ABSTRACT

Laura M. Spivey, DIVISION I ATHLETICS DIRECTORS AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS: A COMPARISON OF SPORT-RELATED VALUES (Under the direction of Dr. Cheryl McFadden). Department of Educational Leadership, November, 2008.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the moral reasoning of university presidents and athletics directors in sport settings, an area into which few initiatives have been undertaken. Electronic surveys were used to collect data from leaders of institutions currently participating in Division I intercollegiate athletics. Respondents were asked to complete an on-line survey consisting of the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI-16) and demographic questions related to their prior undergraduate athletic involvement, occupational tenure, and gender. Eighty-six useable responses were collected.

A series of ANOVAs were used to assess differences between university presidents and athletics directors on measures of moral reasoning. Results of the analysis showed no statistical significance indicating that presidents and athletics directors reason from a moderate deontological level and the conventional level of Kohlberg's hierarchy of moral reasoning. A series of additional ANOVAs found significant interactions for the variables leadership position, football division, and tenure.

Findings show stakeholders involved in managing Division I athletics programs have similar ethical views in sport settings; however, variables influencing administrators' views include length of occupational tenure and the presence of a football program. These findings contribute to the body of

knowledge on moral reasoning in sport settings, yet additional research should be conducted to further investigate the impact of tenure and football.

DIVISION I ATHLETICS DIRECTORS AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS: A COMPARISON OF SPORT-RELATED VALUES

A Dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership

East Carolina University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Laura M. Spivey

November, 2008

DIVISION I ATHLETICS DIRECTORS AND UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS:

A COMPARISON OF SPORT-RELATED VALUES

by

Laura M. Spivey

APPROVED BY:

DIRECTOR OF DISSERTATION:_____
Cheryl McFadden

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Michael Brown

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Emmett Floyd

COMMITTEE MEMBER:_____
Nelson Cooper

INTERIM CHAIR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP:

_____
William Rouse, Jr.

DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL:

_____
Patrick Pellicane

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee for their support and constructive feedback throughout this process. My original chair, Dr. William Shelton, was kind enough to take on this project and provided guidance, support, and a wonderful sense of humor. My methodologist, Dr. Michael Brown, provided significant feedback on the project and consistently pushed for my best effort. Dr. Cheryl McFadden deserves special mention for assuming the role of chair, with a lot of enthusiasm, once Dr. Shelton retired. Finally, I would like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Emmett Floyd and Dr. Nelson Cooper, for their assistance, mentoring, and support.

Others that deserve special mention for their assistance with this document include Ms. Jennifer Gronewold for her valuable assistance with editing. She has been instrumental in the completion of this process. A better friend could not be found! To the girls, Diane, Jayne, Karen, Maggie, and Kendra: thank you for listening, providing laughter, and encouragement.

Finally, I must thank my family who has been supportive of this endeavor; my mom and my brother have been my biggest fans and supporters. To my dad, who watched me begin this challenge but did not get to see me finish; I think he would be proud. Lastly, to my husband, Jason, he suffered the most through this project but rarely complained (until the very end). I could not ask for a better partner or friend. Thank you for being my rock!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

According to a 2005 survey in the Chronicle of Higher Education, 59.4% of four-year college presidents believe “big-time” college athletics programs are more of a liability than an asset (“The Chronicle Survey of Presidents of 4-Year Colleges,” 2005, Retrieved January 19, 2007, from www.chronicle.com). On many campuses, winning athletic programs are celebrated more than key academic discoveries, while masses file into palatial stadiums to watch college sports, not academic lectures (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Intercollegiate athletics has become a nationwide preoccupation as alumni, fans, and students regularly attend events and millions of other people watch via television exposure (Gerdy, 1997).

Yet, the extraordinary economic growth, popularity, and win-at-all costs atmosphere of college sports has created an athletic culture based on questionable values and misplaced priorities. Ethical problems, including illegal payments and gifts to athletes, academic scandals, illegal booster involvement, and a host of other improprieties, have plagued many athletic programs and their respective universities (Ehrlich, 1995; Fleisher, Goff, & Tollison, 1992; Nyquist, 1985; Staudohar & Zepel, 2004). Abuses include the 2004 University of Colorado football recruiting scandal in which the football program, having been scrutinized by a special panel, was found to have used sex and alcohol to lure football prospects (“College Town Grapples with Recruiting Scandal,” February 18, 2004, Retrieved February 7, 2007, from www.cnn.com). In another example, the

president of St. Bonaventure University in 2003, Robert Wickenheiser, was forced to resign after admitting he enrolled a junior-college basketball transfer who failed to meet the school's and the National Collegiate Athletic Association's (NCAA), eligibility requirements (Lederman, 2004).

While supporters believe in the positive outcomes derived from intercollegiate athletics (Duderstadt, 2000; Ehrlich, 1995), others conclude the current culture and environment surrounding college sports programs has tarnished the American higher education system (Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletes [Knight Commission], 1991). Ultimately, these problems must be addressed by the athletic and institutional leaders responsible for the administration and regulation of these programs, namely the athletics directors and university presidents.

As intercollegiate athletics evolved from a student organized and led endeavor (Andre & James, 1991) to big-business (Fizel & Fort, 2004), an increased need for effective and ethical leadership has emerged. Athletics departments require skilled leaders to oversee the complexities and intricacies that define college sports today. Leaders must balance the institution’s educational mission with the pressure to produce a winning athletic program. Adding to the difficulties university presidents and athletics directors encounter are exuberant growth and commercialization of college athletics (Nyquist, 1985), and their effect on the moral conduct of the institution and the athletics program. In the competitive climate of current-day intercollegiate athletics, the positive

contributions that sports make to higher education are threatened by disturbing patterns of abuse, particularly in some “big-time” athletic programs that have experienced tremendous growth (Knight Commission, 1991). “The sad truth is that on too many campuses “big-time” revenue sports are ‘out of control’” (Knight Commission, 1991, p. 20). These patterns of abuse are grounded in institutional indifference, presidential neglect, growing commercialization of sports, and the urge to win at all costs (Knight Commission, 1991).

Faced with the exceedingly difficult task of institutional control of intercollegiate athletic programs, university presidents and athletics directors find themselves at the forefront of addressing the ethical improprieties that have become commonplace in “big-time” college sports. These leaders are challenged as they attempt to unify the institutional mission and support an intercollegiate athletics program, both of which must be accomplished within an ethical framework.

History of College Athletics

The origin of intercollegiate athletics can be traced back to1852, when students at Harvard and Yale were interested in organizing games and rowing competitions (Andre & James, 1991). These early athletic competitions were organized by students with little interference from colleges or universities. By the end of the 1800s, college sports were rapidly growing (Gerdy, 1997). Eventually, college administrators became interested in incorporating athletics into the mission of higher education. These leaders realized the potential for providing

fiscal benefits to the institution, increasing prestige and recognition, in addition to satisfying the public's growing interest in college sports (Gerdy). According to Fleisher et al. (1992), significant expansion took place during the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s as intercollegiate athletics grew from a small industry into a nationwide preoccupation. By the 1930s, college sports had become national in scope as radio and improved transportation made coverage more accessible to students and fans (Gerdy).

Rapid expansion of collegiate sports led to the creation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) in 1906, which was an organized attempt to reform college football and reduce the number of injuries. However, just as collegiate sports continued to grow, so did the power and influence of the IAAUS. In 1910 the IAAUS condensed its name to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), but expanded its jurisdiction to an additional eight sports. Currently, it is the sole governing body of thirteen intercollegiate sports (Retrieved March 15, 2007, from www.ncaa.org). Its responsibilities include establishing student-athlete eligibility rules, defining amateur status, and regulating financial/scholarship allotment (Fleisher et al., 1992).

The NCAA oversees three distinct divisions—I, II, III—consisting of thousands of athletes in a variety of women's and men's intercollegiate sports (Retrieved March 15, 2007, from www.ncaa.org). University athletic programs are grouped by the NCAA according to the number of sports offered by gender,

attendance and scheduling requirements, and the amount of financial awards offered to student-athletes (Retrieved March 15, 2007, from www.ncaa.org). The most competitive division is Division I, in which schools recruit nationally, football and basketball games are televised, and most student-athletes receive financial awards for participating. Division II schools often highlight local or in-state student-athletes, who pay for school through a combination of athletic scholarships and grants or loans. Finally, Division III institutions feature student-athletes that receive no scholarships or grants based on their athletic ability. In contrast to the first two divisions, Division III institutions emphasize the student-athlete's experience, not the spectator's experience. The NCAA has established itself as the primary agency involved with the oversight of these three main divisions of intercollegiate athletics.

Role of Athletics in Higher Education

College athletics have been a unique part of the American higher education system since the 1850s (Andre & James, 1991) and have played a significant role in American culture (Feezell, 2004). From their early beginnings, intercollegiate athletic programs have evolved into complex, extensive, commercialized enterprises (Nyquist, 1985). According to Andre and James, small groups of students participating in rowing and track-and-field clubs have now developed into multi-million dollar athletic departments within universities, consisting of men's and women's teams, hundreds of scholarships, large fan bases, and coaches that often earn millions of dollars. Athletic programs often

yield significant power with alumni and economic and political influence in the community (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Frey, 1985a). This tremendous growth and commercialization has resulted in some of the problematic issues and common abuses surrounding college sports today. Yet, throughout the history of American higher education, athletic programs have played an important part in the campus life of most institutions (Duderstadt, 2000).

There have been both proponents and critics of the inclusion of college sports into the fabric of higher education. Duderstadt (2000) argued that intercollegiate athletics can be a beneficial part of the college experience. With alumni and potential students coming from diverse backgrounds and regions, athletic programs provide a way to unify the university community (Gerdy, 1997). “Sports are a ‘safe’ vehicle for affiliation, cutting across at least some religious, cultural, racial, and generational lines, and even linking students with alumni and members of the local community” (Francis, 2001, p. 251). Another justification for intercollegiate athletics includes the developmental benefits that participation can have on students and student-athletes (Duderstadt). Students can gain a variety of benefits from the college sport experience, such as the development of leadership skills and teamwork. A further argument concludes that intercollegiate athletics have had a positive impact on women and minorities by providing opportunities for educational advancement through athletic scholarships (Francis).

By contrast, critics of intercollegiate sports, including many university

faculties, believe intercollegiate athletics detract from the ideals of higher education (Shulman & Bowen, 2001; Sperber, 2000). With exorbitant amounts of money funding athletics, many faculties believe institutions are emphasizing the wrong programs as they witness a decline in spending on academic initiatives (Estler & Nelson, 2005; Upton & Wieberg, 2006).

Economic Growth in Intercollegiate Athletics

Substantial economic growth in intercollegiate athletics has occurred throughout the past 25 years. From 1996-2001 there was a 62% increase in spending in Division I athletic programs (Upton & Wieberg, 2006) which can be attributed to several factors. Corporations like CBS paid $6 billion in 2005 to broadcast the NCAA Division I basketball tournament and shoe and apparel companies have signed multi-million dollar deals with universities (Fizel & Fort, 2004). Individual schools have witnessed an expansion in their athletics budgets. In 2005 the University of Texas had an operating budget of $74 million (Retrieved May 5, 2007, from www.mid-majority.com), an increase from $49 million in 2002-2003 (Rombeck, 2003). Likewise, the University of Florida and the University of Tennessee each spent over $71 million on their respective athletics programs in 2005 (Retrieved on May 5, 2007, from www.mid-majority.com). In order to stay competitive, many institutions have built massive new facilities on campuses to attract star athletes. This practice has become so routine in intercollegiate athletics that many refer to it as an “arms race” (Knight Commission, 2001; Sperber, 2000). These facilities include state-of-the art equipment, training

facilities, luxury locker rooms, skyboxes, and stadium expansions (Sperber). Finally, coaches in revenue producing sports, such as men's basketball and football, have been the benefactors of multi-million dollar compensation packages that include media shows, apparel contracts, and sports camp revenues (Fizel & Fort; Upton & Wieberg). Jim Tressel, football coach at The Ohio State University, along with eight other Division I football coaches in 2006, enjoyed enticing perks including the use of private jets, low-interest home loans, luxury suites at the school's stadiums, and vacation homes, in addition to earning over $2 million each (Upton & Wieberg). Similarly, in 2007 Nick Saban signed a $32 million contract to coach the University of Alabama for the next eight years ("After repeat denials Saban takes Alabama job", January, 3, 2007, Retrieved on April 6, 2007, from www.espn.com).

In the win-at-all costs environment of intercollegiate athletics, economic growth and increased spending have become standard practice. Yet, despite these growing budgets, the resulting "arms race," and the attempt to woo revenue-producing coaches, most Division I institutions lose money on their athletics programs (Sperber, 2000).

Roles of Presidents and Directors of Athletics in Intercollegiate Athletics

On university campuses often the most publicized and well-known program is intercollegiate athletics (Sperber, 2000). Athletics departments are traditionally run as auxiliary units on the campus and are given, under the direction of the athletics director, considerable independence to manage their

own budget and finances. Athletics directors are also responsible for NCAA compliance, hiring and firing of coaches, fundraising, management of physical and financial resources, marketing, and the academic success of the student-athlete (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Duderstadt, 2000). An athletics director is accountable not only for carrying out the day-to-day leadership and administration of a complex department, but also leading with basic ethical values (Bailey & Littleton). In most situations the athletics director reports directly to the university president (Duderstadt). At times, however, the president's authority is questioned by alumni, boosters, governing boards, and athletics administrators (Frey, 1985a). The independence granted the athletic department and the questionable control of the university president has sometimes led to difficulty in uniting an athletic department with the institution's mission (Duderstadt).

Leadership of intercollegiate athletics is complex for both athletics directors and university presidents. Presidents of Division I institutions must attempt to balance the educational and economic benefits of a successful athletic program while keeping the school's academic and moral integrity intact (Estler & Nelson, 2005). Moreover, both parties must address outside pressure from fans, boosters, and governing boards that may be primarily interested in producing winning teams no matter the institutional cost.

Governance in Intercollegiate Athletics

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, society, including fans and educational leaders, became alarmed at the numerous scandals and morally ambiguous issues that had become commonplace in “big-time” programs (Knight Commission, 1991). Trustees from the Knight Foundation believed scandals in college sports were threatening the honor of higher education. In response to escalating concerns surrounding college sports, both the NCAA Presidents Commission and The Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics were formed. Their creators hoped to restore integrity to higher education and reform intercollegiate athletics programs.

The NCAA’s Presidents Commission was created in 1984. It focused on academic integrity and the general improvement of intercollegiate athletics programs (Funk, 1991) by advocating interaction between university leaders and athletics departments (Slaughter & Lapchick, 1989; Staudohar & Zepel, 2004). The Knight Commission, formed in 1989, analyzed issues affecting college sports while recommending a “new model for intercollegiate athletics” (Knight Commission, 1991). The model emphasized the need for presidential control and authority over finances (including television contracts), and administrative decisions of governance, equity, academic integrity, certification, and conference placement. Presidential control, understood and accepted by all parties, was one of the key convictions and recommendations of the Knight Commission (1991) Report. The Knight Commission’s original work was completed in 1991.

However, it was not until 1996 that the most significant recommendation was approved by the NCAA (Knight Commission, 2001). This recommendation monumentally changed the governing structure of intercollegiate athletics programs. Until this period, athletics directors managed the athletic departments. The new system placed college presidents in charge of policy and planning decisions (Knight Commission, 2001).

After assessing the work done in the early 1990s, the Knight Commission determined that the problems in “big-time” athletic programs had grown and not diminished. The Commission reconvened in 2000-2001 and proposed a new “one-plus-three” model (Knight Commission, 2001). The new model encouraged “a Coalition of Presidents, directed toward an agenda of academic reform, de-escalation of the athletics arm race, and de-emphasis of the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics” (Knight Commission, 2001, p. 4). Since the original work in the 1990s, it had become obvious that presidents alone could not reform college sports. The new model emphasized a grassroots effort by the entire higher education community to combat the current state of commercialization and scandal.

