

The Coach-Educator: NCAA Division I Coach Perspectives About an Integrated University Organizational Structure

Erianne A. Weight, Coyte Cooper, and Nels K. Popp

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Philosophical debate about the proper role of athletics within the academy has reverberated through each era of collegiate sport, and a growing body of literature points toward an impending tipping point unless radical reform ensues. This study contributes perspective to a proposed reform model through investigating perceptions of National Collegiate Athletics Association Division I coaches ($N = 661$) about their roles as educators and how this role could be altered through structural and philosophical changes within the academy. Quantitative and qualitative data provided mixed findings related to coach support for an integrated organizational structure with high variance in all structural facets explored except for compensation, where coaches believed structures should not be uniform between athletic and academic units because of the perceived greater workload, hours, media attention, and pressure in athletics.

Keywords: organizational structure, college sports, higher education, intercollegiate athletics, organizational change

Controversy has been a steady companion of college sport, amid media attention and commercial enticements, because the proper role of athletics within the academy has never been philosophically reconciled (Desrochers, 2013; Oriard, 2001; Smith, 2011; Thelin, 1996). The organizational philosophy of housing intercollegiate athletics within the academy has largely been based on the notion of athletics as a unique element of a holistic education (Adler & Adler, 1990; Bowen & Levin, 2003; Lapchick, 1987; Weight, Navarro, Huffman, & Smith-Ryan, 2014) with tremendous brand-building, relationship-forging, and student-drawing power (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Smith, 1988; Stevens, 2007) that is “significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p. 82). This foundational philosophy has been used to justify the burgeoning college sport enterprise, but a growing body of reformers has condemned the industry for its excessive commercialism (Anthes, 2010; Gerdy, 2006; Oriard, 2001; Smith, 2001), unprincipled behavior (Byers & Hammer, 1997; Smith & Willingham, 2015), and athlete exploitation (McCormick & McCormick, 2006; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Zimbalist, 1999). These factors, coupled with the

media frenzy that often accompanies athletic events, have led some scholars to believe intercollegiate athletics are a significant detractor from the mission of higher education (Benford, 2007; Duderstadt, 2003; Smith & Willingham, 2015; Zimbalist, 1999).

Although this philosophical debate between supporters and reformers has reverberated through each era of collegiate sport in the 20th and early 21st centuries, a growing body of literature points toward an impending tipping point (Oriard, 2001; Smith, 2001, 2011; Southall & Nagel, 2009; Staurowsky, 2011) unless radical reform ensues. This study investigates a possible route to reform through the perspectives of National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) Division I (DI) coaches.

A philosophical reform approach was delineated by Myles Brand, NCAA president from 2002–2009. A vocal proponent of the educational value of intercollegiate athletic participation and an “integrated view” of intercollegiate athletics within a university, he believed the importance of intercollegiate athletics was significantly undervalued. He condemned the academy for its bias against bodily skills and nonart and its view on athletics as an auxiliary to the university that is unworthy of subsidy (Brand, 2006a). This athletics-as-an-auxiliary mind-set, “the standard view,” Brand argued, is at the root of many of the conceptual problems that have led to intense competitive pressure related to winning and the arms race of intercollegiate athletic expenditures (Cooper & Weight, 2012; Knight Commission on Intercollegiate

The authors are with the Department of Exercise and Sport Science, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC. Address author correspondence to Erianne A. Weight at eweight@unc.edu.

Athletics, 2010; Weight, Weight, & Schneider, 2013). Brand suggested overcoming this bias would require an integrated view of intercollegiate athletics in which athletics would be treated as an academic unit similar to the performing arts, such as music, dance, or theater, which have very similar structures. If this philosophical and structural paradigm shift were to occur, it could lessen the competitive pressure and associated detriments to the system, and the educational foundation of intercollegiate athletics could resurface as the fundamental purpose of athletics within higher education (Bowen & Levin, 2003; Brand, 2006a).

This view as applied to big-time revenue-producing sport has been termed *academic capitalism* in reform literature and has been criticized for its acceptance of commercialization and lack of protection of athlete rights (Sack, 2009). Critics of academic capitalism believe there is no line of demarcation between the collegiate and professional models of athletics except that the vast majority of the revenue-generating employees (the “student-athletes”) are not paid (Gerdy, 2006; Sack, 2009; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Southall & Nagel, 2009; Splitt, 2007; Sperber, 2000). These scholars contend that the current focus on the bottom line and winning in this hypercompetitive environment undermines the mission of higher education.

Brand countered many of these concerns. He suggested that commercialization, within an academic-capitalism framework, is a healthy byproduct of a top-notch educational experience. Just as a music department might host a nationally televised concert that could financially benefit the department and university, exposure and revenue through a successful athletic department event is a welcome supplement toward the subsidization of athletic scholarships and departmental infrastructure (Brand, 2006a). He emphasized

clear distinctions between the collegiate and professional models of athletics. Professional sports’ sole purposes are to entertain the public and make a profit for team owners. The purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of student-athletes. (Brand, 2006b, p.5)

Commercialism, he argued, is appropriate when it is congruent with the mission of higher education (Brand, 2006c).

Building on the literature surrounding this philosophical viewpoint, the purpose of this study was to contribute perspective to Brand’s (2006a) proposed reform model by examining the perceptions of NCAA DI coaches about their role within the university structure and how the industry could be altered through an “integrated view” of intercollegiate athletics. Research has demonstrated the tremendous educational influence that youth sport coaches can have on the athlete experience (Barton, 2011; Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2012; Danish, 2002; Danish, Petitpas, Hale, 1993; Horn, 2002; Smoll & Smith, 1989). Little research, however, has examined the role of col-

legiate coaches in the facilitation of educational experiences (Becker, 2009). Given the intimate knowledge a coach holds relative to athlete educational growth through participation, the legitimacy of Brand’s (2006a) model was explored through the following research questions:

[RQ1] How do coaches feel about implementing an integrated organizational approach within athletics and academics?

[RQ 2] What organizational structures do coaches believe should be uniform between athletics and academics?

[RQ3] Do significant differences exist between coaches’ beliefs regarding an integrated athletic/academic structure based on institutional NCAA DI subclassification, “revenue” sport classification, coach position, sex, and years coaching?

As a segment within academia that is largely publicly subsidized and highly scrutinized, this population will provide depth to the limited literature related to the “integrated view” of intercollegiate athletics as a possible reform avenue. Before exploring the methods used to address these research questions, we will first outline additional literature central to foundation of this study.

Literature Review

Intercollegiate Athletics Organizational Structure and Philosophy

Despite the centrality of structure to an organization’s operational effectiveness (Huber & Glick, 1993; Kimberly & Rottman, 1987), very little empirical investigation has explored the structure of American intercollegiate athletics relative to operational success (Cunningham & Rivera, 2001; Smart & Wolfe, 2000). Cunningham and Rivera (2001) discussed departmental specialization, formalization, centralization, and size relative to athletic achievement and concluded that departments with a decentralized decision-making structure have better athletic achievement.

