

1-1-2013

A Polarizing Issue: Faculty and Staff Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletic Academics, Governance, and Finance Post-NCAA Investigation

Gregory Lewinter

Erianne A. Weight

Barbara Osborne

John Brunner

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm>

Recommended Citation

Lewinter, Gregory; Weight, Erianne A.; Osborne, Barbara; and Brunner, John (2013) "A Polarizing Issue: Faculty and Staff Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletic Academics, Governance, and Finance Post-NCAA Investigation," *Journal of Applied Sport Management*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 4.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/jasm05e0tq>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm/vol5/iss4/8>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of Applied Sport Management* by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jasm>.

A Polarizing Issue

Faculty and Staff Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletic Academics, Governance, and Finance Post-NCAA Investigation

Gregory Lewinter

Erianne A. Weight

Barbara Osborne

John Brunner

Abstract

Following an athletics scandal that invoked internal upheaval and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) sanctions, non-athletics employees at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill were invited to participate in a survey investigating their satisfaction with academics, governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. This study extends the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, *Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Institution* to a post-infraction single-school population. Three philosophical viewpoints describing basic faculty issues and assumptions that divide Division I institutional reformers were utilized to frame the examination (Sack, 2009). Results indicate polarized viewpoints on most issues with satisfaction for athletics positively correlated with event attendance. Reflecting this polarization, respondent narratives demonstrated vast array of responses from individuals with no concern regarding current practices to individuals calling for athletics to be removed from the university.

Gregory Lewinter (MA) is a budget analyst in the Division of Graduate Professional Studies at Brandeis University.

Erianne Weight (PhD, MBA) is an assistant professor in Sport Administration at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Barbara Osborne (JD) is an associate professor in Sport Administration at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

John Brunner (MA) is the Director of Athletic Operations at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Please send correspondence regarding this article to Gregory Lewinter, gregory.lewinter@gmail.com

There has been debate and controversy surrounding the role of intercollegiate athletics on the college and university campus since their inception (Thelin, 1996). Supporters of intercollegiate athletics have stated that “college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p. 82), while dissenters believe that intercollegiate athletics do not fit the university’s core academic mission, engage in excessive commercially driven behavior, and permit scandalous and unethical behavior on the part of coaches and student-athletes (Duderstadt, 2003).

Scholarly inquiries into faculty perceptions and satisfaction levels pertaining to intercollegiate athletics have provided valuable insight into the variation between campuses as study results have not been uniform (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). With differing beliefs, faculty-led reform groups have also reflected differing agendas and guiding principles. Even on individual campuses, divided groups of faculty make it difficult to prioritize proposals for reform and engage athletic departments and governing bodies in productive discussions.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) was involved in major controversy and debate pertaining to issues within the athletic department (“Faculty and staff data,” n.d.). A major National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) investigation and sanctions for violations involving the football program, as well as an internal investigation into the university’s African and Afro-American Studies Department led to changes in athletic department personnel, as well as feverish debate about the role and mission of intercollegiate athletics on the university’s campus.

The purpose of this study was to gather preliminary data to examine the concerns UNC-CH employees have with academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. This information can be utilized to bridge the widening gap between intercollegiate athletics and the academy. As Joy Renner, chairwoman of UNC-CH’s Faculty Athletics Committee stated, the goal of bridging this widening gap at UNC-CH is to “ensure that athletes receive a quality education in a friendly academic environment” (Crampton, 2011, para. 5). The mission statement of UNC-CH states a need to “invest our knowledge and resources to enhance access to learning and to foster the success and prosperity of each rising generation” (“The mission statement,” n.d., para. 2). With potentially dissatisfied faculty and staff, an adverse environment may lead to a lesser quality education educational experience for athletes, preventing the university from adhering to its stated educational mission. To follow is an overview of intercollegiate athletic reform efforts at UNC-CH, as well as other national reform efforts. Previous research into faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics will then be reviewed to provide a foundation for the survey methodology and instrument of this study. Lastly, Sack’s “Clashing Models of Commercial Sport in Higher Education” will be utilized as a lens through which the philosophical differences between faculty/staff pertaining to the issues of intercollegiate athletic

academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance can be more fully understood (2009).

Review of Related Literature

Intercollegiate Athletics Reform Efforts at UNC-CH

An increasing number of faculty-led reform groups have questioned the mission of the NCAA due to increased commercialization and rampant spending. In the sections to follow, prominent national reform groups including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (KCIA), the Drake Group, and the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) will be discussed to understand the issues that many faculty and staff across the country have with the current state of intercollegiate athletics and the NCAA. President Mark Emmert has reaffirmed the mission of the NCAA is “to be an integral part of higher education and to focus on the development of our student-athletes” (“Office of the,” 2010, para. 4). Discussion of the mission of intercollegiate athletics is now a localized issue at UNC-CH due to high-profile investigations and subsequent penalties that brought into question the purpose and role of intercollegiate athletics on campus.

In the summer of 2010, the NCAA began an investigation of the UNC-CH football program for potentially major violations. Football players were interviewed by the NCAA about whether they had been in contact with agents and received gifts or extra benefits. The NCAA examined phone records of the players to determine which agents the players had been in contact with. This investigation began after Marvin Austin, a former UNC-CH football player, tweeted about a trip to Miami, which led to questions about who paid for the travel. The investigation found that seven football players received \$27,000 in impermissible benefits, including the previously mentioned trip to Miami. The impermissible benefits were provided by “runners,” or those who work as the middle men for agents (“NCAA probing UNC,” 2010).

The NCAA’s investigation also examined academic misconduct and multiple athletes’ relationships with a former tutor and academic advisor. It was found that a former academic tutor was involved in academic fraud. This tutor had written parts of academic papers and done other coursework for football players. She had also paid multiple parking tickets for players, including paying over \$1,700 in parking tickets for one player (George, 2012).

After the investigation, the institution self-imposed penalties, including vacating wins from the 2008-2009 seasons, as well as placing the football program on two years of probation. The NCAA Committee on Infractions then released additional penalties which placed UNC-CH on probation for three years, removed 15 football scholarships over the same three-year period, fined the institution \$50,000, and banned the football team from participating in postseason play for the 2012-2013 season (Curtis, 2012; Tysiac, 2011).

Following the NCAA's investigation into the football program, UNC-CH launched an internal investigation into potential academic fraud in the African and Afro-American Studies Department at UNC-CH in 2011. An internal investigation revealed "unauthorized grades, forged signatures, and other irregularities" (Schoonmaker, 2012, para. 1). According to the investigation's report, which examined courses from the start of the summer session in 2007 to the end of the summer session in 2011, "43 courses taught by Professor Julius Nyang'oro were either aberrant or were taught irregularly" (Schoonmaker, 2012, para 4). Ultimately, these courses showed that work was assigned and grades were issued, but there was very little interaction between professor and students (Schoonmaker, 2012).