The reoccurring theme from both the Knight and Presidential Commissions centered on presidents gaining more control and authority over the sports enterprise at their respective institutions as well as wielding more control on a national level. As a result, both presidents and athletics directors have found themselves in precarious situations on their own campuses. Pressure from

governing boards, boosters, and fans has made oversight and ethical operations difficult. As abuses and improprieties continue to be an issue in Division I athletics programs, both educational and athletic leaders must address the growing concerns facing college sports.

Problem Statement

Currently, intercollegiate athletic programs are battling a host of improprieties and abuses. The combination of exuberant economic growth, the on-going pressure to win, and the unethical practices confronting college athletics creates a compelling need to better understand the moral reasoning levels of administrators charged with managing these departments on campus. As Mr. Lee Hills of the Knight Foundation confirms:

> "The demanding task of monitoring college sports is made all the more difficult today by a confluence of new factors. These include the perception that ethical behavior in the larger society has broken down, the public's insistence on winning local teams, and the growth of television combined with the demand for sports programming. Clearly, universities have not immunized themselves from these developments" (Knight Commission, 1991, p. 15).

It is difficult to comprehend the complexity of intercollegiate athletics, the difficulty of institutional oversight, and the ethical problems associated with some Division I programs. As responsible parties for the governing and regulation of these multi-million dollar athletic programs, it is important to understand the ethical

preferences and moral reasoning levels of university presidents and athletics directors in sport settings.

Purpose of the Study

There has been limited research assessing ethical values for university administrators using a sport-specific instrument. As university presidents and athletics directors attempt to address the complex issues surrounding intercollegiate athletics, it becomes important to understand whether these individuals have similar attitudes regarding ethical judgments in sport settings. The intent of this study is to determine if a difference exists on measures of sport-related ethical values between these two primary stakeholders.

Research Question

The null hypothesis of this study directed the research analysis by examining the primary research question: Do Division I athletics directors and university presidents differ on measures of sports-related ethical values?

Null Hypothesis:

1. There is no significant difference on measures of sports-related ethical values between Division I athletics directors and university presidents.

Methodology

This descriptive research study utilized information obtained from responses on the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory in the Sport Milieu-16 (HBVCI-16) and demographic information supplied by Division I athletics directors and university presidents to assess sports-related ethical values.

Subjects answered 16 sport scenarios on the HBVCI-16 that reflected their judgments on ethical sport situations. Theoretically, the HBVCI is based on deontological ethics and has a high reliability and validity, with Chronbach Alphas from .79 to .86 (Beller & Stoll, 2004).

Significance of the Study

Athletics departments are often viewed as the “window” to the university (Gerdy, 1997; Sperber, 2000). Thus, establishing an ethical program should be of paramount concern to all constituents. This research can provide greater understanding of the ethical preferences of athletics directors and university presidents and the nature of leadership in college sports. The literature reflects significant inquiry into ethical values and moral reasoning of athletes and non-athletes (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Lumpkin, Stoll, & Beller, 1995) but few studies have examined the perceptions of athletics administrators and university presidents utilizing a sport specific instrument. Thus, limited research efforts exploring leadership preferences in sport settings justify further investigation of moral principles in this setting. The information gained through this study will be useful for numerous groups, including conference officials, university leaders, governing boards, reformists, and the academic community as a whole, as they attempt to understand, reform, and regulate intercollegiate athletic programs.

Operational Definitions

The following operational definitions will be used throughout this study:

Athletics Director - Athletics director is defined as the individual responsible for the financial, physical, human, and ethical oversight of an intercollegiate athletics program.

Deontological Ethical Principles - Moral acts, intentions, and motive have an inherent rightness that individuals should follow (Beller & Stoll, 2004).

Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory - The Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) is a 16 question survey that measures sport-related ethical values.

Moral Reasoning - The personal evaluation of values in which a consistent and impartial set of moral principles are developed and lived by (Lumpkin et al., 1995).

University President - University president is defined as the highest ranking officer at an institution of higher education.

Unless otherwise specified, the terms intercollegiate athletics and college sports were used interchangeably as were the terms university, college, and institution of higher education.

Summary

Reoccurring themes in higher education and the sports community focus on the problematic issues currently facing Division I intercollegiate athletics programs. Tremendous growth in college athletics creates extensive opportunities for televised games, football bowl appearances, and additional financial support for universities (Slaughter & Lapchick, 1989). However, this

growth also fosters a variety of improprieties such as commercialization and the illegal recruitment of athletes. The integrity of many Division I athletic programs has come under scrutiny. Higher education, the sport community, and the public in general are looking to the leadership of university presidents and athletics directors to address these concerns and shape the future direction of intercollegiate athletics. Thus, assessing the sport related ethical values of university presidents and athletics directors will provide a clearer picture of the moral leadership of institutions with regard to athletics.

Chapter 1 outlines the issues and problems facing Division I athletic programs and higher education institutions. It demonstrates the need for inquiry into the perceptions of athletics directors and university presidents on issues pertaining to ethical values. Chapter 2 will explore the theoretical basis for this research study including the history and growth of intercollegiate athletics and previous research on ethical issues in sports and moral reasoning.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the sport-related ethical values of athletics directors and university presidents. It is meaningful to compare these two stakeholders within the ethical framework of the sport settings in which they reason. Chapter 2 will explore crucial themes of this topic including the context of athletics in higher education, the history of intercollegiate athletics, and the administrative leadership of these organizations. The second part of the chapter identifies the theoretical framework of the study by examining the historical basis of moral development and moral reasoning before addressing the literature on moral reasoning in sport settings.

Intercollegiate Athletics and Higher Education in America

American higher education had an ill-defined and weak “charter” during the formative years (Chu, 1985). Unlike other countries, higher education in America was influenced by immigrants, varying beliefs and religions, and wide expanses of land (Chu, Segrave, & Becker, 1985; Frey, 1985b). The diversity within American culture produced contradictory organizational goals within universities, but also led to the creation of innovative programs that were not offered in European schools (Chu, 1985). This desire to create contemporary campuses fostered environments of disparate activities and programs, some conflicting in nature (Thelin, 1994). Even today, modern universities are expected to provide a wide variety of services including research and publications,

vocational training, hospital facilities, and successful athletic programs (Frey, 1985a; Funk, 1991). The formalization of intercollegiate athletics was an attempt to best meet the needs of American institutions and its students (Chu, 1985). From its inception, intercollegiate athletics in America has been a unique component of the higher education system (Andre & James, 1991; Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Chu, 1985).

Intercollegiate athletics was accepted into the fabric of higher education because of the financial gains and the benefit of increased institutional prestige and visibility it provided (Lawrence, 1987). Both benefits were especially important during the formative years of several institutions when schools were in fierce competition for students and resources (Frey, 1985b). Faculties and administrators believed a successful athletic program could promote the school and attract more students while garnering additional alumni donations (Lawrence; Thelin, 1994). Institutional administrators justified the existence of athletics as providing developmental benefits to students (Duderstadt, 2000) like endurance, team work, and motivation (Ehlrich, 1995). Financial gain, increased visibility, and the benefits to student-athletes provide a context for understanding the unique evolutionary relationship between higher education and intercollegiate athletics in America (Chu et al., 1985).

Evolution of Intercollegiate Athletics in America

Athletics have been a part of campus life at America's higher education institutions for over 150 years (Smith, 1988). Early American college sports were

influenced by the organization of school athletics in England. As early as 1827, schools like Oxford and Cambridge were organizing extramural cricket and rowing matches (Smith). Intercollegiate athletics in America, in contrast, began as annual competitions between upper and lower classes within each school (Smith; Thelin,1994) and then developed into student-initiated contests between rival institutions (Davenport, 1985). The evolution of college sports had begun. However, unlike their European predecessors, American colleges and universities gained visibility and prestige based on the success of their basketball and football programs (Guttmann, 1991).

To delineate the evolution of intercollegiate athletics, Duderstadt (2000) organizes its growth into three distinct phases: the amateur phase, the exhibition phase, and the show business phase.

Amateur Phase

America's first organized intercollegiate sporting event was a rowing regatta between Harvard and Yale in 1852 (Smith, 1988). Students were responsible for the general administration of these early athletic activities. Sports were seen as an institutional afterthought (Gerdy, 1997). These early sporting events did not foster the professionalization that is apparent in today's modern intercollegiate athletics programs. There was no full-time coach, systematic training, or lengthy preparation to win (Smith). It did not take long, however, for institutional administrators to take control of intercollegiate athletics

from the students who initiated them (Guttmann, 1991). Athletics had become too important to the schools they represented (Gerdy).

Intercollegiate sports continued to evolve through the late 1800s with a primary focus on rowing, baseball, and in the later part of the century, football (Smith, 1988). The first intercollegiate football game was held in 1869 between Princeton and Rutgers (Davenport, 1985) and football quickly became the sport that created the most excitement and controversy on college campuses (Thelin, 1994). Yet problems associated with intercollegiate athletics were becoming apparent by the late 1800s (Duderstadt, 2000). Eligibility issues surfaced as some of these early athletes were paid, while others were not even registered students at the institutions they represented (Fleisher et al., 1992). By the time the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was formed in 1905, the foundation for highly commercial and professional sports in higher education had already been established (Smith).

Exhibition Phase

As America continued to grow and industrialize, intercollegiate sports were transformed from a participatory activity involving a few student-athletes to a spectator activity for students, alumni, and fans (Smith, 1988). Professionalism and commercialism flourished (Duderstadt, 2000; Funk, 1991). The public's interest in athletics resulted in a clearer incorporation of athletics into the structure and culture of universities (Gerdy, 1997). As revenue and interest grew, so did the significance of athletics to the institutions, which could no longer allow

athletics to remain a student-led enterprise (Gerdy). Consequently, professional coaches, instead of team captains, became the norm (Funk).

In the 1920s, the invention of radio allowed extended broadcasts from coast-to-coast and the press became more involved with college sports coverage (Gerdy, 1997). Athletics expanded from being regional in scope to the opportunity for national visibility (Thelin, 1994). In the 1960s and 1970s, television turned intercollegiate athletics into public entertainment on a national scale (Duderstadt, 2000; Funk, 1991). Conferences eventually broke away from NCAA television control in the early 1980s and negotiated their own, less restrictive contracts with the networks (Byers, 1995). Basketball grew in popularity with the assistance of television exposure. The NCAA basketball tournament expanded to 64 teams, becoming a major television production (Zimbalist, 1999). Football also gained national popularity and became a foremost part of the culture at many universities (Duderstadt). The exhibition phase paved the way for the current state of intercollegiate athletics, the show business phase.

Show Business Phase

The show business phase, also referred to as “big-time” college athletics, was marked by the transformation of college sports into a commercial entertainment industry driven by the media (Duderstadt, 2000; Sperber, 2000). In this current phase of intercollegiate athletics, universities strive to accommodate television and a growing fan base by scheduling games late in the evening, early

in the morning, or even during the week (Nyquist, 1985). Institutions make concessions for additional television exposure through extended football and basketball seasons, and added bowl games, conference playoffs, and tournaments (Sperber). Major conferences, like the Atlantic Coast Conference, have realigned to produce more powerful business alliances (Upton & Wieburg, 2006), sacrificing traditional rivalries to procure greater financial payouts (Funk, 1991). New, massive campus sport facilities are being built and extensive advertising, even naming rights, have become commonplace on many campuses (Zimbalist, 1999). These modern athletic facilities are state-of-the art with luxury locker rooms and stadium boxes that are sold to increase revenues (Zimbalist). By 2006, the budgets for highly competitive Division I programs had reached over $70 million per year (Retrieved May 5, 2007, from www.mid-majority.com). Basketball and football coaches have been the benefactors of million dollar salaries and have earned celebrity status not only on campuses but nationwide (Byers, 1995; French, 2004; Upton & Wieberg). In order to sustain the athletics enterprise, institutions have established elaborate corporate connections (Zimbalist), and have become, in fact, big-businesses.

Culture of "Big-Time" Athletics

Insight into the climate, culture, and environment of intercollegiate athletics is fundamental to understanding the current state of ethics and abuses in "big-time" programs. Unlike other university departments, intercollegiate athletics is shaped by both an external and an internal environment (Estler &

Nelson, 2005). The external environment consists of many complex social and economic factors and numerous stakeholders (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Estler & Nelson). These influential factors include “the perception that ethical behavior in the larger society has broken down, the public’s insistence on winning local teams, and the growth of television combined with the demand for sports programming” (Knight Commission, 1991, p. 15). Internally, problems and issues plaguing intercollegiate athletics revolve around the ambiguous ethical motives and questionable practices of players, coaches and administrators (Bok, 1985; Thelin, 1994). Ethical and legal concerns, especially in Division I basketball and football programs, have been identified, documented, and scrutinized by several media outlets in the areas of student-athlete recruitment, academic fraud, the use and sale of drugs, assault, rape, robbery, and sexual and racial discrimination (French, 2004; Nyquist, 1985). The transgressions committed within college sports are moral in nature and highly visible (Nyquist).

Money and the win-at-all-costs attitude that permeates college sports are the sources of “moral decay afflicting college athletics” (Funk, 1991, p. 93). Too many institutions focus primarily on self- or institutional-interest and are not concerned about good sportsmanship or ethical and moral guidelines in their athletic programs (Nyquist, 1985). Athletic departments’ focus on winning and the unethical attainment of this goal are accepted as common practice and overlooked by coaches, fans, and institutional administrations (Funk). This culture puts money before the well-being of student-athletes and winning before

ethics (Funk). The desire to win pushes ethical and moral considerations into the background (Santomier & Cautilli, 1985).

The ethically and morally ambivalent atmosphere of intercollegiate athletics has been influenced significantly by three factors: commercialization, common abuses, and the win-at-all costs environment surrounding college sports.

Commercialization

The growth of college sports has been tremendously influenced by commercialization (Atwell, 2001; Byers, 1995). Commercialization, or the selling of college sports as a profitable commodity, developed simultaneously with the expansion of intercollegiate athletics (Smith, 1988; Thelin, 1994). Since then, revenue-producing sports, consisting mainly of men's football and basketball, have continued to change the landscape of intercollegiate sports (Staudohar & Zepel, 2004).

Commercialization's historical influence is widespread. In today's college sport environment, commercialization maintains its influence and visibility (Byers, 1995). The environment of commercialization has led to conference realignments, bowl game manipulations, corruption, and a host of other problems (Hanford & Greenberg, 2003). Furthermore, money from television deals has distorted institutional priorities and driven unnecessary growth (Duderstadt, 2000).

The NCAA plays a substantial role in the ethical and financial issues

surrounding college sports (Nyquist, 1985). In 2005, CBS Sports televised 63 Division I basketball tournament games as part of a $6 billion, 11-year agreement with the NCAA (Retrieved April 23, 2007, from www.NCAA.org). The “March Madness” TV contract was third behind the NFL and NBA in monies generated (Sperber, 2000). The NCAA sports enterprise, with the addition of profits earned from football, surpasses every professional league in the world (Sperber). For a share of this large monetary base, institutions have moved football games to Tuesday and Thursday nights or early Saturday mornings and have played more condensed basketball schedules (Nyquist). The academic careers of the student-athletes are affected as athletes are forced to miss class time due to scheduling, a practice that conflicts with the mission of higher education (Nyquist).

Common Abuses

Intercollegiate athletic programs have experienced various forms of scandal and abuse over the years (Thelin, 1994). There is a long history of problems within intercollegiate athletics organizations. Some programs have faced NCAA violations for gambling, academic corruption, and recruiting violations (Staudohar & Zepel, 2004). Other programs have been troubled by student-athletes or coaches participating in sexual assaults, DUI, and other law breaking situations (French, 2004).

Over one-half of all Division I institutions received sanctions for violating NCAA regulations over the last decade (Duderstadt, 2000). One common abuse is academic corruption (Bok, 1985). In order to field winning teams, coaches are

often forced to recruit talented athletes who are not academically prepared for college (Funk, 1991). There are several examples of athletes, who despite not being able to read or write, are recruited and chauffeured through the educational system (Funk). For instance, some athletes have been enrolled in non-degree classes such as driver education and physical education electives, or guided into lower caliber academic programs (Funk), while other athletes find themselves "majoring in eligibility" (Andre & James, 1991, p. 21). Though the NCAA has increased eligibility requirements, student-athletes are still recruited to schools where their prior educational background leaves little chance for academic success (Bok).

