

STUDENT-ATHLETE DEVELOPMENT, UNIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT AND
WINNING: THE INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS OF AN NCAA DIVISION II
ATHLETIC PROGRAM

A Dissertation

by

KRISTOFER CALVIN NITE

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

August 2011

Major Subject: Kinesiology

Student-Athlete Development, University Enhancement, and Winning: The Institutional
Logics of an NCAA Division II Athletic Program
Copyright 2011 Kristofer Calvin Nite

STUDENT-ATHLETE DEVELOPMENT, UNIVERSITY ENHANCEMENT AND
WINNING: THE INSTITUTIONAL LOGICS OF AN NCAA DIVISION II
ATHLETIC PROGRAM

A Dissertation

by

KRISTOFER CALVIN NITE

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,	John N. Singer
Committee Members,	George B. Cunningham
	Paul J. Batista
	Reuben A. Buford May
Head of Department,	Richard B. Kreider

August 2011

Major Subject: Kinesiology

ABSTRACT

Student-Athlete Development, University Enhancement, and Winning: The Institutional Logics of an NCAA Division II Athletic Program. (August 2011)

Kristofer Calvin Nite, B.S., Hardin Simmons University;

M.S., Texas A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. John N. Singer

There has been a great deal of research conducted which examines the development of student-athletes on college campuses. However, there has been limited investigation into how the institutional logics (i.e. the belief structures and related practices) within an athletic department may affect the manner in which athletic administrators and coaches perceive and approach the development of their student-athletes. The purpose of this study was to understand the institutional logics of an NCAA Division II athletic department and how those logics may affect student-athletes. In order to address the purpose and research questions of this study, I conducted a qualitative case study at a private university where I interviewed thirteen members of the university including eight members of the athletic department and five university faculty members and administrators. Additional data were obtained through various documents such as the university's mission statement and the NCAA Division II Handbook.

It was found that the athletic department operates under certain institutional logics wherein they are expected to foster student-athlete development. These include

the academic, physical, social, and spiritual aspects of their development. Additionally, the athletic department is expected to enhance the university by building community and promoting the mission and vision of the university. Finally, winning athletic competitions is an important expectation of members of the athletic department. Further exploration of the data reveals that certain aspects of these logics may conflict.

Primarily, the participants acknowledged that they were expected to foster the development of their athletes in other aspects beyond athletics; yet their primary job performance evaluations were based on wins and losses. Additionally, the logic of enhancing the university may also contend with the academic development of the student-athletes. This is significant because research has suggested that conflicting institutional logics within an organization may lead to confusion as to which logics are paramount. Though the specific findings of this research may be contextually bound, this provides insight into how the institutional logics of an organization may influence the actions of its members and key stakeholders who are influenced by the processes within that organization.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family as the manifestation of a higher standard of excellence which my parents pushed for me to achieve. May the next generation set the bar even higher.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not be possible without the support of many people. First I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. John N. Singer, for his guidance, his patience, and his constant challenges to my lines of thinking and reasoning. He fostered a relationship between us that allowed me to think and explore different concepts of religion, race, education, and life under his tutelage. Thank you for letting me be me as I continue to grow. I would also like to thank my committee members: Dr. George B. Cunningham and Dr. Reuben A. Buford May for always challenging me to think outside of the box on a variety of issues and Dr. Paul J. Batista for supporting me as a student and this past year as a faculty member. Without their support, all of this would have been a much more difficult struggle.

In addition to my doctoral committee members, I must thank some influential teachers and professors that I've had throughout the years. To name a few: Mrs. Gill, Mrs. Thompson, Mrs. (Jones) Edwards, Dr. Rainwater, and my many coaches. Thank you all for what you provided me, whether it was mentorship or just acceptance. I would not be here today without you all. I would also like to say a special thank you to Dr. Curtis Dickson. He may not realize it but his simple and direct words still ring in my ears. Turns out that he was right!

Next, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge those who I have walked with during these past few years: Michael, Nicole, Khalid, Brian, and Jacob. On a daily basis I was constantly reminded that I am never alone in the struggles of the past few years. I

hope that I was able to provide them with the same strength and sense of peace in the PhD storm that each of them provided me. As iron sharpens iron, so a friend sharpens a friend (Proverbs 27:17). Thank you for sharpening me.

Without the support of my family I would not have been able to accomplish this dissertation or degree. Kelly and Jeannie, Aunt Pam and Uncle Carlton, Dave and Anne; I am forever grateful for their support over the past years. We all had to walk through the fire, yet we were not set ablaze (Isaiah 43: 1-3). I hope that I have made you all proud and exuded the hope and strength that you each provided me.

I am also grateful for my loving and supportive parents. Their sacrifices allowed me to achieve everything that I have and become who I am. To my dad, you have sacrificed your life in order to provide me with the opportunity to challenge the old standards of what it has meant to be a man in our family. Everything that I am and have accomplished is a direct reflection of your investment in me. I hope to make you proud as I build on your foundation. To my beautiful mom, you were and continue to be the definition of strength and courage for our family. You poured your life into me so that I might grow into a man of substance. I wish that you could be here to experience and witness your legacy but your path took you home. You will be forever missed but your legacy lives on.

Finally, my beautiful wife has supported me in pursuing this goal. She has sacrificed much to be with me on this journey. I love you Val with all my heart. You are my best friend and I look forward to walking with you on our path. Thank you for your patience, your understanding, your strength, and for putting up with me!

And most importantly, I must thank Almighty God for the grace and strength that has been provided to me. In the midst of life's storms, I thank you for the peace that transcends all understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	5
II LITERATURE REVIEW	8
College Student Development	8
Student-Athlete Development	12
Student-Athlete Role Conflicts	16
Athletic Department and University Personnel	18
Institutional Logics	23
Summary	25
III METHODOLOGY	27
Research Design	27
Research Setting	29
Participants	31
Data Collection	33
Data Analysis	34
Trustworthiness	35
Ethics and Human Subjects	37
IV FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	39
Overview of Findings	39
Research Tensions	40
Student-Athlete Development	41
Academic Development	43
Physical Development	50

CHAPTER	Page
Social Development	53
Spiritual Development	57
University Enhancement	63
Building Community.....	63
University Mission and Vision.....	65
Marketing and Recruiting.....	67
Winning.....	70
Winning and University Enhancement	76
Discussion	78
Theoretical Implications: Conflicting or Complementary Logics .	78
Student-Athlete Development and Winning	79
Student-Athlete Development and University Enhancement.	82
Practical Implications	83
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	86
Summary	86
Limitations and Future Research.....	90
Conclusion	93
REFERENCES.....	94
APPENDIX A	106
APPENDIX B	112
APPENDIX C	115
APPENDIX D	118
APPENDIX E	121
APPENDIX F	124
VITA	125

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an introduction to the current study. The concepts of student development and student-athlete development are briefly discussed and the purpose of the current study is provided along with the research questions which guided the research process.

The years that people spend in college are highly informative times when people continue to mature and begin to decide who they are and in what direction they may want to go with their lives (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Scholars have identified many stages of growth that occur during the college years which are important in the process of student development (see Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). They argue that colleges and universities should be a place where students are challenged to mature yet are also provided with the necessary support needed through the maturation process (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Sanford, 1966).

An important aspect of the developing as a person is the exploration of various lifestyles and roles. Research has suggested that individuals may occupy a variety of roles in their lives, and these roles may be influential in their overall growth and development as people (Goffman, 1959; Lieberman, 1956; Markus & Wurf, 1987; Mussweiler, Gabriel, & Bodenhausen, 2000; 2002; Nevill & Calvert, 1996; Shih, 1999; Turner, 1978). Ideally, the college experience should be one that provides students with

This dissertation follows the style of the *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*.

an assortment of opportunities to explore various roles in order to foster their overall development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Niles & Goodnough, 1995; Petipas & Champagne, 1988; Terenzini, et al., 1994).

Student-athletes undergo developmental processes similar to other students while they are in college; however, they are not necessarily afforded the opportunities to consider a variety of roles in the process. Student-athletes undergo development across the athletic, academic, and social domains of college (Adler & Adler, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles, et al., 2002; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005), yet the consuming nature of intercollegiate athletics prevents student-athletes from fully exploring roles that are not rooted in athletics (Adler & Adler, 1991; Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Petipas & Champagne, 1988; Simons, Van Rheenan, & Covington, 1999; Valentine & Taub, 1999). Thus, student-athletes engulf themselves in their athletic roles to the point that their athletic roles take precedence over the rest of the roles in their lives, particularly their academic roles (Adler & Adler, 1991, 1987, 1985; Miller & Kerr, 2003, Settles, Sellers, & Damas, Jr., 2005; Valentine & Taub, 1999).

As students-athletes progress through their college careers, the dominance of their athletic roles may hinder their personal growth and development in other areas of their lives. Some tend to neglect their academic requirements as they become immersed in their athletic roles (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003, Settles et al., 2005). Also, with the conclusion of their playing careers, student-athletes may face identity crises as they have been forced out of roles that have consumed their lives

throughout their college experiences (Adler & Adler, 1991; Chartrand & Lent, 1987). Furthermore, student-athletes may experience delayed career development (Murphy, Petipas, & Brewer, 1996) along with difficulties transitioning out of their athletic roles at the conclusion of their playing careers (Adler & Adler, 1991; Baille, 1993; Drahotka & Eitzen, 1998; Kleiber, Greendorfer, Blinde, & Samdahl, 1987).

The salience of the athletic role of student-athletes may be attributed to various factors. These factors may include the time and energy demands of intercollegiate athletics (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Valentine & Taub, 1999), along with the positive affirmation received as a result of being a student-athlete on a college campus (Adler & Adler, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Murphy, et al., 1996; Simons et al., 1999; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). Additionally, the prominence of the athletic role may be attributed to authority figures in the lives of student-athletes. Research has pointed to the widely held notion that coaches and other stakeholders within athletic departments, and even the student-athletes' families, may in fact consider the athletic roles as most important in the student-athletes' lives (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Kimball, 2007; Woodman & Hardy, 2001; Woodruff & Schallert, 2008). Finally, university faculty and staff members may contribute to the salience of the athletic role within student-athletes by perpetuating stereotypical beliefs about student-athletes (Adler & Adler, 1987; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Yopyk & Prentice, 1993).

While coaches may have significant influence on the development of student-athletes, certain structural pressures of the coaching profession could contribute to the overall development of student-athletes. The increased commercialism of intercollegiate

athletics has resulted in the evaluation of coaches becoming centered primarily on winning (Adler & Adler, 1991; Buer, 2009; Eitzen, 2006; Sperber, 2000). Consequently, although coaches believe they have a responsibility to focus on the holistic development of their athletes, the nature of the coaching profession precludes their attention to the student-athletes' development outside of the athletic realm (Adler & Adler, 1987; Cullen, Latesa, & Byrne, 1990; Singer & Armstrong, 2001; Sperber, 2000). Simply, coaches may not be able to risk losing their jobs by diverting their attentions from specific on-the-court or field matters.

Though there has been significant research investigating the roles and development of student-athletes, certain influences regarding their development have yet to be examined. Specifically, there is limited research specifically examining the institutional pressures of the coaching profession and the effects that these pressures may have on the development of student-athletes. Management scholars have observed that institutional logics may be influential in the identity development of an organization's members (Lok, 2010), which may hold true in the context of college athletics. Scholars have argued that intercollegiate athletics operate under different, often conflicting, institutional logics that tend to compete for primacy (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). The conflicting logics of intercollegiate athletics may indeed have an effect on the development of student-athletes.

Finally, the development of student-athletes who compete at the NCAA Division II level of athletics has been overlooked by researchers. It is likely that NCAA Division II athletic departments operate in unique environments compared to their Division I

counterparts, which could in turn influence the approaches to and attitudes concerning student-athlete development at this level. For example, because of the size of their institutions, many Division II universities may lack the financial capabilities to provide the student-athlete support facilities and services which have become common on larger, Division I campuses. Also, scholars have found that winning may not be as important in the evaluation of Division II coaches, thereby increasing the importance of the overall development of student-athletes at this level (Gorney & Ness, 2000). Though scholars have found that general operations within athletic departments do not necessarily differ based on NCAA classification (Cunningham & Ashley, 2001), there may, however, be certain challenges that effect Division II universities and different institutional logics which may in turn effect Division II student-athlete development. This concept warrants further investigation.

Purpose of the Study

In light of these voids in the literature, the purpose of this study is to understand the institutional logics within an NCAA Division II athletic department and how these logics may affect student-athletes. To clarify, institutional logics can be defined as the dominant belief systems and practices within a setting that guide the practices of individuals within that setting (Herremans, Herschovis, & Bertels, 2009; Scott, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). For the purposes of this investigation, I conducted a qualitative case study of an NCAA Division II athletic department. As with other qualitative methods, the implementation of a case study research design allowed me to obtain a close, detailed perspective of the research participants' attitudes and beliefs, as

well as the context and social realities in which the participants' experiences are embedded (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Additionally, the data collection methods used in a qualitative case study allowed for the examination of certain theoretical constructs within the setting of the study (Stake, 2005). Three broad research questions were utilized to guide this investigation:

1. What are the different institutional logics within the NCAA Division II athletic department of this study?
2. What are the expectations of the university faculty and staff in regards to the operation of the athletic department?
3. What is the nature of the relationships among the institutional logics within this Division II athletic department?

To address these questions, this dissertation is organized into five chapters.

Chapter II presents an overview of college student development. I discussed the importance of authority figures in this development. Then, I expanded on the concept of student-athlete development. Particular attention is paid to the influence that significant people, namely coaches and university faculty members, have on student-athlete development. Finally, I reviewed the concept of institutional logics, with emphasis on the idea of conflicting or competing institutional logics within intercollegiate athletics. Chapter III provides the methods that were employed for this study along with the strategy for analyzing the data. Chapter IV includes the results of the study and interpretation of the data. This chapter concludes with discussion of the results as well as

the implications of this study. Chapter V then offers a summary of this study along with the limitations and future areas of research that may result from this investigation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature relevant to this study. First, I provide a brief overview of college student development and some of the key factors of their development. Secondly, I discuss the development of college student-athletes, paying particular attention to research concerning aspects of their personal development. I then address the function of authority figures such as coaches and professors in the development of college student-athletes. This chapter culminates with a summary of the concept of conflicting institutional logics.

College Student Development

As American culture has become more diverse, people have been provided abundant opportunities to connect with people from different cultures and countries in ways which have never before been possible. Thus, scholars have observed that it is no longer a foregone conclusion that the development of young people will reflect the primary cultures in which they live (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). Even as early as the mid twentieth century, Chickering observed:

No longer do young persons experience a unified and internally consistent framework of beliefs, behavior, and adult roles that can be assimilated almost automatically through the pores, that has been built in since early childhood. Now, conflicting values, diverse behaviors and mutually exclusive models combine to offer multiple alternatives from which a particular identity must be

constructed, and then reconstructed again in the light of new opportunities or new frustrations (Chickering, 1969, p. 92).

In light of this, scholars have suggested that the growth and development of students should be the central focus of higher education (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

For students, the transition from high school to college presents various challenges and opportunities for growth and development. This transition has been described as “a highly interrelated, web-like series of family, interpersonal, academic, and organizational pulls and pushes that shape student learning and persistence” (Terenzini, et al. 1994, p. 61). Because of the nature of this transitional period in the students’ lives, scholars have paid particular attention to the development of students while they are on college campuses. Chickering and colleagues have observed that students develop across seven different “vectors” throughout their years in college (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser; 1993). These vectors include: developing competence, managing emotions, moving through autonomy toward interdependence, developing mature interpersonal relationships, establishing identity, developing purpose, and developing integrity. Effectively, Chickering and Reisser’s (1993) model highlights the process in which students discover and refine themselves as individuals, eventually resulting in them learning to live in communion with others in broader society. This points to the importance of student involvement in a variety of campus communities and activities which allows students opportunities to explore a variety of roles and life-styles which may factor into them establishing who they are and in what direction they want

their lives to go (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Niles & Goodnough, 1995; Petipas & Champagne, 1988; Terenzini, et al., 1994).

