

ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF HBCU DIVISION I-AA ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

by

CHARLES FRANKLIN MCCLELLAND, JR.

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

May 2011

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF HBCU DIVISION I-AA ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

A Dissertation

by

CHARLES FRANKLIN MCCLELLAND, JR.

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee, Christine Stanley
Committee Members, Frank Ashley
Homer Tolson
Luana Zellner
Head of Department, Fred M. Nafukho

May 2011

Major Subject: Educational Administration

ABSTRACT

Athletic Directors' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of
HBCU Division I-AA Athletic Programs.

(May 2011)

Charles Franklin McClelland, Jr., B.B.A., Prairie View A&M University;

M.B.A., Prairie View A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Christine Stanley

Few studies were reported in the literature of researchers investigating variables affecting the operation or effectiveness of athletics at HBCUs. This study was designed to identify variables that athletic directors perceived would determine the athletic program's potential for effectiveness in the current NCAA Division I-AA and Division II structure.

A questionnaire instrument containing 66 closed-ended items and a comment section was used to collect data. Fifty-eight positive, closed-response statements in nine categories were organized on a 5-point Likert scale. Another category of eight closed-response items were organized on a 3-point scale. Findings of the investigation included variables that were perceived to determine the effectiveness of football and basketball athletic programs. The following categories of variables were perceived to determine the effectiveness of athletics at HBCUs with Division I-AA football and basketball programs: revenue/funding and its influence, gender equity, NCAA policies and their influence, academics, the student-athlete, diversity, and the expertise of the athletic director.

Data were analyzed through descriptive and nonparametric inferential statistics to describe and report findings. For the question, “Do athletic directors at HBCU Division I-AA and non Division I-AA football institutions differ in the proportion of their perceptions of the important variables that influence program effectiveness and the potential for program survival?,” the researcher found that directors did not differ in their perceptions of variables that influence program effectiveness. Other findings that resulted from application of the Chi-square test were as follow:

1. Statistically significant differences were not found with respect to age, gender, or institutional size for any category of variables.
2. Statistically significant differences were not found with respect to years of experience for variable categories except for the influence of NCAA policies on football and basketball programs.
3. A statistically significant difference was found for the opinions of all participants on the influence of NCAA policies on football and basketball programs.

Participants’ comments were analyzed for similar themes and supported that the variables associated with revenue/funding and revenue generating determined the program’s effectiveness. Participants also commonly acknowledged that tutorials and other support services for student-athletes influenced program effectiveness. These results may be useful to athletic directors and others engaged in planning for the sustainability of athletics at HBCUs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Christine Stanley, and my committee members, Dr. Homer Tolson, Dr. Luana Zellner, and Dr. Frank Ashley for their support throughout the course of this research.

Thanks also to Mrs. Joyce Nelson for assisting me over the years with her wisdom and advice.

A special thank you to my two children, Cainan and Ashton; you are truly the joy of my life.

Finally, thanks to my mother and father for your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	10
Purpose of the Study	11
Significance of the Study	11
Research Questions	12
Operational Definitions	13
Assumptions	16
Limitations	
Organization of the Study	17
II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	18
Introduction	18
Historical Background	19
Intercollegiate Athletics at HBCU Institutions	19
The National Collegiate Athletic Association	25
Issues Associated with Athletics and the NCAA	29
Revenue	30
Gender Equity	35
Academic Performance and the Student-Athlete	39
Summary Statement	42
III METHODOLOGY	44
Population	44
Instrumentation	44

CHAPTER	Page
Procedures	48
Data Analysis	50
IV ANALYSIS OF DATA	52
Introduction	52
Analysis of Data Collected	52
Research Questions	55
Findings for Research Question 1	56
Findings for Research Question 2	70
Summary of Findings	82
V SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS...	86
Summary	86
Discussion of Findings	87
Conclusions	91
Recommendations	93
Recommendations for Future Research	93
Recommendations for Practice, Athletic Programs, and Personnel	95
REFERENCES	98
APPENDIX A	104
APPENDIX B	109
VITA	111

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1 Frequency of Years of Experience as Athletic Director	54
2 Frequency of Variables Affecting Program Effectiveness in Category 1.....	56
3 Chi-Square Statistics for College/University Funding Item.....	57
4 Means for Effectiveness of Category 1 Revenue/Funding Items	58
5 Means for Effectiveness of Category 6 Diversity Items	60
6 Means for Two Category 8 Items.....	62
7 Means and for NCAA Items: Simplify Regulation, Attendance, Marketability, Tighter Rules on Performance Enhancing Substances	63
8 Summary of Responses for the Influence of NCAA on Program Effectiveness	66
9 Frequency of Responses to the Influence of NCAA on Generating Revenue	67
10 Chi-Square Test for Influences of Revenue Funding on Attracting Talented Athletes	71
11 Chi-Square Test for Effectiveness of Graduation Rates on Program Success	73
12 Chi-Square Test for Effectiveness of Recruitment of Athletes on Program Success	74
13 Chi-Square Test for Effectiveness of Administrative Support Expertise on Program Success	75

TABLE	Page
14 Chi-Square Test for NCAA Policies: Financial Aid/Scholarships	77
15 Responses to NCAA Policies Cross Referenced to Degree Type.....	78
16 Chi-Square Test for Effectiveness of Requiring Tutorial Services for Student-Athletes	80
17 Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	81

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The United States has enjoyed a long history of intercollegiate sports dating back to the 1800s with events such as rowing races between Harvard and Yale and football competitions between Rutgers and Princeton (Veneziano, 2002). Early attempts to regulate intercollegiate sports began with the formation of a Faculty Athletic Committee at Yale University in 1881 (Watson, n.d.). Significant dates related to the history of regulating intercollegiate athletics include 1895 when the Big Ten was formed, 1905 where meetings of institutions regarding rules guiding playing football led to the official constitution of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) in 1906, and 1910 when IAAUS became the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) (Hawes, 1999). According to a review of the history of the NCAA, early emphases on regulating athletics on most college campuses were on football which was also the leading factor in the formation of the NCAA (Hawes, 1999). Although football is a major sport at many institutions, all intercollegiate athletics at participating NCAA member institutions are governed through the organization's certification policies.

Organized intercollegiate athletics at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) dates back to the 1890s when Florida A & M University moved from the unsupervised sports of baseball, tennis, and football to such sports as tennis and basketball supervised by faculty (Chalk, 1976). By 1906, this institution was engaging

in varsity status competition in football with Alabama State University and Tuskegee University (Chalk, 1976).

Other HBCUs that were founded during the 1800s and began an early rich successful tradition in athletics included (a) Alabama A&M University (Alabama), (b) Alcorn State University (Mississippi), (c) Howard University (Washington, DC), (d) Jackson State University (Mississippi), (e) Kentucky State University (Kentucky), Morgan State University (Maryland), (f) Prairie View A& M University (Texas), and (g) Wiley College (Texas) (The HBCU Guide, 2004). Now, more than 60 HBCUs have followed a prominent tradition of intercollegiate athletics under the auspices of the NCAA competing as Division I-A, I- AA, II-III divisional membership teams in a variety of sports (NCAA Members by Divisions, n.d.). In recent years, the viability of athletics at HBCUs has been questioned by some athletic directors in view of how some NCAA issues and other trends such as budget limitations and Title IX impact program growth and continuation (Greenlee, 2002; Rishe, 1999).

Among the issues to which the NCAA has responded over the years in the form of policies or standards for membership compliance are graduation rates of student athletes, recruitment of talented athletes, facilities and equipment, gender equity, amateurism, eligibility, and contributions/revenue for scholarships and resources (Greenlee, 2002; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003; Sigelman and Wahlbeck, 1999). Sample NCAA responses to these issues include (a) Proposition 42 which restricted the ability of student athletes to receive financial aid based on low grade-point averages or low SAT/ACT scores, (b) Proposition 16 that increased the number of core courses

needed for athletic competition at the college level and instituted an initial eligibility index that matched required test scores with grade point averages, and (c) the 2005 Academic Reform Plan which called for college teams to graduate 50 percent or more of its student athletes or be subjected to losing scholarships for a year (“NCAA Passes Landmark Academic Reform Plan,” 2005).

Hawes (1999) reported that opposition to regulations based on test scores was registered by some coaches as they believed that the NCAA was not considering minority and at-risk students and that standardized tests were being misused. In terms of NCAA policies regarding scholarships and player pay restrictions, Baird (2004) summarized NCAA regulations on these issues as follows: “NCAA regulations limit athletes’ compensation to the nonmonetary [*sic*] benefits of tuition, books, and room and board. They also limit the number of “full-ride” scholarships that each school can offer” (p. 218).

Baird (2004) suggested that there exists some impact on institutions’ revenue generating practices and how they distribute revenue. Important also is that for some institutions, these regulations limit the number of highly talented athletes that can be attracted through scholarship offers. Baird also suggested that strategies employed by some institutions to circumvent the restriction have resulted in increased NCAA investigations of possible infractions.

Baird (2004) presented findings of the effects of NCAA regulations on college athletics. Baird suggested that although player pay restrictions, for example, were designed to promote competitive equity for student athletes and institutions, “with limited

ability to compensate athletes, losing teams and weak conferences could be disadvantaged by NCAA regulations restricting player compensation and, hence, disadvantaged in the competition for wins and revenue” (p. 221). Schools have used various measures to ensure athletic programs are appealing, thereby, attracting talented athletes who see greater opportunities for personal benefits. The ability of the school to establish a strong student community and relationship with the institution, to afford lucrative salaries for coaching staffs, expansive media coverage, and a variety of support services for athletes are among institutional attractions that are used to influence the decision of athletes regarding their choice of schools (Baird, 2004; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003).

Although numerous studies exist regarding athletic programs in higher education and some with implications for HBCUs, a review of the literature specifically on athletic programs at HBCUs revealed a limited number of research studies on variables affecting the operation or effectiveness of athletics at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Branch and Crow, 1994; Drain and Ashley, 2000). Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004) are among the most recent researchers to investigate NCAA governance issues such as amateurism, the influence of professional sports on college student-athletes, membership requirements for Division I-A and I-AA, graduation rates, and college participation in policy-making and their relationship to the operation of athletics at HBCUs. Goss et al., collected data from athletic directors at 15 HBCUs through a questionnaire which required athletic directors to rank critical issues that could be associated with their NCAA Division I-AA programs.

Goss et al. (2004) found that respondents envisioned the emergence of NCAA policies that would regulate the influence of professional sports. Respondents also indicated individual schools would not have increased participation in NCAA policy-making for years to come. Further findings with regard to revenue, student-athletes, academics, and gender equity were as follows:

1. The majority of the respondents indicated that HBCUs would increase revenue sources through corporate sponsorships;
2. The majority of the respondents envisioned the creation of severe sanctions for student-athletes participating in gambling and the institution of stipends for athletic at HBCUs;
3. Admission criteria for athletes was sometimes found to be higher than those for other students, but respondents felt that the criteria would be the same for all within ten years and the graduation rates of student-athletes would also compare with those of other students;
4. The majority of the respondents projected an increase in sports for women within three years and a decline in men's non-revenue sports to improve compliance with gender equity regulations.

Researchers Branch and Crow (1994) and Drain and Ashley (2000) conducted studies that involved athletic directors from predominantly white institutions and categorized issues with one category being NCAA related. Branch and Crow (1994) used a sample of eight NCAA Division I-A athletic directors and identified 27 issues affecting current and future trends which they categorized as follows: amateurism, academics,

Division I-A bowls/playoffs, NCAA issues, gender equity, funding, student-athlete issues. According to Goss et al. (2004), in responding to questions about critical issues facing HBCU athletics at NCAA Division I-AA schools, participating panelists determined which issues were most critical in terms of the desirability of occurrence, the impact on the quality of higher education, and the estimated date of occurrence within time frames. The researchers reported that the panelists agreed as follows: (a) it was slightly desirable for corporate sponsors to become a major source of revenue; (b) they desired the revision of NCAA rules to become less burdensome; (c) they highly desired that Division I-A football champions be determined through a playoff system rather than through bowl games; (d) they highly desired strengthened admission and eligibility standards; and (e) they indicated as highly undesirable that grants for student athletes would include stipends.

Using a sample of 13 athletic directors of Division I institutions, Drain and Ashley (2000) found their panelists reached consensus on 12 of 31 issues identified as having some impact on athletic success. Among the issues investigated, panelists agreed that it was desirable for the following to occur: the existence of corporate sponsors as a major source of revenue for athletics (which also would have some impact on athletic departments); that NCAA rules be revised; and that admission standards for student athletes be the same as those for non-athletes. They felt it undesirable to eliminate football bowl games and institute a playoff system for Division I-A champions and for agent representation of student athletes to occur.

Goss et al. (2004) compared their findings with those of two earlier studies (Branch and Crow, 1999; Drain and Ashley, 2000) and found consensus on the categories of funding and governance as critical issues in all three studies. Based on issues investigated in these studies and in view of the future of intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs, Goss et al. suggested that investigators seek opinions of HBCU athletic directors on such issues as the possibility of the approval of student-athletic stipends by the NCAA and mandated compliance with gender equity to determine what impact such actions might have on their programs.

In this study, the researcher surveyed athletic directors at HBCUs to identify variables perceived to determine the effectiveness of athletic programs, how specific variables influence athletic operations at HBCU institutions, and what effect the variables may have on the potential of program survival. Intercollegiate athletics is a big business and any consumer can determine that some institutions' programs represent better business ventures than others. Although few studies exist that address problematic areas or contain alternatives for enhancing intercollegiate programs at HBCUs or at less competitive institutions, newspapers and journals are replete with announcements and opinions about decisions to be made regarding athletic programs.

Opinions regarding the fairness of NCAA policies have been fueled by individuals as a result of efforts to comply with some policies instituted by the organization (Baird, 2004; Boyd, 2003). For example, FairTest (n.d.) reported that NCAA eligibility requirements based on SAT/ACT tests pose double jeopardy in terms of race and class for African American women as wealth is a strong predictor of the

scores, and the SAT is a less accurate predictor of the academic abilities of African American women than grade averages or school performance, for example. This situation translates to the possible need to review NCAA rules as observed in three studies (Branch and Crow, 1994; Drain and Ashley, 2000; Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville, 2004) cited earlier in this introduction. Similarly, Cook (2003) expressed grave concern for possible NCAA regulations regarding eligibility for teams participating in bowl games that may be influenced by positions of the Knight Commission, an organization designed to monitor and report on university or school control and academic and financial integrity of athletics programs (The Knight Commission, n.d.).

Publications regarding the NCAA academic reform plan, revenue factors, graduation rates, program visibility, preparation of athletic personnel, hiring practices for coaches and athletic directors, and the commitment of athletic personnel have implications as problematic areas for HBCUs and possible alternatives for program enhancement (Anonymous, 2004; Lovaglia and Lucas, 2005; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003; Sagas and Cunningham, 2004; Schneider and Stier, 2005; “Study: Few Minority,” 2004). Further, Greenlee (2002) provided an overview of problematic situations facing baseball programs at several institutions and concluded that, “the extent to which Black college baseball programs survive will continue to depend on recruiting and their ability to upgrade facilities and generate revenue” (p.21). The conclusion also mimicked findings of previous studies (Baird, 2004; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003) regarding finances required for an institution to afford services associated with competitive and quality athletic programs.

Investigations based on the opinions of athletic directors and coaches and a review of athletic budgets and national studies of intercollegiate athletics commissioned by the Knight Foundation and NCAA (Frank, 2004; Litan, Orszag, and Orszag, 2003; Orszag and Orszag, 2005) have been completed. Investigators suggested that the success of athletic programs at colleges and universities is dependent on several factors. A leading factor identified as important to program success was funding/revenue (Baird, 2004; Greenlee, 2002; Rishe, 1999; Upthegrove, Roscigno, and Charles, 1999).

In NCAA commissioned studies, researchers (Frank, 2004; Litan, Orszag, and Orszag, 2003; Orszag and Orszag, 2005) explored the financial effects on college athletics in terms of spending and revenue especially in relation to football and basketball. These researchers concluded that operating budgets for Division I-A schools represented an average of 3.8% of the school's overall budget but budgets did not include all athletic expenditures such as salaries for coaches. The athletic spending share was found to vary across Division I-A conferences and was higher in Division I and II schools. Researchers also concluded that real operating expenditures had accelerated and that variations existed in expenditure, revenue, and winning percentages for football and basketball.