The notion of structuralized decentralization from a university perspective is evident; many athletics departments operate as autonomous or auxiliary units separate from the rest of campus (Brand, 2006a; Byers & Hammer, 1997; Duderstadt, 2012; Frey, 2012). Organizational psychologist Karl Weick (1984) posits that the culture of higher education is at odds with organizational coordination and control. Add on the complexities of intercollegiate athletics as a subunit within a system of “organized anarchies” (Cohen & March, 1974), and organizational control appears a daunting proposal (Frey, 2012). In fact, only one NCAA DI school in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), Vanderbilt, has truly embraced the concept of housing the athletic department fully under the academic umbrella, shifting oversight of the department to a Director of University Affairs in hopes of better integrating student-athletes into the academic experience provided

by the institution (Pope, 2008). Other examples dot the lower levels of the college athletics landscape, such as the Ivy League's decision to eschew athletic scholarships (Wilson, 2013) or the decisions at Ricks College (Call, 2000) and Spellman College (Tierney, 2013) to eliminate intercollegiate athletics altogether in favor of more student-centric sport offerings.

The evolution of independent athletic structures appears to be the result of a combination of unique industry demands coupled with powerful external constituencies and faculty elitism within a somewhat dysfunctional university institutional culture (Brand, 2006a; Frey, 1985a, 1985b, 2012; Weick, 1984). A growing body of literature documents the divide this independence has fostered and the impending need to close the gap (Brand, 2006a; Byers & Hammer, 1997; Duderstadt, 2012; Sack, 2009; Smith, 2011; Thelin, 1996; Zimbalist, 1999). This divide has taken a variety of forms. Independent foundations, business structures, facilities, and revenue sources are maintained in athletic complexes often miles away from "main campus" (Brand, 2006a; Byers & Hammer, 1997; Duderstadt, 2012; Frey, 2012). This confluence of structural distinctness may contribute to a theoretical dissonance between the educational mission of the university and commercial enticements of big-time intercollegiate athletics.

Combining the ideas of decentralized decision making in athletics (Cunningham & Rivera, 2001) with decentralized organizational structures within athletics and universities (Frey, 1985b, 2012), Southall et al. (2008) explored the institutional logic driving organizational functions. Findings demonstrated competing institutional logic in which "official" rhetoric espousing educational values was deemed "ceremonial conformity" (p. 694) perceived to be a requirement for institutional legitimacy yet often not supported by administrator decisions.

Research exploring the values driving administrative decisions within intercollegiate athletics was extended in a study of 356 NCAA DI administrators (Cooper & Weight, 2011; Cooper, Weight, & Pierce, 2014). Quantitative and narrative data from head, senior, and associate athletic directors provided evidence of a leader-value continuum. On one end of the continuum, efficient and transformational leaders embrace inspiring educational values and proactively promote those values through day-to-day decision making. Administrators in the middle of the continuum believe organizational values to be important but don't consciously make the values part of the culture. At the extreme end of the continuum reside administrators who embrace a hypocritical-value approach, publicly proclaiming certain values to be important yet consistently acting contrary to those values.

In a follow-up study investigating values expressed by administrators and perceived by coaches, a similar phenomenon was observable. A slight majority of coaches provided passionate agreement that departmental values are unified and that administrators and coaches strive to provide optimal student-athlete experiences. Many coach narrative responses, however, indicated administrator

hypocrisy and intentional inconsistency in departmental word and action, translating into difficult situations for many coaches (Cooper & Weight, 2012).

NCAA DI coaches struggle to reconcile contradictory values espoused by department leadership (placing student-athlete educational goals first) with the manner in which they are often evaluated professionally (win at all costs), researchers have suggested steps to improve this organizational disconnect. Among their recommendations to the University of Minnesota, scholars Kane, Leo, and Holleran (2008) suggested sport coaches become more involved in university-wide committees and faculty forums to more fully integrate academics and athletics. Likewise, in their examination of athletic-reform case studies, Corrigan, Hardin, and Nichols (2011) highlighted several best practices regarding athletic department governance. Among their conclusions were (a) greater faculty oversight of athletics, (b) partnerships between coaches and administrators during the recruitment of athletes, and (c) the development of academic progress standards. Some observers of college athletics have even suggested that a major step toward reforming college athletics is to encourage NCAA DI coaches to become bona fide faculty members and teach academic courses as part of their responsibilities (Jenkins, 2011). Such recommendations would probably force college coaches and administrators to shift paradigms regarding their view of the coach's role within the complex college athletics dynamic.

Coach-Educator Retention and Promotion Factors

Most NCAA DI coaches are evaluated not on their team's academic performance but rather on their team's athletic success. For example, Wilson, Schrager, Burke, Hawkins, and Gauntt (2011) found NCAA DI men's basketball coaching contracts financially incentivized team success five time more heavily than academic performance. In a follow-up study, Wilson and Burke (2013) actually uncovered a decrease in potential financial reward for coaches with high-performing academic teams over a recent 4-year span. Inoue, Plehn-Dujowich, Kent, and Swanson (2012) examined factors affecting coaches' salaries for NCAA DI football coaches and found that the variable with the highest positive predictive ability was winning percentage. Meanwhile, Brewer, McEvoy, and Popp (2013) found lifetime winning percentage to be a strong predictor of coaches' salaries among NCAA DI men's basketball head coaches, and lifetime academic progress rate scores (a measure of academic progress of student-athletes) had virtually no predictive power in determining compensation value.

For some coaches, the emphasis on team success rather than objectives more closely aligned with university missions—such as academic achievement or personal growth—skew even more so if their sport generates revenue. In college athletics, the emphasis on creating revenue has produced a culture with little patience and job security for coaches in big-time sports such as foot-

ball or men's basketball (Hill, 2012). Corresponding to this emphasis has been a drastic increase in salaries for head and assistant coaches in revenue-producing sports (Berkowitz, Upton, Schnaars, & Dougherty, 2015). Even lower-level DI schools are increasingly investing large amounts in salaries for football and men's basketball coaches to increase chances of winning (Brady, Upton, & Berkowitz, 2012). Previous research has demonstrated that nonrevenue sports have an expectation for athletic success that can influence their job expectations as well (Cooper & Weight, 2011). This research is reinforced by the early contract termination of many coaches because of a lack of athletic success (Massey, 2011).

Faculty Retention and Promotion Factors

If athletics were indeed to become integrated into the academic design of universities, as promulgated by Brand (2006a), the manner in which coaches were assessed and remunerated would likely be altered, perhaps reflecting the promotion practices of faculty members within higher education. Several researchers have examined variables affecting faculty promotion and salaries on college campuses. Significant retention and promotion factors in these studies include years of service, number of publications, possession of a terminal degree (Webster, 1995), gender, academic expertise, type of university (Hearn, 1999), and seniority as measured by "time in rank" (Castle, 2005).

