

Texas Southern University

## Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University

---

Dissertations (2016-Present)

Dissertations

---

5-2022

### HBCU Athletic Administrators' Perception Toward Creating A Graduate Level Curriculum for Directors of Athletics

Kevin Granger

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Granger, Kevin, "HBCU Athletic Administrators' Perception Toward Creating A Graduate Level Curriculum for Directors of Athletics" (2022). *Dissertations (2016-Present)*. 13.  
<https://digitalscholarship.tsu.edu/dissertations/13>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations at Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations (2016-Present) by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship @ Texas Southern University. For more information, please contact [haiying.li@tsu.edu](mailto:haiying.li@tsu.edu).

HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION TOWARD CREATING A  
GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree Doctor of Education in the Graduate School  
of Texas Southern University

By

Kevin Granger, B.A., M.S.

Texas Southern University

2022

Approved by

Dr. Delilah Gonzales  
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

Dr. Gregory H. Maddox  
Dean, The Graduate School

Approved By

Dr. Delilah Gonzales  
Chairperson, Dissertation Committee

3/29/22  
Date

Dr. Ingrid Haynes  
Committee Member

3/29/22  
Date

Dr. Roderick Holmes  
Committee Member

3/29/22  
Date

Dr. J. Kenyatta Cavil  
Committee Member

3/29/22  
Date

Dr. Hope Luster  
Committee Member

3/29/22  
Date

© Copyright by Kevin Granger 2022

All Rights Reserved

HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION TOWARD CREATING A  
GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

By

Kevin Granger, Ed.D.

Texas Southern University, 2021

Associate Professor Delilah Gonzales, Advisor

The purpose of this study was to investigate historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e., Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) perceptions of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs. Few studies were reported in the literature of researchers investigating variables affecting the operation, effectiveness and curriculum development of athletics at HBCUs. Athletics curriculum continues to be debated amongst this discipline's educators. Athletic directors (ADs) in institutions of higher education are the chief administrators of their respective athletic departments. Davis (2002) explains that ADs are consequently praised for the success or either blamed for the failure of an athletic program. Through their leadership and management, athletic programs are built and are equipped with the resources to compete, and student-athletes develop skills for life (Carodine et al., 2002). Curricular content impacts professional sport organizations as program graduates become employees.

In addition, the questionnaire used in this study is a modified version of the instrument entitled *Questionnaire of Athletic Directors' Perception of Variables*

*Determining the Effectiveness of Athletic Programs* used by McClelland (2011). Data collected allowed the researcher to determine historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e. Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) perceptions of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs.

Keywords: Athletic Administrators, Gender Equity, NCAA/NAIA, Diversity

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
LIST OF TABLES .....	iv
VITA.....	viii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE .....	11
3. METHODOLOGY .....	31
4. ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	36
5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	69
APPENDIX.....	74
A. INFORMED CONSENT .....	75
B. QUESTIONNAIRE OF HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION TOWARD CREATING A GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS .....	78
REFERENCES .....	82

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequency Distribution of the Participants by Divisional Classification .....	38
2. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Institutional Enrollment.....	39
3. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Type of Educational Attainment .....	40
4. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Age .....	41
5. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Gender .....	41
6. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of College/University Funding .....	42
7. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Corporate Sponsorship .....	43
8. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Facilities.....	44
9. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Televised games .....	45
10. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Bowl Games .....	46
11. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Alumni Donations.....	46
12. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Revenue/Funding in terms of Support Groups.....	47



Table	Page
13. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Gender Equity in terms of Program Funding for Gender Equity .....	48
14. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Gender Equity in terms of Salary Equity .....	49
15. Frequency Distribution of Participants by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Eligibility Policies/Practices .....	50
16. Frequency Distribution of Participants by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Compliance with NCAA/NAIA Rules .....	51
17. Frequency Distribution of Participants by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Financials Aid/Scholarships .....	52
18. Frequency Distribution of Participants by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Structure of NCAA/NAIA Divisions .....	53
19. Frequency Distribution of Participants by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Governance .....	54
20. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academics in terms of Graduation Rates.....	54
21. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academics in terms of ACT/SAT Standardized Test Scores .....	55
22. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academics in terms of Grade Point Averages .....	56
23. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academics in terms of Admission Standards .....	57

Table	Page
24. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academics in terms of Involvement in Educational Mission of Institution .....	58
25. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Academic in terms of Academic Progression Rate .....	59
26. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Student-Athlete in terms of Recruitment of Athletes.....	59
27. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Student-Athlete in terms of Stipends for Student-Athletes.....	60
28. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Student-Athlete in terms of Sportsmanship .....	61
29. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Student-Athlete services in terms of Support Services.....	62
30. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Diversity in terms of Number of Ethnic Minority Coaches.....	63
31. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Diversity in terms of Number of Ethnic Minority Student Athletes.....	64
32. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Athletic Director’s Expertise in terms of Public Relations.....	65
33. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Athletic Director’s Expertise in terms of Selecting and Training Staff.....	66
34. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Athletic Director’s Expertise in terms of Knowledge of Financial Management.....	67

Table	Page
35. Frequency Distribution of Participants by Athletic Director's Expertise in terms of Program Supervision .....	68

## VITA

2000.....	Bachelor of Business Administration Texas Southern University Houston, TX
2015.....	M.S., Health Education Texas Southern University Houston, TX
2016-Present .....	Adjunct Professor Department of Health, Kinesiology and Sports Studies Texas Southern University Houston, TX
2017-Present .....	Vice-President of Intercollegiate Athletics Texas Southern University Houston, TX
Major Field.....	Curriculum & Instruction

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Delilah Gonzales, and my committee members, Dr. J. Kenyatta Cavil, Dr. Roderick Holmes, Dr. Ingrid Haynes, and Dr. Hope Luster.

Thanks also to my beautiful wife, Tracy Granger for assisting me over the years with her wisdom and advice.

A special thank you to my children, Vasquez Haynes, Kevin Granger, Jr., Kolby Granger and Kennah Granger- you are truly the joy of my life.

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

# **CHAPTER 1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The modern-day Athletic Directors' job has transformed into a role that attracts some of the top executives both in and outside the sports industry (Belzer, 2015). Though the complexity of the AD's position varies depending on the size and type of institution, the effectiveness of the department is largely determined by the skills and talents of the director and the previous experiences that have prepared him or her for the responsibilities of a directorship (Fitzgerald et al., 1994). Since that 1994 study, additional research has uncovered information about the profile of current collegiate ADs as it relates to education, age, race, and gender. Few studies examine skillsets and curriculum development as it relates to the success of an Athletic Director (Belzer, 2015).

Athletic directors must have the ability to coordinate with university presidents and direct key members of university leadership (LeCrom & Pratt, 2016). Communicating and collaborating are crucial to this process. "Creating an environment where others can flourish" is part of the athletic director's job description (LeCrom & Pratt, 2016, p.203). An athletic director and athletic department are examples of a leader's influence on the performance of a team (Smith & Washington, 2014).

As college athletics have evolved, so too has the role of the athletic director. The role of athletic directors has grown from having simple roots as teachers and coaches to requiring specialized knowledge in business, finance, and marketing (Whisenant & Pedersen, 2004). To understand the position of today's athletic director, knowledge of

how the position evolved requires insight into its myriad responsibilities and expectations.

Today's athletic directors come to their positions from diverse backgrounds, and they bring a range of leadership styles. The professional backgrounds they bring to the athletic department vary in work history, associations, and business experience (Smith & Washington, 2014). Although the believed common path to the chief officer role in an athletic department is to have previous athletic administrative experience, coaching, higher education administration, college teaching, and business have become viable alternative paths (Hardin et al., 2013). Most athletic directors today hold advanced degrees reflecting recognition of the importance of a strong educational background to succeed in the role (Comeaux, Brown, & Sieben, 2015). These graduate degrees may be in sports management, business, or education. Athletic directors frequently do not come into their roles ready, rather they evolve into their roles. They also must continue to advance their knowledge to remain effective in their roles. Education, experience, and professional development are required for the modern athletic director (LeCrom & Pratt, 2016).

### **Statement of the Problem**

The problem investigated in the study was that variables are not known that may lead to and help sustain the effectiveness of athletic programs at HBCUs as perceived by athletic directors. Few studies of the future of intercollegiate athletics at HBCU institutions exist. Goss, Crow, Ashley, and Jubenville (2004) examined the perspectives of HBCU athletic directors regarding conditions within the NCAA and their prognostications for the future. They recommended that further study be conducted to

determine athletic directors' opinions on how their departments would cope with conditions that might exist such as student athletic stipends, if permitted by the NCAA, and mandated compliance with gender equity provisions. Issues such as revenue and governance could pose problems for the operation of inter-collegiate programs at HBCUs. As these and other variables appeared to have some influence on the effectiveness of intercollegiate programs in NCAA divisions, research was needed to identify those variables applicable to HBCUs. Additionally, because of limited reports in the literature on the future of intercollegiate athletics at HBCU, studies were needed to determine the effects of variables on athletic programs, to identify alternatives for college/ university officials and athletic leadership, as well as possible implications for the NCAA.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to investigate historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e. Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) perceptions of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs. Athletic directors (ADs) in institutions of higher education are the chief administrators of their respective athletic departments. Davis (2002) explains that ADs are consequently praised for the success or either blamed for the failure of an athletic program. Through their leadership and management, athletic programs are built and are equipped with the resources to compete, and student-athletes develop skills for life (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2002). Curricular content impacts professional sports organizations as program graduates become employees.