Colleges and universities with larger enrollments are in different NCAA divisions than smaller institutions. Researchers (Litan, Orszag, and Orszag, 2003; Orszag and Orszag, 2005) suggested that revenue and spending are impacted to some extent by the division of NCAA or other governing body where the school has membership. This means that larger schools attract greater television coverage and receive other

endorsements that serve as revenue sources augmenting school budgets not afforded smaller schools, specifically HBCUs. HBCUs, as do other institutions, must comply with regulations of their governing body despite any problematic issues. Rishe (1999) suggested that some athletic programs have suffered a decrease in visibility and a decrease in the variety of sports offered because of problems associated with their limited ability or inability to comply with regulations such as Title IX.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in the study was that variables are not known that may lead to and help sustain the effectiveness of athletic programs at HBCUs as perceived by athletic directors. Few studies of the future of intercollegiate athletics at HBCU institutions exist. Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004) examined the perspectives of HBCU athletic directors regarding conditions within the NCAA and their prognostications of the future. They recommended that further study be conducted to determine athletic directors' opinions on how their departments would cope with conditions that might exist such as student athletic stipends, if permitted by the NCAA, and mandated compliance with gender equity provisions. Issues such as revenue and governance could pose problems for the operation of inter-collegiate programs at HBCUs. As these and other variables appeared to have some influence on the effectiveness of intercollegiate programs in NCAA divisions, research was needed to identify those variables applicable to HBCUs. Additionally, because of limited reports in the literature on the future of intercollegiate athletics at HBCU, studies were needed to determine the effects of variables on athletic programs, to identify alternatives for

college/ university officials and athletic leadership, as well as possible implications for the NCAA.

Purpose of the Study

The study was conducted to identify which variables were perceived to determine the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs based on the opinions of athletic directors at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The study was designed to identify possible factors that would enhance an HBCU athletic program's potential to survive in the current NCAA Division I-AA and Division II structure. Further, the study was designed to determine if opinions differed among athletic directors at HBCUs with Division I-AA football and those at other HBCU institutions whose football or other intercollegiate athletic programs were within lower NCAA divisions.

Significance of the Study

The research on intercollegiate athletics contains questions regarding such issues as graduation rates, diversity, control of athletic programs, gender equity, funding, compliance, and organizational effectiveness. Institutions have engaged in efforts to add to the body of intercollegiate athletic research through organizing special entities such as the Laboratory for the Study of Intercollegiate Athletics (LSIA) at Texas A&M University (LSIA, 2003). Authors reviewed in the literature suggested that programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities may be at risk of surviving, especially with respect to their inability to compete for the top dollars that non-HBCU institutions are able to secure. Further, in view of budgetary concerns and compliance issues, questions facing HBCUs and some other institutions include, "what teams are most visible? What

teams make the most \$ [money]? . . . What teams are most likely to get cut or under funded?” (Watson, n.d.).

The challenge facing many athletic directors and leaders of higher education institutions is to identify alternatives and make decisions that would increase the likelihood of program survival in view of the number of changes that have resulted in the business of intercollegiate athletics. Perceptions of personnel directly involved in managing athletic programs about what is needed to build and ensure quality programs are important as these perceptions will likely impact the program’s status. Likewise, perceptions about a college or university’s athletic program will likely influence the perception of the university. Positive perceptions generally lead to increased enrollment and increased funding for university operations.

Good decision-making involves acquiring information from various credible sources that will allow a situation to be observed from different perspectives. The results of this study may assist in establishing baseline data for consideration in decision making relative to HBCU intercollegiate athletics. Additionally, the results of the study may contribute to the body of knowledge concerning variables and trends impacting HBCU athletic programs and suggested alternatives for program survival.

Research Questions

Data were collected through an instrument that was modified from the survey instrument that Goss et al. (2004) used in their athletic study and from interviews with athletic directors. The instrument was designed to generate answers to the following questions:

1. Based on the perceptions of HBCU Athletic Directors, what variables are ranked highest to determine the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs?
2. Do athletic directors at HBCU Division I-AA and non Division I-AA football institutions differ in their perceptions of which variables are more important that influence program effectiveness?

Operational Definitions

The following terms were applied to the context of this study:

Bowl game. A college football game played between two successful teams in late December or early January after the regular season.

CIAA. The Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association is a NCAA Division II Conference that is composed of 12 HBCUs located in the southeastern part of the United States and is divided into the western and eastern divisions.

College world series. These are games that represent a post season competition between Division I baseball programs to determine NCAA national champions.

Conferences. These are groups of schools into which teams are divided in college and professional football.

Contemporaneous penalties. These are restrictions based on graduation rates below 50%. Schools are prohibited from re-awarding financial aid that was previously awarded to a student-athlete who left the school and would not have been academically eligible had the student-athlete returned to school.

Division. This term is used to identify a grouping of NCAA teams in college football organized based on the level of competition and represented by such designations as Division I, II, or III.

Effectiveness. This term is used to describe the overall competitive athletic program as determined by the number of championships won in post season play, graduation rates, and academic progression rates of student athletes.

Final four. This designation represents the four regional champions (West, East, Midwest and Southwest) remaining from the college basketball teams that compete in the NCAA Tournament; they play one another to determine the national champion.

Gender equity. The fair and equitable treatment of both male and female student-athletes and athletic department personnel for all sports is described as gender equity.

Guarantees. These are contests in which set revenue is paid to visiting sports teams to participate in regularly scheduled athletic contests.

HBCU. Historically Black College and Universities are described by a subcommittee of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) as “black colleges . . . bound together by the fact that they were established prior to 1964 (the year of the Civil Rights Act) with the express purpose of educating African Americans. These institutions . . . are public, private, large, small, religious, nonsectarian, selective, and openenrolling” (Gasman, 2006, p.1)

Historical penalties. Restrictions placed on an institution’s athletic program based on four years of data that indicate the student-athletes have consistently performed below

the NCAA criteria for academic success are historical penalties. Such penalties include scholarship reductions, postseason competition bans, and membership restrictions.

Independents. These are schools that are not formally affiliated with NCAA Division I or II Conferences.

MEAC. The Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference is a NCAA Division I Conference composed of 11 HBCUs located along the Atlantic coastline.

NCAA. The National Collegiate Athletic Association is a voluntary association of over 1200 colleges and universities in the United States which is made up of three divisions. The role of the association is to establish standards and protect the integrity of amateurism for student-athletes.

NCAA tournament. This type of competition is a set of post season games for team sports to determine the NCAA national champions.

NIT. The National Invitational Tournament is the oldest annual college tournament in which 32 teams compete that are not selected to the NCAA Tournament.

PWI. Predominately White Institutions are described as colleges and universities that originally were established for educating predominately white students.

SIAC. The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference is a NCAA Division II Conference which is composed of 11 HBCUs located in five southern states with some of its members located on the Atlantic coastline.

SWAC. The Southwestern Athletic Conference, a NCAA Division I Conference, is currently composed of 10 HBCUs in the southern United States that participate in NCAA's Division I-AA for football and Division I for all other sports.

Title IX. This is a federal law which prohibits sex discrimination by institutions receiving federal funds.

Variable. This term is used to denote a concept, feature, or condition that contributes to effective athletic programs.

Assumptions

The assumptions associated with the study are cited below:

1. The surveyed participants responded objectively, honestly, and accurately to questions regarding variables that influence the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs.
2. The instrument used for this study provided data to accurately measure variables that determine the effectiveness of intercollegiate athletics and the potential for programs to survive as identified by athletic directors at selected institutions of higher education.
3. The interpretations of the findings accurately reflected the purpose of this study.

Limitations

The following were limitations to this study:

1. The study was limited to information acquired through a review of the literature, the use of a survey instrument, and phone interviews.
2. The study was limited to the participation of 41 HBCU institutions representing NCAA Divisions I-II athletic programs with membership in the CIAA, MEAC, SIAC, SWAC, Independent and other conferences during 2007-2008.
3. Findings may be generalized only to selected institutions of higher education with demographic characteristics similar to the population of the study.

Organization of the Study

The report of this study is organized in five chapters. Chapter I is an introduction of the study and contains the statement of the problem, the purpose and significance of the study, the research questions and operational definitions. In Chapter II, the literature related to the problem investigated is presented which addresses intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and several major issues that affect the success of athletic programs. In Chapter III, the methodology is discussed to include the selection of the population, instrumentation, and procedures for analyzing the data. The analysis of the data and a summary of findings are presented in Chapter IV. The study is summarized in Chapter V along with a listing of conclusions, assumptions, and recommendations based on the findings of the investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter contains a review of literature related to intercollegiate athletics with emphases on variables identified as pertinent to the effectiveness of programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). This study was conducted to determine if variables identified in previous studies remain as those that determine the success of HBCU athletic programs, to identify current variables that determine the effectiveness of the program, to identify possible strategies that would enhance a program's effectiveness and potential to survive, and to determine if there are differences in opinions between athletic directors at HBCUs regarding which variables influence the effectiveness of athletic programs and the potential survival. The results of the study may assist in establishing baseline data for consideration in decision making relative to HBCU intercollegiate athletics.

Sports programs that are included in intercollegiate athletic programs differ according to the mission and nature of the college or university. Typically, both contact and non-contact sports are present in most institutions governed by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). As revenue has been identified in the literature as a leading variable impacting program success (Baird, 2004; Greenlee, 2002), the most revenue generating sports at HBCUs were targeted, namely football, basketball, and baseball. The presence of these sports as a part of the history, social, cultural, and overall climate of HBCU institutions is well documented (Bass, 2002; Freeman, 1998; Miller and

Wiggins, 2004; Roebuck and Murty, 1993). Although these and other athletic programs remain a vital part of an institution's curriculum, researchers assert that because of problems such as financial instability, accreditation processes, and issues related to NCAA compliance, the likelihood of some HBCU programs continuing to succeed is not as great as non-HBCU institutions (Gasman, 2006; Provasnik and Shafer, 2004).

A number of challenges facing both HBCU and non-HBCU institutions have been cited and addressed in such documents as the Knight Commission Report: "A Call to Action" (Friday and Hesburgh, 2001), and "Challenges Facing Amateur Athletics," (2002). Further, Sandbrook (2004) and the American Council on Education (2005) are among recent sources that have traced institutions' responses to specific issues to include revenue, graduation rates, and student-athlete welfare. Selected issues and a historical background related to the research questions posed for the study are summarized in this review. Specifically, the review is divided in the following sections: Intercollegiate Athletics at HBCU Institutions; the National Collegiate Athletic Association; and Issues: Revenue, Gender Equity, and the Student-Athlete.

Historical Background

Intercollegiate Athletics at HBCU Institutions

For this review, selected programs with Division I-AA and II football that hold membership in four major conferences were included. Conferences pertinent to this study are the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC)-Division II, Central Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (CIAA)-Division II, Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC)-Division I, and Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC)-Division I. These

organizations were formed as regulatory bodies for promoting and conducting intercollegiate sports activities among black colleges in various regions of the United States. Many of the original members were church-supported colleges. The first conference was formed in 1912 (CIAA) and three others followed in 1913 (SIAC), 1920 (SWAC), and 1969 (MEAC). All conferences are members of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and collectively represent 45 HBCUs (CIAA Online,n.d.; MEAC, n.d.; SIAC, n.d.; SWAC.org, n.d.) Other HBCU athletic programs represented in the study are independent of these conferences.

Intercollegiate sports were formed on many HBCU campuses long before conferences were organized; many of the member institutions were founded in the early 1800s. The rivalry between Morehouse College and Tuskegee University beginning in 1902 and an early competition between Florida A&M University, Alabama State University and Tuskegee University in 1960 are examples of the beginning tradition of organized football at HBCUs (Chalk, 1976; SIAC, n.d.). Intercollegiate sports on these campuses today include baseball, basketball, cross country, golf, indoor track and field, tennis, volleyball, bowling, softball, and soccer. Activities are organized for both men and women athletes.

Reports of athletic conferences contain a description of the rich athletic history shared among HBCUs which includes the nature of the competitive teams, the visibility of the teams, and renowned athletes and coaches. For example, the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC, n.d.) reported that “in 1978, Florida A&M became the first black college to win the NCAA Division I-AA National Football

Championship when they defeated Massachusetts 35-28 ” (History section, ¶ 6).

Additionally, among inductees in the National Football Hall of Fame reported by SIAC were John Stallworth of Alabama A&M and Larry Little of Bethune-Cookman. Among famous coaches in this conference were Alonzo Smith and “Jake” Gaither. Other renowned athletes from this conference include Alice Coachman, the first black female to win a gold medal in any Olympic Sport, Althea Gibson (Florida A&M), the first black to win the singles title at Wimbledon, and Bill Lucas (Florida A&M), the first black general manager in baseball (Atlanta Braves).

The Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC, n.d.) has the greatest number of athletes representing the majority of conference schools that have been inducted in professional halls of fame. These include football players Lem Barney, Walter Payton and Jackie Slater (Jackson State), Mel Blount (Southern University), Willie Brown, Buck Buchanan, Willie Davis, and Charlie Joiner (Grambling State), Ken Houston (Prairie View A&M), and David “Deacon” Jones and Jerry Rice (Mississippi Valley State). Additionally, baseball greats Lou Brock (Southern University) and Bill Foster (Alcorn State) and basketball player Willis Reed (Grambling State) are in their respective profession’s hall of fame. The tradition of intercollegiate athletics in this conference has enabled it to achieve the status in football of being “the biggest draw on the Division I-AA level of the NCAA, leading the nation in average home attendance for 19 of the 20 years the I-AA division has been in existence. In fact, in 1994, the SWAC fell just 40,000 fans short of becoming the first non-Division I-A conference to attract one million fans to its home games” (SWAC, n.d., ¶ 2).

The Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC) is composed of 11 schools and includes Bethune-Cookman College, Florida A&M University, Howard University and South Carolina State University. This conference has had automatic qualifying bids for NCAA postseason play in baseball, basketball, football, softball, tennis, and volleyball for a number of years. It is recognized for producing star professional football players and for defeating teams in the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournaments held in 1997 and 2001 which were categorized as No. 2 and No.15 seed teams (MEAC, n.d.). Further, MEAC conference schools have accomplished a number of other feats that were recognized by such organizations as ESPN, USA Today, and the American Volleyball Coaches Association. The following account is one such example:

In 2004, the Lady Rattlers [Florida A&M] became the first HBCU ranked in the Top 25 American Volleyball Coaches Association (AVCA) national poll.

Bethune-Cookman earned the league's first-ever At-Large bid into the NCAA Softball Tournament in 2005 Bethune-Cookman ended its remarkable 2005 season with the league's first-ever rankings in the final softball polls, reaching No. 18 in the NFCA/USA Today Coaches poll and No. 23 in the USA Softball/ESPN.com Poll. (MEAC, n.d.)

The Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) is the oldest of the four conferences cited in this review. Its members are Bowie State University, Elizabeth City State, Fayetteville State, Johnson C. Smith University, Livingstone College, North Carolina Central University, St. Augustine's College, St. Paul's College, Shaw University, Virginia State University, Virginia Union University and Winston-Salem

University. A rich tradition of excellence in athletics is visible through television coverage of its football and basketball games and accomplishments in various sports. Notably, its member, St. Augustine's College, won the 2005 NCAA Women's Indoor Track and Field Championship. Among the conferences great players was Art Shell, a member of the NFL Hall of Fame and who is also known for his leadership in coaching the Oakland Raiders and other NFL teams (The CIAA, n.d.).

Despite their rich tradition, maintaining membership in conferences has been problematic for some HBCUs. Among issues facing HBCUs today is one that plagued the success of member schools in the early years when conferences were formed. For example, the founding members of the SWAC basically represented church-supported schools that experienced difficulties in financing athletics. Therefore, the conference's composition resulted in state-supported institutions (SWAC.org, n.d.). Today, a most prevailing issue among HBCU athletic programs is that of revenue. A review of websites for these conferences found discussions of bowl games or guarantee competitions in their efforts to support programs or discussions centered on indications of plans to increase revenue generating possibilities.

In their review of trends in athletics at Historically Black Institutions, Goss, Crow, Ashley and Jubenville (2004) cited an account of statements about financial conditions applicable to HBCUs made by former NCAA president Cedric Dempsey at the 2001 NCAA annual convention. According to Goss et al., "Dempsey cited what he termed 'the financial dilemma' faced by athletic programs' need to increase revenue to cover escalating costs as a root cause of competitive inequity, incompatibility with

academic missions, and a lack of diversity in hiring” (p. 368). Goss et al., described the revenue issue for HBCUs in terms of the inability of the institutions to continuously compete with other major conferences [such as the “Big Ten” or other Division I football programs] for revenue dollars generated through television coverage, increased expenses above revenue generated, and the system of spending required for compliance with governing regulations to include Title IX.

Challenges cited in this and other sources that impact the success of athletic programs to include those at HBCUs are graduation rates of student athletes, recruitment of talented athletes, recruitment of coaches especially for baseball, facilities and equipment, gender equity, and contributions/revenue for scholarships and resources (Greenlee, 2002; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003; Sigelman and Wahlbeck, 1999). Greenlee (2002) identified trends impacting the decline of athletics at HBCUs to include the now limited focus on baseball in predominately African American secondary schools. In past years, these schools provided a pool of talented baseball players from which college programs could recruit. The author suggested that only a small number of African American baseball coaches are available for baseball at the collegiate level. Also, the make-up of many NCAA Division I football and basketball teams at some predominately white institutions is 60-90% African American. These percentages, related to the decline Greenlee described, are indicative of a trend for a majority of the more talented African American athletes to be attracted to the visibility that some non HBCU institutions can provide through televised play and other marketing strategies (Boyd, 2003).