Former North Carolina Governor Jim Martin was appointed by the UNC-CH administration to lead an investigation. This three-month investigation found that the issue was not an "athletic, but academic scandal" (Pickeral, 2012, para. 3). The investigation showed that no misconduct occurred outside of the university's African and Afro-American Studies Department, and that the academic fraud involved both student-athletes and non-student-athletes, meaning no NCAA rules were broken and no further penalties would be issued. (Pickeral, 2012).

The investigations galvanized UNC-CH employee efforts to engage in critical discussion about the role of athletics in higher education. The university's faculty/staff expressed concerns over the increasing separation of the athletic and university missions (Hartness, 2012). Dr. Richard Southall, Director of the College Sport Research Institute at UNC-CH stated, "It is not simply up to the athletic department to make judgments about athletics, because as college sport become more corporatized and commercialized, there's going to be conflicts" (Niss, 2012, para. 12).

Three principles aimed to "protect academic integrity" (Carter, 2012, para 2), including institutional openness, educational responsibility, and mission consistency, were presented to the Board of Trustees by an informal group of faculty ("A statement of," 2011). By adhering to these three principles, the group hoped the university could work towards a stronger sense of unity between the athletic department, faculty, and university at large in order to better the educational experiences and opportunities for all student-athletes (Carter, 2012).

National Intercollegiate Athletics Reform Efforts

In the early 1990s, "the emphasis on intercollegiate athletic reform was driven by university Presidents" ("The role of the faculty," n.d., para. 1). More recently, prominent national reform groups including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (KCIA), the Drake Group, and the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) have become involved in reform (Ridpath, 2008).

The AAUP was founded after Professor Edward Ross was fired from Stanford University after speaking out on policies pertaining to immigrant labor and railroad monopolies ("History of the," n.d., para. 1). Philosopher Arthur Lovejoy

of Johns Hopkins University heard of the incident and organized a meeting in 1915 to create an organization that deals with academic freedom and prevalent issues for university faculty members. The AAUP has stated, “College athletics in this country are a continuing crisis” (“The role of the faculty,” n.d., para. 1), and has stressed the importance of athletic program transparency, and faculty involvement in policy-making (“Statement on,” n.d.). Although the organization has heavily criticized the role of college athletics within the academy, the AAUP has worked in congruence with the NCAA. For example, in 2003, the AAUP, NCAA, and COIA held a conference to “explore the challenges of collaboration” (Smith, 2011, p. 195). The conference was meant to explore teamwork and examine methods of creating a stronger relationship between faculty and the NCAA (Smith, 2011).

The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation created the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in 1989 in response to multiple highly visible scandals within Division I collegiate athletics with an initial goal “to recommend a reform agenda that emphasized academic values in an arena where commercialization of college sports often overshadowed the underlying goals of higher education” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 1). The primary purpose of the Commission is to promote transparency for athletic departments to ensure “integrity in both financial and academic policies” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 3). In 1991, the Knight Commission published, “Keeping Faith with the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics,” which promoted a one-plus-three model (“A call to action,” 2003, p. 10). The model pushed for Presidential control, which would lead to academic and fiscal integrity to be verified with an extensive certification process (“A call to action,” 2003). The reform group has worked extensively with faculty from across the country to work towards their stated mission to “balance both academics and athletics” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 2).

The Drake Group, described by former NCAA President Dr. Myles Brand as a group of “self-appointed radical reformers and incorrigible cynics...consisting of a small number of faculty members with an eye for publicity” (Smith, 2011, p. 191), formed in the early 1990s when Professor Jon Ericson, of Drake University, organized a group of faculty pushing for athletic reform from institutions across the country (“The Drake Group,” n.d.). The mission of the Drake Group is “to help faculty and staff defend academic integrity in the face of the burgeoning college sport industry” (“The Drake Group,” n.d., para. 1). The Drake Group’s national network of college faculty lobby aggressively for proposals that promote “quality education for college athletes, support of faculty whose job security is threatened for defending academic standards, and [dissemination of] information on current issues and controversies in sport and higher education” (“The Drake Group,” n.d., para. 1).

The most recent formation of a faculty reform group was COIA, developed in 2002 after Pac Ten and Big Ten faculty senate presidents felt there needed to

be “cohesion among all campus faculty governance committees to create a united voice in intercollegiate athletic reform efforts” (“The coalition,” 2003, para. 2). The stated purpose of the organization is to “articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission” (“Framing the Future,” 2007, para. 1). The COIA steering committee has established five areas in need of reform within intercollegiate athletics including academics, athlete welfare, finances and scale, commercialization, and governance (“Framing the Future,” 2007).

Although each reform group has unique and distinct suggestions and proposals for reform, it is clear that faculty/staff are most concerned with the academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. The issues and efforts for reform on the campus of UNC-CH are a microcosm of the greater landscape of intercollegiate athletics.

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics

Several previous studies have investigated faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at Division IA institutions. A 1988 study investigated “Faculty Perceptions of Athletics at Division IA Universities” (Sherman, Weber, & Tenago, 1998) utilizing a random sample of 75 faculty members from 18 institutions with a response rate of 52%. The survey results and analysis showed that the general attitude of faculty toward athletics was mixed. On the positive side, 74% percent of the faculty expressed that they have a voice in decisions about sports, conversely only 44% of faculty believed the central administration provided good leadership in sports; 29% felt that coaches encouraged student-athletes to succeed academically, and 35% felt as if student-athletes were as successful in the classroom as non-student-athletes (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988). This study provided three main conclusions. First, faculty indicated a belief that athletics are an important, but not an essential part of higher education. The faculty also voiced a belief that athletic personnel, not just faculty, should assume the primary responsibility of assisting student-athletes in achieving academic success. Lastly, faculty did ultimately believe their opinions counted in decisions about the relationship between academics and athletics, but not necessarily in other athletically related policy and decision-making (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988).

In 1994, Cockley and Roswal studied faculty member knowledge and satisfaction with NCAA athletic programs from Divisions I, II, and III. Their survey was distributed to 40 faculty members and all current faculty athletic board members from each of 48 institutions yielding a response rate of 38.2%. Findings demonstrated divisional satisfaction to increase from Division I, to II, and II to III among general faculty with board members significantly more satisfied than their faculty colleagues in Division I and II. The satisfaction level of Division I faculty members was the lowest of all groups surveyed. This particular group was the only group

to have items with 50% or greater dissatisfaction (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). Although this study investigated faculty satisfaction levels from institutions in all three NCAA divisions, the Division I analysis is an interesting foundational study for this research.

In 2006, the Knight Commission sponsored a study examining Division I-FBS faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs (Lawrence, Ott, & Hendricks, 2009). The survey was organized around academics, governance, and finance issues pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. This study revealed that a large number of faculty members were most pleased with aspects of academics, as the respondents indicated they had a positive experience in working with student-athletes, and believed student-athletes demonstrated academic integrity in their studies. Another significant finding was the faculty who were involved in athletics-related governance at their particular institution had much higher satisfaction with all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. Lastly, faculty members were displeased with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators and the extent to which the entire faculty had input in developing policy for intercollegiate athletics (Ott, 2011). The mixed results from the aforementioned studies indicate that faculty and staff have varied views on pertinent issues in intercollegiate athletics.