Keeping these academically deficient student-athletes eligible can lead to unethical practices. In 1999, The University of Minnesota was sanctioned for providing inappropriate academic assistance to student-athletes as an academic corruption ring was uncovered within the University's men's basketball program (Wieberg, 2001). An office manager from the men's athletic academic advising department was found guilty of writing more than 400 papers and reports for 18 members of the basketball team over a five year period (French, 2004; Wieberg). The head coach knew about the situation, yet did not intervene. The NCAA sanctioned Minnesota, resulting in their records being erased from NCAA Tournament appearances in 1994, '95 and '97 and NIT appearances in 1996 and 1998 (Wieberg). This change in emphasis from academics to winning

through any means increases the pressure to violate NCAA rules (Andre & James, 1991).

Win-at-all Costs Environment

On many college campuses, there is a focus on winning-at-all costs, and the educational mission of higher education is lost for the student-athletes, coaches, and athletic departments (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). This winning-at-all costs atmosphere is driven by the strong competitive element in American society (Smith, 1988) and by revenue producing sports (Bailey & Littleton). The pressure to produce winning teams is further compounded by the heavy financial burden of Division I athletics departments (Funk, 1991). Winning records help fill stadiums and coliseums, sell tickets, and attract donations. Losing seasons can be detrimental to an athletics department's revenues and budgets (Funk).

Coaches are also affected by the atmosphere of winning-at-all costs. Coaches are fired if they do not meet internal and external expectations. Tyrone Willingham, football coach at the University of Notre Dame from 2002-2004, had athletes with exceptional academic records ("AD Cites Lack of On Field Progress," Retrieved May 17, 2007, from www.espn.com). "From Sunday through Friday our football program has exceeded all expectations, in every way. But on Saturday, we struggled" (Quote by Athletic Director Kevin White, "AD Cites Lack of On Field Progress," Retrieved May 17, 2007, from www.espn.com). Willingham's team failed to perform on the field to the standards established by the athletics department, students, alumni, and fans. He was fired after just three

seasons because his team did not win enough games to satisfy these constituents (“AD Cites Lack of Lack of On Field Progress,” Retrieved May 17, 2007, from www.espn.com). This scenario is common in intercollegiate athletics, primarily in football and men’s basketball programs, where winning is the barometer of a successful program (French, 2004). The pressure to produce winning teams every year is often the catalyst to ethical shortcomings. In order to maintain winning records, coaches fight to recruit the most talented high school athletes, despite academic considerations (Byers, 1995; French).

Institutions have also hired coaches with questionable ethics in an attempt to produce winning teams. In 2006, Kansas State University hired men’s college basketball coach Bobby Huggins after he was fired from the University of Cincinnati for various infractions; the most significant a DUI arrest (“Huggins takes over at Kansas State,” March 24, 2006, Retrieved January 18, 2007, from www.espn.com). After being fired, Huggins continued to recruit top talent without the restrictions of NCAA recruiting rules (Reiter, 2006). When Huggins finally received a job offer from Kansas State University, he brought a top notch recruiting class with him to the school. His questionable recruiting methods and DUI arrest did not deter the athletics director or the university from selecting him as the new basketball coach. Just one year later, Huggins surprised KSU administrators by accepting another coaching job at his alma mater, West Virginia University (“Huggins glad to return home to WV,” April 6, 2007, Retrieved September 21, 2007, from www.espn.com).

Furthermore, athletic departments and institutions of higher education act slowly in reprimanding winning coaches and athletes (French, 2004). Indiana University President, Thomas Ehrlich, was confronted early in his tenure by the importance and power intercollegiate athletics held at the institution. Men's basketball coach, Bobby Knight, had numerous confrontations with university administration at IU (Ehrlich, 1995). Ehrlich openly criticized Knight for an altercation during an exhibition game in 1988 and again later in the year over an offensive comment made on a national television broadcast (Ehrlich). Faculty called for Knight's resignation and Ehrlich weighed his options. Ehrlich received thousands of letters from angry IU basketball fans and even a call from the Governor supporting Knight as the basketball coach (Ehrlich). Knight was retained as the coach but had numerous run-ins before finally being fired in 2000 for an altercation with a student ("Knight's Out," September 12, 2000, Retrieved May 24, 2007, from www.cnnsi.com).

Winning is the bottom line in the high profile sports of football and men's basketball. College sports have evolved into big-businesses where the pressure to win leads schools to retain coaches with winning records who do not embody good values (French, 2004; Lawrence, 1987), and to commit other types of ethical and moral abuses. "In summary, it can be determined that much of the unethical and deviant behavior in intercollegiate athletics is related to achieving organizational goals and objectives, and that the rationalized actions required to

achieve these goals and objectives violate the normative expectations surrounding the organization" (Santomier & Cautilli, 1985, p. 399).

Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

At first, institutions were indifferent to student-organized and administered extramural contests (Smith, 1988). However, early on it became apparent that administrative oversight would be required to manage intercollegiate sports (Chu, 1989). Since its inception in 1905, the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) has been the primary organization responsible for the oversight of intercollegiate athletics (Chu, 1989).

National Collegiate Athletics Association

In an effort to reduce violence and improve safety in football games, the presidents of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton met with President Theodore Roosevelt in the fall of 1905 (Guttmann, 1991). Roosevelt was a fan of football and concerned about the increasing level of violence. That year alone several players were crippled and 18 died from their football injuries (Lawrence, 1987). Despite criticism from the Harvard University president, Roosevelt lobbied to have the game reformed and not abolished (Guttmann). Discussions concerning how football would be controlled and reformed continued even after Roosevelt's intervention.

In December of that same year, representatives from 13 Eastern schools met in New York City to discuss the state of intercollegiate football (Guttmann, 1991; Lawrence, 1987). Three institutions called for the abolition of football while

the remaining majority called for reforms (Guttmann). West Point led the pro-football side and secured a majority vote to retain but reform the game (Lawrence). A second meeting was called later that month, this time for all the institutions participating in intercollegiate football (Lawrence). Representatives from West Point and the chancellor from New York University drew up a list of reforms that were accepted by all participating universities (Guttmann). One of the most significant outcomes of these meetings was the establishment of Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS). In 1910 the IAAUS became the NCAA (Lawrence), which continues to influence and provide oversight for intercollegiate athletics today.

The NCAA is the primary governing organization (Chu, 1989) and the most powerful force in intercollegiate athletics (Lawrence, 1987). At the beginning, the NCAA was an organization dedicated to the formalization and standardization of football rules and the amateur status of players (Chu, 1989; Lawrence). Since then, the NCAA has sought to promote positive standards for athletic conduct and confront common abuses in college sports (Lawrence). As intercollegiate athletics grew in popularity, the NCAA grew as well (Chu, 1989). Through the organization of championships and promotion of television exposure, the NCAA became the official voice for college sports by the later half of the twentieth century (Chu, 1989).

Women's college sport participation evolved in a different manner than that of their male counterparts. In 1971 the Commission on Intercollegiate

Athletics for Women (CIAW) was formed and was the forerunner of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The AIAW governed women's sports until the early 1980s, when the NCAA became involved in the oversight of women's championships. The involvement of the NCAA led to the ultimate demise of the AIAW (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985). Since 1983, the NCAA has been the main association dedicated to the governance of women's sports (Acosta & Carpenter).

Today the NCAA is a complex association overseeing three divisions of collegiate athletics, I, II, and III, and over 300,000 athletes in both women's and men's sports (Retrieved March 15, 2007, from www.ncaa.org). Since the 1950s the NCAA has been responsible not only for developing the rules of intercollegiate sports, but also for the enforcement of these sanctions (Chu, 1989). As the current athletic environment becomes exceedingly complex, once simple rules have become lengthy and convoluted (Byers, 1995) resulting in a NCAA infractions manual well over 500 pages in length (Estler & Nelson, 2005). The NCAA is not without its critics (Chu, 1989) who argue that the NCAA has been ineffective in protecting the amateur goals of college sports (Duderstadt, 2000) and unable to deter common abuses (Chu, 1989). Furthermore, the NCAA's mission to promote and market college sports protects athletics from those who emphasize reform (Duderstadt). However, despite criticisms and its tendency towards commercialization, the NCAA remains the primary legislative and judicial body of Division I-III intercollegiate athletics.

Though the NCAA controls many facets of intercollegiate athletics, other educational stakeholders have had an impact on governance and reform measures related to college sports.

Governance and Reform Efforts in Intercollegiate Athletics

Problems in intercollegiate athletics have been evident since the beginning of organized sports on college campuses (Smith, 1988). As management of intercollegiate athletics shifted from students and faculty, to athletic administrators, and to university presidents (Chu, 1989; Smith), there appeared to be a level of control over college sports that was “murky” throughout the entire twentieth century (Smith, p. 216). The NCAA, as the governing body of college athletics, had been involved in various capacities throughout each of these transitions but was not able to prevent increasing public concern over the abuses in college sports (Chu, 1989; Smith). Public outcry against the abuses and scandals prompted several investigative committees, commissions, and reports calling for reform measures within the intercollegiate sport arena (Thelin, 1994). These reports were compiled from in-depth examination and analysis by several organizations, including the NCAA, the Carnegie Foundation, the American Council of Education, the NCAA’s Presidents Commission, and the Knight Foundation on Intercollegiate Athletics. Together these reports reveal a long history of misconduct and calls for reform within college sports, and provide a national context for the problems associated with intercollegiate athletics (Thelin).

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

In 1916, the NCAA called for an independent foundation to study the state of intercollegiate athletics. The Carnegie Foundation accepted the task and produced a report written in 1929, *American College Athletics*, which explained the widespread problems with the recruitment of student-athletes. Foremost among these problems were monetary enticements to gifted players and the concern over the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Gerdy, 1997; Lawrence, 1987; Thelin, 1994). Findings indicated that professionals had replaced amateurs and that education was being neglected. The commission also pointed out several instances of recruitment corruption and the prevalence of commercialism (Knight Commission, 1991). The report emphasized that oversight for athletics was the responsibility of the university president and called on the president's authority to exact the reforms needed in intercollegiate athletics (Thelin). However, the NCAA took limited action in implementing the recommendations and the report had little impact on addressing the problems in intercollegiate athletics (Gerdy; Lawrence). Ultimately, the Carnegie report demonstrated the ineffectiveness of the NCAA in maintaining and enforcing association rules (Lawrence).

American Council on Education

The next major inquiry into the state of college athletics was a report by the American Council on Education (ACE) in 1974 (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). ACE was unable to produce a full detailed report. Yet the committee's preliminary

outline, rather than condemn intercollegiate sports, attempted to identify and improve several issues surrounding college sports (Bailey & Littleton). The ACE report acknowledged the discrepancies between the mission of higher education and the environment of intercollegiate athletics. It also questioned institutional priorities concerning the welfare of student-athletes in relation to “big-time” programs (Bailey & Littleton). Finally, the ACE report recognized the need to shift power from coaches and athletic directors to college presidents (Duderstadt, 2000). Yet like the Carnegie report, the ACE study produced few practical changes in the problems associated with intercollegiate athletics.

The NCAA Presidents Commission

In another attempt at reform, the Presidents Commission was formed by the NCAA in 1984 (Slaughter & Lapchick, 1989). The Presidents Commission hoped to develop a reform agenda for the NCAA and take a more active role in the NCAA national convention (Duderstadt, 2000; Gerdy, 1997).The Presidents Commission also sought to restore the authority of university presidents over increasingly powerful athletic directors and coaches, who had long been using their influence to support issues disengaged from institutional priorities (Duderstadt). In order to direct reform the Presidents Commission addressed three primary questions: (1) How can we maintain integrity in intercollegiate athletics? (2) How can we contain the costs of athletic programs? (3) What is the proper role of intercollegiate athletics in American higher education (Slaughter & Lapchick)? By 1993 the Presidents Commission was in control of the NCAA

legislative agenda, which focused on four main points for intercollegiate athletic reform: academic integrity, financial integrity, ethical conduct, and student-welfare (Knight Commission, 1991). Presidents overwhelmingly agreed to measures that would restore integrity and morality to intercollegiate athletics (Slaughter & Lapchick). Overall, the Presidents Commission was able to make contributions in several areas including higher standards for academic performance by prospective athletes, institution of the “death penalty” for repeated NCAA violations, athletic certification, and the initiation of several forums to discuss athletic reform (Knight Commission, 1991; Slaughter & Lapchick). Presidential control was a fleeting façade, however. Backlash was growing within the athletic community calling for presidents to stay out of athletic business (Slaughter & Lapchick).

The Presidents Commission ended in 1997 in favor of structural changes to the NCAA. The NCAA was completely reorganized providing more autonomy for each division and additional control for presidents (Retrieved March 15, 2007, from www.ncaa.org). Restructuring for Division I institutions included the disbandment of the NCAA-wide voting style and the formation of a Management Council and Board of Directors (Duderstadt, 2000). The Management Council is composed of faculty representation and athletics officials. The Presidents Commission was reorganized in favor of a Board of Directors made up of university presidents. These groups now make decisions that affect college sports, rather than the NCAA wide voting style of the past (Duderstadt).

Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics

Like the reports and commissions before, The Knight Foundation was concerned by several scandals that stunned intercollegiate athletics in the 1980s (Knight Commission, 1991). In a 1989 response, the Foundation established a Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics dedicated to proposing reform measures in college sports.

The Knight Foundation produced two significant reports on the state of intercollegiate athletics. The first collection of reports, written throughout the early 1990s, included *Keeping Faith with the Student Athlete, A Solid Start: A report of Reform of Intercollegiate Athletics,* and *A New Beginning for a New Century: Intercollegiate Athletics in the United States.* Collectively, these reports proposed a “one-plus-three” model to reform college sports. The first part of the model, “one,” consisted of presidential control of intercollegiate athletics. Presidential control was then directed toward the “three” part of the model, which comprised the “reform triangle”. The reform triangle consisted of academic integrity, financial integrity and accountability through certification of athletic programs (Knight Commission, 1991).

Unlike other reform measures in the past, many of the goals recommended by the first Knight Foundation Report were accepted by the NCAA. “Despite the fact that it held no formal authority, nearly two-thirds of its specific recommendations had been endorsed by the NCAA by 1993” (Knight

Commission, 2001, p. 6). Yet while the Knight Commission had a positive impact on improving some areas of college sports, problems continued to escalate.

The second report, *A Call to Action-Reconnecting College Sports and Higher Education*, was completed in 2001 (Knight Commission, 2001). This report acknowledged the continued acceleration of problems within college sports programs. The Commission proposed a new “one-plus-three” model to address issues with commercialization, academic transgressions, and the financial arms race within the college sports enterprise (Knight Commission, 2001). The new “one-plus-three” model included a “Coalition of Presidents, directed toward an agenda of academic reform, de-escalation of the athletics arms race, and de-emphasis of the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics” (Knight Commission, 2001, p. 4). In order to implement these changes, the Commission stressed the need for a collective grassroots effort by the entire academic community including trustees, administrators and faculty.

The issues and problems in intercollegiate athletics today are similar to those identified in the Carnegie Foundation report, the report by the American Council on Education, the Presidents Commission, and both Knight Commission reports. In 2008, college sports are still plagued by many of these same improprieties. Reform efforts have been difficult to implement due to the complex dynamics and the structural, legal, sociocultural, and economic realities of modern college sports (Estler & Nelson, 2005).

Leadership in Intercollegiate Athletics

Despite residing on the fringe of a university's academic mission, intercollegiate athletics is an intricate network of external associations that produce internal uncertainties (Estler & Nelson, 2005). "Athletics demand the primary attention of those charged with decision making at the institution's center" (Estler & Nelson, p. 4). Making these key institutional decisions and providing internal leadership are the responsibility of the university president and the director of athletics. These stakeholders are confronted by the difficulty of balancing institutional integrity with the economic and social benefits of a strong athletics program (Estler & Nelson).