Additionally, the trend of hiring athletic directors and coaches that reflect the ethnic make-up of the institution limits the diversity among athletic leaders. The result of this practice is that the most recognized powerful collegiate athletic leaders are not represented through HBCUs (“Study: Few Minority,” 2004). Boyd (2003) suggested that talented athletes tend to select institutions where they see a greater potential for upward mobility to professional sports. This means that they select those institutions where the coaching staffs and programs are recognized as very powerful in collegiate athletics, resulting in part from the continuous television and other coverage they receive (Baird, 2004; Mangold, Bean, and Adams, 2003).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

The National Collegiate Athletic Association was founded in 1906 as the Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Its name was changed to the NCAA in 1910. The original basic focus of the organization was on football. According to Hawes (1999), President Theodore Roosevelt and Henry MacCracken, chancellor of New York University, were early proponents for a policy setting and regulating group for football. The association was organized for “the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States, in order that the athletic activities ... may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education” (Hawes, 1999, p.2).

Because of the number of severe injuries and deaths resulting from violent-like actions during play, the game of football was at risk of remaining a college sport. With the input of representation from a number of schools, the association created a football

rules committee, developed a reporting system for its then six districts, and over the years regulated basketball, track and field, and baseball. In the early years of the association, attention was focused on amateurism, eligibility, codes of ethics, the involvement of faculty in athletics, and other issues presented by the districts (Challenges Facing Amateur Athletics, 2002; Hawes, 1999). These are also issues currently seen in the literature regarding intercollegiate athletics

One report of the history of the NCAA is divided in periods of time: 1900-39, 1940-79, 1980-89, and 1990-99 (Hawes, 1999). Throughout these periods, actions of the NCAA have been explained in great detail. In the first period an accounting of the charter members and early activities of regulating football and basketball are presented. The second period, as Brown (1999) explained, was influenced by the appearance of televised sports, professional gambling on college games, and the need for methods whereby rules and regulations could be enforced. It was during this period that the “Sanity Code” was designed which gave rise to a modified enforcement process. This process formed the basis of how the NCAA and its Infractions Committee currently enforce its policies which address such issues as recruiting, post season play, academic standards, financial aid, and institutional commitments.

During the 1980s, women’s sports were included in the NCAA (Hawes, 1999). During this period, institutions faced the challenge of gender equity as dictated by the 1972 Title IX legislation. Scandals involving payoffs to student-athletes and altering academic records as well as a recognized need for reform in the NCAA led to the establishment of the NCAA Presidents Commission and the Student-Athlete Advisory

Committee. Additionally, the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics was formed and purported that college and university presidents take leadership of NCAA intercollegiate athletics, a position that received some opposition as did the Commission's idea that a 50% graduation rate should be required for teams participating in bowl games (Cook, 2003; Hawes, 1999). Leadership from university presidents received some opposition because of their proposals such as restricted-earnings (which resulted in a lawsuit) aimed at limiting coaching staffs, reductions in scholarships, and time spent on recruiting.

The final period, 1990-1999, was characterized by poor graduation rates, professional players with low literacy skills, and opposition to new NCAA policies including Propositions 42 and 16. Proposition 42 placed restrictions of student-athletes receiving financial aid based on low grade-point averages or low SAT/ACT scores. Proposition 16 called for increased core courses and "an initial-eligibility index that matched required test scores with grade-point averages" (Hawes, 1999, p.2). This period also saw dissatisfaction with regulations of the NCAA from the Black Coaches Association and some other well known white coaches as they registered concern that the regulations did not provide for minority and at-risk students (Hawes, 1999).

According to the membership roster (NCAA Membership, 2009), the NCAA currently contains more than 1,051 active members organized in three divisions. Division I is comprised of 331 institutions, Division II has 291, and 429 institutions are members of Division III. In the current composition of NCAA there are 95 voting conferences cited on the organization's fact sheet (NCAA.org). In the NCAA participation report,

DeHass (2009) cited that for the period 2007-08, approximately 236, 774 men and 175, 994 women make up the student-athletes that the NCAA represents. These student-athletes are represented through legislation resulting from input of the NCAA Leadership Advisory Board, volunteer members of the association, the executive staff presently headed by NCAA President Myles Brand, and a number of committees whose actions filter into the association's strategic planning process.

Similar to non-HBCU institutions, the impact of NCAA regulations over the years has been registered by personnel in conferences composed of HBCUs. With regard to the 1948 Sanity Code adopted by the NCAA, Hawes (1999) reported comments about the code made by the athletic director at Bradley University:

The restrictions in the Sanity Code were such that the majority of institutions felt they couldn't live by it it got to the point where a great many schools, especially in the South and Southeast, said that if the code was adopted, they would withdraw their membership from the NCAA. Those schools at that time were some of the few granting aid to athletes. They felt the code placed quite a restriction on the amount of financial aid that could be granted. (p. 3)

Following the abolishment of the Sanity Code, the NCAA established academic standards in relation to grade-point averages and test scores for prospective college student athletes under the title Proposition 42. This action drew opposition from such individuals as John Thompson, a black basketball coach at Georgetown University who addressed the misuse of standardized tests. Also, the Black Coaches Association threatened to boycott the NCAA because of the NCAA's position on grant-in-aid and

other actions that appeared not to consider the African-American student-athlete (Hawes, 1999).

Issues Associated with Athletics and the NCAA

A number of issues have been associated with athletics since the founding of the NCAA. All issues are not specific to Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) and all are not limited to athletics. For example, the issue of gender equity is relatively new to athletics and became more pronounced with the Title IX legislation. However, gender equity is as common an issue in employment and other areas as it is in athletics. Further, it is a concern among both HBCU and non-HBCU athletic programs.

Other common issues to which athletic leaders in colleges and universities have had to respond were cited in this review. These included the graduation rates of student athletes, recruitment of talented athletes, facilities and equipment, amateurism, eligibility, and contributions/revenue for scholarships and resources (Greenlee, 2002). Although these issues offer challenges for most higher education institutions, it appears that HBCUs in particular are faced with greater challenges because of other features characteristic of their make-up (Gasman, 2006; Roebuck and Murty, 1993). A common feature of HBCUs is the commitment to racial uplift for African Americans (Gasman, 2006).

Gasman (2006) cited conditions that increase challenges for HBCUs. Among them were that HBCUs rely heavily on outside funding sources, their level of endowment and operating funds is generally lower than those of predominately white institutions (PWIs), and their infrastructure for soliciting alumni contributions is often weak. Issues

associated with student enrollment, financial deficits, and inadequate numbers of doctorate degreed faculty have often led to problems in maintaining accreditation. Additionally, the participation rates in governance at HBCUs has been linked to an autocratic presidential leadership style, the practice of faculty in not publicly opposing the leadership, and communication difficulties among black and white faculty that may result because of dissimilarities in their ethnic, racial and socioeconomic backgrounds.

These features and others impact athletic operations. In the section to follow, the more challenging athletic issues for HBCUs included in the literature were targeted for discussion. Namely, these issues are revenue, gender equity, governance, and the student-athlete (Baird, 2004; Greenlee, 2002).

Revenue

Financial resources for athletic programs in large and small institutions are primary concerns for both the athletic director and other institutional officials, especially at HBCUs (Kimberly, 2006; Seymour, 2006). Institution-wide financial problems have led to the closing of at least 12 HBCUs (Watkins, 2005). Researchers have addressed revenue from different perspectives. In an interim report commissioned by the NCAA on the effects of spending in intercollegiate athletics, researchers Litan, Orszag, and Orszag (2003) used empirical data that contradicted views suggesting that increased spending on college sports either results in a financial advantage for schools or in bankruptcy.

Litan et al. (2003) reported that few studies exist in which researchers have examined the effects of costs associated with athletics on athletic revenue and that those studies do not contain a thorough examination of the effect on football and men's

basketball. Litan and associates completed a thorough examination of costs which included the use of multiple forms of data related to football and men's basketball in Division I-A programs for an 8-year period. Findings from the study led to the conclusion that operating costs associated with expenditures for athletics represented a small share of the total academic expenditures at the Division I-A schools. Orszag and Orszag (2005) arrived at the same conclusion in a follow-up study that used data over a 10-year period. Their findings suggested that increased spending on athletics neither increased or decreased the financial standing of institutions in terms of net operating revenue for Division I-A schools.

Despite these findings, the picture for athletic programs at HBCUs does not appear to be a question of the relationship between the amounts of an institution's budget allocated to academia versus athletics; rather, at issue is how the funds needed for the program can be generated. For example, according to Seymour (2006), operating costs for two-thirds of the athletic program at Southern University, a Division I-AA HBCU, come from student fees and ticket sales. The program depends upon an annual football classic game for the balance. Seymour acknowledged that the same is true for athletic programs at most other HBCUs.

The crucial state of affairs of revenue generation for many small schools and HBCUs is implied through their participation as visiting teams in guarantee contests in which they face competitors that overmatch them. Basketball and football games scheduled at the beginning of the seasons provide opportunities for smaller schools to compete against nationally ranked teams and to be assured of an amount or percentage of

revenue. The uneven match between teams is usually a guarantee that the smaller school will lose the game and often by a wide margin as in the football match between Florida A&M University and the University of Miami Hurricanes in 2006. Although there was a 41-point score difference in favor of the larger school, despite the scores, at stake was revenue needed and acquired for the program at the smaller school (Seymour, 2006). However, in comparison to classics, institutions cannot depend upon this source of revenue because there is no assurance when they will be provided such opportunities.

Closely associated with the ability to generate revenue is the visibility of the athletic program. Lewis (2006) observed that aside from past coverage of the Bayou Classic (Grambling and Southern Universities) on NBC, little consistent television coverage has been given to HBCUs. However, in recent years through a network agreement with ESPN, more HBCUs have been able to get exposure through televised coverage (Lewis, 2006). Lewis reported that through a seven-year agreement with the Mid-Eastern and Southwestern Athletic Conferences, games between schools in these conferences will be broadcasted on ESPNU, ESPN2 and ESPN Classic. This coverage will not only generate revenue for the schools, but will serve as a recruitment tool. Thus, the coverage will allow aspiring athletes exposure to features of different athletic programs enabling them to make more informed decisions in selecting a college (Lewis, 2006).

Linked to the need to generate revenue and for marketing is that quality athletes promote the efforts of schools to generate revenue. HBCUs are limited in their ability to attract quality athletes (Lewis, 2006). The following account which included statements

from a former football player at an HBCU provided further insight to the revenue generating and marketing dilemma:

Black college football is really viewed upon as second-tier football or at least not as good as the Division I programs, . . . it's often hard for black college programs to produce talent like that at major Division I programs. Many factors, from basic economics to the fact that the best players in a given state, say Florida for example, are heavily recruited to play at Division I programs in that state. If a blue-chip player from Florida has visions of doing a touchdown two-step on Sundays as a pro, he'll likely look to the University of Miami or Florida State University, not Bethune-Cookman College or Florida A&M University. (Lewis, 2006, ¶ 9-10)

Lewis (2009) is among individuals who suggest that HBCUs cannot automatically rely on talented black athletes to attend their schools and play on their respective teams. According to Watkins (2005), as these talented players become a part of winning records of top-ranked teams, through televised play and other mechanisms, they become economically viable for revenue generating possibilities of top athletic programs. In this regard, Watkins examined revenue generated through the NCAA in terms of the value of the black male athlete. Watkins reported that among earnings of the NCAA for 2004-2005 were \$242.9 million from bowl games which were not included in the \$485 million earned in operating revenue. Noting that the 2004 NCAA Ethnicity Report showed that blacks represented 57.9% of Division I basketball starting players and they represented 45.1% of Division I-A football starting players, Watkins concluded that 45.1% of the

\$242.9 million in revenue from bowl games could be attributed to the participation of black student-athletes. Given this conclusion, 54.9% of the revenue could be attributed to the participation of white student-athletes.

Based on the opinions Watkins (2005) expressed, the potential economic wealth from the participation of the black athlete has not assisted HBCUs. The author suggested that a transfer of a portion of the wealth through building programs for these talented individuals would assist the financially struggling HBCUs. However, in concert with views presented earlier in this section, the author observed that “the capital investment necessary to attract top athletes and to build winning athletic programs proves to be a substantial hurdle” (p. 16).

Revenue for an institution’s athletic program is generated through several sources. Depending upon program features, such as the number of sports, funds are also distributed as provided by the NCAA. For example, an NCAA Revenue Distribution Analysis (2002) contained procedures for the distribution of revenue in Division 1 institutions within such components as Broad-Based Distribution and a Special Assistance Fund for Student-Athletes. The broad-based distribution, for example, was based on weights assigned to the number of varsity sports sponsored and the number of athletics grants-in-aid awarded. Infractions posed on an institution may alter part or the total amount of the distribution. According to the document, the following stipulations were observed:

For the sports-sponsorship distribution, an institution receives a unit for each sport sponsored beginning with the 14th sport (the minimum requirement for

Division I membership). Only sports in which the NCAA conducts championships competition (which meet the minimum contests and participants requirements of Bylaw 20.9.3.3) and emerging sports for women are counted. (NCAA Revenue Distribution Analysis, 2002, Explanation Section, ¶ 2-5)

Gender Equity

The passage of Title IX in 1972 increased opportunities for the participation of women in sports at all levels of schooling. Under this legislation, colleges were required to provide gender-neutral access to participation in sports which increased the participation of women from 15% in 1972 to 42% in 2002 (Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg, 2004). Despite this increase, Anderson et al., found that many institutions were not in compliance in 2001-2002. However, the American Civil Liberties Union of the Washington Foundation (2007) reported that since the passage of Title IX, the participation of women athletes in colleges had increased from 32,000 to 171,000 by 2005. Implicit from the increase in women participation in subsequent years is that the number of institutions in compliance with Title IX also increased.

The gender compliance rates were associated with how athletes were counted as participants. Compliance for participation was measured by a three-part test established by the Office of Civil Rights. In the part one test of compliance, a determination for substantial proportionality was made by comparing the percentage of representation of men and women in sports to the overall student enrollment. However, Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg (2004) noted that duplicated figures for an athlete participating in more than one sport resulted in a better compliance rate for women. Additionally

associated with compliance rates were high population rates of women, small student bodies, low financial status of the institution, and the number of sports offered. The authors concluded that given these circumstances and insufficient resources, an institution may not be able to demonstrate substantial proportionality in gender equity to comply with NCAA standards.

Naughton (1998) suggested that the proportionality standard was challenging for predominantly black colleges. The author reported that for the 1995-96 school years, in 18 of 20 Division I schools, the proportion of women athletes was 19 percentage points lower than the proportion of women undergraduates enrolled. As cited earlier, the proportionality standard is influenced by the number of women undergraduates in an institution. In the case of some HBCUs, the proportion of women undergraduates is high and the proportion of women is often higher than that of men (Naughton, 1998).

To further explain the challenges that HBCUs have faced, Naughton (1998) noted the historical and national reputation of some HBCUs in football and stressed that participation in athletics was often limited because only a few sports were available. The ability to afford the level of expansion needed to comply with the standard was among the challenges identified. However, Naughton concluded that some of the institutions lagging behind the proportionality standard had created and expanded programs in such sports as track and field, golf, volley ball, swimming, and bowling. Carpenter and Acosta (2002) indicated that little over a one percent increase in the average number of women's teams per school in Division I had occurred since 1996.

A gender equity report that DeHass (2002) compiled for the NCAA contained overall revenues, expenses, and other information for 309 Division III institutions reporting survey data. In comparing the number of men and women engaged in athletics for the years 1997-1998 and 1999-2000, a decrease in the number of both men and women was observed for the years 1999-2000. DeHass reported that for 184 male athletes at institutions between 1999-2000, the average operating expense was \$137,000 while the average operating expense for 123 women athletes was \$94,700. Additionally, recruiting expenses for men almost doubled that for women. Inequities were also seen in salaries paid to men and women head and assistant coaches. Men head coaches were paid an average of \$25,000 more than women head coaches; men assistant coaches were paid an average of \$33,800 more than women assistant coaches.

The allocation of resources is an example of the gender issue. The issue is not reserved solely for inequalities related to women participation in sports but also to those that limit opportunities for men. In a position paper of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2003), a number of advantages of Title IX were cited and Congress was urged to maintain its intent to preserve the rights of athletes. The paper concluded with the notation that to ensure gender equity, schools should not deter opportunities for the participation of men.

