Slack, 1997, p. 24). Depending upon the organization, some will only have one goal, while others have more; the Faculty of Kinesiology at the University of Windsor for example, has goals relating to teaching, research and service. "This multiplicity is compounded in organizations when operative goals are added, and subunits have their own goals, as is so often the case" (Slack, 1997, p. 24). Some goals may be competing or even incompatible making the presence of multiple and conflicting goals in organizations. Thus, effectiveness cannot be solely determined by one single indicator. When an organization plans for outcomes it is usually presumed that these are goals, while those that were not planned were presumably non-goals.

Another limitation to the goal model occurs when many organizations declare their goals in broad, global terms (Chelladurai, 1985). "That is, their goals are designed to delineate a domain of activity and their charters and official notifications are formulated to rationalize their existence and to justify support from the larger community. However, global statements do not provide a focus for organizational analysis. And, if you do not know where you wanted to go in the first place, how can you establish whether you have arrived"(Chelladurai, 1985, p. 174).

Goal displacement is another issue that confuses the issue of goals. If goals are set too low, misplaced or inadvertently dysfunctional, an organization may be ineffective even if it reaches its goals because of those reasons. "These are value-laden terms that tend to..."
view the goals of management as the only legitimate ends of an organization" (Williams, 1988, p. 14). Other problems creep into the goals approach when organizations are being judged effective in areas outside its goal domain (William, 1988).

"Many organizations pursue multiple goals and this factor also limits the utility of a goals model approach for the analysis of organizational effectiveness. Prior to assessing the relative goal attainment, it would be necessary to know the relative importance attached to each" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 174). The problem lies in the possibility of goals being indifferent with each other. An organization can reach one goal "but would be ineffective in terms of the conflicting goal." The goal model does not address the issue of conflicting goals (Chelladurai, 1985).

It is easy to argue that for sport organizations like the Chicago Bulls and the Toronto Blue Jays that the number of games won is a measure of goal-effectiveness, but it is harder to both identify and measure the goals of high school physical education department. Likewise, profit-making sport organizations and professional sport teams also may have goals that relate to such areas as job satisfaction and player development. These goals only can be measured qualitatively and progress toward them is difficult to assess, further complicating the use of goal attainment approach to effectiveness (Slack, 1997).

Price (1972) suggests the one way to overcome the problem of goal clarity is to focus on the organizational decision makers, because their statements and actions regarding the organizations operations reveal its priorities. Chelladurai (1985) notes, that although Price's suggestion has merit, it tends to ignore the fact that there may not be consensus among decision makers as to what the actual sport organization's goals are and
in addition, their goals may change in as much as their power to influence decision changes. In the case of service organizations (i.e., universities) the goal model has problems measuring outputs. In these organizations goals are not easily quantifiable. "Thus, the problem of measuring outputs is acute in all service organizations, particularly in professional service organizations" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 175).

The third problem with the goal model is how it "relates to temporal dimension of goals" (Slack, 1997, p. 25). Most of the published empirical studies focus on the short term goals which might not be appropriate depending on the function of each organization's goals (Hannan & Freeman, 1977). Some organizations emphasize quick return on their investments which short term goals should be considered but other organizations evaluate performance over longer periods such as university faculties producing graduates and research (Slack, 1997). "In addition, different sport organizations operating in the same environment and with the same structure may have similar goals, but may place a different emphasis on their rate of return on investment" (Slack, 1997, p. 25).

The final problem is whose goals count. "Even in the senior management levels of a sport organization there will be variation in beliefs about what are appropriate organizational goals. In some sport organizations the people with power may actually be outside the senior management levels. This condition is not uncommon in voluntary sport organizations, where individuals who may have held a power position (e.g., president) in the organization remain after the tenure, as a member of the rank and file. These individuals, despite not holding an official position, may still exert considerable influence
on organizational goals. The goals usually attributed to the organization are actually those of the dominant coalition" (Slack. 1997. p. 26).

"It is also possible that the goals of an organization maybe considerably influenced by the contextual situation in which the sport organization exists. Macintosh and Whitson (1990), for example, have suggested that Sport Canada strongly influenced the high-performance goals of Canadian national sport organizations" (Slack, 1997, p. 26).

In summary, the goals model can be viewed as effective when an organization has specific and clearly defined goals over time and where performance can be assessed unbiasesly. Because it is logical, those organizations tend to adapt the goal model. In most cases, organizations do not have the ability to clearly define their goals, or the obtainment of goals cannot be objectively measured (Chelladurai, 1985). "The fact that one of the main functions of sport organizations is to achieve their goals, the problems are identifying these goals, deciding which are important (or more important than others) and measuring whether or not they are achieved" (Slack, 1997, p. 26).

"Robbins (1990, p. 57) suggests five ways to increase the validity of the identified goals:

1. Ensure that input is received from all those having a major influence on formulating the official goals even if they are not part of the senior management.

2. Include actual goals obtained by observing the behavior of organizations members.

3. Recognize that organizations pursue both short and long term goals.

4. Insist on tangible, verifiable and measurable goals rather than relying on vague statements that merely mirror societal expectations.

5. View goals as dynamic entities that change over time rather than as rigid or fixed statements of purpose" (Slack, 1997, p. 26).
Another approach to effectiveness is the system resource approach that was originally proposed by Yuchtman and Seashore (1967). They "defined effectiveness as the ability of the organization, in either absolute or relative terms, to exploit its environment in the acquisition of scarce and valued resources" (Yuchtman & Seashore, 1967, p. 898). In doing so, Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) rejected the notion of the organization having goals (Williams, 1988).

Every organization competes with other organizations for resources from the environment and/or society. Thus, effectiveness is associated with the ability to obtain the needed resources. This causes a constant interaction between the organization and the environment. Since different organizations exist in different environments (i.e., poor/rich), effectiveness must be assessed to the potential of that particular environment (Yuchtman and Seashore, 1967). To survive the existing conditions the organization must depend upon the resources (Williams, 1988). "Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) do not limit the concept of resources to physical or economic objects or states but follow Gamson's (1966) argument that the 'reputation' of individual/groups as influential in their community political affairs is itself a resource" (Slack, 1997, p. 26).

"Using the systems resource approach, the more resources an organization gains, the more effective it is judged. Inputs replace outputs as the primary consideration. The systems resource model is most useful when there is a clear connection between resources received by the organization and the products of an organization" (Williams, 1988, p.15).
"Macintosh and Whitson (1990) exemplify the use of national sport organizations in Canada have actively sought out board members with 'corporate credentials'. Obviously those organizations who succeeded in placing senior management individuals on their board would, from a system resource perspective be seen as effective" (Slack, 1997, p. 26). A successful organization must do more then just collect its resources and not use them, which makes the systems resource model very similar to the goal model approach.

Yuchtman and Seashore's (1967) idea of an ultimate criterion that "may never be measured" can be likened to some ultimate organizational goal or "official" goal, which makes this model open to the same criticisms as the goal model (Williams, 1988). When finding these resources, an organization in effect is trying to accomplish some sort of goal. Since many organizations need different resources, this approach of effectiveness must be examined from the point of view of each individual organization or similar types of organizations. This approach does not address the problem of resource accumulation that could cause the effectiveness along one scale, and yet may cause ineffectiveness along another.

Cameron (1981) says that organizations could flourish even when inputs are not optimal and when an advantage in the resource marketplace does not exist. The opposite may also be true, in that an organization could be incompetent when finding optimal resources and still be competitive in the marketplace. In nonprofit organizations the acquisition of inputs is not tied to the production of outputs (Molnar and Rogers, 1976). Thus, the use of obtaining the resources cannot be employed as a proper measure of effectiveness for non-profit organizations.
The systems resource model does help in highlighting an affiliation between an organization and its environment, making this open systems viewpoint a functional one. Both internal and external environment conditions are very important to an organization's existence. By adapting to the environment, an organization is more effective than those organizations that do not adapt.

Coulter (1979) noted that control over the environment and the ideas of flexibility, creativity, adaptability and open communications are all associated with the systems resource model. Cameron (1981) and Chelladurai (1985) further expanded on the systems resource model by saying that those who can receive or exploit greater resources (inputs) or gain scarce and valuable resources would be considered effective. Chelladurai (1987) points out that resources are a requirements to achieve organizational goals and the "greater" the resources, the greater the organizational effectiveness.

It is questionable whether or not public sector and third sector organizations can truly use the system resource model. "A distinguishing characteristic of these organizations is that their resources are guaranteed (to some extent at least) by a superior organization (i.e., government)" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 177).

Thus, the system resource model contains the assumption that the proportion to which an organization can control environmental factors and protect essential resources is a measure of its effectiveness. The importance is placed on the input phase and is purposeful only to the magnitude that the organization's outputs cannot be easily assessed (Chelladurai, 1985). "It may appear at first glance that the goals model and system resource approach are significantly different, the former emphasizes the outputs of the
organization while the latter emphasize the inputs. An organization can only secure inputs from its environment on a continuous basis when its outputs are acceptable to the environment" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 176). "The acquisition of resources does not just happen but is based on what the organization is attempting to achieve, namely its goals" (Hall, 1982, p. 277). In her study of Canadian national sport organizations, Frisby (1986) "did in fact find significant correlation between measures of goal attainment and resource acquisition" (Slack, 1997, p. 27).

The strength of the system resource model is that it uses the organization as its own frame of reference and takes into account the relationship that the organization has with its environment (Slack, 1997). As Daft (1989) points out, it can compare organizations that have different goals. "For example, because all sport organizations have to obtain human, physical, and financial resources to survive (survival being the most basic measure of effectiveness), they can be compared on their ability to obtain these resources from their environment. The local basketball association able to attract a large number of members, for example, will probably be seen by the municipal council as more effective than an orienteering group with just a few members" (Slack, 1997, p. 27).

As a means of assessing effectiveness there are several problems with the systems resource model. First, the foremost of these problems is the fact that this approach to organizational effectiveness is widely quoted in the management literature and even within the relatively sparse literature on the effectiveness of sport organizations, it has produced 'no coherent line of research' (Goodman & Pennings, 1997). A second problem is semantic; it concerns the question of what is an input and what is an output. By way of
illustration, consider the example of attendance at New York Knicks basketball games: is this in fact one form of resource acquisition or is it actually a goal of the organization to increase attendance?" (Slack, 1997, p. 27).

The systems resource approach is also problematic to those public-sector organizations concerned with sport, and to some voluntary sport organizations. The problem arises because these types of organizations, more often than not have a percentage of their funding guaranteed. In Canada, some national sport organizations obtain part of their financial resources from the government. This makes financial resources as an indicator of effectiveness not particularly appropriate. A legitimate way to measure the effectiveness of these sport organizations would be by the amount of funding they obtain from other sources, such as membership fees or corporate sponsorship, because these funds are not guaranteed (Slack, 1997).

Cameron (1980) stated organizations can be successful even when they do not have an advantage in obtaining resources in their environment. An example of this would be the 1978-79 Seattle Sonics of the National Basketball Association (NBA). They did not have any "superstars" on their team and had a rookie head coach, yet they finished second in 1978 and won the world championship in 1979 (Slack, 1997).

**Internal Process Approach**

The process model is directed to the internal processes as the throughputs of an organization which converts the inputs into outputs "rather than on its proposed end states" (Cameron, 1981; Chelladurai, 1985, Slack, 1997). "And, if those throughput processes are internally logical, consistent, and without friction, then it can be assumed
that the organization is effective" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 178). The organization is doing what is reasonable in the framework of its goal and its environment (Chelladurai, 1985).

Coulter (1979) points out that certain behavioral/attitudinal characteristics of an individual or group, offer the most precise measure of organizational effectiveness. Levels of satisfaction, absence of tension and conflict, subordinate commitment and turnover rates are all suitable measures of effectiveness within the process model. "Effective organizations are those with an absence of internal strain, whose members are highly integrated into the system, whose internal functioning is smooth and typified by trust and benevolence toward individuals, where information flows smoothly both vertically/horizontally and so on" (Cameron, 1980, p. 67).

Both Argyris (1964) and Likert (1967) suggested "that human resources practices are linked to organizational effectiveness (Slack, 1997). Daft (1989) suggested that, indicators of an effective organization would should incorporate: supervisors interest and concern for their workers, a feeling of team spirit, group loyalty, and teamwork, good communication, and finally, rewards for managers for the performance growth, the development of subordinates, and the creation of an effective working team, through a compensation system (Slack, 1997). As indicators of internal process effectiveness, Chelladurai and Haggery (1991) used information sharing among members, meaningful organizations of work and concern over employee welfare and happiness when studying national sport organizations.

