

AN ENTREPRENEURIAL BEGINNING: RECOGNIZING THE VALUE OF NONREVENUE¹, OLYMPIC PROGRAMS THROUGH NCAA ADMINISTRATORS' AND COACHES' PERCEPTIONS

Coyte G. Cooper

Erianne Weight

Conference realignments, multi-billion dollar television deals, and superstar amateur athletes dominate the headlines as the “arms race” continues to exist in intercollegiate athletics in the United States (Knight Commission, 2004, 2010; Sack, 2009). While data supports the notion that only a handful of athletic programs operate outside the red (National Collegiate, 2009), escalating commercialism stands as the most visible product of the administrative reward system that exists in this institutional sphere. This model of excessive deficit spending has come with a cost as many nonrevenue, Olympic sport programs¹ have been eliminated—particularly Division I men’s programs (National Collegiate, 2010; Ridpath, Yiamouyiannis, Lawrence, and Galles, 2008). To complicate this already difficult trend, the recession, rising tui-

tion costs and subsequent university fiscal crises have led to a new wave of sport cuts and a climate that encourages financial justification, leaving many Olympic sport stakeholders searching for proactive methods to fortify their programs (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Steinbach, 2007).

Scholars have researched these issues from multiple angles including strategy (Smart & Wolf, 2000); entrepreneurship (Cooper & Weight, 2009; Weight, 2009); and sport discontinuation justification (Carroll & Humphreys, 2000; Gray and Pelzer, 1995; Leland & Peters, 2003). To date, however, there has not been a scholarly investigation of Olympic sport value. An understanding of this value is fundamental to the progression of scholarly inquiry related to preservation and sustainability of these at-risk programs. This study will address the cur-

¹ In intercollegiate athletic environments, the term “*nonrevenue*,” Olympic refers to the sport programs in NCAA athletic departments that are not seen as capable of generating a profit. In general, this means all sport programs outside of men’s basketball and men’s football because there are programs within these sports that operate at a profit.

rent void in the literature through framework of entrepreneurial theory and integrated academic capitalism.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Myles Brand, National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) president in the United States from 2002–2009, was a vocal advocate for the educational value of sport and an integrated view of intercollegiate athletics within a university. In an article released in the *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, Brand (2006) argued the importance of intercollegiate athletics and condemned the academy for its bias against bodily skills, non-art, and its view on athletics as an auxiliary to the university unworthy of subsidy. This “standard view,” which has been characterized by the Division I philosophy stating that institutions should strive to be self sustaining (National Collegiate, 2010), is at the root of many conceptual problems which have led to the “arms race” of intercollegiate athletic expenditures. As explained by Brand, if athletics were treated as an academic unit similar to the performing arts (e.g., music, dance, or theatre), the intense competitive pressure related to winning and driving revenue could be substantially decreased, and as a result the educational foundation of intercollegiate athletics could resurface as the fundamental purpose of athletics within higher education.

This view in application 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 (Gerdy, 2006; Sack, 2009; Sperber, 2000). Academic capitalism has roots in resource dependency theory and was outlined by Slaughter and Leslie (1997) in their book *Academic Capitalism*, which discusses the “encroachment of the profit motive into the academy” (p. 210) that often characterizes big-time intercollegiate athletic departments. This concept is defined as “the pursuit of market and marketlike activities [in higher education] to generate external revenues” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 11). Slaughter and Rhoades evolve academic capitalism into a theory documenting the blurring lines and boundaries of the academy as networks now bind all players to internal and external markets that are mutually beneficial in the new information-based economy (2004).

Since the inception of college sport in the United States, there has been “encroachment of the profit motive into the academy” (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 201), and “blurring of the boundaries” (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004, p. 11) between financial incentives and amateur ideals. The chronicles of reform initiatives have been well documented by scholars (Benford, 2007; Craighron, 2001; Gerdy, 2006), and at the center of each reform initiative is the strong presence of commercialism and its corrupting influence. Sack (2009) eloquently organizes current reform movements and their divergent philosophies into three conceptual models—intellectual elitist, academic capitalist, and athletes’

rights. This model organization facilitates scholarly inquiry into commercial sport in higher education through the lenses proposed.

Sack outlines the academic capitalist view as “an approach to university governance that emphasizes the importance of ‘the bottom line’” (2009, p. 78). If commercialism is embraced and accepted within an academic capitalism framework, it is viewed as a healthy by-product of a top-notch educational experience (Brand, 2006). Just as a music department might host a nationally-televised concert which 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, 2006; Sack, 2009).

While the other two reform outlined by Sack (2009) seek an end to most forms of intercollegiate athletic commercialism, their adaptation would rely on significant policy change that is often difficult to accomplish within institutions of higher education (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996; Tierney, 1999). This research attempts to address the value of nonrevenue, Olympic sports *within the current NCAA organizational structure and ideological framework*. With an emphasis on entrepreneurship, defined as the recognition and exploitation of value creating opportunities (Covin & Slevin, 2002), the pursuit of this inquiry is to identify the value in nonrevenue sport so that sustainability initiatives can be enhanced at the intercollegiate level. As

demonstrated in previous research, coaches play an integral role in the identification and recognition of the program areas that create value within athletic programs (Weight, 2009). However, there has been no previous research that has explored the inherent value of nonrevenue sport as defined by administrators and coaches. Thus, the purpose of the study was to explore nonrevenue, Olympic program elements (administrators’ assessment and coaches’ perceptions of administrators’ assessment) to identify potential strategies to avoid future program eliminations.