Many of the factors guiding promotion decisions for college faculty revolve around personal achievement, such as publication record, degrees and certificates obtained, and longevity served. Although most institutions use some faculty assessment relative to student performance (such as student and peer teaching evaluations), athletic coaching appraisal at NCAA DI institutions is currently far more dependent on student-athlete performance. This difference is a key element within any discussion of academic integration efforts for major college athletics. Consequently, any reform directed at integrating academic achievement within athletic departments must be inclusive of coaches' opinions. Virtually no research to date, however, has aggregated the perspectives of coaches regarding a more integrated approach to this academic and athletic dichotomy. The intention of this study is to examine coaches' perspectives and determine whether an integrated approach would be positively received and promoted by this key stakeholder group.

Method

Instrument Design

To facilitate inquiry into these critical issues, we used a mixed-methods research design through the use of a survey. A mixed-methods approach has been demonstrated to effectively explore research questions involving multiple perspectives and a population difficult to access (Bryman, 2006; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Plano Clark, 2010). Mixed methodology allowed the

research team to gain qualitative insights to an unexplored phenomenon while also allowing for quantitative assessment of assumptions based on anecdotal evidence and popular media accounts. By asking respondents for their perceptions and ratings of existing measures, researchers gained a more complete picture. Because of the exploratory nature of the research, an instrument was developed on the basis of the body of foundational literature outlined above. The survey was reviewed by a panel of experts representing unique viewpoints ($n = 6$) to enhance instrument validity. This panel included two sport administration professors, two DI collegiate coaches, one DI collegiate administrator, and a survey design consultant from the Odom Institute of Social Science Research. Pilot testing with a sample of 20 coaches yielded a test-retest reliability value (α of more than .85 on the Likert-scale elements, providing evidence of reliability within the survey instrument (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

The contents of the survey used for this study include four sections:

1. Demographic information with six questions corresponding to the independent variables of NCAA DI football classification, coaching position, gender, years as a college coach, and sport coached.
2. Open-ended questions gauging why coaches believe similar (or different) organizational structures are the best model for intercollegiate athletics (Tables 1 & 2).
3. A statement broadly explaining an integrated philosophy followed by a matrix Likert-scale question gauging support for uniformity in the categories of compensation, job security, emphasis on educational curriculum, and "faculty" title (Table 3).
4. A yes/no question gauging support for an educational curriculum to be used within athletics (Table 4).

Sample

After instrument review, the survey was sent via Qualtrics online survey software to the entire population of NCAA DI head and assistant coaches with available e-mail addresses retrieved from departmental Web sites. After initial dissemination to approximately 3,500 coaches, a response rate of 19% was attained, providing a sample of coaches ($N = 661$) with representative distribution between DI subclassifications and sports.

Survey respondents were primarily White (89.9%, $n = 594$), with 5.9% ($n = 39$) Black respondents, 2.1% ($n = 14$) Asian, and 2.1% ($n = 14$) respondents representing "other" ethnicities. Men represented nearly two thirds of the sample (62%, $n = 410$). A nearly equal number of head (47.5%, $n = 314$) and assistant (49.3%, $n = 326$) coaches responded from each NCAA DI subdivision; most respondents were from schools in the FBS (58.2%, $n = 385$). Coaches were quite diverse in their years of experience ($M = 13.76$ years, $SD = 9.70$). Coaches from all NCAA sponsored sports were represented in the sample;

the majority of responses were from women's volleyball (10%, $n = 71$), outdoor track and field (9.6%, $n = 68$), women's soccer (8.7%, $n = 62$), women's basketball (6.6%; $n = 47$), cross country (6.5%; $n = 46$), swimming/diving (5.9%, $n = 42$), softball (5.5%; $n = 39$), wrestling (4.8%, $n = 34$), rowing (3.9%, $n = 28$), and men's soccer (3.7%, $n = 26$). The independent variable of revenue sport comprised football (3.5%, $n = 25$) and men's basketball (3.4%, $n = 23$) coach respondents. Each of the other sports representing the remaining 28% of the sample had fewer than 25 respondents. These sports included women's golf, baseball, tennis, field hockey, lacrosse, men's golf, women's gymnastics, men's lacrosse, men's volleyball, women's ice hockey, men's ice hockey, bowling, fencing, rifle, skiing, and men's and women's water polo.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using IBM SPSS (Version 19.0). Data analysis included basic frequencies and descriptive statistics to provide a framework of the wide array of respondents represented. In addition, one-way analyses of variance and χ^2 analyses were run to determine whether significant differences existed between levels of the independent variables (a) institutional NCAA DI subclassification, (b) revenue sport classification, (c) position, (d) years coaching, and (f) gender within each dependent variable. Dependent variables included (a) support for an educational curriculum to guide athletics education and (b) support for uniformity between academics and athletics in four organizational structure elements.

Qualitative data were independently organized into emergent categories by two researchers on the basis of the nature of the responses to an open-ended question pertaining to support for an "academic unit" organizational structure ($n = 405$). Four coding categories and 11 subcategories emerged after 2 rounds of code modification. After finalizing the code, data were independently coded yielding a Krippendorff's α of .9, reflecting 91.9% (high level) agreement between coders. In addition, χ^2 analyses of independence were conducted to add an additional layer of rigor to the qualitative analysis using the same five independent variables listed above.

Results and Discussion

Coaches' Perceptions of an Integrated Approach

Qualitative responses were used to answer the first research question: How do coaches feel about implementing an integrated organizational approach within athletics and academics? Nearly half (48.1%, $n = 195$) of the 405 coaches who chose to respond to qualitative items indicated that athletics should be structured similarly to academics. Five independent themes emerged within this major category (see Table 1). Coaches emphasized (a) potential benefits of athletics being structured simi-

larly to academics, including achieving the university's academic mission through athletics (24.4%, $n = 99$), (b) providing greater job security to coaches (11.9%, $n = 48$), (c) building relationships with academic departments (5.2%, $n = 21$), (d) correcting the win-loss, revenue-sport dominating culture (3.5%, $n = 14$), and (e) validating the role of a coach (3.2%, $n = 13$).

Nearly the same number of coaches (43%, $n = 174$) expressed concern with a homogeneous organizational structure between athletics and academics. These coaches delineated narratives relaying belief that athletics and academics require unique organizational structures to allow athletics personnel to (a) focus on facilitating athletic excellence (16.8%, $n = 68$), (b) be compensated for extra responsibilities (7.4%, $n = 30$), (c) protect expert control and flexibility (7.2%, $n = 29$), (d) avoid additional responsibilities (5.4%, $n = 22$), (e) generate publicity (3.2%, $n = 13$), and (f) teach life lessons (3.0%, $n = 12$). Categories, with selected excerpts, are included in Table 2.