"In contrast to an emphasis on human resources, some writers have suggested that economic efficiency should be the focus when evaluating the internal processes of an
organization. Martindell (1962), for example, developed a management audit of organizations, which appraises performance on such criteria as health earnings, fiscal policies, research and development, production efficiency and sales. There are ten areas in total in Martindell's audit and each is assigned a weight in terms of its perceived contribution to the organization's overall performance. Although many of the criteria are related to organizations of a profit-making nature, it is possible to modify the approach for use in voluntary organizations" (Slack, 1997, p. 28). The advantage of studying an organization from an audit angle is the comparison of many organizations that would have different outputs, inputs or lack of control over their environment. Human resource variables would pose a problem with this type of evaluation. Chelladurai, Szyszlo, and Haggerty (1987) studied Canadian National Sport Organizations (CNSO) and used such throughputs (transformation) variables as morale among staff members, and volunteers involved in community based programs and the working relationship between the National Sport Governing Bodies (NSGB) and its provincial branches on elite programs. Although these transformational variables are important, the internal processes of organizations makes it extremely difficult concepts to measure in any valid or reliable way" (Slack, 1997).

The problem with the process approach is that it assumes that a panel of experts can decide the relevance of particular processes (Chelladurai, 1985). This judgement gets transferred to all other systems. "Thus, the danger in the use of the process model of effectiveness is that organizations would tend to deify the processes irrespective of their relationship to effectiveness. When specific processes are designated as most effective,
there is a strong likelihood that uniform procedural prescriptions will be set out for all organizations" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 179).

**Multiple Constituency Approach**

There are many studies that emphasized the multiple constituency approach of assessing organizational effectiveness (Coulter, 1979; Salancik, 1984; Hoy et al., 1984). This approach resulted because of the dissatisfaction with the goal and system resource models (Rawlings, 1988; Williams, 1988). "These models share a common theme: organizations are intersections of particular influence loops, each embracing a constituency biased toward assessment of the organization's activities in terms of its own exchanges within the loop" (Williams, 1988, p. 17). The criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness comes from the many constituents and the value they put on things. Perspectives come from: subordinate and superordinate organizational units, large hierarchical organizations, interests of members of the organization who import personal values, and purposes that can reflect on the organization as well as "outside interest" groups and those who represent the public interest (Cameron and Whetten, 1983). Each group (i.e., athletes, administrators, faculty, alumni) defines effectiveness in different and unique ways because of their perspective. An organization is effective when it satisfies the needs of its constituents. Both the external and internal environments influence the organization, so they need to be part of the organizational effectiveness assessment (Zammuto, 1982). Any changes in the environment can define certain constraints that can be put on an organization. The association of preferences and restrictions formulate the conditions for the organization in the future (Zammuto, 1982).
Ostroff and Schmitt (1993) examined the relationship between various characteristics of organizations, such as resource inputs, context, rules and regulations, goals, climate, informal systems and the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations. "Discriminant analyses of the data with the organizations categorized along effectiveness and efficiency domains revealed that different sets or configurations of organizational characteristics were meaningfully related to the different organizational classifications" (Ostroff & Schmitt, 1993, p. 1345).

"It is important to distinguish between a multidimensional approach to effectiveness and the multiple-constituency approach. The former approach simply suggests that an organization should be evaluated on different dimensions - resource acquisition, productivity, smooth functioning of internal processes, and so on. In the multiple-constituency model, however, a focal organization is evaluated by the various constituents on the same dimensions" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 180). Tsui (1990) viewed the multidimensional model as different patterns emerging from organizational performance and its determinants.

Ramanujam, Venkatraman and Camillus (1986) recognized the multidimensional nature of planning systems and "the plurality of approaches that can be used to assess their worth" (p. 348). This particular research study had three features. The first was the identification of seven distinct design and contextual dimensions of planning systems that many previous researchers believe influence their effectiveness. Second, it recognized the many possible meanings of effectiveness in the context of planning and use multiple criteria for assessing effectiveness of planning systems. Third, it used the technique of
discriminant analysis in order to bring the differences between more effective and less effective planning systems closer (Ramanujam et al., 1986). The purpose of this study was to point out that more effective systems will differ from relatively less effective ones along the seven key design and contextual dimensions and the relative importance of these dimensions will vary depending upon the criterion of effectiveness used (Ramanujam et al., 1986).

Even though members of an organization share a traditional theoretical foundation, the constituency models are diverse in terms of the model taken into consideration. The conjecture is that organizational effectiveness will vary depending upon the criteria which is used by the various constituents (Williams, 1988). Depending whether the viewpoint comes from inside or outside the organization, effectiveness means different things. The problem with this model is the difficulty in satisfying all the constituents and "deciding which outcomes are satisfied before one can say an organization is effective" (Salancik, 1984; Cameron, 1984). A solution to this problem "has been selecting an arbitrary set of preferences (e.g. goals of management) or weighting constituencies according to some principle or criterion" (Salancik, 1984, p. 617). Salancik (1984) attempted to demonstrate that such a unique value function is logically possible. "The key to this solution lies in determining the value of outcomes on the basis of relationships among outcomes rather than individual orientations toward them" (Salancik, 1984, p. 617). In the multiple constituency literature, there seems to be four identifiable approaches—relativism, power, social justice and evolutionary perspective.
Relativistic multiple constituency models were viewed as a method to collect data concerning preferences for and judgements about organizational effectiveness. An overall inquiry is considered neither possible nor agreeable and right/wrong are viewed as relative and dynamic according to the situation (Bennett, 1986). Since no assumptions are made concerning the relative primacy of one constituency's judgements over those of any other constituency, an overall judgement of organizational effectiveness is viewed as being neither possible nor desirable (Zammuto, 1982). Constituent preferences will therefore be satisfied on the basis of outcomes in performance because every situation is unique and decisions are individual.

A resource dependence model (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978; Miles, 1980) was used by Armenta (1984) in a study on assessing effectiveness in public community colleges. With this model, effectiveness was defined in terms of those who ultimately control the resources essential to survival. The model that Armenta used relied upon the opinions and perceptions of the external constituencies as a means of evaluating the organization's effectiveness. Armenta recommended using the information concerning preferences of strategic constituencies for shaping institutional priorities and alternatively, that public information programs could be used to alter the preferences of strategic constituencies.

The power criterion is based on the authoritarian approach that right and absolute good are defined by those in power. By applying normative standards the solution to any ethical dilemma could then be solved. Keeley (1984) saw survival as carrying a heavy justification role in power based theories but it may not be a sufficiently important value to bear the load. The greater the power of each of the members, the more likely they will
impose their preferences on other members of the coalition. Participation in an organization did not indicate that individuals were receiving the benefits that they wanted through continued system survival. Therefore, the effective organization according to the meta criterion of power, is seen as the one that satisfies the preferences of the most important organizational constituencies to ensure itself of access to the critical resources controlled by these constituencies. However, Cameron and Whetten (1983) refute the criterion of power because the most powerful constituency is hard to identify in organizations with multiple constituencies and few organizations rely on only one constituency. Determining the most powerful constituency is partly based on subjective assessments and varies according to whom is doing the rating.

The principle of social justice (Keeley, 1978) approach to effectiveness makes the assumption that organizations existed for human benefit and therefore decisions were based on ethical principles. This concept of justice does not allow inequalities unless they benefit the least advantaged person and tradeoffs cannot occur between basic liberties and social or economic advantages (Zammuto, 1984). Connolly et al (1980) criticized the social justice perspective because in a prison, the prisoners are the least advantaged constituency and if dissatisfied would be judged as ineffective.

Zammuto (1982) developed the evolutionary model for effectiveness that based on an evolutionary meta criterion. In the evolutionary model, effectiveness is viewed as situation specific and the definition of organizational performance changed as the context in which it is operating changed. Effectiveness is a wicked problem where societal change has a major implication for organizations and for the assessment of organizational
effectiveness. The effectiveness of an organization at one point in time might be viewed as ineffective at another time because the social context in which it operated has changed.

This view is possible when underlying meta criterion is an evolutionary one (Zammuto, 1982).

Keeley (1982) and Cameron and Whetten (1983) have criticized the evolutionary perspective on the grounds that it presents an indeterminate view of evaluation performance. Identifying survival as the criterion is also a product of individual preference and there is no reason to preferential accept survival and not any other criterion as the best (Cameron and Whetten, 1983). The criterion of survival may not be applicable to organizations which are set up for an explicit time span, therefore an organization might not need to survive in the long run in order to satisfy the needs of its participants. Sometimes it is more advantageous if the organization does not survive. Both survival and demise may represent effectiveness (Williams, 1988).

In overview, evaluation of the four multiple constituency models showed that the construct of organizational effectiveness alludes to human decisions pertaining to the desirability of results of organizational performance according to the viewpoint of the constituencies directly and indirectly influenced by the organization. Zammuto (1984) stated "constituent preferences for performance are the raw materials on which evaluations of organizational effectiveness are based." Cameron and Whetten (1983) reinforce the fact that organizational effectiveness criteria are subjective and not often clear which constituencies are best to solicit.

The multiple constituency model demonstrated its relevance because it considers the
numerous values of an organization's constituent groups. Effectiveness is based on the constituents' values and understanding of what is competent and accurate. The goal model recognizes the organizational goals of a corporation and effectiveness is interpreted as the extent to which these goals are achieved. The core of this model is on outputs: the closely the outputs of an organization approximate its goal, the more effective it is. The system resource model strong point is in exploiting the environment in acquiring valued resources for system maintenance. The organization is in constant exchange with their environment.

"As Yuchtman and Seashore (1967) pointed out, since the three processes of an open system - acquisition of resources, transformation of the inputs (throughputs) and disposal of the outputs - are integrally linked to each other, the effectiveness of the system can be measured at any point in the input-throughput-output cycle" (Chelladurai, 1985, p. 185).

Many articles on organizational effectiveness are not specifically based on findings of empirical research which classify them as conceptual, making their work meaningless in the "real world." None of the empirical research has been organized into an overriding system that explains the great majority of the results. The fact that scholars have a difficult time defining effectiveness makes it a major problem.

Organizational Effectiveness/External

Sport Research

Although there has been very little research on organizational effectiveness in sport organizations, the word "effectiveness" has been used many times in articles relating to
sport governing bodies. Chelladurai and Morrow (1992), and Chelladurai and Orders (1994) support the incorporation of all major parties involved in amateur sport as a means of improving effectiveness.

In sport organizations, effectiveness usually has been operationalized in terms of won/loss records, and in terms of meeting specific objectives. Frisby (1986) concluded that effectiveness in sport has been defined in several different ways with most incorporating the goal model of effectiveness whereby the concept was measured in terms of the ability of the organization to achieve desired objectives.

Recent research (i.e., Chelladurai & Morrow, 1992) on sport organizations has favored the multiple model perspective and has focused on both internal and external constituencies. Most federally funded organizations, however, have usually been evaluated using goal-based model and in federally funded sport organizations it is the goal of performance excellence that has been the focus. Chelladurai et al (1981) used a sample of university students and identified eleven sets of effectiveness criteria for intercollegiate athletic programs. The authors stressed that different criteria are used by different decision makers reflecting the various objectives they hold for the program.

In a study on sport governing bodies, Frisby (1986) used both attainment (goal model) and acquisition of resources (systems model) as two measures of effectiveness viewing them as logical and complementary extensions of each other. There was a correlation between the ability of elite amateur sport organizations to acquire resources and their ability to achieve their performance goals. Frisby indicated that future investigations should focus on the relationships that environmental factors and other
organizational characteristics have on organizational effectiveness.

Some scholars approach organizational effectiveness as different constituents having opposite perspectives of effectiveness and the balancing of these views is a necessity (Cameron, 1981; Chelladurai, 1987; Quinn & Rohrbaugh, 1983). As one constituent gets involved in a project, various interest from other groups will increase and then compete with each other. These issues of conflict can be addressed in a number of ways (focus on one at a time, treat all equal). Problems arise when these paradoxes go unnoticed.

Chelladurai's (1987) model of organizational effectiveness is to apply the prime beneficiary criteria. This is another version of the multiple constituency approach. While many constituents may be influential or beneficial, one group can be identified as the prime beneficiary, that is the group whose benefit is the primary reason why the organization exists. Managers would make sure this group would be satisfied. To keep the prime beneficiary in perspective is to keep the ultimate purpose of the organization in perspective.

Branch (1990) did research on college athletic administrator's leadership behavior as it pertains to the effectiveness of the athletic organizations. The study used a multiple regression model to study the data and learn whether leader behavior predictors and athletic organizational effectiveness were linearly related. The author concluded that athletic directors were significant contributors in forecasting athletic organizational effectiveness.

Kerr (1991) examined ways in improving sport organization effectiveness. The article outlined three of the most prominent models; systems resource, goals and process.
The author believed a more realistic assessment of organization would look at effectiveness as the process that occurs from the acquisition of resources to the attainment of goals. The origin in obtaining resources, reaching goals and pleasing subordinates involves establishing, prioritizing goals and designating strategies for all subordinates. Communication among co-workers is the operative word in trying to attain goals that will make an organization effective. This enables those people who will try to obtain the goals of an organization to be part of the process.

