

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7922408

GREAVES, ELLEN C.  
PERSONAL VALUES, INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND  
VOTING ON SPORT GOVERNANCE ISSUES.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT  
GREENSBORO, ED.D., 1979

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background \_\_\_\_\_
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
6. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages  throughout  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
8. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
9. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available  
from school or author \_\_\_\_\_
10. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text  
follows \_\_\_\_\_
11. Poor carbon copy \_\_\_\_\_
12. Not original copy, several pages with blurred type \_\_\_\_\_
13. Appendix pages are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
14. Original copy with light type \_\_\_\_\_
15. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
16. Other \_\_\_\_\_

PERSONAL VALUES, INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND VOTING  
ON SPORT GOVERNANCE ISSUES

by

Ellen C. Greaves

A Dissertation Submitted to  
The Faculty of the Graduate School at  
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Doctor of Education

Greensboro  
1979

Approved by

Margaret A. Mord  
Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation  
Adviser

Margaret A. Mosley

Committee Members

Harold M. Dennis

Cliff Wieg  
Paul Berlin

Jacquelyn W. Sablino

March 23, 1979  
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 23, 1979  
Date of Final Oral Examination

GREAVES, ELLEN C. Personal Values, Institutional Goals and Voting on Sport Governance Issues. (1979)  
Directed by: Dr. Margaret A. Mordy. Pp. 128.

The purpose of the study was to investigate personal values, institutional goals for athletics, and voting behavior of members of the AIAW Executive Board on issues concerning the governance of athletics in the years 1975 through 1977. A total of 47 women who had served on the AIAW Executive Board completed Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV). The scales measured were **Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership**. Subjects were assigned the status of High or Low on each of the six SIV factors; they were designated to be Conservative or Liberal in their voting behavior; and they were associated according to their institutions' goals for athletics as Conservative or Liberal.

Data were organized in crossbreak tables for analysis. Fisher's exact probability test and Chi Square were used to accept or reject each null hypothesis. The following results were obtained:

1. There was no significant difference in voting behavior between subjects with Conservative and Liberal goals.
2. Of the six SIV factors, only Recognition was related to voting behavior. High Recognition subjects tended to vote liberally and Low Recognition subjects tended to vote conservatively.
3. There was no difference among groups of subjects being similarly categorized on personal values and goals.
4. Members of the Board voted conservatively on 18 issues and liberally on 14. There was no pattern on a year-to-year basis.

5. In 1976 and 1977, when the Board was comprised of a majority of liberally voting members, the majority voted liberally.

6. There was no pattern between institutional goals and voting behavior nor personal value systems and voting behavior on a year-to-year or aggregate basis.

It was concluded that, with the exception of the SIV Recognition factor, voting behavior was not related to institutional goals nor personal value systems. The findings of the study did not support the expectation that faculty representatives to AIAW vote according to their personal value hierarchy and congruently with the goals of the institutions they represent. Continued study of sport governance from a sociopolitical perspective was deemed necessary.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere gratitude is extended to Dean Margaret Mordy, chairperson and adviser, for her direction, wisdom and support. My appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Pearl Berlin, Dr. Jacquelyn Gaebelein, Dr. Gail Hennis and Dr. Celeste Ulrich for their assistance in the preparation of the dissertation and throughout my course of study. Sincere thanks are also extended to the members of the AIAW Executive Board who served as subjects in the study, and to the colleges and universities that shared their goals for their athletic programs with me. Finally, I am indebted to those individuals who so generously gave of their time as experts and judges but who cannot be named so as to preserve their anonymity.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	4
Definition of Terms . . . . .	5
Assumptions Underlying the Research . . . . .	6
Scope of the Study . . . . .	7
Significance of the Study . . . . .	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	9
The Nature of the Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics . . . . .	9
Research Pertaining to the National Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics . . . . .	13
Voting Cues of Elected Representatives . . . . .	13
The Nature of Values and Their Relationship to Decision Making . . . . .	19
Organizational Goals and Individual Behavior . . . . .	22
Summary . . . . .	25
III. PROCEDURES . . . . .	26
Preliminary Preparation . . . . .	26
Data Collection . . . . .	34
Preparation for Data Analysis . . . . .	36
Data Analysis . . . . .	38
Debriefing of Participants . . . . .	39
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA . . . . .	40
Question 1 . . . . .	42
Question 2 . . . . .	42
Question 3 . . . . .	44
Question 4 . . . . .	52
Question 5 . . . . .	60

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. DISCUSSION. . . . .	67
Investigator's Orientation . . . . .	67
Findings . . . . .	70
Implications for Further Research. . . . .	74
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	76
Summary. . . . .	76
Conclusions. . . . .	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	80
APPENDICES. . . . .	92
APPENDIX A Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale. . . . .	93
APPENDIX B Letter to Athletic Committee of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro . . . . .	97
APPENDIX C Mailing to Panel of Judges . . . . .	99
APPENDIX D Mailing to Panel of Experts. . . . .	106
APPENDIX E Mailing to Subjects. . . . .	110
APPENDIX F Letter to Schools Requesting Statement of Philosophy or Goals for Athletics. . . . .	116
APPENDIX G Classification of Issues by Judges . . . . .	118
APPENDIX H Classification of Institutions by Panel of Experts. . . . .	123
APPENDIX I Raw Data . . . . .	126

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Crossbreak of Institutional Goals and Voting Behavior. . .	43
2. Crossbreak of Support Score on SIV and Voting Behavior . .	45
3. Crossbreak of Conformity Score on SIV and Voting Behavior.	47
4. Crossbreak of Recognition Score on SIV and Voting Behavior . . . . .	48
5. Crossbreak of Independence Score on SIV and Voting Behavior . . . . .	50
6. Crossbreak of Benevolence Score on SIV and Voting Behavior . . . . .	51
7. Crossbreak of Leadership Score on SIV and Voting Behavior.	53
8. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Support Score on SIV . . . . .	55
9. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Conformity Score on SIV. . . . .	56
10. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Recognition Score on SIV . . . . .	58
11. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Independence Score on SIV. . . . .	59
12. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Benevolence Score on SIV . . . . .	61
13. Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals and Leadership Score on SIV. . . . .	62
14. Issue Classification and AIAW Executive Board Action, 1975-1977. . . . .	63
15. Institutional Goals, Personal Values and Voting Behavior by Year. . . . .	65

CHAPTER I  
INTRODUCTION

Intercollegiate athletics continues to be an issue receiving a great deal of attention. For example, the American Council on Education (ACE) created a commission charged to explore intercollegiate athletic programs in the United States in 1977. The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER) proclaimed "Sanity in Sport" a major thrust for the 1977-78 year. For the ACE and AAHPER (two academically oriented professional organizations) to devote such energies to similar endeavors suggests that the status quo of athletics may be incongruent with the goals of these organizations for intercollegiate athletics. Even as Godkin decried the overemphasis of intercollegiate sport in 1893, college faculty committees charged with the direction and guidance of the athletic programs existed on several campuses (Savage, 1929; Munford, 1960).

In the 95 years since the first athletic conference was called together by Eliot of Harvard, college faculties have moved from positions of laissez-faire to positions assuming more of a role in the governance of sport. The Intercollegiate Athletic Conference was called together by President Eliot in 1883 to "help regulate sports competition through faculty control" (Weston, 1962, p. 43). When the Western Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (Big Ten<sup>1</sup>) was formed in response to Smart's invitation in 1895, a faculty member of

---

<sup>1</sup>Hereafter referred to as the Big Ten

each institution was empowered to cast a representative vote for the institution. The Big Ten served as a model for the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association in 1905. This organization, formally named the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) in 1910, emphasized the creation of athletic conferences and the faculty control of athletics (Van Dalen & Bennett, 1971). The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), which evolved from a basketball committee to a national sport-governing body in 1953 as an alternative to the NCAA, established an advisory committee of 36 college presidents (Shea & Wieman, 1967). When the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) created its delegate assembly, the voting privilege for each institution was vested in the president's designated representative (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1977).

The assumption underlying the concept of some form of faculty control of athletics was that such members of the academy acted rationally and congruently with the goals of the institutions they represented (Betts, 1974, pp. 347-350). In light of the inquiries of the ACE and AAHPER, however, the question remains: Do voting representatives in fact vote rationally and congruently with their institutions' goals?

Buchanan and Tullock (1962) emphasized the view that the understanding of the rationality of social decisions rests in the understanding of the rationality of individual decisions. Votes on motions before the governing bodies of intercollegiate athletics can be considered social decisions. Thus, individual voting behavior was investigated in

this inquiry with respect to the actions taken by the AIAW Executive Board.

Those who vote in governing bodies of intercollegiate athletics represent an institution in addition to representing their own ideas. It has been assumed that voters act congruently with the goals of the institutions they represent. Max Weber (1946) suggested that an individual and the bureaucratic structure of which that individual is a member operate in a reciprocal relationship. For the individual's time and for the constraints made on the person's behavior, the bureaucratic structure compensates that individual with a salary and some degree of economic security. Because of this authority of the bureaucratic structure, an individual, when making a decision for the organization, should take the goals of that institution as a preference ordering (Cyert & March, 1963; Ebert & Mitchell, 1975; Simon, 1976). It would, thereby, follow that when an individual acts in a representative's role, that individual would also take on the goals of that institution as a preference ordering which would guide voting behavior. It is on this assumption that voting procedures of national sport governance structures have been based. However, an individual is also capable of making independent decisions. Some of these decisions are thought to be based on presentations made prior to the voting experience. There may be multiple constituencies which may be in conflict. Institutional preferences may be unclear. In such instances, the voters may cast their votes contrary to their institutions' preferences.

With respect to sport governance the question was raised: In what way is voting behavior on issues within sport organizations related

to an individual's preference or value system, and the stated goals of the institution for which he or she works? The writer believed that the answer lay in the study of roll call voting behavior of representatives.

Public voting in sport organizations has been rare (e.g., roll call voting). There was a permanent record, however, of the votes cast by members of the Executive Board of AIAW which chronicled each person's vote on each issue for the years 1975-1977. These votes constituted a portion of the data for this study.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this inquiry was to investigate the relationships, if any, among the six variables of the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV<sup>1</sup>) (Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence and Leadership), institutional goals for athletics as ascertained by a specially developed Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale (IGAS<sup>2</sup>) and voting behavior of members of the AIAW Executive Board on selected issues concerning the governance of intercollegiate athletics in the years 1975 through 1977. Answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Do AIAW Executive Board members from institutions with goals classified as conservative by a panel of experts, in accord with the IGAS, vote conservatively?

2. Do AIAW Executive Board members from institutions with goals classified as liberal by a panel of experts, in accord with the IGAS, vote liberally?

3. Do AIAW Executive Board members with similar personal values

---

<sup>1</sup>Hereafter referred to as the SIV

<sup>2</sup>Hereafter referred to as the IGAS

as assessed by the SIV vote similarly?

4. Do AIAW Executive Board members from institutions with similar goals and with similar personal values vote similarly?

5. Are any voting patterns discernible with respect to institutional goals and personal values among AIAW Executive Board members?

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions served to operationalize terms for interpretation in this study.

Conservative institutional goals. Institutional goals classified as "3" or "4" in intensity by the panel of experts on the nature of intercollegiate athletics (hereafter referred to as the panel of experts) on the IGAS (see Appendix A). The use of the labels conservative and liberal was based on the conventional meaning of the terms. That is, conservative refers to the status quo and liberal refers to a deviance from the status quo. Both conservative and liberal concepts have been used in the political science literature to such an extent that they no longer imply evaluation (Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan & Ferguson, 1962; Jackson, 1974). The writer believed the use of such neutral labels important to avoid emotional reaction to the labels by the people who were to use them as reference points in the classification process.

Conservative voting behavior. Voting behavior classified by a panel of judges as reflecting the current status of major college athletic programs as presented by the national sports media.



Institutional goals. Inferred from the public statements of policies and philosophy, or catalogue description, used to describe an institution's intercollegiate athletic program by the panel of experts. The intensity of such goals was labelled "1," "2," "3," or "4" from low to high according to the IGAS.

Liberal institutional goals. Institutional goals classified as "1" or "2" in intensity by the panel of experts on the IGAS.

Liberal voting behavior. Voting behavior classified by a panel of judges as reflecting a deviance from the current status of major college athletic programs as presented by the national sports media.

Value system. An individual's order of preference concerning alternatives open to her as measured by the SIV.

Voting behavior. The public record of votes cast by a member of the Executive Board of AIAW on selected issues and classified by a panel of judges.