Support for integration. Coaches who believe athletics should be structured similarly to an academic unit believe it could facilitate building relationships with academic departments or debunking current barriers and biases to the student-athlete myth. For example, FBS Head Coach 412 expressed that "We have been separate for so long that I cannot even picture such a relationship . . . however, I would enjoy it and support it!" Likewise, FBS Assistant Coach 355 believed "it would tie everyone together closely I think and bridge a[n] unnecessary gap that exists." It would "help the athletic department to be part of the bigger whole, not on an island" (FBS Assistant Coach 354). These comments reflect the literature citing the structural and philosophical divide between "main campus" and the athletics conglomerate (Brand, 2006a; Byers & Hammer, 1997; Duderstadt, 2012; Frey, 2012) and provide evidence of a strong desire to bridge the gap that has been a source of so much contention over the years (Benford, 2007; Duderstadt, 2003).

The themes uncovered by this subgroup also reflect a desire to be evaluated similarly to their academic counterparts, rather than by the performance of student-athletes. As the literature attests (Hearn, 1999; Webster, 1995) few faculty members, particularly at the type of institutions that comprise the NCAA DI level, are promoted or compensated on the basis of students' classroom performance or grade point averages, whereas coaches are most likely to be retained and promoted on the basis of the athletic success of their athletes (Brewer et al., 2013; Inoue et al., 2012; Wilson & Burke, 2013; Wilson et al., 2011). Respondents in this group often felt their role as character builders and developers of well-rounded students was underappreciated.

Others who supported an integrated structure believed it could be a catalyst to amplify the educational foundation of intercollegiate athletics and reverse the increasing competitive and commercial pressure. "If [coaches were] viewed as educators, it would change the emphasis from totally on winning to character-building

Table 1 Narrative Responses

Athletics Should be Structured Similarly to Academics	n	%
Achieve academic mission through athletics	99	24.4
"We are all educators, we just have different classrooms."		
"The athletic unit is a multidisciplinary learning environment."		
"As much learning happens in athletics as in the classroom."		
"I am first and foremost an educator."		
Provide greater job security to coaches	48	11.9
"Coaching is a high risk profession where coaches are at the mercy of athletes and fans."		
"Professors do not have to worry about losing their jobs after a semester of "subpar" performances in the classroom."		
Build relationships with academic departments	21	5.0
"We are all part of the university and this model would build more cooperation between all units."		
"It would tie everyone together closely, I think, and bridge an unnecessary gap that exists."		
Correct the win/loss, revenue-sport dominating culture	14	3.5
"In athletics the public tends to view a W or a L as the only criteria for evaluating coaches, so a different organizations structure could be useful because not everyone can win every year."		
"Coaches are held to a double standard. We are told that great value is placed on doing things the right way and building leaders, but we are judged on winning or on individual mistakes made by players."		
Validate the coaching profession	13	3.2
"It would validate what I do at a university setting as valuable."		
"Brings more credibility to what we do as a perception of the public."		
Total	195	48.1

and educating" (FCS Assistant Coach 155). "If athletics were an academic department, perhaps we wouldn't have so many issues blown out of proportion because of the outrageous monetary value in athletics that skews the morality of the system" (FBS Assistant Coach 182). Respondents seemed to reflect hopefully on the prospect of an integrated organizational structure: "ADs are business managers charged to care about the bottom line, and the bottom line for coaches is winning conference championships year after year. If we were organized as an academic unit, maybe this would change" (FCS Assistant Coach 276). Likewise,

Athletics has great potential as a laboratory for critical thought. So much emphasis has been placed on entertainment and marketing through athletics that too often we lose sight of athletics[] great other potentials. A reorganization integrating academics may be what athletics needs, at least for the majority of universities. (FCS Head Coach 146).

These narratives reflect literature documenting increasing commercial pressure (Anthes, 2010; Gerdy, 2006; Oriard, 2001; Smith, 2001) and the importance of reform and

restoration of the founding organizational philosophy of athletics as a unique element of a holistic education (Adler & Adler, 1990; Bowen & Levin, 2003; Lapchick, 1987). The passionate hope of coaches who expressed feelings of ostracism from the educational mission of the university should serve as an important catalyst for exploring the application of the integrated philosophy more fully.

The final themes expressed by coaches who supported the idea of an integrated organizational structure included validation for the educational role of coaches and increased job security. As FBS Head Coach 103 mentioned, "I am first and foremost an educator. I'd love to be compensated when my athletes do well academically. My women's team averaged a 3.6 GPA. I get nothing for that except a pat on the back." FCS Assistant Coach 104 expressed a similar perspective:

The athletic unit is a multidisciplinary learning environment. Each member wears hats that combine all facets of the college's goals: student life, academics, career planning, etc. Why not call our jobs what they are? We're educators. It would be nice to be viewed as such, especially with regard to security.

Table 2 Narrative Responses

Athletics and Academics Require Unique Organizational Structures	<i>n</i>	%
Focus facilitating athletic excellence	68	16.8
“Coaches are held accountable for student performance whereas professors just show up and teach. Our structure facilitates fostering athletic excellence.”		
“They are apples and oranges and require different structures. Professors don’t have a win-loss record that affects their job security. They also don’t recruit their students.”		
Be compensated for extra responsibilities	30	7.4
“Coaches should be making more because of the hours they work.”		
“I work many more hours than any faculty member. I should make much more—including bonuses.”		
Protect expert athletics control & flexibility	29	7.2
“The educational system is broken . . . why would we want to model it? When the music teacher can understand the physical and mental demands of obtaining a degree while participating in athletics then they can have their input.”		
Avoid additional responsibilities	22	5.4
“We already work nights and weekends, there is no room for an additional workload.”		
“We have far too much on our plate already.”		
Generate publicity, funds, and entertainment	13	3.2
“Athletics is a completely different beast because we are in the business of entertainment.”		
“Although the moral value of education is the emphasis, athletics is still a business driven by revenue that is gained through winning. The underlying goal should be enforced by leadership and not by anything else.”		
Build character/teach life lessons	12	3.0
“Athletics provides a rare opportunity to teach life lessons in ways that can’t be done in traditional educational settings.”		
Total	174	43.0
Other	14	3.5
I don’t know/don’t understand.	22	5.4

Others acknowledged the competitive nature of coaching, in which promotions are based on performance. An educational organizational structure was acknowledged to facilitate a “middle ground where there could be some form of security similar to faculty” (FCS Head Coach 201) where “it would make it harder to get fired over wins and losses” (FBS Assistant Coach 180) because “the coaching profession is a very unstable environment and greatly strains the family structure. Any semblance of security and compensation to provide for the family is needed” (FBS Assistant Coach 270). Coaches in this school of thought echoed the literature outlining job insecurity (Campbell & Strong, 2012; Hill, 2012; Kensler, 2010; Massey, 2011) and associated personal and organizational strains (Barling & Kelloway, 1996; Hellgren et al., 1999; Jex & Beehr, 1991; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