Chelladurai and Morrow (1992) used an alternative approach by studying one National Sport Organization (NSO). They described Sychro Canada is "terms of three structural characteristics (formalization, centralization and complexity) and five processes (activities to ensure resources, work flow, control, identification, and homeostatic activities) based on evidence from documents and to a limited extend interviews" (Chelladurai and Morrow, 1992, p.133). Four constituent groups (administrators, judges, coaches and athletes) were asked to assess their perceptions of Sychro Canada's overall effectiveness through a questionnaire (Chelladurai and Morrow, 1992). Previous research provided insight into the structure, function and effectiveness of many NSO's. "The analyses showed that the organization's structures and processes were consistent with the literature in organization theory. From an overall perspective, the respondents perceived the structural and process characteristics as contributing to overall effectiveness" (Chelladurai and Morrow, 1992, p.133). By dealing with them as a common group their conclusions implied that there was one best way for all organizations (Chelladurai & Morrow, 1992).
Orders and Chelladurai (1994) studied the effectiveness of Sport Canada's athlete assistance program during the decade of the 1980's. The authors analyzed swimmers and track and field athletes of both genders. Since there is a difference in performance standardization, male and female athletes in each sport were examined separately. "Results showed that carded athletes in each of the four groups improved their performances significantly following the awarding of carding status" (Orders and Chelladurai, 1994, p.140).

**Summary**

In overview, current research has equipped sport managers with lots of indicators of effectiveness that can be helpful in their respective organizational appraisal. Additional research needs to be performed to classify effectiveness criteria, implement the criteria in assessing organizational achievement and determine the influence of internal/external components on organizational effectiveness.

"Because of the paradoxical nature of the concept of effectiveness, one of the best ways to summarize the various approaches that have been presented is to suggest that each is useful under different circumstances" (Slack, 1997, p. 36).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

This chapter includes descriptions of (a) the participants in the study, (b) the development of the scales of the study, (c) the analyses to test the significance of differences among subgroups defined by gender and ethnicity in the variables of the study, and (d) the analyses testing the relationships of NCAA functions (both importance and perceptions) with respondent satisfaction. Survey research methods were used to generate data that described the relative importance and perceptions of NCAA functions and activities. Statistical analysis technique were employed to verify the sub-scale structure of the scales employed in the study and to assess gender differences in the importance attached to, and perceptions of NCAA functions and activities. Permission to conduct the study and waive the condition of written consent to participate was granted after review by The Ohio State University Human Subjects Review Board (Protocol # 98E0135).

Participants

There are 306 Division I institutions (see Appendix A) geographically distributed across the country (1997-98 NCAA Directory). They vary in student enrollments (1600-53,000) and confer both undergraduate and graduate degrees. The
survey was mailed to 612 (males=306; females=306) second level administrators (i.e.,
associate or assistant athletic directors) who were requested to participate in the study.
The names of individuals representative of this population were secured from the official
1997-98 National Directory of College Athletics, thereby negating the potential for both
frame and selection error threats to external validity (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990). The
second level administrators listed first in the directory were chosen. Those who had not
returned the questionnaire within two weeks of the initial mailing were contacted again and
requested to participate in the study. The present report is based on 234 usable responses
received (response rate=38%). Of these, 126 were males while 108 were females. One
hundred and forty three of the respondents held the position of associate athletic director
(males=76, females=67) while the remaining respondents held the position of assistant
athletic director or a similar position (males=50, females=41). A majority of the
respondents (67.9%, n=159; males=79, females=80) had a master’s degree while 22.2%
(n=52; males=35; females=17) had a bachelor’s degree and 7.3% (n=17; males=8;
females=9) had a doctors degree. The remaining respondent (n=6) had other forms of
qualifications.

Of the 234 respondents, 211 (males=108; females=103) were whites, 17
(males=13; females=4) were African American, 2(male=1; female=1) Hispanics, one
male American Indian and one male Asian American. One respondent did not list
ethnicity.

**Instrumentation**

As noted before, the questionnaire contained three sections. The first section
elicited background information. The second section contained 106 items where the
respondents indicated the importance they attached to each of the items as well as their perceptions of the extent to which the NCAA carries out the activities indicated by the items. Of these 106 items, 74 items reflected the 16 principles outlined by the NCAA. The remaining 32 items reflected the network functions the NCAA was expected to perform as a federation (or industry association). The third and final section contained items assessing respondents’ satisfaction with the NCAA, its policies, and supervision. The following sections describe the procedures adopted to refine the scales.

**NCAA Principles**

Each of the principles were represented by 5 to 6 items. The items were generated by the investigators who relied on the publications of the NCAA and writings by other scholars (see Appendix B). The items under each principle were scrutinized by a panel of experts including university professors (n=7), athletic administrators (n=5), and current or former employees of the NCAA (n=5). The panel of experts are presented in Appendix C. Based on the feedback from the panel members, the items were revised and randomly distributed to form the final version of the instrument shown in Appendix D.

The strategy in scale purification was to first factor analyze the importance items to derive meaningful dimensions, and items to represent those dimensions. This was followed by an assessment of the internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of each of the selected importance dimensions. In the final step, the internal consistency of the items in each dimension in the perceptions data was estimated. These steps are further explained below.

The 74 items pertaining to the importance attached to the NCAA principles were subjected to principal component analysis (varimax rotation with Kaiser
normalization). The results showed that 19 factors had eigenvalues higher than one However, the scree plot showed that the eigenvalues leveled off after the eighth factor (See Figure 1). Thus, only eight factors (explaining 48.5% of the variance in the data were extracted. It was also decided to select only those items with a loading of .5 or higher with a limit of seven items in each factor. As the seventh and eighth factors had only two items loading on them, and as they were not interpretable, they were deleted from further analysis. The selected six factors, and the items with their loadings are shown in Table 2. As a group, these six factors are called “Principles” Factors, and they are interpreted below.

**General Equity Concerns.** The seven items refer to promotion of gender equity, commitment to gender and ethnic diversity, and activities being free of biases. Therefore, the factor was labeled General Equity Concerns. This factor subsumes the NCAA principles of gender equity (Principle No.3), governing financial aid (Principle No. 13), and diversity within governance structures (Principle No. 7).

**Institutional Autonomy.** This 7-item factor focused on the NCAA encouraging member institutions to conform to their own constitution and bylaws, allowing members members to control their own programs, and promoting the financial stability of member institutions. In addition, the factor also included items relating to guidelines for athletes on their responsibilities and time for academic studies. The factor was named Institutional Autonomy as the items cumulatively suggest such a focus. This factor largely encompasses the NCAA principle of institutional control and responsibility (Principle No. 1).

**Competitive Equity.** This factor includes five items reflecting the creation of competitive equity by ensuring that athletes are bona-fide students, stating clear
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<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor I. General Equity Concerns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81. Promotes Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Ensures that its Practices Reflect Commitment to Gender/Ethnic Diversity</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Promotes Equity Among all Athletic Programs</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Places Appropriate Limits on Financial Aid</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Ensured its Activities are Free of Gender Bias</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. Championship Competitions are Free Of Gender Bias</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Hires People from Diverse Backgrounds</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor II. Institutional Autonomy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Ensures that Each Member Institution Conforms with its Constitution and Bylaws</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Provides Adequate Guidelines to Student-Athletes with regards to Their Responsibilities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Ensures that its Recruiting Rules are Not Discriminatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Encourages Financial Stability of Member Institutions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Enacts Bylaws that Allow Member Institutions to Control their Own Programs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Ensures Proper Time is Made Available To Student-athletes for Academic Studies</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Items and Loadings in the Factors of Importance of Principles
| Factors & Items | Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Makes sure that its Policies and Procedures are not Discriminatory</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor III. Competitive Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Enacts Rules that Deter Contacts Between Student Athlete and Agents</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Makes Sure that Every Athlete is a Bona fide Student</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Creates Competitive Equity Among Conferences</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85. Encourages Member Institutions to Report Any Violations of Rules</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. Makes the Recruiting Rules and Regulations Clear and Understandable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor IV. Rule Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Is Consistent in Enforcing its Bylaws</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Hires Qualified Administrative Professionals</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Makes Clear its Academic Requirements</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Enacts Eligibility Rules that are Nondiscriminatory</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor V. Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. Ensures that Coach-athletes Relationships will be Free of Harassment or Coercion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. Handles the Grievances of Student-athletes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Makes Appropriate Recruiting Rules and Regulations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 (Continued)

Items and Loadings in the Factors of Importance of Principles
## Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor VI: Student-athlete Status</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotes an Atmosphere of Respect for the Dignity of all Student-athletes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emphasizes that Every Athlete is an Integral Part of the Student Body</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages Honesty Among Student-athletes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Communicates Adequate Guidelines to Student-athlete with Regards to their Rights</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Loadings lower than .3 omitted.

Table 2 (Continued)

Items and Loadings in the Factors of Importance of Principles
recruiting rules, encouraging reporting of violations, and deterring athlete-agent contacts. The factor is representative of NCAA principles of rule compliance (Principle No. 8), competitive equity (Principle 10), and amateurism (Principle No. 9).

**Rule Enforcement.** The four items in this factor relate to the NCAA being consistent in enforcing its rules, hiring qualified administrative personnel, and specifying clear academic requirements and eligibility rules. This factor, labeled **Rule Enforcement**, encompasses aspects of NCAA principles of rule compliance (Principle No. 8), sound academic standards (Principle No. 5), and nondiscrimination (Principle No. 6).

**Student-athlete Welfare.** This 6-item factor focuses on the athletes, their harassment-free interactions with their coaches, their academic eligibility, and the quality of their experiences. It also includes the accountability of member institutions, and appropriate recruiting rules. This **Student-athlete Welfare** factor is largely representative of NCAA principle of student-athlete welfare (Principle No. 2).

**Student-athlete Status.** The four items in the factor emphasize the athlete as an integral part of the student body, their dignity, and their rights. Thus it was labeled **Student-athlete Status.** The factor covers aspects of NCAA principles of nondiscrimination (Principle No. 6), sound academic standards (Principle No. 5), sportsmanship and ethical conduct (Principle No. 4), and student-athlete welfare (Principle No. 2).
NCAA as an Inter-organizational Network

The procedures in developing the subscales relating to activities of the NCAA as an inter-organizational network were the same as used in developing the subscales reflecting the NCAA principles. That is, the items were factor analyzed (principal component analysis with varimax rotation and Kaiser normalization) to derive a meaningful set of factors. Items with a loading of .5 or higher were selected to represent each factor with a limit of seven items per factor.

The initial principal component analysis showed that 9 factors had an eigenvalue of one or more. The scree plot indicated that these eigenvalues leveled off after the fifth factor (See Figure 2). Accordingly, five factors explaining 50% of the variance were extracted. As two of these five factors was not interpretable, they were eliminated from further consideration. The selected three factors, items, and their loadings are shown in Table 3. These three factors, named “Network” Factors are interpreted below.

Marketing and Development. The seven items in this factor focus on the NCAA helping its members develop and market new products and services, and securing funds through donations, sponsorships, and grants. Hence, it was named Marketing and Development.

Management Enhancement. The five items in this factor refer largely to the NCAA assisting member institutions enhance their managerial skills and techniques, and improve their day-today operations. Accordingly, the factor was labeled Management
Figure 2

Scree Plot of Importance of “Network” Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors &amp; Items</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor I. Marketing and Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Helps Member Institutions Design New Products</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79. Helps Member Institutions Develop New Products</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Secures Business and/or Industry Sponsorships</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. Helps Member Institutions Develop New Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Solicits Funds from Private Donors</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Solicits Funds from Government Agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Helps Member Institutions Market their Products Jointly</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor II. Management Enhancement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Helps Member Institutions Improve their Day-to-Day Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. Helps Member Institutions Acquire New Skills in Managing their Athletic Departments</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78. Helps Member Institutions Acquire New Techniques in Managing their Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

Items and Loadings in the Importance of "Network" Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>104. Helps Member Institutions Assess Correctly their Competitive Capabilities</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. Has Increased Interactions Among Member Institutions</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor III: Image Projection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106. Protects the Integrity of Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. Projects a Positive Image for Intercollegiate Athletics</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. Distributes Television Revenues Equitably Among Member Institutions</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. Projects a Positive Image for Member Institutions</td>
<td>I: -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 (Continued)

Items and Loadings in the Importance of "Network" Factors
Enhancement.

Image Projection. The four items in the factor refer to protecting the integrity of, and projecting a positive image for intercollegiate athletics and member institutions. Thus, it was named Image Projection.

Satisfaction with NCAA

The ten items in this final scale were purported to measure a single construct of respondents' satisfaction with the NCAA and its activities. The item-to-total correlations indicated that four of the items did not correlate with the total. The remaining six items (shown in Table 4) were retained and combined to derive a single score for further analyses.

Internal Consistency Estimates

It must be recalled that only the items eliciting the importance attached by respondents, and the items relating respondents' satisfaction with the NCAA were factor analyzed. As for respondents' perceptions of NCAA activities, only the internal consistency of the subscales (selected in the previous importance phase) were estimated. The internal consistency estimates for all of the variables of the study are shown in Table 5. Twelve of these estimates were higher than .8 and 6 were higher than .7. Only one was lower than .7 at .69. These sufficiently high values let us place greater confidence in the scales.

