![Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics]

Maximizing Organizational Effectiveness: NCAA Division III Administrator Core Values and Departmental Culturization

_____

Coyte G. Cooper
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

Erianne A. Weight
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

_____

The purpose of this study was to explore Division III athletic administrator perceptions of organizational values through a lens of core value culturalization literature. Survey methodology was utilized to garner responses from 192 Division III head athletic directors [n = 75] and lower level (senior, associate, or assistant) athletic directors [n = 117]. Cumulative administrator emphasis on the "student-athlete experience" and "academic excellence" as top priorities demonstrates support that the mission of these Division III departments is to provide student-athletes with a high quality educational experience both in the classroom and in athletic competition (NCAA Division III, 2011). Analysis of lower-level administrator responses and open-ended responses, however, reveal insight into the lack of value-culturalization within the departments in this sample. The significant differences between athletic directors and lower-level administrators on all but four of the core values point toward an internal disparity in shared values. In order to fully maximize the educational potential of intercollegiate athletics, further concentrated efforts need to be made to imbed these values into the daily processes of these Division III organizations.

Introduction

In recent years, National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) scandals have dominated the headlines (Dufresne, 2011; Mandel & Staples, 2011; Weiberg, 2011) leading many stakeholders to question the holistic approach upon which intercollegiate athletics is supposed to be founded (Benford, 2007; Lapchick, 2006). With core values such as academic excellence, integrity, and respect consistently stated in athletic department mission statements, skeptics have started to wonder whether these purported values are anything more than rhetoric (Splitt, 2011; The Drake Group, 2011).

While the majority of scandals that reach the headlines have taken place at the Division I level where athletic departments are encouraged to be self-sustaining (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011), and thus often driven by financial incentives (Howard & Crompton, 2004; Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003; Zimbalist, 2010), Division III institutions are generally regarded as bastions of holistic education largely sheltered from the commercial enticements that encroach upon other NCAA divisions (Bowen & Levin, 2003; Miranda, 2009; Shulman & Bowen, 2001). The NCAA Division III philosophy statement outlines a divisional emphasis of ensuring that student-athletes are provided with a high quality educational experience both in the classroom and in athletic competition (2011).

Value systems within intercollegiate athletics have been extensively explored at the Division I level (Baxter, Margavio & Lambert, 1996; Bowen & Levin, 2003; Cooper & Weight, 2011; Southall, Wells, & Nagel, 2005; Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). To date, however, there are no studies that directly examine the core values being emphasized by administrators within NCAA Division III athletic departments. Because much of the previous research on intercollegiate athletic value systems has focused on Division I institutions, it is possible that "distorted views of intercollegiate athletic programs" has been provided for NCAA athletics as a whole (Coakley, 2007, p.495; Schroeder, 2010). Thus, the purpose of this research was to explore Division III athletic administrator organizational values deemed most important in carrying out the mission of their athletic departments in order to develop a deeper understanding of value systems within Division III athletic programs. Core value culturalization literature will provide the conceptual framework for this inquiry.

Core Value Literature

Organizational leadership has been examined a great deal in previous literature focusing on enhancing efficiency in the business field (Ouchi, 1979; Van Rekom, Van Riel, & Wierenga, 2006). The era of organizational value systems began in 1994 shortly after Jim Collins and Jerry Porras released their influential book titled *Built to Last*, which documented the consistent presence of a core ideology in high performing organizations (Lencioni, 2002). In essence, the concept of core ideology is a central foundation that "guides and inspires people throughout the organization and remains relatively stable for long periods of time" (Collins & Porras, 2000, p. 48). Further, it is the core values associated with this ideology that serve as "glue that holds [the] organization together as it grows, decentralizes, diversifies, and expands" (Collin & Porras, p. 73).

To expand upon the ideology concept presented by Collin and Porras (2000), it is important to discuss the role of core values in an organizational setting. Based on previous psychological and sociological research, values have been broadly defined as the shared beliefs about desired behaviors and outcomes that guide the selection and/or evaluation of events on a day-to-day basis (Rokeach, 1973). In the business field, scholars have built on this definition when explaining that core values are deeply ingrained principles that guide all of an organization's daily actions (Lencioni, 2002). When these core values are identified as consistent shared beliefs, it allows an organization to effectively create a culture where employees at all levels embrace common goal pursuits and outcomes (Abreu, Macedo, & Camarinha-Matos, 2009; Berings, DeFruyt, & Bouwen, 2004). Naturally, there are a variety of benefits (e.g., efficiency and employee effectiveness) that are associated with the creation of sound values that are culturalized throughout an organization (Pattakos, 2004; Van Rekom et al.,

2006). The culturalization process will first be discussed before outlining the unique benefits associated with strong value systems.