Presidential Leadership

The role of the college president is extremely complex. This individual must balance numerous institutional priorities. Presidents are obligated to provide academic as well as ethical leadership to the complex infrastructure of their institutions (Perlman, 1998). As the primary leader of an institution, presidents must establish relationships with state legislatures, obtain resources, oversee medical schools and research, and balance university and community needs (Chu, 1989). Furthermore, the president must address any actions or activities that may be deemed questionable by faculty, the board of trustees, or even the public. Presidents, as the responsible parties for both institutional and extracurricular goals, must react to all ethical situations surfacing at their institutions (Wright, 1997). "Ethical wrongdoing or a scandal anywhere in a

university or college reflects negatively upon the institution and, inevitably, upon its leadership, whether or not the president is directly and personally involved" (Perlman, p. 356). Most frequently ethical issues within a university are related to biomedical research, plagiarism, and the falsification of research findings from a variety of disciplines (Langlis, 2006). At times presidents themselves have even been implicated on charges of conflicting interests leading to personal financial gains or the misuse of state property (Wright). These accusations and their subsequent investigations have lead to presidential resignations at some institutions (Baker & Slackman, 2005).

Presidents however, have the power to influence the ethical culture of their institution by confronting ethical concerns, establishing ethical procedures, and questioning the ethical dimensions of various issues (Perlman, 1998). The role presidents play in containing or exacerbating ethical and moral situations has a direct and permanent effect on the perceived success of their presidencies and the reputations of their universities. University presidents face ethical challenges from many directions both internally within the university and externally from the extended higher education community.

The university president is ultimately responsible for the institutional leadership of an intercollegiate athletics program. However, the president is faced with complex internal and external dynamics in relation to athletic department decisions (Estler & Nelson, 2005). Presidents must understand the power of the athletic department and the important economic and political

influence it carries within the community (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). Presidents must balance the educational mission of the institution with the convoluted priorities of boosters, alumni, students, and fans (Thelin & Wiseman, 1989). While ultimately responsible for the athletics department, the president's involvement with athletics is not always accepted nor understood (Duderstadt, 2000).

Presidents of Division I institutions must firmly understand that the actions of the athletics department are the most publicized on campus (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). As former Indiana University President, Thomas Ehrlich stated, "In my first year I learned an essential lesson: Intercollegiate athletics can be an all-consuming diversion from the academic goals of a university president" (Ehrlich, 1995, p. 137). Presidents and chancellors have been fired due to scandals within intercollegiate sports departments on their campuses (Thelin, 1994). Moreover, some presidents may be slow to act since a winning athletics team can help label a successful tenure (Chu, 1989). Historically, intercollegiate athletics commissions and committees consistently called for presidents to take greater control of intercollegiate athletics (Knight Commission, 1991, 2001). However, presidents are often fighting with boards, boosters, alumni, fans, high profile coaches, and athletics directors to assert and maintain control (Atwell, 2001).

Athletic Director/Administration Leadership

The second key stakeholder in collegiate athletics administration is the director of athletics or athletics director. The daily administration of a Division I

athletics program is maintained by the athletics director (Bailey & Littleton, 1991). With the growth of intercollegiate athletics, the job description of athletics directors has grown increasingly complex (Single, 1989). Directors of athletics must possess skills in business, marketing, personnel, resource acquisition, licensing, facility management and finance (Duderstadt, 2000; Single). This individual must have the ability to balance priorities for a range of programs from football to women's gymnastics. In addition, the athletics director must establish authority and administer the program in compliance with all institutional and NCAA rules and regulations while promoting and adhering to ethical values and institutional integrity (Bailey & Littleton).

Athletics directors are responsible for the integrity of the athletics department (Duderstadt, 2000). However, many athletics directors avoid scrutinizing the problematic conditions associated with "big-time" athletics (Thelin, 1994). For coaches and athletics directors, ethics are difficult to maintain when faced with pressure from the win-at-all costs environment of intercollegiate athletics (French, 2004). The 2001 Knight Commission Report stated that many athletics administrators have little concern for academic matters beyond eligibility requirements. Athletics directors have been extremely successful in promoting intercollegiate athletics at an extraordinary growth rate, but with this success some may be overlooking their primary role as educators (Single, 1989).

Thanks in part to the athletics director, intercollegiate sports continue to grow. The powerful traditions and symbols of college sports have become a

national preoccupation making institutional oversight and leadership of these multifaceted departments difficult (Single, 1989). “Although intercollegiate sport may be historically extracurricular, trustees, CEO’s, and presidents must recognize that sport is central to the public image of higher education and, therefore, deserving of routine oversight by the central administration” (Chu, 1989, p. 194). In order to regain America’s trust in higher education, “athletics must be grounded in the academic tradition that created and nurtured it” (Knight Commission, 1991, p. 8).

Increasing national pressure has called on presidents to take a more active role in the oversight and governance of intercollegiate athletic programs (Knight Commission, 2001). Athletic directors are responsible for day-to-day oversight of the athletics department, yet are ultimately accountable to the president (Duderstadt, 2000). Assessing the moral reasoning of both university presidents and athletics directors becomes important in determining the significance of making the ethical and legal decisions involved in intercollegiate athletics. If the university president and athletic director have significantly different levels of moral reasoning, overseeing and managing an ethically sound athletic department becomes difficult if not impossible.

Historical Overview of Moral Development/Moral Reasoning

Moral development research within sport settings is largely based on two models of psychological theory: the “internalization” and “constructivist” theories (Beller & Stoll, 2004). These theories rely on differing assumptions concerning

the person, nature of morality, and the dynamics of moral learning (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Much of the relevant literature is based on the constructivist theories that have dominated the literature on moral development as a whole. Though some background in the theory of internalization is crucial to understanding moral development, the constructivist theories are more prevalent in research involving sport settings and will be the focus of the next section.

Internalization Model-Social Learning Theory

Social learning theories provide the framework for the internalization models of moral reasoning (Beller & Stoll, 2004). Social learning theories emphasize people's need to follow norms associated with socialization, the behavioral outcomes of that process, and they stress people's desire to act in relation to personal gain, social approval, or self-satisfaction (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Weiss & Smith, 2002). Within this approach, individuals learn moral behaviors by modeling adults and peers as their actions conform to social norms (Shields & Bredemeier; Weiss & Smith). Children learn behaviors through modeling and accepting the reinforcement of their behavior by significant others (Weiss & Smith).

In relation to sport, social learning theories become apparent as people are "often motivated by a desire to win rewards in the form of public acclaim, a coach's acceptance, or self-praise" (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995, p. 47). Social learning theories' focus on modeling can also impact sport settings as athletes model the positive or negative behaviors of a coach or other role model.

Constructivist Theories-Structural Development Approaches

Most literature on moral reasoning in sport settings utilizes a structural developmental approach. Structural development approaches moral development through the lens of cognition and reasoning by examining how an individual reasons, judges values, and behaves (Weiss & Smith, 2002). This process of reasoning, judging, and behaving is based on the developmental stages of reasoning (Beller & Stoll, 2004) proposed in varying degrees by Piaget, Kohlberg, Gilligan, Haan, and Rest. While these theorists do not agree on all points, they contain three fundamental themes (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). First, constructivists believe individuals and their environments are responsible for producing meaning. Second, people have a coherent mental structure based on a logical set of rules. Finally, individuals pass through differing stages as they develop in maturity (Shields & Bredemeier).

Piaget

Piaget was the first to comprehensively study moral development in children from a cognitive developmental approach (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Weiss & Smith, 2002). Piaget formulated his theory on how children develop moral judgment while observing children playing marbles (Rich & DeVitis, 1985). He concluded that (a) cognitive development and moral development evolve simultaneously (Rich & DeVitis), and (b) children move from a morality of constraint to a morality of cooperation (Weiss & Smith). In a morality of constraint, children focus on adult authority and view rules as absolute. In

contrast, a morality of cooperation centers on mutual respect among peers, and rules which are flexible. Piaget's theory is based on four elements, which he described as *innate*, *invariant*, *hierarchical*, and *culturally universal* (Rich & DeVitis*).* He concluded that a child's moral development will naturally progress as long as the child is exposed to social interaction with peers, which fosters cooperation and equality. Peer interaction is crucial, as Piaget understood it to be a genuine form of moral participation and moral growth (Weiss & Smith). The notion of peer interaction is consistent with Piaget's general view that cognitive development results as an interaction between the child and his or her environment.

Kohlberg

Kohlberg's work is considered the most influential and significant theory on moral development (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). His theories were built upon Piaget's theory on cognitive moral development in children (Kohlberg, 1984). Kohlberg's theory involves both psychological and philosophical principles based on the premise that "moral development passes through invariant qualitative stages, and that moral development is stimulated by promoting thinking and problem solving" (Rich & DeVitis, 1985, p. 88). He assessed moral development in children through open-ended questions which identified individuals' reasoning on moral dilemmas (Rich & DeVitis).

Kohlberg found that children pass through six developmental stages within three levels of morality: the preconventional level, the conventional level, and the postconventional (autonomous or principled) level (Kohlberg, 1984).

Preconventional level. Stage 1, *heteronomous morality*, is characterized by a naïve moral realism that focuses on rule following and the avoidance of punishment. At this stage, authority rather than cooperation among equals defines what is wrong and right (Kohlberg, 1984).

Stage 2, *individualistic instrumental morality,* is characterized by a concrete individualistic perspective. Individuals pursue their own interests but are aware that these may conflict with the interests of others. Individuals maximize their own needs and desires while minimizing the negative consequences to themselves. Personal interest can be achieved through exchange of goods and actions with others (Kohlberg, 1984).

Conventional level. Stage 3, *interpersonally normative morality,* is a third-person perspective, whereby mutually trusting relationships among people lead to a set of shared moral norms that form behavioral expectations. At this stage, there is an emphasis on being good and altruistic, and on viewing good or bad motives as indicative of general personal morality. Individuals at this stage are concerned with gaining social approval and maintaining trust, and justify their moral reasoning based on these motives (Kohlberg, 1984).

Stage 4 reasoning, *social system morality*, is based on the perspective of the members of a society with a consistent set of expectations that applies to all

members. Individual pursuits are only legitimate when they are consistent with the sociomoral system as a whole (Kohlberg, 1984).

Postconventional, autonomous, or principled level. Stage 5, *human rights and social welfare morality*, is differentiated by a perspective that takes into account the universal values and rights that underlie a moral society. Individuals look to preserve the rights and welfare of all members of society even if they conflict with laws (Kohlberg, 1984).

Stage 6, *morality of universalizable, reversible, and prescriptive general ethical principle(s),* is characterized by a sociomoral perspective that focuses on a "moral point of view" (Kohlberg, 1984, p. 176). At this stage, individuals develop a self-conscious structure for moral decision making that equally considers claims by others to ensure fairness (Kohlberg).

Kohlberg's stages represent an organized system of hierarchical modes of thinking (Rich & DeVitis, 1985). Higher levels are philosophically advanced, as they provide the ability to organize complex data. At the highest level individuals base moral decisions upon a concept of justice (Stage 6). "This is the level of principles which can be universalized, where the individual views moral judgment not from his or her individual perspective or society's values, but from the perspective of any human being" (Rich & DeVitis, p. 91). Kohlberg found that most of the adult population operates from Stages 3 and 4, only 20 to 25% of the adult population reaches the last two stages, and very few, 5 to 10%, reach Stage 6 (Rich & DeVitis).

Two principles directed Kohlberg's theory and defined his understanding of moral development (Weiss & Smith, 2002). First, cognitive disequilibrium is a key to promoting moral growth. When children are outside of their situational comfort zone, (i.e. cognitive disequilibrium), they search for ways to reduce the disequilibrium. This type of situation promotes moral growth and development as the child expands his or her thinking to incorporate the novel situation. Second, the importance of justice is acknowledged. Kohlberg's theory emphasizes justice as the norm from which other moral norms are derived (Weiss & Smith). Justice is important in providing an understanding of how moral conflicts can be logically and consistently resolved.

Rest

Building upon Kohlberg's theory, Rest developed a four component model of morality that examines the psychological processes that influence moral behavior (Weiss & Smith, 2002). The first component Rest proposes is characterized by an awareness of how an individual's actions affect others (Weiss & Smith). In this component, an individual considers the range of possible actions and the consequences of the actions. In the second component an individual makes a judgment of what is morally right or wrong and in the third component the individual decides what to do. The final component in Rest's model is the actual implementation of a moral plan of action. In contrast to Kohlberg, Rest believes that the levels and stages are "soft" stages - that persons are not "in" a single stage, but can make decisions based on several

stages. Rather than viewing persons as making decisions based on a single stage, Rest viewed an individual's decisions as the percentage of decisions made in each of the stages (Rest, 1979).

While the component stages model of morality provides additional theoretical foundations for moral reasoning, one of Rest's most important contributions was the development of the Defining Issues Test (DIT). The instrument presents moral dilemmas to respondents using a Likert scale and has been used extensively in moral development research (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thomas, 1999). The DIT has also been effective in measuring the levels of moral reasoning in athletic populations.

Gilligan

Gilligan was critical of Kohlberg's theory of moral development as it was based on research conducted almost exclusively on males. She questioned whether the justice orientation of morality postulated by Kohlberg is truly universal. The justice orientation consists of a strong sense of autonomous self, responsibility as obligation, and a contractual approach to relationships (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). In studying female approaches to moral dilemmas, she discovered that females used "a principle of responsibility and care to guide their postconventional reasoning" rather than an objective standard of justice (Weiss & Smith, 2002, p. 249). Gilligan refers to this orientation as a morality of care, which is based on an interdependent sense of self, responsibility as obligation, and a nurturing approach to relationships (Shields & Bredemeier). Gilligan

attributed this difference to the differing socialization boys and girls receive in childhood (Weiss & Smith). According to Gilligan's model, men and women in sport situations may have differing orientations toward moral reasoning. Female athletes may approach situations with more of a care orientation, while males may not (Crown & Heatherington, 1989). Other scholars, however, have disagreed with Gilligan's perspective on moral reasoning, contending that men also show care principles in moral reasoning (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Shields & Bredemeier).

Haan

Haan was interested in ascertaining how people resolve moral disputes in real life situations (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). She proposed *interaction morality* as an alternative structural development model. This model focused on an individual's moral reasoning within social constructs (Weiss & Smith, 2002). Her model is based on three primary concepts: (1) moral balance, (2) moral dialogue, and (3) moral levels (Beller & Stoll, 2004). Haan believes that, "when individuals are confronted with a situational conflict (i.e., moral dilemma), they need to discuss ('moral dialogue') their corresponding viewpoints and try to reach consensual agreement about a solution to their problem ('moral balance')" (Weiss & Smith, p. 251). Individuals seek equalization or a balance of needs and interests (Beller & Stoll). Conflict resolution results through interpersonal dialogue that consists of openly discussing and negotiating needs and rights (Weiss & Smith). Thus, Haan promotes social disequilibrium and inductive reasoning as

keys to moral growth (Weiss & Smith). Unlike Kohlberg and other developmentalists, Haan does not believe moral reasoning is confined to stages of hierarchical operations (Beller & Stoll).

Moral Reasoning and Moral Development in Intercollegiate Athletics

A number of studies have examined the moral reasoning of athletes and coaches at the high school and college levels. Overall, athletes display lower levels of moral reasoning than do nonathletes (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; French, 2004; Shields & Bredemeier, 1995; Stoll, 2007) and Division I coaches typically display lower levels of moral reasoning than their Division III counterparts (Wigley, 2002). While there have been significant inquiries into the moral reasoning patterns of athletic versus nonathletic populations, there is little to no research examining the moral reasoning of intercollegiate athletics directors and university presidents, either individually or comparatively, using a sport-specific instrument.

Athletes

Bredemeier and Shields (1986b) examined the moral maturity of men's basketball players and nonathletes in both high school and college settings using Haan's model of moral development. They found no difference between athletes and nonathletes at the high school level. College nonathletes, however, scored significantly higher than athletes when presented the same moral dilemmas, which is indicative of higher levels of moral reasoning. "It may be that when sport becomes highly competitive and central in terms of time and focus in a person's

life, the patterns of sport reasoning become habitual and detrimentally effect general moral development" (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, p. 13).