Anderson and Cheslock (2004) made similar comments in their assessment of institutional strategies for gender compliance, noting the possible negative impact on men. The AAUP (2003) observed further that decreases in programs at institutions in recent years had been a result of budgetary priorities of the institutions and emphases

placed on high profile sports. The association suggested that schools should be encouraged to streamline costs for athletics and collaborate on reforms to ensure opportunities for both men and women engagement in sports.

Title IX regulations have posed concerns for many schools and colleges in their attempts to comply with requirements such as ensuring gender equity. Critics of the law have suggested recommendations for changes. For example, as a result of the dismantling of wrestling teams, the National Wrestling Coaches Association filed a lawsuit to ban the proportionality standard. In response to the lawsuit, former Secretary of Education Paige formed a commission to review the law. In a report, “Open to All” Title IX at Thirty (2003), the commission deemed the law appropriate but made recommendations regarding its clarity for compliance. Clarity of the meaning of “substantial proportionality” was made by adopting the definition as “strict proportionality” which had been commonly used by athletic departments to explain the concept.

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) is the regulatory body for Title IX and has clarified its policies and compliance standards at various intervals. The latest clarifications issued regarding gender equity came after the February 2003 report by the U.S. Secretary’s Commission on Opportunities in Athletics. OCR required compliance with regulations for gender equity to be determined by a three-part test for assessing participation compliance, the cutting or reduction of teams, and the implementation of sanctions for non-compliance (Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics, 2006).

Using the three-part test for assessing compliance, OCR allowed a school to use a survey with its student body that was designed by OCR to determine that no unmet

interest and ability of the under-represented gender existed. Although regulations would be enforced to include implementing sanctions for non-compliance, OCR determined that it would assist institutions in their efforts to comply, thus to avoid sanctions. OCR made clear the position that it did not require, and in fact found it unfavorable, the cutting or reduction of teams to promote gender equity (Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics, 2006).

Many issues associated with gender equity mirror concerns generally associated with operating athletic programs at HBCU institutions. A basic concern is revenue. Sufficient funding is required for scholarships, marketing, facilities, equipment, and other operational expenditures. Adequate funding is required to meet the needs of each sport; and in terms of gender equity, equitable funding is required for athletic programs. Equity in the awarding of scholarships is also required through Title IX.

Academic Performance and the Student-Athlete

The NCAA bylaws require that Division I members ensure that the environment for student-athletes supports the academic mission of the institution and enhances the ability of the student-athlete to earn a degree (Division I Official Notice, 2004).

Therefore, among the performance requirements are criteria established for the academic progress rate (APR) and graduation success rate (GSR) of student-athletes. Measures used by the NCAA to determine academic performance of student-athletes have changed over the years; some changes have been controversial among its membership.

The current APR standard is reflective of calculations based on points awarded for the number of student-athletes on scholarship who meet eligibility requirements. An

APR of 925 is the benchmark which translates to at least 45% of the student-athletes making appropriate progress toward the academic mission of the institution in graduating students. Institutions failing to meet the cutoff score may be penalized in the form of loss of scholarships, restrictions on recruitments, and inability to participate in postseason play. Reports of the results of the performance system for 2005 through 2007 showed that major teams involving football and basketball at institutions struggled to meet the APR standard, especially the bowl-bound teams. An associated press release (ESPN.com, 2005) reported that for 2005, 41% of the bowl-bound football teams fell below the minimum requirements for academic progress.

Reports of studies conducted by the Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport at the University of Central Florida provided the status of Division I-A bowl-bound football and Division I basketball teams for 2006 and 2007 (BSTM, 2007a, 2007b). According to the reports, in 2006, the graduation success rate (GSR) for 85.9% of the football bowl teams was above 50%; the APR for 62.5% of these teams was 925 or above. Similarly, in 2006, the GSR for 64% of the basketball teams was above 50%; the GSR in 2007 for 64.1% of the teams was above 50%. Although these rates showed improvement, the persistent concern as cited in the report was the gap which exists between the rates for white and African-American student-athletes.

According to the report, although the graduation rate of all men student-athletes in 119 Division I-A schools for 2006 was higher than men non-athletes in these schools, the African-American graduation rate for football student-athletes was 49% compared to 62% for white student-athletes (BSTM, 2007a). The report noted that the graduation rates

were lower in men's basketball than any other college sport. In Division I basketball, 59% of men basketball student-athletes graduated. According to the percentages cited, fewer African-American student-athletes graduated than did white student-athletes in this sport. The GSR for African-American student-athletes was reported as 51%, while the GSR for white student-athletes was 76% (BSTM, 2007b).

In a report of the NCAA Division I Committee on Academic Performance Meeting (2007), the penalties for a team whose APR falls below 900 were detailed. The report stipulated that beginning with the 2006-2007 term any team with an APR below 900 that failed to demonstrate acceptable progress on an improvement plan would be subject to historical penalties. Historical penalties may include restrictions on financial aid, team practice, and postseason play for institutions whose data on student-athletes over a four-year period show consistent performance below the NCAA criteria for academic success.

The report also indicated criteria for determining whether a waiver of contemporaneous and or historical penalties would be permitted based on characteristics of the institution. Contemporaneous penalties occur when a team's APR is below 925 and an academically ineligible student-athlete is no longer retained. The grant-in-aid of the ineligible student-athlete cannot be awarded to another player; therefore, the team's financial aid limit is reduced by the financial award calculated for the non-retained student-athlete. Information from an academic progress rate research report (Academic Progress Rate, 2010) revealed that 215 (3.5%) of Division I athletic teams fell below the 925 score for contemporaneous penalties during the school year 2006-07. Of the 99

sports teams that were subject to contemporaneous penalties in 2006-07, there were 23 football teams, 17 men basketball teams, and 9 women basketball teams.

Summary Statement

According to citations in the literature reviewed, HBCUs have faced many challenges including meeting compliance standards of the NCAA. Issues related to APR and graduation rates, gender equity, and provisions for the student-athlete have also been identified among the challenges. These and other challenges appearing in the literature have been associated with the success of athletics at HBCUs. As a result of these challenges, especially related to revenue, some institutions including Fisk University (Tennessee) withdrew participation from the NCAA and or eliminated one or more of their athletic programs (Johnson, 2008).

A small number of studies have been conducted that involved directors of HBCU athletic programs in examining the variables that affect the success of their programs. Guidance from such studies may have a positive impact by providing creative and proactive measures in the administration of athletic programs. These measures may then prevent institutions from eliminating programs or withdrawing membership from national accrediting agencies. To this end, among reasons for conducting this research study was to identify actions that athletic directors envisioned would assist their program to survive the impact of current NCAA policies. These policies include gender equity and possible future regulations of the NCAA regarding student-athletic stipends. The researcher surveyed athletic directors at HBCUs to identify variables perceived to determine the effectiveness of athletic programs, how specific variables influence athletic operations at

HBCU institutions, and what influence the variables may have on the potential for program survival.

The procedures used to investigate athletic directors perceptions of variables that determine the effectiveness and potential for survival of their programs are presented in Chapter III. The chapter contains a discussion of participants, the instrument used to collect data, and methods for analyzing the data.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to determine the perceptions of athletic directors regarding variables that affect the effectiveness of athletic programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities whose football program was in NCAA Division I-AA. Further, a determination was made regarding whether or not perceptions of variables differed for HBCU athletic directors with Division I-AA football from those of athletic directors at HBCUs whose programs were in other NCAA divisions. Data were collected through a questionnaire modified from the survey instrument that Goss et al. (2004) used in their athletic study. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analysis. The methodology for conducting the study described in this chapter is as follows: the population, instrumentation, procedures, and data analysis.

Population

The participants targeted for this study consisted of the total population of 50 athletic directors employed at HBCUs designated as NCAA Division I-II institutions. These directors were representative of athletic programs with membership in the CIAA, MEAC, SIAC, SWAC and independent conferences. A directory of athletic directors in various divisions developed by the NCAA was used to identify the participants targeted for the study.

Instrumentation

A questionnaire instrument with space for open-ended responses contained items and questions related to the following categories: funding/revenue, gender equity, NCAA

policies, academics, student-athlete, minority representation, and expertise of athletic directors, revenue/funding influence, NCAA influence, and actions employed for variables. A copy of the instrument can be found in Appendix A. The instrument was a modification of the instrument used in the athletic study completed by Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004). The instrument was modified in its structure and through the addition of categories and variables. Goss et al. identified five categories of actions that participants were asked to indicate when they anticipated these actions would occur in NCAA Division I-AA HBCU athletics. The categories were (a) student-athlete, (b) academics, (c) NCAA, (d) gender equity, and (e) funding issues.

The instrument was modified to include variables frequently listed in the intercollegiate literature, to ensure the presentation of variables that may impact the success of athletic programs, and to provide athletic directors the opportunity to respond by reflecting on practice at their institutions. The modified instrument contained 9 categories of variables that may determine or influence program effectiveness and activities directors and institutions may use to address variables that may inhibit program effectiveness. An additional component was designed for participants to suggest changes in program operations that may have a positive influence on the potential for program effectiveness. These modifications were intended to permit a more meaningful analysis of the efforts and status of HBCUs in their attempts to sustain successful athletic programs.

Participants were requested to give their perceptions of variables influencing athletic programs through responding to positive, closed-ended statements organized on a 5-point Likert scale which ranged from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Each item

had a possible score of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 with 5 as the *highest possible* score on each item, and 1 as the *lowest possible* score. Fifty-eight items were listed for responses on the 5-point scale; the highest possible total score was 290 and the lowest total possible score was 58. Another part of the survey contained eight closed-response activities related to all categories on the instrument. Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency (1 = *none*; 2 = *some*; 3 = *often*) that each listed action was employed to address or overcome those variables that did not lead to an effective program and inhibited program survival.

Content validity of the instrument was established through a logical relevancy approach involving expert review and a field test of the questionnaire. Content validity refers to the degree that the instrument measures the intended content. According to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2005) establishing content validity entails item and sampling validity. The appropriateness of the item's content for measuring the content is described as item validity. Sampling validity involves assessing the instrument for its appropriateness in sampling the total content area. Research methodology experts agree that the most appropriate method of establishing content validity is through expert judgment or peer review (Creswell, 2003; Gay et al., 2005).

An expert review panel was established and included individuals with expertise in training sports administrators and or serving as athletic directors. Reviewers ($N = 3$) were selected based on the first respondents meeting the criteria who agreed to review the instrument. Reviewers consisted of a professor responsible for training athletic directors and two former athletic directors with experience in NCAA Division 1-II schools. Reviewers rated the strength of items in each category on a 5-point scale for content and

structure. Composite ratings of 4.7, 4.8, and 4.7 resulted in a mean score of 4.7 which supported content validity in addition to statements of the reviewers confirming that content of the questions were appropriate.

The reliability of the instrument to consistently measure its content was determined through a field test of the instrument administered to another group of experts in the field ($n = 7$) that included former athletic directors, coaches, and professors who trained athletic directors. These individuals represented different areas of the United States including Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. Experience in their fields ranged from 3-25 years. *The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 15.0 (SPSS)* was used to apply Cronbach's alpha and the Guttman Split-Half coefficient for internal consistency (Gay, Mills, and Airasian, 2005).

The split-half reliability test was completed because the procedure is appropriate when only one administration of the instrument is feasible for the selected population. The split-half test is also appropriate for use when the instrument contains many items (Creswell, 2003). Once the instrument was administered, the data were entered in the *SPSS* software where 5-point scale odd and even items in three sections of the questionnaire were computed to find the internal consistency of the two halves. The minimum to maximum scale score range per respondent was originally 36 to 180 for the variables identified as affecting program effectiveness in sections of the questionnaire. Calculations of the reliability test resulted in the deletion of one item in part 2 which adjusted the range of scores from 35 to 175. The sum of the ratings across the scale was 988 for the 7 respondents. Calculation of the Guttman's Split-Half Reliability resulted in

Cronbach's alpha value of .871 for part 1 ($n = 18$), .904 for part 2 ($n = 17$), and an overall coefficient of .865. Gay et al. (2005) suggested that a high coefficient indicates that an instrument has a good split-half reliability and that a coefficient of .80 is indicative of a good level of reliability. The Guttman Split-Half coefficient of .87 found was interpreted as indicative of the instrument being reliable with caution because of the small number of participants who pre-tested the instrument.

Procedures

A concurrent mixed method design (Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003; Teddlie and Tashakkori, 2006) was employed to determine perceptions of the status of HBCU's athletic programs and implications for their survival. Tashakkori and Teddlie described the design as multistrand involving the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data for answering a single type of research question. These authors explained that the two types of data are collected independently at the same time or after a period of time. Teddlie and Tashakkori (2006) further explained that the purpose of the concurrent mixed method design was to permit the use of independent strands to answer exploratory and confirmatory questions (p.20).

As suggested by the design procedures, inferences for the study's results were made from a statistical analysis of questionnaire responses and from a content analysis of narrative and phone interview comments. Data generated from the comment sections on the instrument were categorized based on open codes and codes generated through the research questions to identify relevant themes or trends. Neuendorf (2002) supported the rationale for using a process of open or emergent coding in content analysis as follows:

When existing theory or research literature cannot give a complete picture of the message pool [as judged by leaders of HBCUs based on the focus of this study], the researcher may take a more practical approach. The researcher may need to immerse himself or herself in the world of the message pool and conduct a qualitative scrutiny of a representative subset of the content to be examined. In this way, variables emerge from the message pool, and the investigator is well-grounded in the reality of the messages. (pp. 102-103)

The open code scheme for analyzing narratives from the questionnaire and interview responses in this study involved an inductive approach. The researcher identified patterns that emerged from counting words, phrases, and sentences that expressed ideas relative to the operation of athletic programs and actions that would likely lead to continuing success of the programs. Chunks of similar responses were assigned alphabets to correspond to a category such as “A” for resources or “B” for student-athletes. The researcher reviewed chunks of categorized responses for consistency and identified relationships between categories which permitted conclusions to be drawn from the data.

Data were collected through a questionnaire e-mailed to athletic directors currently employed in NCAA I-II schools. E-mail addresses were identified from a directory of athletic directors. An information sheet (see Appendix B) detailing the purpose of the study and requesting the consent of participants accompanied the questionnaire. Procedures for maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of

respondents were followed which included destroying the e-mail after receipt from respondents to eliminate any links with data and the participants.

Participants were asked to respond and return the survey within a two-week period. As suggested in the educational research literature, a second communication was required as the initial response rate ($n = 10$ or 20%) was lower than 70% (Gay, Mills, and Airasian, 2005). The second communication yielded a 50% ($n = 25$) late response rate. Therefore, phone interviews were conducted with a sub sample ($N = 15$ or 30%) of non-responding participants who requested to complete the survey in this manner. Usable returns from 41 participants resulted in an 82% response rate. All raw data were kept secured in a locked file at the residence of the researcher.

Data Analysis

Questionnaire data were analyzed using the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 15.0 (SPSS)*. Results of the analysis were reported through descriptive statistics which included percent, means, and calculations for Chi-square. Research Question 1 was analyzed through descriptive statistics. These statistics were reported in tabular form to further describe the results of the study. Research Question 2 was analyzed through the application of the Chi-square to *Likert* scaled responses. Chi-square, a form of inferential statistics, is used to compare frequency counts to determine if a significant difference exists between the expected and observed frequencies of occurrences between the groups or events (Gay et al., 2005). Chi-square Goodness of Fit was used to determine if there was a significant difference in participants' opinions of variables that influence program effectiveness. The .05 level of significance was established as the region of rejection.

Chi-square was used to compare frequencies found for 58 questionnaire items with point values assigned from 5-1 (*strongly agree* = 5; *strongly disagree* = 1) and 8 items with values from 3-1 (*often*, *some*, *none*). These responses were from athletic directors of HBCU Division I programs and those of Divisions II programs regarding their opinions of variables that determine the effectiveness of the programs and their potential to survive.

The researcher used a coding scheme that linked open-ended responses to categories such as student-athlete, marketing, and the NCAA to determine the number of times recurring words and phrases emerged and to analyze the content of responses. Codes from narrative data allowed for the identification of themes, analysis of similarities and differences in responses, and for summarizing the content of responses. Analysis of data for Research Question 1 included the use of content analysis. Content analysis was used to identify themes from open-ended questionnaire items and interviews that were linked to the frequency and percentage of like responses on closed-ended questionnaire items. A detailed analysis is found in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify variables that athletic directors perceived would determine the effectiveness of athletic programs in the current NCAA Division I-AA and Division II structure. The purpose of this study was also to determine if opinions differed among athletic directors at HBCUs with Division I-AA football and those at other HBCU institutions whose football or other intercollegiate athletic programs were within lower NCAA divisions. Few studies were reported in the literature where researchers investigated variables affecting the operation or effectiveness of athletics at HBCUs (Goss et al., 2004); therefore, this study was designed to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning variables and trends impacting HBCU athletic programs and suggested alternatives for program success.