Conceptual Framework

In order to guide the examination of employee satisfaction of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, this study was framed utilizing three philosophical viewpoints which describe generally accepted staff and faculty issues and assumptions that divide institutional reformers and reform groups within Division I institutions. The differentiation in philosophical viewpoints will allow for understanding of the varied responses pertaining to particular intercollegiate athletic issues from the faculty/staff at UNC-CH. The three reform groups, as constructed by Sack (2009), include intellectual elitists, academic capitalists, and athletes' rights advocates. The basis of differentiation between the philosophies stems from assumptions regarding three main issues: the relationship of commercialism to academic values, the legal status of athletic scholarships, and the mission of higher education (Sack, 2009).

Intellectual Elitism

The intellectual elitist model maintains that highly commercialized athletics have a negative effect on our current higher education system and an institution of higher education should simply consist of scholars and students (Gerdy, 2006). Academic elitists argue that the extravagant resources used in the never-ending arms race of intercollegiate athletics could be used for academic purposes rather than lavish athletic-related facilities (Gerdy, 2006).

The role of athletics within the academy, as related to intellectual elitism, is founded on the idea that competitive athletics is a means of enhancing the educa-

tion of the athletes via on- field competition (Gerdy, 2006). These faculty members also believe that scholarships should be given based on financial need or academic-related merit and should be controlled by the university and not the coaches of the athletes' particular sport. Having the coaches involved in the scholarship process allows the coaches to set the academic priorities for the athletes and may allow for student-athletes to be admitted with lower credentials, which undermines the academic integrity of the institution (Dowling, 2007; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

Academic Capitalism

The conceptual model of academic capitalism can be directly related to the increasing commercialization of intercollegiate athletics in higher education (Sack, 2008). The late president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand, supported the academic capitalism model and believed that the athletic department is a core aspect of the academy and revenue associated with athletics is a healthy byproduct of quality athletic education. Dr. Brand felt that the revenue generated from the athletics department is in fact worthwhile, as it is being used as a source of funding for scholarships and department infrastructure (Brand, 2006b). Academic capitalists believe that the mission of higher education should include career preparation, as well as intellectual studies and as such, extracurricular activities are equally valuable to in-class studies (Sack, 2008).

Pertaining to the relationship of commercialism to academic values, academic capitalists believe that all athletes are amateurs. This means that athletes are not employees of the institution, but rather students receiving an opportunity to participate in meaningful extracurricular activities. Dr. Brand stated, "There are ... clear distinctions between the collegiate and professional models of athletics. Professional sports' sole purposes are to entertain the public and make a profit for team owners. The purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of athletes" (Brand, 2006a). Dr. Brand also noted that commercialism does not hurt academic value, as long as the commercialism does not prevent a meaningful educational experience for all athletes (Sack, 2008).

Athletes' Rights

The last subset of Sack's reform groupings are the athletes' rights advocates. Those advocating for the student-athlete argue that collegiate sport are "commercial entertainment" and that will most likely not change in the near future. These faculty members believe the NCAA supports a free market for every party but the athletes. Commercialism has become "deeply embedded" in collegiate athletics, yet the system gives no opportunity for the athletes to be involved in such commercialism and deprives the athletes of rights that other stakeholders have (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

Athletes' rights advocates believe that amateurism is simply a myth and that athletes are both university employees and students. As employees at the institution, athletes should be eligible for workers' compensation and receive a share of

the revenues in which they help to produce (McCormick & McCormick, 2006; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998). Athletes' rights advocates believe that athletic scholarships undermine the academic values that should be the priority for student-athletes. Similar to the views of the model of intellectual elitism, athletes' rights advocates also believe that because coaches control financial aid, they will set the academic priorities for the athletes low, and simply ensure that their athletes remain academically eligible for athletic participation (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

In terms of the mission of higher education, those associated with athletes' rights believe that athletes deserve the same educational opportunities as all other students. However, if these athletes are working like employees, then they are clearly deprived of all of the educational and intellectual opportunities that an institution offers. The mission of higher education is not being fulfilled if the student-athlete is both an employee and a student at the same time (Sack, 2008). Dr. Sack's framework allows for an understanding of the variety of viewpoints on issues within collegiate athletics and provides a lens that the faculty/staff perceptions of athletics on the UNC-CH campus can be viewed.

Significance of Study

This study examined employee satisfaction with specific aspects of academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. The data gathered provides an understanding of underlying issues of discord that need to be discussed if the relationship between athletics and the academy can be strengthened. Toward this purpose, the following research questions were pursued.

1. How satisfied are employees with the following aspects of academics (a-c) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
 - a. Standards
 - b. Performance
 - c. Integrity
2. How satisfied are employees with the governance of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
3. How satisfied are employees with the financing of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
4. Do selected demographic and behavioral factors (4a- 4f) influence employee satisfaction related to academics, governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH?
 - a. Gender
 - b. Race
 - c. Role in Athletic Governance
 - d. Attendance at home Olympic sporting events
 - e. Attendance at home Men's basketball games
 - f. Attendance at home football games

Methodology

Survey methodology was utilized within the study in an effort to reach a broad sample of employees. The instrument utilized in this study was based on the survey used in the Knight Commission study (2006). The original survey was developed in three phases. Discussions about the content commenced with a meeting of a faculty advisory committee convened by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in September of 2006. Prominent themes that evolved during this meeting were then discussed in interviews with faculty and members of the provost's office on five campuses that differed in size, location and control. A questionnaire was then drafted based on previous research, advisory committee discussion, the interviews, and documents from groups such as the AAUP, COIA, and the NCAA. The draft questionnaire was piloted with project advisors from the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and a group of faculty from the University of Michigan from January of 2007 to April of 2007 (Ott, 2011).

The instrument for the present study was adapted, with permission from the original authors to fit particular characteristics of the athletic department and university as a whole to better survey the employees at UNC-CH. Modifications were reviewed by a panel of experts in an effort to maximize content validity. This panel included two UNC-CH professors, a Senior Staff member in the UNC-CH athletic department, the initial drafter of the Knight Commission Study, a survey methodology expert from the Howard W. Odum Institute for Social Science, and two Sport Management faculty members from other institutions. The survey included both Likert-scale and open-ended questions organized around three theoretically distinct yet interrelated aspects of intercollegiate athletics and the general campus climate: academics, governance, and finance.

The population of interest was UNC-CH employees to determine their satisfaction and concerns pertaining to academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. The study was approved by UNC-CH's Institutional Review Board and the appropriate steps were taken to ensure confidentiality for each survey respondent. The surveys were distributed online via Qualtrics using the UNC-CH employee listerv. According to the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the survey was sent to 9,104 employees. The survey (n=579) yielded a response rate of 6.36%. While there is some congruency between the target population and the sample, the small response rate makes it such that this data should be viewed as informative but not generalizable. The survey instrument did not allow for an opportunity to examine the differences in levels of satisfaction between faculty and staff, as many respondents indicated positions on campus that were difficult to categorize. This limitation will be addressed throughout the discussion.