Role exploration is a significant aspect of students' discovery of themselves as individuals while they learn to function in the broader context of a society. Historically, scholars have understood that individuals, particularly college students, tend to occupy numerous roles simultaneously (Goffman, 1959; Lieberman, 1956; Mussweiler, Gabriel, & Bodenhausen, 2000; Turner, 1978; 2002). Students on campus must delicately prioritize and negotiate within themselves which roles are most important on a day-to-day and even moment-to-moment basis. In light of this, research concerning role and identity development has, historically, pointed to the belief that people tend to develop attitudes that are congruent with expectations associated with the dominant roles in their role hierarchies (Lieberman, 1956). Thus, the most salient roles in a person's life tend to influence the person's lifestyles and self-conception (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Lally, 2005; Markus & Wurf, 1987; Nevill & Calvert, 1996; Shih, 1999; Stryker & Burke, 2000). Though this process and the negotiation of role importance is a highly personal endeavor, one cannot undervalue the effects that authority figures and leadership within a person's life may have on this process. Research has suggested that people tend to assign higher levels of importance to the roles that authority figures and leadership see as most important (Sarbin & Allen, 1958; Stryker & Burke, 2000; Turner, 1978).

Further, a critical function of leadership in any organization, even on a college campus, is its ability to prioritize the role functions of personnel within that organization. Scholars have highlighted that those occupying leadership and positions of authority

may be influential in resolving role conflicts within their subordinates (Floyd & Lane, 2000; Hill & Stephens, 2005; Teh, Yong, Arumugam, & Ooi, 2009). Supervisors within organizations have been found to influence the role stress within members of their organizations (Odriscoll & Beehr, 1994). Thus, Hill and Stephens (2005) have suggested that leaders within organizations may benefit from implementing management techniques, such as role prioritizing, with their employees in order to reduce role strain. Similarly, Floyd and Lane (2000) posited that managers within organizations “can shape [their] members’ collective tendencies by clarifying the broad priorities and expectations considered fundamental to organizational effectiveness” (p. 167). Thus, leadership on campus, similar to that within any organization, likely plays an important role in the development of students on their campuses.

In regards to the importance of leadership on college campuses, research has suggested that students may be influenced more by authority figures, such as professors and coaches, than even their own parents (Jodl, Michael, Malanchuk, Eccles, & Sameroff, 2001). Moreover, scholars have argued that the influence of faculty members on lives of students is only rivaled by the power of the students’ peers (Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). In regards to student development efforts on campuses, scholars have suggested that leadership is instrumental in setting the precedence on their campuses. Chickering and Reisser (1993) spoke to this notion:

The basic point is that clear and consistent objectives, stated in terms of desired outcomes for learning and personal development, are critically important in creating an educationally powerful institution... They should be defined by the

members of the college community, taken to heart by campus leaders, and invoked as guides to decision-making (pg. 287).

Thus, through the creation of a campus culture with the student development as a primary objective, it has been recommended that staff and faculty members on a university campus should provide a wide array of opportunities to encourage students to challenge themselves as they continue the maturation process through their college years (Guiffrida, 2009).

Student-Athlete Development

On college campuses, student-athletes, similar to other students, undergo the aforementioned developmental processes (see Chickering, 1969; Chickering & Reisser, 1993). However, student-athletes are confronted with the pressures and fame that accompany their statuses on campus that most students do not have to manage (Adler & Adler, 1991; Parham, 1993). Also, they are heavily influenced by coaches and athletic administrators in their day to day decision-making. Thus, it is important to examine specific challenges to student-athlete development.

It has become well documented that student-athletes negotiate numerous roles during their time on college campuses. Scholars have suggested that student-athletes development encompasses a variety of roles, namely those of student, athlete, and socialite (Adler & Adler, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles, et al., 2002; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). As with other people, certain roles are regarded as more important and become salient aspects of the identities of student-athletes. Indeed, scholars have observed that student-athletes tend to regard athletic roles as foremost in

their lives, especially early in their college careers, thus resulting in those roles becoming the primary focus of student-athletes as they develop as people (Adler & Adler, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Simons, et al., 1999; Valentine & Taub, 1999). This trend continues once student-athletes become veterans of their sport and have received numerous letters for athletic participation (Curry, 1993).

Scholars have observed various factors that may contribute to the salience of athletic roles in the development of student-athletes. Initially, intercollegiate athletics consume a majority of the student-athletes' time and energy through the demands of games, team meetings, practices, and other team functions (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Valentine & Taub, 1999). Further, student-athletes identify with the roles from which they receive positive affirmation, and they distance themselves from the roles that provide negative feedback (Adler & Adler, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Murphy, et al., 1996; Simons et al., 1999; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). People in the lives of student-athletes, namely coaches and professors, are also influential in their development. Student-athletes have been shown to identify more with their athletic roles because these roles are regarded as most important in their lives by their coaches, peers, and families (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Kimball, 2007; Woodman & Hardy, 2001; Woodruff & Schallert, 2008). Student-athletes have also been found to deemphasize the importance of academics in their lives because of a lack of reinforcement of this role by significant others in their lives (Adler & Adler, 1991; Singer & Armstrong, 2001).

Involvement in intercollegiate athletics and highly identifying oneself as a student-athlete is not necessarily negative. Studies once indicated that student-athletes

have scored higher than non-involved students on measures of well-being (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1992), and they have also been shown to possess superior life management skills (Cornelius, 1995). Additionally, the personal growth of student-athletes has been reported as positively correlated with the time spent with teammates (Richards & Aries, 1999). Further, participation in athletics also has been linked to life-long physical activity in athletes (Bailey, Armour, Kirk, Jess, Pickup, & Sandford, 2009). Participation in intercollegiate athletics may also be associated with lower levels of depression within student-athletes as well as lower probabilities of suicide attempts (Miller & Hoffman, 2009). Finally, scholars have suggested that participation in intercollegiate athletics may not be as detrimental to student-athletes academically as some have suggested when lifestyle and background variables are taken into account (Robst & Keil, 2000). Thus, there is evidence to suggest that involvement in intercollegiate athletics may not be particularly problematic (Richards & Aries, 1999).

However, in spite of the positives associated with participation in intercollegiate athletics, many scholars have exposed a number of problems associated with highly identifying as a student-athlete. Some have argued that student-athletes who are highly committed to their athletic roles may neglect the exploration of other roles while they are in college (Brewer et al., 1993; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Petipas & Champagne, 1988; Valentine & Taub, 1999). This lack of exploration, which may be largely due to the intense time demands of the athletic role (Adler & Adler, 1991; Simons et al., 1999), has been shown to inhibit the movement through Chickering's (1969) vectors of student development (Valentine & Taub, 1999). Moreover, student-athletes' failure to explore

alternative roles may result in delayed career development along with impeded career decision-making skills (Murphy et al., 1996). Indeed, basing one's identity primarily in one role set or dimension of one's life potentially establishes a limited foundation for continued maturation and personal development (Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Further, delayed or lack of exploration may result in difficulties transitioning out of the athletic role at the conclusion of the student-athletes' playing career. Retirement from athletics is difficult for many athletes because of the intense nature of and commitment to their various sports (Baille, 1993; Chartrand & Lent, 1987; Kleiber et al., 1987). Though some have observed that retirement may not be detrimental to the overall life satisfaction of student-athletes (see Kleiber et al., 1987; Lally, 2006; Webb, Nasco, Riley, & Headrick, 1998), retirement from athletics is arduous because student-athletes lose the primary source of their focus, energy, and, ultimately, their identity upon the conclusion of their playing careers (Drahota & Eitzen, 1998). Additionally, student-athletes lose their supporting social network of teammates, coaches, and fans, all of whom had been instrumental in building and reinforcing their athletic identities (Adler & Adler, 1991; Baille, 1993; Heyman, 1987).

Perhaps the most discussed concern of student-athletes' highly salient athletic identity is the neglect of their academic roles. Research has indicated that the cognitive development of student-athletes was negatively impacted by their participation in intercollegiate athletics (Astin, 1993; Pascarella & Trueman, 1999). Scholars have observed that the academic roles were indeed highly important to student-athletes (Adler & Adler, 1991; Curry & Parr, 1993; Lally & Kerr, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles et

al., 2002; Simons et al., 1999); however, their concern for their academic affairs began to dwindle as they became immersed in their athletic roles (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Miller & Kerr, 2003, Settles et al., 2005). Yet, some scholars have found that student-athletes increase the primacy of their academic roles in the latter portions of their college careers (Kimball, 2007; Lally & Kerr, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003). Other scholars have observed that student-athletes suffered lower SAT scores than the general student body (Aries, McCarthy, Salovey, & Banaji, 2004) and have maintained lower grade-point averages (GPAs) than regular students (Robst & Keill, 2000; Simons et al., 1999). In an experiment, Yopyk and Prentice (2005) observed that student-athletes performed poorer on a math exam when they were primed with their athletic identities than they did when they were primed with their student identities. The interplay between the academic and athletic roles in the lives of student-athletes has led scholars to suggest that university personnel should be more involved in the lives of student-athletes to ensure that the university is fulfilling its obligations of providing them with a well-rounded education (Sharp & Sheilley, 2008; Simons et al., 1999).

Student-Athlete Role Conflicts

One key factor in the development of student-athletes is likely the conflicting nature of the various roles they occupy-- notably, the conflicts between the athletic and academic roles. The academic and athletic roles have been described as competing, forcing student-athletes to negotiate various compromises between the two realms (Miller & Kerr, 2003). This conflict is especially difficult for student-athletes in that they must balance their efforts in both roles or they risk losing them both (Adler & Adler, 1991;

Chartrand & Lent, 1987). The time and energy demands of participation in intercollegiate athletics, along with the glorification associated with intercollegiate athletics, are key contributors to the conflict between athletic and academic roles (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Simons et al., 1999; Upthegrove, Roscigno, & Charles, 1999). Thus, the athletic role tends to become predominant in the role hierarchy of student-athletes (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Simons et al., 1999).

However, the progression of student-athletes through their collegiate athletic careers results in changes in their role hierarchies. Miller and Kerr (2003) illustrated that student-athletes began their college careers with highly salient athletic identities, yet they deemphasized their athletic roles in the latter years of their careers when they realized that they were not going to become professional or world class athletes. Adler and Adler (1991) also observed this phenomenon, but the student-athletes in their study still had difficulties relinquishing athletics as key facets of their identities. Regardless of their efforts to reduce the importance of athletics in their identities, it is likely that student-athletes will still face the previously discussed challenges of retirement from athletics.

The conflicting roles of student-athletes have been associated with high levels of stress for the student-athletes (Settles et al., 2002). As discussed by Sarbin and Allen (1968), individuals must find suitable methods for resolving role conflicts in their lives. In order to resolve their role conflicts, student-athletes typically become engulfed in their athletic roles (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Valentine & Taub, 1999). Though

engulfment in the athletic role may result in the difficulties discussed in previous sections, interestingly, Killeya-Jones (2005) suggested that the convergence of the academic and athletic roles into one single role may result in less distress within the student-athlete. Conversely, Settles et al. (2002) found that separation of these roles resulted in higher levels of psychological well-being within student-athletes. Though these and other researchers (see Cornelius, 1995; Miller & Hoffman, 2009; Richards & Aries, 1999; Robst & Keil, 2000; Snyder & Spreitzer, 1992) have observed the positive aspects of being a student-athlete, complete engulfment in intercollegiate athletics may still be detrimental to the development of student-athletes because they may neglect the other important aspects of their lives (e.g. academics). Indeed, scholars have asserted if a choice must be made between academic or athletic pursuits on a college campus, student-athletes primary focus should be on academics (Snyder & Spreitzer, 1992).

Athletic Department and University Personnel

Along with role conflicts, the development of student-athletes is heavily influenced by athletic department personnel (i.e. coaches, athletic administrators, academic advisors, etc.) (Kimball, 2007; Woodruff & Schallert, 2008). Scholars have primarily focused on the effects of coaches in the lives of student-athletes. Coaches indeed recognize their influence over the personal development of their student-athletes (Gould, Collins, Lauer, & Chung, 2007; Miller, Salmela, & Kerr, 2002), and are influential in the process of student-athletes establishing priorities as well as their student-athletes' decision-making processes (Adler & Adler, 1991; Kimball, 2007; Miller et al., 2002; Simons et al. 1999; Woodruff & Schallert, 2008). Typically, coaches

are concerned with the athletic roles of their student-athletes by generally requiring high levels of commitment (i.e. time and effort) from their student-athletes to athletics (Adler & Adler, 1991; Simons et al., 1999). Notably, other scholars have observed that coaches can be a source of considerable stress in the lives of student-athletes (Fletcher & Hanton, 2003). In spite of the stress caused by them, research has indicated that coaches believe they have a responsibility to focus on the holistic development of their athletes, yet the current structure of the coaching profession along with the time demands of their jobs presents barriers to them focusing their efforts outside of the athletic realm (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Cullen, Latesa, & Byrne, 1990; Singer & Armstrong, 2001).

Additionally, student-athletes may receive limited reinforcement for their non-athletic roles from their coaches. Adler and Adler (1987) observed that coaches and peers provided little or no acknowledgement of the academic successes of the student-athletes while they provided positive reinforcement of the student-athletes' athletic accomplishments. Sharp and Sheilly (2008) confirmed that student-athletes' academic successes may suffer if they receive little positive feedback from their coaches and athletic administrators. In spite of the athletic pressures confronted by coaches, it is essential for them to provide positive feedback regarding their student-athletes' academics while providing substantial time and effort for the academic development of the student-athletes (Sharp & Sheilley, 2008; Valentine & Taub, 1999).

In addition to the influence of coaches and athletic administrators, university faculty members have also been found to effect the identity development of student-athletes. Faculty members may harbor negative attitudes toward student-athletes (Adler

& Adler, 1991; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991; Engstrom, Sedlacek, & McEwen, 1995; Valentine & Taub, 1999). These negative feelings have been attributed to the perception that student-athletes receive special treatment on campus (Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Valentine & Taub, 1999), along with the belief that student-athletes are less capable to perform academically than other students (Engstrom & Sedlacek, 1991; Sharp & Sheilley, 2008). Student-athletes have been labeled by professors and other students as “jocks” (Adler & Adler, 1987; Sailes, 1993; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005), thus invoking the stereotype that student-athletes are athletes first and students second (Adler & Adler, 1987). The negative attitudes of faculty members toward student-athletes may be attributed to the faculty’s ignorance concerning the daily demands and requirements of student-athletes (Sharp & Sheilley, 2008). Yet, in spite of the negative feelings of faculty members, scholars have suggested that university faculty and staff member should work in cooperation with the athletic department in order to aid in the development of student-athletes (Simons et al., 1999; Valentine & Taub, 1999).

Though some professors and faculty members may hold negative attitudes towards student-athletes, it is important to note that there are also instances of faculty members having positive relationships with student-athletes. Faculty members who frequently attend sporting events on campus generally hold favorable attitudes towards athletes (Weber, Sherman, & Tegano, 1990). Additionally, student-athletes who have had positive relationships with their professors have been found to be more involved in non-athletic activities on their respective campuses (Harrison, Comeaux, & Plecha, 2006; Schroeder, 2000). This notion is in concordance with Simons et al.’s (1999)

suggestion that student-athletes may become better integrated into their campus communities if they have more interaction with university faculty members.

In light of this review, certain aspects of student-athlete development warrant further investigation. Though research has pointed to the influence of coaches regarding the growth and development of student-athletes, there has been limited research examining the pressures that the coaching profession may have on the ability of coaches to engage in the development of their student-athletes beyond the athletic realm. Some scholars have observed that coaches may indeed be concerned with the complete development of their student-athletes (see Adler & Adler, 1991; Singer & Armstrong, 2001), so it may be beneficial to explore factors that may be inhibiting them from fully engaging in practices that could result in the growth of their student-athletes beyond athletics. Moreover, there is a dearth of literature exploring the culture within athletic departments and how that culture may affect attitudes among coaches and athletic administrators toward development of student-athletes. Many colleges and universities employ numerous student-athlete support personnel (i.e., academic advisors, tutors, life-skills coordinators) who are involved in the development of programs which are designed to aid in the development of student-athletes (Howard-Hamilton & Sina, 1993). Thus, the values and attitudes of these people may be influential in shaping the culture of development of student-athletes within an athletic department.

Additionally, universities competing in NCAA Division II athletics are often overlooked by research endeavors that seek to examine intercollegiate athletics (Baucom & Lantz, 2001). Coaches and athletic administrators employed by Division II

universities likely operate under differing conditions than do their Division I counterparts which may affect the value they place on student-athlete development. For example, in regards to evaluation of Division II coaches, Gorney and Ness (2000) observed that “winning” was ranked as less important than personal and academic development factors by administrators of the sampled Division II universities. It may be that coaches and athletic administrators at the Division II level are expected to foster areas of development outside of athletics for their student-athletes. However, it is likely that many (if not most) Division II universities lack the financial capabilities to provide support facilities and services for their athletes that are common on many larger, Division I campuses. Therefore, it is important to gain a better understanding of the challenges of operating under the Division II model of intercollegiate athletics and how these challenges may affect the student-athlete development practices at this level of competition.