### **Significance of the Study**

The research on intercollegiate athletics contains questions regarding such issues as graduation rates, diversity, control of athletic programs, gender equity, funding, compliance, and organizational effectiveness. This study is beneficial in identifying the perceptions of athletic directors on how well they gain greater competence in understanding curriculum regarding athletic programs, graduation rates, and student-athlete academic performance. The study provided insight into the number of directors' perceptions of how well they are prepared to do the job. Athletics is a major financial component of a college or university's budget. Thus, the ability to maintain high functioning athletic department is difficult when directors of athletics have not been educated in their occupation of choice. The findings are important in determining the need for reform and best practices to ensure all student-athletes are successful on and off the court.

### **Research Questions**

Based on data collected through the modified survey instrument used in the athletic study completed by McClelland (2011), answers to the following question were sought:

1. Do the profile factors (divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender) have an impact on HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
2. Do courses related to revenue funding in seven content areas of study as measured by Section A of the questionnaire have an impact on HBCU athletic

directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

3. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of a gender equity course for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
4. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding NCAA/NAIA policies for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
5. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding academics, as measured by Section D of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
6. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding student-athletes, as measured by Section E of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
7. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding diversity, as measured by Section F of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

8. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding athletic directors' expertise, as measured by Section G of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

### **Definition of Terms**

The following terms were operationally defined and applied to the context of this study to make terms used in a study as explicit as possible:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***Historical penalties.*** Restrictions placed on an institution’s athletic program based on four years of data that indicate the student-athletes have consistently performed below the NCAA criteria for academic success are historical penalties. Such penalties include scholarship reductions, postseason competition bans, and membership restrictions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

***Variable.*** This term is used to denote a concept, feature, or condition that

contributes to effective athletic programs.

### **Assumptions**

Several assumptions were made before the current study was fully developed and completed.

1. It was assumed that the participants who were surveyed responded objectively, honestly, and accurately to questions regarding variables that influence the effectiveness of HBCU athletic programs.
2. It was assumed that the instrument used for this study provided data to accurately measure variables that determine the Athletic Directors' perceptions of curriculum development and graduate-level curriculum for athletic programs.
3. It was assumed that the interpretations of the findings will accurately reflect the purpose of this study.

### **Limitations**

The current study is not without several limitations.

1. The study was limited to information gathered through the use of a survey instrument
2. The study was limited to the number of HBCUs that participated in the study.
3. The study was limited to HBCU athletic administrators.

## **Organization of the Study**

This study is organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 consists of the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, definition of terms, assumptions, limitations, and organization of the study. Chapter 2 presents literature related to the problem investigated is presented which addresses Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Historically Black College and University Athletics, intercollegiate athletics at HBCUs, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, Issues Associated with Athletics and the NCAA, Issues Associated with HBCUs, and Intercollegiate Athletics Profile and Role of the Athletic Director, Academic Performance and the Student-Athlete, and several major issues that affect the competence in understanding curriculum regarding athletic programs, graduation rates, and student-athlete academic performance. Chapter 3 contains the methodological framework of the study. This chapter includes the population, instrumentation, reliability of the instrument, validity of the instrument, data collection procedures, and procedures for analyzing the data. The analysis of the data and a summary of findings are presented in Chapter 4. The study is summarized in Chapter 5 along with a listing of findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on the findings of the investigation.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

It may help college presidents to choose the right person for their university's athletic department if they take a close look at the formation and outcome of Division I athletic leadership. In addition, this information may be beneficial for professionals looking to advance to the position of athletic director at the Division I level if they can use best practices to hone their skills. Putting this knowledge together may help to advance the profession and provide insight into the role of the athletic director. This chapter contains a review of literature related to intercollegiate athletics with emphasis on the professional and education trends most common among contemporary HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics, interest, and curriculum development for educational programs.

#### **Historically Black Colleges and Universities**

Historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) are a unique feature of the higher education landscape in the US. Most HBCUs are founded and located in southern states. HBCUs were established before the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to provide higher education for the African American community. The black population had no choice but to find educational opportunities separately from their White counterparts. Before the Civil War, the limited options for freed Black slaves who sought higher education were at Lincoln University (Pennsylvania), Cheyney University (Pennsylvania), and Wilberforce University (Ohio) (Albritton, 2012; Gasman, Baez, & Turner, 2008; Gasman & Bowman III, 2012; Gasman & Tudico, 2008).



Further, following the Civil War millions of newly freed slaves saw the need to create educational opportunities. The Freedman's Bureau and other religious missionary efforts (i.e., African Methodist Episcopal, American Baptist Home Mission Society, American Missionary Association) spurred the creation of more HBCUs primarily in the Southeast, Southwest, and Northeast United States (Evans, Evans, & Evans, 2002; Gasman & Bowman III, 2012).

The early HBCUs were established as a result of two pieces of legislation, namely the first and second Morrill Land Grant Acts in 1862 and 1890 (Harper, Patton, & Wooden, 2009). Evans, Evans, and Evans (2002) noted that HBCUs were initially established to deter Blacks from matriculating into PWIs (Evans, Evans, & Evans, as cited Nichols, 2004, p. 219). However, due to the evolution of education HBCUs are not considered holding for blacks and have managed to far exceed initial historical expectations. Further, Black colleges were founded by Black missionaries, for example, Morris Brown College located in Atlanta, Georgia, Paul Quinn College located in Dallas, Texas, and Allen University, located in Columbia, South Carolina. These Black colleges were able to operate and function with little to no support from White or PWIs. As a result, these Black schools had autonomy over the curriculum and growth of the college (Gasman & Bowman III, 2012). Nevertheless, HBCUs were forged with the stated intent of providing higher educational opportunities for Blacks and principally provided primary and secondary education opportunities upon inception with an emphasis on preparing Blacks as teachers to help further educate the Black community (Gasman, Baez, & Turner, 2008; Jenkins, 1991).

The early HBCUs were private colleges and in 1890 the second Morrill Act laid the foundation to establish public Black colleges. According to the second Morrill Act, public institutions of higher education saw a dramatic shift in the attention directed toward the academic advancement of Black students. Segregated historically White colleges and universities would only receive federal funding if they established a subsequent land-grant institution for Blacks with access to equitable funding (Redd, 1998). Some of the institutions established through this act were Southern University located in Baton Rouge, Louisiana in 1880, North Carolina A&T State University, located in Greensboro, North Carolina in 1891, Florida A&M University located in Tallahassee, Florida in 1887), and Prairie View A&M University located in Prairie View, Texas in 1876) reaching a total of 19 institutions (Gasman & Bowman III, 2012; Redd, 1998). Although the second Morrill Act in 1890 called for “equitable” funding for these institutions, strict adherence to this policy. Subsequently, HBCUs were established with inferior facilities and infrastructure to promote future growth in student capacity (Albritton, 2012; Jenkins, 1991; Redd, 1998). As Black colleges continued to struggle to find means to fund their institutions, new investors emerged. White northern industrialists such as John D. Rockefeller, Andrew Carnegie, Julius Rosenwald, and John Slater led the surge of support for Black colleges (Gasman & Tudico, 2008). Their investment raised the question of whether the philanthropic efforts were altruistic or rooted in ulterior motives. Gasman and Tudico (2008) state that although these philanthropists made contributions totaling upwards of \$63 million to Black colleges for 60 years, the motive behind these efforts was to create more skilled laborers to fuel their personal industrial entities.

Further, Blacks many of these institutions focus on providing education in more fields like industrial education and liberal arts. In the 1990's HBCUs began to see an influx in the development of professional schools and sciences. For example, Howard University and Meharry Medical College established professional schools for medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy, and Howard offered law degrees (Redd, 1998).

Despite the limited funding of HBCUs, many are thriving as higher institutions of learning. The *Brown v. Board of Education* (Brown) decision in 1954 (347 U.S. 483) played an instrumental role in the advancement of education for African American learners. The Brown decision provided the legal foundation to formally integrate schools, although slow in transition, it allowed Blacks to attend predominantly white institutions.

Although only accounting for less than five percent of U.S. higher education institutions, HBCUs graduate almost 20 percent of Black undergraduates. HBCUs graduates account for over half of Black professionals as well as half of the Black public-school teachers (About HBCUs, 2013). HBCUs continue to be staples in the Black community by serving as springboards for enriching the lives of the Black community and platforms to educate and uplift Blacks.

### **Historically Black College and University Athletics**

Similar to their counterparts at PWIs, intercollegiate athletics on HBCU campuses began as contests organized by students before the formation of conferences and even governing bodies over intercollegiate athletics. Intercollegiate athletic contests were cited as far back as the late 1800s into the early 1900s. Many intercollegiate athletic programs were highly unstructured with no formal oversight. Graham (2021) these informal

student-led activities then transitioned into highly organized and institutionally controlled operations. . For example, Biddle University and Livingstone College participated in the first Black intercollegiate football in 1892 (Chalk, 1976). Others followed and there was a need for governance. Thus, in 1912 the first HBCU athletic conference was the Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA) and it was later named the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Later, three other HBCU athletic conferences were formed including the Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC), the Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC), and the Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC); in 1913, 1920, and 1969 respectively (Gaither, 2013; McClelland, 2011). Although these conferences represent only 45 HBCUs, they are still considered to be the major conferences associated with HBCUs.

### **The National Collegiate Athletic Association**

The National Collegiate Athletic Association was founded in 1906 as the Intercollegiate Athletic Association. Its name was changed to the NCAA in 1910. Smith (2000), explained that it was primarily organized and run by students at each respective institution. As competition expanded, the need for formalization is of main priority. The original basic focus of the organization was on football. According to Hawes (1999), President Theodore Roosevelt and Henry MacCracken, chancellor of New York University, were early proponents of a policy setting and regulating group for football. The association was organized for “the regulation and supervision of college athletics throughout the United States, in order that the athletic activities ... may be maintained on an ethical plane in keeping with the dignity and high purpose of education” (Hawes, 1999, p.2).

