



*“Working to ensure that intercollegiate athletic programs operate within the educational mission of their college and universities since 1989”*

**GRANT PROGRAM FINAL REPORT**

Examining Administrator and Coach Perceptions of Value Systems in NCAA  
Division I Athletic Departments

Coyte G. Cooper, Ph.D. & Erianne A. Weight, Ph.D.

Assistant Professors in Sport Administration

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Statement of the Problem .....	3
II. Conceptual Framework .....	3
III. Relevant Literature .....	4
IV. Data and Methodology .....	5
Survey Instrument .....	5
Sample .....	6
Data Analysis .....	6
V. Results .....	7
Administrator Responses .....	7
Coaches Responses .....	8
Open-Ended Responses .....	9
VI. Conclusions .....	12
VII. Report References .....	16
VIII. Tables .....	19

## **Statement of the Problem**

The presence of the intercollegiate athletics “arms race” in the United States has led several National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) athletic departments to embrace a commercial model that encourages spending on “major,” revenue-producing sports (Knight Commission, 2010). Conference realignments, multi-billion dollar television deals, and superstar amateur athletes dominate the headlines as the “arms race” continues to escalate (Knight Commission, 2004, 2010; Sack, 2009). While data supports the notion that only a handful of athletic programs operate outside the red (National Collegiate, 2009), escalating commercialism stands as the most visible product of the administrative reward system that exists in this institutional sphere.

Based on previous research, an evident dualism in value systems has been identified within Division I intercollegiate athletics (Cooper & Weight, 2011a; Cooper & Weight, 2011b; National Collegiate, 2010; Knight Commission, 2010). On one side resides the stated purpose of intercollegiate athletics “to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of the student-athlete is paramount” (National Collegiate, 2010). However, an often-opposing value system that seems to exist in college athletics is the presence of the “arms race” and lavish expenditures toward the battle for supremacy, national exposure, and financial rewards (Knight Commission, 2010). With this perceived dualism in “big time” college athletics, it seems relevant to take a closer look at the value systems that exist in Division I athletic departments.

## **Relevant Literature**

In past research, scholars have emphasized the importance of value systems when attempting to provide a meaningful direction for employees and stakeholders within an

organization (Abreu, Macedo, & Camarinha-Matos, 2009; Collin & Porras, 2000). At the heart of these value systems are the core values that administrators/executives establish surrounding the mission of their organization. In a pioneer study, Collin and Porras (1996) identified core values as shared beliefs that are an “essential and enduring element of an organization” due to the fact that “they are timeless guiding principles that have intrinsic value and importance to those inside of an organization” (p. 66). For organizations to be successful in establishing a sound value system, they must first identify the core values that will allow them to create a culture that embraces common goal pursuits and outcomes (Abreu et al., 2009; Berings, De Fruyt, & Bouwen, 2004). However, for organizations such as NCAA athletic departments to realize the benefits associated with “culturalized” core values (e.g., enhanced efficiency within organization and motivated employees), there must be congruency in the values that are being established throughout the organization at all levels. Thus, in addition to establishing meaningful core values, there must be agreement between administrators and coaches in the priority level of these values if athletic departments hope to realize their full potential in academic and athletic endeavors. An examination of related research in college athletics is helpful in illustrating the importance of having a sound value system.

### **Value Systems in College Athletics**

There is limited research available on the value systems that exist within NCAA athletic departments. In an examination of the “nonrevenue,” Olympic and “revenue-producing” sport programs in NCAA Division I athletic departments, Cooper and Weight (2011b) surveyed athletic directors. The results revealed an athletic organism that has morphed into a divided system with each school mimicking one another in the arms race of expenditures in their revenue sports (Knight Commission, 2010), while maintaining core values in the Olympic

sports. Further, in a follow-up study, Cooper and Weight (2011a) further examined the value of Olympic sports and determined that variations existed between administrators and coaches in the perceived importance of the following program elements: personal relationships, community involvement, athletic success, and fan support. However, while the previous research is helpful, it does not address the overall value systems that exist within the structure of NCAA Division I athletic departments. Thus, the purpose of the current study is to explore the priority level of core values from two viewpoints to gain an understanding of the value systems that exist within NCAA Division I athletic departments: (1) NCAA administrators' perception of the core values deemed most important within department, and (2) coaches' perceptions of the core values deemed most important within department.