Finally, scholars have examined the idea of competing institutional logics in intercollegiate athletics (see Southall, Nagel, Amis, & Southall, 2008; Washington & Ventresca, 2008), yet the pressures of competing institutional logics on coaches and athletic administrators have not been fully explored. Specifically, the effects that these pressures may have on the capacity of coaches and athletic administrators to foster the development of student-athletes beyond the athletic realm have not been examined. Thus, this study seeks to address the lack of research in this area.

Institutional Logics

The concept of institutional logics is a facet of institutionalism, which is the progression wherein social processes, obligations, or realities become norms in social thought and action (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Through various formal structures and ceremonies within an organization, institutional norms serve to legitimize the operations within that organization, whereby it becomes assumed that the most effective way to operate is through the institutionalized structures that have become embedded into the organization or culture (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Southall & Nagel, 2010). As the assumptions within the organization are internalized by its members, they are passed along to new members to the point that the culture and norms are maintained with little influence from those governing the operations (Southall & Nagel, 2010; Zucker, 1977). Institutional logics then serve as the belief structures and related practices that guide practices within an organization (Herremans et al., 2009; Scott, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). Scholars have concluded that organizations are embedded within prevailing institutional logics that effect organizational decisions and outcomes (Herremans et al., 2009; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Yet, research has also suggested that institutional logics not only guide practice within an organization, the logics in that organization may in fact shape the identities of its members (Lok, 2010).

Though institutional logics may provide a framework for decision-making within an organization (Herremans et al., 2009), problems may arise when personnel members are operating under multiple logics within the same organization. Namely, multiple logics within an organization may present different assumptions and norms thereby

creating a situation where there is contention over which of the logics are paramount within the organization (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). In essence, “contending logics provide a source of contradiction in the field in the sense that they represent coherent alternatives to both the dominant status ordering and to the current legitimate activity in the field” (Washington & Ventresca, 2008, p. 33). Thus, members operating in these types of situations may be forced to balance their efforts to meet the expectations of both logics, or they align their attitudes and actions with the more dominant logic (Southall & Nagel, 2010). Predictably, competing logics may create contention among the different stakeholders within the organization as there are likely differing beliefs as to which logics should be the dominant line of reason thereby providing confusion for members of that organization concerning their responsibilities and expectations (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Lok, 2010).

Considering this, the concept of competing or contending logics may be a useful lens for examining intercollegiate athletics. Southall and Nagel (2010) suggested, “While NCAA and college athletic administrators consistently espouse educational policies in public statements, the theory of institutional logics provides an objective framework from which to examine [whether] college sport... reflect[s] consistency with the organization’s stated educational mission, goals, and values” (p. 71). Indeed, scholars have offered evidence to suggest that big time college sport operates within two institutional logics: “educational” and “commercial” (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). Other scholars have extended this by suggesting that the increased commercialism of intercollegiate athletics has placed a much greater emphasis on

winning thereby devaluing academic achievements (Adler & Adler, 1991; Buer, 2009; Eitzen, 2006; Sperber, 2000). Trail and Chelladurai (2002) found that stakeholders of intercollegiate athletics may have different values which may emphasize or deemphasize certain goals within the athletic department. That is, if increasing revenues is deemed most important, then perhaps the value of winning may be emphasized. However, this emphasis on winning has met resistance. Some scholars have suggested that sports programs should be evaluated in terms of a university's core educational mission, not necessarily wins and losses (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Consequently, these logics could be seen as competing since decisions made within one particular logic may be viewed as inappropriate or unacceptable to those operating in the other (Buer, 2009).

Summary

The time spent on a college campus is an important time in a student's growth and development as a person. Scholars have concluded that college should be a time when students can explore a variety of roles as they develop as people (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Niles & Goodnough, 1995; Petitpas & Champagne, 1988; Terenzini, et al., 1994). Student-athletes also undergo similar process of growth and development to that of other students. This includes their development as athletes and students (Adler & Adler, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles, et al., 2002; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). Further, research has examined that their growth and development is effected by coaches and professors who can often be sources of stress in the lives of the student-athletes (Adler & Adler, 1991; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Engstrom & Sedlacek,

1991; Engstrom et al., 1995; Gould et al., 2007; Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Miller et al., 2002; Valentine & Taub, 1999).

Finally, research has suggested that organizational pressures and demands may affect coaches' concern for the development of student-athletes outside of athletics (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Cullen, Latesa, & Byrne, 1990; Singer & Armstrong, 2001). Yet, the perceptions of coaches and athletic administrators regarding these institutional pressures and their effects on student-athlete development efforts have not been fully explored. Fittingly, this investigation examined the institutional logics within a university's athletic department and how these logics may affect its student-athletes.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In order to understand the different institutional logics within a university's athletic department and the effects these logics may have concerning its student-athletes, I implemented a qualitative methodological approach. For the purposes of this study, I was situated in the interpretivist paradigm (see Lather, 2006; Sipe & Constable, 1996). From this paradigm, the primary objective of the researcher is to understand the socially constructed realities of the research setting and its participants (Lather, 2006). Ontologically, the researcher assumes that individuals construct meaning according to their different subjective principles that are salient in their lives (Sipe & Constable, 1996). The epistemological assumption of the interpretivist paradigm is that there are many "truths" and the objective of the researcher is to form a dialogue between different "knowers" in attempts to describe and understand "truth" from the perspective of someone else (Lather, 2006; Sipe & Constable, 1996).

Research Design

Specifically, a case study approach was utilized in this investigation. To be clear, a case study is the systematic accumulation of data in a particular setting which then allows the researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of the operations and social functions within that research setting (Berg, 2001). Similar to other qualitative methods, the implementation of a case study research design allows the researcher to obtain a close, detailed perspective of the research participants' attitudes and beliefs, as well as

the context and social realities in which the participants' experiences are embedded (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Stake, 2005). The case study approach is one that allows the researcher to "move from being a beginner to being an expert" (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 222) in the research setting because of the extended amounts of time and personal contact that the research has with members in the research setting (Stake, 2005). Additionally, the data collection methods used in a qualitative case study allow the researcher to examine certain theoretical constructs within the setting of the study (Stake, 2005). It is also important to understand the bounded nature of case study research designs. This refers to the assumption that processes, understandings, and certain features of the case study are contextually bound to the specific research setting that is being studied (Stake, 2005). This is not to say that readers may not perceive similarities between the setting of the case and their own situations; it simply implies that the specifics of the case may not necessarily be generalizable.

By implementing case study methods for this project, I was able to gain a better understanding of the institutional pressures placed upon athletic department personnel and university faculty members and how these pressures affect the participants' attitudes toward the development of student-athletes beyond the athletic setting. As Flyvberg (2006) suggests, "It is important for the development of a nuanced view of reality, including the view that human behavior cannot be meaningfully understood as simply the rule-governed acts found at the lowest levels of the learning process and in much theory" (p. 223). Thus, the implementation of a case study design was deemed most effective for this investigation.

Research Setting

The setting for this study was a private university in the southern portion of the United States that currently competes in the NCAA Division II level of athletics. This is significant because universities that compete in NCAA Division II athletics are often overlooked by research endeavors that seek to examine intercollegiate athletics (Baucom & Lantz, 2001). In particular the university in this investigation has a tradition of athletic excellence, winning numerous NCAA Division II National Championships (most of which are in Men's and Women's Track and Field) while also producing numerous professional athletes. Yet, the university has also experienced difficulties competing in certain sports within their conference. The conference in which this university competes is recognized as being one of the more competitive Division II conferences in the country and is the destination for many Junior College and Division I transfer athletes.

Though the facilities and winning traditions of the university would seemingly be highly appealing for transferring athletes, the stringent academic requirements of this university often present obstacles for recruiting and admitting some of these athletes. Consequently, transferring student-athletes are often denied into the university because of their grades, and the athletic programs are then forced compete with younger athletes who are admitted to the university directly from high school. I witnessed this during my time spent as a student-athlete at this university. Especially in men's basketball and football, often the university's teams are comprised by a much higher number of younger players (i.e. freshmen and sophomores) than are the teams of their competitors.

This makes it difficult for certain sports at the university to be competitive in their conference. However, a noticeable shift has occurred within certain athletic programs toward the end my time there as a student-athlete. Both men's basketball and football had begun to start recruiting more transfer athletes in efforts to become more competitive. This practice has not necessarily yielded the success hoped for in the men's basketball program. The men's basketball team still struggles to maintain a .500 win to loss record. It is also important to note that the women's athletic programs at this university have experienced success in athletic competition. These programs have not necessarily endured the same challenges as the men's programs of trying to recruit or admit transferring student-athletes. Particularly, women's basketball and volleyball routinely participate in post-season play which has historically eluded the men's basketball and football programs. Yet, with the hiring of the current football coach, the football program at the university has experienced unprecedented success at the university. Over the past few years, the football team has been a perennial top ten program in the nation.

This university employs a similar number of athletic staff and personnel compared to the other universities in the conference, but as a private institution, the school and its personnel are highly influenced by certain religious traditions, which are practiced and promoted throughout all departments (including the athletic department) on campus. Recently, the athletic department hired a full-time staff member who serves as an academic advisor within the university. Though common among NCAA Division I programs, this position is less common at the Division II level. Another unique aspect of

the university is the presence of the Faculty Athletic Committee. This committee is comprised of various members of the university faculty and administration and is meant to ensure that operations within the athletic department are in concordance with the university's policies. Yet in spite of these efforts to ensure acceptable conduct within the athletic department, the NCAA has recently sanctioned this university for various infractions. In light of the religious tradition of the school and the university's oversight of the athletic program, one can reasonably assume that the athletic department would be particularly concerned with maintaining an athletic program that strictly adheres to NCAA guidelines. This might suggest that there are conflicting logics within which the Athletic Department at this university are negotiating.

Participants

In order to achieve an in-depth understanding of the different institutional logics that may affect athletic department personnel and the development of student-athletes, a purposive sample of participants for this study was identified (Patton, 2002). The participants in the study were selected because of their ability to provide insight into the various institutional logics within the athletic department at the university (see Appendix A). Participants for this study were individuals employed within the University's athletic department (see Appendix A), which included head coaches of various sport teams along with staff members of the athletic department (n=8). Previous scholars have indicated that athletic department personnel and coaches play important roles in focusing the academic efforts of student-athletes (e.g. Sharp & Sheilley, 2008; Adler & Adler, 1991); thus, it is important to understand their perceptions regarding the effects that different

institutional logics may have on their abilities to foster the growth and development of student-athletes beyond the athletic realm.

Secondly, university faculty and staff members who are in administrative positions were targeted as well (n=5; see Appendix A). Scholars have examined that, in fact, faculty and staff members often highly regard their universities' athletic programs and can serve in a mentoring role to student-athletes (Harrison et al., 2006); yet, others have suggested that university faculty members may be ignorant to the inner-workings of intercollegiate athletics and are frequently unaware of the demands of being a student-athlete and managing a successful athletic program (Sharp & Sheilley, 2008; Valentine & Taub, 1999). Also, those in administrative positions throughout the university likely expect the athletic department to operate under certain logics, thereby providing a source of pressure on the athletic department to meet certain expectations. Information gleaned from these participants provided insight into the different logics in the research setting.

Often, one of the challenges of conducting a case study (or any qualitative study) is negotiating access into the research setting. However, for this case study, gaining access was not particularly problematic. I had maintained a relationship with the athletic director at the university since my time there as a student-athlete. I also viewed favorably by many of the faculty, staff, and administrative members at the university from my time there. During one conversation with the athletic director, I broached the idea of doing a study at the university and within the athletic department. He was receptive to the idea and asked me to send him the names of the people whom I would like to interview. Once I had compiled a list of possible participants, he and his staff

contacted each participant and scheduled the interviews into time slots. With his endorsement and assistance, I was able to gain access to key administrators within the athletic department as well as the broader university.

Data Collection

Multiple data collection strategies were implemented in this investigation. Primary data collection for this case study was obtained through in-depth, semi-structured interviews (see Appendices B, C, D, & E). The usage of semi-structured interviewing was appropriate because it allows for a certain level of flexibility while still addressing the core research questions and theoretical constructs of this study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Each interview was structured in a manner that allowed the researcher to espouse information from the participants concerning their perceptions of the institutional logics affecting the development student-athletes. Each interview lasted approximately thirty minutes to one hour and was audio recorded and transcribed. Additionally, detailed notes were kept during each interview. Throughout each interview, various member-checking techniques were employed to ensure the accuracy of the researcher's notes and interpretations of the content of the interviews (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This allowed for the participants to clarify or expand upon the content of the interviews.

Secondary data included various documents, which were analyzed in order to gain a deeper understanding of different policies and rules that govern not only this particular institution but also NCAA Division II athletics as a whole (Yin, 1994). These documents included press releases from the university's athletic department, the

university's student handbook, the athletic department's student-athlete handbook, and the NCAA Division II Handbook. Throughout the entire research process, I maintained a reflective journal in which I would record my thoughts concerning patterns in the data. Further, I also recorded thoughts on how the data aligned with the theoretical constructs of this study; that is, I maintained a working record of what I felt were the institutional logics within the research setting and how these logics may conflict with or complement each other. Finally, my lived experiences as a student-athlete at this university were also included as data. My experiences supplemented the data and provided additional insight into this research context. These data collection techniques allowed for data triangulation, which is one aspect of trustworthiness.

Data Analysis

As outlined by Thomas (2006), the data collected in this investigation were examined using a general inductive approach of qualitative data analysis. This method for data analysis allows the researcher to “use detailed readings of raw data to derive concepts, themes, or a model through interpretations made from the raw data” (Thomas, 2006, p. 238). The general inductive approach to qualitative data analysis closely resembles that of grounded theory (see Strauss & Corbin, 1990). In the grounded theory approach, the researcher places data into specific, named categories (open coding), and then these categories are further scrutinized to find data patterns (axial coding) (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). However, the general inductive approach is different in that the processes of open and axial coding are not explicitly separated, and theory building is

limited to presentation and description of the themes most relevant to the objectives of the study (Thomas, 2006).

The inductive analysis of the data in this study began with a thorough reading of the interview transcripts. After the initial reading, each transcript was reread and the portions of each transcript that were thought to address the purpose and research questions of this study were identified. Then, these relevant portions of each interview were categorized through the process of color coding in order to denote the themes and patterns within the texts. This process allowed me to identify the overlapping ideas in the data and categorize them in a manner that was appropriate for this study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 1995; Thomas, 2006). Also, the process of document analysis, along with my lived experiences, was used to support the themes in the data (Yin, 1994). Thus, this process of data analysis provided the basis for understanding the different institutional logics of the university's athletic department. Each of the themes in the data were interpreted as being the dominant institutional logics within the university's athletic department.

Trustworthiness

The first aspect of trustworthiness in qualitative research is credibility. Credibility ensures that the data from the study and the interpretations of that data coincide with one another (Lather, 1986; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To ensure credibility, each interview was audio-taped and transcribed to ensure an accurate representation of the interview data. In addition to audio-taping, the researcher employed member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member-checking is the process in which the

interviewees are allowed to clarify their responses and verify the interpretations of researcher. In this instance, member-checking took place during each interview where I would ask the participants to clarify their responses or confirm my interpretation of their comments. One common practice of member-checking is allowing the participants to review the interview transcriptions. However, this was not implemented because the participants expressed a disinterest in examining their transcripts.

In addition to member-checking, data triangulation is another technique used for ensuring the credibility of the research findings. Triangulation is the gathering of multiple data sources for purposes of corroborating the findings of the research and increasing confidence that the researcher's interpretations are accurate (Fielding & Fielding, 1986; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, triangulation occurred between the interviews, document analyses, field notes, and personal experiences. Finally, peer-debriefing is a technique that is used to ensure credibility of the data. Peer-debriefing consists of reviewing the data with someone who is not necessarily involved in the data collection and analysis of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Four peer-debriefers were used to ensure the credibility of the findings from this study. One of these is a faculty member who is well versed in qualitative research methods. Two others were doctoral students with working knowledge of the concepts being examined in this study. The final peer-debriefer had no formal research training yet would provide feedback concerning the clarity and understandability of the concepts of this case study.

The second aspect of trustworthiness in qualitative research is transferability. Data transferability can be described as the degree to which the findings from one study

can be applicable to another study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). As Flyvberg (2006) suggested, “The goal is not to make the case study be all things to all people. The goal is to allow the study to be different things to different people” (p. 238). One of the key techniques for ensuring transferability is thick description of the research setting. This allows for the readers to compare the similarities and differences of the setting to their own. This technique was used to obtain transferability of the findings.

