



This is to certify that the  
dissertation entitled

CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT AND INTERCOLLEGIATE  
ATHLETICS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS, ROLES,  
VALUES AND BEHAVIORS OF COLLEGIATE COACHES,  
ATHLETIC DIRECTORS, AND PRESIDENTS AS RELATED TO  
STUDENT-ATHLETE DEVELOPMENT

presented by

Earnest Marcellus Fingers

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

Doctoral degree in Educational Administration

  
Major Professor's Signature

October 20, 2005

Date

*MSU is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution*

LIBRARY  
Michigan State  
University

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX** to remove this checkout from your record.  
**TO AVOID FINES** return on or before date due.  
**MAY BE RECALLED** with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
1216 -- SEP 06 2009		

**CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS, ROLES, VALUES AND BEHAVIORS OF  
COLLEGIATE COACHES, ATHLETIC DIRECTORS, AND PRESIDENTS AS  
RELATED TO STUDENT-ATHLETE CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT**

**By**

**Earnest Marcellus Fingers**

**A DISSERTATION  
Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of requirements  
for the degree of**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**College of Education**

**2005**



## **ABSTRACT**

### **CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT AND INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE PERCEPTIONS, ROLES, VALUES AND BEHAVIORS OF COLLEGIATE COACHES, ATHLETIC DIRECTORS, AND PRESIDENTS AS RELATED TO STUDENT-ATHLETE CHARACTER DEVELOPMENT**

**By**

**Earnest Marcellus Fingers**

One of the primary reasons for maintaining collegiate athletics hundreds of campuses is because “athletics builds character.” The primary purpose for conducting this study was to explore and assess the perceptions held by head coaches, athletic directors and presidents regarding their roles and responsibilities as related to student-athlete character development. In particular, the research examines perceptions concerning individual impact upon the development of character by student-athletes. Two Division I and two Division III NCAA schools were selected in order to compare and contrast “big time” Division I athletics to the Division III “love of the game” perception. Traditional revenue sports of football and men’s basketball were targeted with the addition of four non-revenue sports. Interviews were conducted for this qualitative research and the information each institution was. Topic areas for this study were character development, leadership, environment, socialization, and mission. Institutional case studies were developed with results of the interviews and a within institution and between divisional level analysis was conducted. Assessment of character development found that most respondents stated that athletic participation does build character and others believed that there was potential for athletics to build character. However, most participants could identify only one of the three key elements necessary for building character. Each institution lacked agreement in definitions of “character.” Examination of external factors

displayed that most institutions lacked consensus in articulation of the institutional and athletic mission. Other points of interest were found as well. Overall, each institution lacked internal consensus on a variety of topics. This research provides greater insight about the role and relationship between those most intimately involved with intercollegiate athletics and student-athletes, and how they directly or indirectly impact student-athlete character development. This study also takes into consideration the external environmental factors presented by both the institution and the athletic department, and the potential influence of such factors on perceptions and behaviors.

Copyright by  
EARNEST MARCELLUS FINGERS  
2005

## DEDICATION

Education is more than learning about what others have had to say. It is an opportunity to learn more so about one's own ability, desire, and perseverance. This journey is dedicated to the *spirits* of all of those who have preceded me, and most especially to all of those who had the desire to obtain a formal education, but not the means nor the opportunity. May the spirit of scholarship burn forever brightly for each of you. I encourage everyone to "Think BIG and live even LARGER." TO GOD BE ALL THE GLORY!  
Amen...Amen...Amen!

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I give thanks and praises to God for providing and sustaining me from Day 1 until leave this earth. This has been an incredible journey. I could not have made it without the prayers and needed support of some special people – my family, friends, colleagues, professors, my committee and committee chair.

My FAMILY has never wavered. The lessons and joys of our lives together came to visit me often during life as a graduate student and surely pulled me through. I love each of you very much. May we party on and celebrate life together. Aunt Delilah (Yvonne) in 1988 you saw in me the “scholar” that I did not see in myself. I thank you for your vision. Your poem saved me in my most difficult moments.

CRF I love you. Thank you for getting me over the final hump. You surely have a piece of this dissertation. LAC thank you for opening so many doors in my mind that would still be closed had God not sent you to help me out at MSU. You encouraged me to truly be “all” that I dreamed and ever thought of being. I am forever indebted to you for your influence. JFT I have appreciated your intellect and pioneering spirit as a scholar since the summer of 1990. Just knowing you has pushed me since then.

I must give a shout out to HIU – Hampton University – My Home By the Sea! It is the foundation of my college education. (thanks Pappy!) For my brothers of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Incorporated (Sigma Upsilon & Sigma Chapters) – thank you for sharing my joys and pains. FIETTS.

Again, I give thanks and praises to God for providing and sustaining me from Day 1 until leave this earth.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Context of the Issue.....	2
	Statement of the Purpose.....	11
	Statement of Research Question.....	12
	Definition of Terms.....	13
	Significance of the Study.....	14
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	16
	Introduction.....	16
	The Role of Intercollegiate Athletics Program.....	18
	Role of Administration (President) .....	22
	Role of Athletic Directors.....	24
	Role of Coaches.....	25
	Organizational and Administrative Structure.....	27
	Divisions I/ II/ III	
	Summary.....	30
	Organizational Culture.....	32
	Cultural Assessment.....	33
	Organizational Subcultures.....	35
	Strengths of the Cultural Metaphor.....	36
	Moral Development & Higher Education.....	37
	Moral Cognitive Development.....	37
	In the Context of Athletics.....	44
	Moral Education.....	48
	Student Athlete Support Services.....	50
	Development Issues and Concerns.....	52
	Life Skills.....	53
	Chapter Summary.....	55

III.	METHODOLOGY.....	57
	Introduction.....	57
	Conceptual Framework.....	58
	Design of the Study.....	60
	Research Questions.....	61
	Participants.....	62
	Instrument.....	65
	Pilot Test.....	68
	Demographics.....	69
	Data Collection.....	77
	Data Analysis.....	79
	Generalizability.....	81
	Summary.....	81
IV.	RESULTS and DISCUSSION.....	82
	Introduction.....	82
	Institutional Analysis.....	83
	Center College.....	83
	Mountain College.....	98
	Gala University.....	111
	Rainbow University.....	125
	Summary Discussion of Results.....	139
V.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	145
	Introduction.....	145
	Character Development.....	146
	Organizational Culture.....	152
	Leadership.....	153
	Environment.....	154
	Socialization.....	156
	Mission.....	157
	Limitations of the Research.....	158
	Implications for Research.....	159
	Recommendations for Higher Education Institutions.....	160
	APPENDICES.....	165
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	174

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE LISTING	PAGE
Table 1	Kohlberg's Levels and Stages of Moral Development.....42
Table 2	Michigan Colleges and University.....63
Table 3	Participants and Participation Rate.....65
Table 4	Head Coach Characteristics.....70
Table 5	Athletic Director Characteristics.....74
Table 6	President and Senior Administrator Characteristics.....75
Table 7	Key Elements.....140
Table 8	External Factors by Position.....142
Table 9	External Factors by Division Level.....143
Table 10	Perception of the Institution's View of Athletics.....143
Table 11	Parents/Family Influence on Current Philosophy.....151
Table 12	Parents/Family Perceived As Being Responsible or Character By Position and Division Level.....151



## **CHAPTER I**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Historically, athletic participation has been viewed as a very useful tool in the development of character (Gerdy, 1997). The notion that sports build character dates back to ancient times. Nevertheless, the debate over the relationship between sport participation and its impact upon values and character development has continued (Boxhill, 2003; Dowell, 1971; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). When looking at the potential benefits of sport involvement, few will contest that the opportunity for sport to impact character and moral development is readily available (Ewing, 1997; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Even so, the information used to support the character building effects of sport often consists of subjective accounts and personal testimonials. Although there is potential to build character through athletic participation at our nation's colleges and universities, the mechanism at these institutions by which character is influenced has not been systematically studied and is not known.

A prevalent belief held today is that there is a conflict of interest between higher education and "big time" intercollegiate athletics (Covell & Barr, 2001; Knight Commission, 2001), leading some to argue for the reduction or even the elimination of intercollegiate athletic programs. Intercollegiate athletics is even considered to be higher education's "peculiar institution" (Thelin, 1994). However, the belief that athletics influence character has been tied directly to the central purpose of maintaining athletics at this nation's college and university campuses (Gerdy, 1997). Athletics are thought to serve a three-pronged purpose in higher education: 1) athletics generates revenue, visibility, and prestige for the university; 2) athletics is entertainment and serves a

unifying function for an increasingly fragmented university community; and 3) athletics is educational [character building] for the student participants (Gerdy, 1997, pp. 33-34). It is this third purpose that was the focus of this study.

### *Context of the Issue*

#### *Moral Development and Higher Education*

In an effort to explore the ability of athletics to influence character more fully, it is important to reflect upon the theories of moral development and the process of moral education. It has been debated whether character (or morality) can even be taught (Stoll & Beller, 1998). Researchers of cognitive and moral development have established that for morality to be learned the following set of conditions must be consistently maintained: moral education, moral role models, and a moral environment (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1998). A resulting conclusion is that moral reasoning (the foundation of character development) can be taught, examined, and evaluated (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1998).

According to Stoll and Beller (1998) moral education is a lifelong process and is central to the development of personal character. Traditionally a commitment to moral education has shaped the mission of American colleges and universities (Morrill, 1980; Kuh, 1998; Pascarella, 1997; Schwartz, 2000). However, over time many institutions have not maintained the tradition of moral education - at least not to the degree where it has remained a priority in the classroom (Kuh, 1998). The ability to shape the attitudes, values, and beliefs of students has been, and must remain, a top priority of American

colleges and universities (Chickering, 1969, 1976; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). It is widely believed that colleges and universities have established themselves as places where the total growth and development of young men and women is enhanced (Chickering, 1981; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kuh, 1998; Pascarella, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schwartz, 2000). Questions have been raised about who holds the greatest responsibility for influencing the attainment of values and the development of character among collegiate student-athletes: parents, coaches, or athletic and university administrators. Institutional administrators must seize the opportunity to tie athletics to the broader vision, mission, and core values of the institution of higher education.

### *Collegiate Athletics*

Collegiate athletics has what could be considered truly dueling images. On one hand there is Division I athletics whose image is held strong and steadfast by “big time” sports of football and men’s basketball that serve as the moniker with which Americans have become most familiar. The perceived primary focus of Division I athletics is generally considered to be the winning of games, the generating of revenues, and a growing “win-at-all-costs” philosophy. Yet, on the other hand there is Division III athletics a place where images of “big time” athletic programs will not be found. The pressures to win, along with high salaries and national attention, are nearly non-existent at the Division III level. It would be assumed that there are moral differences to be found between Divisions I and III (Stoll, Beller, Cole & Burwell, 1995).

From an administrative perspective, it is important to recognize that the soundness of any athletic program is based heavily upon the three-tiered leadership of college/university presidents, athletic directors, and coaches, and upon the effectiveness

of the role played by each (Chu, 1989). Presidents are held accountable for the control and direction of the athletic program, as well as the general welfare of all participants (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; NCAA, 2003). Yet, it must be duly noted that presidents cannot move or react in earnest to arising situations without the full support of their boards (Knight Foundation, 2001). Presidents should remain aware of the degree to which institutional integrity has now been tied to the behavior exhibited by its athletic department. As a result, presidents must take decisive actions to direct and guide their athletic programs to resolve problems resulting from those programs (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Gerdy, 1997). For example, the President of the University of Georgia dismissed the men's basketball head coach for unethical conduct related to academic integrity regarding student-athlete grade reports (Moran & Jenkins, 2003).

A solid athletics program also rests upon the leadership of the director of athletics. The athletic director stands at the helm of the athletic enterprise (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). Athletic directors are in ideal positions to monitor the internal and external acts being conducted by the athletic department (Duderstadt, 2000). Both the president and athletic director share the responsibility of showing the campus community how the athletics program contributes to the institution (Andre & James, 1991).

Beyond the administrative leadership, each coach is directly responsible for and maintains the greatest impact upon student welfare (McEwin & Dickinson, 1996; Yeager, Buxton, Baltzell & Bzdell, 2001). In addition, the public views coaches as the true custodians of athletic competition (Yeager et al., 2001). As such, sport participation is usually a positive experience when coaches are knowledgeable of the developmental aspects affecting the participants (McEwin & Dickinson, 1996; Yeager et al., 2001).

The pressures faced by athletic directors and coaches grow as the financial arms race (mounting salaries, increased spending, growing facilities) rages forward (Knight Foundation, 2001). The result is a “*win at all cost*” philosophy viewed by some as counter to the display of values needed at this stage of development for student-athletes (Barefield, McCallister, Bungum, & Pate, 1997).

It would be reasonable to assume that the same holistic development of the goals and expectations held for the general student population also hold true for the population of student-athletes and would include some measure of character development. For the general public, intercollegiate athletic programs serve a unique role as the most widely visible resource within the context of higher education, and athletics help to shape public perceptions regarding the quality, effectiveness, and purpose of the institution (Bok, 1983; Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997). Although athletics has been touted as a “builder of character” the demands of athletic participation have been cited as having a negative impact upon the development of various character traits (Adler & Adler, 1991; Barefield, McCallister, Bungum, & Pate, 1997; Beller & Stoll, 1994; Decker & Lasley, 1995; Gerdy, 1997). In addition, incidents concerning inappropriate behavior by members of collegiate athletic teams continue to reach our national headlines. A most recent example of poor moral judgment can be observed at the University of Colorado and members of its football program (O’Driscoll, 2004). While acting as hosts for visiting recruits these student-athletes illegally utilized alcohol and sex as part of the enticement of signing top prospects. This incident, and many others that go unpublicized, actively involve a moral dilemma of some sort to be decided by the student (athlete). The research aims to identify

organizational culture in resolving such dilemmas can be addressed by points presented in this study.

The analysis of character development should also take into consideration the divisional structure (Division I, II, and III) that exists within the membership of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). There are differences across Divisions related to the size, scholarships, and hierarchical structure of the athletic program and the respective institution. Organizational culture is influenced, in part, by the size, tightness, age, and founding history of the institution (Clark, 1980). For example, there are differences in the anticipated revenue generated by the athletic programs and the level of emphasis placed on winning (NCAA, 2002). Variations in the process/framework being utilized, the values, and even the mission of the institution could impact the “total” development of the student in different ways across the Divisions.

It would be reasonable to believe that if asked whether or not athletics build character most college presidents, athletic directors and coaches would quickly state, “Yes, athletics does build character.” In addition, if asked what student-athletes learn from athletic participation, the responses would likely span the gamut of positive “character building” attributes such as leadership, teamwork, discipline, perseverance, commitment, and sacrifice. This study will explore the apparent disconnect between this subjective sense that sport builds character and the implementation of a consistent framework for student-athlete character development.

### *Organizational Culture*

There are several factors that influence an institution’s ability to affect the character of its population of students, including student athletes. One of the most

important factors is organizational culture. By viewing an athletic program, and its character building philosophy of athletics, through a lens of organizational culture it may be possible to generate insight into the leadership and values of those responsible for the effective delivery of the institution's athletic program. An organizational culture perspective may also lead to a greater understanding of how, when, where, and even why the enhancing effect of collegiate athletics either does or does not take place, and may also reveal what values are being taught.

Masland (1986) describes organizational culture as a powerful force that serves to control the behavior of those within it (the organization). An organization's culture influences what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it (Tierney, 1988). All of this seems quite germane to (collegiate) athletics' intended purpose of developing character within higher education. From the outside looking in, organizational culture would appear to play a role in the effective establishment and communication of institutional values and the process of developing character. There are multiple aspects by which to analyze an organization's culture. For example an institution's culture can be investigated by focusing on such essential concepts as environment, the mission, symbolism, and socialization to name a few (Chaffee, 1988; Tierney, 1988). Tierney (1988) points out that the culture of higher education varies by institution and that no two institutions are identical.

However, within any institution the existing culture of one department can vary from the culture of other departmental units. Higher education is an example of such cultural conflict. Institutions have met with a great deal of criticism in relation to their management and lack of (cultural) influence upon intercollegiate athletics (Knight

Commission, 2002). As the popularity and fan base of intercollegiate sport, particularly that of football and men's basketball, continue to grow, the public image and integrity of higher education continues to suffer under the cloud of allegations of exploitation and the neglect of student athlete welfare (Boggan, 1999; Schulman & Bowen, 2001). Given the high stakes, win at all cost philosophy that has developed within collegiate athletics, it is questionable whether or not adequate attention is being paid to the "potential" character building effects of athletics. It was this organizational culture lens that helped to guide the present study by looking internally at collegiate athletics and its opportunity to impact the personal development of its student participants.

#### *Student-Athlete Support Services*

Parham (1993) established that the solidifying of values is an important element of the college student experience. Student-athletes are often placed in socially isolated positions as a result of athletic participation; as such, they often lack the opportunity to develop social skills in the same manner as the general student body (Parham, 1993). Other unique challenges such as these that are faced by student-athletes have been discussed and outlined by Parham (1993) and Ferrante, Etzel and Lantz (1996). The learning of how to balance academic and athletic demands, along with adapting to a certain degree of isolation from social and more "mainstream" activities are a few. Such challenges are in addition to the demands already placed upon the general college student (Chickering, 1981; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). A valid attempt, by all involved, to meet the developmental needs of student-athletes remains a mission of most athletic departments across the country (Ferrante et al., 1996).



Most institutions of higher learning offer student development programs (Chickering, 1969, 1976; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). For the population of collegiate student-athletes it is important to identify the key methods and opportunities to assist them with the intricate student development puzzle. This approach becomes even more important given that the “big time” revenue generating sports of men’s basketball and football have tended to graduate student-athletes at a lower rate than the general student population (NCAA, 2001). As a result, the implementation of character development becomes that much more critical in preparing young people to become productive and contributing citizens. This is often a dual goal not widely expressed as degree completion.

In 1994 the NCAA made an effort to address the needs of the “total” student [with character being a central part of that “total”] while also attempting to meet the special developmental challenges faced by student-athletes. These efforts began with a comprehensive life skills program (Ferrante, 1996; Ward, 1999). Since its inception in 1994 the CHAMPS Life Skills Program has taken a holistic approach to the development of the student-athlete. The Life Skills Program addresses five broad areas: 1) Academic Commitment, 2) Athletic Commitment, 3) Personal Commitment, 4) Career Development Commitment, and 5) Service Commitment. Programs such as CHAMPS have been designed to increase opportunities for student development, and potentially to enhance character development through exposure to certain settings and events.

However, many initiatives provided through the Life Skills Programs can be considered quite passive and do not require or mandate student-athlete participation in a specific number of planned events. Some student-athletes do not and will not participate

voluntarily (Ferrante et al, 1996). These opportunities for growth and development are not being fully utilized. Although the Life Skills Program has great intentions, its effectiveness is not known, and it does not appear to reach a significant number of student-athletes.

An important aspect of the socialization of students is the selection of quality experiences for the learning and development of values and morals (Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kuh, 1998; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Pascarella, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Schwartz, 2000). Because student-athletes spend an exorbitant amount of time involved with activities, both mandatory and “non-mandatory,” directly related to their sport, there is an ample supply of opportunities for quality learning and development. It is within these instances that coaches, in particular, have a grand platform (as well as a captive audience) with which to build and influence student-athletes’ moral development.

Society maintains high expectations for the outcomes of higher education (Chickering, 1981; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kuh, 1998; Pascarella, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). This sentiment generally includes athletic programs, which often establish the public’s first perception and serve as the only mode of interaction between the institution and the public. In an institution of higher learning, academic recognition and achievement are viewed as the more critical components of the college student experience. However, academics do not fully encapsulate the “life lessons” that students experience prior to their departure from institutions of higher learning (Chickering, 1976; Schlossberg, 1981).

When reviewing the impact of athletics upon moral development, the literature does not provide sufficient and conclusive empirical evidence to support the “sports builds character” belief (Oglivie & Tutko, 1971; Shields & Bredemeir, 1995; Stevenson, 1975, 1985). The proposed study will explore efforts to deliver quality “life lessons” and moral tests that spur the development and growth of moral reasoning.

#### Statement of Purpose

The popularity of intercollegiate athletics seems to be at an all-time high. Yet, it appears that the original reason for establishing intercollegiate athletic competition has been forgotten (Boggan, 1999; Schulman & Bowen, 2001). In working with student-athletes, athletic departments too often focus upon maintaining the athletic eligibility of the student and not upon the multiple elements that are vital to overall student growth and development (Chickering, 1981; Ferrante et al., 1996; Parham, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). As a result, this population of students is often left to manage and plan their own development. This phenomenon is exacerbated with the admittance of “high-risk” populations statistically less likely to obtain a college degree (Suggs, 1999).

The primary purpose for conducting this study was to explore and assess the perceptions held by head coaches, athletic directors and presidents regarding their roles and responsibilities as related to student-athlete character development. In particular, the research examines each individual’s perceptions concerning his/her impact upon the development of character by student-athletes. This study aimed to identify and explore the values, beliefs, and actual behaviors that were practiced by head coaches, athletic directors and presidents in their efforts to directly or indirectly impact student-athlete character development.

This research provides greater insight about the role and relationship between those most intimately involved with intercollegiate athletics and student-athletes. Indirectly, this study takes into consideration the external environmental factors presented by both the institution and the athletic department, and the potential influence of such factors upon the perceptions and behaviors of a coach.

This research addresses present conditions that aim to promote “character development” and social values. It was hoped that the values and beliefs of coaches, athletic directors, presidents and senior administrators are congruent with the basic tenets of higher education’s mission [service, teaching, and research], and that consensus would be found amongst the institution, athletic department, and head coaches.

#### Statement of Research Questions

The following research questions were developed to address the purpose of the study:

1. Do Division I and III head coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators believe that student participation in intercollegiate athletics build character?
2. What do Division I and III head coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators perceive to be the essential elements/components needed to develop character in student-athletes? [Informally or Formally; Advertently or Inadvertently]
3. Are there differences among the head coaches, athletic directors, and presidents regarding how character is developed in student-athletes?
4. Are there differences among head coaches, athletic directors, and presidents regarding their views and perceptions related to the impact athletics has upon student-athlete character development?
5. Are there differences between Divisional levels regarding the impact of athletics upon student-athlete character development?

### Definition of Terms

Athletic Director – The chief administrative officer of the Department of Athletics of a college or university.

Attitudes – Dispositions or tendencies to make evaluative judgments concerning objects or events (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995, p. 14)

Belief – An idea held to be true.

Character - Intelligent direction and purposeful control of conduct by definite moral principles (Eddy, 1959). The moral action model of Shields and Bredemeier (1995) holds four virtues as being related directly to character: compassion, fairness, sportspersonship, and integrity.

Coach – Head of an athletic team viewed as responsible for the performance and conduct of the student-athlete members of the team (Humphrey, Yow & Bowden, 2000).

Moral – Knowledge of what is considered good, proper and right (Lumpkin et al., 1999).

Moral development – The evolving growth process by which one learns to take other into consideration when making moral decisions (Lumpkin, et al., 1999).

Moral education – The intentional process of informing and making one knowledgeable of the morals that unify members of a group. Based upon the premise that civilization has a common core of shared values, referred to as universal values or public values.

Moral environment – The aggregate of social and cultural institutions, forms, patterns, and processes that influence the life of an individual or community.

Moral role model – An individual viewed as a good example to follow with regard to moral behavior.

NCAA – The governing body of most intercollegiate athletic programs.

Organizational Culture – Induces purpose, commitment, and order; provides meaning and social cohesion; and clarifies and explains behavioral expectations (Masland, 1988).

President – The chief executive officer of a college or university.

Prosocial Behavior - Social action intended to benefit others without anticipation of personal reward, indeed, perhaps at some cost or risk to oneself (Gibbs, 2003, p. 112).

Value – An enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end-state of existence (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995, p. 15)

### Significance of the Study

There is a history of concern about scandals and proposed reforms, and student-athlete welfare among intercollegiate athletics “big-time” programs (Byers, 1995; Boggan, 1999; Knight Commission 2001). In this pressure-filled and “win-at-all cost” era of intercollegiate athletics, concerns about “values” and “character development” have taken center stage and become even more compelling. The larger context presents a general concern about appropriately managing the developmental needs and welfare of student-athletes.

This study seeks to make a significant contribution to empowering young men and women with the “values” and social skills that will be in line with the basic tenets of higher education’s mission. In addition, although there is no sufficient substitute for a college degree on the job market, for the population of students who will not obtain a degree this research will be of substantial benefit. As a result, we can increase the likelihood that we will come to stand more firmly on Gerdy’s (1997) third justification

for the maintenance of athletics within higher education — that athletics are educational and character building.

This investigation will be valuable for all who are interested in American higher education. A particular audience interested in this proposed research may be the student-athlete population and their families. Athletic directors, presidents, trustee members, as well as conference and NCAA administrators and legislators may also find this analysis to be of interest. Essentially, the goal of this research was not merely to get more out of athletics and athletic programs, but to place more of a collective interest into the “teachable moments” and opportunities for character development often presented through athletic participation. Finally, this investigation will lead the field to moving closer to an unveiling and understanding of how the stated mission and values of the institution are translated and conferred throughout the administrative and athletic structures, and then onto students via athletic participation.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Introduction

This chapter will survey literature that is relevant to the issue of intercollegiate student-athlete character development. The various areas being reviewed are a) the role of intercollegiate athletics, b) organizational culture, c) moral development, and d) student-athlete support services. The perceived benefits of athletics are discussed on almost a daily basis. A closer look into the actual impact of intercollegiate athletics will now be investigated.

This era could be considered one of the finest in the history of intercollegiate athletics. As the overall graduation rate for the population of student-athletes hits an all-time high of sixty percent, and as the total annual revenue generated by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) [and its member institutions] exceeds four billion dollars, “big-time” intercollegiate athletics is at the peak of its popularity (Dempsey, 2002; NCAA, 2002).

However, some will say that this shining moment in intercollegiate athletics is tainted by a few contentious topics. Among the points of concern are the primacy of athletic participation and its apparent precedence above all other student-related activities and requirements (Knight Commission, 2001). This concern has led to accusations of a disregard for student-athlete welfare. There is also public lapses of integrity by athletic programs, such as violations in recruiting, illegal payments, grade fixing. To make matters worse, there remain whispers regarding the exploitation of student-athletes in a system already considered by some to be biased and unfair (Byers, 1995; Boggan, 1999;



Knight Commission, 2001). Taken together, these factors have prompted many to ask what the true purpose of an athletics program is on a college campus (Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997; Lucey, 1982; Simon, 1991). Many of the actions and behaviors that occur within athletics run counter to the very character and moral fiber expected of higher education (Byers, 1995; Knight Commission, 2001; Sperber, 1990). The most recent and common examples of this can be found in the multiple recruiting and extra benefit violations committed by various institutions.

Lost amidst the issues are the student-athlete and the purpose of maintaining collegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletics has three distinct purposes that justify its existence within the body of higher education (Gerdy, 1997). First, athletics generates revenue, visibility, and prestige for the university. Second, athletics is entertainment and serves a unifying function for an increasingly fragmented university community. These two purposes are widely accepted inside and outside of the academy.

One could argue that the third reason for collegiate athletics -- that it builds student character -- is the one given by university leaders most often over the years (Gerdy, 1997). Yet it has neither wide appeal beyond the academy, nor have academic institutions solidly demonstrated anticipated effects (Sage, 1998; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). There has been no consistent and conclusive empirical evidence to support that athletic participation builds character in a higher education setting (Adler & Adler, 1990; Oglivie & Tutko, 1971; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Stevenson, 1975, 1985). The current study intends to assess the effects of intercollegiate sports on character development.

Higher education is recognized as an institutional setting that promotes multifaceted learning and development – a principal product is the “student” (Chickering, 1981; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Kuh, 1998; Pascarella, 1997; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Student growth and development (e.g., personal, professional, social) within higher education institutions occurs in both a formal and informal manner. Intercollegiate athletics and its feeders purportedly could ensure that student-athletes gain in these fundamental ways from the college student experience.

Graduation rate is one indicator of success for academic institutions. By NCAA (2004) assessment, a small number of Division I, II and III athletic programs were in the upper eighties and low nineties in graduation percentages in 2003. These are recognized as the exceptions and not the rule. The 62% average graduation rate experienced in 2003 by the body of student-athletes across Division I was a record high, while Divisions II and III posted 53% and 58% respectively (NCAA, 2004). For the Division I revenue sports of men’s basketball and football the graduation rates are found several points below the national average. As an example, for men’s basketball the graduation rate was 44%, while football saw its average rate of graduation sit at 55%. However, until the rate of graduation reaches a respectable percent for all groups, educators and administrators must seek to take advantage of and/or create opportunities that will teach valuable “skills for life” and “character building” attributes.

### The Role of Intercollegiate Athletics Programs

Athletics has been a part of the collegiate environment for as long as most Americans can remember. Soon after its arrival athletics became by far the university’s

most public and recognized department and program (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997; Sperber, 1990). The role that intercollegiate athletics presently plays in higher education varies by whom you ask. It is important to understand the evolution and history of college athletics to appreciate how it arrived at its present role(s) in the university.