## **Data and Methodology**

### **Survey Instrument**

The current research utilized an online survey designed to gain an understanding of the core values that are emphasized when carrying out the mission of Division I athletic departments. Using an existing instrument with established reliability that was developed by the Principle and Co-Principle investigators, the study surveyed administrators and coaches at each of the NCAA Division I institutions to understand the organizational and aspirational values emphasized within these departments. The actual core values included in the survey were developed using several steps to ensure instrument validity. First, an examination of NCAA athletic department websites was conducted to identify the values listed in mission statements. Following this assessment, there were a set of values that emerged as the most prevalent organizational initiatives for NCAA athletic departments. Prior to distribution, a panel of experts (four senior-level intercollegiate athletic administrators, two professors, and an expert in research

and survey design) was formed to ensure the instrument's content was sound and had the ability to effectively measure the core values of administrators. Based on the panel's feedback, the decision was made to include 27 core values in the survey. Following a series of revisions, the online survey instrument was unanimously approved by the panel of experts for distribution.

### **Sample**

The instrument was distributed via email to the entire population of NCAA Division I athletic departments ( $N = 342$ ). The athletic department staff directories were used to obtain the email addresses for the administrators (head athletic director(s), senior athletic directors, associate athletic directors, and assistant athletic directors) and coaches (head and assistants) at each individual institution. While the head athletic directors were identified as the primary contact from an administrative standpoint, the remaining administrators were copied on the invitation and were strongly encouraged to participate in the research. Similarly, the head coach was the primary contact, but assistant coaches were strongly encouraged to complete the survey. Each of the populations received two email invitations (initial and follow-up) to participate in the research.

### **Data Analysis**

The project utilized a combination of both quantitative and qualitative research methods. While an emphasis was placed on the quantitative analysis of the data, open-ended questions were also examined to add depth to the research. Descriptive statistics were generated for each of the items that were included in the research instrument. In addition to means and standard deviations, a one-way *T*-test was conducted for each of the values to determine the significance of the sample mean relative to the scale. Further, an analysis of variance was used to examine

the differences between administrators and coaches in their perceived priority level of these core values within corresponding athletic departments.

## **Results**

The results of the study demonstrate some of the unique trends that exist within NCAA Division I athletic department value systems. In addition to showing the overall cumulative values receiving the highest priority level by administrators, the data also highlights the unique variations that are present within these departments when focusing on the level of administrator. To add further depth to this line of research, the coaches' perceptions of the priority level of values within their athletic department were examined before comparing them to administrator's responses. Each of these areas will be presented in this report prior to discussing some of the qualitative responses provided by respondents.

### **Administrator Responses**

Overall, administrators tended to rate the organizational values at the higher end of the spectrum with the means for each item coming in at or above the "medium priority" ( $\mu \geq 3$  level) on a five point scale. Further, as illustrated in Table 1, there were seven organizational values that differentiated themselves by being rated as a "high priority" ( $\mu \geq 4$ ) by administrators (*in rank order*): (1) academic excellence, (2) student-athlete experience, (3) health and safety, (4) athletic excellence, (5) fiscal responsibility, (6) disciplined diversity, and (7) contribution to university mission. While the remaining organizational values were rated below this standard, the data demonstrated that each of these items were rated above the 3.5 mark (*in between medium and high priority level*) on the likert scale that was used on the instrument. As shown in Table 2, similar trends existed for the aspirational values as eight values were rated as being a "high priority" for administrators: (1) ethics, (2) integrity, (3) honesty, (4) sportsmanship, (5)

teamwork, (6) responsibility, (7) discipline, and (8) respectfulness. Once again, each of the remaining aspirational values were rated at or above the 3.5 level by the administrators participating in the research (see Table 3).

### **Coaches Responses**

Similar analyses determined slightly different responses from the coaches' perceptions of departmental values. As illustrated in Table 4, there were fewer organizational values that were rated at the "high priority level" as only three met this criteria (*in rank order*): (1) academics, (2) student-athlete experience, and (3) athletics. In addition, every single organizational value was rated at a lower level of perceived priority when in comparison to the responses provided by the administrators in the study. Similarly, there were only four of the 16 aspirational values that were rated as being "highly important" within Division I administrators by coaches: (1) ethics, (2) integrity, (3) honesty, and (4) sportsmanship. Again, every single aspirational value was rated lower in perceived priority level by coaches than by administrators. The data for these aspirational values are presented in Table 5. The specific variations between administrators and coaches will be discussed in the following sections.