The investigation focused on HBCU institutions whose football programs had a designation of NCAA I-AA for the 2005-2007 academic terms. Chapter IV contains the analysis and results of data collected through a survey questionnaire and telephone interviews. The chapter also contains a discussion of the findings pertaining to the research questions.

Analysis of Data Collected

Surveys (see Appendix A) were e-mailed to 50 Division I and II respondents in HBCUs throughout the United States. Twenty-six usable instruments were returned through e-mail. Another 15 instruments were completed through phone interviews.

Responses to a total of 41 usable surveys were secured through e-mail and phone interviews yielding a response rate of 82%. The sample included 22 I-AA, 6 D-I, and 13 D-II directors. The instrument contained a total of 66 closed-ended response items in 10 categories with an additional part provided for comments. Items represented potential effectiveness variables in categories which included revenue, equity, and NCAA policies.

The demographic profile section of the instrument required identification of the NCAA division and institutional enrollment. Additionally, data were secured on gender, age, experience, and professional training of the participant. Not all participants completed each demographic item; therefore, incomplete items were coded as 0 for no response. The results from the analysis of the narrative portion of the instrument were also limited as only 24% ($n = 10$) of the participants completed the comment section of the survey.

For participants completing the demographic profile section, 20 (59%) of them were males and 14 (41%) were females. These participants varied in the amount of academic training received, especially related to the level of degree attained. For degrees held, 46.3% of the participants had only attained the bachelor degree, 43.9% had earned a master's degree, and 9.8% held advanced degrees which included the specialist and doctorate.

The areas of academic concentration for participants with the master's degree (43.9%) were more closely associated with some field of management, administration, or area within health, physical, and recreation education. Table 1 contains participants' years of experience as athletic director of an HBCU athletic program. According to

Table 1

Frequency of Years of Experience as Athletic Director

Years	<i>f</i>	ρ	Cumulative ρ
0	1	2.4	2.4
1	6	14.6	17.1
2	4	9.8	26.8
3	5	12.2	39.0
4	2	4.9	43.9
5	2	4.9	48.8
6	2	4.9	53.7
7	5	12.2	65.9
8	3	7.3	73.2
9	3	7.3	80.5
10	1	2.4	82.9
11	1	2.4	85.4
13	2	4.9	90.2
15	2	4.9	95.1
17	1	2.4	97.6
31	1	2.4	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

the demographic profile of participants, experiences ranged from 1-31 years. As shown in Table 1, the years 1, 3, and 7 were representative of the most frequent years of experience for 39% of participants in the study.

Research Questions

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 15.0 (SPSS) was used to analyze quantitative data for each of the research questions. The analyses included the use of cross tabulations of demographics to questionnaire items and the Chi-square Goodness of Fit Test to determine differences in responses based on participants' gender, age, experience, degree, and football division (NCAA Division I-AA and Division II). Specifically, Chi-square was used to identify if significant differences existed in the opinions of athletic directors who were in different divisions regarding variables they identified as impacting the success of their athletic programs. Descriptive statistics including frequencies and means were also used to describe results.

Content analysis was used with data collected through comments on the questionnaire and from phone interviews. Content analysis involved organizing the information according to the concepts presented. Following recommendations in the research methodology literature (Creswell, 2003), the researcher identified concepts through observing original words of each participant and then organized them in patterns that emerged from their responses. This process involved comparing new data from each questionnaire with the emerging clusters of data to determine any changes in patterns that were already found. Once these determinations were made, data were linked with themes based on each of the research questions. The results for each question follow.

Research Question 1. What variables are ranked highest to determine the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs?

Findings for Research Question 1

Data for this question were secured from all sections of Part I of the questionnaire. Participants indicated their level of agreement with 58 closed-ended responses arranged in 9 categories of success variables. This section of the questionnaire also contained space for open-ended responses. Variables identified as Revenue/Funding in Part 1, Category 1 contained seven items: (a) college/university funding, (b) corporate sponsorship, (c) facilities, (d) televised games, (e) bowl games, (f) alumni donations, and (g) support groups. Table 2 contains the frequency of the level of agreement that participants selected for the seven items included in this category that determine the effectiveness of athletic programs at HBCUs.

Table 2

Frequency of Variables Affecting Program Effectiveness in Category 1

Scale	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	Cumulative <i>p</i>
No Response	9	3.0	3.0
Strongly Disagree	10	4.0	7.0
Disagree	40	14.0	21.0
Undecided	29	10.0	31.0
Agree	107	37.0	68.0
Strongly Agree	92	32.0	100.0
Total	287		

Note. *N* = 41.

For these items in Part I of the questionnaire, 37% of the responses to the “agree” choice were indicated by the 41 participants. Thirty-two percent of the responses constituted the “strongly agree” choice. As indicated in Table 2, there were 29 (10%) undecided responses and nine (3%) no responses to items.

College/University Funding was one of the seven items included in Part I (Categories 1-7) of the questionnaire for Category 1, Revenue/Funding. Application of the Chi-square test to each of the seven items resulted in values that were significant at the .05 level. Evidence of variables perceived to determine program effectiveness was found through an examination of observed and expected frequencies as shown in Table 3 which contains statistics for the item College/University Funding.

Table 3

Chi-square Statistics for the College/University Funding Item

Scale	OF	EF	χ^2	df	Significance
Disagree	2	10.3	36.951	3	.001
Undecided	1	10.3			
Agree	13	10.3			
Strongly Agree	25	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

As shown in Table 3, twenty-five participants agreed very strongly that this variable determined program success. The Chi-square value for all seven items of Revenue Funding exceeded the critical value for significance. In an attempt to extrapolate more information about which items within Category 1, Revenue/Funding were responded to with similar levels of agreement, a calculation of the mean scores for items was completed. Table 4 contains scores based on participants' level of agreement on five items included in Revenue Funding that determine program effectiveness.

Table 4

Means for Effectiveness of Category 1 Revenue/Funding Items

Item	Agree/ Strongly Agree <i>f/p</i>	Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Undecided <i>f/p</i>	M
College/University Funding	38/92.7	3/7.3	4.49
Facilities	34/82.9	7/17.1	4.20
Corporate Sponsorship	32/78.0	9/22.0	3.95
Alumni Donations	30/73.2	11/26.8	3.78
Support Groups	28/68.3	13/31.7	3.59

Note. *N* = 41.

As shown in the table, mean scores of four or above were found for college/university funding and facilities as variables affecting program effectiveness. A review of these means suggests that participants felt more strongly about these variables than others in the category. The mean for corporate sponsorship was 3.95, alumni donations, 3.78, and support groups, 3.59. All other items (televised games; bowl games) had mean scores of 3.1 which represented that participants were undecided.

The remaining six categories for Part I of the questionnaire were (a) gender equity, (b) NCAA policies, (c) academics, (d) student-athlete, (e) diversity, and (f) athletic director's expertise. Categories 8 and 9 are discussed in another section of this chapter. Participants' opinions relative to Gender Equity resulted from responses to items in Category 2. In participants' responses to items in Category 2, participants indicated that program funding for gender equity and salary equity were leading effectiveness variables.

Participants agreed that all items listed as variables that related to NCAA Policies (Category 3) were success variables. Among NCAA policy items, the item financial aid/scholarships was identified as the leading variable and governance was identified as the lowest influential variable in this category. The three most frequently selected questionnaire items that participants used to describe academics as a determinant of program effectiveness were academic standards, graduation rates, and grade point averages. Items less frequently selected in this category were academic progression rate and ACT/SAT/standardized test scores. These items were listed in Category 4.

Response choices to variables related to the Student-Athlete (Category 5) were split. For example, the frequency of “agree and strongly agree” responses to the variables, recruitment of athletes and support services was greater than the same type responses to the variables stipends and sportsmanship. Opinions varied on the latter items as participants chose more responses of all possible choices than for any other variables in Category 5.

Variations in agreement also existed for the Diversity (Category 6) variables. For the variable, number of ethnic minority coaches serving as a determinant of program effectiveness, 68.3% ($n = 28$) of the participants either agreed or strongly agreed with the item; however, 14.6% ($n = 6$) were undecided and 17.1% ($n = 7$) either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Participants’ responses were similar for the variable, number of minority student-athletes. In Table 5, the combined percentages for types of responses are

Table 5

Means for Effectiveness of Category 6 Diversity Items

Item	Agree/ Strongly Agree/ No Response <i>f/p</i>	Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Undecided <i>f/p</i>	M
Number of Ethnic Minority Coaches	18/10-68.3	3/4/6-31.7	3.66
Number of Minority Student-Athletes	14/12/1- 65.8	2/4/8-34.2	3.61

Note. $N = 41$.

presented along with the corresponding means and standard deviations for the items.

Participants who agreed that the number of minority student-athletes determine program effectiveness represented 63.4 % ($n = 26$) of the participants. Another 14.7% ($n = 6$) were not in agreement; 19.5% ($n = 8$) were undecided and 2.4% ($n = 1$) did not respond.

The final set of items in this seven-part category for Research Question 1 was the Athletic Director's Expertise (Category 7). The percentage of agree/strongly agree responses for the variables administrative support (85.4%) and program supervision (87.8%) was indicative of a high level of agreement between participants on the importance of these variables to program effectiveness. The highest level of agreement among participants was found for the supervision item. The item also had the lowest number of participants not responding or indicating undecided in this category of questions. Agreement percentages ranged from 80.5% to 82.9% for the items selecting and training staff and knowledge of financial management. The frequency of strongly agree and agree responses to public relations as a variable for success was less than any other variable.

Category 8 for Part 1 of the questionnaire contained 14 items for which participants rated the degree that Revenue/Funding influenced the effectiveness of the athletic program. Items included in this category for the Influence of Revenue/Funding on program effectiveness differed from those in Category 1 which were identified as determiners of program success. Category 8 items were (a) attracting talented athletes, (b) differentiated athletic program structure, (c) sports sponsored, (d) conference membership, (e) college or university mission, (f) athletic program mission, (g) provision

to support equitable opportunities for all, (h) demonstration of ethical conduct, (i) student-athlete welfare, (j) win-loss ratio, (k) program decision-making, (l) faculty representatives, (m) camps and clinics, and (n) attendance. Table 6 contains statistics for the items attracting talented athletes and win-loss ratio.

Table 6

Means for Two Category 8 Items			
Item	Very Strong Influence	Other Influence	
	<i>f/p</i>	<i>f/p</i>	M
Attracting Talented Athletes	38/92.7	3/7.3	4.59
Win-Loss Ratio	38/92.7	3/7.3	4.39
Cumulative Total	38/92.7	41/100.0	

Note. *N* = 41.

Percentages for attracting talented athletes and win-loss ratio were above 90 as reflected in Table 6. The data included in Table 6 under “Other Influence” is based on a composite of the influences that participants identified as “some” and “limited influences” for the variables. One participant cited limited influence for win-loss ratio (Item 10) and two indicated limited influence for attracting talented athletes (Item 1). The lowest percentages for items having a strong or very strong influence on program success were faculty representatives (58.5%), camps and clinics (58.6%), college/university

mission (60.9%), and athletic program mission (73.1%). Percentages for very strong or strong influence on all other items ranged from 75.6% to 85.4%.

The final component for Part 1(Category 9) requested opinions of the degree of NCAA influence on program effectiveness for 12 items. The degrees of influence were the following: no influence, limited, some, strong, and very strong. Means and deviations for items having the lowest percentages for no or limited influence responses appear in Table 7.

Table 7

Means for NCAA Items: Simplify Regulation, Attendance, Marketability, Tighter Rules on Performance Enhancing Substances

Item	No/Limited Influence <i>f/p</i>	M
Simplify Regulation	3/7.3	3.63
Attendance	3/7.3	3.68
Marketability	2/4.8	3.76
Tighter Rules on Performance Enhancing Substances	4/9.8	3.32

Note. *N* = 41.

The statistics for the four items shown in Table 7 were for items that participants did not identify as having strong influence. Two other items in Category 9 that do not appear in the table received a mean score of four or above. On the item revenue generating, 73.2% of the participants selected very strong or strong influence and a mean of 4.07 was found. On the accountability item, 78.1% of respondents indicated very or strong influence and a mean of 4.12 resulted.

Part II of the questionnaire (Category 10) provided further clarity on variables influencing the effectiveness of athletic programs at HBCUs. Eight items were listed for participants' responses to the frequency of activities completed to address or overcome variables that did not lead to an effective program. These items were (a) appearances on local television or radio broadcasts, (b) organizing advisory boards, (c) requiring tutorial services for student-athletes, (d) networking for financial support, (e) procedures to influence community attitudes about athletics, (f) establishing clearer lines of communication with top administrators, (g) establishing incentives for attracting quality personnel, and (h) marketing strategies to increase diversity among student-athletes.

In addition to analyzing the individual responses through descriptive statistics, where appropriate, responses were cross referenced to responses in Part I of the instrument. From the analysis of responses, the researcher found that the single action most often taken by the majority (51.2%) of participants to address variables impeding program success was requiring tutorial services for student-athletes. Organizing advisory boards ranked first in actions that were completed "sometimes" (63.4%).

Actions implemented in the athletic program that participants most frequently selected as occurring “sometimes” were (a) appearances on local television or radio broadcasts (53.7%) and (b) networking for financial support (51.2%). Some participants indicated they did not employ any of the eight actions. Percentages for the “none” choice ranged from 2.4% ($n = 1$ for the item networking for financial support) to 9.8% ($n = 4$ for the item appearances on local television or radio broadcasts). Although 4.9% of the participants either did not view networking for financial support as a tool to promote effectiveness or did not respond, trends from written comments and the percentages of “sometime use” (51.2%) and “often use” (43.9%) supported this process.

Comments supporting acquisition of funds through networking were included in write-in components of the questionnaire. These comments included the following:

More involvement with NCAA major sponsors to enhance revenue.

Revenue [acquired] through non-traditional revenue sources. Revenue/funding via community support.

Other actions suggested for promoting effectiveness based on changes in the NCAA were also cited. These suggestions included the following:

Forcing the BCS Conferences to share football revenues with other divisions and conferences.

[acquiring] NCAA enhancement money.

NCAA funding to improve academics, and opportunities for training.

Providing additional resources to assist the HBCUs with staffing shortages in critical areas.

Actions cited related to changes in the NCAA were also linked to how participants viewed the influence of NCAA on program effectiveness.

Participants responded to 12 questionnaire scale items for the Influence of the NCAA. The scale included the following: no influence, limited, some, strong, and very strong influence. An overall summary of the degree of influence for Category 9 is presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Summary of Responses for the Influence of NCAA on Program Effectiveness

Scale	<i>f</i>	ρ	Cumulative ρ
No Influence	1	2.4	2.4
Limited Influence	1	2.4	4.9
Some Influence	13	31.7	36.6
Strong Influence	23	56.1	92.7
Very Strong Influence	3	7.3	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

As may be observed in Table 8, the majority of the participants agreed that the NCAA has an influence on program effectiveness. A very strong influence was cited by

7.3% of the participants, while 56.1% identified a strong influence and 31.7% indicated the variables had some influence on program effectiveness. Items in Category 9 included the structure of NCAA and its policies related to such areas as generating revenue, sanctions on gambling, and performance enhancing substances.

A major influence associated with NCAA was related to generating revenue. The level of influence for this item was evident through both comments and responses to items. Information about the responses was extrapolated through a review of frequencies and percentages. Information is presented in Table 9 for participants' responses to the influence on NCAA on the item, revenue generating.

Table 9

Frequency of Responses to the Influence of NCAA on Generating Revenue

Scale	<i>f</i>	<i>p</i>	Cumulative <i>p</i>
No Influence	1	2.4	2.4
Limited Influence	1	2.4	4.9
Some Influence	9	22.0	26.8
Strong Influence	13	31.7	58.5
Very Strong Influence	17	41.5	100.0
Total	41	100.0	

As indicated in Table 9, the majority of participants found the NCAA to have a strong or very strong influence on revenue generating for athletic programs. These findings are also supported by results of a test of significance of observed and expected frequencies of responses. Through calculations of the Chi-square test, differences in the frequencies for all possible responses were statistically significant, $\chi^2(4, N = 41) = 24.976$, $p = .001$ which exceeded the established significance level. Seventeen observed and 8.2 expected frequencies for the very strong response resulted.

The level of agreement of influence was also supported through open-ended responses on the questionnaire. Revenue needs were also implicit in comments regarding other changes noted for NCAA operations. For example, “more television exposure,” “specific marketing initiatives for HBCUs,” and “championships [should have] teams paired [corresponding] to school sizes, [and] program football division” were expressions indicative of the potential influence that the NCAA could have on future program effectiveness.

Additionally, from the open-ended comments the theme of emphases on the welfare of student-athletes emerged. Samples of views regarding NCAA changes that would support the student-athlete were the following: “Allow student athletes, regardless of scholarship situations, the ability to hold full-time jobs in or out of season,” and “Make mandatory academic avenues such as tutors.” Further, from an analysis of the narrative section of the questionnaire, the researcher found that participants’ comments supported the finding from their responses to scale items that recruitment of athletes and support services affect program success.