Quantitative data were analyzed utilizing Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis included basic frequencies and descriptive statistics to gather the demographic information of survey respondents and cumulative satis-

faction means for each survey question. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were run to determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between any of the independent variables and Likert-scale satisfaction items. The Levene's Test for Equality of Variance was used when comparing the sample means within the related statistical procedures. An alternative "equal variances not assumed" format was used when necessary to account for heterogeneous variances. Two researchers, including the author of the study and a member of the Master's thesis committee, independently coded the qualitative data. The qualitative data gathered from survey respondents' open-ended responses, asking to identify the greatest concerns with intercollegiate athletics on the UNC-CH campus was coded. Six coding categories and eighteen subcategories emerged after two rounds of code modification. Inter-coder reliability was tested utilizing Scott's Pi and a reliability coefficient of .91 was attained indicating a high degree of inter-coder agreement.

Results

Demographic information collected indicated that the majority of survey respondents were white women (72% of respondents were white; 57% of respondents were women). Only 6% of the respondents were Black/African American, and the remaining 22% of respondents identified with "other" races/ethnicities including Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, and Alaska Native. Behavioral patterns were also collected as a part of the initial survey. Along with basic demographic information, particular behavioral patterns were also collected to continue to divide the faculty and staff at UNC-CH into more detailed subsets. Employee attendance at home football, men's basketball, and Olympic sporting events during the 2011–2012 seasons was also measured. Frequency analysis indicated that 59% of respondents indicated they attended no football games, 39% attended 1 to 4 games, and 2% of all respondents attended 5 to 7 games. Data analysis also showed that 52% of the sample had attended no home men's basketball games, while 40% attended 1 to 12 games, and 8% attended 13 to 18 games. Olympic sporting events were the least attended based on the survey's sample, as 60% attended no events, 37% attended 1 to 10 events, and 3% attended 11 to 20 or more events. Lastly, survey respondents were asked to identify whether they have been involved in a governance role that pertains to intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, with 6% (n=38) indicating that they have served in such a capacity, while 93% (n=541) have not been involved in any form of athletic governance role. Please see Table 1 for a complete list of sample demographic information.

Table 1*Demographic Information*

	%	n
Gender		
Male	43.30%	202
Female	56.70%	264
Age		
Under 30	9.00%	40
31-40	15.00%	72
41-50	21.00%	99
51-60	33.00%	155
61-70	18.00%	86
71-80	3.00%	15
Over 80	0.00%	0
Race/ Ethnicity		
White	86.90%	405
Black	7.30%	34
Other	5.80%	27
Administrative Responsibilities?		
Yes	28.60%	128
No	71.40%	319
Teaching Responsibilities?		
Yes	55.70%	251
No	44.30%	200
Level of Education		
Doctorate	43.60%	202
Other	56.40%	261
Home Football Attendance		
0 Games	58.50%	336
1 to 4 Games	39.40%	226
5 to 7 Games	2.10%	12
Home Men's Basketball Attendance		
0 Games	51.90%	300
1 to 12 Games	40.30%	233
13 to 18 Games	7.80%	45
Home Olympic Sport Attendance		
0 Games	59.80%	336
1 to 10 Games	37.20%	208
11 to 20 + Games	3.20%	18
Athletics Governance Role (Past or Present)?		
Yes	6.60%	38
No	93.40%	541

Note. Other includes those who identified as mixed race. Teaching responsibilities include those who are professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors/lecturers. Olympic Sports include all varsity sports other than football and men's basketball.

Academic Performance, Standards, and Integrity

Descriptive statistics were first tabulated to examine satisfaction with academic performance, standards, and integrity. Analysis of cumulative satisfaction means indicated that UNC-CH employees are fairly “neutral” in terms of their levels of satisfaction with admissions standards for football players compared to both men’s basketball players and Olympic sport athletes. An average satisfaction level of 3.32 (SD= 1.65) on a scale ranging from (1) *very dissatisfied* to (5) *very satisfied*, shows the survey sample to be somewhat impartial towards the admissions standards specific to football players. The lowest satisfaction levels were indicated in the areas of student-athlete academic integrity (M= 2.58, SD= 1.944) and academic performance (M= 2.63, SD= 1.93), where employees were between *somewhat dissatisfied* and *neutral* on these particular issues. Interquartile range figures presented as mean values do not necessarily reflect the “average” sentiment of this population as there was significant variance. Five measures had quartiles at both extreme values with the first quartile of responses *very dissatisfied* and the third quartile *very satisfied*. Standard deviations at or near the 2.0 mark reflect this extreme variance. Analysis of variance revealed significant differences on select dependent variables when analyzed by gender, athletic governance role, home men’s basketball attendance, home football attendance, and home Olympic sport attendance as presented in Table 2. Select significant findings will be discussed.

Overall, 38 respondents had participated in an athletic governance role on campus, past or present. Those who currently or have previously participated in an athletic governance role were more “satisfied” with all aspects of academic standards, performance, and integrity. Statistical testing indicated significant differences with the satisfaction level of the academic integrity ($F(1, 479) = 4.17, p = 0.042$) and performance ($F(1, 471) = 7.625, p = 0.006$) of student-athletes, as well as the satisfaction level with faculty efforts to engage student-athletes ($F(1, 474) = 8.08, p = 0.005$) and non-student-athletes ($F(1, 483) = 9.86, p = 0.005$) to ensure the quality of the educational experience.

Significant differences were found in the satisfaction level of UNC-CH employees with the academic and athletic balance among those who attended home Men’s basketball, football, and Olympic sporting events. Those employees who attended 0 home football games (M= 3.34, SD=2.03) were less satisfied with the academic and athletic balance on campus versus those who attended 5 to 7 games (M= 3.75, SD=1.28). There were clear distinctions in employee views pertaining to the academic and athletic balance when examining home Men’s basketball attendance. The average satisfaction level of attendees of zero games was 2.87 (SD= 1.42) versus an average of 4.05 (SD= 1.10) for those employees who attended 13 - 18 games, with a significant interaction, $F(2, 494) = 13.74, p < 0.001$, and mean difference of -1.77. This is the greatest significance and largest mean difference among all factors examined. Additional statistics related to academic standards, performance, and integrity are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Employee Satisfaction of Academic Performance, Standards, and Integrity of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	p	IQR 25	IQR 75
Admission Standards- Football	3.32	1.648					2
Admissions Standards- Men's Basketball	3.48	1.671					2
Admissions Standards- Olympic Sports	3.98	1.738					3
<i>White vs. Black</i>			0.749	5.201	0.035		
Academic Integrity- Non Student-Athletes*	2.96	1.913					1
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.297	0.022		
Academic Integrity- Student-Athletes*	2.58	1.944					1
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.693	0.017		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				4.168	0.042		
Academic Performance- Non Student-Athletes*	2.92	1.959					1
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.66	0.018		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				9.862	0.002		
Academic Performance- Student-Athletes*	2.63	1.930					1
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				7.613	0.006		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				7.625	0.006		
Quality of Educational Experience- Non Student-Athletes*	3.33	1.998					1
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				8.088	0.005		
Quality of Educational Experience- Student-Athletes*	3.10	2.118					1
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				8.075	0.005		
Academic vs. Athletic Balance*	3.11	1.416					2
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 Games</i>			-0.352	13.47	0.019		
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-1.777		0.000		
<i>Basketball Attendance 1 to 12 games vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-0.825		0.002		
<i>Olympic Sport Attendance- 0 vs. 11 to 20+ games</i>			-0.887	3.571	0.047		
<i>Football Attendance- 0 vs. 5 to 7 games</i>			-0.317	5.638	0.010		