In an entrepreneurial framework, the integrated view (and its interpretation as academic capitalism) of intercollegiate athletics provides a fitting backdrop for an exploration of the nonrevenue sport value within intercollegiate athletics because within the current structure, entrepreneurial activity is necessary to fortify at-risk programs and populations—nonrevenue, Olympic sports. The value of these programs needs to be recognized and built upon in order for their position in the educational marketplace to be secured. The capitalistic potential of these programs, however, is unclear based on how athletics fits within the university’s institutional sphere. If viewed as an auxiliary with limited educational value to offer the university community (the standard view), financial values would likely be paramount to administrators, and perhaps vicariously through coaches. If, however, the educational value is of utmost importance and athletics is

viewed as a significant part of a holistic educational offering within the university structure (the integrated view), educational value should be at the forefront of all-administrative and coach actions. The method of entrepreneurial action, therefore, is inherently dependent on the university structure and its relevant value system.

As the value of these sports are explored through the eyes of NCAA athletic administrators and coaches, this conceptual model of academic capitalism paired with entrepreneurial theory provides a very fitting theoretical foundation. Previous research highlights an evident dualism in value systems within intercollegiate athletics (Bowen & Leven, 2003; Cooper & Weight, 2011; Duderstadt, 2003; Toma & Cross, 1998). On one side resides the stated purpose of college sport to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount (NCAA, 2010). An often-opposing value system, however, is frequently present with the "arms race" of expenditures toward the never-ending battle for supremacy, national exposure, and financial rewards (Bowen & Leven, 2003; Byers, 1995, Knight Commission, 2010, Sack & Staurowsky, 1998), which may be the result of treating athletics as a separate entity of secondary educational importance.

In this current model of practice in intercollegiate athletics, it is often difficult to ascertain where nonrevenue sports fit (Cooper & Weight, 2011). If the university and departmental pendulum

swings heavily on the side of commercialism and the battle to remain viable as a department, there is a chance that nonrevenue sports will be discontinued as money is directed towards the sports that have the potential to maximize departmental revenues (Ridpath et al., 2008; Weight, 2009). If, however, the value of education is emphasized and financial concerns are not of paramount importance in day-to-day sustainability of the department as a whole, the educational worth of the intercollegiate athletic experience should provide significance enough to sustain university support.

One potential issue with the current intercollegiate model is that many athletic administrators and coaches have been trained, educated, and advanced through this same system with these often conflicting value systems. (Chelladurai, 2005; Cooper & Weight, 2011). Entrepreneurial theory would support finding the true source of nonrevenue sport value and building upon that foundation toward a fortification of the sports. *Integrated academic capitalism* would suggest addressing business concerns within the athletic department through an emphasis on the educational value of the experience—demonstrating the importance of holistic instruction through intercollegiate athletics. Without a solid understanding of administrator and coach views about the inherent significance of these programs, it is difficult to determine how Olympic sports are valued, and how stakeholders can seek to maximize this value and therefore strive to fortify the program

through entrepreneurial value-creating endeavors. Prior to discussing this research initiative, the literature focusing on program elimination in college athletics will be examined to guide the study.

SPORT DISCONTINUATION LITERATURE

In today's intercollegiate athletic environment, administrators have the unique challenge of balancing university values while attempting to maximize the revenues realized by their department. When discussing program eliminations, several Division I head athletic directors have stated that eliminating nonrevenue programs is the only way to remain financially viable (Arizona State, 2008; Steinbach, 2007). However, scholars have argued that tight budgets are not the cause for these program eliminations, and instead they are due to profit-driven athletic programs (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). To support this statement, Ridpath et al. (2008) explained that the loss of these Olympic sport programs can "arguably can be found in out-of-control and unfair economics in big-time college athletic programs" and the "reallocation of money from some men's sports (such as wrestling) to other men's sports (such as football, basketball, and even baseball)" (p. 278). With the economic environment surrounding college athletics (e.g., rising costs in men's basketball and men's football [Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003], state budget deficits and higher education cut-backs [Brady, 2009]), it is likely that nonrevenue sport

teams will face diminishing financial support in future years.

In response to these program eliminations, several researchers have focused the identification of athletic director's criteria for elimination to enhance sustainability efforts (Carroll & Humphreys, 2000; Leland & Peters, 2003). For example, Gray and Pelzer (1995) surveyed athletic directors and confirmed that lack of spectators/student interest again had a significant influence on athletic director's decisions to eliminate nonrevenue programs. In addition the authors claimed that the following four criteria were influential criteria: (1) conference alignment, (2) shifting resources, (3) inconvenient travel, and (4) cost.

In response to escalating program eliminations, scholars have recently focused on the identification of strategies to improve sustainability efforts within specific sports (Weight, 2009). While focusing on Division I wrestling programs, Weight (2009) interviewed athletic directors and determined that coaches can enhance their program's chance of vitality through complementary entrepreneurship promotion. In essence, this meant that programs can be strengthened when a coach develops CEO type skills in the following areas: relationship cultivation (with administrators, alumni, and other key figures), fundraising development, and marketing growth.

While the previous research has provided a sound foundation for understanding program eliminations, there is one primary limitation in the literature that needs to be addressed. The emphasis

on the reasons why programs were eliminated in the past is a retroactive approach to sustainability. Thus, to improve chances of nonrevenue sport program sustainability, there must be a focus on the nonrevenue program values that are most important to administrators in today's intercollegiate athletic environment. With this understanding, coaches have the opportunity to act as the CEO of their programs as they highlight program areas that are valued in their respective athletic departments. Based on this assessment, the following research questions were created to guide the study:

- [RQ 1] What are the nonrevenue, Olympic program values that are most important to NCAA [1A, 1B, 1C] administrators and coaches within their coinciding athletic departments?
 - [1A] Division I
 - [1B] Division II
 - [1C] Division III
- [RQ 2] Are there variations in the nonrevenue, Olympic program values that are most important to NCAA administrators and coaches when focusing on the divisional affiliation (Division I, Division II, Division III) of the athletic department being examined?
- [RQ 3] Do nonrevenue, Olympic program coaches allocate their time based on program elements that are most highly valued by coaches or administrators?