Bredemeier and Shields (1986a) followed up their earlier study with an investigation of the difference between morality in everyday life and the morality involved in sport participation. The same sample of high school and college athletes and nonathletes from their previous study were given a moral interview and a "postgame" interview. They determined that athletes use "bracketed morality" or "game reasoning" in sport situations. In other words, athletes possess a moral reasoning which is more egocentric in orientation than moral reasoning in life situations. "Egocentrism is the hallmark of immature reasoning in everyday life, but the sport realm provides socially legitimated opportunities to suspend the usual requirements that others' interests be given equivalent consideration to those of the self" (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986b, p. 271). Researchers also found a significantly greater life-sport reasoning divergence between athletes when compared to nonathletes. The divergence of life-sport reasoning was greatest for male high school athletes and male college athletes as compared to their female counterparts, which indicated that males may be more familiar with moral expectations in specific sport situations than female athletes and nonathletes.

Beller and Stoll (2004) used the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI) to assess the moral reasoning of college level athletes and nonathletes (French, 2004; Wolverton, 2006). The HBVCI is a sport-specific instrument that

measures levels of moral reasoning. Team sport athletes scored lower than individual sport athletes or nonathletes. Male athletes in competitive contact sports like lacrosse, ice hockey, football and basketball had the lowest scores and thus the least aptitude to reason morally in sport situations (Wolverton). Individual sport athletes had higher scores than team sport athletes but had lower scores than nonathletes. Team sport athletes scored lower on measures of moral reasoning because they make few decisions during games, relying mostly on coaches for direction. The researchers concluded that athletes are more "morally calloused" than the general population (French). This callousness is attributed to various factors associated with sport participation such as a sense of entitlement, difficulty in distinguishing rules from strategy, and the belief that not getting caught means you have done nothing wrong (French; Wolverton).

Priest, Krause, and Beach (1999) also found differences between the moral reasoning of athletes (team, individual, and intramural) and nonathletes. They studied moral reasoning patterns of cadets in the class of 1993 at the United States Military Academy (USMA) over a four year period. The HBVCI was administered at the beginning and at the end of the four year period to assess cadets' ethical values in sport settings. Overall, the cadets showed a decrease in scores on the HBVCI over the four year period. "Athletes are more willing to take advantage of any game situation that increases the likelihood of victory regardless of the ethical implications (Priest et al., 1999, p. 9)." Intercollegiate team athletes scored lower on the HBVCI than intercollegiate individual sport

athletes and intramural sport participants on both assessments. While team sport athletes had the lowest overall scores, individual-sport athletes demonstrated a greater decline in HBVCI scores over a four year period.

Brower (1992) found similar results when assessing the moral reasoning patterns of college athletes in both team and individual sports at the Division I and Division III levels. Division III athletes scored higher on the Defining Issues Test (DIT) than did Division I athletes and thus have higher levels of moral reasoning. Basketball players at both Division I and Division III institutions scored lower on scales of moral reasoning than did individual sport athletes and nonathletes. The difference was especially prominent for Division I basketball players when compared with nonathletes at the same institution. Division III basketball players scored significantly higher than did the Division I basketball players. These results are in accordance with Bredemeier and Shields (1986a, 1986b) findings, which state that the more competitive the environment the lower the moral reasoning skills of the athletic population. The environment of “big-time” Division I programs may result in athletes with lower levels of moral reasoning.

Tod and Hodge (2001) presented 19-to-21-year-old rugby players with moral dilemmas and asked questions that focused on ascertaining the player’s moral reasoning and achievement goals. They concluded that moral reasoning is a complex phenomenon and players often use multiple levels of reasoning, depending on the dilemmas presented. Results from the study indicated that an

individual's achievement orientation influenced their level of moral reasoning. Players with ego-driven goals used less mature levels of moral reasoning than those with a task achievement goal orientation. Those participants with more mature levels of moral reasoning showed greater concern for others. A win-at-all cost attitude and self-centeredness influenced those athletes with lower moral reasoning scores, while situational factors such as teammate perceptions, influenced the moral reasoning scores of all athletes.

Coaches and Administrators

Wigley (2002) studied the ethical values and behavioral intentions among coaches within Division I and Division III athletic departments. Participants were given the HBVCI with additional questions related to Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior to assess ethical values and behavioral intentions in sport situations. In this study, Division III coaches scored higher on measures of ethical values and behavioral intentions than did Division I coaches. These findings support the Bredemeier and Shields (1986a, 1986b) conclusion that competitive environments influence individual's moral reasoning skills. In relation to Kohlberg's theory on moral development, Division I coaches would be reasoning at the preconventional level. At a preconventional level individuals pursue their own interests but are aware that these may conflict with others' interests as they maximize their own needs and desires while minimizing the negative consequences on themselves (Kohlberg, 1984). Consequently, this lower level of reasoning is more likely to focus on making decisions based on getting what you

want while avoiding punishment, rather than making decisions based on what is best for the entire university community.

Division III coaches' scores on ethical values increased as their tenure increased, while Division I coaches' values did not change significantly over time. These findings may be attributed to the climate and culture associated with "big-time" athletic programs in comparison with Division III athletics. Division III institutions have limited television exposure, smaller budgets, and offer fewer athletic scholarships. Nor are these institutions competing on the same national stage as Division I programs. Consequently, it is perceived that Division III athletic programs are more in line with the amateur goals of college sports.

Malloy and Zakus (1995) provide an overview of the primary theoretical underpinnings of ethical decision making used by sport administrators. They examine several theoretical approaches including levels of moral reasoning and ethical orientation of administrators in sport contexts. Reviewing previous research, Malloy and Zakus determined that most decision makers in sport environments fall into the preconventional and conventional stages of moral reasoning, the lowest levels on Kohlberg's hierarchy of developmental stages. Working from these stages, administrators typically operate by maintaining the status quo, which is often not ethically sound. The authors concluded that sport administrators are not only under ethical pressures with day-to-day organizational operations but are also faced with significant external pressures. In order to improve ethics in sports, the structural conditions of winning and

power must change and must be addressed in higher education sport curriculums (Malloy & Zakus).

Moral Reasoning and Moral Development in Presidential Leadership

There is little to no research on the moral reasoning patterns of university or college presidents at four year institutions. There has been research on moral reasoning in other leadership groups such as public administration, health care, and public school teachers and administrators (Galla, 2007; Maitland, 2006; Schmidt, 2007). Yet, little research focuses solely on the moral reasoning patterns of university and college administrators.

Mennuti (1987) interviewed 16 community college presidents to assess their levels of moral reasoning. Using an open-ended qualitative research design, respondents provided information on both professional and personal moral dilemmas. Community college presidents utilized three overlapping orientations when making moral decisions. The three main orientations employed were (1) a concern for justice; (2) a concern for others; (3) and a concern for self. These orientations were used by all members of the sample and were interwoven in the dilemmas presented. Respondents varied their reasoning and orientations depending on the dilemma presented but most utilized a preferred and consistent method of reasoning.

The justice orientation in the study relates directly to Kohlberg's and Gilligan's theories on moral reasoning. According to Kohlberg's theory of moral reasoning, an orientation based on justice is the norm from which all moral norms

come (Weiss & Smith, 2002). At the highest level individuals base moral decisions upon a concept of justice (Stage 6). “This is the level of principles which can be universalized, where the individual views moral judgment not from his or her individual perspective or society’s values, but from the perspective of any human being” (Rich & DeVitis, 1985, p. 91). Gilligan also considered justice as a premise for moral decision making, yet she found it was not the only orientation of importance.

Community college presidents also used a concern for others orientation in making moral decisions (Mennuti, 1987). The responses of the presidents relates to the theory presented by Gilligan, who found that individuals, especially females, employ a principle of responsibility and care to guide their moral decision making (Shields & Bredemeier, 1995). Individuals utilizing this orientation focus on maintaining harmony in relationships in addition to being concerned with the needs of others.

Community college presidents also made responses consistent with a concern for self orientation. Relating to Kohlberg’s theory, since these presidents used orientations of self they were operating from a preconventional or lower level of reasoning for these specific situations (Kohlberg, 1984). In solving the moral dilemmas presented, presidents considered the dilemma and its effect on their status, achievement, and psychological/physical health (Mennuti, 1987). The self may play a larger role in the moral reasoning process than previously believed (Mennuti).

However, based on such a small sample and the differences that exist between community colleges and prodigious universities, it is difficult to generalize these results to university leadership.

Summary

The evolution of intercollegiate athletics in America can be traced from simple early beginnings involving few participants and even fewer schools to an ever-growing popularity and national presence in American culture (Chu, 1985, Smith, 1988). Athletics have grown from an institutional activity to a national preoccupation encompassing large crowds, significant television and media exposure, and multi-million dollar athletic budgets (Funk, 1991; Gerdy 1997; Single, 1989; Sperber, 2000). Growing revenues and recognition garnered by the universities with the biggest and best athletic programs foster an atmosphere where scandals and improprieties committed by players, coaches, and athletic directors, in both sports and academics, are overlooked or smoothed over to preserve a successful collegiate sports program (Bailey & Littleton, 1991; Bok, 1985; Thelin, 1994). It is this “win-at-all-costs” atmosphere that permeates intercollegiate athletics today. Throughout the history of athletics, several attempts at athletic reform have tried to curb these scandalous behaviors and moral improprieties and to advocate for a greater working alliance between university presidents and athletic administrators to preserve the integrity of higher education (Knight Commission, 1991, 2001). Yet concern over ethical issues

surrounding college sports continues to strain the relationship between higher education and athletics departments.

There is a negative relationship between participation in sports and the levels of moral reasoning for athletes (Beller & Stoll, 2004). Using the foundations of moral theories presented by psychologists, such as Piaget, Kohlberg and Haan, researchers have determined that participation in organized sport, especially at highly competitive levels, resulted in lower measured levels of moral reasoning (Bredemeier & Shield, 1986a, 1986b; Beller & Stoll; Brower, 1992; Priest et al., 1999). The focus of previous research has been athlete based, failing to account for the moral reasoning of either university presidents or athletic directors. Yet the pressure of preserving a successful athletic program amid an increasing number of scandals and the fissures they create within the mission of higher education ultimately falls on both university athletics directors and presidents. Understanding the moral reasoning of both presidents and athletics directors is crucial to understanding the moral and ethical soundness of intercollegiate athletic programs.

Chapter 2 has reviewed the relevant literature related to intercollegiate athletics, moral reasoning, and moral reasoning in sport settings. Chapter 3 will outline the research methodology that guides this study.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to compare university presidents and athletics directors on measures of sports-related ethical values. The current study examined the primary research question: “Do Division I athletics directors and university presidents differ on measures of sports-related ethical values?” The null hypothesis stated: there is no significant difference on measures of sports-related ethical values between Division I athletics directors and university presidents, and directed the research.

To determine levels of moral reasoning, university presidents and athletics directors responded to the sixteen questions of the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI-16). The dependent variable of this study was moral reasoning levels as determined by total scores on the HBVCI-16, while the primary independent variable was the leadership position held by the respondent. Additional independent variables included occupational tenure, sex, prior undergraduate intercollegiate athletic participation of the respondent, and institutional involvement in Division I football.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to organize and analyze the responses garnered from the HBVCI-16. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if differences existed between university presidents and athletics directors on the selected variables.

Participants

The population for this study consisted of 658 university presidents and athletics directors from all 329 universities and colleges participating in Division I athletics. University email addresses were not found or inaccurate for 37 members of the survey population, and these individuals were not included in the population. Therefore, the total population equals 621.

Instrumentation

Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory-16 determines how individuals reason and make cognitive judgments about moral issues in sport settings (Beller & Stoll, 2004). The HBVCI-16 consists of sixteen questions about moral issues faced in typical sport situations. Participants rate their responses on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” The scenarios of the HBVCI-16 simulate sport situations such as heckling, game strategy, breaking the rules when a referee cannot see the act, and retaliation (Priest et al., 1999). The HBVCI-16 covers a variety of sports including basketball, baseball, swimming, soccer, gymnastics, track, hockey, volleyball, and football. Possible responses range from obvious rule violations to other conduct that may be technically legal but not the behavior for a good sport (Priest et al.).

The HBVCI-16 is based on deontological ethical principles that stress the importance of rightness and duty. Within the deontological framework, consequences of behavior are unimportant, rather, “there is an inherent rightness for all actions which we ought to follow” (Lumpkin et al., 1995, p. 28). Similarly,

moral judgments are made by references to a rule or principle, with little regard for consequences (Beller & Stoll, 2004).

The HBVCI-16 poses questions that assess the three deontological principles of justice, honesty, and responsibility, which are innate to moral reasoning and decision-making in sport (Lumpkin et al., 1995, p. 22). Justice is defined as “an equity of fairness for treating peers or competitors equally” (Lumpkin et al., p. 30). The principle of honesty is “the condition or capacity of being trustworthy or truthful” (Lumpkin et al., p. 29). Responsibility involves “accounting for one’s actions in the past, present, and future” (Lumpkin et al., p. 29). The HBVCI-16 does not measure or predict moral action but does identify how a person values moral decisions in simulated situations (Beller & Stoll, 2004).

The range of possible scores on the HBVCI-16 is 12-60 points (Beller & Stoll, 2004). A higher score on the HBVCI-16 indicates a respondent who has used a deontological approach when making moral decisions on the instrument (Beller & Stoll). Individuals with higher scores have based decisions on abstract principles (what is inherently right according to the situation) rather than basing their decision on the consequences of their actions. Therefore, presidents and athletics directors with high scores have based their decisions on a just action “without violating their opponents’ pursuit to fair play” (Goeb, 1997, p. 41). While a respondent with a low score based his or her decisions on self interest or to merely avoid repercussions or possible consequences.

The HBVCI-16 has proven to be highly reliable with Chronbach Alpha coefficients ranging from .79 to .86 (Beller & Stoll, 2004). Validity of the instrument was established in two ways. First, the instrument was evaluated for validity by sport and general ethicists who concluded it does measure deontological reasoning (Beller & Stoll). Second, the instrument was compared to the Defining Issues Test (DIT) for concurrent validity.

Procedure

Perseus SurveySolutions/EFM software was used to manage the deployment of the survey, follow-up reminders, and completed instruments. Email and physical addresses of presidents and athletics directors at all Division I schools were collected. A letter was sent via postal mail to all 621 individuals in the population. The letter outlined the purpose of the research study, a timeline and mode of delivery of the survey instrument, and information concerning confidentiality of respondents.

Approximately a week after the letter was mailed, an electronic reminder with a link to the survey instrument was sent to the university e-mail addresses of participants. This message provided information on the significance of the research study, confidentiality of their responses, and directions for completion of the instrument. A follow-up email was sent to those university presidents and athletics directors who had not yet answered the web-based survey after two weeks. The follow-up email encouraged non-respondents to participate in the survey and included a link to the survey instrument.

Data Analysis

Data for this study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 15.0). A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if differences exist between university presidents and athletics directors on the HBVCI-16. Descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation) were generated to summarize demographic characteristics of the subjects. Additional ANOVAS were used to determine the significance of other independent variables including gender, occupational tenure, prior athletic participation of the respondent, and institutional football involvement on total scores of the HBVCI-16.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations are important to consider in this study. Although the survey respondents were from a variety of institutions, the low response rate does not allow for generalization back to the entire population of Division I administrators. In addition, it is assumed that university presidents and directors of athletics answered the questionnaire and not a third party, and that the respondents answered the instrument honestly.

A significant percent (66%) of the survey population participated in intercollegiate athletics as an undergraduate. Thus, these individuals may have a different perspective of the sport scenarios than those without this competitive experience. These participants may have been more interested in the study and were therefore more likely to respond. Finally, the research study measured

moral reasoning of the respondents and not ethical behavior. Moral reasoning levels, then, may not mimic an administrator's behavior during an actual ethical sport situation.