Note. Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Governance

Research question two examined employees' levels of satisfaction with aspects of intercollegiate athletics governance on the UNC-CH campus. Respondents' levels of satisfaction varied widely in terms of the governance of intercollegiate athletics, with moderate means between 3.06 (SD= 1.42) and 3.58 (SD= 1.86) and large standard deviations. Despite the variance in responses, only two significant differences were uncovered with the independent variables tested related to the institutional control of intercollegiate athletics and home Men's basketball attendance, as well as Chancellor oversight and general. Basketball game attendees were more "satisfied" with the institutional control of intercollegiate athletics than

those who did not attend any home Men's basketball games. A one-way ANOVA yielded a significant interaction of $F(2,471) = 4.43$, $p = 0.022$ and mean difference of -0.360 . Also, there was a significant difference between male and female employees when examining the level of satisfaction with Chancellor oversight of intercollegiate athletics, as testing yielded a significant interaction of $F(3, 449) = 5.220$, $p = 0.023$, and a mean difference of -0.320 . Results may be seen in Table 3.

Table 3

Employee Satisfaction of Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	p	IQR 25	IQR 75
Level of Cooperation to Uphold Academic Standards	3.26	1.782				2	5
Role of Faculty in Governance	3.42	1.780				2	5
Institutional Control*	3.06	1.420				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs 1 to 12 games</i>			-0.360	4.431	0.022		
Chancellor Oversight*	3.30	1.502				2	4
<i>Male vs. Female</i>			-0.320	5.220	0.023		
Faculty Input- Campus Decisions	3.45	1.675				2	5
Faculty Input- Athletic Decisions	3.25	1.759				2	5
Governance by Opposing/ Dissenting Faculty	3.58	1.856				2	5

Note: Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Tested for significant differences based on independent variables of gender, age, race/ethnicity, administrative responsibilities, teaching responsibilities, level of education, home football/men's basketball/ Olympic sport attendance, and athletic governance role.

Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory.

* $p \leq .05$

Finance

The third research question was developed to assess the level of satisfaction UNC employees had with financial aspects of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. Cumulative satisfaction means ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 1.33$) indicated that the UNC-CH employees surveyed are closer to "neutral" in terms of their satisfaction with the balance struck on campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics. Analysis of variance uncovered significant differences between two independent variables. Those who attended 13 - 18 Men's basketball games were more satisfied with the allocation of resources on campus ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.43$), the awarding of athletic scholarships ($M = 4.19$, $SD = 1.39$), and the balance between commercialization and the amateur ideal of intercollegiate athletics ($M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.41$) than those employees who attended 0 or 1-12 Men's basketball games.

When examining the satisfaction levels for the allocation of resources on campus, practice of awarding athletic scholarships, and balance between commer-

cialization and amateurism on campus there was a significant difference between those faculty and staff who attended 0 home Men's basketball games versus those who attended 1 to 12 and 13 to 18 games. Also, when comparing the allocation of resource on campus for those employees who attended 0 versus 13-18 Men's basketball games, the Tukey Post-Hoc test yielded a p-value of $F(1, 457) = .470, p = 0.003$. In each case, there was a large mean difference of -0.788, -0.788, and -0.766 respectively, meaning those who attended more games were more satisfied with the finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. Statistical results pertaining to financial issues are presented in Table 4.

Table 4*Employee Satisfaction of Finance of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH*

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	p	IQR 25	IQR 75
Allocation of Resources*	3.26	1.345				2	4
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games			-0.415	8.739	0.004		
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games			-0.778		0.003		
Practice of Awarding Athletic Scholarships*	3.59	1.541				2	4
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games			-0.415	7.347	0.010		
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games			-0.778		0.003		
Commercialization of Intercollegiate Athletics*	2.96	1.327				2	4
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games			-0.304	6.848	0.044		
Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games			-0.766		0.003		

Note: Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Tested for significant differences based on independent variables of gender, age, race/ethnicity, administrative responsibilities, teaching responsibilities, level of education, home football/men's basketball/ Olympic sport attendance, and athletic governance role.

Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory.

* $p \leq .05$

Qualitative Employee Concerns

In an open-ended question at the end of the survey, respondents were invited to express "general concerns with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH." Three hundred and thirty seven (337) employees responded to the qualitative section. Six coding categories emerged including 1) nothing; 2) power of intercollegiate athletics; 3) commercialization of intercollegiate athletics; 4) student-athlete experience; 5) academic performance, standards, and integrity; and 6) institutional issues. There were 18 related sub-categories identified. The open-ended responses provide some insights into the polarity of opinions among UNC-CH employees regarding the athletics program.

Of the 337 respondents who chose to comment, 18.69% expressed no concerns with collegiate athletics. On the other hand, strong negative opinions were voiced regarding several issues. Pertaining to institutional issues, one employee

noted, “The integrity and reputation of UNC have been harmed by the excessive emphasis on the need for high performance in the revenue sports” (Respondent 102). Another employee expressed concerns with the power of athletics and institutional issues at UNC-CH, stating, “Athletics plays way too strong a role at UNC and occupies way too much time and effort. The latest scandals have justifiably diminished the prestige of UNC...” (Respondent 110). Comments regarding commercialization included: “Disparity in financial priorities within the university with academics getting very little” (Respondent 4) and “ADs all over the Smith Center monitors and the salaries and benefits of coaches” (Respondent 130).

Criticisms of academics, admissions, and the student-athlete experience were also expressed: “I think athletes are given academic passes that are unfair both to other students and ultimately to the athlete because they do not get the kind of education they otherwise could” (Respondent 19). Respondent 36 stated expressed concerns with “Student-athletes being accepted to the university solely on athletic ability, while respondent 38 was concerned with the” number of admissions exceptions made in recent years for student-athletes.” Respondent 89 stated, “We pretend these athletes are actually students. They are not—they are being used by UNC (for generating money and prestige) and they are essentially training camps for the NFL and NBA. We do a severe disservice to these students—most will not go on to professional athletic career—and by not providing them with a real educational college experience is further exploitation for these students.” Respondent 64 stated, “It’s impossible for student-athletes in major sports to be serious students, given their required time commitments to sports.” Analysis of qualitative responses can be found in Table 5.