METHOD

The current research utilized a survey methodology to examine the variations in NCAA administrator and coaches' perceptions of nonrevenue, Olympic sport program values. Specifically, the study initially examined NCAA Division I administrator's responses to these Olympic program values to establish a baseline for statistical comparisons. In addition, the study also obtained coaches' perceptions to the Olympic program values that they felt were most important to administrators within their athletic department. Further, the data was also used to compare the program value responses provided by administrators and coaches. The survey instrument, data collection, and analyses will be discussed in the following sections to guide the research.

Survey Instrument

To examine the administrator and coaches' viewpoints, a review of inquires measuring organizational value systems (Amos & Weathington, 2008; De Clercq, Fontaine, & Anseel, 2008) was performed to aide in the development of the 17-item survey instrument that was used to examine the nonrevenue, Olympic sport program values within athletic departments. In addition to an agreement on the inclusion of three background questions (NCAA affiliation, conference affiliation, and current position), the panel agreed on the inclusion of 11 specific program values to assess the most important nonrevenue, Olympic sport elements within

Table 1
Cumulative NCAA Administrator and Coach Perceptions of “Nonrevenue” Program Values

Olympic Program Values	Administrators		Coaches		Time Allocation (Weekly)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Conduct (Competition) <i>Proper behavior exhibited by coaches/student – athletes during competition.</i>	5.77	.614	5.59	.754	6.2%
Conduct (Social) <i>Proper behavior exhibited by coaches/student-athletes outside competition.</i>	5.69	.664	5.49	.769	5.5%
Academic Achievement <i>High levels of individual and team success in the classroom.</i>	5.68	.672	5.44	.781	10.9%
Personal Relationships <i>Strong relationships between administrators and coaching staff.</i>	5.21*	.960	4.39	1.316	6.0%
Community Involvement <i>Strong team presence in local community service initiatives.</i>	5.08*	.955	4.75	1.055	4.0%
Athletic Success <i>High levels of individual/team success in sport competition.</i>	5.04*	.977	4.71	1.223	36.2%
Fundraising <i>Development of external funds to supplement team’s operating budget.</i>	4.39	1.279	4.30	1.491	6.4%
Enrollment <i>Increase in university enrollment from student-athlete participation on team.</i>	4.37	1.491	4.01	1.616	9.9%
Fan Support <i>Strong team support by fans in surrounding geographical region.</i>	3.98*	1.182	3.64	1.365	3.9%
Program Cost <i>Low cost to fund the annual operating budget of sport team.</i>	3.90	1.276	4.35*	1.338	8.3%
Revenue Production <i>Development of positive revenue streams at team athletic competitions.</i>	3.03	1.566	2.99	1.541	2.7%

Note. The scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6). The “Time Allocation” category refers to the number of hours coaches dedicate to this program area.
* $p < .001$

NCAA Division I athletic departments (see Table 1). For the questions dealing with these specific program values, the decision was made to include a 6-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree; 6=strongly agree) to examine the administrators' and coaches' perceptions to these program elements. Further, there were also three open-ended questions that were included to allow the two groups to expand on their responses of these nonrevenue, Olympic program values.

However, considering the fact that the area of NCAA athletic institutions had not been previously examined, there was a need to address the construct validity within the instrument. In response to this issue, the research implemented a panel of experts (four senior-level intercollegiate athletic administrators, two professors, and an expert in research and survey design) to ensure that the instrument's content was sound based on the purpose of the research. The evaluation process included an initial assessment of the survey instrument. Based on the comments and suggestions provided by the panel (e.g., clarification on value definitions, improved formatting, grammatical considerations), the survey was adjusted and distributed to the panel for one more round of revisions. After these adjustments were made, the final revisions were made to the instrument.

Following two rounds of revisions, the survey content was unanimously supported by the panel.

Data Collection

The online survey instrument was distributed via email administrators and coaches at the NCAA Division I, II, and III levels. The staff directories on the related websites were utilized to identify the head athletic directors at each of the Division I, II, and III institutions featured within the NCAA. However, while head athletic directors were established as the preferred primary contact, the two highest-ranking senior administrators were also copied on the invitation to maximize the return rate of the survey. As a precaution to avoid redundancy in athletic department responses, the head athletic director was asked to respond or to have one senior-level administrator (with most appropriate credentials) respond to the survey. In addition, a consolidated coaches' database (with nearly 7,000 contacts) was used to target nonrevenue coaches at the Division I, II, and III levels. Each of the groups received two invitations to participate in the research during a two-month time frame.

Overall, the administrators ($N = 413$) were broken down fairly evenly between the three different divisions: Division I ($n = 140$ [40.9% of institutions]), Division II ($n = 124$ [43.9% of institutions]), and Division III ($n = 149$ [33.2% of institutions]). Similarly, using the database of 7,000 nonrevenue coaches, the responses from the coaches ($N = 685$) was fairly balanced between the three divisions: Division I ($n = 417$ [10.4% of institutions]), Division II ($n = 181$ [11.7%]), and Division III ($n = 187$

[9.4%]). Thus, based on these balanced responses between the different divisions, the sample was representative of the populations being examined.