Intercorrelations Among Subscales

Important Subscales. The correlations among the subscales (shown in Table 6) ranged from .16 to .56. The highest correlation was .56 between Marketing and Development and Management Enhancement. As shared variance between these variables was only 31.4%, it is concluded that these subscales measure distinct constructs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>I believe that the policies and procedures of the NCAA are excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am happy with the supervision provided by the NCAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I believe that the NCAA is effective in promoting intercollegiate sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the NCAA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am satisfied with how the NCAA is handling problems in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am pleased with the ways of the NCAA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4

*Items in the Satisfaction Subscale*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NCAA Principles Based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Equity</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network Based</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Enhancement</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Projection</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondent Reactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with NCAA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Internal Consistency Estimates for the Variables of the Study
### Table 6

Correlations Among Importance of "Principles" and "Networks" Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive Equity</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management Enhancement</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Image Projection</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perception Subscale. The correlations among the perceptions of “Principles” and “Networks” Factors are shown in Table 7. These values ranging from .35 to .80 were generally higher than those in the case of importance subscales. The highest shared variance between perceived Competition Equity and Student-athlete Welfare was 64%.

Analyses

Subgroup Differences

Five different MANOVAs were carried out to test the differences between genders in (a) the importance of “Principles” Factors, (b) the importance of “Network” Factors, (c) perceptions of the “Principles” Factors, (d) perceptions of “Networks” Factors, and (e) satisfaction with the NCAA. It was unfortunate that the small number of non-whites participating in the study did not permit such an analysis with ethnicity as the grouping variable.

Relationship with Satisfaction with NCAA

Correlational analyses were employed to assess the relationships between (a) perceptions of each of the “Principles” Factors and satisfaction and (b) perceptions of each of the “Network” Factors and satisfaction with NCAA. In order to assess the unique and cumulative variance explained by these variables, two regression analyses were carried out where satisfaction with the NCAA was the dependent variable, and the “Principles” Factors or the “Network” Factors were the predictor variables. Finally, a third regression analysis was carried out with those variables that contributed significantly to the previous two regression equations. This was done to assess the combined impact of both the “Principles” Factors and “Network” Factors.
## Table 7

Correlations Among Perceptions of “Principles” and “Networks” Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive Equity</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management Enhancement</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Image Projection</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4

Results

The chapter reports the results of analyses carried out to test (a) gender differences in the importance and perception of factors derived from the NCAA Principles as well as the "Network" Functions, and (b) the relationships between the perceptions of both "Principles" and "Network" Factors with respondents' Satisfaction with the NCAA. Table 8 presents the means and standard deviation for all the variables by gender and the total sample.

Gender Differences

The results of the five MANOVAs are shown in Table 9 through Table 13. None of the multivariate or univariate effects of gender on any of the dependent variables was significant. That is, males and females placed the same degree of importance on each of the "Principles" and "Network" Factors. They also perceived the NCAA to be involved in the same extent in each of the "Principles" and "Network" Factors. Finally, the genders did not differ in their level of satisfaction with the NCAA. Because of the lack of significant effect of gender on the variables of the study, the data of both genders were pooled for further analyses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males (n=126)</th>
<th>Females (n=108)</th>
<th>All (n=234)</th>
<th>Males (n=126)</th>
<th>Females (n=108)</th>
<th>All (n=234)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>7.74 (.91)</td>
<td>7.85 (.88)</td>
<td>7.79 (.89)</td>
<td>6.40 (1.44)</td>
<td>6.49 (1.41)</td>
<td>6.45 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>7.79 (.79)</td>
<td>7.88 (.79)</td>
<td>7.83 (.79)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.32)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.25)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Equity</td>
<td>7.74 (.90)</td>
<td>7.69 (1.00)</td>
<td>7.72 (.95)</td>
<td>6.50 (1.37)</td>
<td>6.43 (1.16)</td>
<td>6.47 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>8.10 (.65)</td>
<td>8.13 (.72)</td>
<td>8.12 (.68)</td>
<td>6.50 (1.74)</td>
<td>6.57 (1.42)</td>
<td>6.53 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>7.53 (1.08)</td>
<td>7.60 (.91)</td>
<td>7.56 (1.00)</td>
<td>6.44 (1.42)</td>
<td>6.47 (1.22)</td>
<td>6.46 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>8.10 (.64)</td>
<td>8.10 (.79)</td>
<td>8.10 (.71)</td>
<td>6.78 (1.39)</td>
<td>6.53 (1.48)</td>
<td>6.66 (1.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Development</td>
<td>6.44 (1.52)</td>
<td>6.16 (1.45)</td>
<td>6.31 (1.50)</td>
<td>5.82 (1.39)</td>
<td>5.65 (1.34)</td>
<td>5.74 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Enhancement</td>
<td>7.17 (1.04)</td>
<td>7.11 (1.20)</td>
<td>7.14 (1.11)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.67)</td>
<td>5.72 (1.46)</td>
<td>5.78 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Projection</td>
<td>8.01 (.85)</td>
<td>8.05 (.84)</td>
<td>8.03 (.84)</td>
<td>6.81 (1.59)</td>
<td>6.65 (1.30)</td>
<td>6.73 (1.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with NCAA</td>
<td>5.76 (1.36)</td>
<td>5.91 (1.27)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.31)</td>
<td>5.76 (1.36)</td>
<td>5.92 (1.27)</td>
<td>5.83 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9

**Analysis of Variance**

**EFFECT.. GENDER**

Multivariate Tests of Significance (S = 1, M = 2, N = 112 1/2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.01304</td>
<td>.50004</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.01322</td>
<td>.50004</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.98696</td>
<td>.50004</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>.01304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistics are exact.

---

**EFFECT.. GENDER (Cont.)**

Univariate F-tests with (1,232) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEQUIT</td>
<td>.80080</td>
<td>185.65411</td>
<td>.80080</td>
<td>.80023</td>
<td>1.00070</td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTON</td>
<td>.48443</td>
<td>143.39626</td>
<td>.48443</td>
<td>.61809</td>
<td>1.0378</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEQUIT</td>
<td>.14538</td>
<td>208.64778</td>
<td>.14538</td>
<td>.89934</td>
<td>1.6166</td>
<td>.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RULEENF</td>
<td>.04813</td>
<td>108.84102</td>
<td>.04813</td>
<td>.46914</td>
<td>1.0260</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHMELF</td>
<td>.20452</td>
<td>234.00547</td>
<td>.20452</td>
<td>1.00864</td>
<td>2.0277</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATHSTUD</td>
<td>.09465</td>
<td>117.29530</td>
<td>.09465</td>
<td>.50558</td>
<td>1.8722</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Variance -- design 1

**EFFECT .. GENDER**

Multivariate Tests of Significance \( (S = 1, M = 1/2, N = 114) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>0.01064</td>
<td>0.82449</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>0.01075</td>
<td>0.82449</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>0.98936</td>
<td>0.82449</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>0.01064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.. F statistics are exact.

**EFFECT .. GENDER (Cont.)**

Univariate F-tests with \( (1,232) \) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARKET</td>
<td>4.35387</td>
<td>516.63514</td>
<td>4.35387</td>
<td>2.22688</td>
<td>1.95515</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGE</td>
<td>0.22477</td>
<td>289.84788</td>
<td>0.22477</td>
<td>1.24934</td>
<td>0.17991</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAGE</td>
<td>0.07835</td>
<td>165.91443</td>
<td>0.07835</td>
<td>0.71515</td>
<td>0.10956</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11

**Analysis of Variance -- design 1**

**EFFECT .. GENDER**

Multivariate Tests of Significance \((S = 1, \ M = 2, \ N = 112 \ 1/2)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>.01924</td>
<td>.74236</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>.01962</td>
<td>.74236</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>.90076</td>
<td>.74236</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>227.00</td>
<td>.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>.01924</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. F statistics are exact.

---

**EFFECT .. GENDER (Cont.)**

Univariate F-tests with \((1,232)\) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGEQUIT</td>
<td>.45676</td>
<td>469.63813</td>
<td>.45676</td>
<td>2.02430</td>
<td>.22564</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAUTON</td>
<td>.00003</td>
<td>385.09643</td>
<td>.00003</td>
<td>1.65990</td>
<td>.00002</td>
<td>.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCHEQUIT</td>
<td>.24430</td>
<td>379.64630</td>
<td>.24430</td>
<td>1.63641</td>
<td>.14929</td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRULENF</td>
<td>.26206</td>
<td>594.57581</td>
<td>.26206</td>
<td>2.56283</td>
<td>.10226</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHWELF</td>
<td>.05305</td>
<td>410.51628</td>
<td>.05305</td>
<td>1.76947</td>
<td>.02998</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATHSTUD</td>
<td>3.51069</td>
<td>474.56837</td>
<td>3.51069</td>
<td>2.04555</td>
<td>1.71625</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis of Variance -- design 1 --

**EFFECT .. GENDER**  
Multivariate Tests of Significance \((S = 1, \ M = 1/2, \ N = 114)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Exact F</th>
<th>Hypoth. DF</th>
<th>Error DF</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillais</td>
<td>0.00678</td>
<td>0.52337</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotellings</td>
<td>0.00683</td>
<td>0.52337</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks</td>
<td>0.99322</td>
<td>0.52337</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>230.00</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roys</td>
<td>0.00678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: F statistics are exact.

**EFFECT .. GENDER (Cont.)**  
Univariate F-tests with \((1, 232)\) D. F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Hypoth. SS</th>
<th>Error SS</th>
<th>Hypoth. MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PMARKET</td>
<td>1.90577</td>
<td>433.84035</td>
<td>1.90577</td>
<td>1.87000</td>
<td>1.01913</td>
<td>0.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMANAGE</td>
<td>0.67751</td>
<td>575.67206</td>
<td>0.67751</td>
<td>2.48135</td>
<td>0.27304</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIMAGE</td>
<td>1.54564</td>
<td>496.60954</td>
<td>1.54564</td>
<td>2.14056</td>
<td>0.72207</td>
<td>0.396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Effects of Gender on Satisfaction with NCAA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHIN CELLS</td>
<td>404.14</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Model)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total)</td>
<td>405.57</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R-Squared = .004
Adjusted R-Squared = .000

Table 13: Analysis of Variance -- design 1
It must be noted that both genders scored higher than 7 on a nine-point scale in evaluating the importance of both the "Principle" Factors and the "Network" Factors except in the case of the function of marketing (M=6.31). In contrast, they scored lower than 7 in their perceptions of all these factors. The perception score was significantly lower than the importance score in each factor (see Appendix E). Further, their score on the satisfaction scale was only 5.83 on a 9-point scale. Thus, the present respondents were not overly satisfied with the NCAA.

**Relationships of Importance and Perceptions with Satisfaction**

**Importance of “Principles” and “Network” Factors, and Satisfaction.** The bivariate correlations of the importance of Principles and Network Factors with satisfaction are provided in Table 14. These values ranged from .084 to .314 for a mean of .190 in "Principles" Factors and .133 in "Network" Factors. All of these positive correlations except those of Importance of Institutional Autonomy, Marketing and Development, and Management Enhancement with Satisfaction were significant. The highest correlation of .314 was between importance of General Equity Concerns and satisfaction.

**Perceptions of “Principles” and “Network” Factors, and Satisfaction.**

The bivariate correlations of perceptions of "Principles" Factors and "Network" Factors with satisfaction with NCAA are provided in Table 15. All of the factors were significantly and positively correlated with satisfaction with NCAA. These correlations ranged from .344 to .439 for a mean of .378 in "Principles" Factors and .421 in "Network" Factors.
Table 14

Correlations of Importance of "Principles" and "Network" Factors with Satisfaction
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPLES</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Competitive Equity</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NETWORK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Management Enhancement</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Image Projection</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p < .001 for all correlations

Table 15

Correlations of Perceptions of “Principles” and “Network” Factors with Satisfaction
Unique and cumulative effects of Perceptions.

It was decided to use only the perception scores as the predictors because they had higher correlations with satisfaction with NCAA than the importance scores. In these analyses, the stepwise method of variable entry was employed. The results of the first regression analysis with the "Principles" Factors as the predictors are presented in Table 16.

In the first step, perception of Rule Enforcement entered the equation explaining 18.3% of the variance ($R^2 = .183$; adjusted $R^2 = .183$). In the second step, perceived Student-athletes Status entered the equation explaining an additional 3.1% of the variance in the data for a total of 21.3% of explained variance ($R^2 = .213$; adjusted $R^2 = .030$). The other perceptions factors did not enter the equation.

In the second regression analysis, the perceptions of “Network” Factors were the predictor variables (See Table 17). In the first step of this analysis, perceived Image Projection entered the equation explaining 19.3% of the variance ($R^2 = .193$; adjusted $R^2 = .193$). Perceived Marketing and Development entered the equation in the second step adding another 4.1% to the explained variance for a total 23.3 per cent ($R^2 = .233$; adjusted $R^2 = .040$). Perceived Management Enhancement did not enter the equation.