The final aspects of trustworthiness are dependability and confirmability. Dependability is the degree to which the researcher accounts for the ever-changing context of the research setting while confirmability is ensuring that the findings can be corroborated by others (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Similar to the process of peer-debriefing, each of these can be obtained by the use of a peer-debriefer or an auditor. The entire research process and findings were reviewed by a professor who is proficient in qualitative research and has completed numerous qualitative studies. This ensured that the findings of this study were indeed dependable and confirmable.

Ethics and Human Subjects

This study underwent the review process of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) to ensure that research was in accordance with the laws governing human subject research. This study was eligible for expedited review, and approval for the study was obtained from the IRB. At the onset of each interview, each participant was provided with an information sheet detailing various aspects of the research process (see Appendix F). The participants were ensured that their participation in the study was voluntary and that their identity, along with that of the university, would be kept

confidential. Though none of the participants chose to do so, each was given the opportunity to provide a pseudonym to preserve their identities. Thus, this research adhered to acceptable practices concerning research using human subjects.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Findings

As previously discussed, the purpose of this investigation was to understand the institutional logics within one NCAA Division II athletic department and how these logics may affect its student-athletes. In this chapter, I present the themes from the data that were relevant to the objectives and research questions of this study (see Thomas, 2006), with the primary focus being the institutional logics within the research setting. Then, I discuss the interconnections among these logics to identify possible conflicting logics. Finally, I provide discussion of how these finding may affect the development of student-athletes at this university, concluding with discussion of the theoretical and practical contributions of this research.

It is important to understand that this study was conducted using an emergent research design; that is, the elements of the study, including the specific research questions and approaches to gathering data, were constantly evolving in order to capture the true nature of research setting (Glesne, 1999). In order to uncover the institutional logics within this athletic department, each interview was conducted in a manner that allowed each participant to express their perceptions concerning the operations within the athletic department along with their job performance (see Appendices B, C, D, & E). The interviews included discussion of the role of athletics within the broad scheme of higher education, culminating with the role of the athletics in the university in this study.

Participants were then asked to provide their interpretations of the expectations of the athletic department from the administration of the university. The manner in which these expectations affected them and the performance of their job was then explored. Each interview subsequently included discussion of key concepts such as the importance of winning along with student-athlete development. Participants were also asked to discuss some of the difficulties they experienced as they performed their job within the athletic department. Finally, university administrators and faculty were asked to provide their perceptions of the difficulties experienced by the members of the athletic department concerning operations within the athletic department and the development of student-athletes.

Research Tensions

As the research instrument for this study, I was forced to grapple with certain tensions throughout the process of conducting this study. My experiences as a former student-athlete at this university with former coaches at the university produced skepticism as to the sincerity of the participants' adherence to the religious ideologies of the university. From my experiences, former coaches of the university may publicly espouse certain religious practices; yet, in the confines of their team, they would behave and speak in manners that were inconsistent with their portrayed persona. For instance, during a meeting concerning certain abusive behaviors, one of my former coaches (who is no longer with the university) told me to "leave that Christian stuff out there" and that "I am going to coach the same as if I am at [the university] or hell state." Memories of

these interactions led me to question many of the participants' sincerity when they would discuss their concern for adhering to the religious doctrines of the school.

Furthermore, religious interpretation became a tension with which I was forced to engage. Religious beliefs are subject to interpretation, and as a researcher, it was important that I not let the agreeing or disagreeing with the religious doctrines of the university become an issue in this study. The openness with which the participants conveyed their religiosity made it difficult to refrain from engaging in religious discussions during this study. This also presented challenges to the data analysis and interpretation process. I found it difficult to remove my religious viewpoints and interpretations and ensure that the findings were an accurate interpretation of the participants' conveyed thoughts and beliefs. In light of these research tensions, the following themes emerged from the data and provided insight into the dominant logics within the athletic department at this university.

Student-Athlete Development

From the outset of each interview, participants from within the athletic department routinely referred to the development of their student-athletes as one of the (if not the) most important aspect of their jobs. When asked directly about the aspects of her job she valued most, the head women's basketball coach offered,

Umm, I think in my eyes, one of the most valuable things that, just as far as my job as a whole....I mean I think it's the development of the student-athlete.

Other coaches in this study routinely expressed similar viewpoints. For many of the coaches, student-athlete development was a highly valued aspect of their jobs. This may be a function of the emphasis that the leadership within the athletic department and the leadership of the university have placed upon the development of not just student-athletes but also the general student body. This is reflected in the following statements:

The thing most of our conversations come back to is the coaches and evaluations and things going on in programs and, you know, he (the university president) probably doesn't look at the level I do, but the student development side of things is really really critical....It's one of those that if we have coaches that don't figure out that piece of it, they won't be here long. – Athletic Director

...but here, by and large, our coaches are trying to do that. And, by and large, if a coach loses sight of that they wind up not staying too long here. We really want the whole picture, and we really try to maintain that. And when you hire a new coach, you may think he's [sic] going to do that but you don't always know, and so someone comes and we find out he [sic] can't really adapt to our system, well wither he'll [sic] resign or he'll [sic] be resigned eventually because it's not going to work... – Faculty Athletic Representative

Through these and similar statements made by other participants, engaging in student-athlete development is expected of the coaches. Further, the university and the athletic

department indicated that they value student-athlete development by suggesting that part of the coaches' evaluation is contingent on their efforts in this area. From the data, development efforts were expected in four key areas: academic, physical, social, and spiritual. Each of these are discussed in depth.

Academic Development

As discussed previously, development for student-athletes has been depicted as a multi-faceted concept that encompasses physical development, mental development, and social development (see Adler & Adler, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles, et al., 2002; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). In concordance with previous research, the participants in this study alluded to these different aspects of development, yet it should be noted that not all of these aspects were specifically referred to in each interview. Of these aspects, the most common reference was to the academic development of the student-athletes. All of the participants in this study suggested that the academic development of the student-athletes is among the principal endeavors of the athletic department and of the coaches. The associate athletic director stated,

First of all, again...we've got to develop them mentally. We've got to get them an education. We've got to get them graduated...So academics here is very important.

This statement is somewhat representative of the expressed sentiments of all the participants in this study. These views are in line with the mission statement of the athletic department which reads,

[The University's] athletics will encourage, endorse and emphasize the academic mission of the university. Prospective students will be screened for inclination and aptitude for collegiate work. The academic progress of student-athletes will be monitored. Time allocations will be determined with academic priorities in mind. Academic excellence by student-athletes will be rewarded.– From the athletic department's website

Each coach routinely emphasized the importance of their role in the student-athletes' academic development. Typically, the role of the coaches and athletic department was conveyed as keeping the student-athletes eligible and on track toward graduation. I interpreted this to mean that their duty was provide support and supervision of their student-athletes' academic endeavors in order to help them progress toward graduation or stay eligible. The operational approaches to keep the athletes eligible and on track toward graduation was varied among the coaches. For instance, the head football coach went into great detail outlining his “strategic approach” to academic development. He articulated that he sends out academic progress reports every five weeks for his athletes in order to gage their academic progress, and that he would assign different “alert” levels to each of his athletes. Depending on which level the athlete was

in, different steps would be taken to ensure the athlete was given the best opportunity to succeed. Though none of the other coaches went into as much detail concerning their tactics for fostering academic development, some common practices included securing tutors for athletes, having team study halls, requiring the student-athletes to sit in the front row of their classes, and communicating with their professors. From my experience as a student-athlete at this university, coaches' primary concerns were with the student-athletes who were in danger of losing their eligibility. Student-athletes who were not on this cusp were generally not approached by coaches to discuss academic matters.

The culture of each team also was suggested as being integral in academic development. To illustrate, the head women's basketball coach referred to herself as an educator, even though she had no direct educational duties in regards to teaching classes for the university. Both of the coaches of women's teams indicated that they typically have not had athletes on their teams who have struggled with academic aspects of college. The faculty athletic representative offered this outside perspective that spoke to the culture of the women's teams,

...many of the girls [sic] come in as good students, and enough of them come in that I can kind of count on when I see, oh this team is bringing kind of a marginal student in, I can pretty much bet by the third semester, that student's going to have a 3.0 average because of the pressure from the teammates. The teammates aren't going to let her stay down at a 2.01. They're going to say get with it. And

they're going to tutor and they're going to help and they're going to encourage and they're going to pull them up.

Though all of the coaches discussed the importance of creating an atmosphere that would allow their student-athletes to succeed academically, the general perception gleaned from the interviews was that the women's programs have less academic struggles when compared to the men's programs. To be clear, this was not explicitly stated; however, this insight may be accurate in light of the university's most recent *Academic Success Rate Report* which is published by the NCAA. This report indicated higher academic success rates for the women's sports at the university when compared to the men's sports.

While the participants asserted that each of the coaches were generally responsible for the academic development efforts on their respective teams, the administrators within the athletic department and university have taken steps to cultivate a culture within the athletic department that values the academic development of their student-athletes. Initially, their commitment to the development of their student-athletes is demonstrated by the athletic department's employment of a full-time academic advisor (Director of Academic Services). It is common practice for most Division I universities to have at least one, if not multiple, academic advisors employed within the athletic department; however, the presence of an academic advisor within the athletic department of Division II schools is less common due in part to the discrepancy of resources

between the two divisions. The athletic director and the director of academic services attested to this, respectively:

You know, at our level, to have somebody in our office who's dedicated to academics...there's not many like that. – Athletic Director

The only other DII school in our conference is [a regional state school]...But it is kind of unusual in DII to have a full-time person. A lot of time, the compliance person or the coaches deal with it. But the standards are that...the admission standards to stay at the school are a lot higher here than they are at some of the other conference schools. – Director of Academic Services

The athletic department's willingness to commit the financial resources required to employing a full-time staff member to enhance the academic development of the student-athletes suggests the department's dedication to the academic development of its student-athletes.

However, as suggested by the director of academic services, the creation of this position may also be a necessity for retaining athletes to the university. Participants indicated that the admission standards along with the requirements for remaining enrolled in the university are more stringent than other universities in their athletic conference and also are beyond the requirements set forth by the NCAA. To clarify, the NCAA outlines in their Division II handbook that to remain eligible for athletic

participation, student-athletes must only maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.0 once they have been at their current institution for 72 semester hours. Student-athletes remain eligible in their first 24 semester hours if they have a 1.8 GPA and are eligible with a 1.9 GPA after 48 semester hours (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2010a). The academic and GPA requirements of the university's students are less lenient. To remain in "good standing" with the university, all students must maintain a 2.0 GPA. Once any student falls below a 2.0 they are immediately placed on academic probation. If in the subsequent semester the student is unable to restore a 2.0 GPA or achieve a 2.5 GPA for that semester, the student is then on academic suspension from the university. Further, the university does not accept Ds on transfer applications. In addition to the difficulties this creates in athletic recruiting for the coaches, athletes transferring in must maintain a higher GPA for a greater amount of time when compared to other schools in the university's athletic conference. Thus, the employment of the director of academic services may be necessary to help maintain the eligibility of student-athletes at the university.

The athletic department's concern for the academic development of its student-athletes may also be a function of the university's interest in this area as well. As might be expected, each of the participants who were a part of the broader university faculty and administration were adamant that the academic development of the student-athletes is the most important mission of the athletic department. Though the university faculty members and administrators that I interviewed conveyed their support for athletics at the university, these participants all communicated that their concern for student-athletes

and their academic endeavors. One professor, who is also a department chair, portrayed this during our interview,

I would say like most of the guys I work with, they just want them to be good students because they're concerned about them in their classroom and in their program. And so they just want them to be good students and are probably much more concerned about their academic success than their athletic success.

This viewpoint was consistent with the other participants in this study. The stance of the university concerning the academic development of the student-athletes was not lost on the athletic department. All of the participants from the athletic department expressed an understanding of these expectations from the university's administration and faculty.

The university and its administration validated their commitment to the academic achievement and development of their student-athletes through a standing Faculty Athletic Committee. This committee is comprised of nine faculty members and is chaired by the Faculty Athletic Representative, and each college within the university has at least one representative on the committee. The vice president of the university described the function of this committee in detail,

...we have a faculty athletic committee that reviews every team's schedule based primarily looking at how many days that schedule would require the student to miss class, how many travel days, out of class days would that be. So they have,

you know, they have some general standards that they want those schedules to meet...the coaches know what they are before they build the schedule...so that provision is in place to say that they are not free to just go out and unaccountably miss too many days of school. So the number of days that they miss is theoretically approved by the faculty athletic committee.

The presence of this type of committee with this level of involvement with team's schedules is a fairly unique occurrence. Careful perusal of multiple universities' websites suggested this as well. Though it is not uncommon for universities to maintain the position of a faculty athletic representative, the presence of a standing committee of faculty members overseeing operations within the athletic department is fairly rare.

Physical Development

When asked to discuss how they conceptualized the idea of student-athlete development, participants consistently indicated that the physical, or the athletic, development of the student-athletes was an integral part of their time spent on campus. This belief was consistent among members of the athletic department as well as members of the university faculty and administration. Considering the competitive nature of physical competition, it is not surprising that the participants would all suggest that physical development is essential for the student-athletes. The athletic director spoke to this,

You know, the thing we harp on, I mean, we want to be recognized nationally, have a nationally recognized program. Which means we are competing at a national level, which means that you've got to have the physical development that student-athletes are looking for. That has to be at its best. Whether it's what coaches do here or what the strength coach does in the weight room, so you have physical development.

All of the participants mentioned that the physical development of their student-athletes was an expected function of the athletic department. As one would expect, physical development was discussed more frequently or with greater intensity among the coaches. The university faculty and administration all made mention of the physical and athletic development of the student-athletes; however, they made it clear that this was not their primary concern. Their primary concern revolved around the student-athletes' development beyond their physical and athletic endeavors.

However, relative to the other aspects of student-athlete development, the physical development of the student-athletes was only a minor portion of each interview (even with the coaches). I did not get the impression that this was necessarily a minor part of their views concerning development; the impression was more that the physical development of the student-athletes was an understood component. Physical and athletic development was conveyed as primarily a function of remaining viable in competition. From my experiences at this university, our coaches' primary concern, perhaps not in speech or thought but in action, was our physical development as players. This was

essential for our ability to compete because as freshmen and sophomores only a couple years removed from high school, we were competing against men in our conference who were in their mid and sometimes late 20s. The university in this study, as outlined in previous sections, typically has trouble recruiting and admitting transfer student-athletes because of financial and academic reasons. Thus, without the physical development of their athletes, coaches may struggle to compete against other athletic programs in their conference. In regards to the benefit beyond competition, only one of the participants suggested the benefits of physical development beyond the realm of athletic competition. The head football coach spoke to this directly,

You know, from a football standpoint, there's the weight room...Just the physical development of a player, the confidence level that he's going to gain by going through a tremendous strength and conditioning program and then go have the opportunity to compete and engage another man physically and do all the things you've gotta do, that's a huge part of that.

This was the only mention of the importance of physical development from a standpoint other than competing in games. The instilling of confidence was the only benefit that was discussed as a benefit away from the realm of competition. Perhaps as I previously suggested, the benefits of developing physically may be seen as a given outcome of participation in college athletics among the participants.

Social Development

Participants in this study suggested that social development was an integral aspect of the development of student-athletes. This concept was primarily discussed by the participants who were within the athletic department. The presence of athletics in the educational setting is often justified under the guise that participation in sport fosters a social awareness among student-athletes (Hyland, 2008); therefore it is not surprising that stakeholders within the athletic department would point to the social development of their student-athletes as an important aspect of their roles. The head women's basketball coach described the role of athletics in the social development of student-athletes,

Umm, and I think also too, you know, it gives them a sense of purpose a little bit, that they belong to something that is bigger than themselves and that what they do can help those directly around them. And, umm, obviously I think it teaches them roles that you're going to have in life. I mean the company that you work for, you may not be the top dog at that company, but you're going to have to learn to work, to get along. Even if you may not be best friends with them but you have to work for a common purpose and you have to get along with them when it comes to certain tasks or programs or something that you're working on in the future. So I think it prepares them a lot for life in general.

Though the other coaches and athletic administrators in this study were not as specific, they all communicated similar opinions to the social development aspect of participation in athletics.