### **Variations in Values**

While the individual responses from administrators and coaches are valuable, they alone do not provide a full picture of the value systems that exist in Division I athletic departments. In fact, you could make the argument that the responses of tiered administrators and employees are far more telling because they help determine whether a value system is being culturalized throughout an athletic department. To fully understand this culturalization process, it is first important to examine the responses to the organizational and aspirational values when focusing on the level of administrators participating in the research. This will determine whether the



upper level of the athletic department is on the same page when it comes to the value system they are implementing. In addition, it is also useful to move down the department to coaches to see if there are discrepancies between administrators in this process. Each of these comparisons will be made before touching on the practical implications of the research.

**Leveled Administrator's Comparisons.** To further understand the value systems that exist within Division I athletic departments, the data was examined from a tiered standpoint by focusing on the responses of different levels of administrators (head, senior, associate, and assistant) participating in the research. As demonstrated in Table 4, head athletic directors unanimously rated the organizational values (*on 10 out of 11 occasions*) as a higher priority than the lower level administrators. It is important to note that athletic excellence was the only occasion where the lower level administrators rated an organizational value higher than the head athletic directors. Similar trends existed when examining the aspirational values based on the level of administrator responding to the instrument.

**Administrator and Coach Comparisons.** When focusing on the comparison between administrators and coaches, the data clearly demonstrates that “lower level” employees rated the perceived priority level of both aspirational and organizational values below that of “higher level” administrators. In fact, the data showed that head athletic directors rated all 27 values significantly higher than coaches in the study. In addition, building on the previous section focusing on leveled administrator comparisons, the data clearly indicates a trend of declining level of perceived priority for the values when moving down the hierarchy within the athletic department. The specific values for these comparisons are provided in Tables 4 and 5.

### **Open-Ended Responses**

Several open-ended questions were asked of both the administrators and coaches within

the study in order to add an additional layer of depth to the quantitative organizational value findings. These qualitative responses illuminate many of the statistical findings discussed above through the actual words expressed by Division I administrators and coaches.

**Administrator Responses.** Administrators were asked what strategies were utilized to “culturize” values throughout their departments. Those who responded mentioned strategies to culturize aspirational (n=178) and organizational (n=172) values including consistency through actions in departmental and university culture (26%, n=91); educational activities or programs to emphasize the guiding values of the department (25.1%, n=88); emphasis on values within departmental meetings and manuals (21.1%, n=74); and personnel and departmental strategy being grounded in values (11.4%, n=40). See table six lists a complete summary of responses.

Administrators were also asked whether there were contradictions between values and practices within their departments. The vast majority (55%, n=104) responded their belief that no contradictions existed. An additional 5.8% (n=11) explained their departmental culture was currently in the process of transforming and thus values were currently unclear, and another 10.1% (n=19) stated tensions exist between resources and competitive demands, but values generally supersede. 29.1% of the administrators (n=55), however, expressed concern related to the contradiction between values and practices at their institution with financial gains and winning listed as two forces that often take precedence over stated departmental values.

**Coach Responses.** Coaches were asked the same question related to contradictions between stated and practiced values within their athletic departments. Responses varied dramatically between the 1005 coaches who responded to the open-ended invitation. The majority of coaches (54.3%; n=546) noted no contradictions between values and practice within their department. Many coaches elaborated on the consistency in message and actions

demonstrated by their exemplary leaders: “Our motto is education through athletics and we practice it!” (FCS Male Assistant Coach); “I am very proud of how united and transparent the athletic department is. We are all about the student-athlete college experience” (FCS-AQ Female Assistant Coach). Several commented on the reputation within intercollegiate athletics propagated in the media and passionately stated how counter that image is to the leadership and values practiced daily within their departmental walls as the unified staff strives to provide an optimal experience for their student-athletes.