Data Analysis

Prior to the actual statistical analyses, an analysis was first run to assess the reliability within the scale that was included in the instrument. The reliability coefficient (.721) obtained by using the formula for Cronbach's Alpha (α) provided evidence of reliability within the survey (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Descriptive statistics were generated using SPSS 18.0 for each of the overall and divisional scale items that were included in the research (see Table 1). In addition to this foundational data, independent sample t-tests were conducted to identify the variations in responses to nonrevenue, Olympic program values between administrators and coaches. Further, the time allocations were included to identify the investments that coaches make in each area on a weekly basis. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variance was used when comparing the sample means within the related statistical procedures. An alternative "equal variances not assumed" format was used when necessary to account for heterogeneous variances.

RESULTS

Cumulative NCAA Program Values

Descriptive statistics confirmed that cumulative (Division I, II, and III) administrator's responses and coach's per-

ceptions of their responses were in agreement when emphasizing the importance of the following three program values: conduct (competition), conduct (social), and academic achievement (see Table 1). However, when focusing on the remaining data, the results illustrated that administrators rated personal relationships [$F(1, 1094) = 120.31, p < .01$], community involvement [$F(1, 1098) = 27.47, p < .01$], athletic success [$F(1, 1098) = 20.69, p < .01$], and fan support [$F(1, 1099) = 16.83, p < .01$] statistically higher than coaches. In contrast, the data also demonstrated that coaches rated the program cost [$F(1, 1087) = 28.47, p < .01$] element significantly higher than administrators. The means and standard deviation for these individual scale items are provided in Table 1.

Program Value Time Commitment. In addition to the variations in program value responses, the analyses also revealed the amount of time that coaches spend each week in the different areas examined in the research. As illustrated in Table 1, coaches spent the largest portion of their time (36.2%) in the development of athletic success within their program. Interestingly, the five program values (conduct [competition], conduct [social], academic achievement, personal relationships, and community involvement) rated higher than athletic success by administrators received a combined time allocation of 32.6% from coaches on a weekly basis. Further, the results illustrated that enrollment (9.9%) and program cost (8.3%) issues received the third and fourth highest time commitments from coaches.

NCAA Division I Program Values

Similar to the cumulative results, the examination of Division I nonrevenue, Olympic program values revealed that administrators and coaches both rated conduct (competition), conduct (social), and academic achievement as the most important program elements. In addition, the data also showed that administrators rated personal relationships [$t(555) = 7.486, p < .001$], athletic success [$t(555) = 3.883, p < .001$], community involvement [$t(554) = 3.044, p < .001$], and fan support [$t(556) = 4.621, p < .001$] statistically higher than coaches at the Division I level (see Table 2). In contrast, coaches rated the program cost [$t(552) = 3.216, p < .001$] element significantly higher than administrators.

Program Value Time Commitment. The examination of individual program area time allocations revealed that the pursuit for athletic success received the largest portion (37.6%) of Division I coaches' time. In addition, similar to the cumulative allocations, the data illustrated that the four program areas (conduct [competition], conduct [social], academic achievement, and personal relationships) rated higher than athletic success by administrators received a combined 28.5% of these coaches' time commitment. Academic achievement (10.8%) and program cost (8.9%) received the next highest allocations. The remaining individual time allocations are presented in Table 2.

NCAA Division II Program Values

Investigation into Division II program values determined that there were no significant differences in administrator responses and coach perceptions of their responses within the following seven Olympic program values: conduct [competition], athletic success, enrollment, fundraising, fan support, program cost, and revenue program (see Table 3). Thus, it seems that the administrators and coaches seem to be on the same page when assessing the importance of these program areas. However, the remaining comparisons illustrated that administrators rated conduct (social) [$t(252) = 3.438, p < .001$], academic achievement [$t(251) = 4.217, p < .001$], community involvement [$t(252) = 3.297, p < .001$], and personal relationships [$t(252) = 4.234, p < .001$] significantly higher than coaches.

Program Value Time Commitment. The examination of coaches' time allocations at the Division II level revealed similar trends to those exhibited at the Division I level. As shown in Table 3, the top program values (conduct [competition], conduct [social], academic achievement, community involvement, and personal relationships) again received a combined time commitment (33.7%) less than that of athletic success (33.8%) from Division II coaches. Outside of athletic success and academic achievement, the data demonstrated that coaches spent the most time on enrollment (9.6%), program cost (8.7%), and fundraising (7.3%) issues. The re-

Table 2
NCAA Division I Administrator and Coach Perceptions of “Nonrevenue” Program Values

Program Values	Administrators		Coaches		Time Allocation (Weekly)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Conduct (Competition)	5.79	.686	5.58	.783	6.7%
Conduct (Social)	5.70	.687	5.35	.905	5.5%
Academic Achievement	5.69	.720	5.49	.781	10.8%
Personal Relationships	5.22*	1.018	4.29	1.339	5.8%
Athletic Success	5.18*	.919	4.73	1.236	37.6%
Community Involvement	5.11*	.929	4.82	1.020	3.9%
Fundraising	4.56	1.211	4.38	1.502	6.5%
Fan Support	4.30*	.903	3.71	1.396	4.1%
Program Cost	3.88	1.357	4.32*	1.404	8.9%
Enrollment	3.85	1.541	3.55	1.586	7.3%
Revenue Production	3.46	1.495	3.16	1.546	2.9%

Note. The scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6). The “Time Allocation” category refers to the number of hours coaches dedicate to this program area.