It has been 175 years since the first intercollegiate athletic contest took place between higher education institutions (Andre & James, 1991). With American post-secondary institutions firmly rooted in the German and English models of higher education, school administrators who held high and proud the intellectual sanctity of academia looked upon activities such as athletics with much disdain (Chu, 1989; Covell & Barr, 2001; Westmeyer, 1985). For many early administrators there was no clear purpose in the futile playing of games, and they nearly moved to forbid such games (Andre & James, 1991).

Early competitive athletic events primarily consisted of rowing, track and field, and crew. Students sought out athletics because they desired to display and compete in physical contests against rival institutions (Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997). With no benefit or value found in these games by most administrators, students were allowed to operate and manage every aspect of the athletic program (Andre & James, 1991; Gerdy, 1997). Control over athletics began to change once football came upon the scene near the close of the nineteenth century. One particular event, as pointed out by Rudolph (1990), signaled the pending change in higher education's stance on athletics. In 1893, an annual football game played between Yale and Princeton drummed up such hoopla that it seemed to have become the primary focus of many in and around New York (Chu, 1989).

At the turn of the twentieth century, many institutions were financially insecure and sought creative means of revenue generation. During this time, and for years to come, many higher education institutions struggled to maintain consistent streams of revenue and enrollment (Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997). The quick growth in popularity of college sport, particularly football, and the potential generation of prestige and revenue, created a wave of new and refined thinking regarding the value of athletics to the entire institution (Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997). For administrators, athletics soon became too popular and too important for students to continue to maintain and deliver it to the public in representation of the institution (Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997; Rudolph, 1990).

The onset of the 1900's brought a widely held belief among leaders of higher education that the success of one's athletics greatly influenced the amount of resources offered to it. This belief led to the acceptance of athletics as a key part of higher education:

Regardless of whether a successful sports team generated additional resources and political favor for a university—point that remains in dispute to this day—college presidents *believed* that a successful football program legitimized their institution as a major, big-time university. This trend intensified during the 1930s when transportation and communications advancements made long-distance travel and the broadcast of games on the radio a part of an expanding sports marketplace. Intercollegiate athletics was no longer regional in scope. With these changes came opportunity to gain widespread national prestige and visibility. Athletics was formally incorporated into higher education's structure because academic leaders believed that a successful athletic team could serve an important public relations function for the university, which in turn would result in increased financial support. (Gerdy, 1997, p. 29)

During this period intercollegiate athletics assumed a large role within higher education, and it would continue to grow. As universities and colleges began to experience growth and expansion within and across various departments and

constituencies, the institution lacked a sufficient means of binding all of these groups together (Gerdy, 1997). Athletics filled this void and supplied a common purpose that continues to tie and unite thousands (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu, 1989; Chu & Segrave, 1985). A successful athletic program would bring together very fragmented external and internal populations. No other program on campus can meet this aim. As the legendary coach Paul “Bear” Bryant put it, “It’s kind of hard to rally around a math class.”(In Chu, 1989, p. 158)

As college athletics, its role(s), and even its impact have grown beyond the imagination of countless past (and present) administrators, it is important to keep in mind that athletics is but one among many units that make up a higher education institution. The fundamental intent of higher education is to address and meet the needs of society (Bok, 1983, 1992; Gerdy, 1997). Toward this end, there typically is an established statement of mission, vision, purpose, and goals. It is critical for every unit to work in support of the institution’s mission. Also, the institution is potentially in a position of mistrust and misunderstanding because so much in higher education is unknown and unobservable by the public (Chu, 1989).

Athletics serve as an institution’s symbolic representation and is at the center of the public’s perception of higher education (Chu, 1989; Duderstadt, 2000). Although many would like to dismiss intercollegiate athletics as games and simple entertainment for its fans, intercollegiate athletics has enormous potential to contribute to the higher education experience (Bok, 1992; Chu, 1989; Duderstadt, 2000; Gerdy, 1997). For example – students, along with faculty and staff often develop fond memories, school spirit, and camaraderie around the athletic events of an institution. The present level of

power and influence that college sport has taken in our society allows it to promote various values – from education and fair play to cheating and win-at-all-cost behavior (DiBiaggio, 1992, 1995; Duderstadt, 2000; Sperber, 1990). In addition, there are even greater opportunities for athletics to impact the students participating in them. However, for any level of greatness to be realized by intercollegiate athletics (and higher education), the present system must be brought to a higher level (Knight Commission, 2001):

The current inseparability of sports, especially football, from the infrastructure of higher education was prefigured late in the previous century in the building of expensive stadiums on college property – inevitably with borrowed funds to be repaid from spectator charges, the frequent playing of championship games in metropolitan centers, and the increasingly widespread coverage of games by newspaper and later by radio. For it was only when the sporting scene began to move, emotionally and at times literally, beyond the confines of the college playing field that the social and populist linkages were formed that gave intercollegiate contests a security their intrinsic character could never have sustained. (Bailey & Littleton, 1991, p. 6)

Athletics, like each department that makes up a university or college, must actively contribute to the mission of the larger institution (Gerdy, 1998). Those tasked with insuring athletics' contribution to higher education are the president, athletic director and coaches (Duderstadt, 2000).

### *Role of Presidents*

Presidents are readily recognized as the chief executive officer (CEO) of the academic institution. Over the course of time the role and even the power of the president has shifted. The size and structure of colleges and universities has changed, and with these changes there have been adjustments in the duties of presidents. In particular, much of the sovereignty once afforded to presidents by their trustees early in the development

of higher education is no longer present (Chu, 1989). Overall, the role of the president in relation to athletics is misunderstood by many, both within and outside of the institution (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Duderstadt, 2000).

As it relates to athletics, Bylaw 2.2 of the NCAA Constitution plainly states: “The institution’s chief executive officer is responsible for the administration of all aspects of the athletics program, including approval of the budget and audit of all expenditures” (2003 NCAA Manual, p. 3). It is the responsibility of the president to oversee the proper functioning and overall integrity of athletics. For programs regarded as “big time” athletic programs, the fiscal health and success of athletic programs must also be kept under watch. Although athletics may not be the centerpiece of every institution, presidents are the critical link in keeping the athletic department tied to the institution and in line with the institutional mission(s) (Bailey & Littleton, 1991).

Even though the NCAA bylaws place authority and responsibility on college presidents, there are moments when it is unclear who is ultimately heading the athletics program (Duderstadt, 2000; Kerr & Gade, 1989):

This point of authority, while legislatively clear and incontrovertible, is often ambiguously communicated, to both university faculty and public, when institutions at times of crisis or significant change in the athletic program seem represented not by the president but by the governing board or even by the athletic director. Unfortunately, the agreement on the president’s authority in these matters is not always secured explicitly with the governing board at the time of appointment, perhaps due to the unjustified assumption that the point is already understood or to the fact that many individuals are promoted, as it were, into the office of president without any significant experience in the administration of athletics and thus are not aware of the critical importance of this issue. (Bailey & Littleton, 1991, p. 67)

In this present era of our sports-dominated society it is difficult for any president to run the institution (of Div I-A status) effectively without being actively involved in its

athletics program (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu & Segrave, 1985; Gerdy, 1997).

Athletics has reached such a level of popularity and solicits far too much attention from the public for a president to attempt to disconnect him or herself from the athletics program (Bailey & Littleton, Duderstadt, 2000). Continuity of leadership makes this issue more complex given that turnover remains at a high level for college and university presidents (Bailey & Littleton, 1991).

#### *Role of the Athletic Director*

Although the president is held responsible for all outcomes pertaining to athletics, the day-to-day responsibility and authority of maintaining proper control of an institution's athletic program falls upon the athletic director (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). In addition, athletic directors are also typically held responsible for developing and maintaining a keen knowledge and understanding of the rules and legislation of the NCAA and in the respective conference (Duderstadt, 2000).

Because collegiate athletics is embedded in an academic environment, some hold that the role of the athletic director should be more educationally oriented. As stated by Curry (1996), there is a need for athletic directors to be more heavily involved with academics:

The athletic director should first of all be an educator. The director of the nineties must help integrate athletics and education, he or she must serve on the academic councils with deans of colleges and the chief academic officer (academic vice-president or provost). The athletic director will enhance the welfare of the student-athlete by providing orientation programs for student-athletes dealing with campus life, academic policies and developing a formal process for evaluation of the program. The athletic director should also provide programs that deal with awareness of diversity. (Craig, 1996)



Over time the selection of and even the search criteria for athletic directors has evolved toward financially savvy individuals. In a 1994 survey, Eastman and Beaudine found that the most common desired traits and characteristics of Division I presidents and athletic directors were:

1. Strategic Thinking — the ability to develop, evaluate, and implement short and long-term plans.
2. Knowledge of and sensitivity to gender equity issues and regulatory procedures.
3. Ability to manage complex financial issues and budgets.
4. Capability to direct a large and diverse staff, including coaches.
5. Marketing expertise.
6. Strong public speaking, writing, and media relations skills.
7. Creativity and problem-solving abilities.
8. Effective human resource talents for dealing with parents, students, faculty, booster groups, and sponsors.

As pointed out by Gerdy (1997), this list fails to include academic goals of any kind. This evolution can be viewed as a reflection of the direction in which athletic programs have moved (Duderstadt, 2000).

### *Role of the Coaches*

The delegation of responsibility for intercollegiate athletics continues with the role of the coach. Each coach is deemed responsible for the conduct of his/her program, and the success of the athletics program is believed to depend largely upon coaches (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Knight Commission, 2001). Success entails the team's performance on the field [wins and losses] and student-athlete behavior off the field including the classroom.

As defined by Webster (2002), a coach is one who instructs players in the fundamentals of competitive sports and directs team strategy. The term coach has its roots in Great Britain. It was used to describe a tutor who assisted a student through his examinations (Humphrey et al., 2000).

The position and role of a head coach is no small order. The head coach wears multiple hats. A coach is considered “at once a teacher, a psychologist, a father/mother figure, and various other roles that he or she finds it expedient or necessary to assume at a given time” (Humphrey et al., 2000, p. 49).

The “high stakes” environment of intercollegiate athletics, generally associated with Division I football and men’s basketball, makes coaching stressful, including the constant pressure to win, whether real or made up (DiBiaggio, 1995). However, both the payout and punishment for winning and losing can both be extrinsically and intrinsically motivated:

For the coach, the rewards of success (i.e., a winning season) are psychological as well as economic. A “Bear” Bryant of Alabama or a Woody Hayes of Ohio State can enjoy national fame and take modestly concealed satisfaction in the fact that he is far better known than the governor of the state — not to mention the president of the university. The results of failure (i.e., losing season) are punitive: coaches whose teams have done badly can expect to be pilloried in print, burned in effigy, and separated from the university. John Robinson, a football coach at Southern California, complained to Sports Illustrated writer John Underwood about the psychological burden of the incessant death threats that are an occupational hazard of college coaching. (Andre & James, 1991, p.22)

At the onset of the growth of collegiate athletics, coaches generally held a position as a member of the faculty (Gerdy, 1997). As college sports began to blossom in popularity, many institutions decided to hire full-time coaches. To this day many hold

tightly to the belief that the primary responsibility of coaches is, and should always be, as educators (Gerdy, 1997; Bailey & Littleton, 1991).

The impact of a coach's behavior and opinion upon the members of his or her team are potentially boundless, and should not be taken for granted (Humphrey et al., 2000). Bailey and Littleton (1991) reaffirm an important point:

The institutional position for its athletic program must clearly establish the role of the coach as a teacher, not merely for the enhancement of athletic ability but also for the responsibility for promoting and contributing to the total education of the student-athlete in his or her program. The potential contribution coaches can make to education is suggested in this observation by a prominent head football coach in Division I-A: "If the coach is not convinced that education is important to that student-athlete, the student-athlete is not going to be interested in going to class and making as good grades as he can. He's got the only excuse he needs. The man he looks up to for all his guidance has made it clear that it really doesn't matter what he does as long as he shows up on Saturday and gets it in the end zone. He's been taught from day one: you please the coach and everything's OK." (p. 80)

Ideally, the qualities of a successful coach are centered upon balance. There is "the balance between being caring, motivational, supportive, and approachable, while maintaining the firm discipline and uncompromising determination to require of student-athletes the academic and competitive excellence that also characterizes outstanding college coaches" (Humphrey et al., 2000, p. 49). Also, while many expect so much of collegiate coaches, for the overall benefit of all involved it is important that coaches be kept well informed and well supported (Bailey & Littleton, 1991).

#### *Organization and Administrative Structure*

Through standards and regulations established by the NCAA and its member institutions, intercollegiate athletics are split into multiple divisions of competition. The size and population of the institution usually determines the divisional level into which

each institution seeks to place itself. There are certain financial ramifications, such as financial aid awards, tied to each division with regard to revenue sharing by the NCAA among institutions and their respective conference(s).

Division I. Member Division I institutions have to sponsor at least seven sports for men and seven for women (or six for men and eight for women) with two team sports for each gender. Each playing season has to be represented by each gender as well. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. For sports other than football and basketball, Division I schools must play 100% of the minimum number of contests against Division I opponents — anything over the minimum number of games has to be 50% Division I. Men's and women's basketball teams have to play all but two games against Division I teams: Men's basketball teams must play at least 1/3 of all their contests in the home arena. Football teams are classified as Divisions I-A or I-AA. Division I-A football schools are usually fairly elaborate programs. They have to meet minimum attendance requirements:

- 17,000 people in attendance per home game, or
- 20,000 average of all football games in the last four years, or
- 30,000 permanent seats in their stadium and average 17,000 per home game, or
- 20,000 average of all football games in the last four years, or be in a member conference in which at least six conference members sponsor football or more than half of football schools meet attendance criterion. Division I-AA teams do not need to meet minimum attendance requirements. Division I schools must meet minimum financial aid awards for their athletics program, and there are maximum financial aid awards for each sport that a Division I school cannot exceed (NCAA, 2003).

Division II. Institutions in Division II have to sponsor at least four sports for men and four for women, with two team sports for each gender. Each playing season must be

represented by each gender. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport, as well as scheduling criteria. Football and men's and women's basketball teams must play at least 50% of their games against Division II or I-A or I-AA opponents. For sports other than football and basketball there are no scheduling requirements. There are no attendance requirements for football or arena game requirements for basketball. There are maximum financial aid awards for each sport that a Division II school must not exceed. Division II teams usually feature a number of local or in-state student-athletes. Many Division II student-athletes pay for school through a combination of scholarship money, grants, student loans, and employment earnings. Division II athletics programs are financed in the institution's budget like other academic departments on campus. Traditional rivalries with regional institutions dominate schedules of many Division II athletics programs (NCAA, 2003).

Division III. Institutions in Division III have to sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender. Each playing season must be represented by each gender. There are contest and participant minimums for each sport. Division III athletics features student-athletes who receive no financial aid related to their athletic ability, and athletic departments are staffed and funded like any other department in the university. Division III athletics departments place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators. The student-athlete's experience is of paramount concern. Division III athletics encourages participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities available to students, placing primary emphasis on regional in-season and conference competition (NCAA, 2003).

in

ge

ad

id

tu

a

F

ca

d

re

a

a

R

I

C

P

I

C

U

S

S

A

Part of the organization and administrative structure of collegiate athletics includes the financing and costs associated with intercollegiate athletics. This financing generally varies by division level. Division I institutions treat athletics as an auxiliary activity, and are separated by a financial firewall from the budgets of academic programs (Duderstadt, 2000). Most Division I programs are expected to operate from the “every tub on its own bottom” budgeting method. This method places each athletics program in a position to generate enough revenue to meet or exceed its expenditures. For some programs this can be achieved with little to no support from central administration. In contrast, most Division III athletic programs are included in the institutional budget as a department within the academic structure of the institution. As a result, athletic programs rely primarily on institutional financing and subsidizing of athletics. Typical expenses for athletic programs are listed below. There are certain revenues and expenses primarily addressed by Division I institutions:

#### Revenues

Ticket Sales  
 Guarantees  
 Payouts from postseason play (Div. I)  
 Television (Div. I)  
 Corporate sponsorships, advertising, licensing  
 Unearned revenues  
     Booster Donations  
     Student fees and assessments  
     State or other govt. support

#### Expenditures

Salaries and Benefits  
 Athletic Scholarships (Div. I)  
 Travel and recruiting  
 Equipment, supplies, medicine  
 Insurance  
 Administrative  
 Capital expenditures (Div. I)

Traditional revenue sports of football and men’s basketball typically generate a significant percent of the revenue for an athletic department. A considerable portion of those revenues are used to cover the expenditures for those two teams (Duderstadt, 2000). At the close of the business day very few Division I programs actually earn a profit each

year (Duderstadt, 2000). There is a general myth that exists among the public that the multi-million dollar deals with television networks are paid directly to each Division I athletic program.

### *Summary*

Although athletics “should” be touted and regarded as another department on campus, the reality is that no other department appears in the news (print, TV, and radio) every day like the athletics program (Bailey & Littleton, 1991, Chu, 1989). It is difficult not to know about the athletics program, particularly for Division I schools. Athletics brings attention and prestige to the institution (Bailey & Littleton, 1991, Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997).

To understand the role of athletics within the context of higher education in America requires examining the many agents involved in the daily operation of the institution. Former Harvard University president, Derek Bok (1985) put it this way:

But America is different. Its universities are unique in their efforts to please many constituencies – prospective students, donors, legislators, and the general public. The growth of intercollegiate sports aptly illustrates the strengths and weaknesses of constituency-oriented system of higher education. With enthusiastic support from students, alumni, and even government officials, our colleges have developed athletic programs that have brought great satisfaction to thousands of athletes and millions of spectators. Few aspects of college life have done so much to win the favor of the public, build the loyalties of alumni, and engender lasting memories in the minds of student-athletes. (Bok, 1985)

Athletic programs continue to serve as a symbol of success for the institution and the overall health and success of athletics is also a sign of effective leadership for institutional presidents (Andre & James, 1991; Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997). This evolution led to replacing students with administrators and coaches in



the management and direction of athletic teams. The institution now takes full responsibility for every facet of the games and their pending success (Andre & James, 1991; Chu, 1989; Gerdy, 1997).

As pointed out by Littleton and Bailey (1991) the inseparability of athletics and the institution is readily observed in the building of elaborate multi-million dollar campus stadiums. Although the role of athletics may shift for some institutions, such permanent structures make it clear that parts will remain central to the operation of many institutions of higher education.

### Organizational Culture

“The way we do things around here” lies at the heart of describing organizational culture (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). Culture is an important aspect of our lives, but the idea and concept of culture is one that remains very difficult to pin down (Morgan, 1997; Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989; Tierney, 1988). Masland (1985) describes organizational culture as a powerful force that serves to control the behavior of those within it (the organization). An organization’s culture influences what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it (Tierney, 1988). Shared values, shared beliefs, shared meaning, and shared understanding are all ways to describe culture (Geertz, 1973; Morgan, 1997).

From a historical perspective, there was a resurgence of research in the area of **organizational** culture in the 1980s (Masland, 1985; Tierney, 1988). Goffee and Jones (2001) point out three reasons for the surge of interest in corporate culture. First, there **was an** increased interest in addressing the challenges brought about by corporate **globalization**. Second, “strong” cultures, which displayed clearly expressed and widely

practiced values, seemed to be high achievers. Third, organizational cultures viewed as distinctive were thought to have a long-term competitive advantage because competitors could not easily replicate them.

Although the origins of the study of organizational culture did not begin with higher education, the concept of organizational culture is not new to colleges and universities (Masland, 1985). Higher education has been defined by four cultural spheres: 1) cultures based upon disciplines, 2) the profession of academics has its own culture, 3) institutional cultures, and 4) a national culture of higher education (Clark, 1980). In addition, Clark (1980) adds that an institution's cultural strength is dependent upon size, tightness (interdependence), age, and founding history. Stronger cultures display greater coherence among beliefs, language, ritual, and myth, while weaker cultures lack such coherence.

Essential elements in organizational culture are the beliefs, values, and norms (Hultman & Gellerman, 2002). In their work Hultman and Gellerman (2002) describe beliefs as subjective assumptions, conclusions, and predictions. Values are looked upon as standards of importance, and norms are standards of behavior based on beliefs and values (p. 70).

### *Cultural Assessment*

Tierney (1988) established a framework for evaluating the culture of the **organization**. This framework included: the environment, mission, socialization, **information**, strategy, and leadership of the setting.

*Environment.* The environment encompasses the present state and condition of **the institution**. It includes the present student population, financial situation, as well as

the school's present relationship and positioning with the campus, local, and national communities. It sets the tone and establishes a base of leadership that defines the organization's surroundings and the existing attitudes of various constituencies (Tierney, 1988).

*Mission.* The disclosed intent (mission) of the institution outlines an underlying principle, as well as the criteria, for the development of high quality curricular program (Tierney, 1988). Related to mission are all employees as well as the student population. One measure to evaluate members of the organization is by comparing individual and/or departmental goals and achieved outcomes to the ability to meet the mission of the institution.

*Socialization.* This concept refers to the fit between individuals and the organization, both in skill and ability. Faculty, staff, and students should also feel comfortable with the present social values and norms displayed within the institution.

*Information.* This aspect refers to understanding the content of information and how it is passed throughout the organization (i.e., mailings, memos, face-to-face gatherings).

*Strategy.* This element refers to how decisions are made, the hierarchical processes and formal structures that exist, and how plans are implemented.

*Leadership.* This concept refers to the expectations that employees hold of leadership, the identification of leadership, and the formal or informal nature of the identified leaders of the organization (Tierney, 1988).

Tierney (1988) also noted the strategic use of symbols. He decidedly did not mention the role of subcultures or roles of cultural artifacts such as buildings or statues.

He

var

all

Pr

cu

ex

cc

th

to

at

Sp

cc

tr

Pr

cu

Co

la

27

Pe

Bo

27

However, after tying each of these concepts together, Tierney (1988) stated that cultures vary by institution, and a cultural perspective of higher education was not a panacea for all institutional woes.

Tierney's framework bears some similarities to the sociological perspective provided by Goffee and Jones (2001). They present four main areas by which to perform cultural observations of both public and private organizations. First, physical space is examined for how is space allocated, decorated, shared, or defended. Second, communication patterns are examined for how information is passed from one person to the next (e.g., email, memo, face-to-face, etc.), inclusiveness/exclusivity, and availability to certain persons. Third, the management of time is examined for how long people stay at work, how is time utilized while at work (work/socializing), and the length of time spent in jobs. Fourth, individual expression of personal identities is examined for common dress codes, manners of speech, rituals, what people identify with (for example - traditions, mission, vision), and the strength of this identification. Each of these areas provides an abundance of information and symbolic meaning regarding the existing culture of an organization.

### *Organizational Subcultures*

The existence of subcultures is common within any organization, particularly with larger organizations (Morgan, 1997; Tierney, 1988; Zellmer-Bruhn, Gibson & Aldag, 2001). Subcultures arise as a result of more frequent member interaction with one set of people than with other people (Zellmer-Bruhn et al., 2001). As Morgan (1997, p. 129) notes, "Organizations are mini-societies that have their own distinctive patterns of culture and subculture". The display of a public face and a private face by an organization is an

aspect of culture – a fragmented culture (Morgan, 1997). Members of the organization say one thing privately and do another thing publicly. This phenomenon can be observed when the mission statement of an institution is in stark contrast to what is actually being acted out by its members.

Cultural influences are viewed as occurring at multiple levels, within the institution and across the system of higher education both locally and statewide (Tierney, 1988). Higher education has various units, departments, colleges, and the like. The existence of multiple cultures does not mean that the dominant culture has been or will be rejected (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1989). With this in mind, one goal of administration is to keep cultural conflict to a minimum, while fostering the development of shared goals (Tierney, 1988).

Research has shown that the goals and/or mission of different subcultures sometimes come into direct opposition with other subcultures (Gregory, 1983). The subculture of athletics has been noted to have a dynamic of intense loyalty (Adler & Adler, 1998). The intense loyalty generally is from the athlete to the team and his/her coach (and institution), and involves five conceptual elements: domination, identification, commitment, integration, and goal alignment (Adler & Adler, 1998). The authors note that loyalty of this degree is typically found in combat units and religious cults.

#### *Strengths of Cultural Metaphor*

The culture metaphor has several strengths. For example, the use of symbolism is applied to each facet of the organization (Morgan, 1997). Most artifacts within the organization hold social meaning, thereby facilitating better understanding of the daily

fur

po

fo

or

tal

are

re

su

Su

di

an

op

in

an

in

W

F

ma

ma

functioning of the organization. Another strength of this metaphor is that it attempts to point out the shared systems of meaning within the organization (Morgan, 1997).

Zwell (2000) outlines specific characteristics leading to a successful culture: 1) fostering employee development and encourages employees to maximally impact the organization, 2) providing an avenue for highly competent employees to exercise their talents and impact the organization, 3) creating a work environment in which employees are engaged, challenged, and motivated, and 4) maintaining systems compensation that reward employees for their performance and their contribution to the organization's success (p. 12).

### *Summary*

The analysis of culture provides higher education with another tool by which to diagnose distinct problems (Tierney, 1988). An examination of culture does not produce an output of "high" or "low"; it is interpretive and provides each individual with the opportunity to arrive at his/her own meaning (Geertz, 1973). More often than not institutions recognize the external factors that impact the organization such as economics and politics. However, the importance of cultural observation brings recognition to the internal forces that serve to shape the organization (Tierney, 1988).

If the success of the organization in part relies upon the culture, then the degree to which members agree and care about the values and norms is essential to this success (Flynn & Chatman, 2001). One compelling task for academic leaders is the effective management of organizational (academic) culture, which involves the management of meaning and the management of social integration (Tierney, 1988).



## Moral Development and Higher Education

### *Moral Cognitive Development Theory*

At the start of twentieth century there was little interest in the topic of moral development (Rich & DeVitis, 1994). Some believed that moral development could not be studied objectively. Others point to a lack of concern, as well as a lack of consensus, related to the identification of society's current primary moral concerns. Yet in intercollegiate athletics a better understanding of moral development contributes to a harmonizing of individual needs and societal pressures (Lumpkin et al., 1999; Rich & DeVitis, 1994). At present little is known about the moral development of intercollegiate student-athletes.

The study of moral development has been approached from competing frames of reference (Chickering, 1969; Kohlberg, 1984; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Piaget, 1932; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Thomas, 1997). The general theory of moral development focuses on the study of how and why moral beliefs and actions change over the course of one's life (Thomas, 1997). However, the general intent of moral development theory is to address the issue of how and through what process individuals develop a moral perspective (Thomas, 1997). This complexity continues to make this a difficult topic to research (Stoll & Beller, 1998).

Cognitive moral development derives from a constructivist theory (Lumpkin et al., 1999; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995) and it serves as the focus of the current research. Moral development is often assessed across different points in the lifespan (i.e., childhood, adolescence and adulthood). Other theories attempt to account for the entire lifespan (Kohlberg, 1972, 1984; Rich & DeVitis, 1994). The following review is not

ch

b

d

co

al

P

ar

er

a

ch

en

am

on

rem

mor

Pig

reval

exhaustive. Instead it focuses on significant perspectives held in the study of cognitive moral development. Although I place the primary focus on moral development in the collegiate environment and of young adults, I also review well-established theories on child and adolescent development relevant to the study of moral development that occurs by college.

*Constructivist Approach.* In a constructivist approach the process of moral development incorporates the concepts of fairness, care, and justice. Using a constructivist approach, the truth is constantly sought from interactions with the physical and social environment (Knowles & McLean, 1986; Kohlberg, 1984; Lickona, 1976; Piaget, 1962; Windmiller, Lambert & Turiel, 1980).

The work of Piaget and Kohlberg are particularly relevant. Although the analysis and tools of assessment may differ, Stoll and Beller (1998) report overall that those emphasizing cognitive processes believe that: 1) morality can be learned, 2) learning has a definitive process, and 3) if learned, morality can be taught, and 4) if taught, morality or the process of thinking can be measured. At the heart of the learning process are the environment, modeling, and a specific, formal education process (Stoll & Beller, 1998).

*Jean Piaget – Cognitive Moral Judgment.* The work of Piaget is considered among the more innovative because he was the first to study moral development from a cognitive approach (Lickona, 1976; Piaget, 1932). The work of Piaget (1932, 1962) remains directly relevant and among the more currently utilized theories of cognitive moral development. His model was based on the cognitive development of children (Piaget, 1932, 1962). Piaget believed that a child's first encounter with learning is a direct result of his/her physical experience with the environment. In other words, it is this

in

19

el

m

op

th

W

n

w

th

o

o

f

(t

f

el

h

K

19

initial experience that serves as the foundation for all other cognitive abilities (Piaget, 1932,1962).

Piaget (1932) divided the thought process into two separate yet interdependent elements – the figurative and the operative. Figurative elements are those things that are mental, imaginative, and promote mental imagery. At the other end of the spectrum is the operative stance. The operative perspective concerns as the rules that govern figurative thought and the way that figurative aspects of thought are utilized (Rich & DeVitis, 1994; Windmiller et al., 1980)

In Piaget's (1932) early work on the moral lives of children, the application of rules during game playing was used to study children's beliefs about right and wrong. It was Piaget's (1932) firm belief that all development emerges from action, and that from this action we build (and rebuild) our knowledge of the world surrounding us. From his observations of children playing, Piaget arrived at the understanding that morality also occurred as a result of development (Lickona, 1976; Piaget, 1932,1965; Rich & DeVitis, 1994; Thomas, 1997).

Piaget's contribution to the study of moral development is widely recognized (Rich & DeVitis, 1994; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). His works inspired many following him. Highlights of Piaget's work were his skills of observation in working with children.

*Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development.* The work of Lawrence Kohlberg is heavily based upon the work of psychologist Jean Piaget and philosopher John Dewey. Kohlberg's theory claims to be both psychological and philosophical in nature (Kohlberg, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1984). Kohlberg was concerned with principles (such as justice) rather

than the relative values (i.e., cooperation and equity) focused on by Piaget (Piaget, 1932; Rich & DeVitis, 1994).

Kohlberg's theory of moral development targeted the motivating factors behind acts, whether they were moral or immoral (Kohlberg, 1972, 1978). It was thought that each individual's interaction with their environment helped to forge a set of core values. Kohlberg did not support the idea that as long as persons believed an act to be right then that particular act was morally justifiable (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995).

Through his work, Kohlberg outlined a system of classification based on three levels and six stages of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969, 1971, 1972, 1984). The three levels of moral reasoning are the pre-conventional, conventional, and post-conventional. A change represents a shift in the social-moral viewpoint of the individual. (See Table 1 below)

Table 1

Kohlberg's Levels and Stages of Moral Development

I.	<b><i>Pre-conventional Level</i></b>
	Stage 1: Orientation to punishment, obedience, and physical and material power. Rules are obeyed to avoid punishment.
	Stage 2: Naïve instrumental hedonistic orientation. The child conforms to obtain rewards.
II.	<b><i>Conventional Level</i></b>
	Stage 3: "Good boy" orientation designed to win approval and maintain expectations of one's immediate group. The child conforms to avoid disapproval. One earns approval by being "nice."
	Stage 4: Orientation to authority, law, and duty, to maintain a fixed order, whether social or religious. Right behavior consists of doing one's duty and abiding by the social order.
III.	<b><i>Post-conventional, Autonomous, or Principled Level</i></b>
	Stage 5: Social contract orientation, in which duties are defined in terms of contract and the respect of others' rights. Emphasis is on equality and mutual obligation within a democratic order. There is an awareness of relativism of personal values and the use of procedural rules in reaching consensus.
	Stage 6: The morality of individual principles of conscience that have logical comprehensiveness and universality. Rightness of acts is determined by conscience in accord with ethical principles that appeal to comprehensiveness, universality, and consistency. These principles are not concrete (like the Ten Commandments) but general and abstract (like the Golden Rule, the categorical imperative). (Rich & DeVitis, 1994, p. 86)

The first level of moral development is associated with the age level of elementary students. While in this first stage, children are believed to behave according to the direction of some authority figure (Kohlberg, 1972, 1984). Adherence to social norms is established by the fear or threat of some form of punishment (Kohlberg, 1972, 1984). In the second, stage the child seeks to maximize his/her own best interests.

The conventional level is associated with the adult population. Those in the third stage, demonstrate a greater appreciation for the “greater good” of those immediately close to the individual such as family and friends (Hoffman, 1970; Kohlberg, 1972, 1984). It is a stage where the approval of others in one’s inner circle is important. The fourth stage claims that obedience to the law is important as individuals take on a heightened sense of duty. It is understood that the shared need for norms and conventions is necessary for the general society to maintain and adhere to laws as well as to social duties.

The final level of Kohlberg’s theory, post-conventional level, is one that Kohlberg did not believe most adults would not reach in their lifetimes (Rich & DeVitis, 1994). At this level individuals base decisions upon principles (e.g., Golden Rule). Empirical research supports distinct stages between 1 through 5, but not 6 (Rich & DeVitis, 1994; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Chickering & Reisser, 1993).

Kohlberg’s theory is credited by Rich and DeVitis (1994) as stimulating greater research and criticism, and for opening new ways of thinking about moral development. Kohlberg’s theory has proven to cross cultural boundaries and is supported by numerous studies spanning numerous cultural groups (Thomas, 1997).

Critics such as Gilligan (1977) point out that Kohlberg’s research may reflect bias against females because it is driven primarily by the interest in and perceptions of men. There were a disproportionate number of male subjects involved in the work of Kohlberg.

Kohlberg’s methodology of utilizing short hypothetical stories to create moral dilemmas for discussion, which he would then probe, is classical and well known (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Each stage formulated by Kohlberg can only be reached



in its specific sequence. Kohlberg posited that people are not necessarily honest and dishonest. Rather people commit honest and dishonest acts (Rich & DeVitis, 1994).

### *Moral Development – In the Context of Athletics*

*Does Athletics Build Character?* The debate regarding the character building power of athletics has been ongoing (Sage, 1998; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). So often athletics is looked upon as a model of the culture, and is purported to reflect the values of the people as a society (Boxhill, 2003; Sage, 1998; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). In American society, in athletics we see the best and the worst of society. Some will do anything to win, while others will make a point to follow the rules to the letter.

Part of the debate is tied to the fact that “character” is a very rich term and difficult to define consistently across individuals (Boxhill, 2003; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Sage, 1998; Schwartz, 2000; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). In the research concerning the relationship of athletics to character, there is no universal terminology (see pages 13-14 for definitions of terms used in this study) and no consistent findings about the process through which character is developed by athletics (Boxhill, 2003; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985).

Sage (1998) identifies several difficulties in developing well-conceived empirical research. First, the word “character” as a socially constructed term is vague – leaving it open to varied definition. In addition, “good” character traits can differ greatly by culture. Even when clearly defined it is difficult to verify the character building effects of sports. In contrast, Stoll and Beller (1998) posit that from a cognitive moral development viewpoint universal values exist. These moral values can be learned and can be measured.

From a historical perspective, the concept that sport builds character is directly related to 19<sup>th</sup> century English tradition (Miracle & Rees, 1994). Student sports teams found within secondary boarding schools for boys were viewed as portals for the promotion of a host of virtues (Mangan, 1981). As a result, British school administrators attached and promoted the added benefit of “character” to the physical exercise that the students received (Mangan, 1981; Miracle & Rees, 1994; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). The future success of boarding school alumna was attributed to student participation in school athletic events (Mangan, 1981; Miracle & Rees, 1994; Sage, 1998; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985).

In the late 1800’s, the British maxim of *sports building character* soon became an American belief (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Sage, 1998). Today “sport, it is argued, provides a social environment for acquiring culturally valued personal and social attitudes, values, and behaviors; moreover, it is implied that what is learned in the sport setting transfers to other spheres of life.” (Sage, 1998, p. 16)

Empirically, Stevenson’s (1975, 1985) review of research concerning the socialization effects of participation in sport found no valid evidence that participation in sport causes socialization effects. In his 1975 review, Stevenson referenced three types of socialization effects: psychological, behavioral, and attitudinal. The psychological effects examined by Stevenson (1975, 1985) focused on personality characteristics of athletes and non-athletes, as measured by personality inventories. The behavioral effects looked at the relationship between participation in sport and behavioral features as revealed by grade point average, intelligence tests, and delinquency. Lastly, Stevenson found no evidence to suggest that sport participation causes any verifiable socialization

effects. The work on delinquency has shown a positive relationship with athletic participation but there was no establishment with regard to its causality (Stevenson, 1975, 1985). Shields & Bredemeier (1995) and Sage (1998) uncovered findings similar to Stevenson.

In 1994, Miracle and Reese discussed the mythical status of school sport as a builder of character, the alleged multiple benefits of athletic participation for students, and the widely anticipated outcomes of society relating to sports. The purported benefits center on the socialization effects on the athlete. As a result, students are expected to learn positive social values that will transfer into other areas of their lives (also see Gerdy, 1997). In a nutshell, interscholastic athletics are seen as a means for maintaining and preserving the values of American society. Even so, Miracle and Reese (1994) arrive at the conclusion that there is no evidence that sport builds character.

Some research suggests athletic participation has a negative impact upon character and moral development (Beller & Stoll, 1994; Decker & Lasley, 1995). For instance, in a comparative analysis of the moral cognitive reasoning of two groups of high school athletes and non-athletes, the athletes scored lower on moral development than their non-athlete peers. Also, athletes showed a steady decline from 9<sup>th</sup> grade through 12<sup>th</sup> grade on moral reasoning scores, while non-athletes tended to see their scores increase over their high school career (Beller & Stoll, 1994; Decker & Lasley, 1995). The researchers did not determine the reasons for these outcomes, recommending further study.

Additional research displaying the potentially negative outcomes attained by student athletic participation can be found in the work of Stoll, Beller, Cole,

and Burwell (1995). This research compared the moral reasoning scores of Division I and Division III student-athletes of NCAA schools. At both levels student-athletes consistently scored significantly lower than nonathletes on the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory for moral reasoning. The author's findings concluded that at that time the manner in which competitive athletics was practiced, modeled, and taught adversely affected moral reasoning of participants (Stoll, Beller, Cole, & Burwell, 1995).

Those involved hope athletics instills a set of values transferable to the world outside of sport (Miracle & Rees, 1994). Yet, "sport has done little to transform dominant social values to enhance personal development and promote social justice for a majority of participants" (Shields & Bredemeier, 1985, p 1).

The magnitude of school sport has reached a ritualistic status and significance in our culture. As noted by Miracle and Rees (1994) school sport is ritualistic in that groups of people set seasonal markers by the playing of certain sports (p.18-20). This finding is indicative of an American addiction to sports (Gerdy, 2002).

It is important to consider the unique experiences of each engaged student/participant rather than group experiences. Shields and Bredemeier (1985) point out that each sport presents different dynamics (individual/team, coaching style, contact/noncontact) and that specific contexts should never be overlooked in the discussion of the moral psychology that is developed through sport. The question is better stated: how could the contribution of athletic participation be enhanced?

## *Moral Education*

When considering the American system of education there are opposing views regarding the expectations of our schools to educate beyond the formal learning in the classroom (Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000; Pascarella, 1997; Rich & Devitis, 1994). Gallup polls have found that over sixty percent of respondents held the belief that moral development is a primary responsibility for public schools (Rich & Devitis, 1994). This same expectation appears to be held for America's higher education institutions as well. Pascarella (1997) agrees that higher education settings have established themselves as places that develop individuals who can think and act morally. However, scandal and unethical behavior have rocked our country, with government officials setting aside moral values, big business knowingly cheating employees and investors out of millions, and sports participants using banned substances to enhance their performance. These scandals have fueled the dismay and distrust of the nation. Many involved in these moral breakdowns have typically been college educated.

As a result, some believe that higher education institutions are no longer a viable setting for teaching morals (Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000). Some people view higher education as disconnected from social ills and concerns. However, school administrators are supposedly attempting to reverse this negative perception (Hollander & Saltmarsh, 2000).

Conversely, with all of this in mind extensive research reports that higher education institutions significantly influence the growth of moral reasoning among college students (Pascarella, 1997). These institutions have a history of influence and impact. Historically, Morrill (1980) points to Greek philosophy, the wisdom of European

thinkers, the British schools and colleges, American moral activism, and the religious traditions of the Jewish and Christian faith as all influencing the moral aim of higher education. As Boxhill (2003) states,

“it does not follow that educational institutions can or should be totally value free. The proper kind of neutrality for educational institutions is not total value freedoms but non-partisanship on controversial issues, which have no direct tie to the educational mission of the institution itself. However, schools, including colleges and universities, must insist on civility in the classroom so that learning can take place, respect for evidence and rational canons of inquiry and investigation, and willingness to consider rather than suppress the points made by others.” (p. 23)

In higher education, however, there are several misconceptions about character. Schwartz (2000) points out that some educators in higher education resist pursuing the teaching of character (morals) because they believe that by the time students reach college the individual’s character has already been formed. From this perspective, it is not the place of faculty to foster “character” which has covert religious or conservative meaning.

At the heart of every collegiate institution are its vision and mission statements. These statements have evolved considerably over time with respect to moral education (Dalton, 1985). The institutional responsibility to the student has shifted and become intertwined with goals of meeting the needs of the community, and with ultimately preparing students for useful careers.

Early teachings of morality often took place with the direct teaching and study of the Bible. In the nineteenth century the focus was on moral philosophy and a student’s establishment of moral truth within the context of general learning and knowledge (Morrill, 1980). In the present, it remains equally important to identify a variety of means

to enhance multiple facets of student personal development, particularly moral and character development (King, 1997; Kuh, 1998; Pascarella, 1997). Traditional liberal arts schools have had greater success in improving moral reasoning. Currently, administrators anticipate that throughout the student's development within the college setting – each student will come to “find their way” through the college experience.

### *Summary*

People arrive at their decided moral position (values, beliefs, norms) in many ways. Simply from a cognitive perspective individual moral development is most likely to occur with the presence of three important factors: moral environment, moral modeling, and moral education (Stoll & Beller, 1998).

It is important to understand the cognitive moral development approach, particularly as a component of and means to enhancing character. In addition, individual differences and experiences are unique. For example, some may be greatly influenced by their interaction with a certain individual (e.g., coach) thereby setting the stage for moral modeling to occur. Nevertheless, all who are actively engaged with students, particularly coaches, must understand the impact and effect their behavior has upon students (Barefield, McCallister, Bungum & Page, 1997).

### Student-Athlete Support Services

The work of past researchers indicates that some have questioned whether enough is being done to meet the needs of today's student-athlete (Boggan, 1999; Dempsey, 2002). The guidelines outlined in the NCAA yearly manual regarding student-athlete welfare (Article 2.2) make it clear that: “Intercollegiate athletics programs shall be

conducted in a manner designated to protect and enhance the physical and educational welfare of student athletes” (2003 NCAA Manual, p.3).

One indication of student welfare is graduation rate. Over a 12-year period, 10 of the 16 top men’s basketball programs (based upon NCAA Sweet 16 appearances) failed to meet the national graduation rate of 42 % (Wieberg, 2002). The elite football programs did not fare too much better. In 50 of the 63 schools that make up the Bowl Championship Series (BCS), the nations 6 top-tier conferences, the graduation rate for football athletes was lower than that of the male student body at those same institutions (Weiberg, 2001). More recently, graduation rates for 2002-2003 Bowl-bound college football teams were worthy of note and concern. There were 25 (45%) of 55 teams with student-athlete graduation rates that were 10 to 20 percent lower than the school’s overall student-athlete graduation rate (Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport, 2003).

Other concerns about student-athlete welfare, both in the past and in the present, relate to the amount of time students are expected to invest in athletic competition and preparation – both formally and informally (Dempsey, 2002; Ferrante et al., 1996). Depending upon the level of competition and the sport in which a student participates, a student may spend in excess of 30 hours per week on sport-related activities. Student-athletes have voiced their concern regarding this issue, and former NCAA President Dempsey (2002) reports about this topic:

“They talk about the intrusion of athletics on their time, especially personal time. They talk about their inability to integrate into the rest of the student body because of time demands and the isolation imposed upon them by coaches. They discuss the socialization and “culturalization” failure they feel because their world is rarely allowed to expand beyond the width of the field or court.” (p. 9)



Although academics stands as the focal point of the student-athlete experience, it is not the only aspect of concern. Boggan (1999, p.42) claims, “the key issue for all of us engaged in college sports is making sure that we concentrate on supporting the student-athlete’s educational development as a contributing member of the society of the institution and our society in general.” Boggan (1999) also points out the very low percentage of student-athletes that go on to play professionally. In men’s basketball 2% of student-athletes will play professionally. In football 3% will play professionally.

#### *Development Issues and Concerns*

The developmental issues and concerns of intercollegiate student-athletes tend to mirror that of the general student population (Chickering, 1969, 1976; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Parham, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). These challenges include identity development, interpersonal and personal relationships, career development, separation from family, and establishing a set of consistent values, behaviors, and beliefs.

In addition to the general student development concerns, student-athletes must meet a unique set of challenges (Ferrante & Etzel, 1991; Nishimoto, 1997; Parham, 1993; Valentine & Taub, 1999). Parham (1993) lists these challenges as learning to balance academics and athletics, adjusting to a degree of isolation, managing success or failure, managing satisfying multiple relationships, being more cognizant of their physical health, and termination of an athletic career. This is quite an intimidating list for a young college student, which leads some to speculate whether or not a “student-athlete” is real or illusionary. These challenges faced by student-athletes often lead to the psychological and developmental concerns later in the career and/or life (Hinkle, 1994; Parham, 1993).

Stress and coping is a consistent theme at the heart of these unique challenges faced by student-athletes.

Support service programs for this population generally are in place, and interventions have been developed to meet many of the student's needs (Carodine, Almond & Gratto, 2001; Ferrante et al. 1996). However, some issues must still be addressed. For example, support programs tend not to focus on the development of character. Yet the establishment of values and beliefs is identified as a concern among the general student population (Chickering, 1969, 1976; Chickering & Reisser, 1993; Parham, 1993; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

### *Life Skills*

In an attempt to provide balance to the collegiate student-athlete experience and to address the growing needs of this population of students, the NCAA developed a comprehensive life skills program. In 1994 the NCAA rolled out what is now known as the Challenging Athletes Minds for Personal Success (CHAMPS) Life Skills Program (Ward, 1999).

This holistic approach to the development of the student-athlete addresses five broad areas, with specified purpose:

**Academic Commitment** - to support the academic progress of the student-athlete toward intellectual development and graduation.

**Athletic Commitment** - to build philosophical foundations for the development of athletics programs that are broad-based, equitable, and dedicated to the well-being of the student-athlete.

**Personal Commitment** - to support the development of a well-balanced lifestyle for student-athletes, encouraging emotional well-being, personal growth, and decision-making skills.

Career Development Commitment - to encourage the student-athlete to develop and pursue career and life goals.

Service Commitment - to engage the student-athlete in service to his/her campus and surrounding community.

Programs such as this one have been designed to increase opportunities for student development, and potentially offer character development through exposure to certain settings and events (NCAA, 2005).

Many initiatives provided through the Life Skills Programs do not require or mandate student-athlete participation in a specified number of planned events. Some student-athletes do not and will not participate voluntarily (Ferrante et al., 1996). Without strong support from coaches the program will not reach its potential (Carr & Bauman, 1999). As a result these opportunities for growth and development are not fully utilized. Although the Life Skills Program has great intentions, its effectiveness is not known, and it does not appear to reach a significant number of student-athletes.

### *Summary*

Some researchers and professionals have focused on the needs of student-athletes (Danish, Petipas & Hale, 1995; Ferrante et al., 1996; Hinkle, 1994; Kirk & Kirk, 1993). Efforts are being made to meet the needs of students either through present programming or with practical models (Denson, 1996; Ward-Roof & Hatch, 2003; Watson, 2003). There was no significant discussion about the character (moral) development of the student-athletes in the literature on student welfare.

## *Chapter Summary*

The literature base is void of the perceptions of institutional presidents, athletic directors and coaches about the role of institutional culture in the athletic program. In addition, the literature does not tie these areas to the moral cognitive development idea that character (morality) can be taught with the presence of important elements (i.e., moral environment, education and models).

The assumption that character development occurs thru athletic participation has not been proven with any level consistency (Arnold, 1994; Sage, 1998; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). Literature on the role of the president, athletic director, and the coach typically does not claim that a function of their position is to be builders of character (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu, 1989, Gerdy, 1997). Should it be their obligation?

Research has identified the unique needs of student-athletes (Parham, 1993) and efforts to meet these needs of student-athletes (Danish, Petipas & Hale, 1995; Ferrante et al, 1996; Hinkle, 1994; Kirk & Kirk, 1993). Studies have identified the ability of athletics to negatively impact moral development (Beller & Stoll, 1994; Decker & Lasley, 1995), and some research has looked at the role of coaches as being the center-piece of having athletics play a more effective role in the character development of athletes (Yeager, Buxton, Baltzell & Bzdell, 2001).

The opportunity for intercollegiate athletic programs to have a lasting effect on the “total growth” of student-athletes remains at issue. Athletic programs have continuously upheld the belief that athletics does indeed build character. The theoretical model of cognitive moral development tells us that certain key factors need to be in place to create the greatest likelihood of developing character (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985;

Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1998). These factors include a moral education, moral role models, and a moral environment (Stoll & Beller, 1998; Lumpkin et al., 1999). A review of the literature revealed several studies that assessed the ability of athletic participation to impact character. In general, no consistent empirical findings have indicated that athletics impacts character.

Previous studies have taken an outcome perspective, attempting to assess the degree to which a change in character development has occurred (Stevenson, 1979, 1985). This approach has left a need to examine the process and variables that may contribute to the anticipated outcome, including factors beyond the formal structure of the organization. By studying organizational culture across various institutions, underlying reasons for particular student development outcomes may be discovered.

The present void in the literature is created by a failure to engage those at the helm of athletic programs (i.e., coaches, athletic directors and presidents) in a reasonable dialogue regarding the methods and means (individually and/or collectively) by which their respective programs attempt to (or not) enhance the character of student-athletes.

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore and assess the perceptions held by coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators regarding their roles and responsibilities related to student-athlete character development. In particular, the research examines each individual's perceptions concerning his/her impact upon the development of student-athlete character. This examination of perceptions shall occur while comparing two Division I and two Division III (2) institutions.

A review of the literature found no conclusive evidence that athletics does indeed build character. Most prior studies focused on the outcomes experienced by the participants (student-athletes). Few researchers investigated the perspective of coaches, athletic administrators, and institutional administrators regarding the impact of athletics on student-athlete character development. This study fills that gap.

A critical element of this study was to identify and explore the perceptions, values, beliefs, and actual behaviors that were put into practice by coaches to impact character development, and to also compare these views with those of athletic directors and presidents.

This chapter describes the conceptual framework. It then outlines the design of the study and research questions. It also describes the participants and their respective institutions, the interview items, the data collection procedures, the analysis of the data, and the limitations of the study.

### Conceptual Framework of the Study

The theory of cognitive moral development provides the researcher with a framework from which to perform the present research. This theory stipulates that key elements – moral education, moral role models, and a moral environment must be present in order for moral development to be taught (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1998, 1998). These critical elements provided a comparative standard of measurement by which to examine perceptions and behaviors that occur within the setting and structure of intercollegiate athletics. The presence or absence of any of these elements will assist in elucidating the level and degree of actual “potential” that may be present for enhancing moral reasoning of student-athletes.

The framework of organizational culture provided by Tierney (1988) was utilized to investigate the impact and role played by organizational culture in the character development of collegiate student-athletes. The concepts utilized by Tierney (1988) to perform an intense analysis of organizational culture are: environment, mission, socialization, information, strategy, and leadership. Tierney (1988) arrived at this particular framework following a year of investigating American higher education. His stated intent was to provide a working framework to diagnose culture in colleges and universities so that distinct problems can be overcome. The aspects of organizational culture of interest for this research were mission, environment, socialization and leadership.

One way culture is used in organizational theory, as identified by Christensen and Kreiner (1984), is as an analytical tool for the researcher to understand complex social

organizations. This organizational culture framework provides a window to observe and examine distinct core values that hold the organization together (Pedersen & Sorensen, 1987).

In following with the premise begun by Tierney's (1988) work, this conceptual framework provided a method to begin diagnosing culture in colleges and universities. As Schein (1981) pointed out, in order to observe organizational culture, a researcher must find the visible and explicit representations.

Just as there are external dynamics that influence higher education institutions such as the economic and political conditions, there are also very intense internal forces that serve to move an institution. Culture is one of these internal forces. Tierney (1988) points out that these internal forces [culture] have their roots embedded in the history of the institution, along with its values, processes, and goals. Sport in America has developed its own set of values as it influences culture in higher education.

Tierney (1988) articulates how organizational culture tends to be only addressed or recognized during moments of crisis, or following publicized debacles. At these moments of crisis members of the organization are in reactionary postures as opposed to proactive positions to maximize productive change within the organization. Crisis moments often are the result of administrators not having a solid grasp of the cultural conditions and influences that exists within the institution

A key aspect of Tierney's (1988) perspective that made this an ideal framework was that it proposed that as challenges continue to mount for higher education the need to understand organizational culture will only intensify. The defined elements of Tierney (1988) provide operative cultural concepts to be utilized as a framework for researching



culture. As a result, an increased understanding of organizational culture will more likely lead to improved management and enhanced performance. This present body of research provides enhanced understanding of organizational culture within several unique higher education institutions.

### Design of the Study

This study was designed to provide a synopsis of the perceptions held by head coaches, athletic directors and presidents regarding their perceived roles and responsibilities in impacting the character development of student-athletes. This study aimed to identify and explore the perceptions, values, and actual behaviors practiced by coaches, athletic directors, and presidents in their efforts to directly and/or indirectly impact student-athlete character development.

This research provides greater insight on the relationship between student-athletes and those within the institution immediately involved in their development. In addition, the study provides a comparative analysis of the present level of internal consistency found between coaches, athletic directors, and presidents concerning the desired values, and behaviors surrounding one of the basic tenets of higher education's mission.

### Research Questions

#### Research Question 1

1. Among coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators - does student participation in intercollegiate athletics build character?

Research Question One sought to gain insight regarding participant's belief in the premise that *athletics builds character*. Interview questions 8 and 11 were related to Research Question One.

### Research Questions 2 and 3

2. What do coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators perceive to be the essential elements/components needed in order to develop character in student-athletes? [Informally or Formally; Advertently or Inadvertently]
3. By position - what, if any, differences are found in the perceptions and beliefs of presidents/senior administrators, athletic directors, and head coaches regarding how character is best developed in student-athletes?

Research Question Two sought to gain insight regarding participant's knowledge, understanding, and beliefs regarding the elements they considered important to development of character in student-athletes. Interview question 10 was related to Research Question Two.

Research Question Three sought to identify differences between participant positions regarding what each respective group perceived and/or believed to be the essential elements needed to develop character. Interview question 10 was related to Research Question Three.

### Research Questions 4 and 5

4. Are there differences, by position, between presidents/senior administrators, athletic directors, and head coaches regarding their perceptions, values, and beliefs in relation to the impact athletics has upon a student-athlete's character development?
5. Are there differences between Division levels regarding the impact of athletics upon student-athlete character development?

Research Questions Four and Five sought to identify differences between participants by both position at the institution and by division level regarding what each respective group perceived to be the impact athletics had upon student-athlete character development. Interview questions 8-11 were related to Research Questions Four and Five.

#### Participants

The participants of this study consisted of coaches, athletic directors, and presidents (including vice presidents to whom athletics [the athletic director] must report). This population was drawn from four colleges and universities within the state of Michigan. Each institution's athletic program holds member status as an affiliate with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Two of the four institutions were Division I programs, and two additional programs held a Division III classification. Among the four institutions selected none are church affiliated. At the time of this study there were approximately 24 colleges and universities with NCAA sanctioned athletic programs within the state of Michigan. (see below Table 2)

Table 2

Michigan Colleges and Universities (NCAA Members)

<b><u>Institution</u></b>	<b><u>Division Level</u></b>
Adrian College	III
Albion College	III
Alma College	III
Calvin College	III
Central Michigan University	I
Eastern Michigan University	I
Ferris State University	I & II
Finlandia University	III
Grand Valley State University	II
Hillsdale College	II
Hope College	III
Kalamazoo College	III
Lake Superior State University	I & II
Michigan State University	I
Michigan Technological University	I & II
Northern Michigan University	I & II
Northwood University	II
Oakland University	I
Olivet College	III
Saginaw Valley State University	II
University of Detroit-Mercy	I
University of Michigan	I
Wayne State University	I & II
Western Michigan University	I

(source: [www2.ncaa.org/sports](http://www2.ncaa.org/sports))

In order to be considered for selection for this study an institution was considered in part by its mission statement. Those institutions identified as having a stated mission or institutional goal to develop “the total person” and/or any aspect of personal development beyond academics was eligible for selection.

A description of the institutions involved in the study was reported in such a way as to protect confidentiality of the institutions and the participants. Both of the Division III institutions are private, liberal arts programs and have student populations ranging

from approximately 1,000 to 1,500. There are at least two revenue sports, and all sports at both institutions are of Division III status. Both of the Division I institutions are land grant, research programs that have student populations ranging from 25,000 to 45,000. There are at least two revenue sports represented, and all sports at both institutions are of Division I status.

The sample of coaches represented segments of what is traditionally considered revenue sports (football and men's basketball) and non-revenue sports. The non-revenue sports in this study were baseball, women's soccer, women's basketball, and softball. In addition, an equal sample of both men's and women's sports teams were selected from each respective institution. The same sports were interviewed at each institution. In total, 23 coaches, 4 athletic directors, 4 presidents, and 2 vice presidents were interviewed for this study. (see below Table 3)

As seen in Table 3, all key participants (coaches, athletic directors, and presidents) at each institution participated. Ninety-seven percent of those who were asked to participate actually participated.

Table 3

Participants and Participation Rate

Position	Division I	Division III	Total Participants	
			Requested	Actual
Coaches				
Football	2	2	4	4
M Basketball	1	2	4	3
Baseball	2	2	4	4
W Soccer	2	2	4	4
W Basketball	2	2	4	4
Softball	2	2	4	4
Athletic Directors				
	2	2	4	4
Administrators				
Presidents	2	2	4	4
Vice Presidents	1	1	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>33</b>

Instrument

Consistent with the conceptual framework, the interview items reflected relevant literature in the field of organizational culture within higher education (Tierney, 1988), and student-athlete character development (Lumpkin, Stoll & Beller, 1999; Stoll and Beller, 1998). The interview guide was separated into five distinct content categories. These sections included: 1) character development, 2) leadership, 3) environment, 4) socialization, and 5) mission (Lumpkin, Stoll & Beller, 1999; Stoll & Beller, 1998; Tierney, 1988). The resulting 14 questions used for the interviews were developed to assess the perceptions, values, roles, and behaviors of the participants. The items were

related to the perceived effect athletics has upon student-athlete character development, and the role of coaches, athletic directors and presidents in that process.