The Culturalization Process

        The culturalization of a value system starts with the establishment of a strong set of central values that have the potential to inspire employees at all levels of the organization. Lencioni (2002) cautioned leaders against stating core values that lack authenticity and explained that insincere values can actually be counterproductive to an organization's effectiveness. In fact, research has demonstrated that empty value statements without organizational buy-in are far more detrimental to the culture of an organization than not having defined values at all (Furguson & Milliman, 2008; Milliman & Clair, 1995). In these particular studies, the authors found that having core values with no substance can have a negative impact on employees' perceptions of the organization, and as a result production and efficiency can suffer. With this in mind, it is critical that organizations first take the time to develop and communicate values that are based on industry demands and standards (Furguson & Milliman, 2008; Milliman & Clair, 1995). More importantly, the value system must be created with employee consideration in mind.
        Drawing upon the notion that individuals join organizations with differing individual core values, Abreau, Macedo, & Camarinha-Matos explored the concept of core value alignment within the context of collaborative networks wherein heterogeneous and often autonomous individuals join together to work toward a common pursuit. The authors document the success of these networks is largely determined by the compatibility and alignment of core values. Because it is difficult to define how and when "alignment" occurs, the authors explored three methodologies that can be utilized including influence-relationship maps, alignment based on compatibility and incompatibility, and member past behavior (2009). While these methodologies are useful, the establishment and culturization of core values rather than the measurement of core-value alignment is typically the early focus of leaders striving toward the benefits of strong core-values within their organizations.
        The most commonly documented method toward culturalization is clear articulation and consistent communication of core values (Ferguson & Milliman, 2008; Milliman & Clair, 1995). Ferguson & Milliman (2008) provide a thorough outline of this research and explore reasons why many organizations have not developed effective core values and are therefore not reaping the rewards of a strong value system. The authors suggest a spiritual leadership philosophy and demonstrate how this can be applied in the public sector. Other authors have articulated the wide range of structures that must be in place for a value system to take hold. As explained by Lencioni (2002), there are several considerations that organizations must embrace:

        If [core values] are going to really take hold in your organization, your core values need
        to be integrated into every employee-related process – hiring methods, performance
        management systems, criteria for promotions and rewards, and even dismissal systems.
        From the first interview to the last day of work, employees should be constantly
        reminded that core values form the basis for every decision the company makes (p. 117).

Ultimately, this process starts by the example set by upper level athletic administration, and the level of effectiveness (and benefits reaped) is determined by the ability to embrace these key areas on a regular basis.

Benefits of Culturalized Core Values

As the previously discussed research has illustrated, one of the primary benefits of a strong uniform culture (and value system) is the enhancement of efficiency and effectiveness among employees within an organization (Van Rekom et al., 2006). When employees are soundly connected to the established value system, they are far more likely to contribute to organizational effectiveness because they have the unique opportunity to fulfill high-level personal aspirations (Berry, 1999; Harmson, 1996; Pattakos, 2004). In other words, employees tend to be far more motivated when they believe in the organization for which they are working. For example, Jack Welch (former CEO of General Electric), cited an example of the value-emphasis impact when he witnessed the speed of organizational operations improve within various organizations when the core value of candor was emphasized because employees were encouraged to be honest with each other (Welch & Welch, 2005).

Another unique benefit of culturalized values is the structure that is afforded when implementing a system that is based on strong central values. Value-based leadership offers a nice alternative to traditional command and control models because it empowers employees to make effective decisions on a daily basis through ingrained organizational principles (Lencioni, 2002; Ouchi, 1979). Rather than focusing on narrowly defined rules, this type of system allows employees to assess their situation based on the values that are most important to the organization. In a time when rapid change is certain, this is critical because it allows employees to use sound situational judgment when facing potential growth situations (Sull, 2010). This is the type of model that empowers employees to be far more productive in their positions because of their ownership in the process.