In the third and final regression analysis (See Table 18), the variables that contributed significantly to the explained variance in the first two analyses were the predictor variables (i.e., perceived Rule Enforcement, Student-athletes Status, and Marketing and Development). Image Projection explained 19.2% of the variance ($R^2 = .193$; adjusted $R^2 = .193$) while perceived Student-athletes Status added 4.2% ($R^2 = .234$; adjusted $R^2 = .041$), and perceived Marketing and Development added
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>BETAa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.462</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beta from final step

** p < .01

*** p < .001

Table 16
Regression of Satisfaction of Perception of Selected Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>BETA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Projection</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beta from final step

** p < .01

*** p < .001

Table 17

Regression of Satisfaction on Perception of “Network” Factors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>BETAa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step I</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Projection</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Development</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Beta from final step

** p < .01

*** p < .001

Table 18
Regression of Satisfaction of Perception of Selected Factors
another 2.2% (R² = .257, adjusted R² = .023). Thus, these three variables explained a total
of 25.7% of the variance in satisfaction with NCAA.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is a unique organization. As Sage (1998) noted, "nothing about the NCAA system is natural or universal" (p. 249). Sanctioned and constituted by Universities in North America, the NCAA serves mostly as an umbrella organization to govern the activities of member institutions. The NCAA is similar to industry associations that cater to the needs of the organizations within their respective industries. That is, the NCAA, like other industry associations, is an inter-organizational network for intercollegiate athletic departments of American universities.

Based on the argument that the traditional models of effectiveness (i.e., the goals, system resources, and process models of effectiveness) may not be relevant to an organization like the NCAA, this study focused on its mandate. That is, the focus was on the external functions of the NCAA than on its own internal processes and system resources. The NCAA mandate is largely reflected in the "principles" it has outlined to govern its activities (Please Table 1). If the NCAA was perceived to uphold and implement the principles, then it could be considered effective. Further, as an inter-organizational network, the NCAA had other functions to perform including generating funds for
member institutions, facilitating creativity in developing and marketing their products, and enhancing general managerial practices and techniques among member institutions. Thus, the main focus of the study was on the extent to which the NCAA was perceived to be effective in fulfilling these two functions—upholding and implementing the "principles" and performing the "network" functions.

A significant approach of the study was to assess both the importance the respondents attached to the "principles" and "network" functions (as suggested by the questionnaire items) and their perceptions of NCAA effectiveness with respect to each of these.

A critical decision in the study was to approach the second level administrators of intercollegiate athletics in Division I institutions, and assess their perceptions of the NCAA and its activities. The rationale for this decision was that these were the people who had the most first-hand information about the NCAA and its activities. Further, they were also the direct recipients of NCAA service (advise, guidance, and/or reprimands as the case may be). As most of the principles outlined earlier and the activities thereof are directed toward high level athletics in Division I institutions, the study was restricted to those institutions.

A final critical decision of the study was to use respondents' level of satisfaction with the NCAA and its operations as a measure of effectiveness. This decision is consistent with the view expressed in Total Quality Management literature that the recipient of a service is the ultimate arbiter of quality. In so far as the present respondents constituted a direct link between the NCAA and member institutions, they are also the
direct recipients of the NCAA services, guidelines, complaints, etc. Thus, their expressions of satisfaction with the NCAA is a meaningful measure of NCAA effectiveness. This is not to deny the usefulness of satisfactions of other constituents as surrogate measures of NCAA effectiveness. Further future studies may also develop other direct measures of NCAA effectiveness (i.e., those not based on constituent satisfaction).

The participants in the study were 234 Associate or Assistant Athletic Directors of Divisions I institutions. Of these, 126 were males while 108 were females. Although the response rate of 38% is normal in research of this kind, it is rather low. However, the high number of participants (n=234) permitted the rigorous multivariate analyses including factor analysis and regression analyses. The following sections discuss the results of the study and their implications.

The Instrument

As noted in Chapter Three, 106 items were included in the instrument after expert verification and confirmation. Of these, 74 items assessed respondents' perceptions of the extent to which the NCAA maintained its own principles. The remaining 32 items were devoted to NCAA functions as a network. As noted earlier, two separate principal component analyses were carried out to identify the underlying constructs in each set of questionnaire items.

Based on an analysis of the scree plot, six factors were extracted from the items on "principles." These six factors were (1) General Equity Concerns, (2) Institutional Autonomy, (3) Competitive Equity, (4) Rule Enforcement, (5) Student-athlete Welfare,
and (6) Student-athlete Conduct. These factors were found to be meaningful and to subsume all the principles outlined by the NCAA. The internal consistency estimates were all adequate allowing us to place confidence in the scales.

Three factors were extracted to represent the items measuring NCAA network functions. These were (1) Marketing and Development, (2) Management Enhancement, and (3) Image Projection. These represent adequately the major network functions of an organization such as the NCAA. Once again, the internal consistency estimates were quite adequate.

It is also encouraging to note that the highest shared variance between any two subscales was only 64%. Thus, it was concluded that the subscales are independent of each other and measure sufficiently distinct constructs.

Thus, the results of the factor analyses, the interpretations of the emergent factors, the internal consistency of each factor, and the intercorrelations among the factors provided sufficient justification for the use of the subscales in the present study. However, it must be noted that the selected factors in each explained less than 50% of the variance in the data. This is a matter of concern, and points to the need for refining the instrument in future studies.

Further, the item generation and subsequent expert verification were all based on the literature including the publications of the NCAA. While this is a useful way of conducting research, this is not the only or even the best way. One approach that could be taken in future research is to engage in some qualitative research such as focus groups and intensive interviews to identify all the dimensions of effectiveness relevant to the NCAA.
Further, the participants should include not only administrators of intercollegiate athletic departments but also the NCAA administrators themselves, the athletes, and other critical stakeholders in the venture. Such an approach would confirm or disconfirm the factors generated in the present study. In addition, it would also reveal additional dimensions of effectiveness that are more meaningful to the stakeholders. This issue is critical because the present study was confined to the assessment of effectiveness only in relations to the “principles” and “network” functions.

**Gender Differences**

Based on the serious concerns expressed over gender equity and gender based employment practices (e.g., Lovett & Lowry, 1995; Pastore, 1992), it was expected that men and women would differ in the importance they attached to the Principles and network functions, and in their perceptions of the NCAA in relations to these functions. Assuming that the genders would differ in the above, it was also expected that the genders would differ in the extent to which they were satisfied with the NCAA. None of these speculations were supported by the results of the present study.

One possible reason for this finding of no gender differences is that as administrators within the same organizational milieu, males and females shared similar perceptions of what “ought to be” and what “is” in intercollegiate athletics and its administration. As Sage (1998) noted, ever since 1981 when the NCAA began scheduling national championship events for women, women's intercollegiate sports began mirroring men’s perspectives on intercollegiate sports, sharing the same objectives, and believing in the same processes. With such amalgam of men’s and women’s sports, it could be
expected that only those who shared these perspectives on intercollegiate athletics
would join its administrative ranks. From a different perspective, it could also be
suggested that only those with similar views would be recruited and hired at the
administrative ranks. Thus, it is not surprising that the genders in the present sample
did not differ in their perceptions of, or reactions to the NCAA.

Importance and Perceptions of NCAA Functions

The respondents as a total group rated all of the Principles and Network factors as
very important. Marketing and Development was the only function to score under 7 on
the importance scale while all other dimensions were rated higher than 7. This high
rating of the nine dimensions (six Principles factors and three Network factors) lends
credence to the conceptualization and derivations of those nine factors. The low rating on
Marketing and Development is somewhat intriguing. Given the modern emphasis on
generating revenue and the associated emphasis on the marketing function, one would
have expected a higher rating for this dimension. It could be that because every university
athletic department has its own marketing department, any assistance from the NCAA in
this regard was not felt to be important. The low rating could also be attributed to the fact
that the development component of the Marketing and Development dimension is not
tenable in the context of intercollegiate athletics. That is, developing new products could
be seen as limited in scope in intercollegiate athletics. Thus, it could have been rated as
relatively less important than the other dimensions. These views need to be explored in
future research. For instance, the two components of marketing and development can be
separated in future studies. Another approach could be to relate the extent and
sophistication of marketing efforts in different schools to the ratings of this dimension. That is, those institutions with a good marketing department may rate this NCAA function as less important while those without a good marketing department may rate this function relatively more important.

The respondents perceived the NCAA to be quite effective in carrying out the nine functions (the mean rating being higher than 6 in 7 dimensions and over 5.7 in two dimensions on a 9-point scale). From this perspective, it can be concluded that the NCAA was effective in upholding the principles and in performing the network functions. However, when the effectiveness ratings are compared to the importance ratings, the notion of NCAA effectiveness is somewhat diminished. That is, the ratings of NCAA effectiveness are not commensurate with the ratings of importance of those dimensions.

The foregoing interpretation that the ratings of importance and effectiveness are not consistent is further strengthened by the fact that the respondents were only moderately satisfied with the NCAA (the mean being 5.83 on a 9-point scale). The NCAA administrators should take note of this moderate level of satisfaction among administrators of member institutions. While there may be several factors that contribute to satisfaction, the present study has identified some factors that influence satisfaction with NCAA. While the associations between importance ratings and satisfaction are interesting in their own right, it is the relationships between perceptions of NCAA activities and member satisfaction that are critical. It was found in the present study, that all the nine factors (six "principle" factors and three "network" factors) were significantly and positively correlated with expressed satisfaction with the NCAA and its activities. Each one of these
effectiveness measures explained at least 11.8% of member satisfaction. In research of this kind, this amount of shared variance between an independent variable and a dependent variable would be considered substantial. The highest shared variance was between Image Projection and satisfaction and it amounted to 19%.

The series of regression analyses showed that Image Projection ($R^2 = .193; 19.2\%$), Student-Athlete Status ($R^2 = .042; 4.2\%$) and Marketing and Development, ($R^2 = .022; 2.2\%$) contributed uniquely to member satisfaction. Jointly these three variables explained nearly 26% of member satisfaction. While all other factors were also significantly correlated with satisfaction, their effects were subsumed by these three variables. As noted before, there may be several other factors that influence member satisfaction. The present study points to three significant areas in which the NCAA can improve its activities—Image Projection, Student-Athlete Conduct, and Marketing and Development. Any improvements in these areas would likely lead to perceptions of higher levels of NCAA effectiveness and member satisfaction.

In summary, the study found that male and female administrators of the intercollegiate athletics in American Universities did not differ in (a) the importance they attached to selected functions of the NCAA, (b) their perceptions of the NCAA carrying out these functions, and (c) their satisfaction with the NCAA and its activities. As a group they rated all of the functions as very important, and perceived the NCAA to be carrying out those functions effectively but at a lower level than the importance ratings. Finally, they were only moderately satisfied with the NCAA. While all of the perceived functions were correlated with member satisfaction, the perceived functions
of Image Projection, Student-Athlete Conduct, and Marketing and development contributed the most to member satisfaction.

**Recommendations for Future Study**

Organizational effectiveness has been a popular subject for research studies. Much of the research effort can be described as a search of how organizations can have similar results but distinct differences in obtaining those results. The NCAA and its members are also popular with the public in terms of society having an opinion on how they should operate.

Further research is recommended that looks at a variety of evaluating domains for athletic organizations. An effort to build upon the evaluation criteria research began with this study. The following recommendations for future inquiry are based on the researcher’s experience with this investigation:

1. Further the verification of the scale with different constituencies of college sport and/or athletic organization sub-populations. Have this survey mailed to the other two Division (II and III).

2. Explore **importance** and **perceptions** criteria dimensions among other levels of the population investigated (faculty representatives, presidents, athletic directors, NCAA office staff) in an effort to explore differences between the constituent groups and any apparent impact on the procedure used.

3. Investigate the differences and/or similarities among conferences (i.e., super conferences, mid-level conferences, and small conferences).
4. Replicate the current study for other sport organizations (i.e., Olympic and other amateur associations).

5. Replicate the current study in Canada with the Canadian Interuniversity Athletic Union (CIAU). Since sport in Canadian universities differs in philosophical orientation from Division I American Institutions, it may be appropriate to investigate other evaluation factors.