In essence, based on the analysis of data for Research Question 1, participants perceived that several variables determined the effectiveness of programs at HBCU institutions. These variables were categorized as follows: (a) Revenue/Funding, (b) Gender Equity, (c) NCAA Policies, (d) Academics, (e) Student-Athlete, (f) Diversity, and (g) Athletic Director's Expertise. Within these categories, the leading variables affecting the success of the program were College/University Funding, Generating Revenue, Program Funding for Gender Equity, Salary Equity, Financial Aid/Scholarships, Facilities, the Recruitment of Athletes, Support Services for Athletes, and Accountability. An implication from these findings is that money is the basic overall arching factor required to ensure program success and survival.

Responses for Research Question 1 were also used to identify activities associated with the institution or the NCAA that athletic directors determined affect the success of programs. An important institutional activity identified was providing tutorial services for student-athletes. The need for funding for this activity is implied as is also the case with the other variables cited. Athletic directors concluded that some funding needs may be addressed through some changes in NCAA policies.

A strong influence of the NCAA on revenue generating for athletic programs was identified in the structure of championship teams which also has implications for the types of television exposure teams receive and the marketability of programs. Additionally, a policy whereby the BCS Conferences would be required to share football revenue with other divisions and conferences was recommended to assist with generating revenue for athletic programs at HBCUs. According to the findings, given the

requirements athletic directors cited for the success of athletic programs, including actions that can occur at the institutional and NCAA levels, the revenue variable was threaded throughout success variables more frequently than any other single variable.

Research Question 2. Do athletic directors at HBCU Division I-AA and non- Division I-AA football institutions differ in their perceptions of which variables are more important that influence program effectiveness?

Findings for Research Question 2

Responses to questionnaire items were analyzed with respect to the demographic profiles of respondents. Responses were cross-referenced to years of experience as athletic director, degree level, age, gender, and athletic NCAA division for football and basketball. The Chi-square was used to test for statistically significant differences for this research question.

The researcher found that participants representing different divisions of the NCAA did not differ in their perception on variables identified for influencing program effectiveness and the potential for program survival. A review of responses for participants in Division I-AA and non-Division I-AA with programs in football and basketball found similar responses of participants for all divisions on the 14 items in the category, Influence of Revenue Funding. Seventy-five percent of Division I-AA respondents and 71.4% of participants representing other divisions indicated that revenue funding had a strong influence on program success.

The following items were included in the Revenue Funding Category:

(a) attracting talented athletes, (b) differentiated athletic program structure, (c) sports sponsored, (d) conference membership, (e) college/university mission, (f) athletic program mission, (g) provision to support equitable opportunities for all, (h) demonstration of ethical conduct, (i) student-athlete welfare, (j) win-loss ratio, (k) program decision-making, (l) faculty representatives, (m) camps and clinics, and (n) attendance. Among the 14 items in the Revenue Funding Category, only in five instances were there responses of no influence by one or two respondents. These items were (a) conference membership (2.4%); (b) college/university mission (4.9%); (c) athletic program mission (2.4%); (d) demonstration of ethical conduct (2.4%), and faculty representatives (2.4%). In these cases when a no influence response was obtained, more than half of the participants either listed strong or very strong influence for the item. The statistics presented in Table 10 for the Influence of Revenue Funding on attracting

Table 10

Chi-square Test for Influence of Revenue Funding on Attracting Talented Athletes

Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	df	Significance
Limited Influence	2	10.3	49.439	3	.001
Some Influence	1	10.3			
Strong Influence	9	10.3			
Very Strong Influence	29	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

talented athletes are representative of findings for all items cited for this category of variables.

Results shown in Table 10 reflect that 70.7% of the respondents perceived that Revenue Funding has a very strong influence on the ability to attract talented athletes. The strong influence choice followed as the next highest percentage (21.9%). No participant indicated that Revenue Funding did not influence the ability to attract talented athletes.

Frequency counts of the opinions of participants about variables perceived to determine program success were compared. The finding from the comparison was that 27 participants indicated that items in Categories 1-7 led to program effectiveness. Twenty-nine participants indicated that items in Category 8 strongly influenced program success, 6 participants indicated items had a very strong influence, and 6 indicated that items had some influence on the success of the athletic program

Agreement of participants on success variables and their influence was found for items in Revenue Funding and other categories of variables despite their age, gender, years of experience, or institutional size. Tables on pages 73-78 contain statistics used to describe the differences in the observed and expected frequencies for the influence of leading variables. These variables were associated with Academics, the Student-Athlete, and Expertise of the Athletic Director on program success.

Table 11

Chi-square Test for Effectiveness of Graduation Rates on Program Success

Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	<i>df</i>	Significance
No Response	1	10.3	39.488	3	.001
Undecided	2	10.3			
Agree	12	10.3			
Strongly Agree	26	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

Of the seven items listed for the Academic variable, 63.4% of the participants strongly agreed that graduation rates affected program effectiveness as determined through the observed frequencies reported in Table 11. The item had a mean score of 4.49 and was followed by academic standards for which 51.2% of participants strongly agreed were success determiners. Table 12 contains similar results for an item associated with the Student-Athlete variable.

Table 12

Chi-square Test for Effectiveness of Recruitment of Athletes on Program Success

Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	df	Significance
Undecided	1	13.7	32.244	2	.001
Agree	10	13.7			
Strongly Agree	30	13.7			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

The responses listed in Table 12 were from 73% of the participants who strongly agreed with recruitment of athletes as a success variable. A statistically significant difference was found in the observed and expected frequencies. Application of the Chi-square test to the variable supports that the participants perceived the item as a variable that is related to program effectiveness.

Items associated with the variable, Expertise of the Athletic Director were (a) public relations, (b) selecting and training staff, (c) knowledge of financial management, (d) program supervision, and (e) administrative support. All participants responded to these items using the following indicators: agree, strongly agree, disagree, strongly disagree, undecided, and no response. Results of the administrative support item are reported in Table 13.

Table 13

Chi-square Test for Effectiveness of Administrative Support Expertise on Program Success

Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	<i>df</i>	Significance
Disagree	3	10.3	26.415	3	.001
Undecided	3	10.3			
Agree	12	10.3			
Strongly Agree	23	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

As shown in Table 13, a statistical significance was found between the observed and expected frequencies on this item. Also shown in the table is that more than half of the participants (56.1%) strongly agreed that this item determined program effectiveness. The percentages for participants (7.3%) disagreeing and those who were undecided were the same. Similar responses in Table 13 were found on all items related to the Expertise of the Athletic Director. Participants strongly agreed that the following areas of expertise of the athletic director determined program success: (a) program supervision, (b) selecting and training staff, (c) public relations, and (d) knowledge of financial management.

Responses to questionnaire items were cross referenced to the number of years the directors had served. One result from the cross tabulations of years of experience for items in Categories 1-8 was that more participants indicated experience at years 1, 3, and 7 than for any other years. For variables associated with the NCAA Influence, responses of directors were observed based on percentages of their opinions for strong or very strong influence of items on program success. Within 1-7 years of experience, 100% of the participants ($n = 4$) for Years 5 and 6 cited strong influence for these items. Seventy-five percent of Year 2 participants ($n = 3$) indicated strong influence and 25% cited very strong influence. One year experience was representative of 3 directors with 66.7% indicating strong influence; 60% ($n = 3$) of the directors at Year 7 cited strong influence.

The responses of participants for Category 4, NCAA Policies Determining Program Effectiveness on Football and Basketball Programs, were tested through Chi-square. A statistically significant difference was found between the observed and expected frequencies for all 5 items in the category. These items were (a) eligibility policies and or practices, (b) compliance with NCAA rules, (c) financial aid and or scholarships, (d) the structure of NCAA divisions, and (e) governance. Table 14 contains the values indicative of agreement on opinions of participants in all divisions for the item, Financial Aid or Scholarships.

Table 14

Chi-Square Test for NCAA Policies: Financial Aid/Scholarships

Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	<i>df</i>	Significance
No Response	2	10.3	45.732	3	.001
Disagree	1	10.3			
Agree	10	10.3			
Strongly Agree	28	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. $N = 41$.

$p < .05$.

The item listed as Table 14 is an example of the results of the Chi-square test where a statistically significant influence was found for all descriptors included in Category 4 for program effectiveness. The percentages of strong and very strong responses on NCAA variables by representatives of all division level participants were found through an examination of differences in the observed and expected variables. An average of 98.8% of all participants indicated that NCAA Policies, its structure, or other elements of the organization determined program effectiveness. A statistically significant difference was found when years of experience were cross tabulated to the NCAA effectiveness variables where, $\chi^2(60, N = 41) = 117.209$, $p = .001$ which exceeded the established level of significance.

Also, for the NCAA Policies Category, responses of participants were observed through cross tabulations of questionnaire items relative to the NCAA determining program effectiveness with the type degree earned and areas of academic concentrations for the degree. The Chi-square was used to describe any significance between the level of degree and participants' responses to Category 4, NCAA Policies. Table 15 contains these statistics.

Table 15

Responses to NCAA Policies Cross Referenced to Degree Type (N = 41)

Degree	Strong/Very Strong Influence		χ^2	<i>df</i>	Sig.
	<i>f</i>	% Within Group			
Bachelor's	10	52.7	29.150	12	.004
Master's	15	83.3			
Specialist	1	50.0			
Doctorate	1	50.0			

$p < .05$.

As can be observed from a review of the table, within the group of participants holding the master's degree ($n = 18$), the percentage of responses for strong or very strong influence (83.3%) were much higher than that of participants with the bachelor's degree ($n = 19$). Participants with a specialist degree ($n = 2$) and the doctorate ($n = 2$) did not indicate very strong influence on any item in the category. When highest degree earned was cross tabulated to NCAA influences a statistically significant difference was found as indicated in the table.

Differences in the opinions of participants were observed according to the area of academic concentration and the degree level of specialization. For example, the major, sport management was associated with the choice, "strong influence" for NCAA variables on program success. The degree level and areas of academic concentration were also cross-referenced to responses in Category 9 of the questionnaire in which participants identified the frequency of actions taken to ensure program success. Participants who received the bachelor degree with majors in business, science, and health and physical education showed higher frequencies for the choice "often" than any other majors or degree levels included in the study.

Participants responded to 8 items on a 3-point scale (3 = *often*; 2 = *some*; 1 = *none*) to indicate the type action that would influence program effectiveness. The items were (a) appearances on local TV or radio broadcasts, (b) organizing advisory boards, (c) requiring tutorial services for student-athletes, (d) networking for financial support, (e) procedures to influence community attitudes about athletics, (f) establishing clearer lines of communication with top administrators, (g) establishing incentives for attracting

quality personnel, and (h) marketing strategies to increase diversity among student-athletes. Organizing advisory boards and appearances on local TV or radio broadcasts had the lowest percentages for the “often” response which were 29.3% and 34.1%.

The comment section of the questionnaire contained expressions that related the item, requiring tutorial services for student-athletes, to the Academic variable item, graduation rates. Tutorials for student-athletes were among actions participants identified to address variables perceived as success inhibitors. Comments associated with needed actions for improving academics and graduation rates included the following: “Make mandatory academic avenues such as tutors;” [Acquire] “NCAA funding to improve academics;” [Provide] “Funding for opportunities for training;” and [Develop an] “Academic improvement plan.” The statistics for tutorial services appear in Table 16.

Table 16

Chi-Square Test for Requiring Tutorial Services for Student-Athletes					
Scale	OF	EO	χ^2	<i>df</i>	Significance
No Response	2	10.3	25.244	3	.001
None	3	10.3			
Some	15	10.3			
Often	21	10.3			

Note. OF = observed frequencies; EF = expected frequencies. *N* = 41.

p < .05.

The “often” scale item shown in Table 16 was chosen by 51.2% of the participants. The frequency of responses to this item is related to opinions of participants regarding Academic variables that determine the effectiveness of the program. Based on the statistics included in the table, the majority of the participants perceived that tutorial services would enhance graduation rates of the student-athletes.

Table 17 shows the results of the independent samples of the Mann-Whitney U test that shows significance for 8 of the 10 categories, with academics and diversity being the only two categories falling below the significance level of .05.

Table 17

Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test

Variable	P-Value	Decision
The distribution of Revenue/Funding 1 is the same across categories of both Divisions	.704	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Gender Equity is the same across categories of both Divisions	.314	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of NCAA Policies is the same across categories of both Divisions	.979	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Academics is the same across categories of both Divisions	.002	<i>Reject the null hypothesis</i>
The distribution of Student-Athlete is the same across categories of both Divisions	.589	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Diversity is the same across categories of both Divisions	.026	<i>Reject the null hypothesis</i>
The distribution of Athletic Director’s experience is the same across categories of both Divisions	.701	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Influence of Revenue/Funding on Program is the same across categories of both Divisions	.455	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Influence of NCAA on Programs is the same across categories of both Divisions	.387	Retain the null hypothesis
The distribution of Actions Addressing Variables Inhibiting Effectiveness is the same across categories of both Divisions	.528	Retain the null hypothesis

The opinions of participants for Research Question 2 suggest that the variables influencing the effectiveness of programs at Division I-AA institutions are the same as those that influence the effectiveness of programs at non-Division I-AA institutions except for academics and diversity. Participants, despite their age, gender, or institutional size identified Revenue Funding and the Influence of the NCAA as variables influencing the effectiveness of their program. Athletic directors with a master's degree, those with academic majors or concentrations in sport management, education, and the sciences; and those with 1-7 years of experience were more likely to indicate that the variables had a strong or very strong influence on program effectiveness than participants with more years of experience as an athletic director.

Summary of Findings

Researchers of college athletics have cited factors that appear to have had some influence on the effectiveness of intercollegiate programs in NCAA divisions (Frank, 2004; Litan, Orszag, and Orszag, 2003; Orszag and Orszag, 2005). However, given the limited amount of available research directly related to the applicability of these factors to Historically Black Colleges and Universities and based on recommendations in the literature, additional research was needed to identify those variables applicable to HBCUs and their effects on the potential for these programs to survive. The analysis of data from both questionnaire items and participants' comments provided answers to the research questions posed for identifying variables that athletic directors at HBCUs perceived would determine the effectiveness of intercollegiate athletics at their institutions.

Participants perceived that variables identified in the study were significant to the success of football and basketball athletic programs. Athletic directors agreed that the following categories of variables determined the effectiveness of athletics at HBCUs with Division I, II, and I-AA football and basketball programs: (a) Revenue/Funding, (b) Gender Equity, (c) NCAA Policies, (d) Academics, (e) the Student-Athlete, (f) Diversity, (g) the Expertise of the Athletic Director, (h) Revenue/Funding Influence, and (i) NCAA Influence. In the category of Revenue/Funding, items that were most frequently identified as strong determinants of success were college/university funding, facilities, and corporate sponsorship. Gender Equity variables identified were program funding for gender equity, and salary equity.

Additionally, the influences of Revenue/Funding and the NCAA on program effectiveness were statistically significant. For NCAA Policies, the most frequent strongly agree responses were for the items financial aid/scholarships and compliance with NCAA rules. In the Academics category, graduation rates and academic standards were found to have the most frequent agree responses.

The frequency of strongly agree responses were indicative that recruitment of athletes and support services were variables within the Student-Athlete Category that participants perceived determine program effectiveness. In the Diversity Category, 68.3% of the participants perceived that the low number of ethnic minority coaches in college athletics affected the success of programs. The category, Athletic Director Expertise, also had higher strongly agree percentages for administrative support and program supervision

as success variables than other items included in the category. Themes identified from comments of participants supported the following as variables: (a) revenue/funding, (b) revenue generating, (c) expertise of the athletic director including knowledge of the NCAA and the conference, and (d) tutorial and other support for student-athletes.

Participants' comments also revealed changes in NCAA policies and structure that could have a positive influence on program effectiveness. Among these changes were the following: (a) "Reduced sanctions for schools with low APR scores," (b) "Revising structure of championship teams to consider school size and football division," and (c) "Minimizing the number and depth of reports that are required to submit on a regular basis." Other phrases from comments that either reinforced or added new variables included, "The athletic program participating in guarantee and bowl games as revenue generating variables," "Funding for full scholarships and for facility improvements," "Academic improvement plans," and "Commitment of alumni for donations."

Statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies were found on the degree of influence items had on the program and on actions participants employed to enhance the potential for program survival. The percentage of responses to items differed for participants based on years of experience, degree of the director, and the academic major of the degree. For example, differences in the responses of directors with 1-7 years of experience ($n = 27$) were seen in the percentages of their opinions as to the degree of influence the items had on program effectiveness. Athletic directors with 1–7 years of experience represented 65.9% of the participants. All

participants with 1-7 years of experience indicated that the following variables had a strong or very strong influence on program effectiveness: (a) Revenue/Funding, (b) Gender Equity, (c) NCAA Policies, (d) Academics, (e) the Student-Athlete, (f) Diversity, and (g) Athletic Director's Expertise.