Another significant number of coaches (40.8%; n=410) noted contradictions do exist within their departments. These contradictions varied significantly (see table 7), with the majority (28.8%; n=118) voicing concern over the considerable administrator hypocrisy that exists within their departments. Examples of these statements include “Yes. Often times the department will say one thing ‘on the record’, and do another ‘off the record’” (FBS-AQ Male Head Coach); “Yes. Do as I say, not as I do is the prevailing example we receive from administration” (FBS-AQ Male Associate Head Coach); and “Absolutely. We go through the motions – we say things are important but there is never any action to back that up” (FCS Female Head Coach). The next most common (21.7%; n=89) subcategory coaches elaborated upon related to value/practice contradictions was based upon the variation in standards administrators practiced between sports within the department. Other common responses within this category included coaches expressing a lack of financial support from administration to facilitate value-achievement (11.7%, n=48); winning prioritized over values (7.6%; n=31); little communication with or care for coaches and staff despite values that ascribe to unity or a family atmosphere (6.1%; n=25); gender equity proclamations vs. practice (4.6%; n=19); widespread hypocrisy in collegiate athletics not limited to their institution (3.4%; n=14); and financial concerns

prioritized over values (2.7%; n=11). “Other” responses (9.5%; n=39) included inconsistencies in administrative practices and stated values related to recruiting, academic standards, athlete discipline, diversity, and coach accountability.

### **Conclusions**

In an era where intercollegiate athletics morals are continually being contested in the media, (Benford, 2007; Weight & Cooper, 2012). it is critical to understand the values driving decisions within these educational departments. The results of this study provide evidence of sound ideals and practices in this industry. Administrator and coach quantitative and qualitative data illuminate the internal importance of the values listed within the survey and the tremendous efforts engaged by some administrators to culturalize these values. A slight majority of coaches supported their administrators in passionate agreement that within their department, values and practices are inline as unified administrators, coaches, and staffs strive to provide optimal experiences for the student-athletes who come through their programs. These narrative responses provide evidence that many of the division I athletics departments in this sample are indeed walking the walk of education through athletics and values-driven leadership.

Two findings within the study, however, support many of the headlines citing widespread corruption that have driven public discourse surrounding intercollegiate athletics over the past several years (Branch, 2011). These findings point toward administrative inconsistency between stated values and entrenched practices within the athletics departments. At a minimum, these findings uncover simply poor leadership as administrators may not understand the importance of communication and culturization of values in an effort to build a sound culture (Collins & Porras, 2000). Judging by many of the coach narrative responses, however, some of these discrepancies point toward a more serious issue of clear administrator hypocrisy and intentional

inconsistency in departmental word and action – department administrators engaging in outright patronization of the public and internal stakeholders which undoubtedly translates into examples of unethical behavior and appalling experiences for the athletes.

In order to progress toward the hope of a brighter future within intercollegiate athletics, it is imperative for internal and external stakeholders of intercollegiate athletics to demand values-driven leadership based on inspiring and education-centered ethos. It is important for departments to have consistent messages and actions from the top-down, for hiring and firing decisions to be founded upon these values, and for intercollegiate athletes to feel these values in all administrative and coach interactions. This study provides evidence that this model does exist within a majority of the schools who responded to this study, and within those schools, the benefits of value-culturalization cited throughout organizational behavior literature (e.g. increased morale, productivity, and decision making) were evident (Collins & Porras, 2000; Pattakos, 2004; Van Rekom, Van Riel, & Wierenga, 2006). What follows are a few of the responses from coaches who passionately championed the culture of their departments. These statements represent the often-forgotten voices and experiences that rarely make their way to the headlines...statements that remind us of the tremendous opportunity for good there is within the industry of intercollegiate education through athletics.

- *“I do not find contradiction between our values and practice. This university knows that life is more than just the present; hence the athletic expectations aren’t our biggest priority. If we can develop athletes who can be leaders and role models in the future we have accomplished what we have set forth to do, and that is what the university embodies”* (FCS Female Assistant Coach).