6. Investigate in greater depth individual dimensions of criteria proposed in this study to establish ease of measurement and criteria utility.
APPENDIX A

DIVISION I INSTITUTIONS
### N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>located in Akron, OH</td>
<td>23,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>located in Tuscaloosa, AL</td>
<td>19,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama Birmingham</td>
<td>located in Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>16,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama State University</td>
<td>located in Montgomery, AL</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
<td>located in Lorman, MS</td>
<td>3,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American University</td>
<td>located in Washington, DC</td>
<td>11,4245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>located in Boone, NC</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>located in Tucson, AZ</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>located in Tempe, AZ</td>
<td>42,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas</td>
<td>located in Fayetteville, AR</td>
<td>14,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas Little Rock</td>
<td>located in Little Rock</td>
<td>12,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas State University</td>
<td>located in State University</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Auburn University: located in Auburn, AL
student enrollment = 21,226

Austin Peay State University: located in Clarksville, TN
student enrollment = 7,800

Ball State University: located in Muncie, IN
student enrollment =19,000

Baylor University: located in Wac, TX
student enrollment =12,240

Bethune-Cookman College: located in Daytona Beach, FL
student enrollment =1,800

Boise State University: located in Boise, ID
student enrollment =14,000

Boston College: located in Chestnut Hill, MA
student enrollment = 14,200

Boston University: located in Boston, MA
student enrollment =13,200

Bowling Green State University: located in Bowling, Green, OH
student enrollment =16,000

Bradley University: located in Peoria, IL
student enrollment =6,000

Brown University: located in Providence, RI
student enrollment = 5,200

Brigham Young University: located in Provo, UT
student enrollment=27,000

Bucknell University: located in Lewisburg, PA
student enrollment = 3,200
NCAA Member Institutions

Buffalo State: located in Buffalo, NY
   student enrollment = 27,000

Butler University: located in Indianapolis, IN
   student enrollment = 3,800

California State Fullerton: located in Fullerton, CA
   student enrollment = 22,000

University of California Irvine: located in Irvine, CA
   student enrollment = 17,889

Cal State Northridge: located in Northbridge, CA
   student enrollment = 24,000

California Poly State U: located in San Luis Obispo, CA
   student enrollment = 16,000

California State U: located in Sacramento, CA
   student enrollment = 23,000

California, U. of (UCLA): located in Los Angeles, CA
   student enrollment = 34,000

Campbell University: located in Buies Creek, NC
   student enrollment = 5,000

Cansius University: located in Buffalo, NY
   student enrollment = 3,334

Centenary College: located in Shreveport, LA
   student enrollment = 1,600

Central Connecticut State University: located in New Britain, CT
   student enrollment = 12,700

Central Florida University: located in Orlando, FL
   student enrollment = 27,300

Central Michigan University: located in Mt. Pleasant, MI
   student enrollment = 16,126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.C.A.A. Member Institutions</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charleston Southern University</td>
<td>located in Charleston, SC</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Charleston</td>
<td>located in Charleston, SC</td>
<td>10,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago State University</td>
<td>located in Chicago, IL</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>located in Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citadel, The</td>
<td>located in Charleston, SC</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td>located in Clemson, SC</td>
<td>16,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland State University</td>
<td>located in Cleveland, OH</td>
<td>15,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Carolina University</td>
<td>located in Conway, SC</td>
<td>4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate University</td>
<td>located in Hamilton, NY</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>located in Fort Collins, CO</td>
<td>21,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>located in Boulder, CO</td>
<td>25,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>located in New York, NY</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>located in Storrs, CT</td>
<td>14,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coppin State</td>
<td>located in Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Cornell University: located in Ithaca, NY
  student enrollment = 13,300

Creighton University: located in Omaha, NE
  student enrollment = 5,933

Dartmouth College: located in Hanover, NH
  student enrollment = 4,000

Davidson College: located in Davidson, NC
  student enrollment = 1,600

University of Dayton: located in Dayton, OH
  student enrollment = 6,300

University of Delaware: located in Newark, DE
  student enrollment = 15,359

Delaware State University: located in Dover, DE
  student enrollment = 2,500

DePaul University: located in Chicago, IL
  student enrollment = 16,747

University of Detroit Mercy: located in Detroit, MI
  student enrollment = 8,000

Drake University: located in Des Moines, IA
  student enrollment = 4,500

Drexel University: located in Philadelphia, PA
  student enrollment = 6,120

Duke University: located in Durham, NC
  student enrollment = 6,600

Duquesne University: located in Pittsburgh, PA
  student enrollment = 9,400

East Carolina University: located in Greenville, NC
  student enrollment = 17,729
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

East Tennessee State University: located in Johnson City, TN
student enrollment = 12,000

Eastern Illinois University: located in Charleston, IL
student enrollment = 10,500

Eastern Kentucky University: located in Richmond, KY
student enrollment = 16,000

Eastern Michigan University: located in Ypsilanti, MI
student enrollment = 24,000

Eastern Washington University: located in Cheney, WA
student enrollment = 8,000

Elon College: located in Elon, NC
student enrollment = 3,500

University of Evansville: located in Evansville, IN
student enrollment = 2,600

Fairfield University: located in Fairfield, CT
student enrollment = 3,000

Fairleigh Dickinson University: located in Evansville, IN
student enrollment = 2,600

Fairfield University: located in Fairfield, CT
student enrollment = 3,000

Fairleigh Dickinson University: located in Teaneck, NJ
student enrollment = 11,000

Florida A&M University: located in Tallahassee, FL
student enrollment = 9,200

Florida Atlantic University: located in Boca Raton, FL
student enrollment = 17,300

Florida International University: located in Miami, FL
student enrollment = 28,000
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Florida State University: located in Tallahassee, FL
student enrollment = 29,000

University of Florida: located in Gainesville, FL
student enrollment = 35,000

Fordham University: located in Bronx, NY
student enrollment = 13,909

Fresno State: located in Fresno, CA
student enrollment = 17,500

Furman University: located in Greenville, SC
student enrollment = 2,500

George Mason University: located in Fairfax, VA
student enrollment = 24,174

George Washington University: located in Washington, DC
student enrollment = 13,390

Georgetown University: located in Washington, DC
student enrollment = 6,038

Georgia Southern University: located in Statesboro, GA
student enrollment = 14,157

Georgia State University: located in Atlanta, GA
student enrollment = 24,000

Georgia Tech: located in Atlanta, GA
student enrollment = 13,000

University of Georgia: located in Athens, GA
student enrollment = 29,404

Gonzaga University: located in Spokane, WA
student enrollment = 5,200

Gambling State University: located in Grambling, LA
student enrollment = 7,533
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Hampton University: located in Hampton, VA
student enrollment = 6,000

University of Hartford: located in West Hartford, CT
student enrollment = 4,500

Harvard University: located in Cambridge, MA
student enrollment = 6,671

University of Hawaii: located in Honolulu, HI
student enrollment = 18,232

High Point University: located in High Point, NC
student enrollment = 2,300

Hofstra University: located in Hempstead, NY
student enrollment = 12,000

Holy Cross University: located in Worcester, MA
student enrollment = 2,675

University of Houston: located in Houston, TX
student enrollment = 30,757

Howard University: located in Washington, DC
student enrollment = 12,500

University of Idaho: located in Moscow, ID
student enrollment = 9,237

Idaho State University: located in Pocatello, ID
student enrollment = 12,442

University of Illinois Chicago: located in Chicago, IL
student enrollment = 24,583

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaigne: located in Champaign, IL
student enrollment = 35,000

Illinois State University: located in Normal, IL
student enrollment = 19,274
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Indiana University: located in Bloomington, IN
student enrollment = 36,000

Indiana State University: located in Terre Haute, IN
student enrollment = 11,484

University of Iowa: located in Iowa City
student enrollment = 27,505

Iona College: located in New Rochelle
student enrollment = 6,000

Iowa State University: located in Ames, IA
student enrollment = 24,899

Jackson State University: located in Jackson, MS
student enrollment = 8,537

Jacksonville State University: located in Jacksonville, AL
student enrollment = 8,260

Jacksonville University: located in Jacksonville, FL
student enrollment = 2,500

James Madison University: located in Harrisonburg, VA
student enrollment = 12,900

University of Kansas: located in Lawrence, KS
student enrollment = 27,639

Kansas State University: located in Manhattan, KS
student enrollment = 21,222

Kent State University: located in Kent, OH
student enrollment = 28,635

University of Kentucky: located in Lexington, KY
student enrollment = 22,000

Lafayette College: located in Easton, PA
student enrollment = 2,000
NCAA Member Institutions

Lamar University: located in Beaumont, TX
student enrollment = 9,000

LaSalle University: located in Philadelphia, PA
student enrollment = 5,800

Lehigh University: located in Bethlehem, PA
student enrollment = 4,500

Liberty University: located in Lynchburg, VA
student enrollment = 10,500

Long Beach State University: located in Long Beach, CA
student enrollment = 26,000

Long Island University: located in University Plaza, NY
student enrollment = 9,500

Louisiana State University: located in Baton Rouge, LA
student enrollment = 25,897

Louisiana Tech University: located in Ruston, LA
student enrollment = 10,000

University of Louisville: located in Louisville, KY
student enrollment = 23,000

Loyola Marymount University: located in Los Angeles, CA
student enrollment = 3,900

Loyola University: located in Chicago, IL
student enrollment = 15,886

University of Maine: located in Orono, ME
student enrollment = 11,000

Manhattan College: located in Riverdale, NY
student enrollment = 3,600
NCAA Member Institutions

Marquette University: located in Milwaukee, WI
student enrollment = 10,000

Marist College: located in Poughkeepsie, NY
student enrollment = 3,500

Marshall University: located in Huntington, WV
student enrollment = 13,000

University of Maryland: located in College Park, MD
student enrollment = 32,908

U. of Maryland (Baltimore County): located in Baltimore, MD
student enrollment = 10,600

U. of Maryland (Eastern Shore): located in Princess Anne, MD
student enrollment = 3,200

U. of Massachusetts: located in Amherst, MA
student enrollment = 16,984

McNeese State U.: located in Lake Charles, LA
student enrollment = 8,700

University of Memphis: located in Memphis, TN
student enrollment = 21,500

Mercer University: located in Macon, GA
student enrollment = 2,356

Miami University: located in Oxford, OH
student enrollment = 16,000

University of Miami: located in Coral Gables, FL
student enrollment = 13,842

Michigan State U.: located in East Lansing, MI
student enrollment = 40,254

University of Michigan: located in Ann Arbor, MI
student enrollment = 36,228
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State U.</td>
<td>Murfreesboro, TN</td>
<td>17,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>37,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
<td>University, MS</td>
<td>12,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley State U.</td>
<td>Itta Bena, MS</td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>Columbia, MO</td>
<td>22,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri (KC)</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth University</td>
<td>West Long Branch, NJ</td>
<td>4,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana State U. Bozeman</td>
<td>Bozeman, MT</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Montana</td>
<td>Missoula, MT</td>
<td>11,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morehead State University</td>
<td>Morehead, KY</td>
<td>8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan State University</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. St. Mary's College</td>
<td>Emmitsburg, Md</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>Murray, KY</td>
<td>8,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>Lincoln, NE</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

University of Nevada (Reno): located in Reno, NV
student enrollment = 12,400

Nevada-Las Vegas (UNLV): located in Las Vegas, NV
student enrollment = 20,000

U. of New Hampshire: located in Durham, NH
student enrollment = 11,500

New Mexico State U.: located in Las Cruces, NM
student enrollment = 15,955

U. of New Mexico: located in Albuquerque, NM
student enrollment = 22,890

U. of New Orleans: located in New Orleans, LA
student enrollment = 15,396

Niagara University: located in Niagara University, NY
student enrollment = 2,400

Nicholls State U.: located in Thibodaux, LA
student enrollment = 7,205

Norfolk State University: located in Norfolk, VA
student enrollment = 8,229

North Carolina A&T State: located in Greensboro, NC
student enrollment = 8,000

North Carolina State U.: located in Raleigh, NC
student enrollment = 28,000

U. of North Carolina (Chapel Hill): located in Chapel Hill, NC
student enrollment = 23,000

U. of North Carolina (Asheville): located in Asheville, NC
student enrollment = 3,500

U. of North Carolina (Greensboro): located in Greensboro, NC
student enrollment = 12,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. of North Carolina (Wilmington)</td>
<td>Wilmington, NC</td>
<td>9,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of North Carolina (Charlotte)</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>15,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of North Texas</td>
<td>Denton, TX</td>
<td>26,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Louisiana U.</td>
<td>Monroe, LA</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Illinois U.</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona University</td>
<td>Flagstaff, AZ</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Iowa University</td>
<td>Cedar Falls, IA</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>DeKalb, IL</td>
<td>24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern State University</td>
<td>Natchitoches, LA</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
<td>7,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Notre Dame</td>
<td>Notre Dame, IN</td>
<td>10,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>Rochester, MI</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>52,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Ohio University: located in Athens, OH  
student enrollment = 18,484

Oklahoma State U: located in Stillwater, OK  
student enrollment = 18,561

U. of Oklahoma: located in Norman, OK  
student enrollment = 25,000

Oral Roberts U.: located in Tulsa, OK  
student enrollment = 10,575

Oregon State U.: located in Corvallis, OR  
student enrollment = 16,600

U. of Oregon: located in Eugene, OR  
student enrollment = 17,000

U of Pacific: located in Stockton, CA  
student enrollment = 4,000

Penn State University: located in University Park, PA  
student enrollment = 30,500