Because of the number of severe injuries and deaths resulting from violent-like actions during play, the game of football was at risk of remaining a college sport. With the input of representation from several schools, the association created a football rules committee, developed a reporting system for its then six districts, and over the years regulated basketball, track and field, and baseball. In the early years of the association, attention was focused on amateurism, eligibility, codes of ethics, the involvement of faculty in athletics, and other issues presented by the districts (Challenges Facing Amateur Athletics, 2002; Hawes, 1999). These are also issues currently seen in the literature regarding intercollegiate athletics

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

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the relationship between academics and athletics became very apparent that regulations were needed. Increased concern from university presidents yielded greater authority for university presidents in the formulation

of an Executive Committee, Board of Directors, as well as other committees on NCAA enforcement and infractions (Smith, 2000). Effectually, university presidents changed the governance structure of the NCAA. The major push-back from the athletic side stemmed from attempts to restrict earnings, limit coaching staffs, reduce scholarships, and reduce recruiting time (McClelland, 2011). Again, commercialization and revenue generation continue to fuel the debate between stakeholders in intercollegiate athletics. Additionally, the 1980s also saw the inclusion of women's sports as a result of Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 and emphasis on gender equity (McClelland, 2011; Smith, 2000). However, the emphasis on proportionality has been met with increasing reservation. Increasing costs in women's sports have placed pressure on intercollegiate athletic programs in which women's sports do not generate revenue for the programs. This pressure increases the responsibility of men's revenue-generating sports to create the revenue to fund women's sports and other men's non-revenue generating sports (Smith, 2000). As a result, this imbalance raises racial equity issues because the majority of athletes in revenue-generating sports are men of color (Smith, 2000). These issues and more (e.g., academic integrity, amateurism, etc.) continue to plague the 19 NCAA and intercollegiate athletics currently and are exacerbated by the consistent revenue generated through intercollegiate athletics (McClelland, 2011).

The final period, 1990-1999, was characterized by poor graduation rates, professional players with low literacy skills, and opposition to new NCAA policies including Propositions 42 and 16. Proposition 42 placed restrictions on student-athletes receiving financial aid based on low grade-point averages or low SAT/ACT scores. Proposition 16 called for increased core courses and "an initial-eligibility index that

matched required test scores with grade-point averages” (Hawes, 1999, p.2). This period also saw dissatisfaction with regulations of the NCAA from the Black Coaches Association and some other well-known white coaches as they registered concern that the regulations did not provide for minority and at-risk students (Hawes, 1999).

Following the abolishment of the Sanity Code, the NCAA established academic standards concerning grade-point averages and test scores for prospective college student-athletes under the title Proposition 42. This action drew opposition from such individuals as John Thompson, a black basketball coach at Georgetown University who addressed the misuse of standardized tests. Also, the Black Coaches Association threatened to boycott the NCAA because of the NCAA’s position on grant-in-aid and other actions that appeared not to consider the African-American student-athlete (Hawes, 1999).

### **Issues Associated with Athletics and the NCAA**

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

Other common issues to which athletic leaders in colleges and universities have had to respond were cited in this review. These included the graduation rates of student-athletes, recruitment of talented athletes, facilities and equipment, amateurism, eligibility, and contributions/revenue for scholarships and resources (Greenlee, 2002). Although these issues offer challenges for most higher education institutions, it appears that

HBCUs in particular are faced with greater challenges because of other features characteristic of their make-up (Gasman, 2006; Roebuck & Murty, 1993). A common feature of HBCUs is the commitment to racial uplift for African Americans (Gasman, 2006).

Gasman (2006) cited conditions that increase challenges for HBCUs. Among them were that HBCUs rely heavily on outside funding sources, their level of endowment and operating funds are generally lower than those of predominately white institutions (PWIs), and their infrastructure for soliciting alumni contributions is often weak. Issues associated with student enrollment, financial deficits, and inadequate numbers of doctorate faculty have often led to problems in maintaining accreditation. Additionally, the participation rates in governance at HBCUs have been linked to an autocratic presidential leadership style, the practice of faculty not publicly opposing the leadership, and communication difficulties among black and white faculty that may result because of dissimilarities in their ethnic, racial, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

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

**Revenue.** Athletic programs generate revenue from a variety of sources. HBCUs are concerned primarily with the financial resources available for athletic programs (Kimberly, 2006; Seymour, 2006), as are large and small institutions (Kimberly, 2006). At least 12 HBCUs have closed as a result of financial problems (Watkins, 2005). The issue of revenue has been approached from a variety of angles. Using empirical data from



an interim report commissioned by the NCAA, researchers Litan, Orszag, and Orszag (2003) showed that increased spending on college athletics does not result in either increased revenues for colleges or increased bankruptcy for schools.

Litan et al. (2003) noted there are few studies on the effect of athletic costs on athletic revenue, as well as those studies that do not thoroughly examine the impact on football and men's basketball. For 8 years, Litan and associates computed the costs of football and men's basketball in Division I-A programs with the use of multiple forms of data. Based on the study's findings, Division I-A schools' operating costs for athletics represented a relatively small share of their total academic expenditures. Using the same data, Orszag and Orszag (2005) came to similar conclusions. They concluded that the increase in athletic spending for Division I-A schools did not affect their financial standing.

The visibility of the athletic program is closely related to its ability to generate revenue. The Bayou Classic (Grambling and Southern Universities) was previously covered by NBC, but Lewis (2006) observed that HBCUs rarely received consistent television coverage. A recent development has been the increased exposure of HBCUs through televised coverage (Lewis, 2006). According to Lewis, through a seven-year agreement with the Mid-Eastern and Southwestern Athletic Conferences, ESPNU, ESPN2, and ESPN Classic will broadcast games between schools in these conferences. By acquiring such coverage, schools will not only generate revenues but will also attract student-athletes.

**Gender Equity.** Women now have more opportunities to participate in sports at all levels of schooling following the passage of Title IX in 1972. Under this law, colleges

were required to provide gender-neutral access to sports, which resulted in an increase in female participation from 15% in 1972 to 42% in 2002 (Anderson, Cheslock, & Ehrenberg, 2004). Anderson et al. found that despite this rise in compliance, many institutions remained noncompliant in 2001-2002. In 2005, the American Civil Liberties Union of the Washington Foundation (2007) noted that the number of women athletes in colleges had increased from 32,000 to 171,000 since Title IX was adopted. As a result of Title IX, more institutions comply.

The NCAA's 2002 gender equity report, prepared by DeHass, contained revenue figures, expenses, and other data for 309 Division III schools that reported survey data. Between 1999-2000, DeHass reported that operating costs for male athletes at institutions averaged \$137,000, while those of women athletes averaged \$94,700. Further, men incurred almost double the cost of recruiting than women. The salaries paid to women and men head and assistant coaches were also inequitable. An average of \$25,000 more was paid to men head coaches than to women head coaches, and \$33,800 more to men assistant coaches than to women assistant coaches.

The gender equity issue is in many ways similar to the issues confronting HBCU athletic departments. It is crucial to generate revenue so that scholarships, marketing, facilities, equipment, and other operating expenses are properly funded. For gender equity, athletic programs must receive equitable funding to meet their needs.

Scholarships must also be awarded equitably through Title IX.

**Connecting athletics to academics.** In Peach (2007), it is noted that the evolution of the NCAA has had a direct influence on how Division I athletics, and particularly, the Board of Directors of Division I universities, maintain academics as a central part of their

missions. Academics and athletics became connected initially because of their intrinsic value aligned with the educational mission of the college, as well as their focus on developing competition, leadership, and character skills (Flowers, 2009). Athletes today are an integral part of the culture of large colleges that hold their athletic programs up as a source of pride.

**Academics Involvement in educational Mission of the Institution.** A

university's academic mission is at the core of collegiate athletics. Ideally, athletics promotes the values of academics and teaches the values of education to the student body (Flowers, 2009). College athletics have been focusing lately on challenges related to ethics and academics in athletics. Many universities sacrifice academic quality for big-time athletics revenue and recognition, according to Clayton et al. (2015).

According to Corlett (2013), college athletics and their role in higher education are questionable. He argued that sports funding is immoral and that former NCAA president Myles Brand should be held to account for his view that college athletics support the educational mission. Clayton et al. (2015) noted that this belief runs counter to the university's mission and educational values if it assumes alumni, faculty, staff, and administrators keep high-profile athletes eligible.

People's perception of how college athletics support academics is challenged by issues around college athletics. Among the top issues requiring the attention of university administrations are ghost classes and academic fraud. To maintain education at the core of athletic departments, the NCAA governance had to be developed. With the growth of the NCAA came the need for the athletic director to change as well.

**Paying Stipends for Student-Athletes.** Paid participation in college athletics has been a topic of discussion since the early days of organized participation in sports. It was partly out of concern for paying amateurs and enhancing amateur participation that structured rules and organizations were developed (Flowers, 2009). Northwestern University football team's petition to the National Labor Relations Board in 2015 to have them vote on unionization demonstrates a recent concern regarding player pay. One example is Weaver's (2015) description that recent concern about player pay was illustrated by the Northwestern University football team's 2015. As a result of their unionization, they believed that participating in the University's football team was more like an employment relationship than a hobby.

Students who participate in college athletics face a conflict between the institution's right to profit from their actions from the sale of promotional materials and rights to broadcast games, as well as the students themselves receiving no benefits from the endeavors (Goldsmith et al., 2014). In the past, the NCAA and its member institutions have used amateurism to avoid antitrust issues and litigation. Challenging universities' right to use images of former student-athletes for commercial purposes, *O'Bannon v. NCAA* (Ehrett, n.d.) accused universities of violating antitrust rules. Student-athletes made a significant amount of money for their schools and the NCAA during their careers through television contracts and the use of their names and likenesses, which the student-athletes had to forfeit to compete (Weaver, 2015). Student athletes made a significant amount of money for their schools and the NCAA during their careers through television contracts and the use of their names and likenesses, which the student-athletes had to forfeit to compete (Weaver, 2015).