### *Character Development*

This section focused on the values, perceptions, and experiences of participants about the concept of character development and the basic factors of learning (and teaching) morality. These questions drew from various researchers and their work related to the process of cognitive moral development (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1994, 1998).

The following questions made up this portion of the interview:

- How do you define character?
- Based upon your experience, does student participation in intercollegiate athletics build character? Explain. (If not, can it build character? Explain)
- What essential elements/components must be provided or must be present in order to develop character in student-athletes?  
(Elements = Moral Education/Moral Role Model/Moral Environment)
- Can you list all who you perceive as responsible for addressing the issue of character development among intercollegiate student-athletes?
- Do you make a specific attempt to address character development among student-athletes?
- Reflecting upon your background and experiences (both professionally and personally) what and/or who has influenced your views on student-athlete character development?

### *Leadership*

These questions focused on the expectations that participants held of leadership, the identification of leadership, and the formal or informal nature of the identified leader's role as it related to athletics and student-athlete character development (Tierney,

1988). Three questions were developed to analyze the aspect of leadership as related to developing student-athlete character and were based primarily upon Tierney's (1988) framework for evaluating culture. As Tierney points out (p. 16), actions [of the president] develop and reinforce an institutional culture. This would reasonably hold truth for all in positions of leadership. The following questions made up this portion of the interview:

- What role do presidents/A.D./coaches play in the building of character among student-athletes?
- Should character development be of concern for those heading intercollegiate athletics at the institutional level (Athletic Directors and Presidents)?

### *Environment*

This section centered on participant perception(s) regarding the campus community's attitude toward and relationship with the intercollegiate athletic program at the institution. This included the native student population, institutional financial situation, as well as the relationship and positioning of the athletic department with the campus, local, and national communities. As pointed out by Tierney (1988), environment sets the tone and establishes a base of leadership that defines the organization's surroundings and the existing attitudes of various constituencies. Three questions were developed to analyze the aspect of environment and were based primarily upon Tierney's (1988) framework for evaluating culture. The following questions made up this portion of the interview:

- a. What are the external factors that impact your role as a head coach at this institution?
- b. What are the external factors that impact the role of a head coach at this institution?
- How does the college/university setting impact student character development?
- What do you perceive to be the college's/university's attitude toward athletics?



### *Socialization*

One question focused on participant perceptions about his/her view of what it takes to achieve success as a student-athlete and beyond college. This question was based upon Tierney's (1988) framework for evaluating culture that looks at the "fit" of an individual in relation to the institution. The following question makes up this portion of the interview:

- What does one need to know in order to survive/excel in this organization as an athlete, as a student, and also following their undergraduate experience?

### *Mission*

Questions in this section explored participant's knowledge about the stated goals, objectives, and purpose of the respective institution. It was anticipated that the likelihood of achieving the mission becomes more probable if the individual has a reasonable grasp of the mission. As identified by Tierney (1988), a standard of measurement for evaluating organizational effectiveness is the mission. Three questions were developed to analyze this aspect of mission and were related to Tierney's (1988) framework for evaluating culture. The following questions make up this portion of the interview:

- What do you understand to be the mission of the College/University?
- What is the mission of the athletics department?

### Pilot Test

Following the completion of the initial design of the interview guide a series of pilot interviews was conducted with a small group of coaches at a junior college (in Michigan). The interview guide was revised as needed following this pilot study.

In particular, no major changes were implemented. However, there were several questions that were rewritten in order to achieve greater clarity for the interviewee. During the piloting process if a participating interviewee asked, “What do you mean?” (or similar), this would require that a question be rewritten. In addition, the order of the interview guide was also adjusted for what would be described as flow and continuity.

### Demographics

The 97% response rate was considered high, especially when considering the time of year. Just prior to the start of the academic year (August) is quite a busy time for most administrators, and certain coaches were in the midst of preparation for their respective fall sports. Tables 4-6 present both categorical and continuous demographic data on participants.

#### *Participant Characteristics*

*Head Coaches.* Table 4 (below) presents the characteristics of the entire sample of coaches. Overall, respondents from this segment of research participants were predominantly male for both Division I (7 of 11 - 64%) and for Division III (1 of 12 - 92%) institutions. The mean age of the coaches was 44 years for Division I [Revenue 46 years and Non-Revenue 43 years], and ranged from 30 to 53 years of age. The mean age was 41 years for Division III coaches [Revenue 48 years and Non-Revenue 38 years] and ranged from 31 to 61 years of age. The sample of coaches consisted of former collegiate athletes. Ninety-one percent of Division I coaches [Revenue 3 of 3 and Non-Revenue 7 of 8], and 100% (12 of 12) of Division III coaches had participated as collegiate athletes. Division I coaches in the study averaged 11.9 years of head coaching experience [Revenue 14 years and Non-Revenue 11.1 years], and ranged from 1 year up to 25 years.

Table 4

Head Coach Characteristics

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Division I Coaches</b>			<b>Division III Coaches</b>		
	Revenue Mean	Non-Revenue Mean	Total Div.I	Revenue Mean	Non-Revenue Mean	Total Div.III
N	3	8	11	4	8	12
Age (Yrs)	46	44		48	38	
Gender	3 of 3 M N/A F	4 of 8 M 4 of 8 F		4 of 4 M N/A F	7 of 8 M 1 of 8 F	
Yrs as a Collegiate Head Coach	14	11.1		7	8.8	
Collegiate Athlete	3 of 3	7 of 8		4 of 4	8 of 8	
Highest Degree						
B.A.	3 of 3	8 of 8		4 of 4	8 of 8	
M.A./MBA	1 of 3	7 of 8		3 of 4	4 of 8	
PhD or Terminal	none	none		none	none	
Yrs at Institution	3.6	9.2		7.75	9.3	
Yrs-Current Position	3.6	7.8		5.25	8	
Number of positions currently held at the institution	1	1.125		1.25	2.3	

Division III coaches averaged 8.25 years of head coaching experience [Revenue 7 years and Non-Revenue 8.8 years] and their ranges were from 2 to 17 years. The majority of the coaches - 72% of Division I coaches [1 of 3 Revenue and 7 of 8 Non-Revenue] and 58% of Division III coaches [3 of 4 Revenue and 4 of 8 Non-Revenue] have obtained a Master's degree. The difference in graduate degree attainment between Division I and Division III may be the result of public attention often received by Division I athletics,

and the role of higher education institutions to portray coaches as educators, as well as being formally educated. Greater numbers of Division I positions state that the Master's degree is preferred, while Division III institutions appear to request most often a graduate degree.

Some coaches held multiple positions in addition to the primary role of a head coach, including that of course instructors. In fact, there are instances of Division III head coaches also serving as assistant coaches of other teams. The mean number of jobs/positions held by Division III coaches was two [1.25 jobs for Revenue and 2.3 jobs for Non-Revenue]. The mean number of jobs for Division I respondents was one [1 job for Revenue and 1.12 jobs for Non-Revenue]. In addition, for Division I coaches the average length of time a coach had presently spent at their respective institution was 7.68 years [Revenue 3.6 years and Non-Revenue 9.2 years] and ranged from 4.5 to 25 years. The mean was found to be 8.8 years at their respective institution for Division III coaches [Revenue 7.75 years and Non-Revenue 9.3 years] and ranged from 5 years to 21 years. Division I coaches average was approximately 6.6 years as the current head coach [Revenue 3.6 years and Non-Revenue 7.8 years], and ranged from 1 year to 25 years. Division III coaches average 7 years [Revenue 5.25 years and Non-Revenue 8 years] and ranged from 2 to 17 years as the current head coach.

As anticipated, a male coach headed each of the traditional revenue sports. The revenue sports are all-male teams. However, both women and men coached the non-revenue female sport teams. Within the population of head coaches a high percentage of these individuals were former athletes.

Division I revenue coaches had spent the least amount of time at the institution.

The number of years at the institution equaled the total number of years as a head coach.

Nearly all other coaches (Division I and III) had spent some time at the institution prior to becoming the head coach, often as an assistant. The volatility that accompanies “big time” athletics brings the hiring and firing of coaches on a yearly basis at a major college institution.

The hiring of head coaches for revenue sports usually does not happen from within the program. A new head coach is generally hired to bring in a fresh start and a new beginning. Typically there is no working up through the ranks at one institution. On occasion an assistant coach may be hired on an interim basis through the end of a season, and depending upon the team’s performance he may be hired or released at the close of the season by the institution. In most situations revenue coaches are fired along with most of, if not all of, their entire staff.

Another point of interest was identified in the number of positions held in addition to head coaching by Division III coaches. Division III coaches on average held one additional position beyond coaching duties. These coaches would usually instruct courses at the institution, or hold another athletics related position. In comparison, Division I coaches would have one role to focus upon. Division III appears to retain the original model of higher education and collegiate athletics where the coaches maintain an active on the college campus. The multiple roles of Division III coaches may have reflected the limited financial resources experienced at this level where athletics remains a part of the institutional budget.

*Athletic Directors.* Table 5 presents the characteristics of the sample of presidents and senior administrators involved in the study. Depending upon the organizational structure of the institution general oversight of the athletic program may rest with the president or another senior-level administrator. During this study two institutions had their athletic program report to the president, and the two other athletic programs reported to a senior administrator. Both of the senior administrators held the title of vice president. The mean age of the president was 47 years and 50.3 years combined for all participating administrators for Division I, and 49.5 years and 45.6 years respectively for presidents and all participating Division III administrators.

There were key disparities that surfaced between division levels. With the present sample there was a gap between years of age, years at the institution and the number of years in the current position with Division I Athletic Directors accruing more years in each category. Division I Athletic Directors also spent time as collegiate head coaches at some prior point in their careers. This can be expected to provide some degree of insight regarding the experience and ability to relate to coaches. Again, Division III Athletic Directors held a greater number of roles/positions that include a wider range of duties than their Division I colleagues. This could possibly be attributed to institutional size and resources.

Table 5

Athletic Director Characteristics

Characteristic	Division I Athletic Directors Mean	Division III Athletic Directors Mean
N	2	2
Age	64.5	42.5
Yrs as a Collegiate Head Coach	26	0
Collegiate Athlete	2 of 2	2 of 2
Highest Degree		
B.A.	-	-
M.A./MBA	2 of 2	2 of 2
PhD or Terminal	-	-
Yrs at Institution	31	3.25
Yrs-Current Position	6.5	1.25
# of Positions currently held at the institution	1	1.5

*Presidents and Senior Administrators.* Table 6 presents the characteristics of the sample of athletic directors. The mean age of the sample of athletic directors was 64.5 years for Division I, and 42.5 for Division III athletic directors. Among this sample of athletic directors, all were former collegiate athletes. It was found that Division I athletic directors had a mean of 12.3 years of head coaching experience, while Division III athletic directors had not acquired any collegiate head coaching experience. One hundred percent of all athletic directors within the study have obtained a Master's degree. The

mean number of jobs/positions held by Division III athletic directors (1.5 jobs) was slightly greater than that of Division I athletic directors (1 job). Division I athletic directors averaged approximately 6.5 years in their current position, and Division III athletic directors average 1.25 years. The mean duration of years at the current institution of the present athletic directors was 31 years for Division I athletic directors, and 3.25 years for Division III athletic directors.

Table 6

President and Senior Administrator Characteristics

Characteristic	Division I			Division III		
	Presidents Mean	All Senior Admin Mean	Total Div. I	Presidents Mean	All Senior Admin Mean	Total Div
III						
N	2	3	3	2	1	3
Age	47	50.3		49.5	45.6	
Yrs as a Collegiate Head Coach	0	0		1.5	2	
Collegiate Athlete	0 of 2	0 of 3		1 of 2	2 of 3	
Highest Degree						
B.A.	-	-		-	-	
M.A./MBA	-	-		-	1 of 3	
PhD or Terminal	2 of 2	3 of 3		2 of 2	2 of 3	
Yrs at Institution	16	15		13.5	12	
Yrs-Current Position	2.5	3.5		3.5	3.25	
Number of positions currently held at the institution	1	1		1.5	2.5	



On average, Division III Presidents held prior experience as a collegiate head coach. This can be expected to provide some degree of insight and understanding regarding the experience and ability to relate to coaches. The number of positions held was greater for Division III participants than for Division I.

Overall the differences found between division levels may not be generalized as the norm if compared to the entire population. However, there are no female coaches of traditional revenue sports (men's basketball and football) within Division I institutions.

The population of Division I and Division III presidents and senior administrators differed in terms of their participation in collegiate athletics. None (0%) of the participating Division I administrators were former collegiate athletes or collegiate head coaches. It was reported that 50% of Division III presidents, and 66% of the participating administrators had been collegiate athletes and also a collegiate head coach. In fact, Division III senior-level administrators had acquired a mean of 2 years of head coaching experience.

Each of the presidents in the study had an earned doctoral degree (100% of Division I and Division III). The mean number of jobs/positions held by Division III administrators was 1.5 positions for presidents, and 2.5 positions when considering all of Division III administrators sampled in the study. The mean for all sampled Division I administrators was 1. Division I presidents average approximately 2.5 years in their current position, and Division III presidents average 3.5 years. The mean duration of years at the current institution of the present presidents was 16 years for Division I presidents, and 12 years for Division III presidents.

### Data Collection Procedure

Consent to conduct the study was obtained from the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects at Michigan State University. This study was approved on July 30, 2004.

All 33 interviews conducted during the study were structured face-to-face interviews. To conduct the interviews, at four separate institutions, the potential participants (coaches, athletic directors, and presidents and senior administrators) were solicited individually by electronic mail (e-mail). The e-mail addresses were gathered from listings posted by each institutional staff directory. A typed letter was mailed to all with a posted e-mail address. Each delivered e-mail and letter explained the purpose of the study (Appendices B-D) and requested a date to meet and conduct the interview. A follow-up phone call was made to any individual who did not respond within 7-10 days to the initial e-mail or mailed letter. Ninety-seven percent of those contacted within the four institutions agreed to participate.

Once meeting dates were established with each participant the interviews were conducted at the campus office of each participant. Open-ended interview questions were used to gain greater understanding of the perceptions, values, beliefs, and behaviors of each participant. With approval of each participant the interview sessions were tape-recorded so that the interviewer would be most attentive to the interviewee rather than taking verbatim notes. Each interview (see Appendix A) was completed within approximately 30 minutes. The data collection period covered approximately eight weeks.

Descriptive data about the participants was also gathered which detailed the duration of each participant's career and their tenure at the present institution (Appendices F-H). Information regarding each participant's level of academic attainment, athletic background, and area of study was also gathered.

Through the use of a coding system the anonymity of each participant was carefully protected. All of the data were then grouped so that no information could be associated with any specific individual or institution.

Data for this study were collected through the process and application of organizational case studies. Each institution was analyzed in this manner. The aim of a case study is to allow for a systematic gathering of information that provides the investigator with a view into the life of the organization (Berg, 2001). A case study is not regarded as an actual data-gathering technique, but it is accepted more as a methodological approach that incorporates different data-gathering measures (Hamel, Dufour, & Fortin, 1993).

The intent of these case studies was to identify a clearer understanding of the perceptions of those most intimately involved with intercollegiate athletic programs at the institutional level. These perceptions would reflect the utilization of athletic participation as a tool to impact character development, and would also provide insight regarding how these individuals operate as a cohesive and collective unit to achieve this aim. Case study data are expected to yield detailed, highly rich, and in-depth information (Berg, 2001).

While visiting the respective institution information, this researcher gathered campus artifacts and symbolism as they relate to the institution and athletics. A separate

note-taking system was utilized in the assessment of the cultural artifacts and symbolism found when visiting the campus.

### Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used for participant responses to the demographic and basic information questions (Tables 4-6). Tables for this preliminary data analysis reported cumulative frequency and relative frequency distributions of the responses.

In using a structured interview format, an open coding of the interview data was conducted for each response to each question (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). This open coding provided an opportunity to examine all of the responses for both similarities and differences, with regard to all participants.

The overall richness of the data called for a blending of manifest and latent content analysis as described by Berg (2001). The resulting search for common responses, themes, and/or patterns was conducted to assess organizational culture among the participating institutions. For each interview question an actual counting and tabulation of responses were tabulated within each position group (Revenue Coaches, Non- Revenue Coaches, Athletic Directors, and Presidents and Senior Administrators) to calculate a percentage for the frequency of a response.

Cultural data were analyzed by thematic analysis (Masland, 1985). Thematic analysis allows the researcher/analyst to identify trends and underlying themes within the organization. Through this basic technique a central “story line” can often be developed describing the organization’s culture (Masland, 1985).

Research Question 1 was examined using the results of the content analysis as reported by the participants. The objective of this question was to assess beliefs related to the outcome effects related to student participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Research Question 2 was examined using the results of the content analysis as reported by the participants. The objective of this question was to determine what participants perceived as being the key elements needed in order to develop character in student-athletes.

Research Question 3 was examined using the results of the content analysis as reported by the three groups, the coaches, the athletic directors, and the presidents/senior administrators. The objective of this comparison was to determine whether there were differences in perceptions held between the groups regarding the identified key elements considered necessary in order to develop character in student-athletes.

Research Question 4 was examined by comparing the results of the content analysis as reported by the three groups of participants [coaches, the athletic directors, and the presidents/senior administrators]. The objective of this comparison was to determine whether there were differences in perceptions between the groups regarding the impact of athletics upon student-athlete character development.

Research Question 5 was examined using the results of the content analysis as reported by respondents from the two division levels (I and III). The objective of this comparison was to determine whether or not there were differences in perceptions between division levels (I and III) regarding the impact of athletic participation upon the development of character in student-athletes.

### Generalizability

Case study methodology serves as a point of information to generate progressive thought regarding the topic of character development and intercollegiate athletic participation. It should not be taken as an absolute truth regarding all similar institutions. When properly applied, case studies can provide understanding about similar institutions, individuals, groups, and events (Berg, 2001).

### Summary

Chapter III presented the methods and procedures used in this study. General characteristics describing participants were reviewed, along with the process by which participants were obtained, and the procedures utilized to gather data were also discussed. The research instrument and its development were described.

## **Chapter IV**

### **RESULTS and DISCUSSION**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to explore and assess the perceptions, roles and values maintained by coaches, athletic directors and presidents of collegiate institutions regarding the impact of intercollegiate athletic participation upon student-athlete character development. The research relied primarily on the comparative and contrasting views and opinions of coaches, athletic directors, and senior institutional administrators. The level of institutional consensus, knowledge, and common practices of those most directly involved with athletics was sought in the attempt to observe their impact on student-athlete character development.

Chapter IV includes interview results discussed within the institutional case analyses. Cultural data were analyzed by thematic analysis (Masland, 1985). Thematic analysis enables identification of trends and underlying themes within the organization. Through this basic technique I attempted to develop a central “story line” to describe each organization’s perspective (Masland, 1985).

The interview questions sought to unveil the respective attitudes, values, beliefs, and behaviors of coaches, and athletic and institutional administrators, and each of their respective relationships to anticipated outcomes involving student-athletes. Responses were grouped and presented by institution [Center College, Mountain College, Gala University, and Rainbow University] and were categorically presented by content area [character development, leadership, socialization, environment, and mission]. Case

studies used data gathered from those tied most directly with athletics and student-athletes.

### Institutional Case Analyses

To maintain confidentiality findings are described in a manner to protect the identity of the institution and the participants.

#### **Center College**

Center College is private residential coeducational liberal arts college nestled within a small town of the state. The buildings of the institution are all nestled closely to each other, and most buildings are situated in the central portion of the campus within walking distance. There were no major physical landmarks that stood out across the campus. A four year institution, Center College was founded over 110 years ago and had enrollment figures with over 1,300 undergraduate students. The student population is predominantly white. Center College awards Bachelor's degrees. Center College has a rich cultural heritage that it has held in tact for over 100 years.

The intercollegiate athletic program of Center College competes at the Division III level. Financially, it receives support from its central administration just as other departments at Center College. There are over 16 varsity sports teams. The sporting event stadiums were of reasonable size. The football stadium was not noticeable at any great distance. Athletic department offices were housed within a classroom building near the center of campus. The offices of the coaches and the athletic director were all located within one building on the same floor and in close proximity of one another. The president was located in the central administration building.



### *Character Development*

A review of the responses provided by Center College displayed that 5 of the 8 respondents stated that athletics built character. Within this group were five out of six coaches. Coaches of Center College often identified specific experiences and/or outcomes witnessed as a result of student participation in intercollegiate athletics. These coaches described how intercollegiate athletic participation presented “real life” opportunities leading to the growth and development of the student-athlete. Athletics was viewed as an activity that “pushes you and shows who you are.” Also, athletics was looked upon as a means to build various personal qualities such as humility while also learning to handle the ups and downs of life. With regard to the focus placed on student development, one coach believed that with athletics the process is more important than the results:

“Yes. You learn how to handle the ups and downs of life. Life is 10% what happens to you and 90% how you react to it. With athletics the process is more important than the results. We can use sports as a mini lesson for life.” (3016/3)

Other opinions of respondents [2 administrators] from Center College believed in the potential for intercollegiate athletic participation to impact character. These administrators expressed the belief that athletics can build character, but does not always have this intended effect. According to these respondents, there must be an intentional effort made to have such a desired outcome. In addition, the choices made by the student must be considered. As one administrator acknowledged, the eventual choices made by the student-athlete play a role as to whether the growth experience is either positive or negative. In and of itself, athletics will not build character:

“Athletics certainly can build character, and it should – but it does not always. There has to be an effort made for it to do so.” (3023/3)

“It [athletics] has an ability to, but it does not always. Some situations enhance character while others do not. The eventual choices made by the student [athlete] play a role as to whether it is positive or negative.” (3022/3)

One revenue coach presented a unique response. This coach considered athletics as a tool that displayed ones’ character rather than built it. This respondent believed that some traits were enhanced through involvement in intercollegiate athletics:

“Athletics reveals character more so than actually build it. There are character traits that are enhanced through involvement in intercollegiate athletics. However, athletics will not improve deep character flaws. High school coaches have a better chance of building character.” (3019/4)

Interviews revealed a variety of definitions of “character” found at Center College. Four of eight participants [two administrators and two coaches] related character to an individual’s morals or values. Character was also described by three of eight Center College respondents [1 revenue and 2 non-revenue coaches] as “who you are when nobody is watching.” In addition, three (coaches) of eight participants also identified a correlation between character and an individual’s actions and behaviors:

“There are multiple aspects of character. We are judged by our acts and how we make other people feel, not just what we say. Honesty, integrity, and saying the right things build character. No person is a finished product. Character is something that is built every day.” (3018/3)

“Character is not just the development of values, but your values on display. It is how you carry yourself. It is your representation of the team family and your own family.” (3020/3)

Respondents at Center College identified such key elements as role modeling, the setting of expectations, and self-discipline as critical to building character. Two of eight participants stated self-discipline as being an essential element. Self-discipline was an element or trait that participants believed student-athletes needed to possess to maximize their development experience.

Three coaches [2 revenue, 1 non-revenue] among eight participants believed that the setting of expectations (and standards) by those in authority was an important element in the development of character. Five of the eight participants [1 administrator, 4 non-revenue coaches] of Center College considered role-modeling important. One coach believed that a student-athlete must observe both positive and negative role models to identify what to do and what not to do. An administrator linked building character to having an athletic program of the highest integrity with the program modeling sportsmanship. Other less common responses included providing an appropriate environment and directly teaching character. The following is what a coach and an administrator, respectively, said regarding role-modeling:

The student-athlete needs to see both positive and negative role models. This way they are able to see what to do and what not to do. Every one is a role model...either positively or negatively. (3018/4)

The key to building character is to have an athletic program of the highest integrity. Then you must model sportsmanship. Presidents in the conference have agreed to model sportsmanship, and we will call each other on inappropriate behavior. Coaches have to model sportsmanship and integrity. (3023/4)

With the exception of two coaches, all respondents believed that at Center College student-athlete character development was the responsibility of all who came

into contact with the student while he/she was at the institution, ranging from coaches and administrators, to faculty and parents/family:

Faculty members, coaches, administration, support staff, everybody. Everyone on campus must model the behavior we expect of the students. (3022/7)

I think, again, in a small setting that it is spread more widely. I think our professors and advisors here have an impact. You know, it probably goes without saying, for those involved in athletics, and the coaches involved with them. Because our [coaches] expectations are a little bit clearer, in a sense there is a team responsibility. A little bit more clearly defined, perhaps. But the student-athletes run into the same thing with our professors here because they're in small classes, typically. Their professor knows their name. (3019/8)

Seven of the eight respondents [all except 1 non-revenue coach] stated that character development was of enough importance to Center College coaches and administrators that they make an intentional effort to address the character development of student-athletes.

When respondents were asked to assess all in their lives (from youth to that moment) who had influenced their current philosophy regarding the development of character, many types of individuals were listed. Mentioned most often by respondents were parents/family [by 2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach], and former coaches [by 1 administrator, 2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach]. In addition, mentors [by 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach] and general life experiences [by 2 non-revenue coaches] were listed as influences. Each respondent provided at least three significant influences over the span of their life.

In summary, Center College seems to hold a high regard for the impact of athletics on intercollegiate student-athlete character development. There was not much

group consistency, however, in how respondents defined character or the organization's overall perception of the key elements to best develop character. Most respondents, though, affirmed that they made specific attempts to address character development. In addition, at Center College everyone is looked upon as having a responsibility for addressing character.

### *Leadership*

At Center College each respondent (8 of 8) believed that character development should be of concern for leaders of the institution. Oftentimes this concern could be expressed both directly and indirectly with student-athletes, as it was explained by some study participants of Center College:

“Not anything directly. Again, because they're my team. So they're not there. Indirectly, yes, because they [student-athletes] want someone they can look up to and be proud of. I'm sure they wouldn't want the athletic director to be someone who's dishonest or anything like that. It is indirectly.” (3015/6)

Yes. Parts of the mission intentionally address character components - such as leadership and service. If we all fulfill the mission, then we impact character. (3022/7)

Respondent descriptions of the role-played by the president and athletic director varied. The president was viewed by 4 of 8 [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] as one who sets the standards and as one who is ultimately responsible for all that goes on within athletics and at the institution. Yet there were additional expectations of administrators. The president in particular was looked upon as the spokesperson and promoter of athletics. The president as well as the athletic director was

expected by 3 of 8 [1 administrator, 2 non-revenue coaches] to promote and develop the image and perception of the athletic program to the campus and local community:

The president's role is to insure that athletic program meets the standards and quality of the institution. To keep the bigger picture in mind, so that it all meshes together. A.D. also has goals and outcomes to meet. They develop a sense of direction for the program. (3023/8)

That's interesting. I think it's more – I think from the very, very top that person can help develop pride and character through their positive response to athletics and really showing that athletics is very important. (3016/11)

Despite these expectations, some respondents [3 of 8; 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] at Center College acknowledged that the president was far too busy to be directly involved with the student-athletes. However, 3 of 8 respondents [1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] believed that the smaller institutional size of Center College increased the possibility of administrators interacting with the student-athletes.

The perception of the athletic director's role was fairly clear among respondents at Center College. The athletic director was viewed by 6 of 8 respondents [2 administrators, 2 revenue coaches, 2 non-revenue coaches] as setting the direction of the athletics program and managing the day-to-day activities of the program. The athletic director was expected to provide more detailed direction than the president. Respondents generally saw the athletic director as managing athletics by developing and applying set policy.

Head coaches were unanimously considered (by 8 of 8 respondents) to hold the ultimate responsibility and the greatest impact in the building of character among student-

athletes. This belief appeared tied to the head coach's ability to impact student behavior by allocating or reducing playing time in athletic competitions.

The viewpoint of administrators' roles in the building of character was generally consistent among those at Center College. Most study participants held similar perceptions regarding the role and expected behaviors of the president, athletic director and even head coaches. There was a clear expectation that athletic directors and presidents would promote and support athletics throughout the institution and in the community. There was an underlying feeling that these anticipated and even hoped for actions were not always taking place.

### *Environment*

External factors often can impact head coach effectiveness and success (Humphrey, Yow, & Bowden, 2000). At Center College five of six of the head coaches [2 revenue coaches, 3 non-revenue coaches] listed financial or budget related issues as affecting their role as a head coach. One of two administrators considered the budget to impact the role of head coaches. Because Center College's athletics budget is tied to the institutional budget, the Board's decision is crucial to athletics. Each year the Board of Center College decides on financial allocations to institutional units and departments. In addition, coaches at Center College revealed that Admissions influenced roster sizes of teams as much or more than athletics. Admissions often requested that coaches maintain a specific number of student-athletes on the squad to meet necessary institutional enrollment figures. For many coaches this administrative decision was frustrating, having little to do with athletics.

Another external factor considered important by coaches [1 revenue, 2 non-revenue coaches] was recruitment and retention of qualified assistant coaches and athletes. Each of these coaches identified the importance of the institution's geographic location in the state. Center College's location is just far enough away from other cities to make it difficult to attract qualified part-time assistants. This situation was exacerbated by a limited budget since the athletic program lacked funding to hire full-time assistants for most teams. According to some coaches a qualified assistant would most likely need to live and work in the general vicinity of Center College, which was not common.