- *“College athletics have a bad reputation right now...and the media show[s] all the negatives. There is not a contradiction within my athletic department between values and practice. My administrators and leaders have the best interest of the student-athletes in mind and are doing their best to make value-driven decisions that are morally right”* (FBS-AQ Female Assistant Coach).
- *“Our leaders walk the walk and work VERY hard 24/7. That work ethic reaches to every area, employees and students”* (FBS-AQ Female Assistant Coach).
- *“The mission of the university and the missions of the athletic department are practiced daily and are fostered in the individual relationships between co-workers and student-athletes”* (FBS-AQ Male Assistant Coach).
- *“The message is the same from the top down and the administration practices what they preach”* (FBS-AQ Male Assistant Coach).
- *“Our athletics department does a great job focusing on people, relationships, and doing things the right way. It is also very competitive and very successful athletically”* (FBS-AQ Female Head Coach).
- *“We have a leader with very high morals and character and that example sets the tone for our entire athletic department”* (FBS-AQ Male Head Coach).
- *“We do not sacrifice our values or integrity for competitive success”* (FBS-AQ Male Assistant Coach).
- *“The values are established from the top and there are countless resources and recognition for standing by those values”* (FBS-AQ Female Assistant Coach).
- *“Being an Ivy League school we have students drafted into the NBA, MLB, MLS, and NFL, but most of our students are here to become doctors, lawyers, engineers, etc. They are here*

*to be successful outside of the athletic arena and we as an athletic department know this. Do we want to be the best in the country in our sports? Yes, but we also want to be #1 in GPA and graduation rates” (FCS Male Head Coach).*

- *“After values are expressed, they are executed” (FCS Female Assistant Coach).*
- *“We are collectively committed to ensuring that our values and mission be at the forefront of our planning, decision making and execution of our duties and behaviors” (FCS Male Head Coach).*

## Report References

- Abreu, A., Macedo, P., and Camarinha-Matos, L. M. (2009), "Elements of a methodology to assess the alignment of core-values in collaborative networks", *International Journal of Production Research*, Vol. 47 No. 17, pp. 4709-4934.
- Benford, R. (2007). The College sports reform movement; Reframing the "edutainment" industry. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 48(1), 1-28.
- Berings, D., De Fruyt, F., and Bouwen, R. (2004), "Work values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests", *Personality and Individual Differences*, Vol. 36, pp. 349-364.
- Branch, T. (October, 2011). The shame of college sports. *The Atlantic Monthly*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/...sports/8643/2/>.
- Chelladurai, P. (2005). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity - a systems perspective (2<sup>nd</sup> ed)*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway Publishers Inc.
- Collins, J. C. and Porras, J. I. (1996), "Building your company's vision", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. September-October, pp. 65-77.
- Collins, J. C., and Porras, J. I. (2000), *Built to Last. Successful Habits of Visionary Companies*, Random House, London.
- Cooper, C.G., & Weight, E.A. (2011a). An examination of administrators' nonrevenue, Olympic program values within NCAA athletic departments. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, Vol. 4, pp. 247-260.
- Cooper, C.G., & Weight, E. (2011b). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 74-89.



- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1991). Introduction. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism* (pp.1-38). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- DiMaggio, P., & Powell, W. (1991). Introduction. In W. Powell & P. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism* (pp.1-38). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (2004). *Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletics success, student quality, and donations*. Ithaca, NY: Frank, Robert H.
- Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (2010). *Restoring the balance: dollars, values, and the future of college sport*. Retrieved from:  
<http://restoringbalance.knightcommission.org>.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2009). *Revenues/expenses 2004-2008: NCAA revenues and expenses of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic programs report*. Indianapolis, IN.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2010). *2010 – 2011 NCAA Division I Manual*. Indianapolis, IN.
- Pattakos, A. N. (2004). The search for meaning in government service. *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 106-112.
- Sack, A. L. (2009). Clashing models of commercial sport in higher education: Implications for reform and scholarly research. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 76-92.
- Scott, W.R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, R., & Meyer, J. (1994). *Institutional environments and organizations: Structural complexity and individualism*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Van Rekom, J., Van Riel, C. B., Wierenga, B. (2006). A methodology for assessing

organizational core values. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(2), 175-201.

Weight, E.A., & Cooper, C.G. (2012, May 25). *Scandal, scholarship, and subsidy: An analysis of intercollegiate athletic coverage within five major newspapers*. Presentation for the North American Society of Sport Management Conference, Seattle, WA.