The administration within the athletic department, namely the Athletic Director, clearly stated that the coaches were required to engage in social activities outside of the competition realm of their sport. The athletic director pointed to involvement in philanthropic activities as part of the requirements for the coaches. Specifically,

One of the other requirements that we have that deals a little bit with this ability to develop student-athletes is community service and engagement. And so, I require each of our coaches to have something that they participate in more than just a one weekend type thing, but something that they're involved with. Whether it be Big Brothers Big Sisters, Boy's and Girl's Club, uh, you know [the baseball coach], they go and read at an elementary school with kids, preparing for the state test. [I'm] trying to really encourage them to find a place to give student-athletes opportunities to be involved in the community and things outside of just [the university]. – Athletic Director

Through the athletic director's requirements and the culture of the university, other athletic administrators suggested that philanthropic activities were part of the tradition within the athletic department. The director of academic services expanded upon this idea,

And I know that group (Student Athlete Advisory Council), that group is doing a lot right now with some fundraising for Make-a-Wish. So I see that with that group and what they're doing. And a lot of them are in FCA. And so there's a lot that's going on there too. I consider that student development because they're going outside this realm and looking beyond; looking what they can do for others...volunteerism is huge. They really encourage students to go beyond.

(parentheses added)

It was left up to the discretion of the coaches as to what activity or organization was best suited for their student-athletes. As eluded to, the baseball coach would have his student-athletes be involved at local elementary schools. The head women's basketball coach and her team adopted a highway outside of their town. When I was a student-athlete at this university, our team volunteered for Habitat for Humanity. The approach adopted by the coaches was not necessarily as important as the effort they put forth to provide their teams with opportunities to be involved in community service.

In addition to philanthropic approaches to social development, coaches would engage in activities within their individual team settings that were meant to foster this development. In order to build accountability and counteract selfish behavior, the head football coach had a unique approach to cultivating social development with his student-athletes. He explained,

At the start of that week, I'll give them all an index card, everyone of them in the room, coaches, players, everybody...I'll have them write down four goals; a weight room goal, a practice goal, an academic goal, and a personal goal for the week...Alright, you write yours out, I write mine out, we switch. Your job is to know my goals for the week and help me achieve them. My job is to know your goals and help you achieve them...That technique, it won't always make them achieve those goals at a high level because they're human, but the fact that I'm forced to give a rip whether you get 320 on the clean this week instead of 295 because I'm watching you, it just makes me care about you.

This practice was implemented by the head football coach to promote accountability and build relationships among his team. He saw this as an important part of the social development of his athletes. Other coaches also spoke to the importance of accountability. A common phrase used by many of the participants was that athletics allows student-athletes to "be a part of something bigger than themselves."

The university faculty and administration also acknowledged the social development, though it was to a lesser extent than the members of the athletic department. They pointed to the development of leadership skills and time management as important elements in the social development of the student-athletes. Also, their concern for the social development of the student-athletes could be perceived from the expectation that student-athletes be involved on campus and not be separated. As previous research has indicated, often student-athletes become isolated from the general

student body (Adler & Adler, 1991); thus, the administration and faculty from this university communicated the importance of student-athletes, along with athletics, being active in the broader campus. However, it should be noted that specifics detailing how the student-athletes should be involved were not necessarily discussed. The only pragmatic action of integration into the broader campus that was mentioned was that student-athletes learned how to communicate with their professors.

Spiritual Development

The participants in this study, similar to previous research (see Adler & Adler, 1991; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles, et al., 2002; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005), conveyed the importance of student-athlete development from an academic, physical, and social perspective. However, they extended these to include spiritual development as an important aspect of the student-athletes' development. Throughout the interviews, only academic development was discussed with the same fervor as spiritual development. With the highly salient religious tradition of the university, it is not surprising that the spiritual development of all students within the university would be an emphasis of the leadership across campus. Specifically, the mission statement of the school avows,

The mission of [the university] is to educate students for Christian service and leadership throughout the world.

Included as part of this mission statement,

This mission is achieved through: meaningful service to the academic disciplines, the university, and the church, expressed in various ways, *by all segments of the [university] community.* (italics added)

Thus, as implied by the mission statement of the university, the spiritual development of the students on campus is valued and all departments on campus are expected to operate in a manner that espouses these values. To illustrate, this university is one of the few religious institutions across the country that maintains a daily chapel service which all students are required to attend. The expectation of spiritual development was also expressed by the university's faculty and administration members who were a part of this study.

And then from a Christian perspective...I am idealistic and maybe somewhat naïve in my hopes for an athletic program and athletic representation that would stand apart, that the language that I think would be acceptable on most athletic fields might not, I would like to not have acceptable here. The kinds of behavior and the kinds of recruiting experiences, the coaches we have, the kind of council, and the interest...[if] we just happen to have a program and we look like everybody else...then I think that we're doing something wrong here. –

Associate Professor

Indeed, the athletic department at the university is not exempt from embodying the values of the university. When questioned about the administration's expectations of the athletic department, the vice president of the university offered,

I guess I'd say the highest expectation is that the athletic program would reflect, accurately, the identity of the university...because of the kind of school we want to be, we want people that see that reflected and emanating from coaches and athletes that represent the school.

This sentiment was shared by the provost along with the other faculty members who were interviewed for this study. It was clear that members of the broader university expect the athletic department to share the same concern for the spiritual development of their student-athletes as the rest of the campus cares about the spiritual aspects of the general student body. In accordance with this concern and speaking to the greater mission of the university, the athletic director communicated the importance of athletics augmenting the university,

I would hope, and I think our president shares the same thing, but athletics should be a vehicle that serves the greater mission of [the university]...To educate students for Christian service and leadership, that's a unique mission that a lot of institutions aren't going to have because it doesn't have a Christian

perspective. So that's why that has to be maintained in our programs as a high priority because we want our students to get that when they walk through our doors.

It is apparent that providing an atmosphere that promotes the spiritual development of their student-athletes is an expected priority for the athletic department.

These expectations may be a likely producer of the culture shared by those employed within the athletic department. Participants in this study affirmed that the Christian culture was a unique aspect of their job and was instrumental in their desire to work in the athletic department at this university. The participants seemingly embraced the expectations of the university as a positive aspect that has positively enhanced their athletic program. In the words of coaches,

There's a lot that we do with the girls [sic] that has nothing to do with our sport, has everything to do with just being a better person, being a better Christian, learning more about God, having him [sic] be the focus of our life. And if I didn't have that vehicle of volleyball, I wouldn't have that team to work with. –
Head Volleyball Coach

I think a lot of the athletes are drawn to [the university] because of the Christian atmosphere. And I think that's a bonus that we have at [the university]. And that's why I love coaching at [the university]...I think at [the university], it's one

of the reasons a lot of us are here and it's the reason I love being here. – Head Women's Basketball Coach

...here's what I've learned, because that was a big part of my vision was to do something in that realm, and I didn't really think that a byproduct of that would be more wins, but it really has been. I believe, one, I believe God blesses that effort and what I'm seeing is he's [sic] sent some players, I think, because he know we would cultivate their heart. – Head Football Coach

This evidence suggests that the religious culture of the university had permeated the athletic department; therefore, fostering the spiritual development of student-athletes was an important aspect of development efforts within the teams and department as a whole.

Spiritual development efforts were varied among the coaches. The athletic department administration did not necessarily dictate the manner in which its personnel engaged the spiritual realm; coaches were simply expected to put forth effort in fostering spiritual growth within their teams. However, coaches and athletic administrators referred some common practices which were believed to be integral in the process of spiritual development. They all pointed to the importance of the university's tradition of daily chapel services as instrumental in cultivating the spiritual lives of their players. Further, the athletic department would facilitate one chapel each month within the department that allowed the student-athletes to engage in religious teachings within the

athletic department's setting. Individually, each coach would also integrate weekly chapel programs within their teams. During these team chapels, coaches indicated that they would facilitate conversations among their teams which would primarily revolve around spiritual issues such as the importance of prayer and serving others as Christians. Interestingly, the development of these weekly team chapels is a fairly recent development. When I attended this university, our coaches rarely, if ever, facilitated team chapel services. In fact, one of our coaches would allow us to skip chapel and spend it in our locker room where we had coaches and a big screen television.

Along with the various chapel services, coaches would engage in other spiritual development activities with their teams. The head volleyball coach commented that they "spend hours upon hours each year in Bible study as a group." Most of the other coaches discussed prayer in their team settings. Routinely, coaches commented that they would open or close their practices with prayers. In addition to these traditions, all of the coaches would take their teams on a team retreat before their competition seasons would begin. This was a common practice that began during my sophomore season at this university. Our coach was one of the first coaches to implement the practice of team retreats. For us, these retreats were seen as team-building times and we rarely discussed religion; however, the coaches in this study suggested that important component of these retreats was their spiritual focus. Coaches acknowledged that fostering a spiritual connectedness among their teams would bring them closer as a unit. Thus, the spiritual development of the student-athletes is a valued component of student development in the athletic program at the university.

University Enhancement

A key purpose of the athletic program that was outlined by the participants is the athletic department's role in enhancing the university. Members of the athletic department along with university faculty and administration all pointed to this as a significant requirement of the athletic programs. Participants communicated three components of university enhancement that the athletic department fulfilled. These included enhancing the university by building community and spirit among the current student-body and alumni; furthering the mission and vision of the university; and serving as a marketing and recruiting tool. Each of these will be discussed in detail.

Building Community

Participants in this study suggested that a key function of the athletic department is its ability to instill campus pride and spirit in the students and alumni which would enhance the sense of community on campus. This is reflected in the commentary of university administrators,

It becomes often, from the university perspective, it becomes a center for developing an esprit de corps and a spirit among the campus. Not just the athletes, but just students going to games and having a sense of community with cheering for our team. – University Vice President

And thus, we do believe, and I do believe, that part of that development comes through participation in athletics and the way in which that develops a

community. I do believe that we're in a very real way, a higher learning community and part of that is associated with our athletics program...I believe the purpose of our athletics program would be two-fold. One is to contribute in a positive way to community life. – the Provost

Faculty members of the university shared a similar sentiment as these members of the administration. They conveyed that athletics not only builds community on campus, but athletics also creates an identity for the university. Though, they acknowledged that there were some detractors among the university's broader faculty, for the most part they conveyed that athletics was generally seen as a valuable aspect of campus life.

Members of the athletic department also acknowledged the ability of their programs to build spirit and a sense of community on campus. Specifically, the athletic director addressed this notion,

It's also a great rallying point for alumni. It's a great opportunity to engage the campus who aren't student-athletes; faculty, staff, people who just like [the university]. You know, athletics serves a unique way to bring people into community, to have something to fight for, to cheer for.

The assistant director of operations shared his viewpoint on this matter,

... it's about having fun and a way to release and have a good time at an athletic event is the biggest thing for students to get and they become passionate about it and follow those teams the rest of their lives really. So I think it's a great way for students, the general population to go ahead and enjoy themselves and have a sense of school pride and it's something that develops into having such a strong alumni base for the university as well.

The ability to build and strengthen the university's sense of community was not lost on members of the athletic department.

University Mission and Vision

In addition to building community, participants in this study conveyed that it is important for the athletic department to exude the mission and vision of the university. They suggested that this was a component of building community on campus. The university's faculty and administration members each conveyed their concern for the athletic department being a part of the university's mission and vision. Specifically,

...because we are a Christian university, that is really at the center of our purposes and so I think most institutions could and would say their athletic programs contribute to community and community life...But we mean those in a particular way...we want to make sure that as our athletic programs contribute to community life, that they are in support of academic achievement and spiritual development. – the Provost

The vice president of the university shared similar commentary,

I guess I'd say the highest expectation is that the athletic program would reflect accurately the identity of the university...because of the kind of school we want to be, we want people to see that reflected and emanating from coaches and athletes that represent the school.

The professors that were interviewed for this study also expressed concern for this matter. Each suggested that the athletic department should respect the broader mission of the university and that they should exude the values and mores consistent with those of the university. This is not surprising given the salient religious traditions of the university.

Further, this concept also resonated among participants from the athletic department. The athletic director communicated precisely that the athletic department has the responsibility to ensure that they are operating in a manner that builds upon the mission and vision of the university. It was apparent that this message had been effectively conveyed to the coaches as well. This importance of representing the university and their traditions can be seen through comments from the head women's basketball coach,

And I think our responsibility as coaches, as athletics programs, I think what they expect of us is to represent the university in a manner that is pleasing to [the university]...that you don't have a lot of negative stuff going out there. I think to represent them with class and integrity, that is a direct reflection on the university...And I think they expect us to represent the university as Christian men and women as well. You know, that's what [the university] is based on and what it's founded on.

The concept of representing the university in a positive manner is an admittedly abstract construct. However, members of the athletic department, as well as faculty members, explained that this could be seen through a variety of actions. These include treating opponents with respect on the playing field or court, acknowledging God after their competition is completed, and finally, refraining from using profanity. It is interesting to note that the language used by players and coaches was of primary concern. Multiple participants pointed to the importance of not allowing profanity in their athletic teams or during athletic competitions. Profanity is considered as a detractor from the mission of the university and is thus looked upon unfavorably within the athletic department.

Marketing and Recruiting

Finally, the athletic department at the university was seen as an important tool for marketing the university and recruiting new students. Participants who are members of the university's faculty and administration conceded that their athletics programs are

the most publicized programs of the university. An associate professor discussed this directly,

So, for example, there's no question that I think the marketing, the advertisement, the interest level that people have with universities is partly, if not in large part, due to an athletic program...So, without a doubt, I think it enhance the image, if done properly, of any university. It enhances marketing, it enhances student draw and support...and it unifies an alumni base, I think, as well.

Though faculty members and administration of the university routinely stated their support of athletics and expressed positive feelings towards the athletic department, some also conveyed some concern that athletics was one of the primary marketing tools of the university. Particularly, the faculty athletic representative spoke to the university being represented primarily by athletics,

These kids are, after all, representing the university...which is sometimes unfortunate because they're not always our best students. They don't always make the best possible representation. But they're the ones in the public eye. They're the only students we have that have a whole section in our newspaper devoted to them and all of the things like them.

Whether or not it was their preference, university faculty and administrators recognized that athletics was one of their primary marketing vehicles. Athletics provides a level of visibility beyond that of academics at a university.

Members of the athletic department also recognized the utility of athletics as a marketing tool for the university. Coaches and athletic administrators alike suggested that the athletic department garnered a significant amount of attention for the university. For instance, the head men's basketball coach elaborated on this idea,

I think our people in our administration realize the importance and the value in athletics and the visibility that it gives to a university. You know, like it or not, I think from a marketing standpoint, there's not anything you can do to bring as much interest to a university as athletics.

The associate athletic director discussed that the athletic department serves as a recruiting tool for the university. He explained,

Well, you've got probably a large percentage of them that expect the athletic department to be successful and create the ability to recruit, not only student-athletes...so that the recruiters can go out and recruit and they can use the athletic department [saying] 'we've got a great football team that's 11-0, ya'll need to come out here and participate and all kinds of stuff.' So they use that.

It is important to note the participants in this study routinely conveyed that the aforementioned aspects of enhancing the university were also an integral part of marketing the university as well. From the interviews with the participants, my perception was that building community and promoting the religious traditions of the school were inseparable from the marketing efforts of the university. The school is built on certain religious mores and by exuding these religious values, the athletic department should reflect aspects of the university that would be attractive to Christian students. This was conveyed by the associate professor when he suggested that his hopes were the university's athletic teams would exude the moral standards of the university by refraining from profanity and exuding grace in competition. Additionally, by creating a spirit on campus and providing events for alumni to attend, the spirit and community that is built on campus by the athletic programs is also an attraction to their target market segments.

Winning

The final theme that emerged from the data is the importance of winning within the athletic department. As I previously discussed, scholars have suggested that the increased commercialism in intercollegiate sport has placed a greater emphasis on winning (Adler & Adler, 1991; Buer, 2009; Eitzen, 2006; Sperber, 2000); though at the Division II level, winning may not be the primary means for which coaches are evaluated (Gorney & Ness, 2000). With research indicating that the importance of winning varies depending on the context, to understand the institutional logics within this university's athletic program the discussion of winning is imperative. Throughout

the interviews, participants were asked to expand upon how winning fits into their job and the importance of winning in the evaluation of coaches and the athletic department as a whole.

Though the majority of time in each interview was spent discussing student-athlete development, each participant was questioned about the importance of winning in competition. Each participant, including university faculty and administrators, acknowledged that winning was one of the, if not the, primary factor in the evaluation of their coaches' success. The head football coach succinctly captured this sentiment when asked what the primary criterion for his job evaluation was,

You know, primarily would be wins and losses. I mean, at the end of the day, if we lose a bunch of games, I'm not going to get to stay.