Other environmental concerns centered on respondent perceptions of the general collegiate environment. The college setting was viewed as holding and creating a tremendous opportunity to affect student-athlete character development. There was an understanding among 7 of 8 Center College respondents [with the exception of 1 non-revenue coach] that the 18-22 year old time period was one of growth and development for college students. The key to this growth, according to respondents, was to involve students in decisions that they must make on their own without their parents. Living in residence halls on campus was critical to this experience. Participants considered the residential campus to provide dormitory experiences, student organizations, and social settings that challenged an individual's character. Participants cited the smaller campus size of Center College as vital to personal development because it had greater opportunities to impact character development:

"The college setting is both good and bad. As a small school, it makes it easier to have an impact on students. College has an impact for life. Who you surround yourself with is important." (3020/14)



“As a residential campus there are plenty of opportunities to shape student character: dorm life, Greek life, parties, and community service. It’s all important in helping people make choices.” (3019/14)

I think it’s another step along your educational path. They’re fairly highly developed in that area before we get them, but, again, it’s another step. Mom and Dad aren’t waking them up saying, “Hey, it’s 8:00 o’clock. Get your butt in school.” They’ve become adults and are making all those decisions. So that’s where I kind of put a lot of responsibility on them, and I think the college or university does also. (3016/15)

The attitude of the campus community regarding intercollegiate athletics was perceived by most participants [2 administrators, 1 revenue, 2 non-revenue coaches] as being positive and significant. Athletics were considered integral to the college student experience. The perceived importance of athletics was linked, by some participants, to the high percentage of the student population that were athletes. It was estimated by some that at Center College close to 40% of the student population were student-athletes:

But it’s an important part of the institution because a lot of students here are student athletes. Close to 40 percent. So it is a major part of it. Now, whether the faculty feels the same, I have no control over that. But the institution, yes. It is an important part. If they get rid of athletics, they might as well get rid of half the student body. (3015/3)

Sometimes I think we’re viewed as a necessary evil. For example, my team alone I recruited ##freshmen this year. ## out of a class of ### is quite a percentage for one program to bring in. Our other team is bringing in ##. Now you look at that, that’s over ## kids out of a class of ###. Yes, they need the kids. Do they want to listen to me when I go in and say, “I need \$5,000 more for uniforms”? They don’t want to hear that part. No businessman does. No accountant wants to hear that – you know, he wants to see things running smoothly. (3018/3)

In contrast, three coaches [1 revenue, 2 non-revenue] described the campus attitude toward athletics as less than positive. One description used was mixed – “some

like it and some don't"-- and another considered the institution's attitude to be inconsistent and ignorant. It was even pointed out that both sides could use some educating and enrichment about the other. The ignorance was symbolized by misunderstandings and misperceptions. These study participants believed that mutual education could benefit by both sides. Respondents believed that educating students, faculty, and staff about the role and potential benefits of the athletics program was an important administrative responsibility:

I think it's inconsistent. There's a group of very supportive faculty and staff, and there's another group that could really care less about it. And I really think that for us to really prosper, the person at the top has to sell some of these extra-curriculars, athletics, choir, band, all those other components that are part of the college. If it's not sold at the top, I just don't think it's ever going to filter down. And some of its education. Some of it's educating the faculty what is athletics really doing for the college? Why do we have athletics? How does it fit in? And, you know, we aren't going to be on ESPN tomorrow night. We're going to get our individuals or teams. So why do we have it? Some of that's education from the top, but also the top is really being a component for us and selling the value of what athletics can do for the college. (3016/5)

Overall, respondents were quite consistent in the view of the impact of the college setting on student-athletes. Most considered the college years to be a period of growth and development that is inspired by new and different experiences that challenge an individual's held beliefs and values. Less consistency was found between coaches and administrators about the external factors that impact the role of the head coach. Even less consistency about the perception of the institution's attitude toward athletics existed.

### *Socialization*

Participants provided a wide range of viewpoints about the traits a student needed to succeed as an athlete, a student, and later on in post-college experiences. Two of eight

participants stated that hard work and effort were important. Two others at Center College believed that self-respect was important. Other responses included students having a passion for what they do, never giving up, making good choices, and thinking about what the student is doing.

Center College respondents based their perceptions on experiences using their own frame of reference as a guide. This phenomenon resulted in some disparity and lack of consistency, which could lessen the impact made on college student-athletes. With various coaches and administrators each providing their personal pathway to success, and each pathway heading in multiple directions, a student-athlete may opt not to adhere to any of the advice because of the lack of consensus.

### *Mission*

According to five of eight respondents [2 administrators, 2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach] the mission of Center College sought to develop well-rounded students and productive citizens. Three of these five study participants stated that a liberal arts education was crucial to provide a well-rounded experience. Here is what three of the five respondents believed:

Our mission is to help students to graduate as a whole person: academically, emotionally, socially. To educate them on how to better their lives and their community for life. (3022/1)

We are an institution that seeks to provide a broad-based background with diverse academic challenges. There is a point to teach students how to think on their feet. (3020/1)

...Its mission is to produce a well-rounded, involved student who has, in a small college setting, has the opportunity to pursue the things about which they are passionate. (3019/1)

The mission of athletics was perceived by 4 of 8 respondents of Center College [1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] as providing an educational component beyond classroom learning. Four of eight respondents [2 administrators, 2 non-revenue coaches], also believed that athletics actually was a partner in reinforcing the institutional mission:

The goal of athletics is to supplement the mission of the institution. Athletics provides us with another area to improve the overall welfare of the students. It really provides another classroom for learning. (3022/1)

I think athletics reinforces that [institutional mission] greatly in that athletics you know, we're going to basically follow along the same guidelines but more in a probably less critical thinking area. More of a reactive, tenser situation. Cause people to think on their feet. Work within a group setting a little bit more than a classroom setting. And provide more of – give the student athlete more of an opportunity to develop leadership roles. (3018/1)

Athletics is a part of the total challenge and package of the college experience. The time that is spent with coaches is extremely developmental. There is so much that is learned while competing as a student-athlete. (3020/1)

There were also a few individuals who stated the mission of athletics was to provide students with an opportunity to compete beyond high school with a high level of coaching and competition. A few (3 of 8) participants believed that athletics reinforced the institutional mission because academics remained the chief priority.

A portion of athletics mission was considered a tool for the enrollment of students at Center College. One coach stated the following:

I see athletics as – at a school like this, even more than the big Division I schools, I see it as an enrollment tool to attract students. So it gives those kids an opportunity. Kids that are good students but also

have some athletic ability to continue doing something they very much enjoy doing and was a big part of their life growing up. So I see it as, you know, from a business standpoint, enrollment. We bring in, I would say, 33 percent, even up to 40 percent of the student body in athletics. (3016/1)

In reviewing both missions, the institutional mission was considered readily observable in athletics because athletics served as the testing ground for most things learned while at Center College. Team work, time management, group skills and leadership were reported skills and benefits gathered by student-athletes , which were then refined within the setting of athletics.

The understanding of the institutional mission among those at Center College appears more clearly understood than the mission for the athletic program. Respondents provided a wider variety of interpretations of the athletic mission than the institutional mission. In both instances greater clarity could be achieved for a more effective relationship between athletics and the institution.

### *Institutional Summary*

Respondents of Center College were somewhat at odds when discussing the impact of intercollegiate athletic participation on student-athletes. Although a majority of coaches (5 of 6) believe that athletics builds character, administrators of Center College are not as convinced. One interpretive difficulty is the multiple definitions applied to the term “character”. Respondents at Center College defined character in at least three different ways: 1) one’s morals and values, 2) one’s behavior and actions, and 3) “who you are when nobody is watching.” There was agreement between administrators in defining character [morals and values], but no agreement was found among coaches or between coaches and administrators.

Center College respondents consistently described role-modeling as the essential element in the development of the student-athlete character. Role-modeling is one of the three key elements identified by the literature as being necessary [role-modeling, environment, educate] (Stoll & Beller, 1998). The lack of consensus with any other elements besides role modeling potentially could adversely affect student-athlete character development at the college.

The external factor identified most often by coaches differed somewhat from that of the administrators. Four of six coaches [2 revenue, 2 non-revenue] commonly gave budget concerns/issues as a factor. One administrator also identified budgets as a concern for coaches, but both administrators identified student welfare issues as an important external factor for coaches.

An understanding and articulation of Center College's mission was well understood. Just over half (5 of 8) of the participants described the mission in a consistent fashion. The president quoted the exact mission, while others provided a reasonable summary of Center College's mission. Only one-half shared the same intended mission of athletics [2 administrators, 2 non-revenue coaches].

The relationship between the coaches and the athletic director was open. The coaches seemed to believe in the ability of the athletic director to represent the interests of athletics. There was more of a relaxed and comfortable relationship between the coaches and the athletic director. However, the relationship between those in athletics and the president did not appear to be as familiar or at-ease. Coaches in particular spoke of the president as more of a position or figurehead and not as someone with a real connection and involvement with the athletic program.

Overall there were several improvements that could be made in various areas related to student-athlete character development at Center College. Improved communication would enhance the clarity and understanding of both the missions and possibly help those involved with athletics develop a common definition of character for its student-athletes. Improving communication would also provide administrators with a better idea of the relative importance of external factors affecting the potential impact on student-athletes.

### **Mountain College**

A small residential collegiate institution located in a quaint town in the south central region of Michigan, Mountain College first opened its doors over 150 years ago. The institution is a private, co-ed, 4-year liberal arts college with a diverse enrollment of over 1000 full-time students. The institution does not have major physical landmarks on its campus. The classroom buildings are spread within a short distance from the central point of campus. The offices of the coaches and athletic director are spread across several classroom buildings or residence halls. The Mountain College senior administrators are located in the central administration building.

Athletics is included in the central budget of the institution, and is funded in the same way as other departments on campus. The athletic facilities are in proportion to the general structures of the campus. Mountain College is a Division III level athletic program. There are more than 17 athletic teams at Mountain College. Each is conference affiliated. The sporting event stadiums were of reasonable size, and the football stadium was not noticeable from a distance.

### *Character Development*

Student-athlete participation at Mountain College has developed a positive perception among many of those involved with intercollegiate athletics. Seven of the nine Mountain College respondents [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 4 non-revenue coaches] believed that athletics does build character. Each individual pointed to specific lessons to be learned as a result of intercollegiate athletic participation. For example, being part of a team and interacting with individuals from diverse backgrounds and distinct personalities helped build character. In addition, the ability to perform in high pressure situations was also considered to be a builder of character:

Yes it does build character. Being in athletics and part of a team brings out things in you that you don't know are in you. Interacting with people you don't know, and building relationships are only a part of the development process. (3006/4)

One administrator agreed that intercollegiate athletics “can and does” build character.

This respondent explained that character was always being built and could be affected by athletics either negatively or positively.

Yes. It can and it does build character. However, the result can be either negative or positive. The messages sent by the coach are often the deciding factor. (3013/3)

This administrator believed that much of the responsibility for building character was in the hands of coaches. Several coaches agreed with this position.

Two of nine participants of Mountain College disagreed with the majority, stating that athletics did not build character in the current environment. However, they believed

that the potential for intercollegiate athletics to build character was readily present. They

believed that a concerted effort was necessary for athletic participation to affect character



development. One stated that everyone involved with intercollegiate athletics wants to believe that athletic participation builds character, but the major portion of development has already taken place by the time they get to college:

The potential is there. Athletics reveals character. By the time we get them it is really late. We would like to believe that we have some impact, but a high percentage of it is already in place. (3010/4)

Mountain College respondents definition of “character” produced diverse responses. Three of nine respondents [2 administrators, 1 non-revenue coach] believed that character was “how one acts when no one is watching.” Three of nine respondents [2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach] viewed character as being associated with and reflected in one’s behavior regardless of the context or setting. Two others [1 administrator, 1 non-revenue coach] defined character as “the core of a person” and that character was something that could not be hidden or faked:

I would define character as responsible decision-making that is done most of the time. When you choose to do the responsible thing regardless of the situation or context, and you hold others accountable as well. (3013/4)

Watch your thoughts, they become your words. Watch your words, they become your actions. Watch your actions, they become your character. (3012/3)

Character is about reputation. It’s what you do when no one is watching. Honest and responsible. Treating all people with dignity and respect. You can often judge one’s character by looking at their friends. (3010/3)

Respondents differed in their beliefs about the key elements in building character. Each participant provided multiple responses. Five of the nine respondents [3

administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] considered role modeling a key element in character development. Coaches were seen as central figures in role-modeling:

Role modeling, organization, clear communication, expectations, consistency, and timely follow through are all involved in the development of character. Coaches are to be the quality control officers to insure that certain standards are met. (3013/4)

Also, five of nine respondents [2 administrators, 2 non-revenue coaches] identified the need to set clear expectations and limitations among student-athletes. Another key component, listed by 4 of 9 respondents [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach], was the student-athlete's self-discipline:

Students must have discipline. They must also have the ability to adapt. Having a core set of values (knowing right from wrong) and act on them appropriately is also important. Having a positive outlook is a key as well. Coaches must role model for the team. Coaches must be involved in a variety of activities (arts and the like). (3012/4)

Coaches and administrators differed in their views. Administrators identified role modeling as the key component on this topic. Most coaches (3 of 6) believed that setting expectations was key; only two coaches listed role modeling as an important element.

At Mountain College the general perception, held by all participants (9 of 9), was that "everyone at the institution" had some responsibility for character development for student-athletes, indeed for all students. A few respondents made direct reference to character development being embedded in the institutional mission:

The mission of the institution states that everyone is an educator. Coaches have the most impact because of what they ask of athletes in preparation in and out of season. Professors, residence life, and others should be an influence. (3005/6)

Well, I think everybody does, really. This is probably the moment where I was more excited about [the institution] than anything is when I saw the philosophy. (3009/6)

The most important individuals in building character were identified as: faculty/professors (8 of 9), followed closely by coaches (7 of 9). Faculty received the most emphasis because many respondents believed faculty were far more likely to interact with the students. Some believed that coaches had the greatest impact because of their long-term and more in-depth relationship with the student-athlete. Additionally, a coach can impact student-athlete participation in their respective sport.

Surprisingly, only two respondents at Mountain College mentioned parents/family as influencing character development among student-athletes. The literature consistently shows parents typically holding the greatest impact in the lives of most young adults (Windmiller, Lambert, & Turiel, 1980).

Every respondent at Mountain College stated that he/she made a specific attempt to address student character development. Opportunities to discuss and build character mentioned by respondents, included leading by example (role modeling) and discussing character related topics during specific meetings and informal settings. In addition, respondents claimed they could discuss character development during moments of intense physical conditioning or following the loss of a game.

In reflecting on their own philosophy of student development, seven of the nine respondents [2 administrators, 2 revenue coaches, 3 non-revenue coaches] stated that former coaches had influenced their current perspective. Five out of six Mountain College coaches agreed; one administrator held a similar belief.

The impact and influence of parents/family upon current philosophy proved to be influential as well as five of nine participants [1 administrator, 2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach] reflectively identified specific moments while growing up that served as examples of what to do and/or how to conduct oneself. Family was identified most often as either parents and grandparents. Lastly, some uncommonly mentioned influences on current thinking were: life experiences (4 of 9) and teachers (2 of 9):

Working at the institution has influenced my philosophy. Developing the institutional mission, my personal background all have had an impact on how I view the world. Even my area of academic study has had an impact. (3013/11)

The underlying sentiment sensed while discussing the topic of character development with Mountain College respondents was one of group understanding and agreement. With the exception of defining “character” respondents were quite consistent in their beliefs about character development.

### *Leadership*

Many at Mountain College [6 of 9 – 3 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] identified the role of the president as establishing the overall expectations and climate of the campus. The president was also expected by some [3 of 9 – 1 administrator, 2 non-revenue coaches] respondents to model acceptable behavior. Along this same vein the athletic director was identified as (by 7 of 9) being more intimately connected to the coaching staff and the daily activities of the athletic department. The athletic director was viewed as the “coach of the coaches” with the duty of hiring and/or firing anyone in the department not upholding the values of the program. The president saw his job as challenging the coaches and the athletes to be responsible:

They are expected to model appropriate actions and behaviors. Athletic Directors have to challenge the coaches and athletes (to be responsible). The President is the quality control officer, and should be constantly asking, "can we do better?" (3013/8)

The President establishes the overall expectations. The Athletic Director is more intimately tied to the coaches and makes sure it happens. It is the Coaches that have the influence with student-athletes. (3011/9)

All Mountain College respondents believed that character development should be of concern for those who head intercollegiate athletics. Most believed that the leaders establish the climate for expected behavior and for the anticipated role athletics plays at the institution.

### *Environment*

Respondents noted three primary external factors affecting head coaches at Mountain College: budgetary concerns [4 of 9 – 2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach], the need for upgrading facilities [4 of 9 – 3 administrators, 1 non-revenue coach], and a concern for student-athlete welfare [4 of 9 – 2 revenue coaches, 2 non-revenue coaches]. Budget concerns were reflected in the inability of the department to hire a full-time head coach for certain sports. The economy and the tightened finances of the entire institution were also mentioned as limitations on athletics.

An external factor affecting coaches identified by each administrator and by institutional facilities as well as one coach at Mountain College was the need and/or the desire to improve not only the athletic facilities. This emphasis, in both circumstances it seemed, that this was partially related to recruiting efforts as well as recognition of what others in the conference were doing at that time. In comparing Mountain College to

similar institutions within its conference several participants considered Mountain as being in the middle of the pack with regard to facilities, and in need of some upgrading and improvements:

Institutional size and the fact that sports are tuition driven are external factors. Then there is also limited funding available. Coaches often must deal with fund raising and this is also an external factor. Facility constraints also presents a concern. (3011/2)

Location can be a drawback – not as much to offer (visibly and tangibly), but once students arrive they like the lack of distractions. Facilities (athletically and institutionally) must continue to be upgraded. (3005/2)

Student-athlete welfare encapsulates a range of issues, including academic performance, and the personal relations and interactions of student-athletes. Four of six coaches identified student-athlete welfare issues as an external factor that affected coaches. An example of student-athlete welfare would be how a student-athlete's personal background affects transition into a new environment:

When students come here they come from a variety of backgrounds, and not every home has a mom and a dad...not saying that a single parent child has to have issues but that can be the case. In any case the development and growth of students will be different. Students may be in a new environment but those issues and behaviors they've learned come with them. It can be a difficult adjustment for some of them. I worry about the personal relationships of players. Who they hang out with and what they do when they have free time can interfere with their success. It's difficult to follow, but I make it clear what the consequences will be for their behavior. (3010/2)

Another coach pointed out that many students enter college with undeveloped social skills needed for social interaction with professors and others on campus:

Well, I think on this campus, how well students are able to interact with professors is a big one because if they don't have other people –

not just professors. They need other outlets, other avenues to go to, people that they can trust. Otherwise, you get to handling everything with that, and that gets tiring. It's rewarding but it's tiring. And I think that external factor, how the student is able relate to teachers and persons here, including the cafeteria workers, the janitors, that's something. (3009/2)

This phenomenon can lead student-athletes to seek individuals they could trust. In both of these instances external factors affecting student-athletes created a need for consistent follow-up by the coach, which took time away from other duties of coaching (game strategy and preparation).

All participants (9 of 9) considered the period of college attendance as a time of growth and development for the students. Respondents focused on both the size of the institution [4 of 9 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] and the nature of a residential campus [3 of 9 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coaches] as having distinct impacts. Both were thought to create greater opportunities to impact intercollegiate student-athlete character development:

With a small school you are always seen, and as an athlete you stand out even more. So for student-athletes that can be a challenge. At a smaller school the opportunity to have an impact is greater simply because you have more time to interact with each student. Our student to staff ratio at Mountain College is great. But no matter what, a student has to develop the skills to survive in this environment. (3008/2)

As a residential college there are greater opportunities to build character in students. We have longer durations to expose students to positive influences. Residence hall leaders, student life and student organizations provide campus activities. So during the most formative years of their adult life we can have that positive impact. (3011/2)

Especially important was the opportunity for students to make decisions without immediate parental supervision (by 4 of 9).

They [students] are on their own. No one looking over them to fix any wrong decisions or to enforce any discipline. They are responsible for their own decisions. This is a time to establish and shape who they want to be. Athletics plays a part in helping to shape who they become. (3005/12)

At Mountain College respondents expressed optimism about the impact of the college environment on student development. However, one coach was not as confident about its positive affects, stating that the college experience can swing both positively and negatively:

College campuses in general have become more negative environments. I would blame that on society's lack of moral structure, and a lack of moral character by students. It's the images and the acceptance of sexually explicit images and songs. Back when I was growing up you couldn't say certain things or do certain things because it was just flat out inappropriate. Now days everyone screams about their rights...what about our rights to not have that filth all over the place. There's a lack of parental involvement and an increase in immoral images displayed in the media. It all has an impact on student behavior and often its not positive behavior. (3010/2)

Most respondents [7 of 9 – 3 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches] at Mountain College described the campus as supportive and positive of intercollegiate athletics. Respondents believed that athletics was a major selling point of Mountain College, and that a high percentage of the student body were athletes.

Athletics is a major selling point and vehicle for growth of the institution. Student-athletes make up a high percentage of the [overall] student population and most people here know this. So they seem to understand how the institution and athletics work to the benefit of everyone. (3007/3)

Athletics is a key component of this campus. People look forward to the weekends and Saturday contests. The support is there. Some don't believe in athletics, but most believe it is a positive piece of the institution and an integral part of what goes on on-campus. (3012/3)



For the most part there is a positive and supportive relationship, and the perception of athletics is positive. There has been a history of dualism to fight through, but we continue to promote the positive aspects of athletics on a college campus. One of those positive attributes is that athletics pushes to integrate the student experience for both participants and supporters. (3013/3)

Four of six coaches stated that Mountain College administrators were very supportive, and that the institutional administrators worked to develop a clear understanding of the role, value, and importance of athletics within Mountain College.

The external factors affecting coaches identified by administrators were not identical to those of the head coaches. Overall, coaches expressed an appreciation of the support provided by their administrators.

### *Socialization*

Four of nine respondents identified [1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] hard work or the development and maintenance of a work ethic as a key to successful character development. Three of nine respondents [2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach] indicated that students must treat others with respect and dignity. Two respondents [1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] stated that it was important to understand people and “know what makes them tick.” Other important elements identified by respondents included being prepared, learning from mistakes, maintaining a sense of balance, and maintaining a positive attitude.

### *Mission*

Seven of nine participants [1 administrators, 2 revenue coach, 4 non-revenue coaches] articulated the mission of Mountain College in the same manner. {Disclosing

the articulation of the mission may threaten confidentiality} Many respondents also discussed how they applied the mission to their work with the student-athletes. The mission of athletics was not as clearly articulated. Participant responses lacked the consensus found for the institutional mission. Examples of respondent's articulation of the mission were: three of nine understood athletics as providing an opportunity to participate in intercollegiate athletics [2 administrators, 1 non-revenue coach]; three of nine [1 administrator, 2 non-revenue coaches] considered athletics a learning opportunity and a place to build skills; 2 of 9 [1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] stated that athletics' mission supported the institutional mission; and 2 of 9 [2 administrators] identified athletics as building character in student-athletes.

The same. I think it should match. It's just another way of getting at the same stuff. And that's actually why I came to Mountain is because of the mission. So I think athletics, it has to be just a branch, another way to reach, just like – whether it be fraternities or other groups on campus. Athletics is just another way to reach that same end. Have the athlete leave with more than they came in with, hopefully, in the process. And it usually happens that they leave something with us, too. (3009/1)

The respondents of Mountain College had an exceptional shared understanding of the institutional mission. This consensus works to ensure that few will stray far from the overarching goals of the institution. However, less consensus among respondents about the mission of athletics existed.

### *Institutional Summary*

Most (7 of 9) respondents at Mountain College considered intercollegiate athletics to affect character building effect character building of student-athletes. Less agreement

existed about the definition of character. Role modeling was identified most often (5 of 9) as an important element in building student-athlete character.

The majority of Mountain College coaches believed that student-athlete welfare was a primary external factor. The concern for the social interaction and the development of relationships with trustworthy individuals was a frequent occurrence. Administrators, in contrast, identified budget issues as the key external factor for head coaches. Each respondent believed that an institutional effort was necessary to address character development.

Seven of nine participants clearly articulated the institutional mission. Mountain College had a high level of engagement and interaction with administrators beginning with the president. The president made a point to engage and integrate the institution into the envisioned value and purpose of athletics. Coaches expressed their appreciation for the support and passion of the president for intercollegiate athletics, and many spoke of the president's appearance at a sporting event of nearly every team of the Mountain College athletic program. The sense of community and collective work was visible. The president seemed to create an atmosphere, at least among those in athletics, where athletics is maintained as an important part of the institutional landscape. This achievement was consistent with the president's meeting each employee to express the expectations of each member of Mountain College.

The president received the respect of all interviewed. The president created a personal touch, helped to create such a positive atmosphere. For example, it was mentioned in interviews that the president "goes above and beyond" what most presidents

would do. Respondents also discussed notes and emails of encouragement that were received from the president as well.

### **Gala University**

Gala University is a distinctive institution with a rich tradition and history both academically and athletically. Considered among the oldest in the state, Gala has been educating and serving the citizens of the state for over 145 years. One of the largest higher education institutions in the state Gala boasts undergraduate and graduate student enrollment figures that eclipse nearly all others. There are more than 200 programs of study offered, and students attend from all over the state as well as many countries around the world.

Athletics has been a part of the institutional landscape for years, and seems literally inseparable from the make-up of Gala University. As an NCAA Division I program there are over 20 varsity squads. The athletic program of Gala has enjoyed both past and present success competing for conference and national championships on a yearly basis. The athletic program of Gala is nearly self-sustaining in its financing of athletics. The facilities enjoyed by teams and fans are also physical landmarks on the expansive campus. The offices of coaches are dispersed among three buildings and the athletic department exclusively utilizes each of them. Administrative offices are found in the central administration building.

#### *Character Development*

A majority of respondents [5 of 8 – 2 administrators, 3 non-revenue coaches] believed that student-athlete participation in intercollegiate athletics built character in student-athletes. Respondents with this belief identified experiences that taught student-

athletes various life lessons. These lessons were considered to be situations that only athletics could possibly create:

Yes. Unequivocally. Absolutely. And I'm sorry for people that don't get that chance. Because you get into situations that cannot otherwise be created. And the battles that we face. The locker rooms. The traveling. The adversity. You never know what's going to happen. ...And sometimes you can scoot through college, let's say, and avoid adversity. We can have no avoidance in athletics. And I think that's the difference. We are in it together come heck or high water, and we have to make the very best of everything we go through. So it's very direct. (1006/4)

I don't know where else in society today that you can bring a group of people together, from all different walks of life, put them under the same set of rules and teach them that hard work, self-discipline, cooperation, perseverance, respect for each other, respect for the game, which is the rules of the game – where else can you teach that today in society? I don't know anywhere else. You don't get it taught at home much any more. You don't get it taught in the classroom much any more. So I think we're one of the last vestiges of teaching people responsibility and teaching them that hard work does pay off. And being on time is important. To me, that's character. Building character. (1012/4)

Three of eight respondents of Gala University believed that athletics presented an opportunity to build character, but only when a specific point was made to have that affect. These respondents did not believe that athletics would not build character in every student. This group consisted of one administrator and two coaches [1 revenue, 1 non-revenue].

It's the same as uhh...in the spirit that not every student that comes to the university graduates, not every student who goes and participates in intercollegiate athletics comes out of the process with the character that I or anyone else might like. (1013/4)

I'm a firm believer that it can. We will make sure that it does. And you do that by having a set of disciplines and principles and expectations that you live by. And if your players are forced and,

again, forced is probably the right word, to live by those expectations, then it will build character. It is when we do not demand, we sometimes are delinquent in our demands and expectations that we don't build character because we allow them to get away with things that they shouldn't. (1010/4)

Gala respondents varied in their definition of "character". A majority of respondents [4 of 8 – 2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] related character to one's behavior and conduct. Respondents took into account peer pressure and a willingness to behave in a manner that reflected one's beliefs, as well as one's sense of right and wrong:

Character to me is a combination of things. Knowing what's right, knowing what's wrong. Having the fortitude to do what's right. Being able to withstand social pressures and other pressures to do the wrong things. And I'm talking about in everything from class, to your job in the weight room, to your job on the practice field, to your job downtown. To me it's more so to do what's right. And we don't need to tell you what's right and what's wrong. Every kid knows what's right and what's wrong. ...So to me character has that as well as a great work ethic falls into character. A discipline, a knowledge of what's right and what's wrong and the discipline to do what's right and what's wrong, and the character to work hard at whatever it is that you do or the discipline to work hard at whatever it is you do. I guess when we talk to our players about character, it is those things. It is a great work ethic combined with the discipline to do the right things. (1010/5)

Three of eight respondents defined character as an intrinsic trait, described as being "an individual's core and center." Respondents believed that character should not be assessed strictly by actions; it should include "what is in a person's heart." Among this group were three non-revenue coaches.