## Tables

Table 1

*Cumulative NCAA Division I Administrator's Responses to Organizational Core Values*

Organizational Core Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Academic Excellence</b> <i>To achieve high levels of student-athlete and team success in the classroom.</i>	4.63	0.59
<b>Student-Athlete Experience</b> <i>To ensure that student-athletes receive a valuable and rewarding experience (on and off field) during their career.</i>	4.54	0.61
<b>Health and Safety</b> <i>To create procedures/protocol that ensures health and safety for all individuals in the athletic department.</i>	4.40	0.74
<b>Athletic Excellence</b> <i>To achieve high levels of student-athlete/team success during athletic competition.</i>	4.36	0.63
<b>Fiscal Responsibility</b> <i>To implement transparent budgeting strategies that encourages sound, equitable financial decisions.</i>	4.36	0.81
<b>Disciplined Diversity</b> <i>To provide fair and equitable opportunities for all individuals regardless of gender, race, and/or physical challenges.</i>	4.31	0.77
<b>Contribution to University Mission</b> <i>To create a culture where individuals embrace and contribute to educational mission and role of university.</i>	4.25	0.77
<b>Growth Opportunities</b> <i>To create an environment that encourages individuals to develop sound professional skill sets (effective leaders).</i>	3.88	0.94
<b>Sense of Shared Community</b> <i>To create an atmosphere that allows stakeholders to feel like they are an integral part of the department.</i>	3.77	0.87
<b>Relationship Cultivation</b> <i>To create an environment that encourages and fosters strong relationships among individuals in the department.</i>	3.67	0.89
<b>Broad-Based Participation Opportunities</b> <i>To provide a wide range of participation opportunities for individuals interested in different sporting events.</i>	3.55	0.99

**Note.** The scale ranged from (1) "Not a Priority" to (5) "Essential Priority."

Table 2

*NCAA Division I Administrator's Responses to Aspirational Values (Top Responses)*

Aspirational Core Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Ethics</b> <i>To develop individuals who have a system of moral principles that allow them to make sound decisions.</i>	4.35	0.78
<b>Integrity</b> <i>To develop individuals with sound values so they can be honest in their communications/interactions with others.</i>	4.35	0.80
<b>Honesty</b> <i>To develop individuals who have the ability to be fair and straightforward regardless of the situation they are facing.</i>	4.29	0.81
<b>Sportsmanship</b> <i>To develop individuals who demonstrate a respectful demeanor when participating in competitive situations.</i>	4.29	0.76
<b>Teamwork</b> <i>To develop individuals who cooperate well with others in group environments to achieve a common goal.</i>	4.29	0.72
<b>Responsibility</b> <i>To develop mature individuals who are accountable for their actions and their impact on other people.</i>	4.16	0.82
<b>Discipline</b> <i>To develop individuals who have the ability to invest their time and energy in activities that will allow them to succeed.</i>	4.10	0.75
<b>Respectfulness</b> <i>To develop individuals who are polite and courteous to the people around them.</i>	4.10	0.85

**Note.** The scale ranged from (1) "Not a Priority" to (5) "Essential Priority."

Table 3

*NCAA Division I Administrator's Responses to Aspirational Values (Bottom Responses)*

Aspirational Core Values	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<b>Professionalism</b> <i>To develop individuals who have the qualities and skill sets necessary to represent the organization appropriately.</i>	4.06	0.77
<b>Personal Development</b> <i>To develop individuals who embrace the opportunity to grow in all aspects of their life.</i>	4.03	0.83
<b>Commitment</b> <i>To develop individuals who have the ability to show loyalty, dedication, and persistence to the things that matter to them.</i>	4.02	0.80
<b>Citizenship</b> <i>To develop individuals who embrace the concept of "contributing" as they strive to be productive members of society.</i>	3.99	0.77
<b>Self-Confidence</b> <i>To develop individuals who believe in their ability to achieve goals in life.</i>	3.95	0.80
<b>Passion</b> <i>To develop individuals who have a strong internal desire to strive towards the things that truly matter to them.</i>	3.91	0.84
<b>Humility</b> <i>To develop individuals who treat people well and are humble when success is achieved (or realized) in their lives.</i>	3.82	0.86
<b>Lifelong Learning</b> <i>To develop individuals who embrace the opportunity to constantly learn and grow throughout their lifetime.</i>	3.79	0.91