Discussions and Implications

Academic Standards, Performance, and Integrity

Survey results and analysis indicated that UNC-CH employees’ satisfaction with academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance was mixed. This study yielded similar results to the 1988 study “Faculty Perceptions of Athletics at Division IA Universities,” where mixed results made it difficult to make conclusions on faculty/staff views of intercollegiate athletics (Sherman, Weber, & Tenago, 1988). Although one might assume that a major NCAA violation might skew the results negatively in most aspects of the survey, the data in this study did not support this assumption.

Congruent with the findings in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988), survey respondents were most “dissatisfied” with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes. However, faculty in the Knight Commission study characterized student-athletes in general as “motivated and prepared and do not perceive student athlete’s as lacking academic integrity” (Lawrence, Ott & Hendricks, 2009). The “dissatisfaction” with academics, particularly academic integ-

Table 5*Open-Ended Concerns*

Category	N = 337	% Respondents
Power of Intercollegiate Athletics	31	9.20
<i>Influence of Donors</i>		
<i>NCAA's Power</i>		
<i>Power of Football</i>		
Student- Athlete Experience	49	14.54
<i>Quality of Education</i>		
<i>Exploitation (racial stereotypes)</i>		
<i>Pressure (time, winning, coaches)</i>		
<i>Separation of football/basketball players</i>		
Commercialization	56	16.62
Nothing	63	18.69
Academics	70	20.77
<i>Integrity</i>		
<i>Performance</i>		
<i>Academic/Athletic Balance</i>		
<i>Academic/ Admissions Standards</i>		
Institutional Issues	80	23.74
<i>Educational Mission</i>		
<i>Lack of Faculty Support</i>		
<i>Reputation after "Scandal"</i>		
<i>Oversight/Governance/Accountability</i>		
<i>Eliminate From University</i>		
<i>Public Relations</i>		

rity in this study, may be attributed to the discovery of academic fraud occurring in one department during the NCAA investigation. Open-ended responses indicate that some faculty/staff feel that the academic reputation of the university after the "scandal" has been tarnished; the most critical demanded that all aspects of academics relating to intercollegiate athletics must be examined, including admissions and performance standards for student-athletes.

Although there was "dissatisfaction" with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes, results indicate those who are more involved in athletics, whether that be as a fan/consumer or an employee involved in athletic governance, were more "satisfied" than their peers in terms of all aspects of academics involving student-athletes. This is a situation that lends itself to more analysis, looking through Sack's lens of "academic capitalism" (2008).

The "academic capitalist" model describes an educational benefit to collegiate sports participation. The late President of the NCAA Myles Brand noted, "The

purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of athletes” (Brand, 2006a). Like Dr. Brand, other academic capitalists believe that the mission of higher education should also be to emphasize career preparation, as well as intellectual studies. This means that extra-curricular activities have as much value as the in-class studies, and many with special talents may need academic advising and differing admissions standards to benefit the institution (Sack, 2008).

Those who attend games or work closely with athletics may see the educational benefits of athletics participation first-hand, which ultimately led to higher levels of satisfaction for these particular respondents. Even though there may be differing admissions standards or increased academic advising for student-athletes, this subset of faculty/staff understand that student-athletes bring unique talents to the campus, and gain unique educational opportunities that translate into career and life-after-college preparation. It is also possible that those who attend UNC-CH sporting events are simply sports fans who are more interested in the team(s) performance than in the well being of the student-athlete, or whether injustice or exploitation is transpiring. It is also possible that those who work most closely with athletics governance are better informed about athletics’ policies, procedures, and student-athlete experiences, and therefore have more educated positive opinions.

Governance

Similar to the findings in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988), UNC-CH employees were also “satisfied” with their input into athletic and non-athletic decisions; however, they were not satisfied with the level of cooperation to uphold academic standards or institutional control over athletics. Although these findings were similar, this may be an area where the UNC-CH NCAA investigation and sanctions for specific issues pertaining to academics impacted this particular employee group.

When UNC-CH was sanctioned by the NCAA for violations committed by the football program, the university did not receive a notice that they “lacked institutional control,” which is a major infraction. However, there was considerable speculation and discussion by the media, prior to the notice of violations from the NCAA, that UNC-CH may have “lacked institutional control,” (Barnes, 2010, para. 2) which may have impacted the perception of these issues for UNC-CH faculty/staff who responded to the survey. Comments provided indicated a perception by the employees that the “scandal” was an outcome of lack of oversight by the Chancellor, Athletic Department, and athletically related governing bodies, even though this was not one of the NCAA violations. Media influence may have impacted levels of satisfaction, as it may have been many faculty/staff’s only exposure to information regarding the investigations and violations.

Finance

Similar to the findings at UNC-CH, results found in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988) and the Knight Commission Study showed that employees were “dissatisfied” with the balance struck between commercialization and the ideal of intercollegiate athletics on campus. Based on results in the 1988 and 2006 studies, it is clear that commercialization of intercollegiate athletics is an issue that has spanned multiple decades. As spending and commercialization increase, it seems as if this is an issue that will continue to cause “dissatisfaction” among UNC-CH employees and other faculty/staff across the country. As noted by Sack, the “intellectual elitist” model for reform maintains the extravagant resources that are used in the arms race of intercollegiate athletics could be used for academic purposes rather than lavish facilities (Gerdy, 2006). These respondents, like intellectual elitists, may think this commercialization has a negative effect on our current higher education system and UNC-CH should only consist of scholars and students (Sack, 2008).

“Athlete’s rights” advocates, according to Dr. Sack believe that the “commercialization has become deeply embedded” in intercollegiate athletics and the commercialization deprives student-athletes of the opportunity to receive compensation” (Sack, 2008, p. 81). The exploitation of student-athletes was a concern for some faculty/staff in their open-ended responses. “Intellectual elitists” and “athletes’ rights” subsets may be represented heavily in the survey sample due to the “dissatisfaction” expressed with the balance between commercialization and the ideals of amateurism within collegiate athletics. It may be that those who do not attend sporting events do not see that the student-athlete experience is enhanced via great facilities and enthusiastic support, but rather that commercialism and increased spending on intercollegiate athletics serves no purpose on a university campus (Sack, 2008).