#### Assumptions Underlying the Research

The assumptions upon which this study was based were that

1. An individual's values are validly measured by the SIV.
2. An institution's statement of goals or philosophy, and/or the catalogue description for its athletic program, reflects the institution's goals. Moreover, it is assumed that such goals apply to women as well as men.
3. The IGAS is an appropriate tool for the two-category classification of institutional goals for athletics.

### Scope of the Study

This inquiry was limited in scope to selected votes recorded in the meetings of the Executive Board of AIAW for the years 1975-1977. The measurement of individual values was limited by the validity of the SIV. The scores obtained from the SIV for the purpose of this study were used as a means of categorizing and not as an attempt to depict a thorough inventory of the individuals involved. The two-category classification of institutions was also limited by the semantic accuracy of their respective statements and the interpretations of the goals or philosophy by a panel of experts. Finally, the classification of issues in a liberal-conservative dichotomy was also limited by the semantic accuracy of the recorder of the meeting and by any subsequent misinterpretations by the judges as a result.

### Significance of the Study

No investigation which examined the voting behavior in a governing body of intercollegiate athletics was found in a review of the literature. It appears to have been assumed, over the years, that those who cast votes on issues concerning the governance of intercollegiate athletics act rationally and congruently with the goals of their respective institutions. With no systematic inquiry what was presumed to be an understanding of the governance of intercollegiate athletics might have been spurious.

Although political behavior has been a part of sport-governing bodies for almost a century, there has not been any attempt to understand decisions which have been reached by these associations from a

socio-political perspective. The writer believed an understanding of the voting behaviors of those who govern intercollegiate athletics was implicit in any attempt to understand the nature of such programs. Furthermore, the AAHPER's thrust for "Sanity in Sport" suggested that changes were desired in the status quo of intercollegiate athletics. An understanding of variables which might affect one's voting behavior was viewed as crucial to the success of the AAHPER program.

The development of an instrument for assessing the goals of institutions for athletics has heuristic value. With additional refinement it has the potential to become a valid assessment tool for use in sport studies.

The significance of this inquiry, therefore, rests in its exploratory nature with potential to enhance the understanding of voting behavior in governing bodies for intercollegiate athletics. The findings of this inquiry may serve as a self-study for AIAW in that voting patterns herein discerned may provide a perspective into the nature of the Executive Board's decision-making process. Also, such knowledge may raise the Board's awareness that each member does have personal and institutional preferences which may influence voting behavior. By providing information regarding personal values, institutional goals and voting that was heretofore unavailable, the results may also have a bearing on any attempts to change the status quo in intercollegiate athletics.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of the literature was concerned with (a) the nature of the governance of intercollegiate athletics, (b) research pertaining to the national governance of intercollegiate athletics, (c) voting cues of elected representatives, (d) the nature of values and their relationship to decision making, and (e) organizational goals and individual behavior. There was limited information about the latter topics. Therefore, the text is disproportionately developed.

The Nature of the Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

The literature depicting the development of the governance of intercollegiate athletics reflected a pattern of periods of varied interest on the part of college faculties in asserting their control of these programs. Despite a century of faculty attempts to ensure the educational integrity of collegiate sports programs, current efforts still appear to fall short of the ideal implicit in these attempts. As Hanford concluded after an intense study of the contemporary nature of intercollegiate athletics, "[The] higher education establishment . . . simply does not take intercollegiate athletics as seriously as it should" (1977, p. 233).

Van Dalen and Bennett (1971) noted that examples of attempts by college faculties to exercise their control over their respective institutions' athletic programs were found before the Civil War, when

some extracurricular sports activities were suspended by the faculty or the president because of excessive injuries to athletes and time spent away from studies. In contrast, the period between the Civil War and the mid-1870s was marked by general faculty inattention. Athletics were controlled by students who hired or invited graduate (i.e., alumni) coaches, scheduled games, and raised the funds necessary to run their programs (Marco, 1960; Lewis, 1972; Betts, 1974). As Lewis (1972) noted, the period between 1875 and 1939 was characterized by the introduction and expansion of enterprise on the American college campus and such enterprise was inextricably related to the nature of the governance of intercollegiate athletics.

In 1883, President Eliot of Harvard called a conference of 21 institutions' representatives to discuss and implement relatively wide reaching regulations for college sport (notably football) through faculty control (Weston, 1962; Lewis, 1972). Eliot's efforts resulted in discussion only, however, as no more than three institutions ratified the conference's recommendations.<sup>1</sup>

The Western Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives (Big Ten) was formed in 1895 in response to an invitation by Purdue President Smart. A faculty member from each institution was empowered with its vote and the original group of seven schools established regulations primarily concerned with eligibility (Powell, 1964; Van Dalen & Bennett, 1971). The Intercollegiate Athletic Association, formed in 1905 and in 1910 named the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), was modeled after the Big Ten and emphasized the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ivan Dalen and Bennett (1971) included Cornell with Harvard and Princeton whereas Lewis (1972) did not mention Cornell.

creation of athletic conferences and faculty control (Savage, 1929; Van Dalen & Bennett, 1971). Lewis (1972) reported that within four years the presidents of the University of Missouri and the University of Alabama were dismissed for attempting such reforms. By 1929, Savage concluded that faculty control essentially existed in name only.

The late 1940s and early 1950s marked the change in the NCAA from a body recommending guidelines to a regulatory and enforcement body. This was brought about as a result of a gambling scandal concerning basketball (Shea & Wieman, 1967). Small colleges, seeking an alternative to the NCAA which would be attentive to their particular needs, formalized the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) in 1953, after an evolution from its initial function as a basketball committee (Shea & Wieman, 1967; Van Dalen & Bennett, 1971). The NAIA established an advisory committee of 36 college presidents (Shea & Wieman, 1967). By the early 1960s, however, there were once again the cries for faculty control of athletics (Marco, 1960; Havel, 1962).

The general tone of extrainstitutional faculty control in the 1970s was characterized by Blackburn and Nyikos (1974).

Rationally, big-time football has no place in the university. Faculty people know this, almost without exception. So the contradiction between the aims and purposes of their school and its athletic practices causes great pain. After all, rationality is the highest academic value. . . .

So faculty elect a distinguished, able, and revered colleague to be their representative and beg him to institute reforms that will resurrect the good old days when all that really mattered was how you played the game, not who won. Even if all other members of the conference are evil and only acting to ensure a victorious team for themselves, we wish to be pure, they tell them. And so the individual and collective faculty guilt is transferred to one saintly individual. The whole ugly business is buried for another year. (pp. 12-13)

Savage (1929) summarized the criticisms of intercollegiate athletic

programs at the turn of the century and concluded the state of athletic affairs was the result of presidential inattention. Hanford (1977), in summarizing his 1974 report to the American Council on Education, which was based on an extensive study which paralleled the scope of the 1929 Carnegie Commission, concluded that intercollegiate athletics suffered from the lack of attention of the college presidents. Thus, his views were consistent with those of Savage. As Hanford further pointed out, what reforms have been made recently have been the result of law and regulation or economic concerns, not for educationally ethical reasons.

The youngest national intercollegiate athletic governing body, the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), evolved from several groups to emerge as a substructure for the then Division of Girls and Women's Sports of AAHPER in the 1971-1972 academic year (Hunt, 1976). Noted among its purposes was the following: "To foster broad programs of women's intercollegiate athletics which are consistent with the educational aims and objectives of the member schools" (Hunt, 1976, p. 79). Voting powers in AIAW's Delegate Assembly were granted to the designated representative of each institution's president (American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1977). The Executive Board, as established in the AIAW Constitution, consisted of its elected officers (President, President-elect, Past President, Treasurer, and Commissioners of Large and Small College Championships), representatives from each of its nine regions, and the National Association of Girls and Women's Sports' president. This composition remained constant through 1977 with the exception of 1976, when each region sent representatives for its large, small and junior college

divisions (American Alliance of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1976).

#### Research Pertaining to the National Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics

Research concerned with the national governance of intercollegiate athletics has been historical in nature with one exception. All of the historical studies reviewed dealt with chronological reports of the developments of AIAW, the Big Ten, NAIA, NCAA and the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) (Stagg, 1946; Hoover, 1958; Powell, 1964; Mould, 1970; Hunt, 1976; Land, 1977). Smith (1973) analyzed role behavior and role expectations of faculty athletic committees and faculty athletic representatives in the NAIA. His findings, however, concerned the mechanics of the faculty control of athletics. No study reviewed was concerned with the decision making process at the national level.

#### Voting Cues of Elected Representatives

The literature concerning the voting behavior of elected representatives herein reviewed is focused entirely on that of federal and state legislators. No treatment of the voting behavior of representatives in nonfederal or state governing bodies was found. The literature reviewed, furthermore, was categorized according to three topics: styles of representation, the constituency's effect on a representative's roll call voting, and the effect of personal preferences, or values, on a representative's roll call voting. Other voting cues (e.g., party affiliation) were not pertinent to this study.



### Styles of Representation

Pitkin (1968) noted that confusion concerning the conceptualization of representation centered on the question "Ought a representative to do what his constituents want, or what he thinks best?" (p. 40) She suggested this controversy was the concern of many political philosophers and scientists.

Edmund Burke is generally credited with initially characterizing a representative as a trustee for the constituency inasmuch as that individual was charged with basing voting decisions on personal judgment. Wahlke, Eulau, Buchanan and Ferguson (1962) labeled this style of representation simply the trustee role. They perceived the trustee as one who follows personal convictions and the "dictates of conscience" (p. 276).

Another dimension of Pitkin's conceptualization was the view of the representative as delegate. Wahlke et al. depicted the delegate as one who does not use personal judgment as a cue for decision making. Though these authors did not describe this style of representation as taking the role of the constituency exclusively, they did note that some research had defined the delegate representative as one who follows the instructions of the constituency explicitly.

A middle ground position, called politico, was defined as involving both trustee and delegate behavior depending on the situation (Wahlke et al., 1962). Pitkin (1968) concluded that this notion of the representative taking cues from both personal preferences and constituency preferences was the best approximation of the conceptualization of representation.

### Constituency Effect on the Roll Call Voting of Representatives

The relationship of the constituency and the roll call voting of representatives has received extensive attention in political science literature. This review is limited to those reports pertaining to the extent legislators use their constituencies for cues in roll call voting. The studies varied as to the legislative bodies on which they focused and direct implications were thereby limited in that the nature of a federal or state legislator's constituency was different than the institutional constituency of the AIAW Executive Board members. Furthermore, those who served on the AIAW Executive Board did not necessarily perceive pressures for reelection, as a political representative would, since most probably regarded their year(s) on the board as professional service rather than as a springboard to continued tenure on the board or as a vehicle for professional advancement.

Dexter (1957) in research done with members of the U.S. House of Representatives noted that many congressmen voted according to what they perceived their district felt strongly about, though this perception of the district was viewed as constituting a self-fulfilling prophecy. MacRae (1959) found that representatives from districts most typical of their parties tended to vote according to party lines more often than those from districts atypical of their party affiliation. Matthews (1960) concluded that there was a tendency for a state's U.S. Senators to vote similarly. In a study of voting on a **Daylight Savings Time** bill by Wisconsin state legislators it was found that the assemblymen voted with their constituencies where their opinions were

not consistent with those of their districts (Crane, 1960). Constituency pressures were viewed as most often coinciding with other pressures in a study by Froman (1963) but, when there was a conflict, congressmen voted according to constituency opinion. Kessel (1964) reached basically the same conclusions in a study on the Washington delegation to the U.S. Congress. Jewell and Patterson (1966), however, qualified a similar finding as they found that a legislator would use the constituency as an important reference group only when that group's demands were clear enough to be identified.

Probably the classic work in literature pertaining to the constituency as a source of cues for roll call voting of representatives was a study done by Miller and Stokes (1969). Originally reported in 1962, the research was based on extensive data from the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. In their report, the authors concluded that representatives' votes did diverge from their own opinions and Miller and Stokes attributed this divergence to the representatives' perceptions of their constituency's attitudes. Finally, they concluded that the prediction of roll call votes was more accurate using both the representatives' policy views and their perceptions of their constituents' views rather than from either alone.

More recently, attention has been paid to the representatives' perceptions of constituency attitudes and to which aspect of the constituency, if any, the representative attends. Hedlund and Friesma (1972) studied the three styles of representative role taking defined in the Wahlke et al. (1962) report and focused on the accuracy of these people's perceptions of their constituencies' opinions.

Interestingly, delegates, who would be expected to heed the constituency's opinions quite carefully, were found to be the least accurate in their assessment of constituency opinion on four issues before the Iowa State Assembly when compared to trustees and politicians.