The narratives in this subcategory expressing support for the integrated view based on increased job security are perhaps less compelling as evidence of true support for the philosophy, in that the narratives reflect some misunderstanding or bias. Yet the implications of these statements do provide impetus for further exploration into the

implementation of this reform philosophy. The narratives reflect a “grass is greener within academics” perception, discussing greater opportunity for job security, greater compensation, and a better overall work environment as compelling reasons to integrate athletics with academics in mission and structure. There are tremendous issues of job insecurity in athletics (Campbell & Strong, 2012; Hill, 2012; Kensler, 2010), but the implicit suggestion that job security is better within academics is problematic; in reality, the “publish-or-perish” structure has fostered many of the same unintended consequences that we see in the win-at-all-costs mentality (Van Dalen & Henkens, 2012). In addition, most lecturers are on yearly contracts, and performance in the classroom could result in termination, just as it can for their coach counterparts. This area of potential misunderstanding underscores the importance of this research toward bridging the gap between athletics and the academy. Perhaps as both parties reflect on the true educational foundation of the university and best pathways for this education to occur, realignment will strengthen all parties.

The narratives expressing support for integration in an effort to gain validation for the educational role that coaches currently fulfill is an important finding. Coach after coach mentioned how little the public (or the rest of the university) understands what they do. They see themselves as educators yet are not regarded or rewarded as such. This is a critical flaw in the current system that could be the foundation of destructive internal dissonance and the byproducts thereof (Cooper & Weight, 2011; Frey, 1985a; Southall et al., 2008; Weick, 1984).

Opposition to integration. Those opposed to an integrated view of athletics and academics often supported the concept in theory, but not in practice. Many of the concerns were bound to the perceived bureaucracy within the university proper. For example, many respondents believed athletics can fulfill the university's educational mission, but coaches wanted to retain flexibility and to facilitate their unique classroom for life. FBS Assistant Coach 50 summed up this line of thought well by expressing,

I don't really like how the organizational structures in education work—I'm not sure they function well as they are, so I don't like the idea of modeling anything in athletics like what already exists. I do support the idea of viewing athletics as critical to full development as a thinking person.

Coaches valued their educational role, but felt there was "more freedom outside the structure of the university" (FBS Head Coach 53). "Though both educational, athletics and academics must have the freedom to operate independently due to the diversity of learning opportunities and relationship between 'teacher' and 'student'" (FBS Assistant Coach 12). These narratives reflect the literature, which suggests the coach-athlete relationship can be similar to the teacher-student relationship, but learning takes place in a unique laboratory of learning outside the constraints of traditional classroom education (Barton, 2011; Camiré, Trudel, & Forneris, 2012; Danish, 2002; Danish, Petitpas, Hale, 1993).

These findings highlight one of the current gaps in the integrated-view philosophy as an avenue of reform. There are very few concrete steps toward implementation. Coaches in this subcategory of narratives view integration as a step toward additional bureaucracy. In theory, most respondents were strongly in favor of being viewed as educators; in practice, however, respondents did not want to lose their freedom to educate as they currently can—free from the constraints they view within the current academic structure, perceived as classroom and test-centric.

Other coaches opposed an integrated organizational structure because they believed athletics simply has a different focus and operational model. These coaches wanted to be able to focus on their unique athletics charge to train athletes, generate revenue and publicity for the university, and be compensated for their uniquely stressful university roles without added "curriculum-based" responsibility. As expressed by the respondents, "Although the moral

value of education is the emphasis, athletics is a business driven by revenue that is gained through winning. The underlying goal should be enforced by leadership and not by anything else" (FBS Assistant Coach 74). "You can't compare coaching with other academic units . . . there is a higher level of pressure and stress, and we bring much more value to the university" (DI school with no football Assistant Coach 16). "Striving to win is the proper goal of sport" (DI school with no football Head Coach 601). "We are not an academic center. We are in the business of entertainment for others" (FBS Assistant Coach 167). "Faculty have job security which leads to complacency. Coaches must win for job security—this risk comes with the reward of higher pay. How you do it is on your own conscience" (FBS Assistant Coach 37).

In many of the narratives, there appeared to be an underlying current of defensiveness reflecting entitlement for additional compensation because of their charge as facilitators of revenue and notoriety for the university. Given the pressure inherent with these commercially driven metrics most highly valued from the perspective of the coach respondents, educational curricula were associated with an unwanted "additional workload" that might take time and energy away from their primary task of winning.

χ^2 Analysis of independence between major coded categories was conducted and revealed significant differences. DI coaches from institutions not sponsoring football were significantly more likely to favor an athletics structure similar to academics than were coaches from FBS and Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) schools, $\chi^2(5, N = 405) = 16.226, p = .003$. Specifically, 56% ($n = 13$) of DI-No Football sport coaches supported an integrated structure, whereas only 18.2% ($n = 18$) of DI-FCS and 28.6% ($n = 44$) of DI-FBS coaches expressed clear support. There were no significant differences for support of an integrated structure for position (head or assistant coach), gender, or tenure as a collegiate coach. These findings are discussed below.

Uniform Organizational Structures in Athletics and Academics

The second research question posed what organizational components do coaches believe should be uniform within athletic and academic units. Options included (a) compensation, (b) job security, (c) educational curriculum, and (d) faculty title. On a Likert-type scale measuring amount of support (1 = *strongly don't support*, 5 = *strongly support*), response means were 1.45 ($SD = 0.50$) for compensation, 3.37 ($SD = 1.15$) for job security, 3.67 ($SD = 1.13$) for educational curriculum, and 3.41 ($SD = 1.01$) for faculty title. In addition to measuring support for uniformity in these organizational structure categories, coaches were asked whether they would be in favor of adopting a curriculum to guide decision making. Mirroring the qualitative results, this concept of adopting educational goals to help drive coaches toward a role as educators was supported by just over half of the respondents (55%, $n = 290$).

Significant Differences Between Groups Relative to Uniform Organizational Structures

To answer the third research question, we analyzed results to determine significant differences between various respondent subgroups on the organizational components listed above. No statistically significant findings were uncovered for gender or years coaching. Significant differences were found between nonrevenue and revenue coach responses. Compared with revenue-sport coaches, nonrevenue-sport coaches were significantly more supportive of the faculty title (nonrevenue: $M = 3.45$; revenue: $M = 2.89$), $F(1, 650) = 17.177$, $p = .000$, and uniform job security (nonrevenue: $M = 3.42$; revenue: $M = 2.62$), $F(1, 650) = 10.799$, $p = .001$. Additional significant variance existed between head and assistant

coaches regarding the “faculty” title, $F(1, 648) = 4.519$, $p = .046$; head coaches were more supportive of the uniform title than their assistant coach counterparts (see Table 3). Perhaps nonrevenue-sport coaches feel conflicting pressures because they are driven to produce team success but also realize their efforts will not affect department revenues. Thus, these coaches may be more intrigued by the idea of being assessed and evaluated similarly to faculty members who do not rely on student success for justification of promotion.