Character's what's on the inside. You know, I think, to me character involves your spirit, your soul. And it's something, when I try to teach character, I talk to kids a lot about what they have on the inside. (1006/3)

Well, first of all, I think character is everything. I think that it's the most important thing that I'll do here. And I think that it's a lot more difficult to teach in general when you lose than it is when you win. So, winning, I think, helps lend you credibility. So that when you talk about character, the kids are more apt to listen to you. If you're a loser, nobody listens to anything you say. How I define character? I think for me it's more the – it's your core. It's your center. It's how you feel about the world and the people in it. It's how you value things. (1007/3)

Setting or establishing clear discipline and expectations was most commonly identified element for developing character in student-athletes [6 of 8 – 3 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches]. Follow up, consistency and fairness were also identified as keys to ensuring the development of character. An administrator also stated that it must be made clear to coaches that character development is a part of the job:

First of all you have to have coaches that believe that it is a part of their role, not simply winning and losing. And they have to have a staff that both can work with students as individuals but also provide the parameters of discipline that's necessary to say that there is a connection between how what you do on the field and how you behave off. And that really is a part of the team rules and discipline and expectations. ...but there is no magic formula. (1013/5)

I think the biggest thing in my mind is making it very clear cut what our expectations are. What those demands are. Make it as much as you can, this is what we demand, this is what we expect. Okay? There are a few things over here that we do not expect and we will not allow. And don't vary from that. You know it is pretty black and white. Try to make it as much so as you can. And once they understand the behaviors that you're going to allow and maybe even more importantly is those that you're not going to allow, then it is easy for them to follow that. Coach isn't going to allow this. If I test positive, my butt is out of here. When they understand that, then they'll do for the most part what it is that is expected. So I think number one is making sure that they understand. (1010/6)

Other key elements believed to assist with building character were recruiting and selecting students of character [2 of 8 – 2 non-revenue coaches] during the recruitment phase. These respondents believed that in assessing student character on the front end would reduce the work to do “on the back end” after the student arrived on campus.

Five of the eight participants [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] believed that everyone was responsible for addressing student-athlete character development. The president of Gala stated:

Well I think it is a team approach because clearly the coach and the coaching staff have a responsibility. The student academic support system has a responsibility, and the faculty and other support staff of the university have a responsibility to partner with athletics to be sure that we are maximally successful. It's not just because a student is an athlete that they are dealt with over there, that everyone has a responsibility. That the academic advisors, the residence hall staff ...and the trick is how to get everyone aligned so that same messages are being given. (1013/6)

Three of eight respondents at Gala identified head coaches and their assistants as being responsible for addressing of character development in student-athletes. Each of these respondents (two coaches and one administrator) placed special emphasis on the yearlong day-to-day interaction of the coaches with student-athletes. These respondents believed that the interaction between coaches and student-athletes was more frequent and consistent than with other authority figures. Most important was the coach's power to control playing time:

Well, obviously, it probably starts with the leader. The leader is the coach and the assistant coaches and so on because they have the day-to-day meetings, the day-to-day operations with those people. Now, I think it's important, as well, myself, as an athletic director, to make sure our coaches understand what I expect in terms of how they run their programs. And, again, that's part of my job to have the philosophy in place as to how I expect them to do business. (1012/6)



cl

u

al

p

re

F

ex

al

as

de

ab

cl

de

*Le*

ins

rev

cor

per

app

All participants of Gala University stated that they made an attempt to address character. Team discussions led by staff persons and/or students was a common approach utilized. Some respondents suggested books or other reading material to students in an attempt to help develop character.

Respondents had at least one influence in their life that affected his/her current philosophy of character development. Five of eight respondents [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coach] identified parents/family as an influence. Four of eight respondents [2 administrators, 2 non-revenue coach] listed “life experiences” as an influence on their philosophy of character development. Respondents also named teachers (2 of 8) and coaches (2 of 8). Surprisingly, few mentioned coaches as a key influence despite the belief that coaches affect student-athlete character development.

Gala respondents differed in their definitions of character and in their beliefs about the key influences on character. Through achieving internal understanding and clarity Gala might improve its level of consensus and effectiveness in impacting character development.

### *Leadership*

Gala respondents expected institutional and athletic administrators to establish the institutional vision and principles [7 of 8 – 3 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches]. Most respondents [5 of 8 – 2 administrators, 3 non-revenue coaches] considered the president to be far too busy to impact student-athlete character on a personal level. The president was expected to influence student development by hiring appropriate key personnel across the university (2 of 8 respondents). In addition, two of

eight Gala University respondents identified oversight of the athletics program as a role for the president:

I think the president should have the ultimate responsibility for setting the direction of the institution. And I think athletics is the most visible aspect of an institution. Certainly of this size. But I do think that it's the president's ultimate responsibility to decide how big of a role or how small of a role and what ultimately is rewarded and not rewarded in athletics. But I think that it's ultimately their responsibility, period. I don't think there's anyway around it because there's just too much money – if a football kid gets arrested, it's going to be in the paper the next day. If the neurosurgeon who just discovered a new drug to cure whatever, it's going to be buried on the seventh page. That's the reality of it. So, you better have your hand in what's going on over here in athletics or you better be prepared for a Colorado. (1007/7)

Many respondents [4 of 8 – 3 administrators, 1 revenue coach] viewed the athletic director as having a direct relationship with the coaches. An administrator described the athletic director as the “coach of the coaches”. The athletic director was also described [6 of 8 – 2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches] as the person that establishes goals and sets the standards athletics.

Well I think that the role of the athletic director has to hold accountable the coaches in ways that take the parts of athletics that we think are valuable and all of the promotional activities and really work with the coaches to make sure they are doing those things, and having appropriate team rules that reinforce the values that we talk about in the 30 second spots, and the athletic director has to hold the coaches accountable. I mean really that's the function of the athletic director. And they've gotta make a judgment that just because somebody wins and they're not paying any attention to the character development and academic development of student-athletes that's not good enough. But on the other hand people have to win. So the athletic director is the key element in trying to find that balance. And also, the athletic director has to be part of this culture of compliance. (1013/7)

There was consistent agreement that character development should be a concern for those heading athletics. Many respondents (5 of 8) considered student-athlete

che

bu

ed

pr

E

v

th

c

de

re

im

you

ath

character development a concern for the institution as a whole. One coach believed that building of character must be a priority in order to justify athletics' role within higher education. Most respondents (5 of 8) at Gala believed that character development was a priority among institutional leaders.

### *Environment*

Coaches had the most consistent view of the influence of the environmental variables on athletics. Four of five coaches [1 revenue, 3 non-revenue] believed that the recruitment of student-athletes was an external factor affecting their role as head coach:

Well, like, for instance, if the university does something embarrassing. You know, if there's a major scandal in the agricultural department, it would impact our ability to recruit. I mean, external to me would be if the football team or another sport did something to embarrass the university, that would impact my ability to recruit. (1007/2)

Location, are you a northern school, are you a southern school, are you a western school, are you an eastern school? There's a perception that goes with location. Geographic desirability is really critical in athletics and that plays a big role in recruiting. (1005/2)

Two (of five) coaches [1 revenue, 1 non-revenue] identified the relationship of donors and boosters to the athletics program, and the politics created by those relationships as key external factors affecting their jobs.

One coach recognized a change in the culture of youth sports an increasingly important external influence. The pressure to perform being placed on children at younger ages, by their parents, was affecting their performance as collegiate athletes:

The changing dynamics and structure of the family. The culture of sports clubs. Families get involved at early ages. That is both positive and negative. Yet more and more often we begin meeting parents who try to live through their children and push their children to play and compete for a college scholarship or a shot at the pro leagues. By the time the kid reaches college they are burnt out and the game is no longer fun to them. You can also see it in the way parents behave in the stands. They are too involved with what is supposed to be fun. (1008/11)

Gala administrators identified a different set of external factors perceived to affect athletics. Two of the three administrators identified NCAA and institutional rules of operation as concerns that would affect a coach's role.

Obviously the expectations that are a part of the NCAA, and their own professional associations impact a coach in the same way that the expectations of the national academy effect faculty members. There's also, I think, a greater scrutiny in the media over small events than is true in the rest of the university in general. (1013/2)

Of course, the coach, as well, as to deal with conference, NCAA, and school rules of operation, and has to follow those rules. So he has these rules and his own set of rules that he has to go by in order to run a program, a clean program. (1012/2)

Some external factors mentioned in combination by at least one administrator and by at least one coach were: meeting the expectations of fans and the institution, and student-athlete welfare:

Well, you have to look at it both ways. What are the external factors that affect the student-athlete. These will be what also affect the coach. And one is professional sports. Another is agents. The others are their own family members or parents. Family members, girlfriends, fans...the coach must make sure that the student athlete understands that it's primary that they look to the coach for direction as opposed to turning outwardly and looking at the external sources for direction. (1012/2)

External factors...we must handle the politics of the University, and the boosters. There is also recruiting. We must manage the externals. However, we must always keep our focus and attention on the student-athletes. Are we making sure our guys [student-athletes] have everything they need? Sometimes we forget the reason we have a job. It is these guys. So there's a bunch of external factors that get into this in our job. But we have to make sure that we take care of those and handle those and put that on the back burner and keep them where they should be, it is a side bar. The biggest thing is to make sure that we take care of our guys and spend time with them. And make sure that they know that that door is open. (1010/2)

All respondents of Gala University believed that the collegiate setting affects student-athlete character. Students were believed to be able to exercise and practice self-discipline through decision-making, which worked to build character. Gala respondents identified the residential campus, as fundamental to student development, articulating the opportunities for the institution to model character both formally and informally:

Particularly with a residential campus there are greater opportunities to impact character. This is a time of development for most traditional students. Making decisions builds character, and this is the time that students must make careful decisions. Things don't always go right, but that is part of the college experience. (1008/10)

One coach believed that although college plays a role, the family impact is much greater:

I don't know how much we can change it if it's already awful. I mean, if a kid comes here a liar and cheat, it's going to be more difficult. I think if a kid comes here on the bubble, then I think that the culture around him definitely going to help him stay on the straight and narrow. I think if I hang out with criminals, I'm going to become a criminal. If I hang out with people who are not and I was a criminal, I got a chance to change my ways. So I think that we play a role. I'm not going to give us all the responsibility because I do think that a lot occurs in character development zero to seventeen. And I've only got four years with that kid. Okay. But I do think that I can help set the kid on a path for success even if he came from a bad background. Definitely. But if the kid really wants to be bad and do bad, there's

nothing anybody can do about it. You got to really be open to the possibility of being different. (1007/11)

Seven of the eight respondents [2 administrators, 1 revenue coach, 4 non-revenue coaches] believed that general institutional support for athletics is present. Three of five coaches took comfort in the efforts made by Gala's administrators to support and promote athletics to the University and the community. One coach stated that everyone at Gala pursued the goal to be the best:

Well, I think the university is -- their perception is they want a winning football team or they want a winning athletic program. They want the very best program. They have a lot of pride in this university. Believing that it is the best university in the country and they want their athletic programs in my opinion to be somewhat the same. That's the feeling I get. (1010/4)

I think that overall there is a support. I mean everybody is always concerned when there is a problem. And Gala U. over its history has had its share of problems, and that really undercuts the confidence of the faculty and the alumni, and the students in the athletic program. And we also try to build confidence... For example the graduation rate of student-athletes is at or above the graduation rate of the population. So those are all ways in which one tries to deal with the natural tensions. (1013/3)

One administrator differed in opinion, and believing that past indiscretions resulted in some wariness regarding athletics and its role on campus.

In sum, Gala participants demonstrated a positive perception of the university environment for athletics and student-athlete development. Coaches and administrators differed in their perceptions of key environmental influence. Everyone at Gala perceived the collegiate setting as having the potential to affect student character.



## *Socialization*

Two of the eight participants believed that maintaining a work ethic was an important link to achieving success in all stages and facets of life. Work ethic was the only key to success identified by at least two respondents. Other keys to success included: maintaining integrity, understanding people, following the rules, respecting self and others, remembering that life is centered upon making [good] choices, and make no excuses:

No excuses. And all things are possible. You know, I really just believe that – you know, I don't have a problem with shit that happened in your life impacts who you are today. But the bottom line is, this world offers nothing but possibilities. And you can make all the excuses in the world you want and you can go to your grave doing it. But it's a waste of time. And I really try to ask them to not settle, to not make excuses for themselves or their teammates for anything. And having an all-things- are-possible mentality. (1007/13)

The first one is obviously development of a work ethic. That permits you to not simply work on the things you love but to work on the things that you don't like to do. And to bring in that work ethic (to the things you don't like to do) the same passion that you bring for the things that you like to do. Because that's one of the essential keys to being successful in life.

I think the second aspect is really internalizing a sense of fairness that goes with following the rules of the game. In the literal athletic sense and it goes with the way you treat individuals and the way in which you would essentially, in that concept of fairness, treat others with respect. And the third thing is to see your special talent and your special characteristics as something that can only grow if you are prepared to share it with others. (1013/11)

## **Mission**

Four coaches [1 revenue, 3 non-revenue] and an administrator articulated their perception of Gala's mission to be "educating students" – a diverse range of students.

Diversity was reflected in areas such as socio-economic status, sex, race and ethnicity.

These coaches believed that a portion of the institutional mission focused on providing an educational opportunity to a wide range of the state's citizens:

The mission is to provide all groups (without discrimination) with an opportunity to get involved with excellent academic programs. Our diversity is an important aspect. We appeal to a wide range of the state population. (1005/1)

Our mission is to educate students. Most specifically, our focus is upon the tax payers. We are more centered on the undergraduate student experience than the graduate student. (1007/1)

Two administrators identified the mission of Gala as maintaining a high level of success in teaching and research. No other respondents held this understanding of the mission.

Four of eight respondents articulated the mission of athletics as a striving to promote and enhance the image of the university. The president along with three coaches viewed athletics as being the community's or the world's first interaction with Gala University. Respondents believed this link results in members of athletics representing the institution in a positive and even classy manner:

The mission is to compliment the image of the University, in terms of both the expectations of student development as well as a sense of ethics, and a pattern of success that brings distinction to Michigan State through the performance of our student-athletes and our coaches. (1013/1)

Our goal is to represent the university. To provide a classy and positive model of the school. Provide students (athletes) with a total life growth experience. (1008/1)

Well, the mission of athletics, is for us to be – as I understand it from our athletic director – is for us to be role models, people in the community, to carry our success, carry our failures with a certain

dignity and pride. Those types of issues. Very much a Gala spirit, as people like to refer to, as corny as that sounds. I think, actually – I know it exists in terms of the prideful nature in which we do things. (1006/1)

In contrast, 2 of 8 participants (an administrator and a coach) identified athletics as a learning and development tool that supplements the more formal education of the classroom:

To work within the framework of the university as being one of the educational branches of the university. I look at what we do in athletics as just as important as what you do in the classroom. You're developing leadership skills, you're developing teamwork skills, you're developing conflict resolution skills, there's always some conflict. You're dealing with time management; you're having to deal with stress and having to perform under high stress with high demands and high expectations by your peers and by those who are not your peers, your coaches who depend upon the student athlete to perform at a certain level, quite honestly to keep their jobs. So it is a complex educational environment I feel in athletics. (1005/1)

A coach and an administrator believed the mission of athletics was to provide an opportunity for students to compete athletically at a first-class program and high quality academic institution. Additionally, two coaches articulated athletics' mission as providing an academic opportunity to students who would not have had the chance to attend an institution like Gala University otherwise.

The traditional goal of any higher education institution is "to educate." The general understanding and articulation of the Gala University mission lacked uniqueness that normally creates a distinction between Gala and other colleges and universities within the state. Athletics was considered as the front line of public perception and public relations for the institution.

### *Institutional Summary*

Respondents at Gala University demonstrated group consensus in several areas. Most (5 of 8) considered athletic participation to affect student-athlete character development positively. Similarly, six out of eight participants believed that setting expectations would assist in the development of character in student-athletes although the literature did not identify this element as critical for building character (Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999; Stoll & Beller, 1998). Five of eight respondents believed that the responsibility for character development belonged to everyone on campus.

There was a lack of agreement about the relative importance of external factors on the role of a head coach. Coaches' perspectives differed from administrators. Differences in the articulation of the institutional and athletic missions displayed group differences as well. Institutional administrators held a more concise understanding of the institutional mission than others at Gala U.

There was a definite positive attitude expressed by the participants of Gala University regarding their experiences between the institution and athletics. Most coaches and the athletic director expressed an active involvement by administrators, and this seems to have made a difference. This positive attitude creates an opportunity for Gala to improve everyone's knowledge and understanding institutional and departmental expectations.

### **Rainbow University**

Rainbow University is positioned close to the upper peninsula of the state. The buildings on campus are primarily modern. As a residential higher education institution Rainbow University is coeducational with a campus enrollment of over 25,000 students,

which includes both undergraduate and graduate programs of study. There are over 200 professionally oriented undergraduate and graduate programs at the bachelors, master's, specialist's, and doctoral levels. Rainbow University has had its educational doors open for over 110 years.

Rainbow is a Division I affiliate of the NCAA and a member of an athletic conference. Rainbow athletics supports over 15 teams, with men and women having nearly the same number of teams. Rainbow athletics has experienced much success primarily among its conference rivals. The coaches were spread across two buildings on campus. Each building was generally exclusive to athletic department staff and activities. The football and basketball facilities were large structures that stood out on the campus. There was a separate indoor facility for football practices and preparation. The athletic program of Rainbow receives financial support from its central administration. Senior administrators were housed in the central administration building.

### *Character Development*

The majority of Rainbow participants [5 of 8 - 2 administrators, 2 revenue coaches, 1 non-revenue coach] believed that athletic participation presents an opportunity to positively build character. Certain elements must be in place in order for positive outcomes to be achieved:

I'll certainly say this, that it has the opportunity to build character. There are a lot of people who don't take advantage of opportunities. So it's not an automatic. But it forces you in situations that demand that you demonstrate character. I was a coach for 16 years before I was the athletic director, so I've had that opportunity to experience both sides. And that's the type of experience that I've been trying to relay as I discuss it. (1022/6)

It can. It doesn't mean it does. If you don't emphasize to make a person have character, then they won't. You as a coach or as the leader of a program and your staff have to say, "These things are important to us." And you have to tell the guys, "This is important."  
(1018/5)

Only two of eight Rainbow U. respondents supported the belief that athletics built character. One coach took notice of higher graduation rates and selections made by employers because of the skills developed by student-athletes:

Most definitely. It's not a secret that student athletes have a higher graduation rate. It's not a secret that businesses like to hire athletes because they're competitive. They're driven. They set goals. They're motivated. They know how to manage their time. I think personal sacrifices. They make a commitment. They make a plan. They work the plan. They achieve the goal. (1016/4)

Another coach believed that athletics reveals one's character more than actually building it. This respondent believed that the environment had to be appropriate, and that student-athletes must be clearly taught to understand character:

It is one of many ways that you can build character. But what it really does I believe is display character, more than builds it. Then I believe it totally depends on the environment that the student-athlete is in if it builds character. It can build bad character if it's in a bad setting, it can build positive character if it's in a positive setting, and the coach, I believe, has a huge responsibility in that area. I do believe that is misplaced in society today, and win/losses have become more important than the building of character. (1017/5)

Rainbow University respondents lacked consensus in defining "character".

Several respondents [4 of 8 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] defined character as being an intrinsic quality, and considered character to be "who you are as a person."

Character is who you are when people aren't looking. It really is intrinsic to who you are, and it eventually shows in one's behavior sooner or later. (1020/3)

It's the "true" person. What that person is truly all about. (1017/4)

Two non-revenue coaches defined character in terms of trust and honesty, along with ethics, morals and values. Others (2 of 8) identified a person's display of commitment as a sign of character. When discussing character one coach stated that character must come first in the recruiting phase:

Boy, that's a good question. It's like how do you define leadership. I think that's all part of it. I think leadership and character somewhat are embracing. I think leadership, maybe, in my definition is – you know, leadership can be – should be, you know, what kind of effect do you have around people around you. And I think character can be lumped into that. I think character and intelligence have to come first in your recruiting of any student athlete. I think a lot of coaches screw up when they put athletic ability ahead of character and intelligence. (1019/5)

Three respondents [1 administrator, 2 non-revenue coaches] identified role modeling by the coach as an important element. Several participants [3 of 8 – 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches] believed that supplying a proper environment was essential for developing character. Three of eight respondents [1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] believed that developing a trusting relationship with the student-athlete was critical to building character:

I think there's one word that's a key. It's trust. I think when an individual – provided, again, the person they're trusting has some values. I mean, you can trust someone that if you look at the outside you say, that's an individual you do not want to identify with. But I think that's a key role. If you trust someone, if you trust someone because that person knows what's right, that person – you trust someone because that person cares about you, then I think you have that opportunity to really develop character. (1022/8)

The head coach and his/her staff is the most critical element because they shape the experience, and they are also role models. But it is the coaches who set the standards and expectations. They then must be firm and fair in any attempts to discipline and correct behaviors. (1015/7)

So, I think there's team building. You try to make sure that your seniors, who've been through your program and been a part of your program, understand that that is important to them. And as that becomes important to them, then they go out and they make sure that the others understand that that's important in this program. And so then it's just not you as a single person or you and your assistant coaches as a single person. It's all of you moving out there and saying, "Hey, this is what we're all about." And so that's how you create an atmosphere that understands that (and an atmosphere that builds character). (1018/6)

Two non-revenue coaches believed that setting clear standards and expectations was also important for building character. Two coaches believed that students contributed to their own character development by possessing and exercising self-discipline.

Most respondents [5 of 8 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches] viewed character development as a responsibility of everyone in a position of leading and guiding students at the institution. Three respondents differed in their responses. The president of Rainbow University believed that the head coach held primary responsibility for building the character of student-athletes. Two coaches identified the team (assistant coaches and players) as having a great deal of responsibility in building character in student-athletes:

Definitely your upperclassmen and your team captains. You want your team captains and your leadership to come from your senior class, if at all possible. They have the most investment. They have the most experience. They can certainly give the best advice to the younger athletes. (1016/6)



Every respondent (8 of 8) reported making specific attempts to address character. Subtle and also more overt attempts to build character were identified by respondents. Such things as honesty, follow through, and understanding were identified as being subtle, while more direct methods were identified as: team discussions, placing information in handouts, and even through coaching. Character was also reinforced via daily interactions between coaches and student-athletes.

Respondents at Rainbow University reflected upon the influences of their current philosophy of development. Five of eight [1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches] identified family members as affecting their philosophy. Former coaches [4 of 8 – 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches], and friends/peers [4 of 8 - 1 administrator, 3 non-revenue coaches] were also identified as important influences on beliefs about character. Families established the foundation with values, while coaches related sport participation to actual life events and situations to be faced later in life. Peers and friends assisted in the making of difficult decisions. They were considered “good people” who had been around through the ups and downs.

Little consensus among respondents existed for defining character and identifying essential elements for building character. Greater consensus was found about the potential of athletics to build character in student-athletes. A majority of respondents considered the entire university as sharing responsibility for the character development of student-athletes.

### *Leadership*

Collectively, the coaches at Rainbow University explained that the president and athletic director did not have much direct contact with or affect on the student-athletes.

Instead their influence was on the coaches. One coach actually stated, “the president and athletic director step back and let you do your job”:

Wow, student impact. I don't know how much impact it [leadership] has because you get into your world and, I think...the biggest thing is, you get in your world. The impact the athletic director and the president have...I think we get tied into our world, so I'm not sure how much impact...besides, maybe, reading in the paper on issues and things like that they catch. But I don't know, because they don't have contact with them [student-athletes] on a daily basis or even on a weekly basis. That's, you know – I think both of them step back and let us do our job, which I appreciate, rather than standing over your shoulder every two minutes. I think it's positive for a coach. But as far as a player, I'm not sure how much impact they have. (1019/12)

Well, I think it's just a trickling effect. I believe our president, of course, is responsible for hiring the athletic director. And the athletic director is responsible for hiring the coaches. And I think that they hire coaches who have the integrity and all the things we discussed here. Good character. Honest. NCAA rule abiding. They have the knowledge of the sport itself. The teaching abilities. I think in that way – you're saying how does the university president and athletic director impact?... I think that they set the standards. We have staff meetings. They have guidelines for us. They have standards for us. And they want our university represented in a first-class fashion, both on and off the court/field. (1016/7)

Two non-revenue coaches and an administrator (3 of 8) believed the president and athletic director were responsible for oversight. The president considered the athletic director to be responsible for modeling ideal behavior and for hiring persons of integrity. The athletic director saw the president's role as overseeing the athletic program and the institution.

Well, again, I think – the president has oversight of your program. So it's important that the president has an opportunity – and we bring him in on various meetings that we have – in which he has a chance to, by and large, see the athletes in whole and talk about what they mean to the university and their importance. You know, again, in some instances he or she may have the opportunity of one-on-one with

various teams or with individuals. And that impacts them very significantly. (1022/10)

Other roles for Rainbow's leaders discussed by respondents included insuring that needed resources were available (1 of 8), representing athletics to the institution (1 of 8), and setting standards (1 of 8).

Rainbow University respondents understood character development as a concern for those heading intercollegiate athletics. One coach affirmed, "the moment educating and developing student-athletes is not a part of any of our jobs then no time should be wasted to quickly remove athletics from within the walls of higher education."

#### *Environment*

Four of six coaches [2 revenue coaches, 2 non-revenue coaches] identified fundraising and attending multiple fundraising events as an external factor that affect their role as head coach:

I mean, we basically have to – you know, we raise certain money through guaranteed games, but we also raise it through golf outings and alumni fund-drives, through ourselves. That impacts us. That's an external force. Does it impact us? Absolutely. I mean, the more you raise, obviously, the better the conditions can be. There's not too many externals – I'm trying to think external things. (1019/3)

I would say Rainbow Club donations impacts the budget. Relations. What kind of relations do you have with your high school coaches, your AAU coaches. External forces, I guess, would be a lot of things. You go out and evaluate talent constantly. Your job is affected by that. If you don't identify good talent and if you don't bring good talent to the floor and produce, it all connects. So, I think you have to have good relations, good communication, e-mail, telephone, in person, written correspondence with both coaches, players. I think that's affected, too, by the NCAA restrictions. The NCAA rules tell us that you can only do this and can only do that, especially with prospects. (1016/2)

Two of six coaches considered the excess in NCAA rules and related paperwork to adversely affect the operation of athletics:

Oh there's huge things that impact me other than that [coaching]. The budget and dealing with fund raising. Here which we spend a lot of time...which I spend a lot of time on... (my staff and I). It takes away some of the opportunities to interact with the student-athlete. The amount of paperwork that is now required via the NCAA and each institution, and with not having clerical that puts it all on the coaches. The pressures of public relations and of not having other help to get things done so that means that we have to do it. (1017/3)

In addition, two non-revenue coaches and the president saw financial/budget related issues as an external factor affecting head coaches.

The president and athletic director identified public perceptions and the media as external factors affecting coaches. The president also mentioned recruiting and general limits in spending within higher education as factors that affect the role of head coaches:

There are a lot of factors that impact the role of our head coaches. The perception of the coach's program by the public, media, and our alumni. Often athletic programs are measured by wins and losses especially at the Division I level. Also being fiscally responsible. There is also recruitment and politics (that is related to the cost and spending within higher education). (1023/2)

Well, there are a lot of external factors. Obviously, the first external factor that everyone has to have to be in coaching is perception. The program that you develop, how is it perceived? How is it perceived by the public? How is it perceived by the media? How is it perceived by future student athletes and those that are in the program? Oftentimes perception is based upon success. And oftentimes that is the degree in which one is measured, especially at the Division I level. (1022/1)

Each respondent of Rainbow University considered the college setting as a place where students can grow as young adults. The freedom and independence experienced

created a learning and living environment where students developed as a result of making their own decisions. Students learned accountability for their decisions and actions:

When you come to a university and you go away to school, you are making your own decisions. And so you are going to develop your own character and you are going to interact with other people. You're going to interact with other adults. And you're going to hear a lot of different things. Ultimately, you will be responsible for your own actions and your own decision of what you think is right and wrong and what you think is important or not important. (1018/10)

Well it certainly...you have to believe in what you do. Believe in your ethics, believe in your morals, because you are going to be questioned and challenged and pushed and prodded to do things so you have to decide what you believe is right and what is wrong – and where the limits are, so you have to be careful of limits and set them. So I think it's challenging for anybody...the students. And then being a student-athlete adds a little bit more pressure to it. (1017/10)

Three of eight participants (two coaches and the president) believed the attitude toward athletics was mixed with supporters and non-supporters. A sufficient balance was needed within the institution to bridge academics and athletics. Currently this gap was considered difficult to bridge because of the ongoing budget constraints faced across the state. These respondents believed that the “mixed” attitude toward athletics was common at many institutions across the state and the country:

It's mixed. The realists understand that one basis for comparing institutions is its divisional rank and athletic program. For a lot of people they see athletics as being disconnected from the mission. They do not see the benefits. A majority are real and do understand the value of athletics. Overall, I would have to say that there are mixed feelings and mixed reviews among our faculty and staff (1023/2)

I think it's no different than, maybe, some other universities I have been with. I think we have a tremendous amount of support from the president. However, I think that there are those few faculty members out there that you see at every institution that think there should be less

emphasis on athletics and more emphasis on academics and can't understand why this money's being spent for that. So it's not something I've not seen before. (1016/3)

Four of eight respondents [1 administrator, 3 non-revenue coaches] identified the attitude at Rainbow University as supportive of intercollegiate athletics. One coach mentioned the media's inaccurate portrayal of the relationship between academics and athletics:

I think that the public perception in the paper is inaccurate that athletics receives too much. The actual perception of a lot of the professors on campus I don't believe its being truly marketed properly or it's not accurate what we are hearing in the paper. Because we receive a lot of support, and I believe that there is not much negativity at all. But then our student-athletes have been good students, and we certainly are not on the excess side of the financial situation, and we've done well (winning and losing), and haven't caused much – to my knowledge- any negative publicity to the university. So as long as everybody keeps it clean and doesn't receive too much I think the University is in favor, if in fact it was marketed. (1017/4)

I think it's a higher percentage than we realize that value intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletics is a part of the total collegiate experience. Not only for the student athletes, as they represent that university and as they move through it and achieve both academically and athletically, but it also is a gathering spot for what we say is the university itself, the other students that are on campus. The opportunity to identify and to be able to broaden themselves as they have an opportunity to be among athletics. The opportunity for the community. The opportunity for the university itself in its image and its alumni. (1022/4)

One coach provided a different lens to view Rainbow University. This coach reported the institution's attitude as being rather cynical toward athletics. The perceived cynicism was linked to years of stagnant mindsets. This stagnant mindset symbolizes the opinions and views of athletics that remain forever linked to former coaches and past

performances of years ago that are not accurate of present athletics staff or of present performances.