Summary

This study dealt with the sport-related ethical differences between Division I university presidents and athletics directors. The population for this study consisted of university presidents and athletics directors at institutions participating in Division I athletics. Electronic surveys consisting of the HBVCI-16 were used to collect information from the population and address the research question pertaining to this study. The HBVCI-16 has been used in numerous studies to assess the moral reasoning of athletes and has been proven reliable and valid. Finally, the research question was tested using a one-way ANOVA. Additional ANOVAS were used to determine the significance of other independent variables including gender, occupational tenure, prior athletic participation, and institutional football involvement on total scores of the HBVCI-16.

Chapter 3 has outlined the methodology; chapter 4 will present the data analysis for this study.

CHAPTER 4: ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This study compared Division I athletics directors and university presidents on measures of sport-related ethical values. The primary independent variable was leadership position (university presidents and athletics directors). Secondary independent variables included occupational tenure, gender, prior undergraduate intercollegiate athletic participation, institutional football participation, and type of football division. The dependent variable was moral reasoning level as measured by scores on the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory (HBVCI-16).

Participants

A link to the web-based survey was sent to 621 athletics directors and university presidents at institutions participating in Division I athletics. Sixty-one surveys were returned in the first 10 days of data collection. Twenty-five additional surveys were received following a reminder email that was sent to non-responders. The total sample included 86 surveys for an overall response rate of 13.8%. Thirty-two presidents (37% of total respondents) and 54 athletics directors (63% of total respondents) completed the surveys.

Descriptive Data

Demographic data was collected from each respondent including gender, undergraduate intercollegiate athletics participation, and length of occupational tenure (see Table 1). The majority of the sample (94%) was male, specifically

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics

Variable		AD	UP	%
Sex	Male	52	29	94
	Female	2	3	6
Football Participation	Yes	35	26	71
	No	19	6	29
Football Division	FBS	12	15	31
	FCS	23	11	40
	None	19	6	29
Tenure	1-5 Years	25	14	45
	6-10 Years	9	6	17
	11-15 Years	8	6	16
	16-20 Years	6	3	10
	20+ Years	6	3	10
Athletic Participation	Yes	41	16	66
	No	13	16	34

Note. AD=Athletics director, UP=University president, FBS=Football Bowl Subdivision, FCS=Football Championship Series.

96% of the athletics directors and 90% of the university presidents. The majority of athletics directors (76%) had participated in college athletics as an undergraduate student, while half (50%) of the presidents participated in intercollegiate athletics. The majority of respondents (45%) had less than five years of experience in their current position.

Thirty-one percent of the respondents were employed by institutions whose football programs participated in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS). Forty percent of the institutions' football programs participated in the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS). Twenty-nine percent of the institutions did not participate in football.

Data Analyses

Responses were analyzed using Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS Version 15.0). The research question guiding this study was "Do Division I athletics directors and university presidents differ on measures of sports-related ethical values?" A one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) revealed no significant difference in the mean scores between athletics directors and university presidents on the HBVCI-16, $F(1, 84)=2.80$, $p>.05$ (see Table 2 and 3). Levene's Test for homogeneity of variance revealed no significant difference ($p> .05$) indicating that equal variance could be assumed in both groups.

Table 2

Mean Scores for Athletic Directors, Football Division, Tenure

Position	Tenure	Football Division	*M*	*SD*	*N*
AD	0-3 Years	None	28.33	6.65	3
		FBS	34.17	4.44	6
		FCS	32.20	7.41	10
		Total	32.21	6.45	19
	3-11.9 Years	None	32.86	5.61	7
		FBS	35.00	2.83	2
		FCS	28.00	8.56	7
		Total	31.00	7.10	16
	12 or More Years	None	35.89	8.99	9
		FBS	34.75	4.11	4
		FCS	35.83	4.16	6
		Total	35.63	6.61	19
	Total	None	33.56	7.67	19
		FBS	34.50	3.80	12
		FCS	31.87	7.45	23
		Total	33.06	6.87	54

Note. AD=Athletics director, FBS=Football Bowl Subdivision, FCS=Football Championship Series.

Table 3

Mean Scores for University President, Football Division, Tenure

Position	Tenure	Football Division	*M*	*SD*	*N*
UP	0-3 Years	None	39.00	21.21	2
		FBS	38.50	4.65	4
		FCS	32.00	10.68	4
		Total	36.00	10.35	10
	3-11.9 Years	None	39.00	8.89	3
		FBS	31.40	3.98	5
		FCS	38.00	4.97	4
		Total	35.50	6.33	12
	12 or More Years	None	24.00	0.00	1
		FBS	34.50	2.95	6
		FCS	42.33	8.50	3
		Total	35.80	7.19	10
	Total	None	36.50	12.61	6
		FBS	34.53	4.50	15
		FCS	37.00	8.66	11
		Total	35.75	7.77	32

Note. UP=University president, FBS=Football Bowl Subdivision, FCS=Football Championship Series.

Occupational Tenure

The study explored the relationship between occupational tenure and leadership position on measures of sports-related ethical values (HBVCI-16). Participants were divided into three groups based on length of tenure: Less than 3 years experience, 3 to 11.9 years of experience, and 12 or more years of experience. A 2 x 3 ANOVA revealed no significant differences on measures of tenure, leadership position, and HBVCI-16 total scores ($F(5,80)=1.36$, $p>.05$; see Table 2 and 3).

A 2 x 2 x 3 ANOVA was conducted to determine if there were differences in ethical values for presidents or athletics directors with three or more years of occupational tenure. No significant main effects were found for tenure, leadership position, or football division. A significant interaction effect was found on position by football division ($F(2,57)=3.42$, $p<.05$ $P=.041$; see Table 4). The greatest difference in scores was found between athletics directors and university presidents in the FCS division. Athletics directors had significantly lower mean scores ($M=31.62$; see Table 5) than did presidents ($M=39.86$; see Table 6) at schools in the FCS division. Mean scores for athletics directors ($M=34.56$; see Table 5) and university presidents ($M=35.25$; see Table 6) at institutions with no football were similar.

A 2 x 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted in order to ascertain the effects of leadership position, tenure, and football participation on HBVCI-16 scores. No significant main effects were found. There was a significant interaction effect

Table 4

Univariate Tests of Between-Subjects Effects for Position, Tenure, and Football Division

Source	Df	MS	*F*	*P*
Position (P)	1	13.25	.313	.58
Tenure (T)	1	2.58	.061	.81
Football Division (F)	2	35.95	.849	.43
P X T	1	91.91	2.17	.15
P X F	2	144.88	3.42	.041
T X F	2	117.55	2.78	.07
P X T X F	2	85.81	2.03	.14
Error	45	42.33		

Note. Tenure includes only those respondents with more than 3 years experience.

Table 5

Mean Scores for Athletic Directors, Football Division, Tenure (3 or More Years)

Position	Tenure	Football Division	*M*	*SD*	*N*
AD	3-11.9 Years	None	32.86	5.61	7
		FBS	35.00	2.83	2
		FCS	28.00	8.56	7
		Total	31.00	7.10	16
	12 or More Years	None	35.89	8.99	9
		FBS	34.75	4.11	4
		FCS	35.83	4.16	6
		Total	35.63	6.61	19
	Total	None	34.56	7.62	16
		FBS	34.83	3.43	6
		FCS	31.62	7.77	13
		Total	33.51	7.13	35

Note. AD=Athletics director, FBS=Football Bowl Subdivision, FCS=Football Championship Series.

Table 6

Mean Scores for University Presidents, Football Division, Tenure (3 or More Years)

Position	Tenure	Football Division	*M*	*SD*	*N*
UP	3-11.9 Years	None	39.00	8.89	3
		FBS	31.40	3.97	5
		FCS	38.00	4.97	4
		Total	35.50	6.33	12
	12 or More Years	None	24.00	0.00	1
		FBS	34.50	2.95	6
		FCS	42.33	8.50	3
		Total	35.80	7.19	10
	Total	None	35.25	10.44	4
		FBS	33.10	3.65	11
		FCS	39.86	6.45	7
		Total	35.63	6.57	22

Note. UP=University president, FBS=Football Bowl Subdivision, FCS=Football Championship Series.

between leadership position and tenure (F (1,57)=4.90, p<.05 P=.032; see Table 7). Mean scores of athletics directors increased (M=31.00 to 35.63) as their tenure increased while presidents' mean scores remained constant as tenure increased (M=35.50 to 35.80). A significant interaction effect was also found between tenure and football participation (F(1,57)=4.67, p<.05 P=.036; see Table 7). Participants at institutions without football programs had similar mean scores across both tenure points (M=34.70). Scores increased significantly for those with football programs from 3-11.9 years of experience (M=31.94; see Table 10) to those with 12 or more years of experience (M=36.21; see Table 10). Table 8 and 9 summarizes mean scores for position, all tenure points, and football participation. Table 11 and 12 summarizes mean scores for university presidents and athletics directors with more than 3 years experience.

Gender and Athletic Participation

An initial research question was whether there was a gender difference in ethical values. Only 5 of the 86 respondents were female; therefore, the number of females was too small to perform a statistical analysis. A 2 x 2 ANOVA was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference on HBVCI-16 scores related to prior participation in intercollegiate athletics. No significant main effects or interaction were found between the groups (F(1,84)=1.56, p>.05).

Football

A 2 x 2 ANOVA was used to identify the effect of leadership position and institutional football participation on HBVCI-16 scores. Institutions were divided

Table 7

Univariate Tests of Between-Subject Effects for Position, Tenure, and Football Participation

Source	df	MS	*F*	*p*
Position (P)	1	2.73	.006	.94
Tenure (T)	1	5.54	.123	.73
Football Participation (F)	1	10.72	.238	.63
P X T	1	220.30	4.90	.032
P X F	1	74.09	1.65	.21
T X F	1	209.82	4.67	.036
P X T X F	1	110.83	2.47	.12
Error	49	44.96		

Note. Tenure includes only those respondents with more than 3 years experience.

Table 8

Mean Scores of Athletic Directors and Football Participation

Position	Tenure	Football Participation	*M*	*N*
AD	0-3 Years	No	28.33	3
		Yes	32.93	15
		Total	32.17	18
	3-11.9 Years	No	32.86	7
		Yes	29.56	9
		Total	31.00	16
	12 or More Years	No	36.00	8
		Yes	35.40	10
		Total	35.67	18
	Total	No	33.50	18
		Yes	32.76	34
		Total	33.02	52

Table 9

Mean Scores of University Presidents and Football Participation

Position	Tenure	Football Participation	*M*	*N*
UP	0-3 Years	No	24.00	1
		Yes	35.25	8
		Total	34.00	9
	3-11.9 Years	No	39.00	3
		Yes	34.43	7
		Total	35.80	10
	12 or More Years	No	24.00	1
		Yes	37.11	9
		Total	35.80	10
	Total	No	33.00	5
		Yes	35.71	24
		Total	35.24	29

Table 10

Total Mean Scores for Administrators With More Than 3 Years Experience and Football Participation

Position	Tenure	Football Participation	*M*	*N*
Total	3-11.9 Years	No	34.70	10
		Yes	31.94	18
		Total	32.93	28
	12 or More Years	No	34.70	10
		Yes	36.21	19
		Total	35.69	29
	Total	No	34.70	20
		Yes	34.13	37
		Total	34.33	57

Table 11

Mean Scores of Athletic Directors With More Than 3 Years Experience and Football Participation

Position	Tenure	Football Participation	*M*	*N*
AD	3-11.9 Years	No	32.86	7
		Yes	29.56	9
		Total	31.00	16
	12 or More Years	No	35.89	9
		Yes	35.40	10
		Total	35.63	19
	Total	No	34.56	16
		Yes	32.63	19
		Total	33.51	35

Table 12

Mean Scores of University Presidents With More Than 3 Years Experience and Football Participation

Position	Tenure	Football Participation	*M*	*N*
UP	3-11.9 Years	No	39.00	3
		Yes	34.33	9
		Total	35.50	12
	12 or More Years	No	24.00	1
		Yes	37.11	9
		Total	35.80	10
	Total	No	32.25	4
		Yes	35.72	18
		Total	35.64	22

into two groups, those that participated in football and those that did not. No significant main effect was found for the mean scores on the HBVCI-16 between athletics directors and university presidents for football participation (F (1,82)=.047, p>.05).

A 2 x 3 ANOVA was used to identify the effect of leadership position and institutional football division on HBVCI-16 scores. Participants were divided into three groups: those at institutions that participated in the FBS, those at institutions participating in the FCS, and those at institutions that did not participate in football. No significant main effects (F (1,80)=2.43, p>.05) or interaction effects (F (2,80)=0.86; p>.05) were found for position or football division (F(2,80)=0.04; p>.05).

Summary

Chapter 4 described the data analyses used in this study that assessed the moral reasoning of Division I university administrators in sport settings. Specifically, this chapter outlined the methodology, the data analysis, and summarized the findings of this research endeavor.

After receiving permission to use the HBVCI-16, data were collected electronically. Eighty-six useable responses were returned and analyzed. Data analysis found that there was no significant difference between athletics directors and university presidents on the HBVCI-16. However, additional data analyses revealed significant interactions between position and football division, position and tenure, and tenure and football participation. Chapter 5 will discuss the

findings and implications of the study and provide recommendations for future research based on these findings.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

College athletics has become a major component of our nationwide obsession with sports (French, 2004). At its best, intercollegiate athletics provide an avenue to unite a diverse campus and community behind a favorite team while providing positive outcomes for many student-athletes. Despite these positive attributes, however, intercollegiate athletics programs have battled reports of improprieties and abuses (Benford, 2007). The combination of exuberant economic growth, continuous pressure to win, and the unethical practices of some in college athletics creates a compelling need to better understand the leadership charged with managing intercollegiate athletics programs.

Division I athletics programs present complex issues of institutional oversight and ethical practice (Duderstadt, 2000). University presidents and athletics directors are the persons largely responsible for the governing and regulating of these multi-million dollar programs. Thus it is important to understand the moral reasoning of presidents and athletics directors as these individuals have significant influence on players, campuses, and the community. Previous studies have focused largely on moral reasoning of athletes participating in college sports (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Priest et al., 1999). Few initiatives have been undertaken to study the moral reasoning of individuals who are responsible for maintaining and managing intercollegiate athletics programs.

This study sought to answer the question, Do Division I athletics directors and university presidents differ on measures of sports-related ethical values? There was no significant difference overall between university presidents and athletics directors on measures of moral reasoning in athletics situations. Presidents and athletics directors both demonstrated moderate deontological considerations in sport settings and operated primarily within Kohlberg's conventional level of moral reasoning. The conventional level is the middle level in Kohlberg's model of moral development, falling between the preconventional and postconventional stages. Ethical decisions made by individuals in the conventional level of moral reasoning are made primarily on the basis of gaining social approval and following a shared set of moral norms and expectations (Kohlberg, 1984). Since most adults fall within the conventional level, the moral reasoning scores of presidents and athletics directors in this study closely resemble those of the typical adult population (Kohlberg, 1984; Rest, 1979).

The conventional level of moral reasoning is composed of two distinct stages of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1984). Stage three reasoning is based on the desire to live in accordance with the defined roles of one's group or society. Moral reasoning in this stage takes into consideration the consequences of a particular action and others' approval of their actions (Kohlberg, 1984). Stage four reasoning is based on complying with societal laws and upholding societal welfare. It is a more sophisticated level of moral decision-making that, unlike stage three moral reasoning, aims to obey and maintain the societal order.

Administrators of Division I college athletics programs in this study reason within the conventional stage of Kohlberg's hierarchy. Moral reasoning from this stage would give importance to actions that elicit the positive perception of their peers or upholds the existing mores in intercollegiate athletics. One's level of moral reasoning is influenced by the culture, socialization, and ethical climate of those around them (Ferrell & Gresham, 1985; Ford & Richardson, 1994; Visek & Watson, 2005). In sport settings an individual's reasoning may be influenced and guided by the pressure to meet or exceed expectations in comparison to rival institutions. Thus competitive sport settings may reinforce the use of conventional moral reasoning and discourage the progression to more sophisticated levels of reasoning (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Forte, 2004).