The final statistical divergence emerged between NCAA DI subclassifications. DI-No Football coaches were significantly more likely to be in favor of using educational goals to drive their role as educator than FBS and FCS coaches $\chi^2(2, N = 534) = 0.89$, $p = .018$ (see Table 4). Perhaps equally interesting is the lack of statistical differences between FBS and FCS coaches,

Table 3 Degree of Support for Criteria Being Used Uniformly Between Athletic and Academic Units

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	p
Compensation	1.45	0.498			
Job security	3.37	1.153			
Nonrevenue sport vs. revenue sport			0.803	$F(1, 650) = 17.177$	.000
Educational curriculum	3.67	1.127			
Faculty title	3.41	1.009			
Head vs assistant coach			0.211	$F(1, 648) = 4.519$	.046
Nonrevenue sport vs. revenue sport			0.560	$F(1, 650) = 10.799$	.001

Note: Tested for significant differences on the basis of independent variables of Division I subclassification, position, gender, and years coaching. Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory. Revenue sports include men’s basketball and football. Nonrevenue sports include all other sports.

Table 4 Data Regarding Question “If Given a Curriculum, Would You Be in Favor of Having Specific Educational Goals to Help Drive Your Role As an Educator?”

Answer	Overall	NCAA Division I classification			χ^2	p
		FBS	FCS	No football		
Yes	54.5%	156 (-1.2)	93 (-0.6)	41 (-2.8)	7.999*	.018
No	45.50%	144 (-1.2)	84 (-0.6)	16 (-2.8)		

Note: Position, years coaching, revenue sport, and gender were also tested for significance—no significant differences were found. Adjusted standardized residuals appear in parentheses below group frequencies. NCAA = National Collegiate Athletics Association; FBS = Football Bowl Subdivision; FCS = Football Championship Series.

* $p < .05$.

revenue-sport and nonrevenue-sport coaches, male and female coaches, or novice and experienced coaches.

The qualitative results of this study suggest that coaches are planted in two camps of relatively equal size regarding implementation of an integrated approach to athletics. Further dissection of the quantitative data revealed only one subgroup distinction. Coaches working at NCAA DI schools without a football program were far more supportive of adopting an integrated approach than those working within the FBS or FCS NCAA subdivisions. The simple presence of football on a campus, despite its size or media presence (FCS vs. FBS), is a significant factor in the overall perception that integration is possible or desired. Because football is often the most visible sport on campus, perhaps departments without football can develop an organizational culture less focused on generating income and more on student-athlete development. If this were the entire justification for this difference, however, we might see distinct variability between FBS institutions (more commercialized) and FCS institutions (less commercialized), and revenue-sport and nonrevenue-sport coaches. The lack of distinction between FBS institutions and revenue-sport coaches in overall support of an integrated structure discredits the hypothesis that Pandora's Box has been opened at the "big-time" college sport level and that commercialization has impeded the possibility of fully integrating education within athletics.

Conclusions

A narrative response from FBS revenue-sport Head Coach 88 provides an illuminating view:

We are held up to public scrutiny on a regular basis, we are judged on our wins and losses whether that be right or wrong, and we have no job security. We are teaching life lessons that are not taught in the classroom. We complement the academic education process, but we are not valued as faculty . . .

This coach probably does many interviews with the national press on an annual basis, and for the majority of Americans, this coach might be the only educator they know from a given college campus. Yet this coach appears to feel undervalued. This articulates a consequence of the "standard view" toward intercollegiate athletics in which academicians hold "prejudice against the body, and with it professional studies that emphasize physical skill" (Brand, 2006a, p.14).

The purpose of this study was to contribute perspective to Brand's (2006a) proposed reform model calling for an integration of intercollegiate athletics into the organizational structure of the university. Quantitatively, coach stakeholders were divided in support of an integrated organizational structure, and nonrevenue-sport assistant coaches from DI-No Football schools were more likely to support an integrated structure. However,

an undercurrent of qualitative narratives pointed toward a conclusion that many of the concerns with integration seem to be rooted in negative perceptions about the current organizational structure within the academy and the associated constriction and bureaucracy that might arise if athletics and academics were more formally aligned. This highlights an area of need within the literature to more concretely define what an integrated structure might logistically entail—What reward and reporting structures would exist? How might the coach-faculty role differ from current coach or faculty positions?

These findings also demonstrated the clear current divide between athletics and academics. An "us versus them" mentality and vocabulary was present in virtually all narrative responses. This was evidenced by the coaches who expressed a desire for an integrated structure primarily to gain the benefits of job security, compensation, and work-family balance perceived to exist on the other side of campus. These results emphasize the need for additional exploration into the application of an integrated philosophy and structure within the academy to bridge this tremendous gap.

Coaches view themselves as educators, expressed a desire to be viewed as educators and to be appreciated for the tremendous role they play in shaping the educational experience of their athletes, yet most coaches do not feel supported in this role by the public or even by their direct administrators. This is clear evidence of conflicting institutional logic (Southall et al., 2008) and administrators who embrace a hypocritical-value approach (Weight & Cooper, 2012), professing the importance of educational values yet defying or passively supporting the values they proclaim. Perhaps if the academy embraced athletics as an important educational unit, recognized coaches for their role as educators, and provided validation and compensation for educational pursuits beyond those evidenced by their win-loss record, many of the competitive pressures currently ailing the profession could diminish—particularly for the nonrevenue sports.

For the potential educational benefits that can come from intercollegiate athletics to be realized, it is important for coaches to feel secure in their positions as the leaders of their programs (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003). Hope and enthusiasm were expressed by a subset of coaches within this sample who recognized the potential benefits of an integrated organizational philosophy and structure of athletics within the academy. Within this subset of narratives were coaches who appeared to be unfettered from bias or skepticism about what the current structure might do to hinder their current level of coaching freedom. These narratives reflected optimism in this pathway toward a reconciliation of the dissonance that has existed and troubled the industry since its inception. This study provides additional perspective and support for the legitimacy of the Brand's reform philosophy and provides a launching point for additional research to be conducted examining its feasibility.