The head women's basketball coach concurred with this idea,

I mean, it comes down to it (wins and losses) and you know, that is my job. Our job is to win games. They're not going to keep me here if I'm winning five or six games every year. (parentheses added)

University faculty members also conceded the importance of winning,

Well, I think without a doubt, you're still in a business where wins and losses matter, and so I don't know that is necessarily, I shouldn't say, any different, but I think there is still a bottom line to what you're measuring success by...And I'm fine with someone wanting to argue that wins and losses aren't the measurement for some evaluation of a coach or evaluation of a program. I'm fine for that argument, but the reality is that that doesn't continue for long. So I think wins and losses do play a part. – Associate Professor

Because again, if you wind up not ever winning here, you probably are going to get fired just like you are any place else because winning is part of the game.

This is, after all, athletics. –Faculty Athletic Representative

The university's Provost also reflected on the value of winning,

I don't think anyone expects every sport to have a winning record every year. But I think in general, the university would be looking to have the kinds of teams that help create community and help promote [the university] effectively to its various stakeholders. And I think winning is an important part of that.

From these, it is important to recognize that winning is an important aspect of the evaluation of success in the university's athletic department. However, most of the participants did continue to say that winning was not the only criterion factored into this

evaluation. As discussed previously, other aspects of student-athlete development were said to be factored into the evaluation of success as well.

Interestingly, the coaches in this study connected the concept of winning to student-athlete development. Coaches suggested that winning was a byproduct of their development efforts away from the realm of athletic competition. The head men's basketball coach spoke to this directly,

Well, I mean, I think winning is kind of a byproduct of what you do. I wouldn't know where to fit it in. You know, obviously as a coach that's important. I don't think you want to get into a situation where it's win at all costs. But I think, you know, if you're doing everything right then I think that's a byproduct of what's going to happen.

The head women's basketball coach similarly stated,

I think if you're doing the other things right and if you're developing your student-athletes like they should be and you're recruiting the right players that are going to buy into what [the university] is about and what is expected of them at [the university], I think the winning part takes care of itself. If you're taking care of your players and you're treating them the way you would want your kids to be treated or the way that you would want to be treated, I think the winning part takes care of itself a lot of times.

The head volleyball coach mentioned this as well,

I truly feel that if my kids are happy with their academic life and their social life and their spiritual life, they're going to perform well for me on the court because they're not stressed out in those other places.

Perhaps this should not be a surprising concept because of the aforementioned expectations of student-athlete development. It seems that the coaches have bought into the culture on the university and the athletic department which espouses the importance of the overall development of the student-athlete.

It should also be noted that not all of the participants necessarily believed that winning holds that much weight at the university. Notably, the head volleyball coach suggested,

...but I don't think that the campus as a whole or our teams or our student-athletes as individuals, feel like winning and losing is the only judge on their character, on their value, on their worth as a student-athlete. And I just don't think that that is the most important thing on this campus, I really don't. And I could be wrong; it could be like every other campus out there that all that really matters is winning and losing.

The faculty athletic representative also addressed this,

All of us like to win. I think virtually everyone would say we want to win and do the other things, but if we can only do one, the other things are more important. I think that would be the majority attitude.

These statements are seemingly in direct contrast of the previously discussed viewpoints of other participants in this study. However, it should be noted that the faculty athletic representative did admit that winning is a primary consideration when assessing the success of coaches and athletic programs (also reflected in previous paragraphs). In conjunction with this, the head volleyball did ultimately acknowledge that she had always won at the university and that her viewpoints may be different if she was not winning as much. In light of her previous comments on concerning the value of winning at the university, the following conversation reveals her concession that winning may still be the primary evaluator of coaches.

Head Volleyball Coach: "...but I also don't feel like my worth is tied up in wins and losses and I don't feel like my boss evaluates me solely on that basis. Now I do think if I ever drop below positive, I mean, I've been above .500 every year I've been here. I think if I ever drop below .500, I might have a different scenario."

Researcher: "So winning and losing, there's still that threshold right?"

Head Volleyball Coach: “Yeah you’re right. You know, I never really thought about it quite that way because I win.”

Thus, even these participants acknowledged that winning is an important aspect in the evaluation of a successful athletic program.

Winning and University Enhancement

The participants in this study admitted that winning is an aspect of university enhancement. This sentiment can be seen in the previous quotation from the associate athletic director. The provost of the university voiced an intriguing belief during our interview. During a discussion of her viewpoints concerning the athletic department contributing to the mission of the university, she was asked to address the importance of winning. The following was her response,

It’s interesting that you ask that question because just last weekend we had our board of trustees meeting and I was very interested to hear that subject discussed. And I think that’s an important question for a board of trustees to wrestle with. What matters? Well, you could develop many of these same skills that I’ve already referred to: responsibility, teamwork, working toward a goal. You could develop those, I believe, with a losing team as well as you could with a winning team. But the other aspect of, a purpose with our athletic program, as I already mentioned, is to build community. And one, I suppose you could have an institution that builds community around a losing program, but probably not so

much...So part of our reason to have athletics programs is to build a community that will help attract and retain students and alumni. And so I believe winning is, it would be, something that we would expect.

Other participants shared similar sentiments regarding the importance of winning. Many acknowledged the difficulties of building spirit and community in accordance with the views of the provost. The head women's basketball coach specifically recognized the importance of having a winning football team on campus and the support that athletics garnered from the university as result of football's successes. She explained,

And I feel like, now, that we do have a little bit more support than what we had in the past...obviously football winning helps a lot. I mean, honestly, when football succeeds, it helps everybody...I think it's helped people see the benefit of athletics a little bit more because [the university] has gotten a ton of recognition because of football. And I think that has opened some people's eyes across campus. Ok, when they win, it helps everybody and our support has gotten a lot better because of that I think.

Therefore, winning was credited as being an important aspect of university enhancement. As the participants suggested, winning athletic programs enhance university support and recognition, even at the Division II level.

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to understand the different institutional logics within an NCAA Division II athletic program and how these logics may affect student-athletes. To review, institutional logics are the belief structures and related practices within an organization that ultimately provide the foundation for the manner in which the organization operates (Herremans et al., 2009; Lok, 2010; Scott, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). These findings from this study suggested that there are multiple logics at work within the research setting. It is important to understand the interplays and connections between these logics and how they may affect the student-athletes at this university. In the following sections, the theoretical and practical implications of these findings are discussed in greater detail.

Theoretical Implications: Conflicting or Complementary Logics?

The themes presented in the findings of this study highlighted the broader logics at work within the athletic department. The athletic department at the university is expected to operate in a manner that fosters student-athlete development, yet also demonstrates success through winning in athletic competition while also enhancing the university. These logics are similar to the education and commercial logics that were observed by scholars of intercollegiate athletics (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Southall & Nagel, 2010). Members of the athletic department and the university faculty and staff conveyed the importance of the athletic department operating in a manner that satisfied each of these. On the surface, the logic of student-athlete development does not necessarily appear to complement the logics of winning and university enhancement and

may in fact contend with these for primacy. However, the participants routinely downplayed the contention between these logics and suggested these logics were often highly related.

Student-Athlete Development and Winning

Participants in this study outlined various aspects of student-athlete development which may be in contention with the requirement of winning. Even the participants acknowledged that there were times when academics and athletics practices and competition times would conflict thereby resulting in coaches and student-athletes having to make compromises in both the academic and athletic realms. Often a compromise on either side seemingly devalues the other there by suggesting the presence of competing logics (Buer, 2009). However, especially conveyed among members of the athletic department, these compromises forced the student-athletes to learn the importance of balancing time requirements and still pursuing goals in both the academic realm and on the playing field/court. The coaches and athletic administrators reframed this conflict to suggest that learning balance was integral in the development of the student-athletes.

It is important to understand that the faculty and administration at this university frowned upon favoritism being shown to the student-athletes and rarely made exceptions of university policies for the athletic department and the student-athletes. This is evident in a situation that was faced by the head volleyball coach in this past season. One of her student-athletes was forced to miss a postseason volleyball match because it would have required her to miss an extra class. Because of the university's absence policy, this

player would have failed the class because of too many absences. However, even amidst the frustration of members of the athletic department, this incident was reframed in a positive light as a developmental opportunity for that particular student-athlete and the rest of the team as well.

Coaches in this study communicated that winning was viewed as byproduct of their student-athlete development efforts. Each one of the coaches asserted the sentiment that if they were doing their job in developing their student-athletes in all aspects of the student-athletes' lives, then their efforts would be rewarded on the field/court. This would suggest that the logics of winning and student-athlete development are more complementary than conflicting. Perhaps this was also a result of the notion that student-athlete development was communicated as generally more important at the university than wins and losses in the evaluation of the athletic department and its teams. Faculty, university administration, and athletic administration all acknowledged the importance of winning, yet through conversations and their portrayed attitudes, they seemingly placed the greatest emphasis on student-athlete development.

Recent events within the athletic department may, however, suggest that winning is still a primary factor in the evaluation of coaches at the university. Shortly after I had completed my interviews, the head men's basketball coach resigned from his position. In the press release following this resignation, the athletic director acknowledged that the head men's basketball coach had fit well into the university's environment. From conversations with former players, members of the athletic

department, and from personal experiences, the head men's basketball coach had worked hard on the developmental side of his student-athletes yet that had not translated into wins on the court. The press release of his resignation cited this lack of winning as the primary reason why he and the university had decided to part ways. This may indicate that perhaps there is a baseline amount of winning that must be accomplished before the student-athlete development is factored into the evaluation of coaches.

The faculty athletic representative spoke to this notion indicating that winning and student-athlete development were expected because current and former coaches have been successful doing both. This was hinted at by women's teams' coaches in this study as well. Though each suggested that winning may be less important than student-athlete development efforts at the university, they both have been highly successful in terms of wins and losses. The head volleyball coach conceded that she was not necessarily attuned to the conflicting nature of winning and student-athlete development because she had always accumulated substantial wins during her time at the university. She also suggested that her emphasis on developmental aspects of her program may change if she was in a position where she was not winning as many games. So it may be that in this context of this research setting winning and student-athlete development are complementary only if an acceptable amount of wins are accumulated by a coach. Until a baseline level of winning has occurred within a given athletic program, winning and the outlined aspects of student-athlete development may in fact be contending logics within this research setting.

Student-Athlete Development and University Enhancement

The data from this study suggests that the various aspects of student-athlete development may complement certain aspects of university enhancement. First, the physical development of the student-athletes contributes to enhancing the university by aiding in more wins for their respective teams. As previously discussed, winning is an important aspect of contributing to the university. Winning teams likely receive more media coverage which supplements the university's marketing and recruiting efforts. Also, administrators of the university acknowledged that creating community and spirit on the campus is enhanced by winning. Therefore these logics may in fact be complementary.

The social and spiritual development of the student-athletes at this university may also correspond with university enhancement. The various activities that were outlined as part of the athletic department's social and spiritual development efforts directly reflect the mission of the university. Primarily, the philanthropic expectations serve to promote the religious service mission of the university throughout the local community. Faculty and administration of the university also suggested that the spiritual development of the players would enhance the university's image during their competitions. It was expected that the student-athletes would exude an accurate representation of the university in order to set the university apart from other schools. Further, the athletic director pointed to the belief that student-athletes who chose to attend the university generally expected the athletic department to foster their total

development as people. Thus the development of the student-athletes may be construed as harmonic with the logic of university enhancement.

Though student-athlete development and university enhancement may be generally complementary ideas, these logics may also be conflicting concepts. The primary source of contention may come from the expectation of academic development. Scholars have proposed that the commercial end of college athletics has emphasized the importance of winning which in turn may devalue the academic development of student-athletes (Adler & Adler, 1991; Buer, 2009; Eitzen, 2006; Sperber, 2000). Participants in this study acknowledged that winning was an important part of athletics ability to enhance the university. Representing the university and enhancing the image of the university includes considerable time commitments that may likely detract from the development of the student-athletes, especially their academic development.

Practical Implications

In addition to the theoretical implications, practical concepts may be gleaned from these results. Though there are some areas of contradiction within the expectations of the athletic department, certain procedures that have been adopted by this university and athletic department may be instrumental in reducing the conflicting ideas within an NCAA Division II athletic department. To begin, the athletic director is an active member of the university's operating cabinet. This allows him to be a part of the overall planning process for the university. The administration of the university recognized this as positively contributing to the relationship between academics and athletics on campus. By being a part of this cabinet, the athletic director has exhibited concern for

the general direction of campus and has demonstrated a willingness to be an integral part of the campus community.

Another strategy of the university to reduce conflicts between athletics and academics is the standing athletics committee. As previously described, this is a standing committee, consisting of faculty members from each of the university's colleges who review all of the athletic schedules to make certain that the student-athletes are not accumulating large numbers of absences. This committee serves as a measure of accountability for the athletic program to help ensure that participating in athletic competition has as minimal effect as possible on the academic development of the student-athletes. The presence of this committee also cultivates understanding of the operations of the athletic department among the various departments on campus because each college has a representative involved with the athletic program.

Finally, other Division II athletic programs may find it useful to employ a full-time academic advisor within their departments. Though it is common for larger Division I programs to have multiple academic advisors within the athletic department, participants in this study suggested that this is fairly uncommon at the Division II level. This may be due to the limited financial resources within Division II athletics. However, the participants in this study all recognized the importance of this position in enhancing the development of their student-athletes. In lieu of an academic advisor, Division II athletic programs may find it useful to develop partnerships with other campus services that are designed to aid all students in their development. These could include partnerships with academic support services, tutoring services, the university library, or

student career services. By cultivating such partnerships, the athletic department could provide more services to their student-athletes which are designed to foster their overall growth and development, thereby reducing the conflicts between academics and athletics.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Summary

In review, the purpose of this study was to understand the institutional logics within an NCAA Division II athletic department and how these logics may affect its student-athletes. This research was meant to address certain voids in the literature concerning student-athlete development within intercollegiate athletics. Principally, literature concerning student-athlete development has examined the internal processes of athletes as they establish their individual identities through the processes of role engulfment (Adler & Adler, 1991; Brewer et al., 1993; Killeya-Jones, 2005; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Settles et al. 2002; Valentine & Taub, 1999; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). This includes the examination of various roles occupied by student-athletes along with the various stakeholders in the student-athletes' lives that may influence their perceptions of the importance of certain roles and areas of their development (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Baucom & Lantz, 2001; Kimball, 2007; Woodman & Hardy, 2001; Woodruff & Schallert, 2008; Yopyk & Prentice, 1993).

Further, scholars have examined that the nature of intercollegiate athletics may also effect the development of student-athletes. That is, the inordinate amounts of time and energy that are required of student-athletes to participate in athletic competition along with the positive affirmation and glorification received by athletes on campus, may contribute to student-athletes developing themselves, above all, as athletes and

neglecting development in other aspects of their lives (Adler & Adler, 1985, 1987, 1991; Kimball, 2007; Miller & Kerr, 2003; Murphy, et al., 1996; Simons et al., 1999; Valentine & Taub, 1999; Yopyk & Prentice, 2005). Research has also suggested that pressures placed upon coaches may indirectly effect student-athlete development. Scholars have long suggested that increased commercialism within intercollegiate athletics has resulted in coaches being evaluated primarily on the basis of wins and losses (Adler & Adler, 1987, 1991; Buer, 2009; Eitzen, 2006; Sperber, 2000). Thus, despite their concern for the total development of their student-athletes, the commercialized nature of intercollegiate athletics has resulted in coaches being much more invested in developing their student-athletes athletically in order to preserve their jobs (Adler & Adler, 1987; Cullen et al., 1990, Singer & Armstrong, 2001; Sperber, 2000).

Though research had examined the effects of commercialism on coaches, none of these specifically addressed how the institutional logics within an athletic department may influence attitudes, beliefs, and ultimately practices of coaches and members of the athletic department. Specifically, the link between these institutional logics and an athletic department's position concerning the development of its student-athletes has yet to be investigated. Considering that institutional logics are the dominant belief systems and practices within an organization that guide the actions of individuals in that particular setting (Herremans et al., 2009; Scott, 2001; Southall & Nagell, 2010), it is important to understand the institutional logics within a given setting so that the reasoning behind certain practices and actions can be better understood. Specifically,

identification of contending or competing logics is crucial because these may invoke confusion of members within an organization as to which expectations are paramount in their responsibilities (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Lok, 2010; Southall & Nagel, 2010; Washington & Ventresca, 2008).

Therefore, the purpose of this investigation was to understand the institutional logics within an NCAA Division II athletic department and how these logics may affect student-athletes. The specific research questions guiding this study included:

1. What are the different institutional logics within the NCAA Division II athletic department of this study?
2. What are the expectations of the university faculty and staff in regards to the operation of the athletic department?
3. What is the nature of the relationships among the institutional logics within this Division II athletic department?