Initially, the institutions were required to cover the full cost of student athletes' attendance at the college/university to address antitrust concerns (O'Brien, 2015). In this case, the Ninth Circuit Court ruled amateurism violated antitrust law (McCann, 2016). To remedy the antitrust concerns, the court ordered that the NCAA compensate the student-athletes for the cost of attending university in full (McCann, 2016). Directors of athletics must be able to handle these challenges and understand the issues surrounding the need to compensate athletes.

### **Profile and Role of the Athletic Director**

Many have characterized ADs as general managers or CEO of sports organizations. Hatfield (1987) study revealed that the most popular undergraduate major for ADs was physical education while most general managers chose business, prompting the researchers to suggest that the educational backgrounds of the two populations reflect their professional environments: one education-focused, the other business-focused, respectively. Hatfield et al. (1987) were among the first to propose the idea that experience as a former student-athlete and coach prepared ADs for their administrative roles. ADs responded positively (87.7%) about the importance of being an athlete, while general managers were mixed, with only 55% replying affirmatively. Coaching experience was a significant contributing factor to present effectiveness; approximately 80% of the ADs believed coaching was beneficial, while only 40% of the general managers responded affirmatively. The authors suggested that perhaps previous coaching experience increased their sensitivity to those demands placed upon the coaches and athletes within their programs (Hatfield et al., 1987).

Quarterman (1992) sought to create a profile of ADs at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) by comparing data collected with that of ADs at Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs). The author found that the average age of responding ADs was 46.1 years of age, with nearly a decade (9.5 years) as athletic administrators. Most (62.2%) held a master's degree as their highest degree, but 29.3% held a doctorate. Undergraduate degrees in health and/or physical education were held by 69% of the ADs and half (50.4%) held graduate degrees in health and/or physical education. The majority (84.4%) of the respondents had teaching experience and nearly all (89%) had coaching experience. In fact, over one-third (36.3%) of the respondents were assigned coaching responsibilities when the survey was conducted, with 71% coaching basketball. In the aforementioned study, Fitzgerald et al. (1994), the researchers found that the average age of responding ADs was 48.7 years, with 85% having earned a master's degree, while 21.5% had completed a doctorate. The most common experiences on the five rungs (college athlete, high school coach, college coach, assistant or associate athletic director, and athletic director) were as a collegiate athlete (80%) or collegiate coach (65%). Though most of the respondents did not hold all five positions, an examination of the chronological order of positions held illuminated that 94.5% had followed the linear time sequence of the positions in the normative career pattern experience.

The authors also found that while career patterns of ADs do suggest collegiate athlete participation as a portal of entry, collegiate coaching was the most common antecedent professional position for the AD position. More recently, Smith and Washington (2014) suggested that organizations tend to model themselves after other

organizations within their field that are perceived to be more successful. The authors' core argument proposes that the collective acquisition of formal education and work experience is similar across all ADs, regardless of the school they are leading. As a result, this creates mimicking or isomorphic properties in college athletics.

The transition from the autocratic, coaching-centered AD to one that has a strong business background with emphasis on fundraising and marketing has yet to be widespread throughout the NCAA, but it is becoming clear that ADs have followed a clear progression of career experiences (Smith & Washington, 2014). Wong, Deubert, and Hayek (2015) updated the work of Fitzgerald et al. (1994), suggesting that four tracks account for the majority of career paths of Division I ADs between 1989-90 and 2013-14. The four tracks are categorized as: collegiate playing, collegiate coaching, business, and academia. Their findings emphasized, "less coaching experience and more business experience" (p. 73) as the primary trends, owing to the increased importance in revenues associated with Division I FBS athletic programs. Lumpkin et al. (2015) compared profiles of Division I ADs with those of other NCAA divisions, finding an underrepresentation of females in all divisions, but particularly in Division I. The study recommended that aspiring students should focus on obtaining an advanced degree, particularly in fields such as sports management, communication, business management, and law. Furthermore, their findings revealed only 31.2% of Division I ADs had experience as a coach, as compared to 69% in Division II and 75.6% in Division III. Taylor and Wells' (2017) qualitative study identified institutional barriers and support that female ADs experienced at NCAA Division I institutions. Most of the women disclosed that they had been seasoned coaches and athletic administrators before being

encouraged to pursue an AD position by individuals in power (males). Although the women noted the need to diversify hiring practices, the participants felt there was a “shift” regarding the “good old boys” network that was often perceived to control intercollegiate sport (Taylor & Wells, 2017, p. 170).

Dittmore et al. (2011) found that 85% of FBS ADs held assistant or associate athletic director positions before taking the chief position, a 45% increase from Fitzgerald et al.’s (1994) findings. Dittmore et al. (2011) attributed a shift in the career paths of ADs to the growth in degree programs specifically tailored to training students to work in sports, including programs geared towards college athletics. As Dosh (2013) noted, “Today, students go to college with the goal of becoming an AD, a reality that largely wasn’t true thirty years ago” (p. 105). Dosh (2013) reported that although several recent AD hires came from outside the world of collegiate athletics, the perception that universities are moving to corporate America to fill the roles and manage multimillion-dollar budgets is deceiving. In 2011, only 15 FBS ADs did not hold a position within a college athletic department immediately before they were appointed AD (Dittmore et al., 2011). Dosh (2013) concluded the role of the AD is specialized and requires working knowledge of different areas within collegiate athletics from compliance to development to communication and more. While a master’s degree in business or a law degree adds depth of knowledge, it takes more than a degree or a few years working at a Fortune 500 company to have the knowledge and connections necessary to lead a collegiate athletic department.



### **Academic Performance and the Student-Athlete**

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

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

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

Reports of studies conducted by the Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport at the University of Central Florida provided the status of Division I-A bowl-bound football and Division I basketball teams for 2006 and 2007 (BSTM, 2007a, 2007b). According to the reports, in 2006, the graduation success rate (GSR) for 85.9% of the football bowl

teams was above 50%; the APR for 62.5% of these teams was 925 or above. Similarly, in 2006, the GSR for 64% of the basketball teams was above 50%; the GSR in 2007 for 64.1% of the teams was above 50%. Although these rates showed improvement, the persistent concern as cited in the report was the gap that exists between the rates for white and African-American student-athletes.

According to the report, although the graduation rate of all men student-athletes in 119 Division I-A schools in 2006 was higher than men non-athletes in these schools, the African-American graduation rate for football student-athletes was 49% compared to 62% for white student-athletes (BSTM, 2007a). The report noted that the graduation rates were lower in men's basketball than in any other college sport. In Division I basketball, 59% of men's basketball student-athletes graduated. According to the percentages cited, fewer African-American student-athletes graduated than did white student-athletes in this sport. The GSR for African-American student-athletes was reported as 51%, while the GSR for white student-athletes was 76% (BSTM, 2007b).

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

The report also indicated criteria for determining whether a waiver of contemporaneous and or historical penalties would be permitted based on the characteristics of the institution. Contemporaneous penalties occur when a team's APR is below 925 and an academically ineligible student-athlete is no longer retained. The grant-in-aid of the ineligible student-athlete cannot be awarded to another player; therefore, the team's financial aid limit is reduced by the financial award calculated for the non-retained student-athlete. Information from an academic progress rate research report (Academic Progress Rate, 2010) revealed that 215 (3.5%) of Division I athletic teams fell below the 925 score for contemporaneous penalties during the school year 2006-07. Of the 99 sports teams that were subject to contemporaneous penalties in 2006-07, there were 23 football teams, 17 men's basketball teams, and 9 women's basketball teams.

### **Summary**

There have been a very limited number of studies that have taken part in the examination of variables that determine the success of athletic programs at HBCUs. Studies such as these may provide innovative and proactive measures that can be used to administer athletic programs positively. Taking such proactive measures will prevent institutions from having to eliminate programs or from withdrawing from national associations. To achieve this goal, one of the purposes of conducting this study was to investigate the perceptions of historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e. Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) regarding curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **METHODOLOGY**

The descriptive statistics study uses the data collected to determine the predictive variables of the Athletics Administrators' perceptions of the effectiveness of the curriculum of athletic programs. The questionnaire was a modified version of the instrument used in the athletic study completed by McClelland (2011). This study seeks to bring awareness to the need for curriculum development and curriculum programs that have a concentration on athletics.

#### **Methods**

This study was designed to investigate the perceptions of athletic directors on how well they gain greater competence in understanding curriculum regarding athletic programs, graduation rates, and student-athlete academic performance. Further, a determination was reviewed regarding the leadership's perceptions of multilayered challenges that supported the development of a graduate curriculum in operating athletic programs at HBCUs. Data were collected through a questionnaire modified from the survey instrument that Goss et al. (2004) and McClelland (2011) used in their athletic study. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analysis.

#### **Population**

The participants targeted for this study consisted of the total population of 36 senior women administrators, assistant athletic directors, associate athletic directors, faculty, athletic director/vice presidents of athletics, conference commissioners, and presidents/chancellors employed at HBCUs designated as NCAA Division I and NCAA

Division II institutions. These directors were representative of athletic programs with membership in the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association (CIAA), Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference (MEAC), Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC), Southwestern Athletic Conference (SWAC), and independent HBCU programs in different conferences. A review of a website and the directory of athletic directors from the aforementioned conferences were used to identify the participants targeted for the study.