Limitations & Future Research

The current research focused on the perceptions of potential integration into the university organizational structure by surveying DI coaches. Moving forward, research could improve the depth of this topic area by conducting focus groups to further examine the opinions of coaches and administrators about the feasibility of making structural and philosophical strides toward integration of athletics within the academy. In addition, although this sample is an extremely useful starting point, it represents one viewpoint. Further validation of this data could be conducted to test for nonresponse bias, and additional viewpoints should be collected. For effective change to occur, several other stakeholders would need to support the adjustment. For example, athletic administrators are one key group that needs to buy in to the integration for it to be effective within the coinciding departments. Further research could examine this stakeholder group's perceptions to determine whether their opinions are in alignment with the coaches in this study. Further, it would be interesting to determine faculty, student-athlete, and general administrators' opinions. If an integrated approach were pursued, the potential for academic credit for athletics participation beyond what some institutions offer could be a consideration. Perspectives on this opportunity and the resulting implications for all stakeholders would be a critical perspective to gain. With additional data, researchers could determine the legitimacy of the integration of athletics into the organizational structure of the university in the future.

References

- Adler, P., & Adler, P. (1990). *Backboards & blackboards: College athletes and role engulfment*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Anthes, R. (2010, March 7). Rutgers 1000 fights big spending as focus drifts from academics. *The Daily Orange*. Retrieved from <http://dailyorange.com/2005/10/rutgers-1000-fights-big-spending-as-focus-drifts-from-academics/>
- Barling, J., & Kelloway, E.K. (1996). Job insecurity and health: The moderating role of workplace control. *Stress Medicine*, 12, 253–259. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1700(199610)12:4<253::AID-SMI710>3.0.CO;2-2
- Barton, G.B. (2011). *Career success and life skill development through sports* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 80398589)
- Becker, A.J. (2009). It's not what they do, it's how they do it: Athlete experiences of great coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4, 93–119. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.4.1.93
- Benford, R. (2007). The college sports reform movement: Reframing the "edutainment" industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48(1), 1–28. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2007.00068.x
- Berkowitz, S., Upton, J., Schnaars, C., & Dougherty, S. (2015). NCAA salaries. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/salaries>
- Bowen, W.G., & Levin, S.A. (2003). *Reclaiming the game: College sports educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, E., Upton, J., & Berkowitz, S. (2012, March 29). Even small schools pay for hot NCAA coaches. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday.30.usatoday.com/sports/college/mensbasketball/story/2012-03-29/salaries-continue-rise-shaka-smart-vcu/53828414/1>
- Brand, M. (2006a). The role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33, 9–20. doi:10.1080/00948705.2006.9714687
- Brand, M. (2006b, January 7). *The principles of intercollegiate athletics: 2006 NCAA State of the Association Address*. Retrieved from http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/NCAANewsArchive/2006/Association-wide/brand+charts+course+for+collegiate+model_s+next+century++1-16-06+ncaa+news.html
- Brand, M. (2006c, April 24). Commercialism controlled when activity aligns with mission. *NCAA News*, 3. Retrieved from <http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/NCAANewsArchive/2006/Editorial/commercialism+controlled+when+activity+aligns+with+mission+-+4-24-06+ncaa+news.html>
- Brewer, R., McEvoy, C.D., & Popp, N. (2013). *Comparing the intrinsic values of NCAA Division I men's basketball coaches to their nominal compensation*. Study presented at the North American Society for Sport Management Annual Conference, Austin, Texas.
- Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research*, 6, 97–113. doi:10.1177/1468794106058877
- Byers, W., & Hammer, C. (1997). *Unsportsmanlike conduct: Exploiting college athletes*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Call, J. (2000, June 23). BYU will miss Ricks recruiting pipeline. *Deseret News*. Retrieved from <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/767565/BYU-will-miss-Ricks-recruiting-pipeline.html?pg=all>
- Camiré, M., Trudel, P., & Forneris, T. (2012). Coaching and transferring life skills: Philosophies and strategies used by model high school coaches. *The Sport Psychologist*, 26, 243–260.
- Campbell, R., & Strong, P. (2012, December 5). Agent says 'double standard' puts college coaches in a no-win situation. *CBSSports.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbssports.com/collegefootball/story/21277519>
- Castle, D.S. (2005). Estimating seniority effects in faculty salary studies: Measurement and model specification. *Public Personnel Management*, 34, 377–384. doi:10.1177/009102600503400408
- Chelladurai, P., & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and commitment of American and Japanese collegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management*, 17, 62–73.
- Cohen, M.D., & March, J.G. (1974). *Leadership and ambiguity: The American college president*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cooper, C.G., & Weight, E.A. (2011). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 74–89.
- Cooper, C.G., & Weight, E.A. (2012). Examining administrator and coach perceptions of value systems in NCAA