Intercollegiate Athletic Values

Literature exploring intercollegiate athletic values has carried a common theme of dichotomy. In a study of Division I athletic administrators, Cooper and Weight (2011) described intercollegiate athletics as an "athletic organism that has morphed into a divided system" (p. 74). Their study examined values between Division I "revenue" and "non-revenue" programs, with administrators emphasizing commercial drivers within the football and men's basketball programs while maintaining traditional educational values in their Olympic sports (2011). This intra-athletic department divide supported findings from Southall, Wells, and Nagel (2005) who identified significant revenue versus non-revenue and male versus female value differences within athletic departments.

Other studies support this consistent inconsistency in values. The pull between amateurism and commercialism, and similarly academic versus athletic values have been explored by scholars (Baxter, Margavio, & Lambert, 1996; Trail & Chelladurai, 2002) as the NCAA holds onto the founding core value of amateurism (NCAA Division I Manual, 2011) despite the multi-million dollar television network deals and increasing emphasis on the bottom line that often are clearly at the expense of student-athlete well-being and academic values (Noll, 2004; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Southall & Nagel, 2008).

Scholars examining why this value-divergence exists have pointed to the powerful stakeholders whose values influence the goals and processes of an athletic department (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). Some primary examples of these goals and processes are externalities such as television networks and the NCAA (Southall & Nagel, 2008), and internal university values or division such as student selectivity and scholarship structure (Baxter, Margavio, & Lambert, 1996; Coakley, 2007; Schroeder, 2000).

With the breadth of core value culturization research serving as a foundation, the current study addresses a gap in the literature by examining the administrator value systems that exist within NCAA Division III athletic departments. To date, the specific values of intercollegiate athletic leaders at the Division III level have not been examined. In addition to identifying current practices, the research will guide future efforts to enhance organizational effectiveness within NCAA athletic departments.

Significance of Research

At a time when purported intercollegiate athletic values are being questioned (Splitt, 2011; The Drake Group, 2011), it is important that athletic administrators understand the values that are being culturalized at the different levels within their department. With a stronger grasp of value systems, athletic directors and high-level administrators give themselves a greater chance to realize the unique benefits that are associated with value-driven leadership. Thus, the purpose of the current research was to use core-value culturalization literature to explore the organizational values deemed as having the highest priority by Division III administrators when carrying out the mission of their athletic departments. Based on a review of the existing literature, the following research questions were created to guide the research process:

RQ 1: What organizational values do NCAA Division III athletic administrators deem as having the highest priority when carrying out the mission of their department?

RQ 2: Are there variations in the priority level given to organizational values between head and assistant or associate athletic directors participating in the research?

RQ 3: How have the organizational leaders (NCAA Division III athletic administrators) attempted to "culturalize" these organizational values within their coinciding department?

Methodology

The current exploratory study featured an online survey designed to gain an understanding of the organizational values being emphasized by NCAA Division III administrators in coinciding athletic departments. Prior to developing the actual instrument, an analysis of athletic department's websites was carried out to identify the common values present in mission statements. Following this investigation, it was determined there were 11 organizational core values that would be included in the instrument. In addition, there were three basic background information questions (conference affiliation, gender, and experience in college athletics) and two open-ended responses (expanding on organizational value systems) for a total of 16-items on the organizational value instrument. However, prior to distribution, there were a couple of steps that were taken to ensure construct validity in the survey. First, the

instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts (four senior-level intercollegiate athletic administrators, two professors, and an expert in survey design) to make sure that it was suitable for distribute to the administrators. Second, adjustments were made to the instrument based on feedback from the panel.

Sample

The instrument was distributed via email to each of the NCAA Division III institutions. Using the staff directories on athletic department websites, invitations were sent to the head athletic directors and lower level administrators (senior, associate, and assistant) at each institution. After a one-month lapse in time from the initial invitation, there were a total of 192 administrators that chose to participate in the research. Of these individuals, the respondents were broken down into the following position rank in their athletic department: Head athletic directors [$n = 75$] and lower level administrators [$n = 117$].

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were generated for each of the organizational value items that were included in the instrument. In addition to basic means and standard deviations (see Table 1), a one-way *T*-test was conducted for each of the organizational values to determine the significance of the sample mean relative to the "high priority" ($\mu \geq 4$) benchmark on the scale. This benchmark was set prior to the analysis based on interactions with the panel of experts. However, to control for Type I error, only the values over four were included in the analyses. In addition, a Bonferroni correction was used to control for Type I errors that can occur when making multiple comparisons. For example, when comparing the values to the "high priority" standard, there were only seven values that received a mean value above 4. Thus, a Bonferroni correction ($.05 / 7 = .007$) was utilized and only p values below this level were reported. Further, an independent *T*-test was used to examine the influence that level of administrator had on the priority that is placed on organizational values in their athletic department. An alternative "equal variances not assumed" format was used when necessary to account for heterogeneous variances.