In sum, Rainbow respondents differed in their perceptions of the institutional attitude toward intercollegiate athletics. In particular, the factors identified as affecting coaches did not agree with the factors stated by administrators. However, the perceived value of the college experience was undeniable among Rainbow University participants. A reasonable amount of discussion occurring across the institution would be beneficial for athletics and the general institution at Rainbow University.

### *Socialization*

Commitment was identified most often as a key to success [4 of 8 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 2 non-revenue coaches]. Students must remain committed through difficulties that are likely to come up in life. Maintaining a work ethic (2 of 8) and honesty (2 of 8) were also stated by respondents. Other keys identified by at least one respondent were respect for others, understanding people, and maintaining integrity.

### *Mission*

Four of eight participants [4 of 8 – 1 revenue coach, 3 non-revenue coaches] articulated Rainbow's mission as providing students with an affordable, quality education. Two of these respondents also believed the mission was oriented toward a liberal arts undergraduate experience. According to these respondents this mission seemed consistent with the growth and development of the students:

...to develop them in a variety of ways. One is, obviously, the educational part. And the educational part in the classroom becomes important. Okay? What are they going to learn? What are they going to become? What degrees are they working on? So that has to be one

of your main focuses, you know. And that is the university's main focus. That's a priority. And then the other thing is, you know, you have interaction. How they act socially with other students. That becomes important. (1018/1)

To educate students. But to also help in their maturation as they continue on in their educational endeavors. (1017/1)

Two respondents believed the mission was to provide an opportunity for students from the region to obtain a degree while also developing productive citizens. The president of Rainbow articulated an academically-oriented mission emphasizing teaching and applied research by members of Rainbow University:

Rainbow University is academically geared, with a teaching mission. There is a strong applied research focus. We do also place some dedication to service. But the keys here are teaching, and this is closely followed by applied research. (1023/1)

Well, as I see it, the mission of the university is what they say, is to provide the wherewithal so that those in it can have every opportunity to be able to succeed and to be able to achieve a degree and be able to be a very productive member of society. (1022/1)

These respondents [3 of 8 – 1 administrator, 1 revenue coach, 1 non-revenue coach] articulated the mission of athletics as assisting in the full development of student-athletes. Athletic participation was believed to develop leaders and leadership skills that would lead to success in areas beyond athletics:

Athletics is designed to create a certain environment for student-athletes, students in general, the public, and alumni. It is a window back to the university and often the first and only opportunity to interact with the institution. It serves to create a point of leadership for students who are athletes. It's a way of bringing people together around a common focus. It builds an enormous degree of support and enthusiasm from the institution. It creates some identity. (1023/1)



Four respondents [5 of 8 – 1 administrator, 2 revenue coaches, 2 non-revenue coach] also discussed athletics' mission as providing an opportunity to compete and participate in a quality athletics program.

Some respondents mentioned that athletics' mission was to serve as a front door and a window into the institution. Athletics works as an external relations tool while also building support and loyalty within the campus and local community. Two respondents considered athletics as a tool that promoted the mission of the institution.

I think it's a multi-purpose mission. It's the front door of the university. It's for the student-athlete, to give them opportunities to participate, to be a signet of their education. For the general student population. To give identity to the university...additional identity. To have an escape and the ability to be a fan, which I believe helps the morale of the student body, and therefore the overall positive experience of everyone on campus, as well as the staff. I believe it also has a role for the staff. So the total university. (1017/1)

I think the mission of athletics – and I think there's a piece of pie in our state for everybody. I think us getting student athletes from our region and not from a national area and try to be as competitive as possible and not risk the ethics and character you need to have. (1019/1)

Many respondents at Rainbow believe they have achieved a balance of academic and athletic success. However, the lack of consensus within the group regarding both the institutional and athletic missions displayed a gap or a breakdown in communication.

### *Institutional Summary*

Most respondents (5 of 8) believed that athletics has a potential to build character. However, much less consensus existed in defining character and in determining the elements considered necessary to develop character in student-athletes.

External factors were perceived differently by organizational position. Coaches and administrators disagreed on the factors affecting coaches. Coaches considered fundraising and attending fundraising events as a factor, while administrators identified public perceptions and the media as important factors affecting coaches. The majority of participants believed that the entire institution was responsible for addressing character development.

Articulating the institutional and athletic missions of Rainbow provided an opportunity to observe another instance where a disconnection exists within the Rainbow organization. The president was more confident in his description of the institutional mission than other respondents. Nearly all others provided less description in their articulation of the mission. The recurring theme of Rainbow University was a general lack of consensus. This could symbolize that there are multiple units (teams) operating separately within a larger system.

### Summary Discussion of Results

This section reviews the results of the study involving intercollegiate athletic coaches, athletic directors, along with senior administrators to identify and explore the values, beliefs, and behaviors about student-athlete character development. This section is organized into three themes: character development, environment, and mission.

#### *Character Development*

*Athletics Builds Character.* There was a strong belief among the participants (21 of 33 - 63%), particularly among coaches, that intercollegiate athletic participation builds character. Sixteen of twenty-three coaches (70%) believed that athletics builds character.

This belief was even greater among non-revenue sport coaches (14 of 16 – 87%). Fewer coaches (2 of 7) of revenue sports held this belief. More Division III coaches (10 of 12) than Division I coaches (6 of 11) held this belief. The other seven coaches held that there is “potential” for intercollegiate athletics to impact character development even if it does not do so currently.

When compared to athletic directors, senior administrators had less confidence in the ability of athletics to impact character. Two of four athletic directors agreed that athletics build character. Both athletic directors were from Division I programs. Among senior administrators 2 of 3 from Division III believed athletics built character. One of these administrators felt that the character being built might be negative. One of three Division I senior administrators believed that athletics built character. Almost all of the 33 respondents agreed that at a minimum intercollegiate athletics has an opportunity to impact character development in student-athletes.

*Defining Character.* Respondents varied considerably in their definition of character. No institution demonstrated consensus in defining character. Nor was there a common definition by position or by division level.

*Key Elements to Develop Character.* Respondents at each institution listed key elements necessary for building character in student-athletes. The most common responses within and among the four participating institutions are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Key Elements

Key Element	Rainbow University	Gala University	Center College	Mountain College
Role Modeling	3 of 8	1 of 8	5 of 8	5 of 9
Setting Expectations	2 of 8	0 of 8	2 of 8	4 of 9
Student Self-discipline	2 of 8	6 of 8	3 of 8	5 of 9
Proper Environment	3 of 8	0 of 8	1 of 8	0 of 9
Teach Character	1 of 8	0 of 8	1 of 8	0 of 9

Table 7 provides a summarized comparison of the key elements identified by institution as necessary for building character in student-athletes. Across all institutions student self-discipline was stated most often by respondents, and followed closely by role modeling. Respondents at Rainbow University were most familiar with the essential elements listed [moral role models, moral environment, and teach morals] in the literature as critical to student moral growth and development (Lumpkin et al., 1999; Stoll & Beller, 1998). Not all institutions were familiar with each of the necessary elements for effectively building character.

*Responsibility for Addressing Character.* Twenty-five of 33 (76%) participants in the research believed that the responsibility for addressing character development fell upon the shoulders of everyone at the institution. Only slightly fewer respondents from Division I institutions than Division III institutions held this belief.

The belief that “everyone is responsible” for building character may run counter both to public opinion and the sentiment found by other members (faculty and staff) of the institution. For example, when an incident occurs involving a student-athlete many are quick to point the finger at the coach or the athletic department. It is often heard that

“the coach is responsible for their behavior” or that “athletics does know how to control the student-athletes.” However, greater individual responsibility seems to be afforded to non-athletes when similar incidents occur.

### *Environment*

*External Factors.* Respondents varied in their view of the external factors impacting the role of a head coach by their role in the institution and by division level. Tables 8 and 9 summarize the most common responses concerning external factors impacting the role of head coaches. Table 8 is sorted by common responses and by role in the institution. Table 9 sorted common responses by division level.

Table 8

### External Factors by Position

<b>External Factors</b>	<b>Coach (23)</b>	<b>Athletic Director (4)</b>	<b>Institutional Administrator (6)</b>
Budget Concerns	7	2	2
Facility Upgrades	2	1	2
Student Welfare	6	2	1
NCAA Rules	2	1	1
Recruiting	7	0	1
Public Perception	1	1	2
Fund Raising	4	0	0
Location/Size of Town	3	0	0
Boosters/Alumni	2	0	0

Table 9

External Factors by Division Level

<b>External Factors</b>	<b>Division III</b>	<b>Division I</b>
Budget Concerns	8	3
Facility Upgrades	4	1
Student Welfare	7	2
NCAA Rules	0	4
Recruiting	3	5
Public Perception	0	4
Fund Raising	0	4
Location/Size of Town	3	0
Boosters/Alumni	0	2

Table 8 shows that the greatest agreement across positions was the external factor budget concerns, followed by student welfare. Recruiting was a high response category for coaches, yet not considered as highly by athletic directors or institutional administrators. Table 9 shows greatest agreement across division levels in the area of recruiting. Within Division III common external factors were budget concerns and student welfare. For Division I commonalities were strongest for recruiting.

Table 10

Perception of the Institution's View of Athletics ("As Supportive")  
By Position and Division Level

<b>Position</b>	<b>Division III</b>	<b>Division I</b>
Coaches	8 of 12	8 of 11
Athletic Directors	2 of 2	2 of 2
Institutional Administrators	3 of 3	2 of 3

Overall, respondents expressed feelings of support as they described their perceptions of the institution's view of athletics. Twenty-four of thirty-three (73%) participants considered their home institution quite supportive of the athletic program. Table 10 presents a breakdown by position and division level of the feelings of support reported by participants.

### *Mission*

Respondents from Division III institutions were better able to articulate the institutional mission clearly and specifically. In contrast, Division I participants reported a more general articulation of the institutional mission. By position and across division levels, senior administrators displayed the greatest awareness and ability to state the institutional mission than respondents in other positions. It appears that individuals operating daily with work that requires understanding the institutional mission are better able to explain and articulate it to others.

Most Division III respondents described the mission of athletics as a learning and development tool for student-athletes. Division I participants were more divided in their responses. There was a fair mix between athletics serving as both a learning and development tool, and as external ambassadors of the institution. With the continued growth and broad national coverage of collegiate athletics it has become more likely that those being entertained will likely receive their first introduction to an institution via its athletics program.

## **Chapter V**

### **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to explore and assess the perceptions held by coaches, athletic directors and institutional presidents regarding their roles and responsibilities related to student-athlete development. In particular, the research examines participants' perceptions concerning his/her impact upon the development of student-athlete character. As higher education seeks to substantiate the purpose and role of intercollegiate athletics to both internal and external critics, it is most critical to bring to light the potential developmental benefits experienced by student-athletes.

A review of the literature disclosed many studies researching the impact of athletics upon athlete character development. However, there was no conclusive evidence that athletics does build character (Stevenson, 1975; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; and Sage, 1998). This investigation sought the perspective of coaches, athletic administrators, and presidents and senior administrators regarding the impact of athletics upon student-athlete character development. As a result certain beliefs, values, and behaviors were identified as affecting the character building effect of intercollegiate athletics.

The five research questions developed to guide the study sought to yield specific information about the perceived impact of intercollegiate athletics upon student-athlete character. I desired to explore the degree of consistency between types of respondents because athletics and its teams have often been viewed as disconnected from the general institution. The research questions and related responses are summarized in the pages that



follow. The results of the additional content areas were discussed, as well as participant data.

## CONCLUSIONS

### *Character Development*

#### Research Question 1

1. Among coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators - does student participation in intercollegiate athletics build character?

Shields and Bredemeier (1995) and Sage (1998) support the sentiment of Stevenson (1975, 1985) that empirical research has provided little to no information regarding the psychosocial effects of sport participation. Despite this finding in the literature, it was reported among all participants (by position and division level) that athletics presents at least an opportunity or possibility to build character in student-athletes. Many (63%) participants stood firmly behind their belief that athletics does build character.

The responses gathered regarding the defining of “character” displayed that these definitions were based upon subjective experience(s) related to each participant’s own life events or occurrences. Personal subjectivity characterized in the responses of nearly all participants, which would likely be true at other institutions. Accordingly, there were nearly as many unique responses about the definition of “character” as there were participants. Overall there was a shared belief that student participation in intercollegiate athletics has the potential to build character. None of the participating institutions used a standard or comparative measure to assess the impact of intercollegiate athletics upon

character. Also, for most participants “character” was thought of in a positive light. Character was seldom discussed as being negative or as producing a negative outcome.

### Research Questions 2 and 3

2. What do coaches, athletic directors, and institutional administrators perceive to be the essential elements/components needed in order to develop character in student-athletes? [Informally or Formally; Advertently or Inadvertently]
3. By position - what, if any, differences are found in the perceptions and beliefs of presidents/senior administrators, athletic directors, and head coaches regarding how character is best developed in student-athletes?

Research Question 2 was designed to obtain comparative information regarding the knowledge of participants about key elements needed to build character. The theoretical model of cognitive moral development shows that certain key factors need to be in place to create the greatest likelihood of developing character (Bredemeier & Shields, 1985; Gilligan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1981; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999; Piaget, 1932; Stoll & Beller, 1998). These factors are a moral education, moral role models, and a moral environment (Lumpkin et al., 1999; Stoll & Beller, 1998). No individual participants identified each of the essential factors spelled out in the literature.

Of particular importance was the differentiation of key factors by the participating coaches, athletic directors, and senior administrators. No participant group seemed to possess a clear knowledge and understanding of the empirically-based elements needed for developing character in student-athletes.

In a comparison of the key elements from the literature against the perceptions reported during this study *role modeling* was mentioned by slightly over forty percent

(42%) of the sample. Supplying a sufficient *environment* was reported by 12% of the sample, while the *teaching* of character was stated by only 3% of the sample. Based on this information there is a disparity between the literature and what is understood amongst the present group of coaches, athletic directors, presidents and senior administrators. This disparity or gap in knowledge is a potential area of concern.

“Athletics is educational [character building] for the student participants” (Gerdy, 1997, p. 33-34). If such boasted claims of athletics’ educational benefit to student participants continue to go unfulfilled intercollegiate athletics will likely damage the culture and values of higher education. Institutional policy to support actions of chief institutional administrators should make certain that true alignment between the institution and athletics is fully realized. If not, is college athletics then destined to move ever closer to the semi-pro status?

Research Question 3 was designed to determine consistency across positions identifying the key elements. Among all Presidents and Senior Administrators, 4 of 6 identified *role modeling* as a key element in building character. Six of seven Revenue Coaches reported that the *setting of expectations* was a key element, while Non-Revenue Coaches (8 of 16) reported *role modeling* as a key element linked to best developing character. Athletic Directors differed in their beliefs about what builds character. There was a small level of agreement between two position groups (Presidents/Senior Administrators and Non-Revenue Coaches) that reported *role modeling* as a key element in building character.

No participant or a position group collectively stated all three of the key factors identified in the literature, nor was any major level of consensus arrived at between

groups. This lack of consensus and shared view, as well as lack of understanding, may adversely affect the ability of athletics to impact character development.

#### Research Questions 4 and 5

4. Are there differences, by position, between presidents/senior administrators, athletic directors, and head coaches regarding their perceptions, values, and beliefs in relation to the impact athletics has upon a student-athlete's character development?
5. Are there differences between Division levels regarding the impact of athletics upon student-athlete character development?

Research Questions 4 and 5 were designed to determine the consistency between positions and across division levels regarding the perceived impact athletics have upon student-athlete character. There was a high level of consensus across all positions and division levels in the belief that athletics has the ability to build character. There was also some degree of agreement between position groups (Presidents/Senior Administrators and Non-Revenue Coaches) that *role modeling* was a key element in building character. Definitions of character, however, varied substantially by role group. Revenue Coaches (4 of 7) defined "character" as being *who you are when people aren't looking*. Presidents and Senior Administrators (4 of 6) related character to a presence of *moral values*. Athletic Directors (3 of 4) associated an individual's *behavior and conduct* as character. Non-Revenue Coaches did not develop major consensus as a group for a common definition of character.

The identification of "all" at the institution as holding a level of responsibility for addressing the issue of character development for the body of intercollegiate athletes was

somewhat surprising. Although I expected some portion to identify character development as a responsibility for all at the institution, 75% (25 of 33) was a higher than expected percentage. All Presidents and Senior Administrators (6 of 6) held “all” at the institution responsible for impacting student-athlete character. Two of the four Athletic Directors reported that “all” at the institution were responsible. Among Revenue Coaches six of seven believed that “all” at the institution were responsible. Sixty-eight percent of all Non-Revenue Coaches reported that character development was a responsibility of everyone at the institution.

Results contradicted the conventional wisdom that all matters involving a student-athlete are only the concern of those in athletics, and particularly of the head coach. A majority of the sample designated everyone on the college campus as having a part to play in developing the character of student-athletes. However, each coach seemed to be aware of his or her primary role and responsibility in impacting the character of student-athletes.

Contrary to expectations only one-quarter (8 out of 33) of respondents mentioned the role of parents and family in the character development of the student-athlete. Half of these respondents were Division I and III Revenue Coaches. When asked to list those responsible for addressing the character development of student-athletes, none of the Presidents/Senior Administration mentioned the role of parents/family.

When asked to recall all in their lives who had an impact on their philosophy of character development, 57.5% (19 of 33) of respondents reported that parents/family played an important role. Table 11 displays the number of respondents that identified parents/family as influences on current character development philosophy. In contrast,

only 24% (8 of 33) of respondents listed parents/family as being responsible for student-athlete character development. Table 12 (below) displays participant responses when they were asked to list all who are responsible for the character development of intercollegiate student-athletes.

Table 11

Parents/Family Influence on Current Philosophy By Position and Division Level

<b>Position</b>	<b>Division III</b>	<b>Division I</b>
Coaches	6 of 12	7 of 11
Athletic Directors	1 of 2	2 of 2
Institutional Administrators	2 of 3	1 of 3

Table 12

Parents/Family Perceived As Being Responsible for Character By Position and Division Level

<b>Position</b>	<b>Division III</b>	<b>Division I</b>
Coaches	2 of 12	5 of 11
Athletic Directors	1 of 2	0 of 2
Institutional Administrators	0 of 3	0 of 3

Although the lack of a clearly understood and accepted definition of “character” among participants was anticipated, it also presented a sense of confusion. It appears that all who are in a position to impact the character development of student-athletes are working toward potentially separate and different endpoints and outcomes. As a result, their efforts may not be as effective as a collective approach that is well planned and

understood by each member involved with athletics and the character development of student-athletes.

Some firmly believe that colleges and universities should remain neutral and objective on the topic of character development. This tenet is virtually impossible to accomplish. Higher education institutions, like other organizations, could never be neutral since it reflects and promotes the culture of which it is a part (Masland, 1986; Schein, 1994).

Intercollegiate athletics presents an opportunity to promote college student development and values (Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1999). Values such as teamwork, cooperation, and self-discipline are developed through athletic participation (Independent Investigate Commission, 2004). However, attempts to define character remain one of the most challenging and significant concerns for those studying it (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). This issue was evident in the findings of this research.

### *Organizational Culture*

As Masland (1986) describes, organizational culture is a powerful force that serves to control the behavior of those within the organization. An organization's culture influences what is done, how it is done, and who is involved in doing it (Schein, 1992; Tierney, 1988). This phenomenon would seem quite significant to (intercollegiate) athletics' intended purpose of developing character in the student-athlete population. From the position of an observer, organizational culture would appear to play a role in the effective establishment and communication of institutional values and the process of developing character. Although there are multiple lenses to analyze an organization's culture only a few were selected for this study. The organizational culture concepts

reviewed here were leadership, environment, socialization, and mission (Chaffee, 1988; Tierney, 1988). Tierney (1988) points out that the culture of higher education varies by institution and that no two institutions are identical.

The acknowledgement and recognition of culture by the sample population often became part of the discussion during interviews. One participant explained, “Our department has a culture. Our coaching staff has a culture. And every institution is different. You can’t have these kinds of things that go on in Colorado and not think that it hadn’t been going on for years. It’s the culture. And so there’s no doubt in my mind that we influence character.”

It cannot be overstated how complex organizational culture can be, both in nature and design (Schein, 1992). The culture of athletics, like most departmental cultures on college campuses, is often found to be intertwined with various aspects of the institution. Culture seems to have many faces within an institution, and yet each culture that is identified appears to overlap and cross paths at some juncture within the institution.

### *Leadership*

This section focuses on gaining greater insight into the expectations that participants hold of leadership, the identification of leadership, and the formal or informal nature of the identified leaders of the organization (Tierney, 1988). The identification and nature of leadership was formal and flowed more so from the hierarchical structure established within athletics and from each institution. The expected role and responsibilities of presidents and athletic directors was fairly consistent across division levels. Presidents were expected to oversee the program, set the standard or expectation of the athletic program, and to be a role model for all at the institution. Most recognized



busy schedules limited the direct interaction of the presidents with the student-athletes. Even limited interactions, though, could be very beneficial and important for the students. Athletic directors were seen as the daily managers of the athletics program. They were expected to direct the program with set goals and outcomes. Athletic directors tended to be looked upon to put departmental policies into effect, and model appropriate conduct. All respondents agreed that character development should be of concern for all of the leadership positions related to intercollegiate athletics.

### *Environment*

The environment encompasses the present state and condition of the institution. It includes consideration of the present student population, finances, as well as the school's present relationship and positioning with the campus, local, and national communities (Tierney, 1988).

During the time of the interview process the state of Michigan's higher education institutions were experiencing significant budgetary cuts. This financial situation would likely impact perceptions, and may also provide a backdrop in understanding why resource shortfalls were pointed out as an external factor affecting head coaches. These limitations in funds and resources were expressed to a greater degree by Division III participants who have nearly all of their funding for athletics tied into the budget of the institution.

Some Division I Non-Revenue Coaches and one of its administrators mentioned a lack of resources and budget concerns as an external factor for coaches as well. These respondents were from an institution where the central administration provided substantial subsidies to the athletic program. Revenue coaches from Division I

institutions were more likely to mention fundraising rather than budget constraints. Oftentimes fundraising takes away from the time and focus that would be spent with sport-related activities and preparation.

Some Division I administrators pointed out that an increase in rules and regulations of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), and the expectations and perceptions of the public were also important external factors. Student-athlete welfare was reported at both division levels as an important external factor. Respondents in leadership roles had a reasonable idea of the external factors that coaches felt affected their jobs. However, athletic directors and presidents could work to improve their knowledge of key external influences such as recruiting. Recruiting was a top external factor among coaches yet was hardly mentioned by administrators. This lack of communication is problematic considering the national scandal and investigation involving the University of Colorado that centered on major recruiting violations. As a result of the findings at the University of Colorado the NCAA enacted legislation and policy to safeguard against similar infractions. Administrators that stay in tune with the external factors affecting coaches can work to prevent such factors from reaching such intense levels.

Most Division III and Division I respondents believed that the collegiate setting offered opportunities for growth and development for students. Participants also reported that the college years were a period of growth and development. Respondent knowledge, which was likely developed by years of experience, contributes to an ability to observe the potential cause and effect of various situations met by student-athletes on the college

campus. Participants seemed to understand that they could either play an aggressive or a passive role in the development of the student-athlete.

Participants' perceptions of how athletics was viewed by the home institution ranged from *supportive* to *mixed* to *misunderstood*. Respondents from each position group at both division levels experienced this type of varied opinions. Reported feelings of support were nearly equal by division level with 11 of 16 Division I respondents and 13 of 17 Division III respondents expressing positive perceptions. A variable exclusively mentioned among Division III institutions was the recognition of athletics' contribution to enrollment totals of both Mountain and Center colleges. Some respondents identified this situation as likely enhancing the perception of athletics and even improved relations between the institution and athletics. Athletics is a considerable recruiting tool at both Division III institutions.

### *Socialization*

The most common characteristic reported by Division III participants tied success to one's work ethic and an ability to work hard. In contrast, Division I respondents did not report this consistently.

This portion of the study brought to light that each coach believed and held certain personal traits and characteristics higher than they do others. Socialization is the key to successfully fitting in with a group (Morgan, 1997). As members of an organization, individual behavior is often molded and even modified to "fit in". As a result, each coach will likely base his/her system of rewards and benefits based upon the display of the desired traits. Such a system establishes a clearer understanding as to what one must do in order achieve a certain level of fit. Socialization will likely reflect the

culture of the institution, the department, and each respective team. Providing this knowledge and information to those involved with athletics might increase opportunities for student-athletes to align their behavior with the advisement they receive.

The general inconsistency found among this group of research participants did not provide specific information concerning the topic of socialization and student-athletes. This finding does not mean that socialization is not occurring. This may reflect the various sub-groups and the values of each sub-group along the sub-group criteria for success in the athletic and academic environment (Schein, 1992; 2004).

### *Mission*

The disclosed intent (mission) of the institution outlines an underlying principle, as well as the criteria, for the development of a high quality curricular program (Duderstadt & Womack, 2003; Tierney, 1988). A standard of measurement for evaluating organizational effectiveness is often the mission. With the exception of one institution in the study there was not a high level of consensus within institutions concerning the institutional mission. Division III institutions found greater accuracy and consensus than the broader descriptions of the mission found at the participating Division I schools. Overall, this finding was rather disappointing and troubling since each member of the institution is expected to operate in alignment with their respective institutional mission, along with its goals and objectives. The lack of awareness of the athletic mission was just as troubling.

The mission of any institution is in many respects the beginning of a contractual agreement. The institution in essence is saying that “this is what we are going to do, or this is what we are willing to provide to each and every student.” It becomes a tool to

evaluate the level and degree of success the institution is achieving with regards to its consumers (students). The same can be said of the mission of an athletic program. In either instance the knowledge and/or understanding of both missions could be improved among most participants. If the mission is not known, then the opportunity to drift and “do one’s own thing” exists, and that can lead to undesirable outcomes, and can also impact productivity and organizational effectiveness.

Intercollegiate athletics in general, and more specifically Division I athletics, often serve as the public’s first engagement with the institution. Often this connection becomes part of the unspoken mission of an athletics program. As Gerdy (1997) notes, athletics generate revenue, visibility, and prestige for the university. This is the first purpose given for maintaining collegiate athletics upon a college campus. This visibility often occurs on the grandest of stages and creates opportunities for such ambassadorships to develop.

#### Limitations of the Research

A limitation of this study is the sample size of the population from which the sample was drawn. The samples were drawn from a single state. Although the response rate was very high, it is still not a wide enough sample to even consider generalizing the data that were obtained.

The researcher selected multiple sites to study in an effort to gain greater insight regarding the topic. There are advantages and disadvantages of selecting multiple sites:  
Advantages:

- a) A comparative type of study can be conducted in which many sites are compared for similarities and differences.

b) One is more likely to be able to move in a direction of generalization with the results from multiple sites than from a single site.

Disadvantage:

a) The depth of analysis will likely have to be sacrificed because of the breadth of the analysis that must occur.

### Implications for Research

The results of this study reveal a few unanswered questions for future research. To better create positive and desirable outcomes the following research questions were developed.

1. What are faculty and staff perceptions, attitudes, and opinions regarding intercollegiate athletics at their institution? Additionally, does athletics build character?
2. What are the views of institutional faculty regarding student-athlete character development? In particular, do they consider character development to be the responsibility of everyone at the institution?
3. Among faculty and staff what is the general understanding and articulation of the institutional mission, and the mission of athletics?
4. Within various departments or units, among faculty and staff what is the general understanding and articulation of the departmental and/or unit mission?
5. Among faculty and staff is there knowledge of the key elements needed to enhance character in students?
6. Do faculty and staff make an attempt to impact character? Why or why not?
7. What are the external factors that impact the role of faculty?

## Recommendations for Higher Education Institutions

*Character Development.* It was clear that athletic participation was believed to have an opportunity to create an impact, either positive or negative, for the student-athlete. If the development of character is an important dynamic of the college student experience, then institutional leaders must make a concentrated effort to develop and establish a definition and/or set of terms to bring understanding to the term “character”. This step can be achieved through sampling individuals across the institution to develop consensus. Or the Board of the institution can set out to develop an understanding of what is meant by the term “character”. It is important that efforts are initiated from the bottom and fully supported at the highest levels.