Erikson, Luttbeg and Holloway (1975) found that trustee type representatives who had served one term or less in the Florida state legislature were most accurate in assessing constituency opinion. Kingdon (1973) concluded that if representatives perceived constituency positions on any issue the probability was high (.76) that they would vote according to that position.

Using a cognitive dissonance orientation, Kingdon further concluded that the probability that representatives would vote with their constituencies was greater with high-salience issues. Boynton, Patterson and Hedlund (1969) and Clausen (1973) suggested that representatives attend to the portion of their constituencies that is politically active and supportive of their reelection. Deckard's (1976) findings also suggested that this may be increasingly the case. Her study focused on southern Democrats and eastern Republicans in the period from 1959 to 1970. These districts have been traditionally "safe" districts for the two parties' candidates in the respective regions. She concluded, however, that the two groups of congressmen increasingly voted their constituents' preferences in a period when these seats became more competitive.

Erikson (1978) reexamined the Miller-Stokes representation data and presented evidence that corrections for measurement error in sample-based estimates of constituency opinion resulted in stronger

correlations between constituency opinion and the behavior of representatives than originally reported by Miller and Stokes. Party affiliation was still considered to be an important factor.

Generally, it was concluded that constituency is an important variable in understanding the roll call voting behavior of a political representative. The impact of the constituency appeared greatest when its position was clear on issues which were highly salient. This effect, as indicated by the research cited, seems to hold regardless of the style of representation. That two studies indicated that trustees were most accurate at the perception of constituency opinions would indicate that they do not operate without consideration of their constituencies' preferences. This would tend to support Pitkin's (1968) contention that the concept of representation embodies a range of behavior from trustee to delegate. However, the extent to which this variable influences voting is yet uncertain. Despite the importance of constituency, the research supported combining the representative's policy preferences with constituency preferences, as suggested by Miller and Stokes (1969) and Erikson (1978).

#### Personal Preferences' Effect on the Roll Call Voting of Representatives

As Searing (1978) emphasized, the effect of personal values on roll call voting behavior has generally been neglected in the literature. However, as early as 1962 Miller and Stokes (1969) concluded that personal preferences, when combined with constituency opinion, were important cues for representatives. Froman (1963) and Anderson (1964) also concluded that the person holding the office of representative made a difference in how a district's vote was recorded.

More recently, Jones (1973), in a study of Texas state legislators, found that on welfare and tax issues, admittedly highly salient concerns, the legislators' attitudes were consistently the major guide to their voting decisions. Searing (1978) studied the British House of Commons and concluded that the study of values would help explain policy preferences, cross-voting and participation in attempts to influence party policy.

Though personal value data were limited, it was concluded that personal preferences have played a role in understanding the roll call voting of representatives. As Dexter (1957) suggested, constituencies tend to be perceived to be that group in agreement with the position of the representative and, therefore, have an effect because they reinforce the representative's preferences. Thus, values may have been confounded in studies of constituency effect.

Both constituency and personal variables were shown to have effect on a representative's roll call voting behavior. It was, therefore, concluded that these two variables should provide some understanding of AIAW representatives' voting behavior either separately or in combination.

#### The Nature of Values and Their Relationship to Decision Making

A brief review of the values literature and the general relationship of values to decision making was deemed important because personal values were shown to have some relationship to voting behavior of representatives. The literature about values is voluminous. Therefore, the review was limited to selected works concerning definitions of values and their relationship to decision making.

### Definitions of Values

Beliefs, attitudes and values were treated as related concepts. Generally, despite considerable overlap, values were considered the most fundamental of these concepts.

The young human organism rapidly progresses from random selections to belief construction (learning to 'know' and to 'value') as he organizes inputs from the raw data of experience; data which include, in addition to momentary feeling-states, the ideals, norms, and established knowledge of his culture. According to this model, values are learned criteria that predispose us to act as we do. They emerge from the inextricably intertwined affective and cognitive belief systems. Attitudes are merely the surface, or more specific manifestations of these underlying values. (Hutcheon, 1972, p. 180)

Of great importance in the definitions of values for the social sciences were the coupling of a hierarchical preference ordering and action.

Kluckhohn (1962) viewed values as persistent standards on an approval-disapproval continuum which serve to organize a system of action (p. 395). Rokeach (1968) concurred, stating that "A person's value system may . . . be said to represent a learned organization of rules for making choices and for resolving conflicts--between two or more modes of behavior or between two or more end-states of existence" (p. 161). A similar statement was reflected in the International Studies of Values in Politics (1971), Margolis (1971), Hutcheon (1972) and Gordon (1976). In response to a pervasive concern expressed by many researchers with regard to artifacts of research in which the actions of subjects were not always consistent with expressed values, Hutcheon (1972) emphasized that "Values bear no necessary relationship to the statements of belief that are cited in response to direct questions" (p. 180).

### Personal Values and Decision Making

As noted above, the hierarchical ordering of preferences is inextricably tied to a course of action requiring choice. Thus, decision making has been viewed in terms of reflecting personal values.

Fleishman and Peters (1962) suggested that leaders function in terms of the values dominant in a particular situation. Murakami (1968) concluded that an individual makes choices based on a preference ordering. Others have reached the same conclusion (Lewis, 1969; International Studies on Values in Politics, 1971; Najder, 1975).

That values have continued to be a focus of research, however, indicated that the relationship between values and decision making was not perfect. In fact, both Arrow (1951) and Black (1968) showed mathematically that it is very possible for individual preferences and voting, an aspect of decision making, to not follow a hierarchical preference ordering, that is, to follow the axiom of intransitivity. Scheibe (1970) also suggested that preference hierarchies were not constant and offered that "Failure to reduce multiple value dimensions to a common utility scale may account for shifting preference hierarchies and intransitive choices" (p. 74). Brubaker and Nelson (1974), in a work focusing on educational organization behavior, emphasized that decisions should be rational and follow a preference ordering, but readily observed that at times this was impossible.

Within physical education literature, the ordering of preferences has been the concern of those contributing to the philosophical aspects of sport and physical education. These sport and physical education philosophers have emphasized the need for a personal philosophy, or



value system, by which decision making can be ordered. Oberteuffer, quoted in Daly (1970), and Zeigler (1975) each suggested that a personal philosophy of physical education gives direction and order to one's professional life. This emphasis was echoed by Harper, Miller, Park and Davis (1977) who further discussed values in terms of administrators.

There has been a normative emphasis on the use of some value system for direction in decision making on several levels. Yet, evidence of the practical limitations of value systems and the resultant appearance of irrationality was often noted in the literature. The implications for the study at hand are readily apparent. The normative ideal for athletics rests with the control of athletics by faculty representatives acting congruently with their own values and/or the goals of their respective institutions. There is much evidence to suggest that the fact that this ideal has not yet been reached is not an idiosyncrasy of intercollegiate athletics.

#### Organizational Goals and Individual Behavior

Organizations have goals which are, to some degree, the focus of the endeavors of their members within the organizational structure. The organization's right to expect of its members some degree of conformity to its goals falls within the purview of its authority. The relationship between organizational goals and the individual, then, is important in understanding an individual's behavior in her or his institutional role. In that the AIAW Executive Board members were also members of their respective institution's faculty or student body and were expected to vote in congruence with that institution's goals

to some degree as a result, an understanding of organizational goals as they pertain to individual behavior was of great importance.

Educational organizations are bureaucracies. Implicit in the bureaucratic structure was the concept of organizational authority. The nature of bureaucracies was the focus of several major works of Weber. According to Weber (1946), an individual and the structure of which that individual was a member operate in a reciprocal relationship. For the individual's time and for the constraints made on the person's behavior, the bureaucratic structure compensates that individual with a salary and some degree of economic security. Because of this authority of the bureaucratic structure, then, an individual should take the goals of that institution as a preference ordering when making a decision for the organization. This view was reiterated by Cyert and March (1963); Ebert and Mitchell (1975); Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) and Simon (1976).

Organizational goals were viewed universally as providing direction and standards for the employees' behavior. Gordon (1970) characterized aspects of the bureaucratic behavior of employees. He described employees' tendency toward Rule Conformity in terms of a "desire for the security that the following of rules, regulations, and standard operating procedures affords" (p. 2). However, as Brubaker and Nelson (1974) pointed out, the goals are neither absolute nor clearly consensual within an organization. According to Brubaker and Nelson, beliefs and faith, or less fundamental characteristics, not rationality, "hold" organizations together (p. 119).

Similarly, Cyert and March (1963) viewed the organization as a coalition in that the members of the organization may have different preference orderings. This diversity in perspectives was also noted by Hall (1972), who emphasized that not only was consensus on what the organization should do unlikely, but that consensus concerning the means of achieving these goals was even less likely. Porter, Lawler and Hackman (1975) described two types of organizational goals: official and operative. Official goals were conceived as the publicly stated goals. Operative goals were viewed as resulting from a number of conditions making official goals unattainable and, thus, as having a greater impact on the employees' behavior than the official goals.

A major contributor to the organizational behavior literature, Simon (1976) emphasized that organizational objectives are indirectly a personal objective of the employees in that "It is the means whereby their organizational activity is bound together to achieve a satisfaction of their own diverse personal motives" (p. 17). He further noted, however, that although this is a goal, the relationship between organizational and personal preferences is rarely fully integrated.

Thus, once again, as in the literature on values and decision making, a normative ideal appeared in the organizational behavior literature concerning the role of organizational goals and their guiding relationship to the behavior of employees. Yet, as Simon (1976) observed, this relationship has not been found to be fully integrated. Ebert and Mitchell (1975), in summarizing England's work, concluded

How personal value systems develop, how they are changed by organizational experiences, and how much disparity among value systems of individuals is best for organizational success are all insufficiently understood at the present time. (p. 64)

As Brubaker and Nelson (1974) noted, educational institutions are no different than those organizations described by Cyert and March; Lawler, Porter and Hackman; Ebert and Mitchell and Simon. AIAW is an organization of educational institutions. Thus, as in the instance of AIAW Executive Board members, faculty members may not always act congruently with the goals of their institutions because they may be neither clear nor fully integrated with their personal goals.

#### Summary

Both constituency and personal values variables were depicted as having an effect on the roll call voting behavior of elected representatives, though the extent of this effect was not shown. Conversely, both personal values and institutional goals were depicted as having imperfect relationships with decision making, of which one example is voting.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURES

This study was conducted for the purpose of investigating the personal values, institutional goals for athletics, and voting behavior of members of a sport-governing body. The voting was on issues concerning the governance of intercollegiate athletics. The following procedures were utilized in this investigation.

#### Preliminary Preparation

The preliminary preparation procedures for this study included the following general steps: (a) identification of the subjects, (b) selection of a personal value systems instrument, (c) development of a means to evaluate institutional goals, (d) identification of sport governance issues, and (e) selection of experts and judges for the classification of institutions and issues respectively.

#### Identification of the Subjects

Availability of a record of the votes cast by members of the Executive Board of AIAW in the years 1975-1977 and the writer's interest in women's sport led to the selection of the AIAW for participation in the present inquiry. Board meeting minutes chronicled each member's vote on each issue. Because of this record the AIAW Executive Board for the years 1975-1977 was used as the time span investigated.

A total of 60 women served on the Executive Board during the three years. Each person's institutional affiliation was discerned from AIAW

records or by personal inquiry in the one case in which an individual had changed schools since serving on the Executive Board. Of the 60 individuals comprising the population universe, one was a former student representative teaching at a public high school, one was a current college student, and the remaining 58 were faculty or staff members of institutions of higher education. All were invited, by letter, to participate.

#### Selection of a Personal Value Systems Instrument

The Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV) is an instrument which provided information about an individual's preference ordering on six scales: Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership (Gordon, 1976). The scale definitions are:

- Support (S): being treated with understanding, receiving encouragement from other people, being treated with kindness and consideration;
- Conformity (C): doing what is socially correct, following regulations closely, doing what is accepted and proper, being a conformist;
- Recognition (R): being looked up to and admired, being considered important, attracting favorable notice;
- Independence (I): having the right to do whatever one wants to do, being free to make one's own decisions, being able to do things in one's own way;
- Benevolence (B): doing things for other people, sharing with others, helping the unfortunate, being generous; and
- Leadership (L): being in charge of other people, having authority over others, being in a position of leadership or power. (Ibid., p. 1)

The SIV consists of thirty items which demand a forced choice among three alternative responses ranging from most to least preferred.

The SIV was chosen for use as the instrument by which subjects' personal values were identified because of the following characteristics:

1. The SIV, with its clear and concise directions, was suitable for administration by mail.

2. Only 15 minutes of time were required of a subject for completion of the instrument.

3. Because of its forced choice format, the SIV was of minimal transparency, even for a sample in which all but one of the subjects had earned at least one college degree.