Tenure

This study also analyzed the effect of length of occupational tenure on the level of moral reasoning of presidents and athletics directors. The average scores for moral reasoning of athletics directors with more than three years of experience increased significantly as their tenure increased. The average scores for moral reasoning of presidents with more than three years experience increased slightly (but not significantly). Athletics directors' scores on moral reasoning were, therefore, highest as their length of career increased. Other factors may impact occupational tenure and moral reasoning scores, including competition level, risk tolerance, and the development of moral reasoning skills as one ages.

Previous studies in sport settings found the opposite for athletes; the longer they are in competitive athletic environments, the lower their levels of moral reasoning (Beller & Stoll, 1995; Priest et al., 1999). Research on coaches produced mixed results. Division III coaches' scores on sports-related ethical values increased as their length of tenure increased, while Division I coaches' values did not change significantly over time (Wigley, 2002). There is ample evidence that the environment and values differ radically between Division I and Division III athletics programs (Goeb, 1997; Griffith & Johnson, 2002). Therefore, one possibility is that the differences in the expectations or environment between Division I and Division III athletics may have differential effects on the level of moral reasoning for coaches in the different divisions.

Administrators with fewer years of tenure may take more risks in order to advance their careers (Kelley, Ferrell, & Skinner, 1990). Athletics directors with lower levels of moral reasoning may be concerned with establishing an initial level of program success and may be more susceptible to outside pressure from boosters and fans (maintaining the approval of others). Often, winning helps define a successful year for sport administrators, which can reinforce the win-at-all costs mentality (Funk, 1991). Athletics directors with limited programmatic success may be under greater scrutiny and face growing criticism from fans, which may lead to job insecurity and even termination (Funk). Thus, perhaps for administrators "the rewards received for unethical behavior are greater than the risks" in athletic environments (Pennino, 2002, p. 224).

Moral reasoning is a developmental process and can change over time (Forte, 2004). Thus, administrators with greater tenure may have developed the ability to morally reason in an increasingly complex manner. As athletics directors gain experience they may perceive they have more job security and become more comfortable making ethical decisions that may be unpopular. Their focus may shift from “popularity” to “doing what’s best for the program.” Administrators with longer tenure may also be less influenced by the culture of intercollegiate athletics and may be able to make decisions from a higher level of moral reasoning. According to Pennino, “older managers have gained more experience that might cause them to reason in more sophisticated manners, and such experience could be related to higher principled reasoning levels” (p. 221).

Football

No relationship was found between overall leadership position and institutional participation in collegiate football. There was a difference, however, between leadership position and football participation for leaders with three or more years of experience. Presidents with 12 or more years of experience and no football program at their institution had significantly higher scores on moral reasoning than did athletics directors with football supervision and fewer years of experience. Moreover, as length of tenure increased, the scores on moral reasoning of athletics directors responsible for football programs also increased. University presidents’ levels of moral reasoning remained constant across tenure points.

A difference in scores on moral reasoning was found for leadership position and football division. Overall, levels of moral reasoning were significantly higher for presidents at institutions participating in the Football Championship Series (FCS) when compared to those at Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions. Presidents at institutions in the FCS also had significantly higher levels of moral reasoning than athletics directors at FCS institutions. Based on these findings, it may be that competition level influences moral reasoning scores for university administrators in sport settings. Additional factors that may influence moral reasoning scores include: competitive athletic settings, socialization, and pressure to adhere to the organizational goals of a sport entity.

Previous studies found that athletes in highly competitive athletic environments had lower scores on moral reasoning than nonathletes or athletes participating in individual sports (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Priest et al., 1999). The competitive environment may therefore influence moral reasoning and moral behavior (Reall, Bailey, & Stoll, 1998). For example, aggressive behavior in sport settings was perceived as more legitimate as the level of competition increased (Conroy, Silva, Newcomer, Walker, & Johnson, 2001). Individuals in competitive situations look for advantages over their opponents, which may modify their moral reasoning structure (Long, Pantaleon, Bruant, & Arripe-Longueville, 2006). The focus on obtaining a competitive athletic advantage leads individuals to rely on lower levels of moral

reasoning in an attempt to meet their sport related goals. Competition may have negative consequences on behavior and moral reasoning (Reall et al., 1998).

Bredemeier and Shields (1986a, 1986b) concluded that competitive athletic environments negatively influence an individual's moral reasoning skills. In the win at all costs environment of highly competitive Division I football, athletics directors are under tremendous pressure from alumni, boosters, and fans to produce winning teams on a yearly basis (Estler & Nelson, 2005). The ethical climate in highly competitive Division I football programs likely influences the decision-making process of administrators. Thus athletics directors may respond to the competitive environment by making decisions that seek to maintain the approval of others or maintain the status-quo in a highly competitive athletics context.

Socialization is vital to the ethical decision-making process (Ferrell & Gresham 1985; Ford & Richardson, 1994). Socialization in competitive athletics settings reinforces norms that include the philosophy that winning has a higher priority than fair play and is acceptable regardless of the consequences (Shields, Gardner, Bredemeier, & Bostrom, 1995). Long et al. (2006) found "the moral atmosphere was an important reason for cheating" (p. 341). Moreover, moral reasoning is often set aside, "bracketed morality," to meet competitive goals (Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a). As athletics departments are pressured to produce winning teams and compete with other universities sport programs, it may be that the moral reasoning of administrators is more focused on meeting

the approval of others. Administrators may also justify morally flawed decisions in sport settings because they meet socially acceptable sport values (Long et al., 2006).

Athletics directors may experience greater conflict between organizational goals and actions based on a more sophisticated level of moral reasoning (Elm & Nichols, 1993). Perhaps pressure to achieve sport related institutional goals unduly influences the level of moral reasoning (Harris, 1990). Whereas athletics directors are under tremendous pressure to win, presidents, on the other hand, have largely been in an academic environment with less pressure to conform to a narrow constituency to achieve organizational goals. For example, presidents' decisions on personnel matters or disciplining a student rarely reach beyond the university. Yet similar decisions made by athletics directors are at times broadcast nationwide due to the extensive media coverage given to intercollegiate athletics. Thus, presidents are not socialized in the same athletics environment as athletics directors, which may explain their more sophisticated levels of moral reasoning within these settings.

Implications for Practice

There are several practical applications of the results of this study. First, competition level in athletics settings may affect the moral reasoning levels of administrators (Beller & Stoll, 2004; Bredemeier & Shields, 1986a, 1986b; Priest et al., 1999). This creates a need to place greater value on the mission of higher education rather than winning athletics programs (Funk, 1991; Knight

Commission, 2001; Nyquist, 1985; Thelin, 1994). One solution may be to base evaluation standards for athletics directors more on educational criteria, such as graduation rates of student-athletes, and less on team performance. In addition, placing athletics administrators on other university committees may help keep the focus on educational priorities and the mission of higher education and help sport administrators make sound ethical decisions despite the pressure of external influences. Unfortunately, there are likely no easy remedies for bringing into balance the mission of higher education and the current realities of college sports administration.

Reform efforts in intercollegiate athletics have called for more direct involvement and supervision from university presidents (Knight Commission Reports, 1991, 2001). More involvement from university presidents may be especially important since athletics directors early in their tenure have lower levels of moral reasoning than do university presidents. Presidents may be more inclined to look beyond the specific goal of a sport organization and focus on the needs of the whole campus community. Their level of moral reasoning may be influenced by a consideration of a broader “society” whose approval or rules provide a different perspective from which to make moral decisions.

Presidents and athletics directors should be made aware of the complexities, environmental forces, and culture that make ethical decisions difficult in intercollegiate athletics settings. Administrators, especially presidents, must understand the pressure and influence of athletics in relation to the

community, boosters, alumni, and fans and the problems these external factors can have on oversight and decision-making (Estler & Nelson, 2005). Individuals may not fully understand the influence of the athletics atmosphere on their level of moral reasoning. New administrators may find spending additional time understanding the athletic culture, expectations, and any past infractions helpful as they prepare to lead the institution.

Administrators need to engage in more complex cognitive reasoning about ethical issues in order to improve the culture in intercollegiate athletics (Jurkiewicz & Massey, 1998). Leaders of athletics programs and universities need to look at issues from the "broadest possible perspective, taking into account multiple stakeholders, principles, circumstances, issues of rights and justice, and the consequences of their decision for all affected by it" (Jurkiewicz & Massey, p. 181). A broad, more inclusive perspective may help reinforce an athletic culture based on fairness and integrity instead of the focused pursuit of program success.

An understanding of the complexities of managing an athletics operation may be beneficial to untested presidents with little to no experience in sport settings. Hiring boards may also want to place emphasis on knowledge and experience related to athletics when choosing a president. According to Powers (2008), "Colleges would be smart to consider all aspects of a presidential candidate's background, including dealings with collegiate sport" (p. 2).

Presidents have the power to influence the ethical culture of their institution by confronting ethical concerns, establishing ethical procedures, and raising ethical dimensions of various issues (Perlman, 1998). The ethical standards of top administrators are important as these persons have significant authority over the value system and conduct at their institution (Jurkiewicz & Massey, 1998). Consequently, administrative decisions should be considered in regard to ethics and ethical leadership. For example, job descriptions and hiring decisions can provide an opportunity for an institution to reaffirm strong educational and ethical values and maintain its integrity (Estler & Nelson, 2005).

If it is the athletics atmosphere that has a strong influence on the level of moral reasoning then there needs to be a systematic effort to change the value system of college athletics. A concerted focus on educational outcomes and sportsmanship is necessary at all levels--institutions, athletics departments, conferences, and the NCAA. Reducing the importance placed on championships and winning seasons may help alleviate some of the internal pressures athletics directors and university presidents face as they make decisions in sport settings. Reducing external pressure by alumni, fans, and boosters reduces the environmental pressure to win-at-all costs (French, 2004; Nyquist, 1985). Establishing guidelines of “best practices” for stakeholders to follow, which provide the guidance necessary to identify problems and make morally responsible decisions may be helpful for administrators (Jurkiewicz & Massey,

1998). Ultimately, administrators must develop a culture of shared values and ideals that are based on ethical principles (Sparks, 2001).

Implications for Future Research

The instrument selected for this study does not directly address administrative decision-making in sport settings. A study that assesses the link between moral reasoning, decision-making, and moral behavior in sport settings may prove beneficial in understanding not only how administrators perceive ethical situations but how their decisions relate to their ethical behavior. Research conducted on the effectiveness of ethics training programs for presidents and athletics directors may provide additional insight into the decision-making framework for these leaders.

Future research should also include a more in-depth study of the influence of football supervision and competition level on the level of moral reasoning of athletics administrators. Other research has determined that competition is important to moral reasoning levels, thus future studies may want to focus on presidents and athletics directors at different levels of intercollegiate athletics. Research assessing competition and moral reasoning levels could be accomplished by comparing Division I administrators and their Division II or Division III counterparts. It may be that administrators involved with oversight of Division I schools have different levels of moral reasoning in sport settings than those in less competitive athletic environments.

Finally, the effect of length of tenure on moral reasoning levels of sports administrators should be studied in more detail. Previous research in other settings has provided mixed results in relation to the influence of tenure on moral reasoning scores. Limited research on coaches and administrators in athletic settings has shown that longer tenure leads to higher levels of moral reasoning for Division III coaches and athletics directors (Wigley, 2002). Future studies could concentrate solely on length of occupational tenure and levels of moral reasoning for administrators in athletics settings. This could be accomplished through research that focuses on athletics administrators at various occupational levels to assess if moral reasoning levels increase as individuals gain more experience.

Summary

Intercollegiate athletics programs are a fixture at many Division I institutions. These programs provide many beneficial opportunities to students, the community, and student-athletes. Yet problems in intercollegiate athletics programs have been a reoccurring theme in higher education and the sports community. In this study presidents and athletics directors involved in managing Division I athletics programs were found to have similar levels of moral reasoning in sport settings.

The competitive environment and external pressure associated with managing a Division I, high profile collegiate football program may negatively impact the sports related moral reasoning of university administrators. Levels of

moral reasoning were significantly higher for presidents at institutions participating in the FCS when compared to those at FBS institutions. Ultimately, increased experience and tenure in the positions of university president and head athletics director may be important factors in combating the intense, win-at-all costs Division I athletics environment. It is important to understand the moral reasoning patterns of university presidents and athletics directors in sports situations as institutions are challenged to maintain their reputations as centers of higher learning.

References

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (1985). Women in sports. In Chu et al., *Sport and higher education* (pp. 313-327). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Andre, P., & James, D. N. (1991). *Rethinking college athletics*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Atwell, R. (2001, July 13). The only way to reform college sports is to embrace commercialization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

Bailey, W. S., & Littleton, T. D. (1991). *Athletics and academe*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Baker, A., & Slackman, M. (2005, February 26). Questions at SUNY Albany on why ex-president left. *The New York Times*.

Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (1995). Moral reasoning of high school student athletes & general students: An empirical study versus personal testimony. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, *7*, 352-363.

Beller, J. M., & Stoll, S. K. (2004). Moral reasoning and moral development in sport review and guide to the Hahm-Beller Values Choice Inventory. Center for ETHICS, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

Benford, R. D. (2007). The college sports reform movement: Reframing the "edutainment" industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *48*, 1-28.

Bok, D. (1985). Presidents need power within the NCAA to preserve academic standards and institutional integrity. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 207-210). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1986a). Moral growth among athletes and nonathletes: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *147*, 7-18.

Bredemeier, B. J., & Shields, D. L. (1986b). Game reasoning and interactional morality. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *147*, 257-275.

Brower, S. M. (1992). An assessment of the moral reasoning patterns of selected collegiate athletes. Doctoral dissertation. University of Northern Colorado (UMI No. 9235574).

Byers, W. (1995). *Unsportsmanlike conduct*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Chu, D. (1985). The American conception of higher education and the formal incorporation of intercollegiate sport. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 36-56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Chu, D. (1989). *The character of American higher education & intercollegiate sport.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chu, D., Segrave, J. O., & Becker, B. J. (1985). *Sport and higher education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Conroy, D. E., Silva, J. M., Newcomer, R. R., Walker, B. W., & Johnson, M. S. (2001). Personal and participatory socializers of the perceived legitimacy of aggressive behavior in sport. *Aggressive Behavior*, *27*, 405-418.

Crown, J., & Heatherington, L. (1989). The cost of winning? The role of gender in moral reasoning and judgments about competitive athletic encounters. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 281-289.

Davenport, J. (1985). From crew to commercialism-the paradox of sport in higher education. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 5-16). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2000). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Ehlrich, T. (1995). *The courage to inquire*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Elm, D. R., & Nichols, M. L. (1993). An investigation of the moral reasoning of mangers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *12*, 817-833.

Estler, S. E., & Nelson, L. J. (2005). Who calls the shots? *ASHE Higher Education Report, 30*(5). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Feezell, R. (2004*). Sport, play, and ethical reflection*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Ferrell, O. C., & Gresham, L. G. (1985). A contingency framework for understanding ethical decision making in marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, *49*, 87-96.

Fizel, J., & Fort, R. (2004). *Economics of college sports*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Fleisher, A. A., Goff, B. L., & Tollison, R. D. (1992). *The National Collegiate Athletic Association: A study in cartel behavior*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Ford, R. C., & Richardson, W. D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *13*, 205-221.

Forte, A. (2004). Antecedents of managers moral reasoning. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *51*, 315-347.

Francis, L. (2001). Title IX: Equality for Women's Sports? In Morgan et al. (Eds.), *Ethics in sport* (pp. 247-267). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

French, P. A. (2004). *Ethics and college sports*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Frey, J. H. (1985a). Boosterism, scarce resources, and institutional control: The future of American intercollegiate athletics. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 115-131). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Frey, J. H. (1985b). College athletics: Problems of institutional control. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 179-189). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Funk, G. D. (1991). *Major violation: The unbalanced priorities in athletics and academics*. Champaign, IL: Leisure Press.