* $p < .01$

Table 3
NCAA Division II Administrator and Coach Perceptions of Nonrevenue Program Values

Program Values	Administrator		Coaches		Time Allocation (Weekly)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Conduct (Competition)	5.72	.644	5.50	.837	5.4%
Conduct (Social)	5.70*	.686	5.35	.905	5.4%
Academic Achievement	5.68*	.658	5.26	.876	11.4%
Community Involvement	5.22*	.915	4.80	1.057	5.0%
Personal Relationships	5.17*	.902	4.59	1.261	6.5%
Athletic Success	5.04	.935	4.72	1.266	33.8%
Enrollment	4.81	1.326	4.56	1.452	9.6%
Fundraising	4.59	1.211	4.51	1.308	7.3%
Fan Support	4.08	1.177	3.76	1.303	4.3%
Program Cost	3.98	1.224	4.36	1.296	8.7%
Revenue Production	3.20	1.557	3.16	1.435	2.6%

Note. The scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6). The "Time Allocation" category refers to the number of hours coaches dedicate to this program area.

* $p < .01$

Table 4
NCAA Division III Administrator and Coach Perceptions of "Nonrevenue" Program Values

Program Values	Administrator		Coaches		Time Allocation (Weekly - In Hours)
	M	SD	M	SD	
Conduct (Competition)	5.79	.498	5.69	.565	5.6%
Conduct (Social)	5.63	.586	5.45	.631	5.5%
Academic Achievement	5.65	.648	5.49	.666	9.9%
Personal Relationships	5.18*	.902	4.59	1.261	5.5%
Community Involvement	4.96*	.992	4.48	1.135	3.2%
Athletic Success	4.87	1.039	4.66	1.181	33.7%
Enrollment	4.56	1.433	4.77	1.417	17.7%
Fundraising	4.09	1.336	3.80	1.552	4.5%
Program Cost	3.92	1.263	4.39*	1.169	7.2%
Fan Support	3.63	1.306	3.24	1.296	2.4%
Revenue Production	2.52	1.482	2.24	1.427	4.8%

Note. The scale ranged from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (6). The "Time Allocation" category refers to the number of hours coaches dedicate to this program area.

* $p < .01$

maintaining time allocations are presented in Table 3.

NCAA Division III Program Values

Further investigation revealed that Division III administrators and coaches seemed to have the best understanding of the Olympic sport program values that are most important within coinciding athletic departments. As illustrated in Table 4, there were no differences in the administrator's responses and coach's perceptions of their responses within the following eight program values: conduct (competition), conduct (social), academic achievement, athletic success, enrollment, fundraising, fan support, and revenue production. In contrast, the remaining comparisons showed that administrators rated personal relationships [$t(278) = 5.678, p < .001$] and community involvement [$t(283) = 3.764, p < .001$] significantly higher than coaches. In addition, the data demonstrated that coaches rated program cost [$t(276) = 3.175, p < .001$] higher than administrators.

Program Value Time Commitment.

At the Division III level, coaches again spent the largest amount of time on the development of athletic success (33.7%) within their program. Further, similar to the other divisional trends, the time investment in athletic success was higher than the combined allocation of the top five rated program values: conduct (competition), conduct (social), academic achievement, personal relationships, and community involvement (see Table 4). However, while athletic suc-

cess was again the top priority in terms of overall time allocation, the data supported the notion that Division III coaches spent a lot more of their time on enrollment (17.7%) issues. The next highest time allocations were academic achievement (9.9%) and program cost (7.2%).

Open Ended Responses

Coaches were invited to supplement their quantitative response in an open-ended question which asked them to elaborate on their general thoughts regarding how they feel valued as an Olympic sport by administrators within their athletic department. In total, there were 381 coaches that responded to this invitation. The vast majority of coaches (48.6%) expressed feeling either entirely not valued, or valued less than the revenue sports within the department. Further, the responses illustrated that 10.2% reported feeling moderately respected. Just under one third of the coaches expressed a feeling of value because of their important role in holistic education, the academic or athletic success of their team, or because the AD particularly valued their sport because of prior association with the sport.

DISCUSSION

Quantitative administrator and coach responses of high value within each division emphasize elements of holistic education with conduct and academic achievement paramount to the significance of these sports. These findings are

very consistent with the ideological framework of the intercollegiate athletic integrated view where student athletes are receiving an education through their participation in sport. One coach mentioned this philosophy that pervades his/her athletic department:

Our department is unique in that there are 38 sports here. When we had budget problems our AD said no team would get cut and followed through. A lot of people lost jobs, but no teams were cut. He believes in education through athletics (our motto) and I think that is why we continue to have so many sports (Coach 180, Division III).

Another coach echoed this by stating *"The administration is proud of the academic success of our program and the number of our athletes who become professionals in their field of study"* (Coach 27, Division I).

In an era where the educational mission of intercollegiate athletics is in question (Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics, 2005; 2007), many proclaim the educational mission to be lost. The findings reveal the educational values within intercollegiate athletics to be quite strong. Athletic administrators and coaches reported the highest means and lowest standard deviations for conduct (competitive and social) and academic achievement. Based on these statistics, it would seem reasonable to believe the pure values of intercollegiate athletics can be unfalteringly focused upon within these programs and coaches can strive to facilitate the assimilation of university value systems with athletic department value systems, and therefore strive to uphold the true

mission of intercollegiate athletics—and hopefully stand integrated within the fabric of the university rather than as a separate entity.

Coach open-ended responses and time allocation results, however, offer an additional layer of insight to the quantitative findings. If athletic programs were truly integrated—with education at the forefront of purpose, one might expect coach time allocation to be consistent with the values expressed, and certainly open-ended responses would supplement the highly rated elements of value as tabulated within the Likert scales. Based upon the findings, however, this does not appear to be the case. Coaches realize the value in the top-ranked elements, but do not necessarily allocate their time as such. Administrators rank educational elements of conduct, academic achievement, community involvement, and athletic success all above more commercially-motivated values including fundraising, enrollment, fan support, program cost, and revenue production. Despite these stated ideals, however, open-ended responses reveal coach feelings of inferiority and lack of value compared to the "revenue generating" programs within the department.