The percentage of responses to actions that participants employed to address items identified as potential inhibitors of success differed for participants with bachelor degrees. Bachelor degree participants selected the option "often" in response to using the eight items listed more frequently than participants with advanced degrees. Percentages found on items related to the degree of NCAA influence differed for participants with a master's degree. The master degree level participants indicated that the NCAA had a strong or very strong influence more often than participants with a bachelor's or more advanced degree. Additionally, differences in percentages of responses to scale items for variables in the category of Revenue/Funding Influence were found for specialist level participants who majored in the sciences and in education. The specialist degree level participants who majored in the sciences and in education did not indicate very strong influence for any items in the category. Further discussion of these findings, in addition to conclusions and recommendations, are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Researchers examining the future of intercollegiate athletics have produced a limited number of studies that focus on the status of athletics at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU). Drawing from research findings and recommendations to include those of Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004), Branch and Crow (1994), and Drain and Ashley (2000), this study was based on an examination of the perspectives of HBCU athletic directors. Procedures were designed for the identification of variables and conditions athletic directors perceived might determine the effectiveness of their athletic programs that were in the NCAA structure. This study was conducted during the 2007-2008 school semesters.

A questionnaire was used to collect data from the pool of athletic directors at HBCUs whose football and basketball programs were in NCAA Divisions I and II. The targeted sample represented the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Washington, DC. Qualitative data were also collected from comments on the open-ended components of the questionnaire and from phone interviews. Data were analyzed through descriptive statistics and the Chi-square test was used to determine statistically significant differences in the frequencies of responses according to the demographic profile data. Content analysis was applied to narratives to identify themes as a method of triangulating data from questionnaire items.

Forty-one athletic directors responded to scale items on a questionnaire. The responses indicated their level of agreement with variables that they perceived determined the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs and the potential for survival in the current NCAA Division I-AA and Division II structure. Further, this study was designed to determine if opinions differed among athletic directors at HBCUs with Division I-AA football and those at other HBCU institutions whose football or other intercollegiate athletic programs were within lower NCAA divisions.

Discussion of Findings

Regardless of the NCAA division athletic directors represented, they were in agreement with variables identified in the study as significant to the effectiveness of Division I-AA football programs at HBCUs. However, differences were found for responses of participants registering strong agreement with items based on their years of athletic experience, type of degree, and training concentration area. Participants with bachelors and masters degrees in business, science, sports management, and health and physical education, and directors whose experience ranged from 1-7 years showed higher percentages of agreement on the variables related to NCAA Influence and Revenue/Funding than participants with advanced degrees and more years of experience.

Participants perceived that significant to the success of athletics at HBCUs with football programs in NCAA Division II-AA were variables categorized as Revenue/Funding, Gender Equity, NCAA Policies, Academics, the Student-Athlete, Diversity, the Expertise of the Athletic Director, the Influence of Revenue/Funding, and the Influence of the NCAA. Although the study did not involve ranking items, items were

identified where participants showed higher levels of agreement according to calculations of frequencies and percentages which revealed how participants responded to items. On a Likert scale where 5 = *highest possible score*, on the average, participants selected 4 or 5 to indicate they agreed or strongly agreed with the following 15 variables listed within the first nine categories of the instrument: (a) recruitment of athletes, (b) attracting talented athletes, (c) college/university funding, (d) graduation rates, (e) financial aid/scholarships, (f) student-athlete welfare, (g) win-loss ratio, (h) academic standards, (i) compliance with NCAA rules, (j) administrative support, (k) support services, (l) program supervision, (m) program funding for gender equity, (n) eligibility policies/practices, and (o) salary equity.

A section of the questionnaire contained Likert scale items where 3 = *often*, 2 = *some*, and 1 = *none* for which directors indicated the frequency they completed specific activities to ensure program success. The majority of the responses were 2 = *some* to indicate that the directors completed activities related to all items on the frequency scale of “sometimes.” However, the item, organizing advisory bodies, had the highest percentage (63.4%) for any single activity that participants identified as 2 = *some action*. This item was closely followed by appearances on TV or radio broadcasts (53.7%) and networking for financial support (51.3%).

The most frequent responses to “action taken often” were on the items requiring tutorial services for student athletes (51.2%) and establishing clearer lines of communication with top administrators (46.3%). Implicit in procedures to influence community attitudes about athletics is increasing alumni donations as a source of

revenue. However, in concert with a finding of Litan, Orzag, and Orzag (2003) that increased athletic budgets do not result in increased alumni donations, participants in this study did not place as much emphasis on contributions from alumni as a success variable. Results of the study were aligned with some findings of previous studies. For example, Drain and Ashley (2000) found that their sample of 13 athletic directors of Division I institutions agreed upon 12 issues that have some impact on the success of athletic programs. Among these 12, two of them were identified as success variables in the present study. They were the existence of corporate sponsors as a major source of revenue for athletics and revision of NCAA rules.

Goss et al. (2004) compared their findings resulting from responses of athletic directors at 15 HBCUs in NCAA Division I-AA with those of Branch and Crow (1994) and Drain and Ashley (2000). Goss et al. found consensus on the critical issues of funding and governance in all three studies. Implied from these findings and those of this study is that current day athletic directors recognize the importance of the NCAA policies, the governance structure of NCAA, and revenue and funding to the success of athletic programs. A reoccurring theme in these prior studies and the current study related to revenue and funding is corporate sponsorship.

Branch and Crow (1994) reported that from their sample of eight NCAA Division I-A athletic directors, 27 issues affecting current and future trends in athletics were identified. The categories for their issues were reflective of the findings in this study. Their categories of academics, Division I-A bowls/playoffs, NCAA issues, gender equity, funding, and student-athletes were among the 58 variables identified in this study of 41

NCAA Division I-AA and II HBCU athletic directors. Issues identified in the previous studies, for example, addressed eligibility standards, stipends for student-athletes, bowl games, playoff system for Division I-A champions, NCAA penalties, and mandates for gender equity. Comments of participants in this study could be linked to the nature of issues addressed in the previous studies on such topics as the structure for championship teams, NCAA reduction of sanctions for schools with low APR scores, scholarships, employment for student-athletes, and training programs related to diversity.

The opinion of participants at HBCUs with NCAA Division I-AA football programs was that the potential for athletics at their institutions within the structure of NCAA Division I and II to be effective is contingent upon many variables. The variable, Funding/Revenue, was identified as a leading variable for program effectiveness. Unlike Shulman and Bowen (2001) who concluded that reasons for pursuing net revenues from athletic programs would be difficult to accept, based on a comparison of responses for use of funds in this study, the researcher found valid and acceptable reasons for athletic personnel to pursue net revenues from athletic programs. For example, in examining participants' responses, the comment was found that, "funds generated through corporate sponsorship along with other avenues to include marketing programs through increased television exposure could impact positively on programs." Participants also suggested that corporate sponsorship would provide revenue for attracting student-athletes, increasing support for student-athletes, training for staff, and for addressing other variables that determine program effectiveness.

Conclusions

Through this study, participants provided their level of agreement with variables that they perceived determine the effectiveness of athletic programs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities whose football program is in NCAA Division I-AA. The variables that were found to determine the effectiveness of these HBCUs were also identified as those that determine the effectiveness of HBCUs whose athletic programs are in other NCAA divisions. This study is a significant addition to the research literature for which investigations of the perceptions of a majority of athletic directors at HBCUs in Division I-AA are limited. The results may contribute to the body of knowledge concerning variables and trends impacting HBCU athletic programs and suggested alternatives for program survival.

The study also provides support to previous studies in which revenue was identified as a leading factor for the success of athletic programs and for providing information that institutional leaders may consider in planning for the sustainability of their athletic programs. Although some of the variables in this study were included in the study Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004) conducted involving 15 athletic directors at HBCUs with NCAA Division I-AA football programs, the conduct of research for this study addressed changes in NCAA policies that occurred after the study of Goss and associates. A major policy change was related to the calculation of academic performance and graduation rates. The need for athletic program leaders to emphasize academic and other support services for student-athletes as part of efforts to ensure that programs are effective is among results reported for this study.

Several conclusions can be drawn regarding the ability of athletic programs to be effective at the types of institutions included in this study. Conclusions are supported by the commonalities among athletic directors in identifying revenue as a leading variable for effectiveness. Descriptions in the literature of institutional financial deficits at some HBCUs that lead to accreditation problems were used to suggest that there is a relationship between revenue and effectiveness of the athletic program. Through linking participants' responses and the review of research literature, an appropriate conclusion is that enhanced revenue generating activities at HBCUs are needed regardless of the NCAA division or conference with which the athletic program is affiliated.

The perception that enhanced revenue generating activities are needed for program effectiveness is also drawn from the literature in which features of HBCUs are described. Features commonly used in describing some HBCUs include the following: (a) endowment and operating funds are generally lower than those of PWI, (b) often a weak infrastructure for soliciting alumni contributions exists, and (c) revenue issues limit the ability to continuously compete with other major conferences (Gasman, 2006; Goss et al., 2004). The conclusion that limited resources and financial deficits are variables that have an impact on the effectiveness of athletic programs at HBCUs can be drawn based on the literature reviewed and the opinions of participants in the study.

In addition to the conclusion that adequate revenue for athletic programs is needed for effective programs, that a major concern for program effectiveness is related to the student-athlete is further concluded. Although implications for revenue needs included recruiting and attracting talented student-athletes, no conclusions could be made

from opinions of athletic directors regarding the influence of the athletic quality of the student-athlete on program effectiveness. Conclusions could be drawn from the literature reviewed that some features of HBCUs limit their ability to be competitive with more affluent institutions in attracting talented student-athletes.

Conclusions could be made regarding the need for appropriate support for the student-athlete. Academic support including tutoring appears to be a valued component of the athletic program. This value is understood as there is a distinct link between the academic performance of the student-athlete and program governance. A history of poor academic performance of athletic teams may lead to the NCAA imposing penalties that may prevent teams from participating in postseason competition. Further, the inability of the institution to use financial aid awarded to a player who becomes academically ineligible further limits the potential effectiveness of the program.

Recommendations

Recommendations for Future Research

Recommendations for additional research relative to the problem of this study are reflective of lessons learned from methods used to answer the research questions. A concurrent mixed design for data collection was employed in the study. According to Teddlie and Tashakkori (2006), in this type design, “there are at least two relatively independent strands: one with QUAL questions and data collection and analysis techniques and the other with QUAN questions and data collection and analysis techniques” (p. 20). Closed-ended questionnaire items served as the quantitative data for analysis and comments to open-ended questions represented the qualitative strand.

Teddlie and Tashakkori (2006) suggested that, “Inferences made on the basis of the results from each strand are synthesized to form meta-inferences at the end of the study” (p.20). Accordingly, participants’ comments offered clarity to the selection of responses on the closed-ended questionnaire which was one method used to triangulate data and allowed inferences to be drawn for the study’s results. Based on the procedures employed in the study, the following research recommendations are presented:

1. A similar design for further studies is recommended to permit researchers to acquire in-depth perspectives on these and other variables that determine the effectiveness of athletic programs through using a variety of qualitative and quantitative research questions and measures for triangulating data. Further, the different strands for data collection in this design can be implemented at different periods during the research such as in longitudinal studies. Benefits of this design are consistent with those illustrated in the research methodology literature (Creswell, 2003; Gay et al., 2005).
2. Although the results of this study included general agreement on the variables among participants and given that demographics and other factors specific to locations of conference institutions differ, further studies should be designed with a focus on individual conference programs in order to understand how the variables impact program effectiveness.
3. The conduction of a follow-up study using the 58 variables identified and the eight activities participants used to address variables is recommended to further validate their impact on the effectiveness of athletic programs. As

recruiting and attracting talented student-athletes were among leading variables, the follow-up study may be an avenue whereby the impact of these athletes on success factors such as the win-loss ratio may be identified.

Further, the study might also be designed to reduce the number of variables which may allow institutions to more effectively create and manage actions designed in response to findings.

4. A study involving participants in ranking the variables in importance to institutional size, number of athletic programs, staff size, and other factors not included in the demographic profile of this study is recommended. Such a study would also be helpful in identifying the needs of programs at specific types of HBCU institutions and strategies that would likely enhance the potential for effectiveness of athletic programs based on the institutional demographic profile.

Recommendations for Practice, Athletic Programs, and Personnel

Implications for program planning, practices, and training for athletic program personnel were drawn based on the results of the study and a review of the related literature. The following recommendations apply:

1. The provision of tutorial services is a strategy often employed to ensure that athletic programs are effective. However, according to researchers, the graduation rate for African American football student-athletes has lagged behind that of White student-athletes (BSTM, 2007a, 2007b). Therefore, it is recommended that planners of support services for athletes review support

service plans of institutions that have experienced increases in graduation rates and tailor services based on the needs of individual student-athletes. In concert with the review of support services, a review of implications of the student-athlete's entry to professional sports during college on academic performance, graduation rates, and possible recommended changes in NCAA policies is recommended.

2. Athletic directors expressed the need to establish clearer lines of communication with top administrators as an avenue for program effectiveness. Therefore, institutions should ensure that the communication infrastructure permits the immediate flow of information. This structure could include the use of e-mail or a web-based information page along with a reporting and information exchange system for planning, addressing concerns, and identifying possible resolutions.
3. In addition to identifying revenue as a variable for an effective athletic program, the participants revealed the need for training to address such program issues as gender equity and diversity. In support of AAUP's recommendation that schools collaborate on reforms to ensure opportunities for men and women to engage in athletics (AAUP, 2003), it is recommended that planners of preparation programs for athletic directors and athletic directors collaborate on defining the essential knowledge needed for providing athletic program leadership. The results of the collaboration may include the infusion of planning methods and related field experience appropriate for

maintaining an awareness of current issues and policies affecting athletics and how issues can be addressed.

4. As participants recognized revenue and generating revenue as leading variables that determine the program's effectiveness, the creation and institutionalization of activities supportive of these variables are recommended.
5. Although participants' responses revealed a limited number of athletic directors or their institutions used forms of networking for financial support, employing networking strategies is recommended to permit institutions with similar concerns to combine resources for enhancing aspects of the athletic programs. In this way, financial strains on any one institution may be reduced.
6. Compliance with NCAA policies has been identified as a variable to determine the effectiveness of programs with membership in the NCAA. Since compliance is dependent in part upon resources to include revenue and knowledge of athletic and institutional leaders, it is recommended that the institution establishes procedures and provides funds for the continuing professional development of athletic directors.