4. Due to the small size of the sample, the categorization process required norms by which subjects could be grouped. The SIV manual provided norms for female adults.

5. Reviewers of the SIV considered it a good instrument for research purposes (Cronbach, 1965; Goodstein, 1965). It had also been used in political science studies (Gordon, 1976).

6. Compared to similar instruments, e.g., the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, the SIV was reasonably current, having undergone revision of the manual in 1976 and the instrument itself in 1965.

#### Development of a Means to Categorize Institutional Goals

Constituencies of regional representatives to the AIAW Executive Board are large and demographically diverse. Furthermore, within the Executive Board, there are both national representatives (e.g., the president) and regional representatives. Each Board member was affiliated with an institution of higher education which, by its membership, subscribed to the goals and purposes of AIAW.

The Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale (IGAS) was developed by the investigator to serve as a guide by which a panel of experts could classify each institution according to its public statement of the goals and/or philosophy for its athletic programs. To the best of the investigator's knowledge, no instrument for a similar purpose existed.

A list of descriptors was discerned from sport philosophy literature (Weiss, 1969; Vander Zwaag, 1972; Harper et al., 1977) and from athletic program descriptions in the catalogues of institutions not involved in the study. The groupings, labeled "School related," "Program related" and "Participant related," were used to present the 38 descriptors in a logical format (see Appendix A). The descriptors within each grouping were phrased in parallel statement form. Items were randomly arranged in each group so as to prevent, as much as possible, a response set. Care was also taken to phrase each descriptor as neutrally as possible in order to assist the respondents in making honest judgments about the item.

The four points on the continuum of intensity of sport programs were based, in part, on Gilbert's sport trichotomy as discussed by Keating (1974). In this trichotomy, sport is envisaged as existing on at least three levels. "True Sport" refers to a participant-centered experience which is conducted privately (e.g., playground pick-up games). "High Sport" is "True Sport raised to the level of art by the talent, even genius, of its participants" (Keating, 1974, p. 5). The aspect by which High Sport is distinguished from True Sport, that is public performance, would be exemplified by an amateur fencing meet. "Big Sport" contains aspects of True Sport and High Sport but these characteristics are tinged with commercial and political interests, such as the International Olympic Games.

Other descriptors of intercollegiate athletic programs used intensity as one differentiating factor (Vander Zwaag, 1972). However, no attempt specifically described what the various levels of intensity



meant. All too often, the names of schools or the names of coaches sufficed in communicating just what a high intensity program entailed. Moreover, low intensity was usually described as the opposite of high intensity or having the same qualities as high intensity but to a lesser degree. The resultant ambiguity was not desirable for this inquiry. Thus, not only were points along a continuum necessary, but a typification of the program each of the points represented was also needed.<sup>1</sup>

Gilbert's labels suggested evaluative judgments, something which the investigator wished to avoid wherever possible. Therefore, the categories were identified by numbers which signified an increased intensity of the sports programs as one moved from left to right on the scale. Four distinctions were used because two were too few and three or five would have permitted a meaningless midpoint.

While the four points were needed for classification purposes, only two were required for the data analysis. It was decided, therefore, to collapse categories "1" and "2" to form one category labeled Liberal, and to collapse categories "3" and "4" to form the second category labeled Conservative prior to the analysis of the data. These labels were chosen because they were considered salient only in situationally defined terms. As such they are relatively void of emotion-laden connotations (MacRae, 1956). The traditional sense of the conservative-liberal dichotomy was used. Thus, Conservative represented the status quo while Liberal represented a deviance from the status quo. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Logically, a continuum involved an infinite number of points. It is suggested that, were all the programs of athletics in the United States arranged, for instance, in a horizontal line from low intensity to high intensity, a continuum would be approximated but not realized.

selection of a standard to represent the status quo demanded a constant which had been highly visible for the three years covered by the investigation and which would be of minimal ambiguity nationally. Therefore, the status quo was defined as the nature of intercollegiate athletic programs as depicted in the national media, i.e., major college athletic programs for men.

The IGAS, in its neophyte form, was mailed to the athletic committee of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro for pilot administration. This committee, comprised of a total of ten undergraduate students and faculty members, was in its fourth semester of intense study of the alternatives for the intercollegiate athletic program on the Greensboro campus at the time the committee members' assistance was requested. As a group they were considered knowledgeable with regard to the nature of intercollegiate athletics. The committee members were asked to place each descriptor into the category or categories in which they felt it belonged (see Appendix B). Thus, a descriptor might have been placed in none, one, two, three or all four of the categories. Nine of the ten committee members responded. The inclusion of a descriptor in a category on the final form of the IGAS was based upon the agreement of five members.

Mechanically, the IGAS needed to be a one-page instrument because the panel of experts would complete one for each institution. That is to say, the goals of 56 institutions were evaluated. A two-page instrument would have been cumbersome for the user. The investigator, therefore, drew the IGAS on a 12 by 15 inch scale which a printer reduced to an 8½ by 11 inch size for duplicating.

### Identification of Sport Governance Issues

As stated previously, the minutes of the AIAW Executive Board for the years 1975-1977 included all motions considered by that body and how each member voted on each motion. Minutes from the winter, spring and fall meetings for each of the three years were used.

The writer was interested in controversial issues to portray variance in voting behavior, as suggested by LeBlanc (1969) in a study of party conflict in state senates. Motions concerning questions of semantics and motions which were passed or defeated unanimously were eliminated from consideration because such issues were not controversial within the context of the Board.

MacRae (1956) and Anderson, Watts and Wilcox (1966) suggested the use of several issues to determine an individual's voting pattern. A Board member's votes on five motions for each tenure of office provided a sufficient number of votes. It was possible, because an odd number of votes was used, to label an individual's voting behavior according to a majority of her votes during her tenure on the Board. It was also important to identify several votes for each Board member because 32 of the 60 women served for only one year. Thus, a pattern could be labeled regardless of the length of time an individual served on the Board.

To ascertain the minimum of five votes per member per year, more than five issues were identified for each year. Some members were absent for some votes. In one instance a proxy voted for a Board member on two issues. These two votes were considered cast as if the regular Board member were voting. This procedure was based upon recommendations from Anderson, Watts and Wilcox (1966). The selection process identified

32 issues which were included on the Judges' Issue Classification Form (see Appendix C).

#### Selection of Experts and Judges

Panel of experts. The classification of each institution's statement of goals and/or philosophy for its athletic program required the selection of a panel of experts. Each individual invited to participate demonstrated expertise as evidenced by a graduate degree in physical education, recent involvement with intercollegiate athletic programs, and the attainment of a leadership position in an organization concerned with the nature of intercollegiate athletics. The experts were invited to participate by letter which described the purpose of the study, the judgmental task to be completed, and procedures for use of the IGAS. Also included with the letter were a copy of the IGAS and a postcard for responding (see Appendix D).

Panel of judges. A panel of five judges who were not otherwise involved in the study but who were familiar with AIAW were asked to classify the list of 32 issues according to whether an affirmative vote would be considered Conservative or Liberal as defined in this study (see Appendix B). Each of the people invited to serve as judges had been her institution's representative to the AIAW Delegate Assembly and/or had served on at least one of AIAW's sports or Ethics and Eligibility committees. Geographically, one worked in the far west, two in the midwest, and two in the southeast.

### Data Collection

The data collection was completed during the spring semester of 1978. The following steps were involved in the collection of the data:

(a) completion of the SIV by the Board members, (b) collection of institutional statements of goals for athletic programs, (c) classification of the sport governance issues by the judges, and (d) classification of institutional goals for athletics by the experts.

#### Completion of the SIV by Board Members

A total of 60 Board members were invited to participate as subjects. The request which each Board member received in the mail included a letter detailing the requirements of their participation as subjects, a subject consent form, a copy of the SIV and a postage paid envelope addressed to the investigator (see Appendix E).<sup>1</sup> Each was asked to return the completed SIV and the Subject Consent Form within three weeks. Four weeks after the initial request, 38 responses had been received. A follow-up postcard was sent to those who had not responded. Six weeks after the initial request, 50 had responded, three negatively. Of the 60 contacted, 47 Board members, or 78% of the population, completed the SIV and returned it to the investigator.

#### Collection of Institutional Statements of Goals for Athletic Programs

Each institution represented on the AIAW Executive Board in the years 1975-1977 was asked to provide the investigator with a copy of its public statement of athletic goals or philosophy (see Appendix F). A total of 56 institutions were contacted. The target person for each

---

<sup>1</sup>The SIV is a secure test and is, therefore, not included. Examination packets are available from the publisher, Science Research Associates, Inc., for a minimal cost.

institution to whom the request was addressed was the athletic director. A follow-up postcard was sent five weeks after the initial request asking those institutions which had not responded to do so within two weeks. In this follow-up, every effort was made to identify and use the name of the athletic director. Of the 56 schools contacted, 17, or 30%, responded. For those institutions from which no response was received, the catalogue descriptions of the athletic programs were used in place of the public statements of philosophy.

#### Classification of Sport Governance Issues by the Judges

The judges were mailed a letter requesting their participation, the Judges' Issue Classification Form (JICF<sup>1</sup>) and a postage paid return envelope (see Appendix B). There were asked to return all materials within three weeks. The JICF presented the issues in chronological order giving the date, the motion verbatim, and columns labeled Conservative and Liberal in which to place the appropriate judgment checks. The operational definitions for Conservative and Liberal were placed at the top of each page to serve as a reminder as the judges completed the form. Each judge classified each motion according to whether an affirmative vote was Conservative or Liberal. All five judges responded. The final designation of each issue was based on the majority of the judges' classification (see Appendix G).

#### Classification of Institutional Goals for Athletics by the Experts

The experts were mailed photocopies of the institutional statements of goals identified only by a code number assigned by the investigator (see Appendix D). The IGAS was attached to each statement as a cover

---

<sup>1</sup>Hereafter referred to as the JICF

sheet giving the code number for the institution. The order in which the statements were to be read was determined randomly for each reader. Each expert read the statement and checked corresponding descriptors on the IGAS based on her/his evaluation. Where the expert's overall or general impression of a given program differed from the frequency of descriptors he/she identified, the opportunity was given to evaluate the program according to her/his overall impression. In such instances the request was made to provide the rationale for the final classification.<sup>1</sup> The experts were asked to return their responses in the postage paid envelope addressed to the investigator within a designated time period.

Upon receipt of the experts' responses, each institution was assigned the label Liberal if all three experts classified the program as a "1" or a "2", Conservative if all three experts classified the program as a "3" or a "4", and "Nondescript" if the experts disagreed in their classification on either side of the division between "2" and "3" (see Appendix H).

#### Preparation for Data Analysis

The preparation of the data for analysis required the following steps: (a) the scoring of the SIV and the coding of the subjects on each of the six factors, (b) labeling the Board members' voting behavior according to the judges' classification of the sport governance issues, (c) labeling each Board member's institution according to the experts' classification by its institutional goals, and (d) recording of the data on a master scoresheet.

---

<sup>1</sup>This discrepancy among descriptors and overall judgment did not occur.

### Scoring of the SIV

The scoring of the SIV is based on a total score of 90 which is the sum of an individual's scores on the six factors: (a) Support, (b) Conformity, (c) Recognition, (d) Independence, (e) Benevolence, and (f) Leadership. Standard scoring procedures were followed (Gordon, 1976).

Scores were designated for each Board member according to each of the interpersonal value items. The mean published in the manual for adult females was used to distinguish between High and Low scores. A score equal to or less than the mean was classified as Low while a score greater than the mean was classified as High.

### Labeling the Board Members' Voting Behavior

Once the judges' classification of each issue had been determined, each Board member's vote was labeled. If an individual voted in favor of an issue classified as Conservative the subject's vote was labeled as Conservative. Similarly, when a Board member voted against a motion classified as Conservative the vote was labeled Liberal. The voting behavior was then determined by the majority of a Board member's votes during her tenure of office. A Conservative vote was coded, for statistical purposes, as 1 and a Liberal vote 2 (see Appendix I). An abstention was coded as neither a vote for nor against the motion. This procedure was suggested by Fiorina (1974) and Wolters (1978).

### Labeling the Board Members' Institutions

Each institution was labeled according to the experts' classification of its institutional goals. A Conservative institution was coded 1 and a Liberal institution 2 (see Appendix I). One that was



"Nondescript" was given a value of zero.

#### Recording of the Data on the Master Sheet

A master data sheet was developed which identified SIV items, voting behavior, and institutional labels (see Appendix I). The data were arranged by the Board members' code numbers.