Many coaches expressed feelings of complete disregard by their administrators: *"We are a necessary evil,"* explained Division I Coach 340. *"We are not at all valued...not one little bit. If our administration could get away with the Big 3 and nothing else, I'm certain they would do it,"* resounded Division I Coach 23. *"We are definitely a second-class program as*

seen by the administrators: budget-wise, marketing-wise, sport info-wise, training-room-wise," Division III Coach 402 explained, "[at our institution], it is the big three: Basketball, football, and baseball taking priority over all others". Another coach mentioned, "we are meant to be seen (roster numbers), and not heard" (Coach 378, Division II). Others expressed concern for their precarious position. One coach, echoing the superficial value of roster numbers, mentioned, "I think that we are a "filler" sport. We help with gender equity on the women's side and I am constantly worried that the men's program will be eliminated" (Coach 12, Division II).

Other coaches were sympathetic to the administrator's plight and were more accepting of their role as second-class citizens,

"I understand that our administration doesn't have the same goals as me. Since more victories don't yield more money, they are not that interested in us winning. They want us to get good grades, stay out of trouble, and not cause problems. They want our women's team to offset numbers and spending of men's football and basketball. If they could cut every sport, but men's football and basketball they would. They see themselves as a business rather than a service to the University and student. The NCAA needs to put rules in place to get this arms race under control and stop letting all of these great sports get trampled on" (Coach 118, Division I).

Similarly, coach 161 mentioned, "I feel as if we are left by the wayside, our facilities need a major upgrade, our offices are located in the basement of the basketball arena and communication with administrators is lack-

ing. But these are challenges that we face and we move on to help the athletes."

The vocal unrest of these coaches clearly delineates a lack of integration. Although there is educational value clearly inherent in the nonrevenue sports, it appears that the system housing intercollegiate athletics does not recognize this educational currency. Rather, the focus is on the bottom line, and thus the sports with the potential to produce revenues. Thus, as one pursues an entrepreneurial approach to grow, sustain, and fortify nonrevenue programs, it appears that the educational value is not sufficient in the current system. Because of this, it is possible that administrators are touting educational value while acting as profit-maximizers. In response, coaches act, believing in the educational value of their program, but allocating time toward activities that hold more clout in the system with which they are constrained to participate

Administrator & Coach Differences

Quantitative differences in valuation between athletic administrators and coaches point to a divide in five primary areas—administrators value personal relationships, community involvement, athletic success, and fan support more highly than coaches, and coaches believe the value of program cost to be more important than the administrators indicate. These significant differences lend to two possible conclusions. One is a hypothesis indicating that coaches do not realize the importance of these

value-creating activities. This is supportive of previous research (Weight, 2009) wherein administrators emphasized the importance of entrelationship promotion (coaches seeking to build relationships and to promote their program in department in community). This divide is certainly important for coaches to be aware of as they run their programs. The findings indicate that their role not only as an educator, but also that of an ambassador is highly valued by administrators.

An alternative hypothesis toward explaining the significant differences between administrators and coaches is supported by 10% of the open-ended responses. This alternative hypothesis lends to a conclusion that coaches are aware of these ambassador responsibilities, but do not have adequate resources to be able to accomplish these functions. One coach—addressing high expectations with low support, mentioned, *“I can't remember the last time I worked less than a forty hour week; fifty hour weeks are the norm in season. Our new AD, six months on the job, didn't even know I was full-time. I would love to be able to better promote our program, but I have no support. The mindset I have taken is to do the best I can for myself and my team...”* (Respondent 307, Division I). Another coach emphasized the philosophy that he feels within the department, *“Be successful, but don't spend too much. You are not high on the athletic order of importance”* (Coach 18, Division I). Very similarly, Division I Coach 49 stated, *“Win, create no problems, raise money, and keep quiet, but know your place, and your place is not football.”* Divi-

sion I Coach 87 explained the frustration of high administrative expectations with limited support.

“We definitely are subtly and blatantly made to feel as if we should be grateful that they even tolerate us and let us exist. Yes, they give us “support” in the technical and financial areas, but we are constantly reminded that we are a “burden” to them and that we're constantly not doing good enough. Even after one of our most successful years in program history last year, their perspective was that it was just average. Their expectations of us are unrealistic because they don't take time to get to know the sport.

As expressed by respondent 87, nearly 5% of the coaches who responded to the open-ended question mentioned that their athletic administrators do not understand their sport. As such, differences in administrative expectations and support are bound to occur. In these instances, it is increasingly important for coaches and nonrevenue sport stakeholders to educate administrators about the unique demands their sport entails. Many of the coaches expressed desires to promote their programs, but simply lacked the resources to be able to do so. If stakeholders were able to inform administrators and demonstrate the potential value of the sport in the currency with which they often favor (fundraising, donor support, and fan support), perhaps administrators would be more likely to provide the necessary funding to sustain promotional activities.

This sport-bias or lack of understanding by administrators is similar to what

we see on a larger scale at many universities between traditionally academic programs and athletic programs where a lack of understanding about the educational nature of athletics marginalizes the inherent value of intercollegiate athletics as a whole. These “unsubstantiated cultural preconceptions within the academy about intercollegiate athletics...against the body and toward cognitive and intellectual capacity” Brand argues, “is the driving force of the disdain by many faculty members for college sports and the acceptance of the Standard View” (Brand, 2006, p.13-14). If the academy could accept and sustain the educational value of intercollegiate athletics, perhaps the inherent value of nonrevenue sport would be unquestioned, but in the current structure wherein Division I athletic departments are encouraged to self-sustain, athletic administrators hold sports with revenue generating potential in higher regard. Solutions to both ideological divides could be presented through education. Perhaps the revenue-generating potential of traditional nonrevenue sports could be presented to administrators through education about the sport and support could thereby be facilitated, and/or administrators and stakeholders can more passionately argue the educational value of intercollegiate athletics and thereby sustain additional funding and acceptance by the academy for its educational purposes rather than its often current auxiliary role.