REFERENCES

- Academic Progress Rate. (2010). *National and sport-group APR averages. Trends and penalties*. NCAA Research. Retrieved August 29, 2010, from NCAA.org
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2003). *Title IX: Gender equity in college sports: An AAUP position paper*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Civil Liberties Union of Washington Foundation. (2007). *Gender equity in Athletics: A guide for families and students*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- American Council on Education (2005). *Knight Commission huddles with NCAA conference commissioners over the future of intercollegiate athletics*. Washington, DC: Retrieved June 6, 2006, from <http://www.acenet.edu/AM/Template.cfm?Section=HomeandTEMPLATE>
- Anderson, D. J., and Cheslock, J. J. (2004). Institutional strategies to achieve gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: Does Title IX harm male athletes? *American Economic Review*, 94(2-13).
- Anderson, D. J., Cheslock, J. J., and Ehrenberg, R. G. (2004). *Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: Determinants of Title IX compliance*. Retrieved December 12, 2005, from http://www.ilr.cornell.edu/cheri/wp/cheri_wp45.pdf
- Anonymous. (2004, December 16). Study: Few minority football coaches reflects leadership. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 21(22), 16.
- Baird, K. (2004). Dominance in college football and the role of scholarship restrictions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 217-235.
- Bass, A. (2002). *Not the triumph but the struggle: The 1968 olympics and the making of the black athlete*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Boyd, J. P. (2003). The affirmative action athlete dilemma. *The Black Scholar*, 33 (3/4), 26-28.
- Branch, D., and Crow, R. B. (1994). Intercollegiate athletics: Back to the future? *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 3, 13-21.
- Brown, G. T. (1999, November 22). NCAA answers call to reform: The 'sanity code' leads association down path to enforcement program. *The NCAA News: News and Features*. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://ncaa.org/news/1999>

- BSTM. (2007a, January). Assessing the graduation rates of the 2006-2007 bowl-bound college football teams. Retrieved February 11, 2007, from <http://www.blacksportsthemagazine.com>
- BSTM. (2007b/April). Academic progress/graduation success rate study. Retrieved May 8, 2007 from <http://www.blacksportsthemagazine.com>
- Carpenter, L., and Acosta, V. (2002). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study-Twenty five year update 1977-2002*. West Brookfield, MD: Carpenter/Acosta.
- Chalk, O. (1976). *Black college sport*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Challenges Facing Amateur Athletics. (2002). Subcommittee on commerce, trade, and consumer protection. 107th Congress House Hearings. [DOCID: f: 77989.wais] Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office
- CIAA Online. (n.d.). About the CIAA. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from <http://www.theciaa.com/about/excellence.htm>
- Cook, B. (2003, December 16). The business of messing up sports. Scripps Howard News Service. Retrieved December 26, 2005 from <http://www.knoxstudio.com/shns/story.cfm?pk=FBCOOK16-12-16-03andcat=LS>
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeHass, D.M. (2002). *1999-00 gender-equity report*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- DeHass, D. M. (2009). *1981-82 – 2007-08 NCAA sports sponsorship and participation rates report*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Division I Official Notice. (2004). Legislation for consideration at the January and April 2004 management council and board of director meeting. Retrieved November 24, 2007, from NCAA.Org.
- Drain, T. S., and Ashley, F. B. (2000). Intercollegiate athletics; Back to the future II: A comparison with Branch and Crow five years later. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 9, 77-84.
- ESPN.com. (2005, December 5). 41 percent of bowl teams miss academic standards. Retrieved December 11, 2007, from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn>

- FairTest (n.d.). Gender bias in NCAA eligibility requirements. The National Center for Fair and Open Testing. Retrieved April 13, 2006 from <http://www.fairtest.org>
- Frank, R. (2004). *Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic success, student quality, and donations*. Miami, FL: Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.
- Freeman, K. (1998). *African American culture and heritage in higher education research and practice*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Friday, W. C., and Hesburgh, T. (2001). "A call to action." *Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Miami, FL: Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.
- Gasman, M. (Ed.) (2006). *Historically black colleges and universities: Recent trends* (2007). A report of the subcommittee on Historically Black Institutions and Schools of Color. Washington, DC: AAUP.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., and Airasian. P. (2005). *Educational research. Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: A practical guide for colleges and universities. (2006). Retrieved January 13, 2008, from NCAA.org
- Goss, B., Crow, B., Ashley, F., and Jubenville, C. (2004). Qualitative trends in intercollegiate athletics at historical Black colleges and universities: The impact of the NCAA structure, *The International Journal of Sport Management*, 5(4), 367-388.
- Greenlee, C. T. (2002). Black college baseball's uncertain future. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 19(12), 18-21.
- Hawes, K. (1999). The history of the NCAA. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/history.html>
- Historically black colleges or universities (HBCU) guide. (2004). *The Black Collegian Magazine Online*. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://www.black-collegian.com/>
- Johnson, R. S. (2008, March 3). Drop sports? Fisk may just have gotten it right. *Sports and Culture-Ballers, Gamers and Scoundrels*. Retrieved August 20, 2008, from <http://passtheword.wordpress.com/category/sports-and-culture/page/2/>

- Kimberly, D. (2006, April 6). In the penalty box: The push for academic reform leaves some schools lagging. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from <http://www.highbeam.com>
- Knight Commission. (n.d.). About us. Retrieved April 30, 2008, from <http://www.knightcommission.org/about/>
- Lewis, M. (2006, September 12). HBCU football is getting some play on ESPN's college sports network. *Blackamericaweb.com*
- Litan, R., Orszag, J. and Orszag, P. (2003). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An interim report*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Lovaglia, M. J., and Lucas, J. W. (2005). High visibility athletic programs and the prestige of public universities. *The Sport Journal*, 8(1-5).
- LSIA (2003). About the LSIA. Retrieved November 26, 2005, from <http://lsia.tamu.edu/LSIA/ABOUT.html>
- Mangold, W. D., Bean, L., and Adams, D. (2003), The impact of intercollegiate athletics on graduation rates among major NCAA division I universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 74(5), 540-562.
- MEAC. (n.d.). Retrieved June 23, 2006, from <http://www.meacsports.com>
- Miller, P. B., and Wiggins, D. K. (Eds.). (2004). *Sport and the color line: Black athletes and race relations in twentieth-century America*. New York: Routledge.
- Naughton, J. (1998, February 20). Title IX poses a particular challenge at predominantly black institutions. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved February 13, 2008, from http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/gender_equity/resource_materials/AdditionalMaterials/Title_IX_Challenge_HBCU.pdf
- NCAA Division I committee on academic performance meeting. (2007, January 4-5). Annual GSR and federal graduation rate announcement. Retrieved February 13, 2008, from http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_I/board_of_directors/2007/April/12_JAN_CAP_Report.htm
- NCAA membership. (2009). NCAA 2008-2009 membership report. Retrieved from <http://catalog.proemags.com/publication/cc5da338#/cc5da338/2>
- NCAA members by divisions. (n.d.). Retrieved November 26, 2005, from <http://web1.ncaa.org/onlineDir/exec/divisionListing>

- NCAA. Org.(n.d.). NCAA fact sheet. Retrieved November 26, 2005, from <http://www.ncaa.org>
- NCAA passes landmark academic reform plan. (2005, January 27). *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 21(25-28), 8.
- NCAA revenue distribution analysis. (2002). Retrieved February 10, 2007, from http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_1/aec_cabinet/2002/june/supplement_9-D.htm
- Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Open to all, Title IX at thirty: The secretary of education and commission on opportunities in athletics. (2003). Retrieved June 21, 2007 from <http://www.ed.gov>
- Orszag, J. and Orszag, P. (2005). The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An update. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Provasnik, S., and Shafer, L. (2004). *Historically black colleges and universities, 1976–2001*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Rishe, P. J. (1999). Gender gaps and the presence and profitability of college football. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(4), 702-717.
- Roebuck, J. B., and Murty, K. S. (1993). *Historically black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sagas, M., and Cunningham, G. (2004). Treatment discrimination in college coaching: Its prevalence and impact on the career success of assistant basketball coaches. *International Sports Journal*, 8(1), 76-88.
- Sandbrook, J. (2004). *Division I-A postseason football history and status*. Miami, FL: Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics.
- Schneider, R. C., and Stier, W. F. (2005). Necessary education for the success of athletics director: NCAA presidents' perceptions. *Sport Journal*, 8(1), 36-46.
- Seymour, A. (2006, December 28). Pigskin payday: For many HBCU athletic departments, the annual football classics keep their sports programs afloat. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved March 5, 2007, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0WMX/is_23_23/ai_n17114778

- Shulman, J. L., and Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sigelman, L., and Wahlbeck, P. J. (1999). Gender proportionality in intercollegiate athletics: The mathematics of Title IX compliance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(3), 518-538.
- Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC). (n.d.). Corporate sponsors. SIAC: History. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from <http://www.thesiac.com/?page=history>
- SWAC.org. (n.d.). The mission and purpose of the Southwestern Athletic Conference. Retrieved December 30, 2005, from <http://swac.org/conference/mission.htm>
- Tashakkori, A., and Teddlie, C. (Eds.) (2003). *Handbook on mixed methods in the Behavioral and social sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Teddlie, C., and Tashakkori, A. (2006). A general typology of research designs featuring mixed methods. *Research in the Schools*, 13(1), 12-18.
- Upthegrove, T. R., Roscigno, V. J., and Charles, C. Z. (1999). Big money collegiate sports: Racial concentration, contradictory pressures, and academic performance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(4), 718-737.
- Veneziano, J. (2002). The Harvard-Yale regatta. *The Ivy League*. Retrieved October 25, 2005 from <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/article.asp?intlD=1696>
- Watkins, B. (2005). Professional amateurism: What is the true economic value of a black male college athlete? Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://www.stepupcollege.org/blackathletes.pdf>
- Watson, J. II. (n.d.). Intercollegiate sports. Retrieved September 30, 2005, from <http://www.wvu.edu/~physed/sportpsych/watson/IntercollegiateSports.ppt>.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE OF ATHLETIC DIRECTORS' PERCEPTION OF VARIABLES

DETERMINING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ATHLETIC PROGRAMS

This survey is being conducted with athletic directors in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) who direct NCAA Division I-III intercollegiate programs. The purpose of this survey is to investigate variables that determine the effectiveness of programs, the impact of revenue/funding on program effectiveness, the influence of NCAA policies on program effectiveness, and actions employed to address perceived barriers to effectiveness. Names of institutions and your responses will be kept confidential. Results will be used for a descriptive analysis and will assist in establishing baseline data for leadership consideration in decision-making relative to intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs. The following definition applies to this questionnaire:

Variable: A concept, feature, or condition contributing to effective athletic programs.

Your participation is appreciated. Thank you!

Note. The questionnaire is a modification of the instrument used in the athletic study completed by Goss, B., Crow, B., Ashley, F., and Jubenville, C. (2004). Qualitative trends in intercollegiate athletics at historical Black colleges and universities: The impact of the NCAA structure. *The International Journal of Sport Management*, 5(4), 367-388.

Part 1.1 Variables Affecting Program Effectiveness

For the following items, please circle the number that best describes your opinion of variables determining the effectiveness of your program using the following scale:

5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Undecided; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree.

Please add any applicable variables.

A. In terms of **Revenue/Funding**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. College/University funding	5	4	3	2	1
2. Corporate sponsorship	5	4	3	2	1
3. Facilities	5	4	3	2	1
4. Televised games	5	4	3	2	1
5. Bowl games	5	4	3	2	1
6. Alumni donations	5	4	3	2	1
7. Support groups	5	4	3	2	1

B. In terms of **Gender Equity**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Program funding for gender equity	5	4	3	2	1
2. Salary equity	5	4	3	2	1

C. In terms of **NCAA Policies**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Eligibility policies/practices	5	4	3	2	1
2. Compliance with NCAA rules	5	4	3	2	1
3. Financial aid/scholarships	5	4	3	2	1
4. Structure of NCAA Divisions	5	4	3	2	1
5. Governance	5	4	3	2	1

D. In terms of **Academics**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Academic standards	5	4	3	2	1
2. Graduation rates	5	4	3	2	1
3. ACT/SAT/Standardized test scores	5	4	3	2	1
4. Grade point averages	5	4	3	2	1
5. Admission standards	5	4	3	2	1
6. Involvement in educational mission of institution	5	4	3	2	1
7. Academic Progression Rate	5	4	3	2	1

E. In terms of **Student-Athlete**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Recruitment of athletes	5	4	3	2	1
2. Stipends for student-athletes	5	4	3	2	1
3. Sportsmanship	5	4	3	2	1
4. Support services	5	4	3	2	1

F. In terms of **Diversity**, the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Number of ethnic minority coaches	5	4	3	2	1
2. Number of ethnic minority student athletes	5	4	3	2	1

G. In terms of **Athletic Director's Expertise** the following determine the effectiveness of the program:

1. Public relations	5	4	3	2	1
2. Selecting and training staff	5	4	3	2	1
3. Knowledge of financial management	5	4	3	2	1
4. Program supervision	5	4	3	2	1
5. Administrative support	5	4	3	2	1

Part 1.2 Influence of Revenue/Funding on Program

Indicate to what degree revenue will influence the effectiveness of your program in relation to the listed items using the following:

5=Very Strong Influence; 4=Strong Influence; 3=Some Influence; 2=Limited Influence; 1=No Influence.
Respond to each item.

1. Attracting talented athletes	5	4	3	2	1
2. Differentiated athletic program structure	5	4	3	2	1
3. Sports sponsored	5	4	3	2	1
4. Conference membership	5	4	3	2	1
5. College/University mission	5	4	3	2	1
6. Athletic program mission	5	4	3	2	1
7. Provision to support equitable opportunities for all	5	4	3	2	1
8. Demonstration of ethical conduct	5	4	3	2	1
9. Student-athlete welfare	5	4	3	2	1
10. Win-loss ratio	5	4	3	2	1
11. Program decision-making	5	4	3	2	1
12. Faculty representatives	5	4	3	2	1
13. Camps and clinics	5	4	3	2	1
14. Attendance	5	4	3	2	1

Part 1.3 (a) Influence of NCAA on Program

Indicate to what degree the NCAA will influence the effectiveness of your program in relation to the listed items using the following:

1=No Influence; 2=Limited Influence; 3=Some Influence; 4=Strong Influence; 5=Very Strong Influence. Respond to each item.

1. NCAA's current structure	5	4	3	2	1
2. Increasing institutional voice in policy matters	5	4	3	2	1
3. Major restructuring of divisions	5	4	3	2	1
4. Simplifying regulations	5	4	3	2	1
5. Tighter rules on performance enhancing substances	5	4	3	2	1
6. Prevention of professional sports influence	5	4	3	2	1
7. Imposing relaxed gender equity regulations	5	4	3	2	1
8. Attendance	5	4	3	2	1
9. Marketability	5	4	3	2	1
10. Revenue generating	5	4	3	2	1
11. Sanctions on gambling	5	4	3	2	1
12. Accountability	5	4	3	2	1

Part 1.3 (b) Suggested Changes for Program Operation

Please list three changes in NCAA policies or structure that may have positive influences on the potential for intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs to be effective.

Part 2: Actions Addressing Variables Inhibiting Effectiveness

Please circle the number that best represents the frequency that each listed action is employed to address or overcome those variables that do not lead to an effective program. Add other actions you employ that have been helpful or may be helpful in the future.

1=None	2=Some	3=Often			
1. Appearances on local T.V. or radio broadcasts	3	2	1		
2. Organizing advisory boards	3	2	1		
3. Requiring tutorial services for student-athletes	3	2	1		
4. Networking for financial support	3	2	1		
5. Procedures to influence community attitudes about athletics	3	2	1		
6. Establishing clearer lines of communication with top administrators	3	2	1		
7. Establishing incentives for attracting quality personnel	3	2	1		
8. Marketing strategies to increase diversity among student-athletes	3	2	1		

Respondent's Profile

1. Indicate current NCAA Division (Football/Basketball)

A. I B. I-AA C. II D. III

2. Indicate approximate institutional enrollment

A. Less than 1000 B. 1000-3000 C. 4000-6000 D. More than 6000

3. Indicate number of years as Athletic Director

4. Indicate highest degree earned

A. Bachelor B. Master's C. Specialist D. Doctorate E. Other _____

5. Indicate college major for each degree

Bachelor _____
 Master's _____
 Specialist _____
 Doctorate _____
 Other _____

6. Indicate age and gender

A. 20-30 years B. 31-41 years C. 42-52 years D. 53 or above years

B. M F

7. Indicate experience as Athletic Director by degree level

Bachelor _____ years

Master's _____ years

Specialist _____ years

Doctorate _____ years

Other _____ years

APPENDIX B

INFORMATION SHEET

Athletic Directors' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of HBCU Division I-AA Athletic Programs

You have been asked to participate in a research study to investigate variables influencing the effectiveness of athletic programs as perceived by athletic directors at Historically Black Colleges and Universities. You were selected to be a possible participant because you were identified to be a current Athletic Director at an HBCU athletic program. A total number of 50 people have been asked to participate in this study. The purpose of this study is to determine which variables are perceived to determine effectiveness of HBCU programs based on the opinions of athletic directors at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and possible actions that would enhance a program's potential to survive.

If you agree to be in this study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire form targeted to ascertain opinions of statements in several categories applicable to intercollegiate athletics at your institution. This questionnaire will take approximately twenty minutes to complete. The risk associated with this study is discomfort for the time taken to complete the document and the risk is no more than minimal. There are no benefits for participating in this study. You will not receive any monetary compensation for completing the questionnaire.

This information is confidential and made known only in the form of aggregate data. E-mail addresses will be identified for all participants and the survey instrument will be e-mailed to each participant individually. Once the instrument is returned, the e-mail will be destroyed to eliminate any links with data and participants. The records of this study will be kept private. No identifiers linking you to the study will be included in any sort of report that might be published. Research records will be stored securely and only Charles McClelland will have access to the records. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University. If you decide to participate, you are free to refuse to answer any of the questions that make you uncomfortable. You can withdraw at any time without your relations with the University, job, benefits, etc., being affected. You can contact Charles McClelland at (281) 772-6472 or by e-mail at cmcclelland1@comcast.net; you may also contact Dr. Christine Stanley at (979) 845-2718 or be e-mail at cstanley@dsmail.tamu.edu with any questions about this study.

This research study has been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board-Human Subjects in Research, Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding subjects' rights, you can contact the Institutional Review Board through Ms.

Melissa McIlhaney, IRB Program Coordinator, Office of Research Compliance, (979) 458-4067, mcilhaney@tamu.edu.

Please be sure you have read the above information, asked questions and received answers to your satisfaction. You will be given a copy of the information sheet for your records.

VITA

Name: Charles Franklin McClelland, Jr.

Address: Texas Southern University
3100 Cleburne St.
Houston, Texas 77041

E-Mail Address: cmccllelland1@comcast.net

Education: B.B.A., Accounting, Prairie View A&M University, 1993

M.B.A., General Business, Prairie View A&M University,
1998

Ph.D., Higher Education Administration, Texas A&M
University, 2011