**Note.** The scale ranged from (1) "Not a Priority" to (5) "Essential Priority."

Table 4

*NCAA Athletic Department Staff Responses to Organizational Core Values*

Organizational Core Values	Staff Mean Values				
	Head AD	Senior AD	Associate AD	Assistant AD	Coaches
Academic Excellence	4.83	4.65	4.63	4.52	4.43
Student-Athlete Experience	4.74	4.57	4.59	4.38	4.28
Health and Safety	4.69	4.35	4.51	4.18	4.03
Athletic Excellence	4.33	4.43	4.41	4.29	4.14
Fiscal Responsibility	4.62	4.34	4.43	4.16	3.91
Disciplined Diversity	4.44	4.23	4.40	4.17	4.10
Contribution to University Mission	4.55	4.32	4.29	4.02	4.02
Growth Opportunities	4.28	3.92	3.93	3.62	3.73
Sense of Shared Community	4.12	3.78	3.78	3.57	3.52
Relationship Cultivation	4.00	3.69	3.69	3.46	3.43
Broad-Based Participation Opportunities	3.73	3.61	3.58	3.37	3.00
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>4.39</b>	<b>4.17</b>	<b>4.20</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>3.87</b>

**Note.** The scale ranged (1) “Not a Priority” to (5) “Essential Priority.”

Table 5

*NCAA Athletic Department Staff Responses to Aspirational Values*

Aspirational Core Values	Staff Mean Values				
	Head AD	Senior AD	Associate AD	Assistant AD	Coaches
Ethics	4.69	4.26	4.40	4.16	4.09
Integrity	4.65	4.35	4.42	4.13	4.07
Honesty	4.67	4.31	4.34	4.04	4.09
Sportsmanship	4.49	4.24	4.35	4.20	4.16
Teamwork	4.52	4.25	4.38	4.07	4.09
Responsibility	4.48	4.21	4.18	3.98	4.04
Discipline	4.35	4.08	4.13	3.97	3.99
Respectfulness	4.43	4.06	4.13	3.94	3.98
Professionalism	4.25	4.07	4.05	3.97	3.96
Personal Development	4.22	4.00	4.02	3.97	3.85
Commitment	4.29	4.06	4.01	3.88	3.96
Citizenship	4.25	3.90	4.04	3.89	3.89
Self-Confidence	4.14	3.94	3.93	3.89	3.82
Passion	4.13	3.89	3.92	3.80	3.84
Humility	4.08	3.78	3.80	3.74	3.70
Lifelong Learning	4.06	3.66	3.87	3.67	3.79
<b>Cumulative</b>	<b>4.36</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>3.95</b>	<b>3.95</b>

**Note.** The scale ranged (1) “Not a Priority” to (5) “Essential Priority.”

Table 6

*NCAA Division I Administrator Open-ended Responses*

Strategies to “Culturize” Organizational & Aspirational Values	(%)	(#)
Engrained through consistent department/university culture	26.0%	91
Education/Activities/Programs	25.1%	88
Emphasize in departmental meetings & manuals	21.1%	74
Make all decisions grounded in these values (strategy, hiring, evaluation)	11.4%	40
Written in strategic plan	7.4%	26
Very little effort made to encourage aspirational values	4.9%	17
Recognition/honor of athletes demonstrating these values	2.3%	8
None	1.7%	6
Total	100.0%	350



Table 7

*NCAA Division I Administrator Open-ended Responses*

Are there contradictions between values and practices within your athletic department?	(%)	(#)
No contradictions exist between values and practice	55.0%	104
Yes, contradictions exist	29.1%	55
Financial gains are often prioritized over values	27.3%	15
Winning is often prioritized over values by coaches and some administrators.	16.4%	9
Our organizational culture is in the process of reforming	5.8%	11
Tensions exist between resources and competitive demands, but values generally supersede.	10.1%	19
Total	100.0%	189

Table 8

*NCAA Division I Coach Narrative Responses*

Are there contradictions between values and practice within your athletic department?	(%)	N
No contradictions exist between values and practice	54.3%	546
Yes, contradictions exist	40.8%	410
Considerable administrator hypocrisy	28.8%	118
Different standards for different sports	21.7%	89
Financial support does not facilitate the values ascribed to	11.7%	48
Winning prioritized over values	7.6%	31
Little communication / care for coaches and staff	6.1%	25
Gender equity proclamations vs. practice	4.6%	19
Widespread hypocrisy in college athletics - not an institutional problem	3.4%	14
Financial concerns prioritized over values	2.7%	11
Other	9.5%	39
Tension exists between resources and competitive demands, but values generally supersede	4.1%	41
No standards, no contradiction	0.8%	8
Total	100.0%	1005