Analysis of the open-ended responses within the survey was also conducted in order to add an additional layer of depth to the research and facilitate triangulation of the data (Patton, 2002). Independent coders reviewed the data and developed coding schemes based on themes uncovered within the narratives. These codes were then compared and a master-code was developed in order to quantify the narrative data (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Following the independent coding of the open-ended responses, a Scott's Pi calculation was implemented to ensure intercoder reliability in the research. The Scott's Pi value of .95 was considered acceptable for the research denoting very strong agreement between coders (Riffe, Lacy, & Fico, 2005).

Results

Descriptive statistics helped identify the organizational values that NCAA Division III administrators deemed as having the highest value when carrying out the mission of the athletic department. As shown in Table 1, there were five organizational values that were rated as a "high priority" ($\mu \geq 4$) by administrators who filled out the survey: (1) student-athlete experience

$t(189) = 13.66$, $p < .001$, (2) academic excellence $t(191) = 14.19$, $p < .001$, (3) health and safety $t(191) = 9.67$, $p < .001$, (4) contribution to university mission $t(191) = 6.63$, $p < .001$, and (5) disciplined diversity $t(191) = 5.36$, $p < .001$. While these were rated as the values given the highest priority, there were several other values that were rated in between the medium ($\mu \geq 3$) and high priority criteria level (see Table 1).

Table 1

NCAA Division III Administrator's Responses to Organizational Core Values (Cumulative)

Organizational Core Values	*M*	*SD*
Student-Athlete Experience *To ensure that student-athletes receive a valuable and rewarding experience (on and off field) during their career.*	4.62*	.619
Academic Excellence *To achieve high levels of student-athlete and team success in the classroom.*	4.58*	.564
Health and Safety *To create procedures/protocol that ensures health and safety for all individuals in the athletic department.*	4.52*	.637
Contribution to University Mission *To create a culture where individuals embrace and contribute to educational mission and role of university.*	4.35*	.727
Disciplined Diversity *To provide fair/equitable opportunities for all individuals regardless of gender, race, and/or physical challenges.*	4.30*	.778
Fiscal Responsibility *To implement transparent budgeting strategies that encourage sound, equitable financial decisions.*	4.18	.839
Athletic Excellence *To achieve high levels of student-athlete/team success during athletic competition.*	4.01	.701
Growth Opportunities *To create an environment that encourages individuals to develop sound professional skill sets (effective leaders).*	3.99	.838
Relationship Cultivation *To create an environment that encourages and fosters strong relationships among individuals in the department.*	3.80	.861
Sense of Shared Community *To create an atmosphere that allows stakeholders to feel like they are an integral part of the department.*	3.74	.886
Broad-Based Participation Opportunities *To provide a wide range of participation opportunities for individuals interested in different sporting events.*	3.66	.739

Note. The scale ranged from (1) "Not a Priority" to (5) "Essential Priority." *$p < .01$ ($\mu \geq 4$)

Tiered Administrator Responses

Building on the cumulative responses, the research focused on gaining a better understanding of Division III value systems through the examination of tiered administrator responses. In the study, this was achieved by analyzing head and lower level administrator responses to each of the 11 organizational values included in the instrument. While athletic directors rated each of the organizational values higher than lower level administrators (senior, associate, and assistant), the data illustrated that the level of administrator had a significant influence on six of the items: (1) student-athlete experience $t(188) = 4.10$, $p < .01$, (2) health and safety $t(190) = 3.73$, $p < .01$, (3) contribution to university mission $t(184) = 3.25$, $p < .01$, (4) fiscal responsibility $t(190) = 4.98$, $p < .01$, (5) growth opportunities $t(176) = 2.48$, $p < .01$, and (6) relationships cultivation $t(190) = 4.26$, $p < .01$. As demonstrated in Table 2, there were no differences between these different levels of administrators in the following items: academic excellence, athletic excellence, broad-based participation opportunities, disciplined diversity, and sense of shared community.