### **Data Collection Procedures**

Although there is a source for a directory of athletic directors that was developed by the NCAA, there is no single database for senior women administrators, assistant athletic directors, associate athletic directors, faculty, athletic director/vice presidents of athletics, conference commissioners, and presidents/chancellors employed at HBCUs, accordingly several gathering techniques and procedures were used to identify the participants targeted for this study. A descriptive research method design was used to determine athletic leaderships' (athletic directors, etc.) perceptions of curriculum development and graduate-level curriculum for athletic programs. Contact persons from NCAA FCS Division I and Division II HBCUs (n=52) were identified, sent a letter of consent describing the study, and a two-page survey. A copy of the letter can be found in Appendix A. Ultimately, a survey questionnaire was sent to HBCU athletic leaders (i.e. senior women administrators, assistant athletic directors, associate athletic directors, faculty, athletic director/vice presidents of athletics, conference commissioners, associate commissioners, and assistant commissioners) as well as presidents/chancellors leading HBCUs. Since these individuals were familiar with athletic programs on their campuses

they were asked several questions related to managing athletic programs and what course subject area would be related to leading their respective athletic programs. This list of data on courses and perceptions of curricula was compiled. Of the 52 institutions receiving the survey instrument, 27 institutions (51.9) responded. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the data.

### **Instrumentation**

McClelland's (2011) instrument was modified for use in this study (See Appendix B). The modified questionnaire instrument included 32 close-ended items related to the following categories: (A) funding/revenue, (B) gender equity, (C) NCAA/NAIA policies/rules, (D) academics, (E) student-athlete, (F) diversity, and (G) athletic director's expertise. Modifications were made to the instrument structure regarding the items in each of the categories. Category A, funding/revenue consisted of seven items; category B had two items, while category C contained five items. On the other hand, category D was comprised of seven items; category E covered four items on the survey; two items were included in category F; the final category G consisted of five items. Participants were asked to provide their perceptions of variables for the development of a graduate curriculum for athletic administrators through responding to positive, closed-ended statements organized on a 5-point Likert scale which ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The items had the possible score of 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1 with 1 as the lowest possible score on each item, and 5 as the highest possible score. Thirty-two items were listed for responses on the 5-point scale; the highest possible total score was 160 and the lowest total possible score was 32.

### **Reliability of the Instrument**

An expert field test was conducted with another group of seven people in the field, including former athletic directors and coaches, and professors who train athletic directors, to determine whether the instrument is reliable at consistently measuring its content. In addition to Alabama, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia, this group represented different locations in the United States. In this study, internal consistency was achieved by applying Cronbach's alpha (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2005). Overall, the 7 respondents gave 988 ratings. A Cronbach's alpha of .871 suggested a high degree of reliability, although caution should be used since only a small number of participants pre-tested the instrument.

### **Validity of the Instrument**

Expert review and field testing of the questionnaire was used to establish the content validity of the instrument. Content validity measures the instrument's ability to gather data intended for measuring the actual content. A valid item sample is required for the establishment of content validity, according to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2005). The items' content needs to be accurate as a measurement of the contents, and this is called item validity. Validating the instrument involves determining whether it is appropriate for sampling the whole content area. Experts in research methodology agree that peer review or expert judgment is the best method to establish the validity of content (Creswell, 2003; Gay et al., 2005).

A review panel of expert reviewers was assembled, which included both individuals with expertise in training sports administrators, as well as those who serve as athletic directors. The panel consisted of two former directors of athletics with experience

at NCAA Division I-II schools who served as reviewers, along with one professor who trains athletic directors. Each item in each category was scored on a 5-point scale based on its content and structure. As well as comments from reviewers that the questions were appropriate, a mean score of 4.7 was also obtained with composite scores of 4.7, 4.8, and 4.7. This resulted in a high degree of content validity.



## **CHAPTER 4**

### **ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The purpose of this study was to investigate historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e. Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) perceptions of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs. Specifically, this study was concerned with the perceptions of athletic administrators at HBCUs and the development of a specific type of graduate curriculum for said administrators. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Do the profile factors (divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender) have an impact on HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
2. Do courses related to revenue funding in seven content areas of study as measured by Section A of the questionnaire have an impact on HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
3. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of a gender equity course for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
4. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding

NCAA/NAIA policies for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

5. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding academics, as measured by Section D of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
6. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding student-athletes, as measured by Section E of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
7. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding diversity, as measured by Section F of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
8. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding athletic directors' expertise, as measured by Section G of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

The sample population for this study consisted of 52 Division I and Division II HBCUs participating within the NCAA structure throughout the southern, midwestern, and south Atlantic regions of the United States. The data analysis was accomplished in

two phases. The first phase dealt with the demographic characteristics of the respondents in this empirical investigation. The second phase investigated the perceptions of athletic administrators as measured by closed-ended questions formulated for this study. The examination of questions was accomplished through descriptive analysis.

### Demographic Profile of Participants in the Study

There were 35 Division I and Division II HBCUs who participated in the study. Descriptive data were computed by NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender.

### Divisional Classification

Regarding the variable divisional classification, 33 or 94 percent of the individuals who participated in this study were leading Division I institutions. By contrast, 2 or 6 percent of the other institutions were in Division II. See Table 1 for these results.

Table 1  
Frequency Distribution of the Participants by  
Divisional Classification

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
<u>Classification</u>		
Division I	33	94.3
Division II	2	5.7
<u>Total</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>100.0</u>

### Institutional Enrollment

The variable institutional enrollment was categorized into four subgroups for this investigation. There were not any participants in this study that led institutions with less than 1,000 students. Three or nine percent of the participants led institutions with an enrollment between 1,000 to 3,000 students and eight or 23 percent of the participants led institutions with enrollments between 4,000 to 6,000 students. Lastly, 24 or 69 percent of the participants led institutions with an enrollment of more than 6,000. See Table 2 for these analyses.

Table 2  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Institutional Enrollment

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Enrollment</u>		
Less than 1,000	0	00.0
1,000-3,000	3	8.6
4,000-6,000	8	22.9
More than 1,000	24	68.6
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

### Educational Attainment

The variable educational attainment was categorized into three subgroups for this study. Sixteen or 46 percent of the participants listed their highest educational attainment as a bachelor's degree and 13 or 37 percent of them earned a master's degree. In addition, 6 or 17 percent of the participants denoted their highest level of educational attainment was

with a terminal degree. See Table 3 for these analyses.

Table 3  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Type of Educational Attainment

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Educational Attainment</u>		
Bachelor	16	45.7
Master's	13	37.1
Doctorate	6	17.1
Total	35	99.9*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

#### Age

The variable age was categorized into four subgroups for this investigation. There were five or 14 percent of the participants in this study led institutions between the age of 20 and 30 years. However, only three or nine percent of the participants were between the age of 31 to 41, and 17 or 49 percent of the participants that led their institutions were between the age of 42 and 52. Lastly, 10 or 29 percent of the participants leading their institutions were 53 years of age or older. See Table 4 for these analyses.

\

Table 4  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Age

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Age</u>		
20 – 30 years	5	14.3
31 – 41 years	3	8.6
42 – 52 years	17	48.6
53 or older years	10	28.6
<u>Total</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>100.1*</u>

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure

Gender

The variable of gender was measured in two categories for this study. There were 23 or 66 percent of the participants in this study identified as male. On the other hand, 12 or 34 percent of the participants identified as female. See Table 5 for these findings.

Table 5  
Frequency Distribution of Participants by  
Gender

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	23	65.7
Female	12	34.3
<u>Total</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>100.0</u>

**Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section A - Revenue/Funding**

In Table 6, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to College/University funding recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. As revealed in this table, there were extremely strong recommendations for such a course or courses with 34 or 97 percent. Six or 17 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 28 or 80 percent strongly agreed. By contrast, 1 or 3 percent replied as undecided.

Table 6  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
College/University Funding

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of College/University Funding</u>		
Undecided	1	2.9
Agree	6	17.1
Strongly Agree	28	80.0
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to Corporate sponsorship recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs in Table 7 overwhelmingly suggested all respondents were in favor of such a course utilizing corporate sponsorship. Six or 17 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 29 or 83 percent strongly agreed.

Table 7  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Corporate Sponsorship

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Corporate sponsorship</u>		
Agree	6	17.1
Strongly Agree	29	82.9
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to Facilities recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of facilities. Five or 14 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 30 or 86 percent strongly agreed. See Table 8 for these analyses.



Table 8  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Facilities

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Facilities</u>		
Agree	5	14.3
Strongly Agree	30	85.7
Total	35	100.0

In Table 9, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to Televised games recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. As found in this table, there was a more diverse framework in the recommendation for such a course. Seven or 20 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 22 or 63 percent strongly agreed. In contrast, three or nine percent replied as undecided as well three or nine percent stated they disagreed.

Table 9  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Televised games

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Televised games</u>		
Undecided	3	8.6
Disagree	3	8.6
Agree	7	20.0
Strongly Agree	22	62.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100.1*</b>

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

In terms of Table 10, the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to Bowl games recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. As found in this table, there was a more diverse framework in the recommendation for such a course. Seven or 20 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 20 or 57 percent strongly agreed. In contrast, three or nine percent replied as undecided. However, five or 14.3 percent stated they disagreed.

Table 10  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Bowl Games

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Bowl games</u>		
Undecided	5	14.3
Disagree	3	8.6
Agree	7	20.0
Strongly Agree	20	57.7
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

The perceptions of a course or courses covering 'Revenue/Funding' as directly related to Facilities recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of facilities. Five or 14 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 30 or 86 percent strongly agreed. See Table 11 for these analyses.

Table 11  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Alumni Donations

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Alumni donations</u>		
Agree	5	14.3
Strongly Agree	30	85.7
Total	35	100.0

In Table 12, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Revenue/Funding’ as directly related to Support groups recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. As revealed in this table, there were extremely strong recommendations for such a course or courses with 32 or 92 percent. Eight or 23 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 24 or 69 percent strongly agreed. By contrast, three or nine percent replied as undecided.