U. of Pennsylvania: located in Philadelphia, PA  
student enrollment = 9,800

Pepperdine University: located in Malibu, CA  
student enrollment = 6,800

U. of Pittsburgh: located in Pittsburgh, PA  
student enrollment = 25,479

U. of Portland: located in Portland, OR  
student enrollment = 2,800

Portland State U.: located in Portland, OR  
student enrollment = 14,500
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M</td>
<td>Prairie View, TX</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>Princeton, NJ</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence College</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>3,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>W. Lafayette</td>
<td>36,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radford University</td>
<td>Radford, VA</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Rhode Island</td>
<td>Kingston, RI</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Richmond</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rider University</td>
<td>Lawrenceville, NJ</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Morris College</td>
<td>Coraopolis, PA</td>
<td>5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bonaventure University</td>
<td>St. Bonaventure, NY</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Coll. Of PA</td>
<td>Loretto, PA</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis College</td>
<td>Brooklyn Heights, NY</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.A.A. Member Institutions</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Student Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John’s University:</td>
<td>located in Jamaica, NY</td>
<td>17,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph’s University:</td>
<td>located in Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis University:</td>
<td>located in St. Louis, MO</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary’s College:</td>
<td>located in Moraga, CA</td>
<td>2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter’s College:</td>
<td>located in Jersey City, NJ</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Houston State U.:</td>
<td>located in Huntsville, TX</td>
<td>12,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samford University:</td>
<td>located in Birmingham, AL</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State U.:</td>
<td>located in San Diego, CA</td>
<td>29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of San Diego:</td>
<td>located in San Diego, CA</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of San Francisco:</td>
<td>located in San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State U.:</td>
<td>located in San Jose, CA</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara U.:</td>
<td>located in Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Hall:</td>
<td>located in S. Orange, NJ</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siena College:</td>
<td>located in Loudonville, NY</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

South Alabama U.: located in Mobile, AL
student enrollment = 12,506

South Carolina State U.: located in Orangeburg, SC
student enrollment = 5,000

U. of South Carolina: located in Columbia, SC
student enrollment = 26,346

U. of South Florida: located in Tampa, FL
student enrollment = 36,000

Southeast Missouri State: located in Cape Girardeau, MO
student enrollment = 8,500

Southeastern Louisiana U.: located in Hammond, LA
student enrollment = 14,300

Southern California, U. of (USC): located in Los Angeles, CA
student enrollment = 27,970

Southern Illinois U.: located in Carbondale, IL
student enrollment = 24,000

Southern Methodist U.: located in Dallas, TX
student enrollment = 9,464

U. of Southern Mississippi: located in Hattiesburg, MS
student enrollment = 13,000

Southern Univ. & A&M: located in Baton Rouge, LA
student enrollment = 10,036

Southern Utah U.: located in Cedar City, UT
student enrollment = 5,000

Southwest Missouri State: located in Springfield, MO
student enrollment = 17,570

Southwest Texas State U.: located in San Marcos, TX
student enrollment = 21,500
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Southwestern Louisiana U.: located in Lafayette, LA
student enrollment = 16,500

Stanford University: located in Stanford, CA
student enrollment = 12,866

Stephen F. Austin State U.: located in Nacogdoches, TX
student enrollment = 12,300

Stetson University: located in DeLand, FL
student enrollment = 2,483

Syracuse University: located in Syracuse, NY
student enrollment = 10,500

Temple University: located in Philadelphia, PA
student enrollment = 30,000

Tennessee State U.: located in Nashville, TN
student enrollment = 7,500

Tennessee Tech U.: located in Cookeville, TN
student enrollment = 8,240

U of Tennessee (Knoxville): located in Knoxville, TN
student enrollment = 25,648

U. of Tennessee (Chattanooga): located in Chattanooga, TN
student enrollment = 8,325

U. of Tennessee (Martin): located in Martin, TN
student enrollment = 5,600

Texas A&M U.: located in College Station, TX
student enrollment = 43,862

Texas-Corpus Christi: located in Corpus Christi, TX
student enrollment = 5,810

Texas Christian U.: located in Fort Worth, TX
student enrollment = 7,050
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Southern U.</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td>8,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Tech University</td>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td>24,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas</td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>49,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas (Arlington)</td>
<td>Arlington, TX</td>
<td>22,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas (El Paso)</td>
<td>El Paso, TX</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas (Pan American)</td>
<td>Edinburg, TX</td>
<td>12,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Texas (San Antonio)</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
<td>17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Toledo</td>
<td>Toledo, OH</td>
<td>21,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towson University</td>
<td>Towson, MD</td>
<td>15,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy State U.</td>
<td>Troy, AL</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulane University</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>11,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Tulsa</td>
<td>Tulsa, OK</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force (U.S.)</td>
<td>Air Force Academy, CO</td>
<td>4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army (U.S.)</td>
<td>West Point, NY</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

Navy (U.S.): located in Annapolis, MD
student enrollment = 4,000

Utah State U.: located in Logan, UT
student enrollment = 21,000

U. of Utah: located in Salt Lake City, UT
student enrollment = 27,100

Valparaiso U.: located in Valparaiso, IN
student enrollment = 3,000

Vanderbilt U.: located in Nashville, TN
student enrollment = 9,724

U. of Vermont: located in Burlington, VT
student enrollment = 8,000

Villanova U.: located in Villanova, PA
student enrollment = 6,150

Virginia Commonwealth U.: located in Richmond, VA
student enrollment = 21,939

Virginia Military Institute: located in Lexington, VA
student enrollment = 1,600

Virginia Polytech. Ins.(Tech): located in Blacksburg, VA
student enrollment = 24,812

U. of Virginia: located in Charlottesville, VA
student enrollment = 18,175

Wagner College: located in Staten Island, NY
student enrollment = 2,000

Wake Forest University: located in Winston-Salem, NC
student enrollment = 3,600

Washington State U.: located in Pullman, WA
student enrollment = 20,000
N.C.A.A. Member Institutions

U. of Washington: located in Seattle, WA  
student enrollment = 34,000

Weber State U.: located in Ogden, UT  
student enrollment = 14,500

West Virginia U.: located in Morgantown, WV  
student enrollment = 21,500

Western Carolina U.: located in Cullowhee, NC  
student enrollment = 6,700

Western Illinois U.: located in Macomb, IL  
student enrollment = 11,295

Western Kentucky U.: located in Bowling Green, KY  
student enrollment = 13,992

Western Michigan U.: located in Kalamazoo, MI  
student enrollment = 25,673

Wichita State U.: located in Wichita, KS  
student enrollment = 17,653

William & Mary: located in Williamsburg, VA  
student enrollment = 5,400

Winthrop U.: located in Rock Hill, SC  
student enrollment = 5,200

U. of Wisconsin (Green Bay): located in Green Bay, WI  
student enrollment = 5,450

U. of Wisconsin (Madison): located in Madison, WI  
student enrollment = 40,305

U. of Wisconsin (Milwaukee): located in Milwaukee, WI  
student enrollment = 22,000

Wofford College: located in Spartanburg, SC  
student enrollment = 1,600
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wright State U.</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>17,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie, WY</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xavier University</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>6,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>5,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youngstown State U.</td>
<td>Youngstown, OH</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principles

P.1 The principle of institutional control and responsibility

Responsibility for Control. It is the responsibility of each member institution to control its intercollegiate athletics program in compliance with the rules and regulations of the Association. The institution’s chief executive officer is responsible for the administration of all aspects of the athletics program, including approval of the budget and audit of all expenditures.

Scope of Responsibility. The institution's responsibility for the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics program includes responsibility for the actions of its staff members and for the actions of any individual or organization engaged activities promoting the athletics interests of the institution.

1. permits each member institution to control its own intercollegiate program.
2. ensures that each member institution conforms with its constitution and bylaws.
43. enacts bylaws that allow member institutions to control their own programs.
63. legislates bylaws that hold member institutions accountable.

P.2 The principle of student-athlete welfare

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be conducted in a manner designed to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student-athletes. Overall educational experience. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment in which a student-athlete activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience. Cultural diversity and gender equity. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among its student-athletes and intercollegiate athletics department staff. Health and safety. It is the responsibility of each member institution to protect the health of and provide a safe environment for each of its participating student-athletes. Student-athlete/coach relationship. It is the responsibility of each member institution to establish and maintain an environment that fosters a positive relationship between the student-athlete and coach. Fairness, openness and honesty. It is the responsibility of each member institution to ensure that coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes. Student-athlete involvement. It is the responsibility of each member institution to involve student-athletes in matters that affect their lives.

2. communicates adequate guidelines to student-athlete with regards to their rights.
23. provides adequate guidelines to student-athletes with regards to their responsibilities.
44. prevents exploitation of its student-athletes by member institutions.
64. ensures that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of the educational program of member institutions.
ensures that intercollegiate athletics programs offer quality experience for student-athlete.

handles the grievances of student-athletes.

ensures that coach-athletes relationships will be free of harassment or coercion.

P.3 The principle of gender equity.

Compliance with federal and state legislation. It is the responsibility of each member institution to comply with federal and state laws regarding gender equity. NCAA legislation. The Association should not adopt legislation that would prevent member institutions from complying with applicable gender-equity laws, and should adopt legislation to enhance member institutions' compliance with applicable gender-equity laws. Gender bias. The activities of the Association should be in manner free of gender bias.

establishes and enforces rules that require institutions to be in compliance with title IX.

promotes equity among all athletic programs.

ensured its activities are free of gender bias.

promotes gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.

championship competitions are free of gender bias.

P.4 The principle of sportsmanship and ethical conduct.

For intercollegiate athletics to promote the character development of participants, to enhance the integrity of higher education and to promote civility in society, student-athletes, coaches, and all others associated with these athletics programs and events should adhere to such fundamental values as respect, fairness, civility, honesty and responsibility. These values should be manifest not only in athletics participation but also in the broad spectrum of activities affecting the athletics program. It is the responsibility of each institution to: (a) establish policies for sportsmanship and ethical conduct in intercollegiate athletics consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution; and (b) educate, on a continuing basis, all constituencies about the policies in 2.4 (a).

encourages honesty among student-athletes.

ensures that coaches uphold the dignity of intercollegiate athletics.

ensures that student-athletes uphold the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.

P.5 The principle of sound academic standards.

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be maintained as a vital component of the educational program, and student-athletes shall be an integral part of the student body. The admission, academic standing and academic progress of student-athletes shall be consistent with the policies and standards adopted by the institution for the student body in general.
4. emphasizes that every athlete is an integral part of the student body.
25. makes sure that every athlete is a bona fide student.
47. monitors the academic eligibility of student-athletes.
67. makes clear its academic requirements.
83. ensures that its academic standards are free of racial bias.
96. verifies that its academic requirements are fair.

P.6 The principle of nondiscrimination

The Association shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person. It is the policy of the Association to refrain from discrimination with respect to its governance policies, educational programs, activities and employment policies.

5. promotes an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of all student-athletes.
26. makes sure that its policies and procedures are not discriminatory.
48. ensures that its recruiting rules are not discriminatory.
68. enacts eligibility rules that are nondiscriminatory.
97. promotes all sports in a nondiscriminatory manner.

P.7 The principle of diversity within governance structures.

The Association shall promote diversity of representation within its various divisional governance structures and substructures. Each divisional governing body must assure gender and ethnic diversity among the membership of the bodies in the division's administrative structure.

6. promotes diversity in its own administrative structure.
27. hires people from diverse backgrounds.
49. ensures that its practices reflect commitment to gender/ethnic diversity.
69. hires qualified administrative professionals.
84. appoints qualified professionals to represent the NCAA.

P.8 The principle of rules compliance.

Responsibility of institution. Each institution shall comply with all applicable rules and regulations of the Association in the conduct of its intercollegiate athletics programs. It shall monitor its programs to assure compliance and to identify and report to the Association instances in which compliance has not been achieved. In any such instance, the institution shall cooperate fully with the Association and shall take appropriate corrective actions. Members of an institution's staff, student-athletes, and other individuals and groups representing the institution's athletics interests shall comply with the applicable Association rules, and the member institution shall be responsible for such compliance.

Responsibility of Association. The Association shall assist the institution in its efforts to
achieve full compliance with all rules and regulations and shall afford the institution, its staff and student-athletes fair procedures in the consideration of an identified or alleged failure in compliance. Penalty for noncompliance. An institution found to have violated the Association's rules shall be subject to such disciplinary and corrective actions as may be determined by the Association.

8. makes clear its rules of compliance.
28. assists institutions in achieving full compliance with rules and regulations.
50. clearly defines the punishment for violations.
70. is consistent in enforcing its bylaws.
85. encourages member institutions to report any violations of rules.

P.9 The principle of amateurism.

Student-athletes shall be amateurs in an intercollegiate sport, and their participation should be motivated primarily by education and by the physical, mental and social benefits to be derived. Student participation in intercollegiate athletics is an avocation, and student-athletes should be protected from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises.

8. maintains amateur standards in intercollegiate athletics.
29. controls illegal payments to student-athletes.
51. enacts rules that deter contacts between student athlete and agents.
71. makes sure student-athletes are not exploited by other commercial interests.
86. ensures that only amateurs participate in intercollegiate athletics.

P.10 The principle of competitive equity.

The structure and programs of the Association and the activities of its members shall promote opportunity for equity in competition to assure that individual student-athletes and institutions will not be prevented unfairly from achieving the benefits inherent in participation in intercollegiate athletics.

9. enacts rules to achieve parity among its members.
30. promotes competitive equity among member institutions.
52. enables all student-athletes to receive similar benefits.
72. creates competitive equity among conferences.
87. ensures that its scholarship rules facilitate competitive equity among its member institutions.