Table 2

NCAA Division III Individual Administrator Responses to Organizational Core Values

Organizational Core Values	Administrator Mean Values	
	Head AD	Lower Level AD's
Student-Athlete Experience*	4.83	4.47
Health and Safety*	4.73	4.35
Academic Excellence	4.64	4.54
Contribution to University Mission*	4.55	4.22
Fiscal Responsibility*	4.51	3.94
Disciplined Diversity	4.47	4.20
Growth Opportunities*	4.17	3.88
Relationship Cultivation*	4.12	3.59
Athletic Excellence	4.08	3.93
Sense of Shared Community*	3.92	3.52
Broad-Based Participation Opportunities	3.78	3.58

Note. The scale ranged (1) "Not a Priority" to (5) "Essential Priority."
*$p < .01$

Segmented Administrator Responses

Further analysis demonstrated that certain demographic indicators (e.g., gender and years of experience) had no influence on the responses provided by administrators within Division III athletic departments. Thus, females and males had very similar responses to the level of

influence that the different organizational values have in their athletic departments. The same can be said about administrators with varying years of experience in their current institution and other intercollegiate athletic positions.

Open-Ended Responses

Administrators were asked to explain the strategies utilized within their athletics department in order to "culturalize" organizational values with staff, coaches, and student-athletes. A total of 108 administrators responded, generating 163 independently-themed strategies grouped into nine coded categories (see Table 3). The most common method cited in the narratives used to culturalize core values included mentioning the departmental values within meetings (n = 39), and providing educational seminars, workshops, or activities (n = 30). Specific examples of open-ended responses will be infused into the discussion section. Refer to Table 3 for a complete listing of open-ended categories organized by response frequency.

Table 3

NCAA Division III Administrator Open-ended Responses

Strategies to "Culturalize" Core Values	(%)	(#)
Emphasize in departmental meetings	23.9%	39
Educational seminars/workshops/activities	18.4%	30
Written in strategic plan / vision / mission statement	14.1%	23
Consistent communication through numerous mediums	12.3%	20
Embody the values in all actions	9.2%	15
No current effort / developing strategies to culturize values	8.0%	13
Hire the right people and hold them accountable	5.5%	9
Personal mentoring of young coaches and athletes	5.5%	9
Recognition of value-based behavior	3.1%	5
Total	100.0%	163

Discussion

Cumulative administrator emphasis on the "student-athlete experience" and "academic excellence" as top priorities in department management provide support for execution of the mission these Division III departments strive to fulfill - to provide student-athletes with a high quality educational experience both in the classroom and in athletic competition (NCAA Division III, 2011). Further, it is encouraging to note the administrators place moderate to essential priority on the majority of core values listed providing support for previous literature that cites the fortification of many Division III institutions from the commercial pressures that often surface within Division I athletics departments (Bowen & Levin, 2003; Miranda, 2009; Shulman & Bowen, 2001).

Analysis of lower-level administrator responses and open-ended responses, however,

reveal insight into the lack of value-culturalization within the departments in this sample. The significant differences between head athletic directors and lower-level administrators on all but four of the core values point toward an internal disparity in shared values. This divide provides an indicator of the pitfall scholars have warned against when effective culturalization does not take place. When core values lack authenticity or are not developed and communicated with organizational stakeholders to develop buy-in, the empty value statements can be far more detrimental to the culture of an organization than not having defined values at all (Furguson & Milliman, 2008; Lencioni, 2002; Milliman & Clair, 1995).

Open-ended statements by assistant and associate athletic directors confirm this phenomenon within some institutions. Associate AD six mentioned the departmental core values are imparted through "endless one-way 'meetings'." Others noted no efforts to culturalize the values, and some mentioned simply having a mission statement or vision statement as their primary method of culturalization. Associate AD sixty-two mentioned culturalization happens annually at his institution – "[values are] part of our mission statement – reviewed yearly." Statements such as these point toward departments who may have taken the first step of creating values, but have a long way to go in terms of filtering and embodying these messages into the fiber of the institution and thereby maximizing organizational performance (Collins & Porras, 1994).

Several institutions demonstrated consistency between the head athletic directors and lower-level administrators. The methods utilized within these institutions are demonstrative of an effective culturalization process. These departments implemented unique and consistent efforts to maintain value-driven direction in organizational functionality. Several administrators cited processes to encourage buy-in through developing the core values and culturalization efforts as a staff. Examples of these processes included "shared book readings and development opportunities" (AD 74); "coaching evaluations based on values such as team's academic record, community involvement, and behavior on campus" (AD 114); "displays that explain our values with corresponding measurable expectations related to 'success'" (AD 116); "core value of the month activities for student-athletes" (AD 157); "articles and thoughts emphasizing departmental values sent to the student-athletes and fans through social media" (Assistant AD 191); and "team check-ins, and individual interviews with athletes to follow-up on the example leaders set through 'living the values'" (AD 33).