Table 12  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Revenue/Funding in terms of  
Support Groups

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Revenue/Funding in terms of Support groups</u>		
Undecided	3	8.6
Agree	8	22.9
Strongly Agree	24	68.6
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

### **Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section B - Gender Equity**

The descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Gender Equity’ as directly related to Gender equity recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, years of experience, age, and gender were reported. There was an extremely strong recommendation for such a course or courses with 35 or 100 percent. Twenty or 57 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 15 or 43 percent strongly agreed. See Table 13 for these analyses.

Table 13  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Gender Equity in terms of Program  
Funding for Gender Equity

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Gender Equity in terms of Program funding for gender equity</u>		
Agree	20	57.1
Strongly Agree	15	42.9
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Gender Equity’ as directly related to Salary equity recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs in Table 14 overwhelming suggested all respondents were in favor of such a course utilizing corporate sponsorship. Seventeen or 49 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 15 or 43 percent strongly agreed. By contrast, three or nine

percent replied as undecided.

Table 14  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Gender Equity in terms of  
Salary Equity

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Gender Equity in terms of Salary equity</u>		
Undecided	3	8.6
Agree	17	48.6
Strongly Agree	15	42.9
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

### **Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section C – NCAA/NAIA Policies**

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘NCAA/NAIA Policies’ as directly related to Eligibility policies/practices recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of facilities. Five or 14 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 20 or 57 percent strongly agreed. By contrast, 10 or 29 percent replied as undecided. See Table 15 for these analyses.

Table 15  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of  
Eligibility Policies/Practices

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Eligibility policies/practices</u>		
Undecided	10	28.6
Agree	5	14.3
Strongly Agree	20	57.1
Total	35	100.0

In Table 16, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘NCAA/NAIA Policies’ as directly related to Compliance with NCAA/NAIA rules recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. As found in this table, there were a more diverse framework in the recommendation for such a course. While 27 or 77 percent were supportive of such a course or courses. Eight or 23 percent were undecided. Three or nine percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 24 or 69 percent strongly agreed.

Table 16  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of  
 Compliance with NCAA/NAIA Rules

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Compliance with NCAA/NAIA rules</u>		
Undecided	8	22.9
Agree	3	8.6
Strongly Agree	22	68.6
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘NCAA/NAIA Policies’ as directly related to Financials aid/scholarships recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Eleven or 31 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, 21 or 60 percent strongly agreed. However, three or nine percent replied as undecided. See Table 17 for these analyses.



Table 17  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of  
 Financials Aid/Scholarships

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Financials aid/scholarships</u>		
Undecided	3	8.6
Agree	11	31.4
Strongly Agree	21	60.0
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘NCAA/NAIA Policies’ as directly related to the Structure of NCAA/NAIA Divisions recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of facilities. There were 12 or 34 percent of the respondents that were undecided on this area for a course. Ten or 29 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 13 or 37 percent strongly agreed. See Table 18 for these analyses.

Table 18  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of  
 Structure of NCAA/NAIA Divisions

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of NCAA/NAIA Divisions</u>		
Undecided	12	34.3
Agree	10	28.6
Strongly Agree	13	37.1
Total	35	100.0

In Table 19, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘NCAA/NAIA Policies’ as directly related to Governance recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. Eight or 23 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 18 or 51percent strongly agreed. By contrast, nine or 26 percent replied as undecided.

Table 19  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of  
Governance

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>NCAA/NAIA Policies in terms of Governance</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	8	22.9
Strongly Agree	18	51.4
Total	35	100.0

**Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section D – Academics**

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to Graduation rates recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were supportive of such a course or courses in terms of graduation rates. Seven or 26 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 19 or 54 percent strongly agreed. By contrast, 9 or 26 percent replied as undecided. See Table 20 for these analyses.

Table 20  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Academics in terms of  
Graduation Rates

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academics in terms of Graduation rates</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	7	20.0
Strongly Agree	19	54.3
Total	35	100.0

In Table 21, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to Graduation rates recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. As found in this table, there were a more diverse framework in the recommendation for such a course. While 21 or 60 percent were supportive of such a course or courses. Twelve or 34 percent were undecided. Although, two or six percent were undecided. Eleven or 31 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 10 or 29 percent strongly agreed.

Table 21  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Academics in terms of  
ACT/SAT Standardized Test Scores

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academics in terms of ACT/SAT Standardized test scores</u>		
Undecided	12	34.3
Disagree	2	5.7
Agree	11	31.4
Strongly Agree	10	28.6
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to Grade point averages recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Thirteen or 37 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, 17 or 49 percent strongly agreed. However, 11 or 31 percent replied as

undecided. See Table 22 for these analyses.

Table 22  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Academics in terms of  
Grade Point Averages

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academics in terms of Grade point averages</u>		
Undecided	11	31.4
Agree	13	37.1
Strongly Agree	11	31.4
Total	35	99.9*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to Admission standards recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of admission standards. There were nine or 26 percent of the respondents that were undecided on this area for a course. Nine or 26 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 17 or 49 percent strongly agreed. See Table 23 for these analyses.

Table 23  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by Academics in terms of  
 Admission Standards

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academics in terms of Admission standards</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	9	25.7
Strongly Agree	17	48.6
Total	35	100.0

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to involvement in the educational mission of the institution recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Sixteen or 46 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, seven or 20 percent strongly agreed. However, 12 or 34 percent replied as undecided. See Table 24 for these analyses.

Table 24  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by Academics in terms of Involvement  
 in Educational Mission of Institution

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academics in terms of Grade point averages</u>		
Undecided	12	34.3
Agree	16	45.7
Strongly Agree	7	20.0
Total	35	100.0

The descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Academics’ as directly related to Academic Progress Rate recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, years of experience, age, and gender were reported. There was an extremely strong recommendation for such a course or courses with 35 or 100 percent. Seven or 20 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 28 or 80 percent strongly agreed. See Table 25 for these analyses.

Table 25  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Academic in terms of  
Academic Progression Rate

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Academic in terms of Academic Progression Rate</u>		
Agree	7	20.0
Strongly Agree	28	80.0
Total	35	100.0

**Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section E – Student-Athlete**

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Student-Athlete’ as directly related to the Recruitment of athletes recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Sixteen or 46 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, 17 or 49 percent strongly agreed. Only two or six percent replied as undecided. See Table 26 for these analyses.

Table 26  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Student-Athlete in terms of  
Recruitment of Athletes

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Student-Athlete in terms of Recruitment of athletes</u>		
Undecided	2	5.7
Agree	16	45.7
Strongly Agree	17	48.6
Total	35	100.0



In Table 27, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Student-Athlete’ as directly related to Stipends for student-athletes recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. As found in this table, there were a more diverse framework in the recommendation for such a course. While 22 or 63 percent were supportive of such a course or courses. Nine or 26 percent were undecided. Although, two or six percent were undecided. Seventeen or 49 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and five or 14 percent strongly agreed. However, four or 11 percent strongly disagreed.

Table 27  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Student-Athlete in terms of  
Stipends for Student-Athletes

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Student-Athlete in terms of Stipends for student-athletes</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Disagree	4	11.4
Agree	17	48.6
Strongly Agree	5	14.3
Total	35	100.0

In table 28, the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Student-Athlete’ as directly related to Sportsmanship recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Nine or 26 percent were undecided. Although, two or six percent were undecided. Seventeen or 49 percent of the

individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and five or 14 percent strongly agreed. However, four or 11 percent strongly disagreed.

Table 28  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Student-Athlete in terms of  
Sportsmanship

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Student-Athlete in terms of Sportsmanship</u>		
Undecided	8	22.9
Disagree	2	5.7
Agree	15	42.9
Strongly Agree	10	28.6
Total	35	100.0

The descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Student-Athletes’ as directly related to Support services recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. Nineteen or 54 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 13 or 37 percent strongly agreed. Three or nine percent were undecided. See Table 29 for these analyses.

Table 29  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Student-Athlete services in terms of  
Support Services

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Student-Athlete in terms of Support services</u>		
Undecided	3	8.6
Agree	19	54.3
Strongly Agree	13	37.1
Total	35	100.0

#### **Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section F – Diversity**

The descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Diversity’ as directly related to Number of ethnic minority coaches recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, years of experience, age, and gender were reported. Nine or 26 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and 13 or 37 percent strongly agreed. However, 13 or 37 percent also were undecided. See Table 30 for these analyses.

Table 30  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Diversity in terms of Number of  
Ethnic Minority Coaches

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Diversity in terms of Number of ethnic minority coaches</u>		
Undecided	13	37.1
Agree	9	25.7
Strongly Agree	13	37.1
Total	35	99.9*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

In table 31, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Diversity’ as directly related to Number of ethnic minority student-athletes recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. Ten or 29 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course, however, only nine or 28 percent strongly agreed. Most notably, sixteen or 46 percent were undecided.

Table 31  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Diversity in terms of Number of  
Ethnic Minority Student Athletes

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Diversity in terms of Number of ethnic minority student-athletes</u>		
Undecided	16	45.7
Agree	10	28.6
Strongly Agree	9	25.7
Total	35	100.0

**Descriptive Analysis for Questionnaire Section G – Athletic Director’s Expertise**

The perceptions of a course or courses covering ‘Athletic Director’s Expertise’ as directly related to Public relations recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Fifteen or 43 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, 11 or 31 percent strongly agreed. However, nine or 26 percent replied as undecided. See Table 32 for these analyses.

Table 32  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Athletic Director's Expertise in  
terms of Public Relations

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Athletic Director's Expertise in terms of Public relations</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	15	42.9
Strongly Agree	11	31.4
Total	35	100.0

In table 33, the perceptions of a course or courses covering 'Athletic Director's Expertise' as directly related to Selecting and training staff recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were also in favor of such a course in terms of admission standards. There were 12 or 34 percent of the respondents that were undecided on this area for a course. Fifteen or 43 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course and eight or 23 percent strongly agreed.