#### Data Analysis

A member of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro's statistical consulting staff recommended statistical procedures. These included the development of crossbreak tables, the restatement of the questions in the two-tailed null hypothesis format, the transfer of the cell values to the Fisher's exact probability test formula or Chi Square formula, and the comparison of the resultant value to the critical value to determine the rejection or retention of the null hypothesis.

Fisher's exact probability test was used in the analysis for Questions 1 through 3 because the expected frequencies precluded the use of the Chi Square statistic used in the analysis for Question 4 (Roscoe, 1975; Reynolds, 1977a; Daniel, 1978). Because the marginal totals exceeded those for which critical values tables had been published, the consultant provided the formula:

$$\frac{\left[ \frac{A}{n_1} - \frac{B}{n_2} \right]}{\sqrt{\hat{p} \left[ 1 - \hat{p} \right] \left[ \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right]}}$$

where  $\hat{p}$  equalled  $\frac{A + B}{N}$ . Symbol meanings were given in Finney (1948). The cell with the larger value of the two upper cells was inserted for A (Daniel, 1978). The voting behavior label which corresponded to the

larger cell value was then inserted in the null hypothesis statement.

The use of the Fisher's exact probability formula generated a value which was translated into a z score (Daniel, 1978, p. 397). The z score was subtracted from .5000 and this remainder was doubled because of the use of a two-tailed hypothesis. The product was subtracted from 1.000. The remainder represented the level of confidence for the testing of the null hypothesis. The .95 level of confidence was used as the criterion for the rejection or retention of the null hypothesis.

The Chi Square statistic (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 171) was used to analyze the data for Question 4 (Roscoe, 1975; Reynolds, 1977a; Daniels, 1978). The .05 level of significance, with three degrees of freedom, was used as the criterion for the rejection or retention of the null hypothesis.

#### Debriefing of Participants

Upon the completion of the data analysis a synopsis of the study and its findings was mailed to the participants (see Appendix B). A copy was also sent to the AIAW Executive Secretary.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to investigate the personal values, institutional goals for athletics, and voting behavior of members of the AIAW Executive Board on issues concerning the governance of athletics in the years 1975 through 1977. Following the procedures delineated in the previous chapter, findings and analyses are given below.

Of the 60 women contacted, 47, or 78%, completed the SIV and returned it to the investigator. From the minutes of the AIAW Executive Board 32 motions were selected. These were categorized by a panel of five judges as Conservative or Liberal as defined previously. Each subject's vote was labeled and the subject's voting behavior categorized. Two Board members voted conservatively and liberally with equal frequency and, therefore, were eliminated from the study.

The statement of institutional goals or catalogue description associated with each subject was designated as either Conservative or Liberal by a panel of three experts using the IGAS. Seven institutions were categorized as "Nondescript" because the experts were not unanimous in their assessment. This resulted in their elimination from data analysis. In all, 39 Board members generated data for both voting behavior and goals. In addition, data for personal values and voting behavior were obtained for six additional Board members.

The five questions presented in Chapter I were used as a guide for the analysis and interpretation of the data:

1. Do AIAW Executive Board members with conservative goals vote conservatively?

2. Do AIAW Executive Board members with liberal goals vote liberally?

3. Do AIAW Executive Board members with similar personal value systems vote similarly?

4. Do AIAW Executive Board members with similar goals and personal value systems vote similarly?

5. Are any voting patterns discernible with respect to goals and personal value systems among AIAW Executive Board members?

Because the data were nominal, crossbreak analysis was used to determine the nature of the relationships between and among variables. Fisher's exact probability test was used in the analysis for Questions 1 through 3 because the expected frequencies precluded the use of the Chi Square statistic. The latter was used in the analysis for Question 4 (Roscoe, 1975; Reynolds, 1977a; Daniel, 1978). The .95 level of confidence was used as the critical level with the Fisher's exact statistic and the .05 level of significance was used with Chi Square. For the purpose of statistical analysis, Questions 1 through 4 were stated in a two-tailed null hypothesis.

To identify any voting patterns which existed with respect to goals and personal values for the analysis for Question 5, the frequencies were grouped both by year and by the adjusted total for the three years. The groups were labeled according to the descriptor which applied to the majority within that group.

### Question 1

The data analysis required the restatement of the question as a two-tailed null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ). The alternate hypothesis was designated by  $H_1$ .

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting conservatively was the same for those subjects with conservative goals as for those with liberal goals.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting conservatively was not the same as for those subjects with conservative goals as those with liberal goals.

The data for the voting behavior and goals of 39 subjects were organized in the crossbreak table depicted in Table 1. Of the 27 subjects whose goals were categorized as Conservative, 13, or slightly less than half, voted conservatively. For data in Table 1 the Fisher's exact test value was .7114. The area under the normal curve obtained for rejection of the null hypothesis at an alpha level of .05 was .2886. The null hypothesis was found tenable.

### Question 2

The data analysis for Question 2 was identical to that for Question 1 with the necessary restatement of the null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses.

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for those subjects with conservative goals as for those with liberal goals.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for those subjects with conservative goals as for those with liberal goals.

Table 1  
Crossbreak of Institutional Goals  
and Voting Behavior

---

---

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
Conservative goals	13	14	27
Liberal goals	5	7	12
Totals	18	21	(39)

Fisher's exact=.7114  
.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.2886

---

Slightly more than half, or 7 of 12, of those subjects with liberal goals voted liberally (see Table 1, p. 43). The value of  $p$  used in deciding whether to reject  $H_0$  was .2886. The null hypothesis was accepted.

Voting behavior did not vary according to institutional goals. Sameness of voting behavior regarding goals was not surprising in light of the works by Cyert and March (1963); Lawler, Porter and Hackman (1975); Ebert and Mitchell (1975) and Simon (1976).

### Question 3

Data for the voting behavior and personal value systems of 45 subjects were organized by SIV factors in crossbreak tables depicted in Tables 2 through 7. Subjects were categorized as High or Low on each SIV factor according to their score and its comparison to the mean for adult females (Gordon, 1976). Conservative and Liberal voting behavior were interchangeable with the variable of interest (Daniel, 1978). Use of one over the other was determined by whichever had the most subjects categorized as High for that factor.

Support and voting behavior. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were as follows

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Support and Low Support subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Support and Low Support subjects. Table 2 depicts the data for the subjects' Support classifications and voting behavior.

Of the 13 subjects categorized as High Support, 7 voted conservatively and 6 voted liberally. Low Support subjects totalled 32 of which

Table 2  
 Crossbreak of Support Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

---



---

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Support	7	6	13
Low Support	14	18	32
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.4648

.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.5352

---

**Note:** The mean score of 18.2 on the Support scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Support categories. The norms depict a range of scores from 7 to 29 with a standard deviation of 4.9.



14 voted conservatively and 18 voted liberally. Table 2 presents the Fisher's exact test obtained value, .4648. The  $p$  of .5352 level of confidence was far below the value needed to reject the null hypothesis.

Conformity and voting behavior. The data concerning the subjects' Conformity classifications and voting behavior are depicted in Table 3. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were as follows:

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Conformity and Low Conformity subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Conformity and Low Conformity subjects.

Of the 11 High Conformity subjects, 7 voted conservatively and 4 voted liberally. Conversely, 14 of 34 Low Conformity subjects voted conservatively while 20 voted liberally. The Fisher's exact test value was .1936. The area under the normal curve obtained for rejection of the null hypothesis at the alpha level of .05 was .8064. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Recognition and voting behavior. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were as follows:

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Recognition and Low Recognition subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Recognition and Low Recognition subjects.

The data are depicted in Table 4.

High Recognition subjects totalled 27 of which 9 voted conservatively while 18 voted liberally. Conversely, 12 of the 18 Low Recognition subjects voted conservatively and only 6 voted liberally.

Table 3  
 Crossbreak of Conformity Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Conformity	7	4	11
Low Conformity	14	20	34
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.1936

.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.8064

Note: The mean score of 18.0 on the Conformity scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Conformity categories. The norms depict a range of scores from 2 to 29 with a standard deviation of 5.8.

Table 4  
 Crossbreak of Recognition Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Recognition	9	18	27
Low Recognition	12	6	18
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.0286

.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.9714\*

---

\* Sufficient to reject null hypothesis

Note: The mean score of 9.9 on the Recognition scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Recognition. The norms depict a range of scores from 0 to 22 with a standard deviation of 4.2.

A value of .0286 was generated by the Fisher's exact test, following z translation, which called for a .9714 value for rejection at an alpha level of .05. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis was accepted. In terms of meanings, High Recognition subjects tended to vote liberally and Low Recognition subjects tended to vote conservatively.

Independence and voting behavior. Data concerning the subjects' Independence classifications and voting behavior are depicted in Table 5. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were stated:

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Independence and Low Independence subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Independence and Low Independence subjects.

Of the 27 High Independence subjects, 11 voted conservatively and 16 liberally. Low Independence subjects totalled 18, of which 10 voted conservatively while 8 voted liberally. The Fisher's exact test resulted in a value of .3320. The  $p$  of .6680 level of confidence was insufficient to reject the null hypothesis.

Benevolence and voting behavior. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Benevolence and Low Benevolence subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Benevolence and Low Benevolence subjects.

The data are depicted in Table 6.

Table 5  
 Crossbreak of Independence Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Independence	11	16	27
Low Independence	10	8	18
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.3320

.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.6680

Note: The mean score of 15.7 on the Independence scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Independence categories. The norms depict a range of scores from 3 to 29 with a standard deviation of 5.9.

Table 6  
 Crossbreak of Benevolence Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

---



---

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Benevolence	5	3	8
Low Benevolence	16	21	37
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.3222

.05 value of  $\beta$  for rejection=.6778

---

Note: The mean score of 20.4 on the Benevolence scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Benevolence categories. The norms depict a range of scores from 7 to 31 with a standard deviation of 4.8.

High Benevolence subjects totalled 8, 5 of whom voted conservatively and 3 liberally. Of the 37 Low Benevolence subjects, 16 voted conservatively and 21 voted liberally. The Fisher's exact test resulted in a value of .3222. The value of  $p$  used in deciding whether to reject  $H_0$  was .6778. Therefore, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Leadership and voting behavior. The data concerning the subjects' Leadership classifications and voting behavior are depicted in Table 7. The null ( $H_0$ ) and alternate ( $H_1$ ) hypotheses were stated:

$H_0$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was the same for High Leadership and Low Leadership subjects.

$H_1$ : The proportion of those voting liberally was not the same for High Leadership and Low Leadership subjects.

Of the 42 subjects classified as High Leadership, 18 voted conservatively while 24 voted liberally. The three Low Leadership subjects voted conservatively. For Table 7, the Fisher's exact test value was .0548. The  $p$  of .9452 was not considered sufficient to reject the null hypothesis, though rounding would normally raise it to the .95 level.

Only the Recognition factor was significant with respect to voting behavior. This was consistent with Gordon's definition of Recognition and what was considered "admirable" within AIAW during 1975-1977.

#### Question 4

The question was restated as the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) and alternate hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) for the purpose of analysis. Both were stated

Table 7  
 Crossbreak of Leadership Score on SIV  
 and Voting Behavior

	Voting Behavior		Totals
	Conservative	Liberal	
High Leadership	18	24	42
Low Leadership	3	0	3
Totals	21	24	(45)

Fisher's exact=.0548

.05 value of  $p$  for rejection=.9452

Note: The mean score of 7.9 on the Leadership scale of the SIV was used to distinguish between High and Low Leadership categories. The norms depict a range of scores from 0 to 27 with a standard deviation of 5.2.



generally and tested for each SIV factor. High and Low referred to classification on each SIV factor. Conservative and Liberal referred to goals.

H<sub>0</sub>: There was no difference in voting behavior among groups of AIAW Executive Board members classified as High-Conservative, High Liberal, Low-Conservative, and Low-Liberal.

H<sub>1</sub>: There was a difference in voting behavior among groups of AIAW Executive Board members classified as High-Conservative, High-Liberal, Low-Conservative, and Low-Liberal.

Data representing the voting behavior, goals, and personal values for 39 subjects were organized by SIV factors in the crossbreak tables, 8-13. Each SIV factor and the goals classification were compared to voting behavior. For these tables the Chi Square table value equalled 9.3484 at the .05 level of significance for a two-tailed test with three degrees of freedom.

Goals, Support, and voting behavior. Of the 8 High Support-Conservative goals subjects, 5 voted conservatively (see Table 8) while 3 of the 4 High Support-Liberal goals subjects voted liberally. Low Support-Conservative goals subjects totalled 19 of which 11 voted liberally. Low Support-Liberal goals subjects totalled 8 and voted conservatively and liberally with equal frequency. The Chi Square value of 1.7637 failed to exceed the table value necessary to reject the null hypothesis at the .05 level of significance.