These administrators and departments who are focused on embedding the values written in their mission plans are likely reaping the benefits of core value culturalization described in the literature. Employees are more likely to perform with more efficiency and effectiveness (Ven Rekom et al., 2006), as they find motivation through the core values and are able to fulfill high-level personal aspirations (Berry, 1999; Harmson, 1996; Pattakos, 2004).

Conclusion

An athletic director with twenty-two years of experience in collegiate athletics, but in his first year as athletic director at his Division III institution relayed his personal feelings of motivation and sense of purpose,

> We make a commitment to excellence and strive to do the right thing. Sometimes, I think coaches don't realize how much impact they have on young adults. We can always do more with teachable moments. However, the need to achieve and the desire to win are so

strong and deeply rooted within our culture, that we need to step back sometimes and look at what is truly important. Student-athletes remind us of that, without even knowing sometimes (AD 184).

It is this conscious decision to step back, look at the big picture, and realize the potential influence of the intercollegiate athletic experience that is fundamental to the value culturalization process. If done correctly, this value-based leadership can empower departmental stakeholders to make effective decisions on a daily basis through ingrained organizational principles (Lencioni, 2002; Ouchi, 1979).

The acclaim that student-athletes and coaches receive for performing on the court, track, field, or mat should be closely rivaled to the acclaim they receive for performing in the classroom, in the hallway, in the leadership of student-organizations, and off campus. Perhaps many of the issues surfacing within the media and reaching a boiling point within institutions stem from the current lack of rich value culturalization within all levels of the athletic organization.

The clear discrepancies in value between the head and lower level athletic directors may be indicative of a much larger problem. If the divide is significant between upper-level administrators, most logically the divide would continue to widen as the core values are not filtered down to the coaches and athletes. It is uncommon to find an athletic department without a written statement of vision, purpose, or mission. The findings within this study reveal administrator support for the articulated values within these statements, and many of the respondents outlined clear and powerful value-culturalization methods. In order to fully maximize the educational potential of intercollegiate athletics, however, further concentrated efforts need to be made to imbed these values into the daily processes of these Division III organizations.

Limitations and Future Research

This study provides a nice foundation for further exploration into values within intercollegiate athletics; however, there are several limitations to be noted. This study examined administrator perceptions of value emphasis within Division III athletic departments. Future research should explore why the values emphasized by the administrators within this Division III sample are of utmost importance. This research could build upon the findings in this study through providing insight related to the organizational constraints administrators face. While this study provided insight into administrator values, these values are likely driven in part by university and/or resource limitations. For example, exploration into the value of "growth opportunities" that emphasizes creating an environment that encourages individuals to develop sound professional skill sets could provide interesting insight into why athletic departments are often viewed as an ancillary unit within the university (Brand, 2006). Perhaps if the organizational structure and mission of the athletic department was equal to that of an academic department with a clear teaching focus, student-athlete growth opportunities would be more highly regarded, and these educational opportunities would become the primary function of athletic departments, facilitating a holistic educational experiences.

Additional research can also investigate whether the core value perceptions of the administrators are infused within their departments. Future research could include core value perceptions of other employees (e.g., staff members and coaches) and student-athletes that reside

within athletic departments. Finally, with the focus on Division III administrator core values, the research did not address the status of core or aspirational value systems in NCAA Division I and II athletic departments. It could be useful to carry out future value-based research projects in all college athletic settings.

References

Abreu, A., Macedo, P., & Camarinha-Matos, L. M. (2009). Elements of a methodology to assess the alignment of core-values in collaborative networks. *International Journal of Production Research*, *47*(17), 4709-4934.

Aurbach, C.F., & Silverstein, L.B. (2003). Qualitative data: an introduction to coding and analysis. New York: New York University Press.

Baxter, V., Margavio, A. V., & Lambert, C. (1996). Competition, legitimation, and the regulation of intercollegiate athletics. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 13,* 51-64.

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

Berings, D., De Fruyt, F., & Bouwen, R. (2004). Work values and personality traits as predictors of enterprising and social vocational interests. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 349-364.