To address these questions and the purpose of this study, I conducted a qualitative case study of an NCAA Division II athletic department. The case study allowed me to gain a detailed understanding of the research setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Stake, 1995, 2005), and allowed me to connect this understanding to the theoretical constructs outlined in this study (Stake, 1995, 2005). Thus, I was able to obtain insight into the institutional logics within the athletic department and how these logics have translated into the athletic department's efforts to engage in the total development of their student-athletes.

The context of this study was an NCAA Division II athletic department. Scholars have suggested that NCAA Division II athletics are often overlooked by research examining intercollegiate athletics (Baucom & Lantz, 2001). Specifically, the setting of this study was a private university that has been successful in numerous sports having gained national recognition while competing for and winning numerous national championships in both men's and women's sports. Through purposive sampling (Patton, 2002), individuals with insight into the operations of the athletic program along with those who could speak to the expectations of the university as a whole were targeted to participate in this study. The participants in this study included eight people employed within the athletic department and six people who are part of the university's faculty and administration (see Appendix A). Data from these participants were collected primarily through individual, semi-structured interviews. Additional data consisted of various website documents and press releases, particularly the NCAA Division II Handbook along with the university's student handbook. Finally, personal experiences from my time as a student-athlete at the studied university supplemented the findings of this study. To examine the data, I used a general inductive approach to qualitative data analysis (Thomas, 2006). This consisted of thorough review of the interview transcripts, from which, patterns and themes in the data were identified and placed into specific categories. The themes that were most relevant to the purpose and the research questions of this study were then reported.

The findings from this study addressed the research questions by providing insight into the institutional logics at work within the research context. The dominant

logics in this setting were student-athlete development, university enhancement, and winning. The athletic department and the various teams representing the university were expected to operate in a manner that fostered the academic, physical, social, and spiritual development of their student-athletes. Members of the athletic department, as well as campus administrators, insinuated that student-athlete development was of primary importance, yet they acknowledged that winning athletic competitions was still the primary measure when evaluating the performance of coaches. Additionally, the participants maintained that the athletic department should also enhance the university by promoting the university's mission and vision. University enhancement also included building community on campus and serving to marketing and recruitment tool for the university. Though some of these expectations may complement one another, some of these expectations may be perceived as contradicting. Particularly, the expectation of winning and enhancing the university seemingly detract from certain aspects of student-athlete development (primarily academic development). Thus, there is evidence of competing institutional logics within this research context.

Limitations and Future Research

This investigation provided unique insight into the institutional logics of an NCAA Division II athletic department, yet, as with any research, this study is not without limitations. The primary limitation of this study is that I was unable to interview all of the members of the university's athletic department. Reasonable attempts were made to gain access to all members of the athletic department; however, unforeseen events resulted in scheduling conflicts with many the targeted participants thereby

limiting their availability. Despite this, I was still able to gain the perspectives of key stakeholders in the athletic department who could speak to the operations and culture within the athletic department. Additionally, I was unable to gain access to key members of the university's administration. The same unforeseen events that limited my access to members of the athletic department also restricted the schedules of certain targeted administrators on campus. In particular, I was originally scheduled to interview the president of the university who would have provided valuable insight into the expectations of the university's administration concerning operations of the athletic department on campus. Yet, in the end I was unable to reschedule this interview. Finally, I was limited to one interview with each participant. The findings from this study would have been enhanced had there been multiple interviews and interactions with each participant (Yin, 1994). Despite these limitations, the participants in this study provided valuable insights into the inner-workings and expectations of the athletic department at this university.

It is important to understand the contextual boundaries of this investigation. This study was performed at a private Division II university. Thus, the specific institutional logics outlined here may or may not be representative of other research contexts. Particularly, the religious and spiritual expectations are likely unique to private, religious based universities. Though the specific expectations and logics within this university may indeed be relegated to this particular setting, this study still provides valuable insight into how the belief structures and related practices of an organization may affect the members of that organization. Specifically, this study highlights that a university's

culture, attitudes, and expectations likely influence the athletic department's approach to the development of their student-athletes.

This study may provide a basis for future research into the manner in which institutionally embedded ideals and attitudes affect student-athletes on college campuses. Future studies into this topic may benefit from the inclusion of student-athletes into this dialogue. Considering that athletic departments routinely suggest the importance of student-athlete development, the perceptions of student-athletes concerning their views on the institutional logics may be particularly insightful. Second, future studies should look into the relationship between institutional logics and organizational culture. It is important to understand the broad culture of organizations and how this culture shapes the imbedded logics within those organizations. Especially, in college athletics, the culture of the university likely influences the dominant logics within the athletic department. Further, scholars should look into the effectiveness of development programs on college campuses and in athletic departments that are meant to enhance the academic and social development of student-athletes. Especially in institutions with limited financial flexibility, it may be useful to examine the possibilities of creating partnerships between other student services departments and athletic departments on campus in order to augment the services provided by coaches and the athletic department. Finally, additional research into ALL intercollegiate athletic contexts is warranted. Considering that there are 738 NCAA Division II and III member universities (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2010b) as well as approximately 300 NAIA member institutions (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, n.d.), it is

important for researchers to keep in mind that student-athletes and members of these athletic departments likely have different experiences compared to their NCAA Division I counterparts. Further, the different and unique insight concerning the institutional logics in athletic departments may be gleaned from the cultural perspective of historically black colleges and universities as well. Thus, it is important to not ignore these research contexts.

Conclusion

The experience of being an athlete can be both highly rewarding and highly taxing to the personal growth and development of a student-athlete. As outlined in this study, the experiences of student-athletes on college campuses can be shaped by athletic administrators, coaches, and university faculty and administration. This study examined the expectations and attitudes (i.e. institutional logics) within an athletic department and the affects these may have on their student-athletes. Although this study presents findings which may be contextually specific, it provides a perspective of how the institutional logics within an athletic department can influence the attitudes and actions of its members.

REFERENCES

- Adler, P. & Adler, P. A. (1985). From idealism to pragmatic detachment: The academic performance of college athletes. *Sociology of Education*, 58(4), 241-250.
- Adler, P. & Adler, P. A. (1987). Role conflict and identity salience: College athletics and the academic role. *The Social Science Journal*, 24(4), 443-455.
- Adler, P. A. & Adler, P. (1991). *Backboards and Blackboards: College Athletes and Role Engulfment*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Aries, E., McCarthy, D., Salovey, P., & Banaji, M. R. (2004). A comparison of athletes and non-athletes at highly selective colleges: Academic performance and personal development. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(6), 577-602.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What Matters in College? Four Critical Years Revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bailey, R., Armour, K., Kirk, D., Jess, M., Pickup, I., & Sandford, R. (2009). The educational benefits claimed for physical education and school sport: An academic review. *Research Papers in Education*, 24(1), 1-27.
- Baucom C. & Lantz, C. D. (2001). Faculty attitudes toward male division II student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 24(3), 265-276.
- Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., & Linder, D. E. (1993). Athletic identity: Hercules' muscles or Achilles heel? *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 24, 237-254.

- Buer, T. (2009). Organizational complexity: The athletics department and the university. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 148, 109-116.
- Chartrand, J. M. & Lent, R. W. (1987). Sports counseling: Enhancing the development of the student-athlete. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 66(4), 164-167.
- Chickering, A. W. (1969). *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A. W. & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and Identity* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cornelius, A. (1995). The relationship between athletic identity, peer and faculty socialization, and college student development. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(6), 560-573.
- Cullen, F.T., Latessa, E.J., & Byrne, J.P. (1990). Scandal and reform in collegiate athletics: Implications from a national survey of head football coaches. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(1), 50-64.
- Curry, T. J. (1993). The effects of receiving a college letter on the sport identity. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 73-87.
- Curry, T. J. & Parr, R. (1988). Comparing commitment to sport and religion at a Christian college. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 5, 369-377.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 3rd ed. (pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Drahota, J. T. & Eitzen, D. S. (1998). The role exit of professional athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 15, 263-278.

- Eitzen, D. S. (2006). *Fair and Foul: Beyond the Myths and Paradoxes of Sport* (3rd ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Engstrom, C. M. & Sedlacek, W. E. (1991). A study of prejudice toward university student-athletes. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 189-193.
- Engstrom, C. M., Sedlacek, W. E., & McEwen, M. E. (1995). Faculty attitudes toward male revenue and nonrevenue student-athletes. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36(3), 217-227.
- Fielding, N. G., & Fielding, J. L. (1986). *Linking Data: The Articulation of Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Social Research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Fletcher, D. & Hanton, S. (2003). Sources of organizational stress in elite sports performers. *Sport Psychologist*, 17(2), 175-195.
- Floyd, S. W. & Lane, P. J. (2000). Strategizing throughout the organization: Managing role conflict in strategic renewal. *Academy of Management*, 25(1), 154-177.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Friedland, R. & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (pp. 232-263). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Glesne, C. (1999). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company.

- Gorney, B. & Ness, R. G. (2000). Evaluation dimensions for full-time head coaches at NCAA division II institutions. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 14(1), 47-65.
- Gould, D., Collins, K., Lauer, L., & Chung Y. C. (2007). Coaching life skills through football: A study of award winning high school coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 19(1), 16-37.
- Guiffrida, D. A. (2009). Theories of human development that enhance an understanding of the college transition process. *Teachers College Record*, 111(10), 2419-2443.
- Harrison, C. K., Comeaux, E., & Plecha, M. (2006). Faculty and male football and basketball players on university campuses: An empirical investigation of the "intellectual" as mentor to the student athlete. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 77(2), 277-283.
- Herremans, I. M., Herschovis, M. S., & Bertels, S. (2009). Leaders and laggards: The influence of competing logics on corporate environmental action. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 89(3), 449-472.
- Heyman, S. R. (1987). Counseling and psychotherapy with athletes: Special considerations. In J. R. May & M. J. Asken (Eds.), *Sport Psychology: The Psychological Health of the Athlete* (pp. 135-156). New York: PMA.
- Hill, R. P. & Stephens, D. L. (2005). The multiplicity of selves and selves management: A leadership challenge for the 21st century. *Leadership*, 1(1), 127-140.
- Howard-Hamilton, M. F. & Sina, J. A. (2001). How college affects student athletes. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 35-45.

- Hyland, D. A. (2008). Paidia and paideia: The educational power of athletics. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 1(1), 66-71.
- Jodl, K. M., Michael, A., Malanchuk, O., Eccles, J. S., & Sameroff, A. (2001). Parents' roles in shaping early adolescents' occupational aspirations. *Child Development*, 72(4), 1247-1265.
- Killeya-Jones, L. A. (2005). Identity structure, role discrepancy, and psychological adjustment in male college student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 28(2), 167-185.
- Kimball, A. C. (2007). "You signed the line": Collegiate student-athletes' perceptions of autonomy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 8, 818-835.
- Kleiber, D., Greendorfer, S., Blinde, E., & Samdahl, D. (1987). Quality of exit from university sports and life satisfaction in early adulthood. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 4, 28-36.
- Lally, P. (2006). Identity and athletic retirement: A prospective study. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 8, 85-99.
- Lally, P. S. & Kerr, G. A. (2005). The career planning, athletic identity, and student role identity of intercollegiate student athletes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 72(3), 275-285.
- Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17, 63-84.

- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 35-57.
- Lieberman, S. (1956). The effects of changes in roles on the attitudes of role occupants. *Human Relations*, 9, 385-402.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lok, J. (2010). Institutional logics as identity projects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1305-1335.
- Markus, H. & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 38, 299-337.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1995). *Designing Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340-363.
- Miller, K. E. & Hoffman, J. H. (2009). Mental well-being and sport-related identities in college students. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 26, 335-356.
- Miller, P. S. & Kerr, G. (2002). The athletic, academic, and social experiences of intercollegiate student-athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 25(4), 346-367.
- Miller, P. S. & Kerr, G. A. (2003). The role experimentation of intercollegiate student athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 17, 196-219.
- Miller, P. S., Salmela, J. H., & Kerr, G. (2002). Coaches' perceived role in mentoring athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 33, 410-430.

- Murphy, G. M., Petitpas, A. J., & Brewer, B. W. (1996). Identity foreclosure, athletic identity, and career maturity in intercollegiate athletes. *The Sport Psychologist, 10*, 239-246.
- Mussweiler, T., Gabriel, S., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2000). Shifting social identities as a strategy for deflecting threatening social comparisons. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*(3), 398-409.
- Nasco, S. A. & Webb, W. M. (2006). Toward an expanded measure of athletic identity: The inclusion of public and private dimensions. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 28*, 434-453.
- National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (n.d.). *Member Institutions*. Retrieved April 2011 from <http://naia.cstv.com/member-services/about/members.htm>.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2010a). *2010-11 NCAA Division II Manual*. Overland Park, KS: NCAA.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2010b). *2009-2010 NCAA Membership Report*. Overland Park, KS: NCAA.
- Nevill, D. D. & Calvert, P. D. (1996). Career assessment and the salience inventory. *Journal of Career Assessment, 4*(4), 399-412.
- Niles, S. G. & Goodnough, G. E. (1995). Life-role salience and values: A review of recent research. *The Career Development Quarterly, 45*, 65-86.
- Odriscoll, M. P. & Beehr, T. A. (1994). Supervisor behaviors, roles stressors and uncertainty as predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(2), 141-155.

- Parham, W. D. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990s profile. *The Counseling Psychologist, 21*(3), 411-429.
- Pascarella, E. T. & Truckenmiller, R. (1999). Cognitive impacts of intercollegiate athletic participation. *Journal of Higher Education, 70*(1), 1-26.
- Petitpas, A. & Champagne, D. E. (1988). Developmental programming for intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of College Student Development, 29*(5), 454-460.
- Richards, S. & Aries, E. (1999). The division III student-athlete: Academic performance, campus involvement, and growth. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(3), 211-218.
- Robst, J. & Keil, J. (2000). The relationship between athletic participation and academic performance: Evidence from NCAA division III. *Applied Economics, 32*, 547-558.
- Sanford, N. (1966). *Self and Society: Social Change and Individual Development*. New York: Atherton Press.
- Sarbin, T. R. & Allen, V. L. (1968). Role theory. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed. (pp. 488-567). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schroeder, P. J. (2000). An assessment of student involvement among selected NCAA Division III basketball players. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(6), 616-626.
- Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and Organizations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Settles, I. H., Sellers, R. M., & Damas, Jr., A. (2007). One role or two? The function of psychological separation in role conflict. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*(3), 574-582.
- Sharp, L. A. & Sheilley, H. K. (2008). The institution's obligations to athletes. *New Directions for Higher Education, 142*, 103-113.
- Shih, M., Pittinsky, T. L., & Ambady, N. (1999). Stereotype susceptibility: Identity salience and shifts in quantitative performance. *Psychological Science, 10*(1), 80-83.
- Shulman, J. L. & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The Game of Life: College Sports and Educational Values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simons, H. D., Van Rheen, D., & Covington, M. V. (1999). Academic motivation and the student athlete. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*(2), 151-162.
- Singer, J.N., & Armstrong, K.L. (2001). Black coaches' roles in the holistic development of student-athletes. *Academic Athletic Journal, 15*(2), 114-131.
- Sipe, L., & Constable, S. (1996). A chart of four contemporary research paradigms: Metaphors for the modes of inquiry. *Taboo, 1*, 153-163.
- Snyder, E. E. & Spreitzer, E. (1992). Social psychological concomitants of adolescents' role identities as scholars and athletes, A longitudinal analysis. *Youth & Society, 23*(4), 507-522.
- Southall, R. M. & Nagel, M. S. (2010). Institutional logics theory. In E. Smith (Ed.), *Sociology of Sport and Social Theory* (67-80). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Southall, R. M., Nagel, M. S., Amis, J., & Southall, C. (2008). A method to March Madness: Institutional logics and the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Men's Basketball Tournament. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*(6), 677-700.
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and Circus: How Big-Time College Sports is Crippling Undergraduate Education*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 3rd ed.* (pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Strauss A. & Corbin J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Stryker S. & Burke, P. J. (2000). The past, present, and future of an identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*(4), 284-297.
- Teh, P. L., Yong, C. C., Arumugam, V., & Ooi, K. B. (2009). Does total quality management reduce employees' role conflict? *Industrial Management and Data Systems, 109*(8-9), 1118-1136.
- Terenzini, P. T., Rendon, L. I., Upcraft, M. L., Millar, S. B., Allison, K. W., Gregg, P. L., & Jalomo, R. (1994). The transition to college: Diverse students, Diverse stories. *Research in Higher Education, 35*(1), 57-73.
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246.