Conclusions

Ultimately, the study of employee satisfaction of academics (performance, standards, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH reinforces the findings in previous studies that attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics are mixed with pockets of advocates and dissenters representing extreme viewpoints. The athletic department and other governing bodies should utilize specific findings as talking points to foster a cooperative environment on campus. The study’s results make it clear that those who attend athletic events or participate in athletically related governance roles at UNC-CH have more positive views of intercollegiate athletics. Involvement in an athletically related committee may allow a faculty/staff member to improve his/her knowledge and perceptions, or it may simply allow engagement in necessary discourse. As discussed in Lawrence, Ott, and Hendricks (2009), it might also be worthwhile for the academy and athletics to create unique athletically related governing committees pertaining to

a wide-array of issues such as a finance of intercollegiate athletics committee. The UNC-CH administration has created several new committees and panels to address varying topics that emerged as a result of the NCAA investigation and is continuing to engage employees in discussions that can improve transparency and provide more accurate information about the athletics programs to better inform employees' opinions. For example, the university's Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) developed a report, which suggested a panel to examine the role of athletics at UNC-CH. This panel included former UNC-CH Chancellor Holden Thorpe, as well as former AAUP President Hunter Rawlings. Also, a special sub-committee of the FEC was developed to investigate internal academic fraud, and this sub-committee has suggested forming a committee to examine the current state of athletics at UNC-CH to see what the university is doing right and what the university needs to improve upon (Childress, 2013). Efforts to increase faculty/staff attendance at sporting events may also help improve employee opinions, as those who attended athletics events were more "satisfied" with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH.

Although efforts to increase employee involvement in athletically-related governance and to increase attendance at UNC-CH sporting events may improve perceptions and relations with athletics, a portion of UNC-CH employees may continue to be dissatisfied with the current state of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, as well as the national landscape of intercollegiate athletics. A major NCAA violation and subsequent sanctions, as well as an internal investigation into academic fraud within a university's academic department should drive the UNC-CH campus toward major efforts for reform. Even if major reform does not occur on the national level, there is an opportunity for UNC-CH to be a leader in collegiate athletics reform. The institution has already taken steps towards aligning academics and athletics.

A strategic plan for the athletic department was implemented in January of 2013. The first priority of the plan is alignment, which is defined as "aligning the athletic department's operation to fulfill the mission of the university" (Gutmann, 2013, para. 5). Other objectives within the strategic plan include, "Balancing athletics and academics in the student-athlete experience, creating the first multi-university coalition to monitor the impact of athletics on a school, seeking leadership roles on collegiate athletics committees and operating in a transparent manner so that the community is informed about decisions made within the department" (Gutmann, 2013, para. 10). The development of the strategic plan is a critical first step for the athletic department in demonstrating its efforts to the rest of the university that it is looking to improve in many facets of its operation. Although the strategic plan is a not an immediate fix, many of its stated objectives, display an effort to engage the entire university campus in the necessary dialogue to improve athletic department relations on campus.

Although many employees may still be dissatisfied with the current state of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, the strategic plan shows the necessary reform

efforts being made by the athletic department. Simply reaching out to employees to participate in governance and attend athletic events may not be enough to demonstrate the department's willingness to accept criticism and strive for change. The university can be a national leader in reform by utilizing institutional reform as path towards potential reform on a national level. In order to adhere to the educational mission of the university, it is imperative that "athletes receive a quality education in a friendly academic environment" (Crampton, 2011, para. 5), and reform on the university's campus may allow the university to better fulfill their stated mission.

Limitations and Recommendations for Future Research

This is the first known study to examine faculty/staff perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at a single FBS Division IA university following a major NCAA investigation finding violations and subsequent sanctions. The low response rate represents a major limitation with the findings as only a small subset of the population was represented and as such may not be representative of all UNC-CH employees. The inability to differentiate between whether respondents were either faculty or staff limited this study, and allowed for no opportunity to separate the results based on each respondent's role on the UNC-CH campus.

Future researchers examining issues on a single campus might provide incentives to the survey population for an increased response rate. Another idea would be to develop a series of focus groups to ensure a more representative sample of the university's faculty/staff. This study also presents an opportunity for non-response bias. Based on the large standard deviations representative of large variance in responses, it is likely that many of the respondents were those with high levels of support or disdain for the current operating model, thus only the more extreme positions were captured (as evidenced in the passionate narrative responses).

If a researcher were to utilize a similar survey instrument in the future to study an institution post-NCAA investigation, it would be worthwhile for a qualitative/open-ended section to ask about the change in perception and attention paid to intercollegiate athletics before and after the incident. Future studies may also want to include athletic department employees in their survey sample; they are institutional employees and employment within collegiate athletics does not necessarily mean all viewpoints are positive.

References

- A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education: Knight commission on intercollegiate athletics.* (2003). John S. & James L. Knight Foundation: Miami, FL.
- A statement of principles for athletics at UNC.* (2011). Retrieved from http://www.wralsportsfan.com/asset/colleges/unc/2012/02/17/10746599/A_statement_of_principles_for_Athletics_at_UNC.pdf

- Barnes, G. (2010, October 12). *Defining lack of institutional control*.
- Brand, M. (2006a, January 9). *2006 NCAA State of the Association Address*. Retrieved from <http://www.i-aa.org/articleprint.asp?articleid=75346>
- Brand, M. (2006b, November 13). *Letter from Myles Brand to William Thomas, Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org>.
- Carter, A. (2012, February 17). *UNC faculty members want athletic department to pursue academics*. *News and Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.news-observer.com/2012/02/17/1863092/unc-faculty-members-want-athletic.html>
- Childress, G. (2013, April 1). *Panel to consider the role of athletics at unc*. Retrieved from <http://www.heraldsun.com/news/localnews/x145786515/Panel-to-consider-the-role-of-athletics-at-UNC>
- Cockley W. T., & Roswal, G. M. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members' perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17(4), 217.
- Crampton, L. (2011, September 11). *UNC faculty discuss preventing scandal*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailytarheel.com/article/2012/09/504d5c8736e39>
- Curtis, D. (2012, April 21). North Carolina football violations outlined in NCAA notice of allegations. *The Sporting News*. Retrieved from <http://aol.sporting-news.com/ncaa-football/feed/2010-08/unc-investigation/story/north-carolina-football-facing-several-serious-ncaa-violations>.
- Dowling, W. C. (2007). *Confessions of a spoil sport: My life and hard times fighting sports corruption at an old eastern university*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State Press.
- Duderstadt, J. (2003). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Faculty and staff data: Office of institutional research. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://oira.unc.edu/facts-and-figures/faculty-and-staff-data/faculty-and-staff-data.html>
- Framing the future: Reforming intercollegiate athletics*. White paper presented by the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (2007, June 15). Retrieved from <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>
- George, R. (2012, October 10). *University of north carolina athletics investigations*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/2012/10/10/north-carolina-athletics-investigations/1625569/>
- Gerdy, J. R. (2006, May12). For true reform, athletic scholarships must go. *Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review*, 52(36), B6.
- Gutmann, H. (2013, January 9). *UNC sets strategic plan for athletics*. Retrieved from <http://www.heraldsun.com/sports/x1506654464/UNC-sets-strategic-plan-for-athletics>
- Hartness, E. (2012, March 13). *UNC faculty working to engage athletes more in class*. Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/news/education/story/10852217/>.