Berry, L. L. (1999). *Discovering the soul of service: The nine drivers of sustainable business success*. New York: Harper Business.

Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education.
Journal of Sport Management, 14, 105-132.

Bowen, W. G., & Levin, S. A. (2003). *Reclaiming the game: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Coakley, J. J. (2007). *Sports in society: Issues and controversies* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Collins, J. C., & Porras, J. I. (2000). *Built to last. Successful habits of visionary companies*. London: Random House.

Cooper, C. G., & Weight, E. A. (2011). Investigating NCAA administrator values in NCAA Division I athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics. 4*, 74-89.

Dufresne, C. (2011, Aug 2). College football's off-season is almost over, but an odor lingers. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from: http://articles.latimes.com/2011/aug/02/sports/la-sp-0803-dufresne-college-football-20110803.

Ferguson, J., & Milliman, J. (2008). Creating effective core organizational values: A spiritual leadership approach. *International Journal of Public Administration, 31*, 439-459.

Harmson, F. G. (1996). *Playing for keeps*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Howard, D. R., & Crompton, J. L. (2004). *Financing sport, 2nd Edition*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Lapchick, R. E. (2006). *New game plan for college sport.* Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Lencioni, P. M. (2002). Make your values mean something. *Harvard Business Review, July*, 113-117.

Mandel, S., Staples, A. (2011, Aug 9). Ten reasons to embrace college football after a year of scandal. *SI.com*. Retrieved from: http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/2011/football/ncaa/08/09/10-reasons-to-embrace-2011/index.html.

Marburger, D. R., & Hogshead-Makar, N. (2003). Is Title IX really to blame for the decline in intercollegiate men's nonrevenue sports? *Marquette Sports Law Review,* 14, 65-93.

Milliman, J., & Clair, J. (1995). Environmental HRM best practices in the USA: A review of the literature. *Greener Management International, 10*, 34-48.

Miranda, M. A. (2009). Anecdote or data: Research on NCAA Division III academic performance and the division III presidential white papers. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports, 1,* 9-15.

NCAA Division I Manual. (2011). National Collegiate Athletic Association. Indianapolis, IN.

NCAA Division III − NCAA Division III Philosophy Statement. (2011). Retrieved from: http://www.scacsports.com/information/ncaad3.

Noll, R. C. (2004). The business of college sports and the high cost of winning. In S.R. Rosner, & K.L. Shropshire (Eds.), *The business of sports* (pp. 477-491). Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A conceptual framework for the design of organizational control mechanisms. *Management Science*, *25*, 933-848.

Pattakos, A. N. (2004). The search for meaning in government service. *Public Administration Review, 64*(1), 106-112.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Riffe, D., Lacy, S., & Fico, F. G. (2005). *Analyzing media messages: Using quantitative content analysis in research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Sack, A. L., & Staurowsky, E. G. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Schroeder, P. J. (2000). An assessment of student involvement among selected NCAA Division III basketball players. *Journal of College Student Development, 41,* 616-626.

Schroeder, P. J. (2010). A model for assessing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics, 3,* 98-188.

Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W.G. (2001). The game of life: College sports and educational values. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Southall, R. M., Wells, D. E., & Nagel, M. S**.** (2005). Organizational culture perceptions of intercollegiate athletic department members. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, *20*, 65-93.

Southall, R. M., & Nagel, M. S. (2008). A case study analysis of NCAA Division I women's basketball tournament broadcasts: Educational or commercial activity? *International Journal of Sport Communication, 1,* 516-533.

Splitt, F. G. (2011, Jan 21). NCAA President Emmert holds to cartel's party line. *College Athletic CLIPS.* Retrieved from: http://www.thedrakegroup.org/Splitt_012111.pdf

Sull, D. (2010). Are you ready to rebound? *Harvard Business Review, March*, 71-74.

Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic goals and processes: The influence of personal values. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*, 289-310.

The Drake Group (2011). Retrieved from: http://www.thedrakegroup.org/about.html.

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.

Weiberg, S. (2011, Aug 8). NCAA retreat set to tackle several critical reform issues. *USA Today.com.* Retrieved from: http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/2011-08-08-mark-emmert-ncaa-retreat_n.htm.

Welch, J., & Welch, S. (2005). *Winning.* New York: HarperCollins.

Zimbalist, A. (2010). Dollar dilemmas during the downturn: A financial crossroads for college sports. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 3*(1), 111-135.