- division I athletic departments. Report submitted to the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. Retrieved from http://www.knightcommission.org/images/pdfs/2012research/2012_kciareports_cooper_weight.pdf
- Cooper, C.G., Weight, E.A., & Pierce, D. (2014). The leader-value continuum: NCAA Division I core values and transformational leadership. *The International Journal of Sport Management*, 15, 1–21.
- Corrigan, T.F., Hardin, M., & Nichols, J.S. (2011). Case studies in athletic-academic integration: A closer look at schools that implement COIA's best practices. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 4, 121–146.
- Creswell, J.W., & Plano Clark, V.L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cunningham, G.B., & Rivera, C.A. (2001). Structural designs within American intercollegiate athletic departments. *The International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 9, 369–390. doi:10.1108/eb028941
- Danish, S.J., Petitpas, A.J., & Hale, B.D. (1993). Life development intervention for athletes: Life skills through sports. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 21, 352–385. doi:10.1177/0011000093213002
- Danish, S.J. (2002). Teaching life skills through sport. In M. Gatz, M.A. Messner, & S.J. Ball-Rokeach (Eds.), *Paradoxes of youth and sport* (pp. 49–60). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Desrochers, D. (2013). *Academic spending versus athletic spending: Who wins?* Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research.
- Duderstadt, J.J. (2003). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Duderstadt, J.J. (2012). Institutional control. In J.W. Swatterfield, R.L. Hughes, & K. Kearney (Eds.), *Sports and athletics in higher education* (pp. 155–168). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Frey, J.H. (1985a). Boosterism, scarce resources, and institutional control: The future of American Intercollegiate athletics. In D. Chu, J.D. Segrave, & B.J. Becker (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 115–129). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Frey, J.H. (1985b). College athletics: Problems of institutional control. In D. Chu, J.D. Segrave, & B.J. Becker (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 179–189). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Frey, J.H. (2012). Institutional control of athletics: An analysis of the role played by presidents, faculty, trustees, alumni, and the NCAA. In J.W. Swatterfield, R.L. Hughes, & K. Kearney (Eds.), *Sports and athletics in higher education* (pp. 169–178). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Gerdy, J.R. (2006, May 12). For true reform, athletic scholarships must go. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 52(36), B6–B8.
- Hearn, J.C. (1999). Pay and performance in the university: An examination of faculty salaries. *The Review of Higher Education*, 22, 391–410. doi:10.1353/rhe.1999.0016
- Hellgren, J., Sverke, M., & Isaksson, K. (1999). A two dimensional approach to job insecurity: Consequences for employee attitudes and well-being. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 179–195. doi:10.1080/135943299398311
- Hill, J. (2012, November 27). Big paychecks, big expectations: Has there ever been less patience, job security for college football coaches. *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-football/story/_/id/8683273/has-there-worse-time-college-football-coach
- Horn, T. (2002). *Advances in sport psychology* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publications.
- Huber, G.P., & Glick, W.H. (1993). Sources and forms of organizational change. In G.P. Huber & W.H. Glick (Eds.), *Organizational change and redesign: Ideas and insights for improving performance* (pp. 3–18). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Inoue, Y., Plehn-Dujowich, J.M., Kent, A., & Swanson, S. (2012). Roles of performance and human capital in college football coaches' compensation. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27, 73–83.
- Jenkins, S. (2011, October 13). The best NCAA coaches are teachers so why shouldn't they all have to try? *Washington Post*, Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/colleges/the-best-coaches-are-teachers-so-why-shouldnt-they-all-have-to-try/2011/10/13/gIQA-LJeUiL_story.html
- Jex, S.M., & Beehr, T.A. (1991). Emerging theoretical and methodological issues in the study of work-related stress. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 9, 311–365.
- Kane, M.J., Leo, P., & Holleran, L.K. (2008). Issues related to academic support and performance of Division I student-athletes: A case study at the University of Minnesota. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 1, 98–129.
- Kensler, T. (2010, October 30). CU's coaches carry on despite storm clouds of job insecurity. *The Denver Post*. Retrieved from http://www.denverpost.com/cu/ci_16473587
- Kimberly, J.R., & Rottman, D.B. (1987). Environment, organization and effectiveness: A biographical approach. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 595–622. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6486.1987.tb00465.x
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2010). *Restoring the balance: Dollars, values, and the future of college sports*. Retrieved from <http://www.knightcommission.org/restoringthebalance>
- Lapchick, R.E. (1987). The high school athlete as the future college student-athlete. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 11(1-2), 104–124.
- Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress appraisal and coping*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Massey, I. (2011). A college coach deserves four year of job security. *New University (University of California, Irvine)*. Retrieved from <http://www.newuniversity.org/2011/01/sports/a-college-coach-deserves-four-years-of-job-security/>
- McCormick, R.A., & McCormick, A.C. (2006). The myth of the student-athlete: The college athlete as employee. *Washington Law Review (Seattle, Wash.)*, 81, 71–157.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Oriard, M. (2001). *King football: Sport & spectacle in the golden age of radio & newsreels, movies & magazines, the weekly & daily presses*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Plano Clark, V.L. (2010). The adoption and practice of mixed methods: U.S. trends in federally funded health-related research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 428–440. doi:10.1177/1077800410364609
- Pope, J. (2008, September 8). No athletic department, but much success at Vanderbilt. *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/education/2008-09-08-vanderbilt-athletics_N.htm
- Sack, A.L., & Staurowsky, E.J. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sack, A.L. (2009). Clashing models of commercial sport in higher education: Implications for reform and scholarly research. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 76–92.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smart, D.L., & Wolfe, R.A. (2000). Examining sustainable competitive advantage in intercollegiate athletics: A resource-based view. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 133–153.
- Smith, J.M., & Willingham, M. (2015). *Cheated: The UNC scandal, the education of athletes, and the future of big-time college sports*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Smith, R. (1988). *Sports and freedom: The rise of big-time college athletics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. (2001). *Play-by-play: Radio, television, and big-time college sport*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, R. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform* (pp. 187–197). Champaign: University of Illinois Press.
- Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (1989). Leader behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 19, 1522–1551. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01462.x
- Southall, R.M., & Nagel, M.S. (2009). Big-time college sport's contested terrain: Jock capitalism, educational values, and social good. *Human Kinetics Sport Management News*. Retrieved from <http://www.humankinetics.com/news-and-excerpts/news-and-excerpts/big-time-college-sports-contested-terrain-jock-capitalism-educational-values-and-social-good>
- Southall, R.M., Nagel, M.S., Amis, J.M., & Southall, C. (2008). A method to March Madness? Institutional logics and the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association division I men's basketball tournament. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 677–700.
- Sperber, M.A. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Co.
- Splitt, F.G. (2007). The U.S. Congress: New hope for constructive engagement with the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics. *The Montana Professor*, 17, 18–25.
- Staurowsky, E.J. (2011, December 1). Urban and me: We're almost twins – except for that six year \$26.6 million contract. *College Sport Business News*. Retrieved from <http://collegesportsbusinessnews.com/issue/march-2013/article/urban-and-me>
- Stevens, M. (2007). *Creating a class: College admissions and the education of elites*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Thelin, J. (1996). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, M. (2013, April 13). At a college, dropping sports in favor of fitness. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/14/sports/at-selman-dropping-sports-in-favor-of-fitness.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0
- Toma, D. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 199(105), 81–90. doi:10.1002/he.10507
- Van Dalen, H.P., & Henkens, K. (2012). Intended and unintended consequences of a publish-or-perish culture: A worldwide survey (CentER Discussion Paper No. 2012-003). Tilburg, The Netherlands: Tilburg University.
- Weight, E.A., Navarro, K., Huffman, L., & Smith-Ryan, A. (2014). Quantifying the psychological benefits of intercollegiate athletics participation: Implications for higher education policy and practice. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 7, 390–409.
- Weight, E., Weight, M., & Schneider, R. (2013). Confronting the arms race: Conference commissioner perspectives on spending within intercollegiate athletics. *The International Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 1–21.
- Wilson, B. (2013, September 18). Ivy League's distaste for football scholarships may sunder scheduling ties with Patriot League. *Express Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.lehighvalleylive.com>
- Wilson, M.J., & Burke, K.L. (2013). NCAA Division I men's basketball coaching contracts: A comparative analysis of incentives for athletic and academic team performance between 2009 and 2012. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 6, 81–95.
- Wilson, M.J., Schrager, M., Burke, K.L., Hawkins, B.J., & Gauntt, L. (2011). NCAA division I men's basketball coaching contracts: A comparative analysis of incentives for athletic and academic team performance. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 396–410.
- Webster, A.L. (1995). Demographic factors affecting faculty salary. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 728–735. doi:10.1177/0013164495055005003
- Weick, K.E. (1984). Contradiction in a community of scholars: The cohesion-accuracy trade-off. In J.L. Bess (Ed.), *College and university organization: Insights from the behavioral sciences* (pp. 211–247). New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Weight, E.A., & Cooper, C.G. (2012). The leader-value continuum: NCAA Division I Organizational Values and Transformational Leadership. Presentation for the NCAA Scholarly Colloquium, Indianapolis, IN.
- Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Copyright of Journal of Sport Management is the property of Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.