Goals, Conformity, and voting behavior. Four subjects were categorized as High Conformity-Conservative goals (see Table 9) and of these 4, 3 voted conservatively. More than half the subjects

Table 8  
 Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
 and Support Score on SIV

		Voting Behavior		
		Conservative	Liberal	Totals
Conservative goals	High Support	5	3	8
	Low Support	8	11	19
Liberal goals	High Support	1	3	4
	Low Support	4	4	8
Totals		18	21	(39)

Chi Square=1.7637

Alpha .05=9.3484

Table 9  
 Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
 and Conformity Score on SIV

		Voting Behavior		Totals
		Conservative	Liberal	
Conservative goals	High Conformity	3	1	4
	Low Conformity	10	13	23
Liberal goals	High Conformity	2	2	4
	Low Conformity	3	5	8
Totals		18	21	(39)

Chi Square=1.6593

Alpha .05=9.3484

were categorized as Low Conformity-Conservative goals and slightly more than half of these voted liberally. High Conformity-Liberal goals subjects voted conservatively and liberally with equal frequency while the majority of the Low Conformity-Liberal goals subjects voted liberally. This apparent lack of pattern was borne out as the Chi Square value equalled 1.6593, insufficient to reject the null hypothesis.

Goals, Recognition, and voting behavior. Table 10 depicts the data concerning the goals, Recognition, and voting classifications for the subjects. Of the 14 subjects categorized as High Recognition-Conservative goals, 10 voted liberally while 9 of 13 Low Recognition-Conservative goals subjects voted conservatively. Similarly, 6 of 8 High Recognition-Liberal goals subjects voted liberally while 3 of 4 Low Recognition-Liberal goals subjects voted conservatively. The Chi Square value of 7.2918 did not exceed the table value; therefore, the null hypothesis that Board members categorized as High Recognition-Conservative goals, High Recognition-Liberal goals, Low Recognition-Conservative goals, and Low Recognition-Liberal goals would not differ according to voting behavior was accepted.

Goals, Independence, and voting behavior. The subjects classified as High Independence-Conservative goals voted conservatively and liberally with equal frequency (see Table 11). Slightly more than half of the Low Independence-Conservative goals subjects voted liberally. Of the 6 High Independence-Liberal goals subjects, 4 voted liberally while the Low Independence-Liberal goals subjects voted conservatively and liberally with equal frequency. That there was little difference among the groups was borne out by the Chi Square

Table 10

Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
and Recognition Score on SIV

---



---

		Voting Behavior		Totals
		Conservative	Liberal	
Conservative goals	High Recognition	4	10	14
	Low Recognition	9	4	13
Liberal goals	High Recognition	2	6	8
	Low Recognition	3	1	4
Totals		18	21	(39)

Chi Square=7.2918

Alpha .05=9.3484

---

Table 11

Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
and Independence Score on SIV

---



---

		Voting Behavior		Totals
		Conservative	Liberal	
Conservative goals	High Independence	9	9	18
	Low Independence	4	5	9
Liberal goals	High Independence	2	4	6
	Low Independence	3	3	6
Totals		18	21	(39)

Chi Square=.5496

Alpha .05=9.3484

---

value of .5496, substantially less than that required for significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis that Board members categorized as High Independence-Conservative goals, High Independence-Liberal goals, Low Independence-Conservative goals, and Low Independence-Liberal goals would not differ according to voting behavior was found tenable.

Goals, Benevolence, and voting behavior. Of the 5 High Benevolence-Conservative goals subjects, 4 voted conservatively (see Table 12). Of the 22 Low Benevolence-Liberal goals subjects, 13 voted liberally. And 2 of 3 High Benevolence-Liberal goals subjects voted liberally while 5 of 9 Low Benevolence-Liberal goals subjects also voted liberally. As the Chi Square value equalled 2.7439, the null hypothesis was determined tenable.

Goals, Leadership, and voting behavior. Using the categorization scheme described in the procedures, a total of 37 of the 39 subjects were labeled as High Leadership (see Table 13). Further statistical analysis of these data was, therefore, not carried out because of the disproportionate distribution. It was decided that no further insights could be gained comparing data for 37 people to 2.

#### Question 5

Are any voting patterns discernible with respect to institutional goals and personal values among AIAW Executive Board members?

Voting patterns. Data presented in Table 14 depict the panel of judges' classification of the issues and the resultant classification of the AIAW Executive Board action by year and for the three-year period. Over the three-year period the Board voted conservatively on 18 issues and liberally on 14. In 1975, the Board voted conserva-

Table 12

Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
and Benevolence Score on SIV

---



---

		Voting Behavior		Totals
		Conservative	Liberal	
Conservative goals	High Benevolence	4	1	5
	Low Benevolence	9	13	22
Liberal goals	High Benevolence	1	2	3
	Low Benevolence	4	5	9
Totals		18	21	(39)

Chi Square=2.7439

Alpha .05=9.3484

---



Table 13

Crossbreak of Voting Behavior, Institutional Goals  
and Leadership Score on SIV

---

		Voting Behavior		
		Conservative	Liberal	Totals
Conservative goals	High Leadership	12	14	26
	Low Leadership	1	0	1
Liberal goals	High Leadership	4	7	11
	Low Leadership	1	0	1
Totals		18	21	(39)

---

Table 14

Issue Classification and AIAW Executive Board  
Action, 1975-1977

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. of Issues</u>	<u>Classification</u>		<u>Actions</u>	
		<u>Conserv.</u>	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Conserv.</u>	<u>Liberal</u>
1975	14	9	5	11	3
1976	12	7	5	4	8
1977	6	1	5	3	3
Total	32	17	15	18	14

Note: Statement of issues as motions and breakdown of classification and action on each are presented in Appendix G.

tively on 11 of 14 issues. However, in 1976 the Board voted conservatively on only 4 of 12 issues. The votes of the 1977 Board were evenly divided between conservative and liberal actions.

Individual voting categorization is depicted in Table 15. For the three-year period, the majority, or 21 of 39 subjects, voted liberally. Both the 1976 and 1977 Boards were comprised of a majority of liberally voting members. The 1975 Board voted conservatively; 17 of 31 members in this study voted conservatively.<sup>1</sup>

Voting patterns and goals. The analysis of institutional goals by year for the three-year period covered by the study depicted in Table 15 indicates more than a two-to-one ratio of Conservative to Liberal goals. When compared to the liberal voting tendency by Board and as individuals, there was an inverse relationship suggested between goals and voting behavior in 1976 and 1977. 1975 was the only year in which voting paralleled the goals breakdown.

Voting patterns and personal values. Table 15 also summarizes the breakdown by SIV factor for each year and for the three-year period. Approximately two-thirds of the subjects were Low Support, almost four-fifths were Low Conformity, slightly more than half were High Recognition, almost two-thirds were High Independence, four-fifths were Low Benevolence and all but two were High Leadership. These ratios remained relatively constant by year despite the difference in voting behavior between 1975 and 1977 from Conservative to Liberal. Except for Leadership, which varied little throughout, only the data for

---

<sup>1</sup>The total number of subjects does not equal the sum of the subjects for each year because a number of subjects were members of more than one Board.

Table 15

Institutional goals, Personal Values and  
Voting Behavior by Year

	Year			Adjusted Total*
	<u>1975</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	
<b>Institutional goals</b>				
Conservative	17	10	14	27
Liberal	11	4	2	12
<b>Personal Values</b>				
High Support	9	4	6	12
Low Support	24	14	12	27
High Conformity	10	3	4	8
Low Conformity	23	15	14	31
High Recognition	18	11	10	22
Low Recognition	15	7	8	17
High Independence	20	12	10	24
Low Independence	13	6	8	15
High Benevolence	7	1	4	8
Low Benevolence	26	17	14	31
High Leadership	30	18	17	37
Low Leadership	3	0	1	2
<b>Voting Behavior</b>				
Conservative	17	4	8	18
Liberal	14	14	10	21

**\*Legend:** The fourth column does not represent a cumulative total across years because of the 33 subjects on the Board in 1975, 10 were also on the Board in 1976 and 7 in 1977. Of the 18 subjects on the Board in 1976, 8 were also on the board in 1977. Five subjects' institutions were Nondescript in 1975, four in 1976, and two in 1977.

Recognition and Independence yielded a majority of subjects categorized as High. For the years 1976 and 1977, this finding varied inversely with the proportion of liberal voters on the two Boards.

No patterns were discerned, therefore, with respect to institutional goals and personal values among AIAW Executive Board members. This finding was consistent with the literature.

## CHAPTER V

### DISCUSSION

Several matters pertaining to this inquiry warrant elaboration. Also, there were numerous arbitrary research decisions which were made by the investigator and have relevance to the reader's understanding of the strategy used in examining the voting behavior of members of the AIAW Executive Board.

#### Investigator's Orientation

In addition to the assumptions delineated in Chapter I, there are several other premises underlying the present study. For example, the notion of representation was critical in the decision to use a Board member's institution's goals to portray her constituency. The state of the development of AIAW as an organization has bearing on the lack of voting pattern apparent in the years studied. The struggle within AIAW concerning the body's commitment to educational athletic programs versus what has been termed as the male model is important in the writer's interpretation of the relationship of the SIV Recognition factor to voting behavior. The decision to use controversial issues to portray voting behavior may also have reduced the degree of variance in voting.

The notion of representation is complex. As discussed in the literature review in Chapter II, not only is the normative ideal for representative behavior imperfectly understood, but the identification of the constituency to which a representative attends is a subject of

controversy. As Pitkin (1968) observed, this complexity is underscored by the length of time this problem has been the focus of political philosophers without coming closer to a consensual explanation of the process of representation. Similar observations in the political science literature are noted by Pennock (1968), Davidson (1969), Birch (1971), Florina (1974), Jackson (1974) and Fenno (1977).

The members of AIAW's Executive Board simultaneously have several overlapping linkages, or ties, to constituencies (Hedlund & Friesema, 1972). Within the Board are the executive officers who appear to have national constituencies, representatives of regions comprised of diverse institutions (i.e., large public universities, small private colleges, and other public universities of varied sizes of population), and representatives of the National Association for Girls and Women's Sport (NAGWS). At the same time, each Board member could also have operated according to her personal preferences. Farquharson (1969) depicts voting in accord with one's personal preferences "the simplest assumption which can be made about the behavior of voters" (p. 17). Concurrently, each Board member was affiliated with an institution of higher education at the time of her tenure on the Board as either a student or employee. Fifty-eight of the 60 Board members were employees and, as the organizational behavior literature suggested, may have been influenced to some extent by the athletic goals of their respective institutions either through sharing or articulation of established goals with personal preferences (Cyert & March, 1963; Porter, Lawler and Hackman, 1975; Simon, 1976). The use of institutional goals as the constituency for the Board members was determined by the investigator

because, coupled with personal values, this seemed to be the most constant constituency. It was also felt that institutional goals may have overlapped with other notions of constituency, though the degree of overlap was not determined in this study.

AIAW is a relatively young organization. The writer felt that because of its youth it might have been in a state of fluctuation as it sought to determine the specifics of the nature of its structure and this may have been reflected in the selection of issues. This may or may not have been an explanation for the lack of any pattern of voting. The writer felt that a study which included a longer period of time might better control for this possible fluctuation and, therefore, considered the age of the AIAW structure as a confounding, uncontrolled variable for this particular study.

As observed by Fields (1976a, 1976b, 1977b, 1977c), in her reporting on AIAW Delegate Assemblies for the Chronicle of Higher Education, the issues of paid recruiting responsibilities of coaches and financial-need-based athletic scholarships served to underscore the conflict within AIAW regarding commitment to educational athletics versus the male model and the implications of federal legislation concerning equal opportunities for the sexes. During the time period of this study, the AIAW leadership reiterated its commitment to keeping women's athletics in an educational perspective (Fields, 1977b). AAHPER reminded the 1977 AIAW Delegate Assembly of its commitment to educational athletics as AIAW considered the separation from AAHPER (Fields, 1977c). Yet repeatedly there were questions raised by the delegates concerning compliance with federal legislation and the fact



that such compliance precluded the possibility of the existence of women's athletic programs which substantially differed from men's programs. In that, during the years 1975-1977, the commitment to educational athletics prevailed, however tentatively, the writer felt that these decisions represented a pressure on the Board members as they voted on selected issues.

It is acknowledged that the decision to use controversial issues to portray voting behavior may have introduced a narrower range of data than what might have occurred had unanimous decisions been included. The possibility of a narrower range of data may explain the lack of pattern among the variables of personal values, institutional goals, and voting behavior.