It should also be recognized that independent attempts to define character will likely result in continued ambiguity. This ambiguity is considered quite common when addressing a term so laden with subjective perceptions (Boxhill, 2003; Lumpkin et al., 1999; Sage, 1998; Schwartz, 2000; Shields & Bredemeier, 1985). Institutions may wish to include, along with specific definition, a list of particular behaviors and characteristics to be identified in coaches, administrators, faculty, and staff. In addition, a systematic internal cultural assessment can be conducted in order to ensure that opportunities to review and discuss the level of consensus (or lack thereof) found within each respective unit.

With the aforementioned established, the following recommendations were developed to best develop character in student-athletes. These recommendations are borrowed in part from the Independent Investigative Commission and its 2004 report on

the University of Colorado. None of the participating institutions experienced any issues similar to those at the University of Colorado.

**1. Require every intercollegiate athletics coach to attend at least one character development program each year.**

Coaches are in a position to influence student-athlete behavior. Coaches are engaged in character building activities and situations, both on and off the field. Some may not recognize the “teachable moments” that arise on a daily basis and such a program can assist greatly. Coaches can assist student-athletes in solidifying their morals and values. Coaches should be provided with on-going training that will be organized through a local organization not affiliated with the institution. Such training would also establish the coaches unique role in the character development process of student-athletes.

**2. Create a handbook for coaches and athletic department personnel.**

A resources book should be developed for all coaches and athletic department personnel that provides critical information on the essential elements that are necessary to best develop character in student-athletes. A “how to” section will be included with tips and suggestions for maximizing virtually all situations that might arise during athletics participation. Also detail responsibilities of department personnel with limited opportunities to affect character, and methods to assess efforts within the department. This would work to improve communication between coaches and student-athletes and can make the Department more responsive to the needs of student-athletes.

**3. Revise all student-athlete handbooks.**

Most athletic departments have handbooks for student-athletes. Revisions should be made to add a section detailing student-athlete character development for every sport. Content should be developed that discusses the process, expectations of the student, and what they should expect from coaches and athletic personnel. The handbook should also explain the department’s character development initiative, its objectives and anticipated short-term and long-term benefits. Students should also be provided with a list of contact information for key athletics personnel for questions. A



statement regarding strict confidentiality if students so desire to keep their comments personal.

### *Organizational Culture*

1. Institutional leaders should seek to establish clear and operational pathways between athletics and the institution. It must be brought to light the service and benefit of athletics to academia whenever possible. There is valuable knowledge to be exchanged through collaboration and partnerships with other departments on campus. This will serve to benefit the student-athlete and enhance the support of athletics, while building the collegiality of the campus.
2. As the life-blood of every academic institution, it is critical that the institutional mission be clearly understood by every employed member of the institution. It is the core and foundation upon which every other action at the institution has developed. If this does not occur the corresponding goals and objectives are only ink on paper. Ultimately, it is the responsibility of leadership to promote the mission, but each employee must take ownership and be comfortable in their knowledge of the mission. The same can be said of each departmental mission.
3. Institutional control and accountability should be clearly established and maintained. Leadership must move swiftly to correct wrongs and improve deficiencies as it relates to student-athlete character development.

### *Student-Athlete Development*

In order to most effectively address the development needs of collegiate student-athletes the student-athlete experience must be recognized as a set of unique challenges that differ from the general student population. Parham (1993) lists these challenges as learning to balance academics and athletics, adjusting to a degree of isolation, managing

success or failure, managing satisfying multiple relationships, being more cognizant of their physical health, and termination of an athletic career.

In addition, an awareness and understanding of specific strategies must be developed and then implemented in order to have the greatest impact upon members of this unique population. As a result, attention must be properly given to the consequences that will likely affect the various role groups interacting with student-athletes. Each one must actively put into practice and become engaged in these strategies as they all aim to impact the “total” development of the student-athlete.

## **APPENDICES**

## [APPENDIX A]

### Interview Questions

Questions are numbered in the order that they were asked during the interview.

#### **A. Mission**

1. What do you understand to be the mission of the University?
2. What is the mission of the athletics department?
3. In what ways do you see the institutional mission articulated in athletics?

#### **C. Environment**

- 4a. What are the external factors that impact your role as a head coach at this institution?  
Please explain.
- b. What are the external factors that impact the role of a head coach at this institution?
5. What do you perceive to be the university's attitude toward athletics?
6. How does the university setting impact student character development?

#### **D. Character Development**

7. How do you define character?
8. Based upon your experience, does student participation in intercollegiate athletics build character? Explain. (If not, can it build character? Explain)
9. What essential elements/components must be provided or must be present in order to develop character in student-athletes?  
(Elements = Moral Education/Moral Role Model/Moral Environment)
10. Can you list all who you perceive as responsible for addressing the issue of character development among intercollegiate student-athletes?
13. Do you make a specific attempt to address character development among student-athletes?
14. Reflecting upon your background and experiences (both professionally and personally) what and/or who has influenced your current philosophy on student-athlete character development?

#### **E. Leadership**

11. What role do presidents/athletic directors/coaches play in the building of character among student-athletes?
12. Should character development be of concern for those heading intercollegiate athletics at the institutional level (Athletic Directors and Presidents)?

#### **B. Socialization**

15. What does a student-athlete need to know in order to survive/excel as an athlete, as a student, and also following their undergraduate experience?

#### **Additional**

16. Do you have a CHAMPS Life Skills Program?  
How effectively does it address the issue of character development?

[APPENDIX B]

Dear Coach \_\_\_\_\_

You are invited to participate in a study of character development related to intercollegiate athletes by Earnest M. Fingers, MA. The intent of this study is to gain a better understanding of how coaches involved with intercollegiate athletics contribute to the enhancement of character for student-athletes.

This study entails an oral interview that should take approximately 35 minutes to conduct. The interview consists of five general areas. In order to gather sufficient data I am scheduling to interview other coaches of the \_\_\_\_\_ Athletic program, as well as your Director of Athletics, and your President. It will be most beneficial to have all three groups to participate.

The anticipated benefit of your participation in this study is that the results will inform coaches, athletic directors and university administrators about enhancing the development of character of student-athletes. I do not anticipate any risks to you for participating in the interview.

All information collected in connection with this study will be kept strictly confidential. Code numbers will be assigned to all information for tracking purposes. At the conclusion the coding information will be destroyed. Michigan State University's Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects approved this study's protocol (IRB#:04-595). Data will be reported in aggregate form and no personally identifiable information will be revealed, including the name of your institution or sport.

Obtaining high participation rates is vital to meaningful research; therefore, I hope you will empathize with my position and elect to participate so that any results will be useful to you and others involved in intercollegiate athletics. As stated, the President and Director of Athletics have elected to participate. Please expect a follow-up phone call within the next 5 days.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please send your name and address to Earnest M. Fingers at [fingerse@msu.edu](mailto:fingerse@msu.edu). If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at (517) 410 4805 or via email. Thank you for your much needed assistance.

Sincerely,

Earnest M. Fingers  
Doctoral Candidate, Education Administration

[APPENDIX C]

Dear AD \_\_\_\_\_

In following up with my phone call/email, you are invited to participate in a study of character development related to intercollegiate athletes by Earnest M. Fingers, MA. The intent of this study is to gain a better understanding of how intercollegiate athletics contributes to the enhancement of character for its student-athletes.

This study entails a brief oral interview that should take approximately 35 minutes to conduct. The interview consists of six general questions and a small number of more specific follow-up questions. In order to gather sufficient data I am attempting to also interview coaches, and the President of \_\_\_\_\_ University. It will be most beneficial to have all three groups to participate.

The anticipated benefit of your participation in this study is that the results will inform coaches, athletic directors and university administrators about enhancing the development of character of student-athletes. I do not anticipate any risks to you for participating in the interview.

All information collected in connection with this study will be kept strictly confidential. Code numbers will be assigned to all information for tracking purposes. At the conclusion the coding information will be destroyed. Michigan State University's Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects approved this study's protocol (IRB#:04-595). Data will be reported in aggregate form and no personally identifiable information will be revealed.

Obtaining high participation rates are vital to meaningful research; therefore, I hope you will empathize with my position and elect to participate so that any results will be useful to yourself and others involved in intercollegiate athletics. Please expect a follow-up phone call within the next 5 days.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please send your name and address to Earnest M. Fingers at [fingerse@msu.edu](mailto:fingerse@msu.edu). If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at 517 410 4805 or via email. Thank you for your much needed assistance.

Sincerely,

Earnest M. Fingers  
Doctoral Candidate, Education Administration

[APPENDIX D]

Dear President \_\_\_\_\_

In following up with my phone call/email, you are invited to participate in a study of character development related to intercollegiate athletes by Earnest M. Fingers, MA. The intent of this study is to gain a better understanding of how intercollegiate athletics contributes to the enhancement of character for its student-athletes.

This study entails a brief oral interview that should take approximately 25 to 30 minutes to conduct. The interview consists of six general questions and a small number of more specific follow-up questions. In order to gather sufficient data I am attempting to also interview coaches of the \_\_\_\_\_ Athletic program, as well as the present Director of Athletics. It will be most beneficial to have all three groups to participate.

The anticipated benefit of your participation in this study is that the results will inform coaches, athletic directors and university administrators about enhancing the development of character of student-athletes. I do not anticipate any risks to you for participating in the interview.

All information collected in connection with this study will be kept strictly confidential. Code numbers will be assigned to all information for tracking purposes. At the conclusion the coding information will be destroyed. Michigan State University's Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects approved this study's protocol (IRB#:04-595). Data will be reported in aggregate form and no personally identifiable information will be revealed.

Obtaining high participation rates are vital to meaningful research; therefore, I hope you will empathize with my position and elect to participate so that any results will be useful to yourself and others involved in intercollegiate athletics. Please expect a follow-up phone call within the next 5 days.

If you would like a summary of the results of this study, please send your name and address to Earnest M. Fingers at [fingerse@msu.edu](mailto:fingerse@msu.edu). If you have any questions or comments please feel free to contact me at 517 410 4805 or via email. Thank you for your much needed assistance.

Sincerely,

Earnest M. Fingers  
Doctoral Candidate, Education Administration

[APPENDIX F]

Coaches Interview

Sport \_\_\_\_\_

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_

2. Gender \_\_\_\_\_

3. Are you a former collegiate athlete? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ Div. I II III (Circle one)

4. # of Years at present Institution \_\_\_\_\_ # years as current Head Coach \_\_\_\_\_

Total # of years as a Head Coach Collegiate \_\_\_\_\_ H.S. \_\_\_\_\_

# of years as a collegiate Asst. Coach \_\_\_\_\_  
(Including other institutions?)

5. What is your academic background?

	Area of Study	Institution
Bachelor's	_____	_____
Master's	_____	_____
Terminal	_____	_____

6. Have you held a role within athletics besides coaching?

If so, what is/was it? \_\_\_\_\_

For how long? \_\_\_\_\_

7. Are/were other non-coaching positions held at present institution? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



[APPENDIX G]

Director of Athletics Interview

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender \_\_\_\_\_
3. # of Years in present position \_\_\_\_\_
4. Are you a former collegiate athlete? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)
5. Are you a former collegiate coach? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_ // Head \_\_\_ Asst. \_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)

6. What is your academic background?

	Area of Study	Institution
Bachelor's	_____	_____
Master's	_____	_____
Terminal	_____	_____

6. How long have you been employed at this present institution? \_\_\_\_\_ years

What are/were other positions held at present institution? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. How many years have you been employed in a college or university athletic department position? (At any institution?) \_\_\_\_\_ years
8. Do you have the ability to make all personnel decisions regarding athletics?  
Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_

Who do you report in the present organizational structure? \_\_\_\_\_

[APPENDIX H]

Institutional Administrator Interview

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender \_\_\_\_\_
3. # of Years in present position \_\_\_\_\_
4. Are you a former collegiate athlete? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)
5. Are you a former collegiate coach? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)
6. What is your academic background?

Area of Study	Institution
Bachelor's _____	_____
Master's _____	_____
Terminal _____	_____
7. How long have you been employed at this present institution? \_\_\_\_\_ years  
Were any other positions held at your present institution? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Have you been employed in a college or university athletic department position?  
If yes, how long were you employed? \_\_\_\_\_ years  
At what divisional level? \_\_\_\_\_  
What was the position(s) held? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

[APPENDIX I]

Institutional President Interview

1. Age \_\_\_\_\_
2. Gender \_\_\_\_\_
3. # of Years in present position \_\_\_\_\_
4. Are you a former collegiate athlete? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)
5. Are you a former collegiate coach? Yes\_\_\_ No\_\_\_  
Div. I II III (Circle one)
6. What is your academic background?

Area of Study	Institution
Bachelor's _____	_____
Master's _____	_____
Terminal _____	_____
7. How long have you been employed at this present institution? \_\_\_\_\_ years  
Were any other positions held at your present institution? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. Have you been employed in a college or university athletic department position?  
If yes, how long were you employed? \_\_\_\_\_ years  
At what divisional level? \_\_\_\_\_  
What was the position(s) held? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Consent Form

Character Development and Intercollegiate Athletics:  
An Analysis of the Perceptions, Roles, Values and Behaviors of Collegiate Coaches,  
Athletic Directors, and Presidents as Related to Student-Athlete Development

You are being invited to participate in a study. I am Earnie, a doctoral student at Michigan State University, and I am greatly interested in the field of intercollegiate athletics. My doctoral program requires that I gain applied experience in designing and conducting research. As such, I have designed a research project to study the impact coaches have upon student-athlete character development.

During this study, you will be asked to participate in an interview. The interview questions will seek to gather your perceptions related to your personal and professional experiences regarding student-athletes and the institution. You will also be asked for some demographic information (gender, age, etc). Your participation will require approximately 35 minutes of your time. There are no known harms associated with your participation in this research.

Your confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study and you will not be identifiable in the research write-up and discussion. The results from this study will be reported in a written research report. Information about the project will not be made public in any way that identifies individual participants or institutions. Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law.

Participation is completely voluntary. It may be discontinued at any time for any reason without explanation and without penalty. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a study participant, or are dissatisfied at any time with any aspect of this study, you may contact - anonymously, if you wish - Peter Vasilenko, Ph.D., Chair of the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS) by phone: (517) 355-2180, fax: (517) 432-4503, email address: [ucrihs@msu.edu](mailto:ucrihs@msu.edu), or regular mail: 202 Olds Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824.

I have read the above information, understand the information read, and understand that I can ask questions or withdraw at any time. If you have any questions about this study, please contact the investigator (Earnie M. Fingers, xxxxx-, Lansing, MI 489--, [fingerse@msu.edu](mailto:fingerse@msu.edu), (517) 410-XXXX).

I voluntarily consent to participate in the research study.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Participant's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Investigator's signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

I also grant permission to be audiotaped? \_\_\_\_\_ (Initials)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

[http://www.lesley.edu/library/guides/citation/apa\\_basic.html](http://www.lesley.edu/library/guides/citation/apa_basic.html)

- Adler, P. & Adler, P. (1990). *Backboards and blackboards: College athletes and role engulfment*. NY: Columbia University Press.
- Adler, P. & Adler, P. (1998). *Intense Loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics*. In Van Maanen, J. (Ed.), *Qualitative studies of organizations: The administrative science quarterly series in organization theory and behavior*.
- Altbach, P. (1997). *Contemporary Higher Education: College Student Development and Academic Life*. Garland Publishing, Inc. New York.
- Andre, J. & James, D. (1991). *Rethinking college athletics*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Bailey, W. & Littleton, T. (1991). *Athletics and academe: An anatomy of abuses and a prescription for reform*. NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Barefield, S., McCallister, S., Bungum, T., Pate, R. et al. (1997). Sociocultural aspects of physical activity. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. Vol. 68, Iss. 1; pg A111.
- Beller, J. & Stoll, S. (1992, Spring). A moral reasoning intervention program for Division I athletes. *Academic Athletic Journal*, 43-57.
- Beller, J. & Stoll, S. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student-athletes and general students: Empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*. 7(4) Nov. p.352-63.
- Bennett, J. & Peltason, J. (1985). *Contemporary issues in higher education: Self-regulation and the ethical roles of the academy*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Berg, B. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. 4<sup>th</sup> Ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Boggan, D. (1999). Student-athlete welfare or "welfare"? In S. Robinson (Ed.), Gaining the competitive edge: Enriching the collegiate experience of the new student-athlete. Monograph Series No. 27 (pp. 41-46). The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition. The University of South Carolina.
- Bok, D. (1982). *Beyond the ivory tower: Social responsibilities of the modern university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Boxhill, J.(Ed.) (2003). Sports ethics: An anthology. MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Bredemeier, B. & Shields, D. (1986). Moral growth among athletes and nonathletes: A comparative analysis. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 147, (1), 7-18.
- Brewer, B. W., Van Raalte, J. L., Petitpas, A. J., Bachman, A. D., & Weinhold, R. A. (1998). Newspaper portrayals of sport psychology in the United States, 1985-1993. The Sport Psychologist, 12, 89-94.
- Brooks, D. D., Etzel, E. F., & Ostrow, A. C. (1987). Job responsibilities and backgrounds of NCAA Division I athletic advisors and counselors. The Sport Psychologist, 1, 201-207.
- Broughton, E. (2001, March). Counseling and support services for college student athletes. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American College Personnel Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 449 460).
- Carr, C. & Bauman, N. Life skills for collegiate student-athletes. In: Etzel EF, Ferrante AP, Pinkney JW. , editors. Counseling College Student-Athletes: Issues and Interventions. 2nd ed. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Info Tech Inc; 1996. pp. 247–308.
- Chaffee, E., & Tierney, W. (1988). Collegiate culture and leadership strategies. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Chu, D. (1989). The character of American higher education and intercollegiate sport. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, Albany.
- Chu, D., Segrave, J & Becker, B. (1985). Sport and higher education. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Clifford, C & Feezell, R. (1997). Coaching for Character. Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc.
- Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., & Earley, P. (Eds.) (2001). The international handbook of organizational culture and climate New York: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Dalton, J. (1997). Five educational approaches for promoting character development and civic responsibility. The Educational Record. Vol. 78, Iss. 3-4; pg. 53.
- Danish, S. J., Petitpas, A., & Hale, B. D. (1995). Psychological interventions: A life development model. In S. H. Murphy (Ed.), *Sport psychology interventions*. Champaign, IL: Human kinetics.

- Dempsey, C. (2002). President to President: The Will To Act Project. National Collegiate Athletic Association, Indianapolis, IN.  
[http://www.ncaa.org/library/membership/will\\_to\\_act/willToAct.pdf](http://www.ncaa.org/library/membership/will_to_act/willToAct.pdf).
- Duderstadt, J. (2000). Intercollegiate athletics and the american university. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Duderstadt, J. & Woack, F. (2003). Beyond the Crossroads: The Future of the Public University in America. The Johns Hopkins University Press. Baltimore
- Eastman & Beaudine. Broad range of talents required for today's athletics directors. NCAA News, 4 November 1994, Vol. 1, Iss. 13.
- Eddy, E. (1959). The college influence on student character. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Etzel, E. (1989). Life stress, locus-of-control and sport competition anxiety patterns of college student-athletes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Etzel, E. F., Ferrante, A. P., & Pinkney, J. W. (Eds.). (1991). Counseling college student athletes: Issues and interventions. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Etzel, E. F., Ferrante, A. P., Pinkney, J. W. Counseling College Student-Athletes: Issues and Interventions. 2nd ed. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Info Tech Inc; 1996. pp. 3–26.
- Etzel, E. F., Pinkney, J. W., & Hinkle, J. S. (1994). College student- athletes and needs assessment. In C.C. Thomas (Ed.), Multicultural needs assessment for college and university student populations. Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.
- Ewing, M. (1999). Sports can benefit children. In Egendorf, L. (Ed.), Sports and Athletes: Opposing viewpoints. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.
- Ferrante, A. P., & Etzel, E., & Lantz, C. (1996). Counseling college student-athletes: The problem, the need. In E. Etzel, A. P. Ferrante, & J. W. Pinkney (Eds.), Counseling college student-athletes: Issues and interventions. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Frey, J. (1982). The governance of intercollegiate athletics (Ed.). West Point, NY: Leisure Press.
- Gibson, John H. (1993). Performance Versus Results: A Critique of Values in Contemporary Sport. State University of New York Press, Albany.

- Garrod, A. (1993). Approaches to Moral Development – New Research and Emerging Themes. Teachers College Press. New York.
- Gerdy, J. (1997). The successful college athletic program: The new standard. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Harris, M (1993). Developmental Benefits of Athletics. In W. Kirk & S. Kirk (Eds.), Student Athletes: Shattering the myths & sharing the realities. (pp. 3-11). Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.
- Hersh, R. (1999). Generating ideals and transforming lives: A contemporary case for the residential liberal arts college. *Damedalus*. Vol. 128, Iss. 1; pg. 173.
- Hinkle, J. S. (1994). Practitioners and cross-cultural assessment: A practical guide to information and training. Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 27, 103-115.
- Humphrey, J., Yow, D. & Bowden, W. (2000). Stress in college athletics: Causes, consequences, coping. New York: The Haworth Half-Court Press.
- Hultman, K. & Gellerman (2002). Balancing individual and organizational values: Walking the tightrope to success. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer.
- Independent Investigative Commission. (2004). Examining the university of colorado's athletic recruitment practices: Final report to the university of Colorado board of regents.
- Jones, C. & McNamee, M. (2003). Moral development and sport: Character and cognitive developmentalism contrasted. Boxhill, J.(Ed.), Sports ethics: An anthology (pp. 40-52). MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- King, P. (1997). Character and civic education: What does it take? The Educational Record. Vol. 78, Iss 3-4; pg. 87.
- Kirk, D. & Kirk, S (1993). Student Athletes: Shattering the Myths and Sharing the Realities. American Counseling Association. VA
- Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2001). A call to action: reconnecting college sports and higher education.
- Knowles, R. & McLean, G. (1986). Psychological foundations of moral education and character development: An integrated theory of moral development. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. New York: Harper and Row.



- Kuh, G. (Summer 1998). Shaping student character. Liberal Educator. Vol. 84, Iss. 3; pg. 18.
- Lind, G., Hartmann, H. & Wakenhut, R. (1985). Moral development and the social environment: Studies in the philosophy and psychology of moral judgment and education (Ed.). Chicago, IL: Precedent Publishing, Inc.
- Linder, D., Pillow, D., Reno, R. (1989). Shrinking jocks: Derogation of athletes who consult a sport psychologist. Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 11(3), 270-280.
- Lumpkin, A, Stoll, S. & Beller, J. (1999). Sports ethics: Applications for fair play. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.
- Maniar, S. D., Curry, L. A., Sommers-Flanagan, J., & Walsh, J. A. (2001). Student-athlete preferences in seeking help when confronted with sport performance problems. The Sport Psychologist, 15, 205-223.
- Masland, A. (1986). Organizational culture in the study of higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed.) ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education (pp. 70-78). Third Edition. Washington, D.C.:ASHE.
- McEwin, C. & Dickinson, T. (1996). Placing young adolescents at risk in interscholastic sports programs. The Clearing House. Vol. 69, Iss. 4; pg. 217.
- Miracle, A. & Rees, C. (1994). Lessons of the locker room: The myth of school sports. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Michaelis, V. Colorado's image now concern ; Students, alums, others fear bad effects of allegations:[FINAL Edition]. USA TODAY. (Feb 20, 2004). pg. C.10
- Moran, M & Jenkins, C. Georgia calls end to season ; School suspends Harrick after 'findings of most serious nature'. USA TODAY. (Mar 11, 2003). pg. C.01.
- Morgan, G. (1997). Images of organization. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishers.
- Morrill, R. (1980). Teaching values in college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Moulton, J. (2003). Why everyone deserves a sporting chance: Education, justice, and school sports. Boxhill, J.(Ed.), Sports ethics: An anthology (pp. 29-39). MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Murray, M. (1999). NCAA CHAMPS/life skills program: Results of the help-seeking survey research project. In S. Robinson (Ed.), Gaining the competitive edge: Enriching the collegiate experience of the new student-athlete. Monograph Series No. 27(pp. 47-60). The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition. The University of South Carolina.

- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (n.d.). Composition of the NCAA. Retrieved March 11, 2003, from [http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/membership\\_svcs/membership\\_breakdown.html](http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/membership_svcs/membership_breakdown.html).
- Nishimoto, Patricia Atsuko. Student athlete engagement: an examination of peer culture in intercollegiate Division I football. Educational Administration: Thesis (Ed. D.) University of Hawaii at Manoa, 1995; LB5 .H28 no.112.
- O'Driscoll, P. Colorado officials deny using sex in recruiting ; Boulder DA says school ignored warnings about parties to lure prospective athletes:[FINAL Edition]. USA TODAY. Jan 30, 2004. pg. C.08
- Parham, W. (1993). The intercollegiate athlete: A 1990's profile. The Counseling Psychologist, 21, 411-429.
- Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (2005). How college affects students (vol 2): A third decade of research. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Pascarella, E. (1997). College's influence on principled moral reasoning. The Educational Record. Washington: Vol. 78, Iss. 3-4; pg. 47.
- Pedersen, J. & Sorensen, J. (1989). Organisational cultures in theory and practice. Brookfield, VT: Gower Publishing Company.
- Peterson, M. (Ed.) (1986). ASHE Reader on organization and governance in higher education.
- Pinkerton, R., Hinz, L., & Barrow, J. (1989). The college student athlete: Psychological considerations and interventions. Journal of American College Health, 37, 218-226.
- Priest, R., Krause, J. & Beach, J. (1999). Four-year changes in college athletes' ethical value choices in sports situations. Research-quarterly-for-exercise-and-sport (Vol. 70, Iss. 2; pg. 170.
- Rich, J., & DeVitis (1994). Theories of moral development. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher.
- Rudd, A. & Stoll, S. (1998). Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance Reston,-Va.) 69(9), Nov/Dec 1998, 38-42,
- Sage, G. (1998). Does sport affect character development in athletes? Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance. Vol. 69, Iss. 1; pg. 15.
- Schein, E. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Schein, E. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schulman, M. (1995). Schools as moral communities: A framework and guide for school administrators, principals, and teachers. Anti-Defamation League.
- Schwartz, A. (2000). It's not too late to teach college students about values. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Washington: June 9, vol. 46, Iss. 40; pg. A68.
- Schwartz, A & Templeton, J. (1997). The Templeton honor roll: Recognizing exemplary character development programs in higher education. The Educational Record. Vol. 78, Iss 3-4; pg. 95.
- Shea, E. (1996). Ethical Decisions in sport. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Simon, R. (2003). Sports, relativism, and moral education. In Boxhill, J. (Ed.), Sports ethics: An anthology (pp. 16-28). MA: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Sperber, M. (1990). College sports inc.: The athletic department vs [sic] the university. NY: H. Holt.
- Sperber, M. (1998). Onward to victory: the crises that shaped college sports. NY: H. Holt.
- Sperber, M. (2000). Beer and Circus: How big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education. NY: Henry Holt and Company.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. procedures and techniques. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Steitz, E. (1971). Administration of athletics in colleges and universities (Ed.). Wash., D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
- Stoll, S & Beller, J. (1998). Can character be measured? Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance. Reston: Jan 1998. Vol. 69, Iss. 1; p. 19
- Stoll, S.K., J.M. Beller, Cole, J., Burwell, B. (1995). A comparison of moral reasoning scores of student athletes in Division I and Division III NCAA member collegiate/institutions. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 66 (suppl). 81.
- Thelin, J. (1994). Games colleges play : scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, c1994
- Thomas, M. (1997). An integrated theory of moral development. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Thompson, D. (Ed.) (1991). Moral values and higher education: A notion at risk. Brigham Young University.
- Thompson, J. (1993). Positive Coaching: Building character and self-esteem through sports. Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.
- Upcraft, M., Gardner, J. & Associates (1989). The Freshman Year Experience. Helping Students Succeed in College. Josey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.
- Valentine, J. J., & Taub, D. J. (1999). Responding to the developmental needs of student athletes. Journal of College Counseling, 2, 164-179.
- Vandervoot, D. J., & Skorikov, V. B. (2002). Physical health and social network characteristics as determinants of mental health across cultures. Current Psychology, 21, 50-67.
- Walton, G. (1992). Beyond winning: The timeless wisdom of great philosopher coaches. Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.
- Ward, E. (1999). History of the NCAA CHAMPS life skills program. In S. Robinson (Ed.), Gaining the competitive edge: Enriching the collegiate experience of the new student-athlete. Monograph Series No. 27 (pp. 61-68). The National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience & Students in Transition. The University of South Carolina.
- Wieberg, Steve. Graduation rates at top-tier football programs poor. USA Today; McLean, Va.; Sept 19, 2001.
- Wieberg, Steve. BCS schools don't measure up ; Athletes lag behind student body; non-BCS schools do better. USA Today; McLean, Va.; Oct 18, 2002.
- Windmiller, M., Lambert, N. & Turiel, E. (1980). Moral development and socialization. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Yeager, J.M., Buxton, J.N., Baltzell, A.L., & Bzdell, W.B. Character and Coaching: Building Virtue in Athletic Programs. Port Chester, NY: Dude Publishing. 2001.
- Zwell, M. (2000). Creating a culture of competence. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02736 7600