Galla, D. (2007). Moral reasoning of finance and accounting professionals: An ethical and cognitive moral development examination. Doctoral dissertation. Nova Southeastern University (UMI No. 3260185).

Gerdy, J. R. (1997). *The successful college athletic program*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Goeb, R. A. (1997). A comparison of cognitive moral reasoning among selected NCAA Division II intercollegiate coaches and athletes. Doctoral dissertation. The University of North Dakota. (UMI No. 9807687).

Griffith, K. A., & Johnson, K. A. (2002). Athletic identity & life roles of division I & division III collegiate athletes. Retrieved March 15, 2007, from http://Murphylibrary.uwlax.edu, 225-233.

Guttmann, A. (1991). The anomaly of intercollegiate athletics. In Andre & James, *Rethinking college athletics* (pp. 17-30). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Hanford, G. H., & Greenberg, M. (2003). We should speak the “awful truth” about college sports…or does the public like the status quo? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, *49*, 10-13.

Harris, J. R. (1990). Ethical values of individuals at different levels in the organizational hierarchy of a single firm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *9*, 741-750.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Massey, T. K. (1998). The influence of ethical reasoning on leader effectiveness: An empirical study of nonprofit executives. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership, 9*, 173-186.

Kelley, S. W., Ferrell, O. C., & Skinner, S. J. (1990). Ethical behavior among marketing researchers: An assessment of selected demographic characteristics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *9*, 681-688.

Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (1991). *Keeping faith with the student athlete: A new model for intercollegiate athletics*. John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2001). *A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education*. John S. and James L. Knight Foundation

Kohlberg, L. (1984). *The psychology of moral development*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.

Langlis, P. J. (2006, January 13). Ethics for the next generation. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 52*(19).

Lawrence, P. R. (1987). *Unsportsmanlike conduct*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Lederman, D. (2004, January 14). College presidents learn it's hard to keep sports pure. Retrieved January 23, 2007, from www.USATODAY.com

Long, T., Pantaleon, N., Bruant, G., & Arripe-Longueville, F. (2006). A qualitative study of moral reasoning of young elite athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, *20*, 330-347.

Lumpkin, A., Stoll, S. K., & Beller, J. M. (1995). *Sport ethics: Applications for fair play*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Maitland, P. A. (2006). Cognitive moral development in city and county of San Francisco public administrators. Doctoral dissertation. Northcentral University (UMI No. 3243179).

Malloy, D. C., & Zakus, D. H. (1995). Ethical decision making in sport administration: A theoretical inquiry into substance and form. *Journal of Sport Management*, *9*, 36-58.

Mennuti, R. B. (1987). An exploration of moral orientation, gender and nature of the dilemma in moral reasoning of community college presidents. Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (UMI No. 8719034).

Nyquist, E. B. (1985). The immorality of big-power intercollegiate athletics. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 101-115). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Pennino, C. M. (2002). Does tenure impact upon the principled reasoning of managers? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *40*, 219-226.

Perlman, D. H. (1998). Ethical challenges of the college and university presidency. In May, W. W., *Ethics and higher education* (364-387). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Powers, E. (2008, February 20). Sports and the presidential pedigree*. Inside Higher Ed*.

Priest, R. F., Krause, J. V., & Beach, J. (1999). Four-year changes in college athletes' ethical values choices in sports situations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 170-179.

Reall, M. J., Bailey, J. J., & Stoll, S. K. (1998). Moral reasoning "on hold" during a competitive game. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *17*, 1205-1210.

Reiter, B. (2006, October 29). "Bob Huggins U" Kansas City Star. Retrieved May 18, 2007, from www.kansascitystar.com

Rest, J. R. (1979). *Development in judging moral issues*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Rest, J., Narvaez, D., Bebeau, M., & Thomas, S. (1999). *Postconventional moral thinking.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Rich, J. M., & DeVitis, J. L. (1985). *Theories of moral development*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas Publisher.

Rombeck, T. (2003, December 7). Athletics arms race: Programs' successes tied to money. Retrieved January 1, 2007, from www.kusports.com

Santomier, J., & Cautilli, P. (1985). Controlling deviance in intercollegiate athletics. In Chu et al. (Eds.), *Sport and higher education* (pp. 397-404). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetic Publishers, Inc.

Schmidt, C. D. (2007). Promoting the ethical development of undergraduate business students through a Deliberate Psychological Education-based classroom intervention. Doctoral dissertation. The College of William and Mary (UMI No. 3257325).

Shields, D. L., & Bredemeier, B. J. (1995). *Character development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL; Human Kinetics.

Shields, D. L., Gardner, D. E., Bredemeier, B. J., & Bostrom, A. (1995). Leadership, cohesion, and team norms regarding cheating & aggression. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *12*, 324-336.

Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life*. Princeton University Press. New Jersey

Single, D. (1989). The role of directors of athletics in restoring integrity to intercollegiate sport. In Slaughter & Lapchick, *The rules of the game* (pp. 151-161). New York: McMillan Publishing Company.

Slaughter, R. E., & Lapchick, J. B. (1989). *The rules of the game*. New York: McMillan Publishing Company.

Smith, R. A. (1988). *Sports and freedom*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sparks, W. (2001). Leadership visited: Integrity, character, and morality-more than perspiration or inspiration? *QUEST*, *53*, 507-521.

Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Staudohar, P. D., & Zepel, B. (2004). The impact of higher education of corruption in big-time college sports. In J. Fizel & R. Fort (Eds.), *Economics of college sports* (pp. 35-51). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Stoll, S. (2007, March 5). Do college athletics corrupt? *Sports Illustrated*.

Thelin, J. R. (1994). *Games colleges play*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thelin, J. R., & Wiseman, L. L. (1989). *The old college try: Balancing academics and athletics in higher education*. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Tod, D., & Hodge, K. (2001). Moral reasoning and achievement motivation in sport; A qualitative inquiry. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 24*(3), 307-327.

Upton, J., & Wieberg, S. (2006, November 16). Million-dollar coaches move into mainstream. *USA Today*, pp. 1A.

Visek, A., & Watson, J. (2005). Ice hockey players legitimacy of aggression & professionalization of attitudes. *The Sport Psychologist*, *19*, 178-192.

Weiss, M. R., & Smith, A. L. (2002). Moral development in sport and physical activity: Theory, research, and intervention. In T. Horn (Ed.), *Advances in sport psychology* (pp 243-280). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Wieberg, S. (2001, October 23). Minnesota trying to rebound from scandal. Retrieved May 17, 2007, from http://www.USATODAY.com

Wigley, B. J. (2002). Ethical values and behavioral intentions of head coaches in NCAA Division I and Division III collegiate athletic departments. Doctoral dissertation, Texas A & M University (UMI No. 3060759).

Wolverton, B. (2006, April 28). Presidents flex their muscle. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved January 18, 2007, from http://www.Chronicle.com

Wright, S. W. (1997, May 5). Two college presidents face ethics complaints. *Community College Week*. Retrieved July 11, 2007 from http://www.ccweek.com

Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sport.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

University and Medical Center Institutional Review Board
East Carolina University
Ed Warren Life Sciences Building • 600 Moye Boulevard • LSB 104 • Greenville, NC 27834
Office 252-744-2914 • Fax 252-744-2284 • www.ecu.edu/irb
Chair and Director of Biomedical IRB: Charles W. Daeschner, III, MD
Chair and Director of Behavioral and Social Science IRB: Susan L. McCammon, PhD

TO: Laura Spivey, 5432 Rebecca Lynn Lane, Raleigh, NC 27613

FROM: UMCIRB

DATE: November 2, 2007

RE: Exempt Category Research Study

TITLE: "University Presidents and Athletic Directors: A Comparison of Sport Related Values"

UMCIRB # 07-0696

This research study has undergone expedited review on 11.1.07. This research study meets the criteria for an exempt status because it is a research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects and any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
Dr. S. McCammon deemed this **unfunded** study **no more than minimal risk.** This research study does not require any additional interaction with the UMCIRB unless there are changes in this study because the changes may impact the level of review required.

The following items were reviewed:
- Internal Processing Form
- Questionnaire

Dr. S. McCammon does not have a potential for conflict of interest on this study.

The UMCIRB applies 45 CFR 46, Subparts A-D, to all research reviewed by the UMCIRB regardless of the funding source. 21 CFR 50 and 21 CFR 56 are applied to all research studies under the Food and Drug Administration regulation. The UMCIRB follows applicable International Conference on Harmonisation Good Clinical Practice guidelines.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY

HAHM - BELLER VALUES CHOICE INVENTORY*
In The Sport Milieu

The following questionnaire describes incidents that have occurred in sport settings. Each question addresses moral values. Because there are no right or wrong answers, please circle the answer that best describes your feelings. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree, N = Neutral; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree

1 - 1. Two rival basketball teams in a well-known conference played a basketball game on team A's court. During the game, team B's star player was consistently heckled whenever she missed a basket, pass, or rebound. In the return game on team B's home court, the home crowd took revenge by heckling team A's players. Such action is fair because both crowds have equal opportunity to heckle players.	SA A N D SD
2 -2. During the double play in baseball, players must tag second base before throwing to first. However, some players deliberately fake the tag, thus delivering a quicker throw to first base. Pretending to tag second base is justified because it is a good strategy. Besides, the umpire's job is to call an illegal play.	SA A N D SD
4- 3. Swimmers are taught to stand completely still just before the gun shot that starts the race. Some coaches teach their swimmers to move their head and upper body slightly which possibly forces an opponent to false start. If swimmer B false starts he will probably stay in the blocks a fraction longer when the race starts. Consequently, swimmer A may have an advantage during the race. Because all competitors have equal opportunity for this strategy, this is an acceptable means for swimmers to increase their advantage	SA A N D SD
5- 4. Male Soccer players are allowed to play the ball with any part of their body except the hands or outstretched arms. A soccer player receives a chest high pass and taps the ball to the ground with his hand. The referee does not see this action and the play continues. Because it is the referee's job to see these actions, the player is not obligated to report the foul.	SA A N D SD
6 -5 . A female gymnast with Big Time U tries diligently to be a great athlete, but alas the gods are not with her. The more she works, the more she seems to all at the most inappropriate times: the big meets. She decides to seek help for her mental shortcomings. She sets monthly appointments with her school's sport psychologist. In six months, the meetings prove fruitful, and she begins to see results.	SA A N D SD
8- 6 Basketball player A skillfully dribbled the ball around her opponents to the basket. Just as she moved toward the basket, she was tripped by played B, causing the basket to be missed. If player A had not been tripped, two points probably would have been made. Player B is charged with a foul and player A must shoot two free throws. Player A missed the two shots from the free throw line. Player B is demonstrating good strategy by forcing player A to shoot two foul shots instead of an easy lay-up.	SA A N D SD
10-7. Certain basketball teams are coached to run plays that cause the opponents to foul. Players and coaches believe this is clever strategy because the opponents may foul out of the game, giving their team an advantage. Because the coach orders this type of play, the players should follow his directions.	SA A N D SD

11-8. A highly recruited sprinter from Zimbabwe attends every practice, works diligently, and is highly respected by his peers and coaches. He is a good student, sits in the front of every class, and is an active participant. He is an NCAA finalist and must miss three days of class for the championships. As per university policy, he contacts all of his professors and receives permission to take his final exams at a different time and place.	SA A N D SD
15-9 Player A who is the center on an ice hockey team skated the puck down the ice, around several opponents. He had a clear shot at the net as he passed player B. Player B, while pretending to go for the puck, decided to turn at the last second to trip Player A with his stick. Consequently, Player A missed the goal. Because Player A must now attempt a penalty shot instead of an easy goal, this is demonstrating good strategy.	SA A N D SD
16-10. During a volleyball game player A hit the ball over the net. The ball barely grazed off player B's fingers and landed out of bounds. However the referee did not see player B touch the ball. Because the referee is responsible for calling rule violations, player B is not obligated to report the violation.	SA A N D SD
17-11. A starting linebacker for Big Time U is a good person, is known for his hard work and determination. He is also known as a fierce competitor and is aggressive on every play. The best part about him is that he is a consummate player. He loves the game and the experiences gained from it. He is also known as a good sport. He has won every team award for sportsmanlike conduct. After the big interstate rivalry, he shakes hands with all opposing players and coaches.	SA A N D SD
19-12. Football players are not allowed to move beyond the line of scrimmage until the ball is snapped. Some coaches encourage their players to charge across the line of scrimmage a fraction of a second before the ball is snapped. The officials have difficulty seeing the early movement, therefore, the team has an advantage compared to their opponents. Because the strategy is beneficial and the officials must call the infraction, the team's actions are fair..	SA A N D SD
20-13. During an intramural basketball game, a student official awarded one free throw shot instead of two to team A. Team B knew the call was wrong, however chose to remain silent, knowing the call was to their advantage. Because the official's job is to make the proper calls, and it is not a formal game, team B's action was acceptable.	SA A N D SD
23-14. The star of the swim team at Big Time U was 21 and had just completed a great collegiate career by winning both of her events at the NCAA Championships. Her parents traveled over 200 miles to support her and cheer her on to victory. After the finals, they take her out to dinner to celebrate. She decides to have a glass of white wine with her fish fillet entree.	SA A N D SD
24-15. During a youth sport football game, an ineligible pass receiver catches a long touchdown pass and scores. The officials fail to determine that the player was ineligible. Because it is the referee's job to detect the ineligible receiver, the player or the coach does not have to declare an ineligible receiver	SA A N D SD
25-16. Ice hockey is often a violent game. Even though players are often hurt, hitting hard and smashing players into the boards is normal. Player A and B are opponents playing in a championship game. While trying to control the puck, player A smashed player B into the boards. Even though the puck is on the opposite side of the arena, player B, a few minutes later, retaliated by smashing player A into the boards. Because "hitting hard" and "smashing players into the boards" are an inherent part of the game, player B's action was acceptable	SA A N D SD

APPENDIX C: PERMISSION EMAIL FROM SHARON STOLL

Spivey, Laura M.

From: Sharon Stoll [SSTOLL@uidaho.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 11, 2007 10:50 PM
To: Spivey, Laura M.
Subject: RE: HBVCI

I am told an email is a legal document, therefore, you have my permission as the Director of the Center for ETHICS* to use our HBVCI in your study. This is contingent on your following ethical practice and giving us a copy of your results. Good luck.
Sharon Kay Stoll, Ph.D.
Director, Center for ETHICS*

From: Spivey, Laura M. [mailto:Spiveyl@uncw.edu]
Sent: Wed 10/10/2007 6:24 AM
To: Sharon Stoll
Subject: HBVCI

Good morning Dr. Stoll,
A few months ago I ordered copies of the HBVCI from your center. In order to get IRB approval, I am in need of a letter of permission to use the instrument. I am hoping someone from your center could email or send me a letter of permission. Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Kind regards,
Laura Spivey

APPENDIX D: EMAIL TO PRESIDENTS AND ATHLETICS DIRECTORS

Spivey, Laura M.

From: Spivey, Laura [triyonisl@ecu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, November 07, 2007 2:56 PM
To: Spivey, Laura M.
Subject: Research Survey Request

Dear Presidents and Athletics Directors,

As part of my doctoral research, I am conducting a study which assesses decisions made by Directors of Athletics and University Presidents in sport specific situations. This project is being conducted under the direction of William E. Shelton, President Emeritus-Eastern Michigan University, and Visiting Clinical Professor-East Carolina University.

I need your assistance which should take no more than 10 minutes of your time. I am inviting you to participate in a brief survey by DATE. The survey can be found at https://survey.ecu.edu/perseus/se.ashx?s=0B87A656742F97B108C9EF8F54284E4F04

The identity of all respondents will be kept strictly confidential. In addition, institutional affiliation will not be referred to individually. Your name, institution, and responses will be kept confidential and will not be reported in my study, which will only report aggregate data.

Your responses will provide valuable information and insights into decision-making in intercollegiate athletics settings and higher education.

Your assistance would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for taking the time to complete my survey.

Respectfully,

Laura M. Spivey

Doctoral Candidate in Educational Leadership

East Carolina University