- History of the AAUP*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/history/>
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Hendricks, L. (2009). Athletic reform and faculty perceptions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2009(148), 73–81.
- McCormick, R. A., & McCormick, A. C. (2006). The myth of the student-athlete: The college athlete as employee. *Washington Law Review*, 81, 71–157.
- NCAA probing UNC football*. (2010, July 15). Retrieved from <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncf/news/story?id=5384232>
- Niss, S. (2012, February 27). UNC athletic director responds to faculty statement on athletics and academics. *The Daily Tar Heel*.
- Office of the President*. (2010, October 5). Retrieved from [http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/NCAA President/On the Mark](http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/NCAA%20President/On%20the%20Mark)
- Ott, M. (2011). Faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 370.
- Pickeral, R. (2012, December 20). *UNC probe reveals academic fraud*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/8765672/north-carolina-tar-heels-investigation-reveals-academic-scandal-african-american-studies-department
- Putler, D., & Wolfe, R. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(4), 301–325.
- Ridpath, B. D. (2008). Can the faculty reform intercollegiate athletics? A past, present, and future perspective. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 1, 11–25. Retrieved from [http://csri-jiia.org/documents/publications/research_articles/2008/JIIA_2008_1_Can the Faculty Publish.pdf](http://csri-jiia.org/documents/publications/research_articles/2008/JIIA_2008_1_Can%20the%20Faculty%20Publish.pdf)
- Sack, A. L., & Staurowsky, E. J. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sack, A. L. (2008). *Counterfeit amateurs: An athlete's journey through the sixties to the age of academic capitalism*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sack, A. L. (2009). Clashing models of commercial sport in higher education: Implications for reform and scholarly research. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 76–92.
- Schoonmaker, A. (2012, May 5). *UNC report reveals widespread problems in afro-studies department*. Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/news/local/story/11064527/>
- Sherman, T. M., Weber, L. J., & Tenago, C. (1988). *An investigation of faculty perceptions of athletics at division IA universities*. 1–17. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED323859.pdf>
- Smith, R. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform*. (pp. 187–197). Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

- Statement on government of colleges and universities.* (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/governancestatement.htm>
- The coalition on intercollegiate athletics (COIA).* (2003, October 20). Retrieved from <http://www.sc.edu/faculty/PDF/COIA.oct2003.pdf>
- The Drake Group proposals.* (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.thedrakegroup.org/proposals.html>
- The mission statement of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.* (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/ugradbulletin/mission.html>
- The role of the faculty in the governance of college athletics.* (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/athgov.htm>
- Thelin, J. (1996). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Toma, D. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 81–90.
- Tysiac, K. (2011, September 20). UNC puts its football team on probation, forfeits wins. *The News and Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsobserver.com/2011/09/20/1503041/unc-puts-its-football-team-on.html>.

Management Whitepaper

A Polarizing Issue

Faculty and Staff Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletic Academics, Governance, and Finance Post-NCAA Investigation

Gregory Lewinter, Erianne A. Weight, Barbara Osborne, John Brunner

I. Research Problem

The purpose of this study was to explore employee perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) following a major NCAA infractions case. The information presented in this article can be utilized to bridge the ever-widening gap between intercollegiate athletics and the academy. Previous scholarly inquiries have investigated faculty perceptions at Division IA institutions; however, this is the first study to examine the levels of satisfaction that faculty and staff have toward intercollegiate athletics on an institution's campus immediately following a major NCAA infractions case. The findings in this article would be useful for any athletic department or athletically related committee who are looking to improve the athletic department's relationship with the faculty and staff on their campus, particularly for an institution involved in any form of an NCAA investigation. The results presented in this study provide the distinct areas of intercollegiate athletics, which are the greatest areas of concern for employees.

II. Issues

Supporters of intercollegiate athletics have stated that "college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university" (Toma, 1999, p. 82), while dissenters believe that intercollegiate athletics do not fit the university's core academic mission, engage in excessive commercially driven behavior, and permit scandalous and unethical behavior on the part of coaches and student-athletes (Duderstadt, 2003).

Previous studies have investigated faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at Division IA institutions. Findings from these studies point toward mixed feelings regarding intercollegiate athletics. These findings include conclusions that faculty members have indicated positive experiences in working with student-ath-

letes (Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2006). Also, faculty members believe athletics is an important, but not essential part of higher education (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988) and are displeased with faculty involvement in developing policy for intercollegiate athletics (Ott, 2011). Lastly, faculty who are involved in athletics-related governance have much higher satisfaction with all aspects of intercollegiate athletics (Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott, 2006).

Following an athletics scandal that invoked internal upheaval and National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) sanctions, non-athletics employees at UNC-CH were invited to participate in a survey investigating their satisfaction with academics, governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. This study extends the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, *Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Institutions* to a post-infractions single-school population. Three philosophical viewpoints describing basic faculty issues and assumptions that divide Division I institutional reformers were utilized to frame the examination (Sack, 2009).

III. Summary

The study of employee satisfaction of academics (performance, standards, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH reinforces the findings in previous studies that attitudes toward intercollegiate athletics are mixed, with pockets of advocates or dissenters representing extreme viewpoints. Although one might assume that a major NCAA violation might skew the results negatively in most aspects of the survey, the data in this study did not support this assumption.

Congruent with the findings in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988), survey respondents were most “dissatisfied” with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes. The “dissatisfaction” with academics, particularly academic integrity in this study, may be attributed to the discovery of academic fraud occurring in the Afro and African American Studies Department during the NCAA investigation.

Although there was “dissatisfaction” with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes, results indicate those who are more involved in athletics, whether that be as a fan/consumer or an employee involved in athletic governance, were more “satisfied” than their peers in terms of all aspects of academics involving student-athletes.

Similar to the findings in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988), UNC-CH employees were also “satisfied” with their input into athletic and non-athletic decisions; however, they were “not satisfied” with the level of cooperation to uphold academic standards or institutional control over athletics. Although these findings were similar, this may be an area where the UNC-CH NCAA investigation and sanctions for specific issues pertaining to academics impacted this particular employee group.

In terms of the financial portion of this survey, the results were similar to the findings in previous studies where employees were “dissatisfied” with the balance struck between commercialization and the ideal of intercollegiate athletics on campus.

IV. Analysis

The study’s results make it clear that those who attend athletic events or participate in athletically related governance roles at UNC-CH have more positive views of intercollegiate athletics. Involvement in an athletically related committee may allow a faculty/staff member to improve his/her knowledge and perceptions, or it may simply allow engagement in necessary discourse. As discussed in Hendricks, Lawrence, and Ott (2006), it might also be worthwhile for the academy and athletics to create unique athletically related governing committees pertaining to a wide-array of issues such as a finance of intercollegiate athletics committee. The UNC-CH administration has created several new committees to address varying topics that emerged as a result of the NCAA investigation and are continuing to engage employees in discussions that can improve transparency and provide more accurate information about the athletics programs to better inform employees’ opinions. Efforts to increase faculty/staff attendance at sporting events may also help improve employee opinions, as those who attended athletic events were more “satisfied” with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH.

V. Implications

The discussion and results presented in this study can be utilized by any athletic department to frame the discussion for improving the relationship with faculty and staff on an institution’s campus. Athletic departments can use this research to bridge the widening gap between athletics and the academy using specific talking points based on the results of this particular study.