- Thornton, P. H. & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Institutionalism* (pp. 99-129). London: Sage.
- Trail, G. & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic goals and processes: The influence of personal values. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16(4), 289-310.
- Turner, R. H. (1978). The role and the person. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 84(1), 1-23.
- Turner, R. H. (2002). Role theory. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory* (pp. 233-254). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Uptegrove, T. R., Roscigno, V. J., & Charles, C. Z. (1999). Big money collegiate sports: Racial concentration, contradictory pressures, and academic performance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 80(4), 718-737.
- Valentine, J. J. & Taub, D. J. (1999). Responding to the developmental needs of student athletes. *Journal of College Counseling*, 2, 164-179.
- Washington, M. & Ventresca, M. J. (2008). Institutional contradictions and struggles in the formation of U. S. collegiate basketball, 1880-1938. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 30-49.
- Webb, W. M., Nasco, S. A., Riley, S., & Headrick, B. (1998). Athlete identity and reactions to retirement from sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21(3), 338-362.

- Weber, L. J., Sherman, T. M., & Tegano, C. (1990). Faculty perceptions of the sources and types of pressure to assist student athletes. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7, 389-393.
- Woodman, T. & Hardy, L. (2001). A case study of organizational stress in elite sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 13(2), 207-238.
- Woodruff, A. L. & Schallert, D. L. (2008). Studying to play, playing to study: Nine college student-athletes' motivational sense of self. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 34-57.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Yopyk, D. J. A. & Prentice, D. A. (2005). Am I an athlete or a student? Identity salience and stereotype threat in student –athletes. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 27(4), 329-336.
- Zucker, L. G. (1977). The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence. *American Sociological Review*, 42(5), 726-743.

APPENDIX A

Participant Information (Athletic Department)

Position	Gender	Years Affiliated with the University	Years of Involvement with athletics
Athletic Director	Male	16	16
Associate Athletic Director	Male	19	19
Assistant Director of Operations	Male	<1	10
Director of Academic Services	Female	10	2
Head Football Coach	Male	6	20
Head Men's Basketball Coach	Male	6	36
Head Women's Basketball Coach	Female	14	14
Head Volleyball Coach	Female	9	9

Participant Information (University Faculty & Administration)

Position	Gender	Years Affiliated with the University	Years of Involvement with athletics
Provost	Female	4	20
University Vice President	Male	40	15
Faculty Athletic Representative	Male	45	>20
Department Chair	Male	27	"lots"
Associate Professor	Male	31	15

Participant Biographies

Athletic Director – The Athletic Director has been affiliated with the university for 16 years, 6 of which as the athletic director. He was also a student-athlete at the university where he was an Academic All-American. He then served as an assistant basketball coach at the university before transitioning into athletic administration. He described his job responsibilities as overseeing all aspects of the athletic department including hiring of coaches, maintaining NCAA compliance, and formulating strategic plans for the athletic department.

Associate Athletic Director – The Associate Athletic Director has been affiliated with the university for 19 years. He has been in this current position for less than a year. Previously, he was the university's head men's golf coach. He then took a job at a large, NCAA Division I state university prior to returning to the university as an athletic administrator. He articulated that his job was to be a liaison between the Athletic Director and the coaches.

Assistant Director of Operations – The Assistant Director of Operations has been employed by the university for less than a year. He previously spent time working in the athletic departments of four NCAA Division I universities. He described his job responsibilities as encompassing all marketing, corporate sales, and game operations.

Director of Academic Services – The Director of Academic Services has been a part of the university for ten years, though she has only been in the athletic department for two years. Her position is relatively new, and it is somewhat uncommon for NCAA Division II universities to have a person in her position. She described that her job is to support the academic development of the student-athletes. This includes arranging tutors, meeting with professors, and over-seeing the campus’s student-athlete organization. She also is responsible for providing a report for the NCAA concerning academic achievements and graduation rates of the university’s student-athletes.

Head Football Coach – The Head Football Coach has been with the university for six years in his current position. He is a former student-athlete of the university. He has been one of the more successful football coaches in the history of the university, leading the football program to three straight trips to the NCAA Division II playoffs. He described his job is to oversee all aspects of the football program.

Head Men’s Basketball Coach – The Head Men’s Basketball Coach was employed by the university for six years. He discussed that he has been involved with basketball and coaching his entire life because his father was also a college basketball coach. He described his job was to lead the men’s basketball program. Though he was relatively successful during his first few seasons as the coach of the program, the past two seasons have been particularly difficult. This past season he only won one game in conference

play. Shortly after the completion of the interviews for this study, he resigned from his position as head basketball coach at the university.

Head Women's Basketball Coach – The Head Women's Basketball Coach has been with the university for 14 years. She is a former student-athlete from a private Division I university. She came to the university as a graduate assistant with the women's basketball program. From there she was promoted to an assistant coach, eventually earning the position of head coach. In her seven years as the head coach, she has been highly successful, qualifying for the regional tournament multiple times. She described her job as being responsible for everything that goes on in the women's basketball program.

Head Volleyball Coach – The head volleyball coach has been with the university for nine years. She started as a student-athlete at the university the same year that I did. Once her eligibility had expired, she was an assistant coach for the volleyball program. She was then promoted to head coach after the previous coach had resigned her position. Interestingly, she was then the head coach of some of the student-athletes she had competed with as a player. She has been highly successful, leading the team to the NCAA Division II volleyball playoffs multiple times. She described that she is responsible for the entire volleyball program; especially the development of her student-athletes physically, spiritually, and academically.

Provost – The Provost has been with the university for four years, two in her current position. Previously she was the provost at another private university that competed in the NAIA. At her previous institution, she discussed that she worked closely with members of the athletic department because coaches also taught courses at the university. Though she does not directly oversee athletics at the university, she is a part of the senior leadership team of the university and they deal with athletic issues on that council. She described that her job is to oversee the work of the faculty and curriculum.

University Vice President – The University Vice President has been with the university for 40 years, working with athletics for approximately 15 of those years. For those 15 years, the athletic department reported directly to him, yet that is now no longer the case. He described that his position is fairly unique in that he is the vice president of the entire university, where most vice presidents on college campuses are vice presidents of certain divisions/departments. He maintains contacts with government legislators at both the state and federal level. Further, he is a former college student-athlete.

Faculty Athletic Representative – The Faculty Athletic Representative has been with the university for 45 years. For about 20 of those years, he has been the faculty athletic representative. He is also a professor in the English department. As the faculty athletic representative, he oversees the eligibility of all the student-athletes. As part of his duties, he is chair of the faculty committee on athletics. This committee reviews all of the

schedules of each team to ensure that the student-athletes are not missing excessive class days for athletic competition.

Department Chair - The Department Chair is an associate professor of accounting and chair of the department of accounting and finance. He has been with the university for 27 years. He is a former student-athlete and has served as a guest assistant coach for the basketball program at the university. He has worked with the university on budget and finance issues throughout his time at the university.

Associate Professor – The Associate Professor is an associate professor in the department of exercise science and health at the university. He has been with the university for 31 years. He also has served on the faculty athletic committee for approximately 15 years.

APPENDIX B

Interview Guide (Athletic Administration)

When you were hired at this university, what was/is your job description?

- Are there certain aspects of your job that are valued as more important than others?

Who evaluates your job performance?

- What are the primary criteria with which the evaluator(s) are concerned?
- Who do you report to on a daily basis?

Describe your thoughts on the purpose of higher education?

- Specifically, what is the purpose/mission of this university?

Explain what you believe is the purpose of athletics in higher education.

- What is the purpose of athletics at this university?
- What are the expectations of the administration of this university for the athletic department?

Are athletics viewed differently at this university differently than at other universities? If so, how are they viewed?

- What are some of the challenges your athletic department faces that may be different from other athletic departments? How do these affect the development of your student-athletes?

How important is winning in the athletic programs at the university?

What do you believe is the duty of your university to its student-athletes?

- What is the responsibility of the athletic department to the student-athletes at this university?

When someone discusses the idea of student-athlete development, how would you define or conceptualize “student-athlete development?”

To what extent are members of this university concerned with the overall growth and development of student-athletes?

Does the athletic department have a responsibility to aid in the growth and development of its student-athletes?

- Specifically, what do you believe that your duty is to the student-athletes at this university?
- With what aspects of the student-athletes' lives are you most concerned?
- Are there aspects of your job that affect this concern? Describe these.

Describe some of the mechanisms in place at your university that are designed to support the overall growth and development of its student-athletes.

- Do you feel that there are adequate resources (financial, infrastructure, staff, etc.) at this university to aid in the overall growth and development of its student-athletes?

Are there instances of conflict at this university between academics and athletics?

Describe these.

Do student-athletes ever experience conflicts between athletics and academics at this university?

- What is the university concerning these conflicts?
- How does the athletic department help student-athletes remedy these conflicts?

As student-athletes progress through their playing careers at this university, are there measures in place within your athletic department that aid the student-athletes in preparing for their transitions out of athletics once they are finished competing at the intercollegiate level? Describe these?

Do you feel that this university does a good job with the overall development of its student-athletes?

APPENDIX C

Interview Guide (Coaches)

When you were hired at this university, what was/is your job description?

- Are there certain aspects of your job that are valued as more important than others?

Who evaluates your job performance?

- What are the primary criteria with which the evaluator(s) are concerned?
- Who do you report to on a daily basis?

Describe your thoughts on the purpose of higher education?

- Specifically, what is the purpose/mission of this university?

Explain what you believe is the purpose of athletics in higher education.

- What is the purpose of athletics at this university?
- What are the expectations of the administration of this university for the athletic department?

What do you believe is the duty of your university to its student-athletes?

- What is the responsibility of the athletic department to the student-athletes at this university?

When someone discusses the idea of student-athlete development, how would you define or conceptualize “student-athlete development?”

To what extent are members of this university concerned with the overall growth and development of student-athletes?

Are athletics viewed differently at this university differently than at other universities? If so, how are they viewed?

- What are some of the challenges your athletic department faces that may be different from other athletic departments? How do these affect the development of your student-athletes?

How important is winning in the athletic programs at the university?

Does the athletic department have a responsibility to aid in the growth and development of its student-athletes?

- Specifically, what do you believe that your duty is to the student-athletes at this university?
- With what aspects of the student-athletes' lives are you most concerned?
- Are there aspects of your job that affect this concern? Describe these.

Describe some of the mechanisms in place at your university that are designed to support the overall growth and development of its student-athletes.

- Do you feel that there are adequate resources (financial, infrastructure, staff, etc.) at this university to aid in the overall growth and development of its student-athletes?
- Do you receive adequate support to develop your student-athletes?

Are there instances of conflict at this university between academics and athletics?

Describe these.

Do student-athletes ever experience conflicts between athletics and academics at this university?

- What is the university concerning these conflicts?
- How does the athletic department help student-athletes remedy these conflicts?

As student-athletes progress through their playing careers at this university, are there measures in place within your athletic department that aid the student-athletes in preparing for their transitions out of athletics once they are finished competing at the intercollegiate level? Describe these?

Do you feel that this university does a good job with the overall development of its student-athletes?

APPENDIX D

Interview Guide (University Faculty)

When you were hired at this university, what was/is your job description?

- Are there certain aspects of your job that are valued as more important than others?

Who evaluates your job performance?

- What are the primary criteria with which the evaluator(s) are concerned?

What is your involvement with the athletic department at this university?

Describe your thoughts on the purpose of higher education?

- Specifically, what is the purpose/mission of this university?

Explain what you believe is the purpose of athletics in higher education.

- What is the purpose of athletics at this university?
- What are the expectations of the administration of this university for the athletic department?

Are athletics viewed differently at this university differently than at other universities? If so, how are they viewed?

How important is winning in the athletic programs at the university?

When someone discusses the idea of student-athlete development, how would you define or conceptualize student-athlete development?

To what extent is the administration at this university concerned with the overall growth and development of student-athletes?

Does the athletic department have a responsibility to aid in the growth and development of its student-athletes?

- Specifically, what do you believe that your duty is to the student-athletes at this university?
- With what aspects of the student-athletes' lives are you most concerned?

Describe some of the mechanisms in place at your university that are designed to support the overall growth and development of its student-athletes.

- Do you feel that there are adequate resources (financial, infrastructure, staff, etc.) at this university to aid in the overall growth and development of its student-athletes?
- What are some of the challenges your athletic department faces that may be different from other athletic departments? How do these affect the development of your student-athletes?

Do student-athletes ever experience conflicts between athletics and academics at this university?

- What is the university's policy for these conflicts (if there are conflicts)?

As student-athletes progress through their playing careers at this university, are there measures in place within your athletic department that aid the student-athletes in preparing for their transitions out of athletics once they are finished competing at the intercollegiate level? Describe these?

Do you feel that this university does a good job with the overall development of its student-athletes?

APPENDIX E

Interview Guide (University Administration)

When you were hired at this university, what was/is your job description?

- Are there certain aspects of your job that are valued as more important than others?

Who evaluates your job performance?

- What are the primary criteria with which the evaluator(s) are concerned?

What is your involvement with the athletic department at this university?

Describe your thoughts on the purpose of higher education?

- Specifically, what is the purpose/mission of this university?

Explain what you believe is the purpose of athletics in higher education.

- What is the purpose of athletics at this university?
- What are the expectations of the administration of this university for the athletic department?

Are athletics viewed differently at this university differently than at other universities? If so, how are they viewed?

How important is winning in the athletic programs at the university?

When someone discusses the idea of student-athlete development, how would you define or conceptualize “student-athlete development?”

To what extent is the administration at this university concerned with the overall growth and development of student-athletes?

Does the athletic department have a responsibility to aid in the growth and development of its student-athletes?

- Specifically, what do you believe that your duty is to the student-athletes at this university?
- With what aspects of the student-athletes’ lives are you most concerned?

Describe some of the mechanisms in place at your university that are designed to support the overall growth and development of its student-athletes.

- Do you feel that there are adequate resources (financial, infrastructure, staff, etc.) at this university to aid in the overall growth and development of its student-athletes?
- What are some of the challenges your athletic department faces that may be different from other athletic departments? How do these affect the development of your student-athletes?

Do student-athletes ever experience conflicts between athletics and academics at this university?

- What is the university's policy for these conflicts (if there are conflicts)?

As student-athletes progress through their playing careers at this university, are there measures in place within your athletic department that aid the student-athletes in preparing for their transitions out of athletics once they are finished competing at the intercollegiate level? Describe these?

Do you feel that this university does a good job with the overall development of its student-athletes?

APPENDIX F
INFORMATION SHEET

You have been selected to participate in a study examining the different institutional pressures that face NCAA Division II athletic departments and the possible effects these pressures may have on the development of student-athletes.

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to answer various questions your role in the growth and development of student-athletes at your university. The interview will last from approximately thirty (30) minutes to one (1) hour in length. Detailed notes of your responses to the various questions will be kept for evaluation. There are minimal risks with this study. Although there will be no tangible compensation for your participation in this study, the benefits of participating include the opportunity to critically reflect upon the development of student-athletes at your university.

This interview will be audio recorded. If you would prefer to not be recorded then no recording will take place. Once the interview is complete, verbatim transcripts of the interview will be constructed and the audio recordings will be erased.

Further, the name of your university will be known only to the investigators and transcribers of the interview and will not appear in any published or unpublished manuscripts. The transcriptions of the interview will be kept in a secure location where only Calvin Nite and John N. Singer, will have access to the records.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Texas A&M University. If you decide to participate, you may refuse to answer any of the questions asked. You may also withdraw from the study at anytime without damaging your relations with Texas A&M University.

For additional questions or concerns please contact either Calvin Nite via email at calnite22@hlkn.tamu.edu or John N. Singer via email at singerjn@hlkn.tamu.edu.

This research study has been reviewed by the Human Subjects' Protection Program and/or the Institutional Review Board at Texas A&M University. For research-related problems or questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you can contact these offices at (979)458-4067 or irb@tamu.edu.

Please be sure you have read this sheet and asked any questions regarding your participation in this study.

VITA

Kristofer Calvin Nite
Dept. of Hospitality, Tourism, and Family & Consumer Sciences
Georgia Southern University
Box 8034
Statesboro, GA 30460

Education

Doctor of Philosophy	Texas A&M University, 2011 Major: Kinesiology (emphasis Sport Management)
Master of Science	Texas A&M University, 2007 Major: Kinesiology (emphasis Sport Management)
Bachelor of Science	Hardin Simmons University, 2005 Major: Sport, Fitness, and Leisure Activities Minor: Sociology Abilene Christian University (attended 2001-2004) Major: Exercise Science

Research Interests

Student-Athlete Development in Intercollegiate Athletics

Institutionalism in Intercollegiate Athletics

Sport Management Pedagogy