Viewing these differences through a lens of entrepreneurial theory is diffi-

cult, because the true value is unclear. If integration is the aim, educational value should be promoted in an effort to provide impetus for growth. Through this avenue, nonrevenue sport can find sanctity as the education value is already at the forefront. If the current system dominated by financial pressures within athletic auxiliaries remains, the value of nonrevenue sport may need to be re-examined in order to find the currency through which fortification is necessary. Given the high educational value as demonstrated through coaches and administrators, this value has not been enough to save programs in the torrent of discontinuation decisions (Steinbach, 2007).

Division III Agreement

The most agreement between administrative and coach populations was evident in Division III, where commercial pressures are generally the least of all divisions (Gerdy, 2006; Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). Student-athletes in Division III are not afforded athletic scholarships, and therefore participate in athletics without subsidization. This model has been supported by “intellectual elitism” reform advocates because arguably student-athletes attend college for education first, athletics second, commercialization is limited at this level, and athletics can be part of a students overall educational experience (Sack, 2009). Open-ended responses supported this sanctity. A former division I athlete reflected on the difference between divisions, “As a Division 1 ath-

lete who is now a DIII coach I think there is a huge different in how our sports are treated by the administrators. At the Division I level there are many tiers and at our school we are all treated equally which I greatly appreciate" (Coach 44, Division III). Another coach echoed that sentiment, "Division III is where it's at. Athletics is valued as a part of a holistic education. Perhaps this is more so because a large percentage of the student body participates" (Coach 217, Division III). These responses reflect an integrated view of intercollegiate athletics. With funding structures more in line with an integrated approach, competitive and commercial pressures are reduced, removing arms-race inducing stimuli (Gerdy, 2006; Sack 2009).

Interestingly, within the time allocation figures of Division III coaches, time devoted to academic achievement, social, and competitive conduct was lower than the other divisions, and time allocated toward increasing university enrollment was significantly higher, demonstrating an interesting shift in divisional priorities. So while some commercial pressures appear to be absent, perhaps other commercial pressures are present. The difference between DI and DIII is that the alternative commercial pressures (pressures to increase enrollment) are equal between all academic and athletic programs within the university structure as athletics is integrated rather than separated. This structure as demonstrated within DIII institutions appears to allow coaches, administrators, and athletes to garner maximal educational value.

CONCLUSION

Is it possible to balance commercial enticements with academic value? Could the academic value inherent within intercollegiate athletics provide currency enough to justify expenditures across multiple programs? If education were valued as the true purpose of intercollegiate athletics, might we see a proliferation of program additions as men and women were encouraged to participate in these opportunities of personal growth through participation? Is this education worthy of university subsidization?

In nonrevenue sport programs across the United States in all divisions the educational value is inherent. This significant worth is highly valued by administrators and coaches alike, but based on the amount of programs that have been cut in the last several years it is evident that this value is not recognized because universities have marginalized athletic departments as "other." If stakeholders can argue educational merits and strive to integrate athletics into the educational fiber of universities, administrative pressure to climb the ladder through competitive success could be reduced and through the systematic ideological shift, the purpose of intercollegiate athletics could stand supreme as of utmost importance and as a beacon of holistic education.

As a wise track & field coach put it,

"I feel that the potential educational value is underappreciated. We have the opportunity to teach lasting life lessons

of commitment, overcoming adversity, work ethic, responsibility, discipline, sacrifice, and teamwork—lessons that can be taught through sport unlike they can be taught in any classroom. We have the opportunities to build leaders that will make a difference in the world after college. We must continue to focus on our country's need for leaders and how those leaders are developed. I think the educational value this provides to the university is overlooked" (Coach 79, Division I).

Practical Implications

In the current economy, departmental budgets across the nation are being downsized and as a result, restructuring and cost-saving measures are being implemented. Perhaps in this time of change, an opportunity is present for intercollegiate athletic stakeholders. By focusing on the most highly valued educational elements of nonrevenue sports, stakeholders could seek to educate and strive toward integration of intercollegiate athletics within their university homes.

From a broad perspective, the existence of a unified set of NCAA program values (e.g., academics, conduct, and community involvement) gives coaches a sound understanding of the program elements that are consistently being emphasized within individual athletic departments. Similarly, it provides *nonrevenue*, Olympic advocate groups (e.g., National Wrestling Coaches Association [NWCA], and USA Track & Field) with the information necessary to create educational programs designed to enhance

the sustainability of programs across the United States. Ultimately, this provides coaches with an opportunity to maximize their program efficiency by focusing on the elements that are most valued by administrators.

As *nonrevenue*, Olympic advocate groups and coaches move forward, it is important that they realize that value systems exist within their NCAA athletic department. However, our research indicates that this institutional value system extends well beyond athletic success for these programs. Instead, there are a variety of critical program values that Olympic coaches must embrace if they are going to enhance their chances for sustainability within their athletic department. Thus, with this in mind, it would be wise for coaches to invest in broad-based initiatives that allow them to maximize their "fit" within their coinciding athletic departments and university structures. More importantly, an understanding of these program values offers the opportunity to highlight elements that will minimize their chances of program elimination in future years.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

With an emphasis on athletic director and coach perceptions of *nonrevenue* sports, the research did not identify the program values that coaches and administrators feel are valued most within their athletic departments in *revenue* programs. Through this type of analysis, researchers could identify whether or

not significant differences exist between revenue and nonrevenue programs which will allow them to more fully address integration within the university—particularly at the Division I level where the pull of commercialism, self-sustaining emphasis, and auxiliary form most often exists. An understanding of the revenue and nonrevenue similarities and differences could provide a more thorough foundation through which to build educational programs necessary to break down the biases within the academy against athletics and their role in university campuses.