Table 33  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by Athletic Director's Expertise in  
 terms of Selecting and Training Staff

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Athletic Director's Expertise in terms of Admission standards</u>		
Undecided	12	34.3
Agree	15	42.9
Strongly Agree	8	22.9
Total	35	100.1*

\*May not add up to 100% due to rounding procedure.

The perceptions of a course or courses covering 'Athletic Director's Expertise' as directly related to Knowledge of financial management recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs were reported. Eighteen or 51 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed with this type of course. In addition, eight or 23 percent strongly agreed. However, nine or 23 percent replied as undecided. See Table 34 for these analyses.

Table 34  
 Frequency Distribution of Participants  
 by Athletic Director's Expertise in  
 terms of Knowledge of Financial  
 Management

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Athletic Director's Expertise in terms of Knowledge of financial management</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	18	51.4
Strongly Agree	8	23.9
Total	35	100.0

In table 35, the descriptive analysis for the perceptions of a course or courses covering 'Athletic Director's Expertise' as directly related to Program supervision recommended in the development of a graduate-level curriculum for athletic administrators at HBCUs aspects of the variables NCAA divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender were reported. Twenty-six or 74 percent of respondents were overwhelmingly in support of this subject area should be offered for course or courses. Fifteen or 43 percent of the individuals who participated in this study agreed and 11 or 31 percent strongly agreed. However, nine or 26 percent were undecided.



Table 35  
Frequency Distribution of Participants  
by Athletic Director's Expertise in  
terms of Program Supervision

Variable	Number	Percent
<u>Athletic Director's Expertise in terms of Program supervision</u>		
Undecided	9	25.7
Agree	15	42.9
Strongly Agree	11	31.4
Total	35	100.0

### Summary

Participants agree to curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs for historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators. The majority of participants rank revenue and funding as the top priority, followed by courses in academics, and NVAA/NAIA policies.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **SUMMARY, FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The purpose of this study was to investigate historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) athletic administrators (i.e. Directors of Athletics, Senior Women Administrators, Commissioners) perceptions of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs. The athletic curriculum continues to be debated amongst this discipline's educators. Athletic directors (ADs) in higher education institutions are the chief administrators of their respective athletic departments. Davis (2002) explains that ADs are consequently praised for the success or blamed for an athletic program's failure. More specifically, the researcher was concerned with the athletic administrators' leadership and management skills and traits in leading athletic programs and based on their perceptions of where they built and equipped with the unique aspects of operating HBCU programs (Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2002). Moreover, a descriptive analysis was used in the study. Curricular content impacts professional sports organizations as program graduates become employees.

The data collected from the questionnaires provided the following seven areas of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs for creation: 1) revenue funding; 2) gender equity; 3) NCAA/NAIA policies; 4) academics; 5) student-athlete; 6) diversity; and 7) athletic director's expertise. The following questions were analyzed for this study:

1. Do the profile factors (divisional classification, institutional enrollment, educational obtainment, age, and gender) have an impact on HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
2. Do courses related to revenue funding in seven content areas of study as measured by Section A of the questionnaire have an impact on HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics' perception of curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
3. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of a gender equity course for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
4. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding NCAA/NAIA policies for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
5. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding academics, as measured by Section D of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

6. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding student-athletes, as measured by Section E of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
7. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding diversity, as measured by Section F of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?
8. What are the perceptions of HBCU athletic directors/vice presidents of athletics towards the creation of content areas of study regarding athletic directors' expertise, as measured by Section G of the questionnaire for curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs?

### **Findings**

The following findings were generated from the results of this investigation:

1. Descriptive analysis revealed that participants perceived curriculum development and design of graduate (doctoral) level courses in revenue and funding as a top priority for athletic programs.
2. The descriptive analysis also found support for curriculum development and design of graduate (doctoral) level courses in NCAA/NAIA policies to improve athletic programs.

3. According to the data, the remaining categories of gender equity, academics; student-athlete; diversity; and athletic director's expertise were perceived as areas of study for curriculum development and design of graduate (doctoral) level courses.

### **Discussion**

Regardless of the NCAA division classification athletic directors represented, participants were in agreement with curriculum development and design of a graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs as significant to the effectiveness of Athletic Administrators' ability to be more successful. Participants with bachelors and masters degrees showed higher percentages of agreement on the variables related to Revenue/Funding than participants with advanced degrees. Participants perceived knowledge from topics categorized as Revenue/Funding, Gender Equity, NCAA Policies, Academics, the Student-Athlete, Diversity, the Expertise of the Athletic Director were significant to the success of athletics at HBCUs with football programs in NCAA Division I programs. Although the study did not involve ranking items, items were identified where participants showed higher levels of agreement according to calculations of frequencies and percentages which revealed how participants responded to items. On a Likert scale where 5 = highest possible score, 28 and 29 participants selected "5" for strong recommendations for a course or courses in revenue funding and corporate sponsorship. This is not surprising because Gasman (2006) cited revenue funding conditions are challenges for HBCUs. HBCUs rely heavily on outside funding sources, their level of endowment and operating funds are generally lower than those of predominately white institutions (PWIs), and their infrastructure for soliciting alumni

contributions is often weak. Similarly, Kimberly (2006) and Seymour (2006) maintain that HBCUs are concerned primarily with the financial resources available for athletic programs, and so are large and small institutions (Kimberly, 2006).

### **Conclusion**

For this study, the researchers drew from descriptive statistics to determine the athletic administrators' perceptions of the effectiveness of the curriculum of athletic programs. Furthermore, the development of this curriculum in sports administration and leadership to enhance sports specialists with an interest in administering athletic departments and athletic programs at HBCUs. Ultimately, this study was conceived to improve the plight of HBCU athletic programs.

### **Recommendations for Further Study**

The limitations of this research study immediately point to the necessity to follow up with more participants. Engaging more of the core of the conference administration and conference commissioners will undoubtedly provide valuable insight for athletic administrators' communications and direction. If we look at the component of generating revenue, then branding and marketing also provide a platform to examine the perception of HBCU athletics for corporate sponsors and the institutional perception versus the athletic perception. Although further exploration is needed in understanding the present revenue generation opportunities for HBCU athletics, the information should further the discussion for strategies to combat the current structure of inequalities in the existing intercollegiate system.

## **APPENDIX**

**APPENDIX A**  
**INFORMED CONSENT**



## HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION TOWARD CREATING A GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

You are invited to take part in a research study entitled HBCU Athletic Administrators' Perception Toward Creating A Graduate Level Curriculum for Directors of Athletics Survey conducted by the College of Education at Texas Southern University. The purpose of this study is to investigate Directors of Athletics' perceptions of curriculum development and design of graduate (doctoral) level curriculum for athletic programs among HBCU athletic programs. This anonymous survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Do not place your name anywhere on this survey. **YOU MUST BE AT LEAST 18 YEARS OLD TO PARTICIPATE.**

**Risk:** The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life.

**Benefits:** You are not expected to receive any direct benefit as a result of your participation; however, a separate link is provided at the end of the survey that allows you to enter a random drawing for one of four \$25 Amazon gift cards. The results will be used to bring awareness to the need for curriculum development and curriculum programs that have a concentration on athletics at the graduate program level, specifically as it pertains to the HBCU athletic programs.

**Voluntary Participation:** Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may choose to not participate at all, or cease participation in the study prior to completion. You will not be penalized in any manner for not completing the survey.

**Anonymity:** Your identity will not be attached to the data (you will remain anonymous).

**Confidentiality:** Your information will be maintained in the strictest terms of confidentiality, including, but not limited to, a password protected file.

**Records (Electronic):** Electronic data records will be password protected, to which only the investigator will have password access.

If you have questions about the research as well as your rights as a research participant, you may contact Mr. Kevin Granger at 713-313-4378. If you choose to participate, please answer the questions as honestly as possible. If any question or questions make you feel uncomfortable, you may contact Texas Southern University's Counseling Center at 713-313-7804 between 8 AM and 5 PM or after hours at 713-313-7863.

The research data will be stored for five years after final publication in a locked file cabinet. After the five period, the data will be shredded.

I understand that "If I have questions about my rights as a research subject, I can call the Texas Southern University's Office of Research at (713) 313-4301 or go to <http://www.tsu.edu/research>."

Thank you for helping us gather this vital information.

### CONSENT

I have read, and I understand the provided information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any

time, without giving a reason and without cost. My answering of the survey questions implies my voluntary willingness to take part in this study.

**APPENDIX B**

**QUESTIONNAIRE OF HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION**

**TOWARD CREATING A GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR**

**DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS**

### Respondent's Profile

Directions: Please indicate your answers with a check ✓

1. Indicate your gender  
 Male  Female
2. Indicate age range  
 20-30 years old  31-41 years old  42-52 years old  53+ years
3. Indicate your current divisional classification (Football/Basketball)  
 I (non-football)  I-AA (FCS)  II  III  NAIA
4. Indicate approximate institutional enrollment  
 Less than 1000  1000-3000  4000-6000  More than 6000
5. Indicate highest degree earned  
 Bachelor  Master's  Specialist  Doctorate  Other

### QUESTIONNAIRE OF HBCU ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATORS' PERCEPTION TOWARD CREATING A GRADUATE LEVEL CURRICULUM FOR DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

This survey is being conducted with athletic directors in Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) who direct NCAA Division I-III/NAIA intercollegiate programs. The purpose of this survey is to investigate variables that determine the athletic administrators' perceptions toward creating a graduate level curriculum for directors of athletics based on the impact of revenue/funding on program effectiveness, the influence of NCAA/NAIA policies on program effectiveness, and actions employed to address perceived barriers to effectiveness. Names of institutions and your responses will be kept confidential. Results will be used for a descriptive analysis and will assist in establishing baseline data for creating graduate level curriculum courses for athletic directors, specifically for those leading HBCU programs. The following definition applies to this questionnaire:

**Variable:** A concept, feature, or condition contributing to an athletic directors' perception of creating graduate level curriculum (courses) for athletic directors.