P.11 The principle governing recruiting.

The recruiting process involves a balancing of the interests of prospective student-athletes, their educational institutions and the Association's member institutions. Recruiting regulations shall be designed to promote equity among member institutions in their recruiting of prospects and to shield them from undue pressures that may interfere with the
scholastic or athletics interests of the prospects or their educational institutions.

11. balances the interests of athletes, and intercollegiate athletics.
31. enforces its recruiting rules consistently.
53. makes appropriate recruiting rules and regulations.
73. makes the recruiting rules and regulations clear and understandable.

P. 12 The principle governing eligibility.

Eligibility requirements shall be designed to assure proper emphasis on educational objectives, to promote competitive equity among institutions and to prevent exploitation of student-athletes.

11. makes its eligibility rules emphasize educational objectives.
32. ensures that its eligibility rules promote competitive equity among member institutions.
54. enacts eligibility rules to prevent the exploitation of student-athletes.

P. 13 The principle governing financial aid.

A student-athlete may receive athletically related financial aid administered by the institution without violating the principle of amateurism, provided the amount does not exceed the cost of education authorized by the Association. Any other financial assistance, except that received from one upon whom the student-athlete is naturally or legally dependent, shall be prohibited unless specifically authorized by the Association.

12. adopts eligibility rules consistent with standards of scholarship.
33. ensures limits on financial aid cover cost of education for student-athlete.
55. places appropriate limits on financial aid.

P. 14 The principle governing playing and practice seasons.

The time required of student-athletes for participation in intercollegiate athletics shall be regulated to minimize interference with their opportunities for acquiring a quality education in a manner consistent with that afforded the general student body.

13. enforces its rules on practice sessions.
34. ensures proper time is made available to student-athletes for academic studies.
56. places appropriate limits on practice sessions.
74. makes certain that post-season competitions do not erode the time for academic programs.
88. makes sure that competitive seasons for all sports are of appropriate length.
P.15 The principle governing postseason competition and contests sponsored by noncollegiate organizations.

The conditions under which postseason competition occurs shall be controlled to assure that the benefits inherent in such competition flow fairly to all participants, to prevent unjustified intrusion on the time student-athletes devote to their academic programs, and to protect student-athletes from exploitation by professional and commercial enterprises.

14. adequately supervises the conduct of national championships.
35. sets appropriate eligibility standards for national championship events.
57. makes sure that the post-season competitions are in best interest of athlete.
75. runs the post-season competitions in the best interest of member institutions.
89. sets appropriate process selection of teams for post-season.

P.16 The principle governing the economy of athletics program operation.

Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be administered in keeping with prudent management and fiscal practices to assure the financial stability necessary for providing student-athletes with adequate opportunities for athletics competition as an integral part of a quality educational experience.

15. encourages financial stability of member institutions.
36. helps member institutions become financially stable.

External Relationships.

16. liaisons with other national sport organizations.
37. secures business and/or industry sponsorships.
58. solicits funds from private donors.
76. solicits funds from government agencies.
90. gains media support for its programs.

Participation of Member Institutions.

17. addresses the concerns of administrators of university athletic programs.
38. seeks input from member institutions in establishing policies and bylaws.
59. promotes the welfare of coaches in intercollegiate athletics.

Federations (interorganizational linkages/networks)

19. creates an atmosphere for innovation in intercollegiate athletics.
39. develops creative ways to manage intercollegiate athletics.
60. serves as an effective forum for exchange of information (and knowledge) among member institutions.
77. establishes the legitimacy of intercollegiate athletics in the United States.
91. projects a positive image for intercollegiate athletics.
98. projects a positive image for member institutions.
101. generates enough finances for itself.
103. generates finances for member institutions.
105. distributes television revenues equitably among member institutions.
106. protects the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.

Transactional Outcomes

19. contributes to the financial stability of member institutions.
40. improves the financial performance of member institutions.
61. helps member institutions improve their day-to-day operations.
78. helps member institutions acquire new techniques in managing their affairs.
92. helps member institutions acquire new skills in managing their athletic departments.

Transformational Outcomes

20. helps member institutions market their products jointly.
41. helps member institutions design new products.
62. helps member institutions design new services.
79. helps member institutions develop new products.
93. helps member institutions develop new services.
99. has increased interactions among member institutions.
102. has created the sense that the competing institutions are partners in a common venture.
104. helps member institutions assess correctly their competitive institutions.

Evaluation

21. reviews its objectives from time to time.
42. ensures that its objectives represent current situation.
APPENDIX C

PANEL OF EXPERTS
Panel of Experts

ADVISORY COMMITTEE:
1. Dr. P. Chelladurai
   The Ohio State University
2. Dr. M. Daniels
   The Ohio State University
3. Dr. D. Porretta
   The Ohio State University

UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS:
1. Dr. Mary Hums
   University of Louisville
2. Dr. Larry McCarthy
   Georgia Southern University
3. Dr. D. Pastore
   The Ohio State University
4. Dr. Harold Reimer
   University of Texas @ Austin
5. Dr. James Weese
   University of Windsor

ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS:
1. Ruth Goehring
   University of Richmond
2. Rick Hartzell
   Bucknell University
3. Terry Holland
   University of Virginia
4. Bob Price
   Davidson College
5. Judy Rose
   University of North Carolina @ Charlotte
1. Ron Brietbach  
   Dubuque Golf & CC

2. Shane Lyons  
   NCAA

3. Robert Minnix  
   Florida State University

4. Donna Noonan  
   NCAA

5. Amy Perko  
   University of Kansas
APPENDIX D

FINAL VERSION OF INSTRUMENT
May 27, 1998

Dear

We request you to participate in this study of the NCAA. We are attempting to assess the extent to which the NCAA is perceived to be effective in fulfilling its mandate. We would like to emphasize that you, as an athletic administrator of a member university, have the most knowledge and insight on how the NCAA operates, and how effective it is. Thus your participation in this study and your candid responses to the following items are critical to the success of the study. The collective perceptions of university athletic administrators would translate into an accurate assessment of the NCAA, and a set of useful recommendations for improvements in NCAA operations.

We appreciate the time constraints you experience. But the attached questionnaire will take only 15 to 20 minutes. While we appreciate very much your help, we request your responses by Monday, June 15, 1998.

Your responses will be kept confidential. Nobody other than the investigators would have access to your responses. The returned questionnaires will be kept under lock and key till the study is completed at which time they will be destroyed.

We thank you for your participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Shawn O’Rourke
Doctoral Candidate

P. Chelladurai, Ph.D.
Professor and Adviser
The National Collegiate Athletic Association: Evaluation by Athletic Administrators

You are requested to respond to each of the following items from two different perspectives. First, please indicate the importance you attach to the substance of each item by marking the appropriate number on the left-hand side. For the same item, please indicate your agreement (or disagreement) with the statement by marking the appropriate number on the right-hand side.

There are no right or wrong answers. Your spontaneous and honest reaction to each of the statements is critical to the research. Please do not spend much time on individual items. Also, please do not discuss the questionnaire or the items with others.

1. Your Position: Associate Athletic Director _____ Assistant Athletic Director _____
   Other (Please Specify) ______________________

2. Your Gender: Male _____ Female _____

3. Your Age: _____ years

4. Your Educational Background: Bachelors_____ Masters_____
   Doctorate_____ Other (please specify)________

5. Your total experience in administration of Intercollegiate Athletics: _____ years

6. Were you an athlete? Yes or No
   If yes, at what level: high school_____ collegiate_____
   Professional_____ 

7. The Conference your School belongs to: __________________________

8. Your Ethnicity (Optional) Please Circle
   Asian American or Asian
   Black or African American
   Hispanic
   American Indian or Native American
   White or Caucasian
   Other (please specify) ______________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>THE NCAA ...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>permits each member institution to control its own intercollegiate program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>communicates adequate guidelines to student-athlete with regards to their rights.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>encourages honesty among student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasizes that every athlete is an integral part of the student body.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotes an atmosphere of respect for the dignity of all student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotes diversity in its own administrative structure.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes clear its rules of compliance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>maintains amateur standards in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>enacts rules to achieve parity among its members.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>balances the interests of athletes, and intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes its eligibility rules emphasize educational objectives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>adopts eligibility rules consistent with standards of scholarship.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>enforces its rules on practice sessions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>adequately supervises the conduct of national championships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>encourages financial stability of member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>liaisons with other national sport organizations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>addresses the concerns of administrators of university athletic programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>THE NCAA ...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>creates an atmosphere for innovation in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>contributes to the financial stability of member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions market their products jointly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>reviews its objectives from time to time.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that each member institution conforms with its constitution and bylaws.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>provides adequate guidelines to student-athletes with regards to their responsibilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>establishes and enforces rules that require institutions to be in compliance with title IX.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes sure that every athlete is a bona fide student.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes sure that its policies and procedures are not discriminatory.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>hires people from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>assists institutions in achieving full compliance with rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>controls illegal payments to student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotes competitive equity among member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>enforces its recruiting rules consistently.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that its eligibility rules promote competitive equity among member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures limits on financial aid cover cost of education for student-athlete.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures proper time is made available to student-athletes for academic studies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>sets appropriate eligibility standards for national championship events.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>THE NCAA ...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>helps member institutions become financially stable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>secures business and/or industry sponsorships.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>seeks input from member institutions in establishing policies and bylaws.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>develops creative ways to manage intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>improves the financial performance of member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>helps member institutions design new products.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that its objectives represent current situation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>enacts bylaws that allow member institutions to control their own programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>prevents exploitation of its student-athletes by member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>promotes equity among all athletic programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that the actions of student-athletes are ethical.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>monitors the academic eligibility of student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that its recruiting rules are not discriminatory.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that its practices reflect commitment to gender/ethnic diversity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>clearly defines the punishment for violations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>enacts rules that deter contacts between student athlete and agents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>enables all student-athletes to receive similar benefits.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>THE NCAA...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes appropriate recruiting rules and regulations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>enacts eligibility rules to prevent the exploitation of student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>places appropriate limits on financial aid.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>places appropriate limits on practice sessions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes sure that the post-season competitions are in best interest of student-athlete.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>solicits funds from private donors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotes the welfare of the coaches in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>serves as an effective forum for exchange of information (and knowledge) among member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions improve their day-to-day operations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions design new services.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>legislates bylaws that hold member institutions accountable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that intercollegiate athletics is an integral part of the educational program of member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensured its activities are free of gender bias.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that coaches uphold the dignity of intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes clear its academic requirements.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>enacts eligibility rules that are non-discriminatory.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>hires qualified administrative professionals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>is consistent in enforcing its bylaws.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>THE NCAA ...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>makes sure student-athletes are not exploited by other commercial interests.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>creates competitive equity among conferences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>makes the recruiting rules and regulations clear and understandable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>makes certain that post-season competitions do not erode the time for academic programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>runs the post-season competitions in the best interest of member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>solicits funds from government agencies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>establishes the legitimacy of intercollegiate athletics in the United States.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>helps member institutions acquire new techniques in managing their affairs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>helps member institutions develop new products.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that intercollegiate athletics programs offer quality experience for student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>promotes gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that student-athletes uphold the integrity of intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that its academic standards are free of racial bias.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>appoints qualified professionals to represent the NCAA.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>encourages member institutions to report any violations of rules.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td>ensures that only amateurs participate in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>THE NCAA ...</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that its scholarship rules facilitate competitive equity among its member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>makes sure that competitive seasons for all sports are of appropriate length.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>sets appropriate process selection of teams for post-season.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>gains media support for its programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>projects a positive image for intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions acquire new skills in managing their athletic departments.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions develop new services.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>handles the grievances of student-athletes.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>championship competitions are free of gender bias.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>verifies that its academic requirements are fair.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>promotes all sports in an nondiscriminatory manner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>projects a positive image for member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>has increased interactions among member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>ensures that coach-athletes relationships will be free of harassment or coercion.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>generates enough finances for itself.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>has created the sense that the competing institutions are partners in a common venture.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>generates finances for member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>helps member institutions assess correctly their competitive capabilities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>distributes television revenues equitably among member institutions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>protects the integrity of intercollegiate</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The following items relate to your personal feelings one may hold toward the NCAA. Please indicate the extent to which these items reflect your feelings by marking the appropriate number on the right hand side.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Very True</th>
<th>Very False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think the NCAA is in need of restructuring.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I believe that the policies and procedures of the NCAA are excellent.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am happy with the supervision provided by the NCAA.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I believe that the NCAA is effective in promoting intercollegiate sports.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I hope that the NCAA will do a better job than what it is doing now.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>My feeling is that university athletics can not operate well without the NCAA.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Overall, I am satisfied with the NCAA.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am satisfied with how the NCAA is handling problems in intercollegiate athletics.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I endorse the goals of the NCAA wholeheartedly.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I am pleased with the ways of the NCAA.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

IMPORTANCE PERCEPTION COMPARISON
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Equity Concerns</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Autonomy</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Equity</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Enforcement</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>15.08</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Welfare</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-athlete Status</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>14.89</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing and Development</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Enhancement</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image Projection</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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