Another limitation within this study is the lack of data available from campus constituents. It would be interesting to more thoroughly research the bias mentioned by Brand (2006) held by many faculty against non-art, and the body. This insight could help in the development of educational efforts toward athletic-academic integration. In addition to providing a foundation to develop educational programs, a study of this nature could also help discover the most appropriate avenues through which to approach building the currency of educational value in nonrevenue sports.

In addition, as with all studies conducted through survey methodology, this research is limited by the honesty of study participants. It may be enticing to provide socially-acceptable answers rather than true measures of value and/or time allocation. In order to address these limitations, future studies examining nonrevenue sports, academic capitalism, and the role of entrepreneurial

efforts within the academy through varying methods are encouraged.

REFERENCES

- Amos, E., & Weathington, B. (2008). An analysis of the relation between employee organization value congruence and employee attitudes. *Journal of Psychology*, 142(6), 615-632.
- Arizona State University cites economics in reducing number of varsity sports. (2008, May 23). The Online Resource for the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Retrieved from: <http://www.ncaa.com/tennismens/article.aspx?id=239282>.
- Benford, R.D. (2007). The college sports reform movement: Reframing the “edutainment” industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48, 1-28.
- Bowen, W.G., Levin, S. A. (2003). *Reclaiming the game: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brady, E. (2009, February 18). Recession forces colleges to find ways to cut spending. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2009-02-18-colleges-economy-cover_N.htm.
- Brand, M. (2006). The role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(1), 9-20.

- Byers, W. (1995). *Unsportsmanlike Conduct: Exploiting College Athletics*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Press.
- Carroll, K.A., & Humphreys, B.R. (2000). Nonprofit decision making and social regulation: the intended and unintended consequences of Title IX. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 43(3), 359-376.
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (2005). *Academic integrity in intercollegiate athletics: principles, rules, and best practices*. Retrieved from: http://wfu.me/cms/coia/index.php/Policy_Papers.
- Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (2007). *Framing the future: reforming intercollegiate athletics*. Retrieved from: http://wfu.me/cms/coia/index.php/Policy_Papers.
- Cooper, C.G., Weight, E.A. (2011). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 74-89.
- Cooper, C.G., & Weight, E. A. (2009). In Pursuit of Satisfaction & Fortification: Stakeholder perceptions of NCAA intercollegiate wrestling rules and regulations. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 18(3), 92-106.
- Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (2002). The entrepreneurial imperatives of strategic leadership. In M.A. Hitt (Ed.), *Strategic entrepreneurship: Creating a new mindset* (pp. 309-327). Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Craughron, R.L. (2001). An historical perspective of reform in intercollegiate athletics. *International Sport Journal*, 5, 1-16.
- De Clercq, S., Fontaine, J., & Anseel, F. (2008). In search of a comprehensive value model for assessing supplementary person—organization fit. *Journal of Psychology*, 142(3), 277-302.
- Duderstadt, J.J. (2003). *Intercollegiate Athletics and the American University: A University Perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gerdy, J.R. (2006, May 12). For true reform, athletics scholarships must go. *Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review*. 52(36), B6.
- Gray, G.R., & Pelzer, J.A. (1995). The Impact of Title IX on the Discontinuation of NCAA Division I Wrestling Programs. *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, 5(2), 17-22.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2004). *Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletics success, student quality, and donations*. Ithaca, NY: Frank, Robert H.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2010). *Restoring the balance: dollars, values, and the future of college sport*. Retrieved from: <http://restoringbalance.knightcommission.org>.
- Leland, T., & Peters, K. (2003). Unresolved public policy issues. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 14, 1.

- Leslie, D.W., & Fretwell, E.K. Jr. (1996). *Wise Moves in Hard Times: Creating and Managing Resilient Colleges and Universities*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Marburger, D.R., & Hogshead-Makar, N. (2003). Is Title IX really to blame for the decline in intercollegiate men's non-revenue sports? *Marquette Sport Law Review* (14), Rev. 65.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2009). *Revenues/expenses 2004-2008: NCAA revenues and expenses of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic programs report*. Indianapolis, IN.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2010). *2010-2011 NCAA Division I Manual*. Indianapolis, IN.
- Nunnally, J.C., & Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric Theory* (3rd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ridpath, B.D., Yiamouyiannis, A., Lawrence, H., & Galles, K. (2008). Changing sides: The failure of the wrestling community's challenges to Title IX and new strategies for saving NCAA sport teams. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports*, 1(2), 255-283.
- 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.
- 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.
- Slaughter, S.,L. Leslie. 1997. *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies and the Entrepreneurial University*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Slaughter, S.,G. Rhoades. 2004. *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- 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.
- Sperber, M.A. (2000). *Beer and circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt and Co.
- Steinbach, P. (2007). Pinned hopes. *Athletic Business*. Retrieved from: <http://athleticbusiness.com/articles/article.aspx?articleid=1624&zoneid=28>.
- Tierney, W.G. (1999). *Building the Responsive Campus: Creating High Performance Colleges and Universities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Toma, J.D., & Cross, M.E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 633-661.

- Weight, E.A. (2009). The role of the entrepreneurial coach: non-revenue sport survival within big-time inter-collegiate athletics. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 1-15.

Dr. Coyte Cooper is a faculty member at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and Dr. Erianne Weight teaches at Bowling Green State University, Ohio.