Your participation is appreciated. Thank you!

Note. The questionnaire is a modified version of the instrument used in the athletic study completed by McClelland (2011). Athletic Directors' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of HBCU Division I-AA Athletic Programs. Retrieved from Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A&M University.

**Part 1.1 Courses Recommended for the Creation of Graduate Level Curriculum for Athletic Directors Affecting Program Effectiveness**

For the following items, please circle the number that best describes your opinion of variables creating the graduate level curriculum for athletic directors using the following scale:

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

Please add any applicable variables.

A. In terms of **Revenue/Funding**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

B. In terms of **Gender Equity**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

C. In terms of **NCAA/NAIA Policies**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

D. In terms of **Academics**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

E. In terms of **Student-Athlete**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

F. In terms of **Diversity**, the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

G. In terms of **Athletic Director's Expertise** the following are content areas of study recommended for creating a graduate level curriculum for athletic directors:

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

## **REFERENCES**

## REFERENCES

- American Civil Liberties Union of Washington Foundation. (2007). *Gender equity in Athletics: A guide for families and students*. Seattle, WA: Author.
- Anderson, D. J., Cheslock, J. J., & Ehrenberg, R. G. (2004). Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: Determinants of Title IX compliance. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(2), 1-32. DOI:10.1353/jhe.2006.0010
- Baird, K. (2004). Dominance in college football and the role of scholarship restrictions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 18, 217-235.
- Belzer, J. (2015, February 19). The dynamic role of the modern day college athletics director. Forbes.com. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/jasonbelzer/2015/02/19/thedynamic-role-of-the-modern-day-college-athletics-director/#78dd02922002>
- Brown, G. T. (1999, November 22). NCAA answers call to reform: The „sanity code“ leads association down path to enforcement program. The NCAA News: News and Features. Retrieved October 25, 2005, from <http://ncaa.org/news/1999>
- Chalk, O. (1976). *Black college sport*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Clayton, A. B., Grantham, A., McGurrin, D. P., Paparella, P., & Pellegrino, L. N. (2015). Winning is everything: The intersection of academics and athletics at prestige university. *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*, 18(2), 144-156.
- Comeaux, E., Brown, A., & Sieben, N. P. (2015). Issues in athletic administration: A content analysis of syllabi from intercollegiate athletics graduate courses. *Innovative Higher Education*, 40, 359-372.



- Corlett, J. A. (2013). On the role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of Academic Ethics, 11*(3), 199-209.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DeHass, D.M. (2002). *1999-00 gender-equity report*. Indianapolis, IN: The National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Dittmore, S.W., McCarthy, S.T., McEvoy, C., & Clavio, G. (2013). Perceived utility of official university twitter accounts: The opinions of college athletic administrators. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 6*, 286-305.
- Dittmore, S. W., White, E., Gates, E., Martin, D. C., & Sanders, C. J. (2011). *Predicting career patterns for becoming an NCAA Division I FBS athletic director: Revisiting the "normative" sequence*. Abstract presented at the College Sport Research Institute Conference, April 19-22, 2011, Chapel Hill, N.C.
- Dosh, K. (2013). *Saturday morning millionaires: How winning football builds winning colleges*. New York, NY: Turner Publishing Company.
- Dosh, K. (2013). *Saturday morning millionaires: How winning football builds winning colleges*. New York, NY: Turner Publishing Company.
- Ehrett, J. (n.d.). *O'Bannon v. NCAA*. Retrieved from <https://www.scotusblog.com/casefiles/cases/obannon-v-ncaa/>
- Fitzgerald, M. P., Sagaria, M. A. D., & Nelson, B. (1994). Career patterns of athletic directors: Challenging the conventional wisdom. *Journal of Sport Management, 8*(1), 14-26.

- Flowers, R. D. (2009). Institutionalized hypocrisy: The myth of intercollegiate athletics. *American Educational History Journal*, 36(1-2), 343.
- Gasman, M. (Ed.) (2006). Historically black colleges and universities: Recent trends (2007). *A report of the subcommittee on Historically Black Institutions and Schools of Color*. Washington, DC: AAUP.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian. P. (2005). *Educational research. Competencies for analysis and application* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Goldsmith, A. L., Carroll, M. S., & Bopp, T. (2014). Examining the moral and ethical ramification of the NCAA amateurism bylaw in regards to sponsorship and endorsements. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 8(2), 93-100.
- Goss, B., Crow, B., Ashley, F., & Jubenville, C. (2004). Qualitative trends in intercollegiate athletics at historical Black colleges and universities: The impact of the NCAA structure, *The International Journal of Sport Management*, 5(4), 367-388.
- Greenlee, C. T. (2002). Black college baseball's uncertain future. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 19(12), 18-21.
- Hardin, R., Cooper, C. G., & Huffman, L. T. (2013). Moving on up: Division I athletic directors career progression and involvement. *Journal of Applied Sport Management*, 5(3), 55-78.
- Hatfield, B. D., Wrenn, J. P., & Bretting, M. M. (1987). Comparison of job responsibilities of intercollegiate athletic directors and professional sport general managers. *Journal of Sport Management*, 1(2), 129-145.

- Hawes, K. (1999). *The history of the NCAA*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/history.html>
- Kimberly, D. (2006, April 6). In the penalty box: The push for academic reform leaves some schools lagging. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com>
- LeCrom, C. W., & Pratt, A. N. (2016). Exploring interactions between NCAA division I athletic directors and university presidents: A qualitative study from athletic directors' perspectives. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 9(2), 200-225.
- Lewis, M. (2006, September 12). HBCU football is getting some play on ESPN's college sports network. *Blackamericaweb.com*
- Litan, R., Orszag, J., & Orszag, P. (2003). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An interim report*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- McCann, M. (2016). *Supreme Court decision leaves NCAA amateurism in limbo*. Retrieved from <https://www.si.com/college-basketball/2016/10/03/ed-obannonncaa-lawsuit-supreme-court>
- McClelland, C. F. (2011). *Athletic Directors' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of HBCU Division I-AA Athletic Programs*. Retrieved from Ph.D. Dissertation, Texas A&M University.
- NCAA Division I committee on academic performance meeting. (2007, January 4-5). Annual GSR and federal graduation rate announcement. Retrieved February 13, 2008, from [http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division\\_I/board\\_of\\_directors/2007/April/12\\_JAN\\_CAP\\_Report.htm](http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_I/board_of_directors/2007/April/12_JAN_CAP_Report.htm)

NCAA membership. (2009). NCAA 2008-2009 membership report. Retrieved from  
<http://catalog.proemags.com/publication/cc5da338#/cc5da338/2>

NCAA members by divisions. (n.d.). Retrieved November 26, 2005, from  
<http://web1.ncaa.org/onlineDir/exec/divisionListing>

NCAA. Org.(n.d.). NCAA fact sheet. Retrieved from  
<http://www.ncaa.org>

NCAA passes landmark academic reform plan. (2005, January 27). *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 21(25-28), 8.

NCAA revenue distribution analysis. (2002). Retrieved February 10, 2007, from  
[http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division\\_1/aec\\_cabinet/2002/june/supplement\\_9-D.htm](http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_1/aec_cabinet/2002/june/supplement_9-D.htm)

O'Brien, T. (2015). Antitrust, amateurism rule in O'bannon case. *College Athletics and the Law*, 12(8), 6-6.

Orszag, J., & Orszag, P. (2005). *The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An update*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Peach, J. (2007). College athletics, universities, and the NCAA. *The Social Science Journal*, 44(1), 11-22.

Quarterman, J. (1992). Characteristics of athletic directors of historically Black colleges and universities. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 52-63

Roebuck, J. B., and Murty, K. S. (1993). *Historically black colleges and universities: Their place in American higher education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Seymour, A. (2006, December 28). Pigskin payday: For many HBCU athletic departments, the annual football classics keep their sports programs afloat.

*Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 23(23), 36-39

- Smith, R. K. (2000). A brief history of the national collegiate athletic association's role in regulating intercollegiate athletics. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 11(1), 9.
- Smith, J., & Washington, M. (2014). Advancing isomorphism in higher education: A critical analysis of the careers of intercollegiate athletic directors. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 8, 15.
- Solomon, J. (2014, August 7). NCAA adopts new Division I model giving Power 5 autonomy. CBSsports.com. Retrieved from <http://www.cbssports.com/college-football/news/ncaaadopts-new-division-i-model-giving-power-5-autonomy/>
- Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (SIAC). (n.d.). Corporate sponsors. SIAC: History. Retrieved from <http://www.thesiac.com/?page=history>
- SWAC.org. (n.d.). The mission and purpose of the Southwestern Athletic Conference. Retrieved from <http://swac.org/conference/mission.htm>
- Taylor, E. A., & Wells, J. E. (2017). Institutionalized barriers and supports of female athletic directors: A multilevel perspective. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 10(2), 157-183.
- Watkins, B. (2005). *A note on professional amateurism: What is the true economic value of a black male college athlete?* Retrieved from <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.490.7000&rep=rep1&type=pd>
- Weaver, K. (2015). Trophies, treasure, and turmoil: College athletics at a tipping point. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 47(1), 36-45.

Whisenant, W. A., & Pedersen, P. M. (2004). The influence of managerial activities on the success of intercollegiate athletic directors. *American Business Review*, 22(1), 21-26.

Wong, G. M., Deubert, C. R., & Hayek, J. (2015). NCAA Division I athletic directors: An analysis of the responsibilities, qualifications, and characteristics. *Jeffrey S. Moorad Sports Law Journal*, 22, 1-73.