### Findings

The results presented in Chapter IV generally depict a lack of any pattern among personal values, institutional goals, and voting behavior, with the exception of the SIV Recognition factor. These findings are discussed below in light of the investigator's orientation and the conclusions derived from the literature reviewed in Chapter II.

Questions 1 and 2. The sameness of voting behavior regardless of institutional goals was not surprising in light of the works of Cyert and March (1963); Lawler, Porter and Hackman (1975); Ebert and Mitchell (1975) and Simon (1976). As Simon noted, the relationship between organizational and personal preferences has rarely been fully integrated. How these preferences interact and develop is not yet understood (Ebert & Mitchell, 1975). Thus, the AIAW Executive Board did not differ from other organizations in that its members did not vote

congruently with their institutions' goals. The absence of a relationship between goals and voting behavior may also be an artifact of the use of institutional goals as the constituency for each Board member.

Question 3. For every SIV factor, subjects categorized as High appeared to differ from those categorized as Low with regard to voting behavior. On the two SIV factors the writer arbitrarily associated with the operational definitions of Conservative and Liberal, Conformity and Independence, the majority of the High Conformity and Low Independence subjects voted conservatively while the majority of the Low Conformity and High Independence subjects voted liberally. Although the findings corresponded favorably with the conceptualization of Conservative as representing the status quo and the desire to retain the status quo and Liberal as representing the deviance from the status quo and the desire to deviate from the status quo, there were no statistically significant distinctions.

Only the Recognition factor showed significant differences with respect to voting behavior, although the Leadership factor was close to distinguishing voting patterns. Gordon (1976) defined Recognition as "being looked up to and admired, being considered important, attracting favorable notice" (p. 1). During the years 1975-1977, AIAW was under some pressure from its own members and AAHPER (Fields, 1977c) to provide a viable alternative to the male model of big-time college sport. In that a classification as High Recognition was related to voting liberally, or generally away from a status quo (defined as major college athletic programs for men), this finding was consistent with Gordon's definition and with what was considered "admirable" within AIAW during 1975-1977.

The results of the analysis suggest that the next research step might be to look at the SIV factors in the context of the whole and voting behavior. That is, regression analysis would yield further insights into any patterns among the SIV factors and voting.

Question 4. No pattern of voting behavior of the subjects was found when both value systems and goals' classifications were studied. This finding was consistent with the literature. While constituency and personal values variables were depicted as having an effect on the roll call voting behavior of elected representatives, the extent of this influence was not explained in the literature. Nor did the results of this study show any particular relationships among these variables. Moreover, personal values and institutional goals were depicted in the literature as having imperfect relationships with decision making, or voting. The findings described previously supported this observation.

Question 5. Consistent with the literature reviewed, no pattern existed between a subject's goals classification and the way she voted as a member of the Executive Board. This might be explained in two ways. Firstly, as the organizational behavior literature suggested, organizational goals have not been well articulated nor well integrated with personal preferences. In that no relationship existed between goals and voting behavior, the AIAW Executive Board was not necessarily unique. That is, its members did not make decisions, i.e., vote, in keeping with their respective institution's goals. Additionally, however, these Board members were also representatives of constituencies other than their own institutions. Each member represented a regional or national constituency, the goals of which were not ascertained in

this study. It might have been that Board members were voting congruently with the goals of their other constituencies. It could similarly be argued that the Board members were elected because their institution's goals were similar to those institutions comprising their constituency.

Individual voting patterns reflected the shift to a more liberally voting group as discussed in Question 3. This finding was consistent with the pressures brought to bear on AIAW by its members and AAHPER to provide an alternative to the male model.

No pattern was discernible between personal value categories and voting. Once again, this was consistent with the literature. There has been a normative emphasis on the use of some value system in decision making on several levels. Yet evidence of the practical limitations of value systems and the resultant appearance, at least, of irrationality was often noted in the literature. The present "ideal" for athletics rests with the control of athletics by faculty representatives acting congruently with their own values and/or the goals of their respective institutions. The study generated evidence that this ideal has not yet been reached. AIAW Board members were not unique in their behavior in that no pattern existed between personal value categories and voting. However, the relationship between Recognition and voting, as discussed in Question 3, suggests that, for this sample, one value factor was related to voting behavior where goals were not.

### Implications for Further Research

It has been assumed that faculty representatives to sport-governing bodies vote according to their personal value hierarchy and congruently with the goals of their institutions. The findings of this study did not support that assumption. Proponents of change in AIAW might best make their appeals in terms of what would attract favorable notice since High Recognition subjects comprised more than half of the Board and tended to vote liberally. Ambiguous institutional goals might also be a source of apparent lack of direction and this could also be an area of concerted attempts to influence voting behavior.

It is important to note that while there was no pattern of voting in light of personal values and institutional goals this does not preclude the existence of some pattern discernible by other means. As Scheibe (1970) suggested, the reduction of many values into more general values, as is done in the SIV, may obscure patterns which may exist.

The concept of issue proximity might also explain why no patterns were found. Flanigan and Zingale (1975) observed that the lack of a relationship between an individual's preferences and her voting behavior may be the result of the choice of issues which were not necessarily important to the individual. That is, a Board member may have opted for what might be considered to be the lesser of two evils. Therefore, the voter's position relative to the issue also needs to be considered with the actual vote. The concern of proximity might also be controlled to some degree with the use of highly salient issues as identified by the Board members.

The IGAS is potentially useful in sport studies. Refinement and the determination of reliability and validity for the instrument is needed.

Replication is also necessary for several other reasons. First, this study is the first to examine voting behavior in a sport-governing body. Not only is there a need to continue the study of AIAW, but there is also a need to investigate any patterns which might exist at the conference, regional, or national level in other sport-governing bodies such as the NAIA and NCAA before it can more confidently be said that the governance of intercollegiate sport is understood. More evidence is needed to substantiate the findings of this study. Data for subsequent years of AIAW Executive Board actions should be added to that used in this study. Perhaps with age this body's voting behavior may settle into a pattern.

Additional factors may also be used to investigate patterns. Information concerning age, region of the country, size and type of school and position within the school may add increased perspective and understanding. Shifts in the voting behavior of Board members with tenures of more than one year might also be of interest. Control for a pattern of voting with the majority (Weisberg, 1978) might result in the identification of patterns.

Continued study of sport governance from a sociopolitical perspective is necessary. Replication may or may not identify any voting patterns. If the latter becomes apparent, however, the question is then raised, is "sanity" possible?

CHAPTER VI  
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships among 1975-1977 AIAW Executive Board members' personal values, their institutional goals for athletics, and their voting behavior on selected issues concerning the governance of athletics in the years 1975 through 1977. Specifically, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. Do AIAW Executive Board members with institutional goals classified as Conservative by a panel of experts vote conservatively?
2. Do AIAW Executive Board members with institutional goals classified as Liberal by a panel of experts vote liberally?
3. Do AIAW Executive Board members with similar personal value systems as assessed by the SIV vote similarly?
4. Do AIAW Executive Board members with similar institutional goals and with similar personal value systems vote similarly?
5. Are any voting patterns discernible with respect to institutional goals and personal value systems among AIAW Executive Board members?

A total of 47 women who had served on the AIAW Executive Board participated in the study. Their personal values on the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values scales of Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership were determined and designated as High or Low. From the minutes of the Executive Board, 32 motions

were selected and categorized by a panel of five judges as Conservative or Liberal. Each subject's vote was coded and her voting behavior categorized according to the majority of her votes for the period of the study. Each subject's institution's statement of goals or catalogue description of its athletic program was also coded as Conservative or Liberal by a panel of three experts according to the IGAS, an instrument developed for the study.

Data were organized in crossbreak tables for analysis. Fisher's exact probability test and Chi Square were used to determine the testing of each null hypothesis. The following results were obtained:

1. There was no significant difference in voting behavior between subjects with Conservative and Liberal goals.

2. Of the six SIV factors, only Recognition was related to voting behavior. High Recognition subjects tended to vote liberally and Low Recognition subjects tended to vote conservatively.

3. There were no differences among groups of subjects similarly categorized on personal values and goals.

4. During the three-year period the Board voted conservatively on 18 issues and liberally on 14. There was no pattern on a year to year basis.

5. The majority of the subjects voted liberally and in 1976 and 1977 the Board was comprised of a majority of liberally voting members.

6. There was no pattern between institutional goals and voting behavior on a year-to-year or aggregate basis.

7. No pattern existed between personal value systems and voting behavior on a year-to-year or aggregate basis.



### Conclusions

The findings of this investigation resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Voting behavior is not related to institutional goals. This was consistent with Brubaker and Nelson (1974), Ebert and Mitchell (1975), and Simon (1976).
2. High Recognition subjects voted liberally and Low Recognition subjects voted conservatively. This was consistent with pressures brought to bear on the group to offer a viable alternative to the male model.
3. Personal value systems and institutional goals, taken together, were not related to voting behavior. This was not consistent with the normative ideal for representatives (see Miller & Stokes, 1969).
4. There were no voting patterns discernible with respect to institutional goals or personal values.

This study relied on established political science procedures. Political behavior in physical education and sport has not previously been subjected to academic inquiry, yet representatives to national sport-governing bodies operate in a political arena.

The development of the IGAS has heuristic value. With additional refinement it has the potential to become a valid assessment tool for use in sport studies.

The findings of this inquiry may serve as a self-study for AIAW and, thereby, provide a perspective into the nature of the Executive Board's ~~decision-making~~ process of which it may be unaware. By providing information regarding personal values, institutional goals, and

voting as was heretofore unavailable, the results may also have a bearing on any attempts to change the status quo in intercollegiate athletics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abelson, R. P. Social psychology's rational man. In S. I. Benn & G. W. Mortimore (Eds.), Rationality and the social sciences. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Akers, J. B. The degree of autonomy exercised by athletic directors as perceived by athletic directors and by the presidents or chairmen of the selected institutions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1971.
- American Alliance of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. AIAW Handbook: 1976-1977. Washington: Author, 1976.
- American Alliance of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. AIAW Handbook: 1977-1978. Washington: Author, 1977.
- Anderson, L. F. Individuality in voting in Congress: A research note. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 1964, 8, 425-429.
- Anderson, L. F., Watts, M. W., Jr., & Wilcox, A. R. Legislative roll-call analysis. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press, 1966.
- Arrow, K. Social choice and individual values. New York: Wiley, 1951.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Executive Board and Delegate Assembly Meetings. Washington: AAHPER, 1975.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Spring Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1975.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Fall Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1975.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Executive Board and Delegate Assembly Meetings. Washington: AAHPER, 1976.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Spring Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1976.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Fall Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1976.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Executive Board and Delegate Assembly Meetings. Washington: AAHPER, 1977.

- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Spring Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1977.
- Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. Official minutes of the Fall Executive Board Meeting. Washington: AAHPER, 1977.
- Benn, S. I. Rationality and political behavior. In S. I. Benn & G. A. Mortimore (Eds.), Rationality and the social sciences. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Betts, J. R. America's sporting heritage: 1850-1950. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1974.
- Birch, A. H. Representation. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.
- Black, D. The theory of committees and elections. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1968.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Nyikes, M. S. College football and Mr. Chips: All in the family. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56, 110-113.
- Born, R. Cue-taking within state party delegations in the U. S. House of Representatives. Journal of Politics, 1976, 38, 71-94.
- Boynton, G. R., Patterson, S. G., & Hedlund, R. D. The missing links in legislative politics: Attentive constituents. Journal of Politics, 1969, 31, 700-721.
- Braun, J. R. Effects of positive and negative faking sets on the Survey of Interpersonal Values. Psychological Reports, 1963, 13, 171-173.
- Brody, R. A., & Page, B. I. Indifference, alienation and rational decisions. Public Choice, 1973, 15, 1-17.
- Brown, S. R. Consistency and the persistence of ideology: Some experimental results. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1970, 34, 60-68.
- Brubaker, D. L., & Nelson, R. H., Jr. Creative survival in educational bureaucracies. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1974.
- Buchanan, J. M., & Tullock, G. The calculus of consent. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1962.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The fifth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1959.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965.

- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The seventh mental measurements yearbook (Vol. 1). Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Buros, O. K. (Ed.). Tests in print II. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1974.
- Caplan, N., Morrison, A., & Stambaugh, R. J. The use of social science knowledge in policy decisions at the national level. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1975.
- Clapp, C. L. The congressman: His work as he sees it. Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1963.
- Clausen, A. R. How congressmen decide: A policy focus. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1973.
- Crane, W. W., Jr. Do representatives represent? Journal of Politics, 1960, 22, 295-299.
- Crase, D. The continuing crises in athletics. Phi Delta Kappan, 1974, 56, 99-101.
- Cronbach, L. J. Review of Survey of Interpersonal Values. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. A behavioral theory of the firm. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.
- Daly, J. A. An identification of some philosophic beliefs held by Australian physical educators with implications for administrators. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Illinois, 1970.
- Daniel, W. W. Applied nonparametric statistics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Davidson, R. H. The role of the congressman. New York: Pegasus, 1969.
- Deckard, B. S. Political upheaval and congressional voting: The effects of the 1960s on voting patterns in the House of Representatives. Journal of Politics, 1976, 38, 327-345.
- DeGrazia, A. Public and republic. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1951.
- Dexter, L. A. The representative and his district. Human Organization, 1957, 16, 2-13.
- Diggs, B. J. Practical representation. In J. R. Pennock & J. W. Chapman (Eds.), Representation. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.
- Dollar, R. J. Relationship between interpersonal values and temperament traits. Psychological Reports, 1966, 19, 228.

- Downs, A. An economic theory of democracy. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.
- DuBois, C. The dominant value profile of American culture. American Anthropologist, 1955, 57, 1232-1239.
- Ebert, R. J., & Mitchell, T. R. Organizational decision processes. New York: Crane, Russak, and Company, Inc., 1975.
- Edwards, W. Behavioral decision theory. Annual Review of Psychology, 1961, 12, 473-498.
- Erikson, R. S. Constituency opinion and congressional behavior: A reexamination of the Miller-Stokes representation data. American Journal of Political Science, 1978, 22, 511-535.
- Erikson, R. S., & Luttbeg, N. R., & Holloway, W. V. Knowing one's district: How legislators predict referendum voting. American Journal of Political Science, 1975, 19, 231-246.
- Evans, W. K., & Applegate, T. P. Value decisions and the acceptability of value principles. In National Education Association, Values concepts and techniques. Washington: Author, 1976.
- Farquharson, R. Theory of voting. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.
- Fenno, R. F., Jr. U. S. House members in their constituencies: An exploration. American Political Science Review, 1977, 71, 883-917.
- Fields, C. M. Women in sport: Scout power politics. The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 12, 1976, p. 12. (a)
- Fields, C. M. Will women follow men into "big-time" sports? The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 20, 1976, p. 3. (b)
- Fields, C. M. Women's athletic group votes to bar payments to coaches for recruiting. The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 10, 1977, p. 9. (a)
- Fields, C. M. Must women copy men to gain equality in athletics? The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 17, 1977, p. 8. (b)
- Fields, C. M. Women's association to consider athletic scholarship, new divisions. The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 12, 1977, pp. 3,4. (c)
- Fienberg, S. E. The analysis of cross-classified categorical data. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1977.
- Finney, D. J. The Fisher-Yates test of significance in 2 x 2 contingency tables. Biometrika, 1948, 35, 149-154.

- Fiorina, M. P. Representatives, roll calls, and constituencies. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, 1974.
- Fiorina, M. P. The case of the vanishing marginals: The bureaucracy did it. American Political Science Review, 1977, 71, 177-181.
- Flanigan, W. H., & Zingale, N. H. Political behavior of the American electorate (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Fleishman, E. A., & Peters, D. R. Interpersonal values, leadership attitudes, and managerial "success". Personnel Psychology, 1962, 15, 127-143.
- Flinn, T. A., & Wolman, H. L. Constituency and roll call voting: The case of Southern Democratic congressmen. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 1966, 10, 192-199.
- Foster, W. T. An indictment of intercollegiate athletics. Atlantic Monthly, November, 1915, pp. 577-587.
- Froman, L. A., Jr. Congressmen and their constituencies. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963. (a)
- Froman, L. A., Jr. The importance of individuality in voting in Congress. Journal of Politics, 1963, 25, 324-332. (b)
- The glorification of athletics. The Nation, December 1, 1892, pp. 406-407.
- Glueck, W. F. Decision making: Organization choice. Personnel Psychology, 1974, 27, 77-93.
- Godkin, E. L. The athletic craze. The Nation, December 7, 1893, pp. 422-423.
- Goldberg, A. S. Discerning a causal pattern among data on voting behavior. American Political Science Review, 1966, 60, 913-922.
- Goodstein, L. D. Review of Survey of Interpersonal Values. In O. K. Buros (Ed.), The sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N. J.: The Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Gordon, L. V. Measurement of bureaucratic orientation. Personnel Psychology, 1970, 23, 1-11.
- Gordon, L. V. The image of political candidates: Values and voter preference. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1972, 56, 382-387.
- Gordon, L. V. Survey of Interpersonal Values (rev. ed.). Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1976.



- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1942.
- Hall, R. H. Organizations: Structure and process. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Handy, R. Value theory and the behavioral sciences. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1969.
- Handy, R. The measurement of values. St. Louis: Warren H. Green, Inc., 1970.
- Hanford, G. H. Intercollegiate athletics today and tomorrow: The presidents' challenge. Educational Record, 1977, 52, 232-235.
- Harper, W. A., Miller, D. M., Park, R. J., & Davis, E. C. The philosophic process in physical education (3rd ed.). Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1977.
- Havel, R. C. Intercollegiate athletics: An educational dilemma. National College Physical Education Association for Men Proceedings, 1962, 66, 91-98.
- Hedlund, R. D. Psychological predispositions: Political representatives and the public. American Journal of Political Science, 1973, 17, 489-505.
- Hedlund, R. D. Perceptions of decisional referents in legislative decision making. American Journal of Political Science, 1975, 19, 527-542.
- Hedlund, R. D., & Friesman, H. P. Representatives' perceptions of constituency opinion. Journal of Politics, 1972, 34, 730-752.
- Hoover, F. L. A history of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958.
- Hunt, V. Governance of women's intercollegiate athletics: An historical perspective. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976.
- Hutcheon, P. D. Value theory: Toward conceptual clarification. British Journal of Sociology, 1972, 23, 172-187.
- International Studies of Values in Politics. Values and the active community. New York: The Free Press, 1971.
- Jackson, J. E. Constituencies and leaders in Congress. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

- Jewell, M. E., & Patterson, S. C. The legislative process in the United States. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Jones, B. D. Competitiveness, role orientations, and legislative responsiveness. Journal of Politics, 1973, 35, 924-947.
- Joyce, E. P. Or "no need"? The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 20, 1976, p. 24.
- Kassouf, S. Normative decision making. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Keating, J. Sport or athletics: A conceptual analysis. In J. A. Murray (Ed.), Sports or athletics: A North American dilemma. Windsor, Ontario: Canadian-American Seminar, 1974.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of behavioral research (2nd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kessel, J. H. The Washington congressional delegation. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 1964, 8, 1-21.
- Kingdon, J. W. Congressmen's voting decisions. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Kluckhohn, C. Values and value-orientations in the theory of action: An exploration in definition and classification. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), Toward a general theory of action. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Kritzer, H. M. An introduction to multivariate contingency table analysis. American Journal of Political Science, 1978, 22, 187-213.
- Kushner, H. W., & Urken, A. B. Measuring power in voting bodies. Public Choice, 1973, 15, 77-85.
- Laird, J. The idea of value. New York: Augustus M. Kelley, 1969.
- Land, C. B. A history of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1977.
- LeBlanc, H. L. Voting in state senates: Party and constituency influences. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 1969, 13, 33-57.
- Lerner, A. W. The politics of decision making. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Levy, A. B., & Stoudinger, S. Sources of voting cues for the congressional black caucus. Journal of Black Studies, 1976, 7, 29-45.

- Lewis, C. I. Values and imperatives. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1969.
- Lewis, G. Theodore Roosevelt and the founding of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. National College Physical Education Association for Men Proceedings, 1965, 69, 30-34.
- Lewis, G. Enterprise on the campus: Developments in intercollegiate sport and higher education, 1875-1939. In B. L. Bennett (Ed.), Proceedings of the Big Ten Symposium on the History of Physical Education and Sport. Chicago: The Athletic Institute, 1972.
- Lunsford, T. F. Authority and ideology in the administered university. American Behavioral Scientist, 1968, 11, 5-14.
- Lyman, R. W. Need. . . . The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 20, 1976, p. 24.
- MacRae, D., Jr. Roll call votes and leadership. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1956, 20, 543-558.
- March, J. G., & Simon, H. A. Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Marco, S. M. The place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1960, 31, 422-427.
- Margolis, J. Values and conduct. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Markus, G. B. Electoral coalitions and senate roll call behavior: An ecological analysis. American Journal of Political Science, 1974, 18, 595-607.
- Matthews, D. R. U. S. Senators and their world. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- McMurtry, J. Sport or athletics: A conceptual analysis. In J. A. Murray (Ed.), Sports or athletics: A North American dilemma. Windsor, Ontario: Canadian-American Seminar, 1974.
- Miller, W. E., & Stokes, D. E. Constituency influence in Congress. In R. L. Peabody & N. W. Polsby (Eds.), New perspectives on the House of Representatives (2nd. ed.). Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Morris, B. B. Cross-validation of the Gordon SIV. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1968, 27, 44-46.
- Mould, M. W. A history of the National Junior College Athletic Association (1937 through March, 1969). Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Springfield College, 1970.

- Munford, J. K. The rise of faculty committees. College and University, 1960, 36, 43-56.
- Murakami, Y. Logic and social choice. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1968.
- Najder, Z. Values and evaluations. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Niemi, R. G., & Weisberg, H. F. (Eds.). Controversies in American voting behavior. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1976.
- Olson, M., Jr. The logic of collective action. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Pattanaik, P. K. Voting and collective choice. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1971.
- Pennock, J. R. Political representation: An overview. In J. R. Pennock & J. W. Chapman (Eds.), Representation. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.
- Pitkin, H. Commentary: The paradox of representation. In J. R. Pennock & J. W. Chapman (Eds.), Representation. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.
- Plant, M. L. The place of intercollegiate athletics in higher education: Faculty control. Journal of Higher Education, 1961, 32, 1-8.
- Porter, L. W., Lawlwer, E. E., III, & Hackman, J. R. Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Powell, J. T. The development and influence of faculty representation in the control of intercollegiate sport within the intercollegiate conference of faculty representatives from its inception in January, 1895 to July, 1963. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, 1964.
- Reynolds, H. T. The analysis of cross-classifications. New York: The Free Press, 1977. (a)
- Reynolds, H. T. Analysis of nominal data. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977. (b)
- Riker, W. H., & Ordeshook, P. C. An introduction to positive political theory. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Rodding, W. Aggregation of individual preferences by voting. Theory and Decision, 1975, 6, 231-235.

- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.
- Roscoe, J. T. Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences (2nd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1975.
- Savage, H. J. American college athletics. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929.
- Scheibe, K. E. Beliefs and values. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.
- Searing, D. D. Measuring politicians' values: Administration and assessment of a ranking technique in the British House of Commons. American Political Science Review, 1978, 72, 65-79.
- Segal, D. R., & Smith, T. S. Congressional responsibility and the organization of constituency attitudes. In D. D. Nimmo & C. M. Bonjean (Eds.), Political attitudes and public opinion. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1973.
- Sen, A. K. Preference, votes and the transitivity of majority decisions. Review of Economic Studies, 1964, 31, 163-165.
- Sengupta, M. On a concept of representative democracy. Theory and Decision, 1974, 5, 249-262.
- Shea, E. J., & Wieman, E. E. Administrative policies for intercollegiate athletics. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Simon, H. A. Administrative behavior (3rd. ed.). New York: The Free Press, 1976.
- Smith, R. E. Analysis of the role behavior and role expectation of faculty athletic committees and faculty athletic representatives in National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic colleges and universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.
- Soule, J. W. Future political ambitions and the behavior of incumbent state legislators. Midwest Journal of Political Science, 1969, 13, 439-454.
- Stagg, P. The history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1946.
- Stimson, J. A. Five propositions about congressional decision making: An examination of behavioral inferences from computer simulation. Political Methodology, 1975, 2, 415-436.

- Uslaner, E. M., & Weber, R. E. Patterns of decision making in state legislatures. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.
- Van Dalen, D. B., & Bennett, B. L. A world history of physical education (2nd. ed.). Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Vander Zwaag, H. Toward a philosophy of sport. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1972.
- Vernon, P. E., & Allport, G. W. A test for personal values. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1931, 26, 231-248.
- Wahlke, J. C., Eulau, H., Buchanan, W., & Ferguson, L. C. The legislative system: Explorations in legislative behavior. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962.
- Weber, M. From Max Weber: Essays in sociology. (H. H. Gerth & C. W. Mills, Eds. and trans.). New York: Oxford University Press, 1946.
- Weisberg, H. F. Evaluating theories of congressional roll-call voting. American Journal of Political Science, 1978, 22, 554-577.
- Weiss, P. Sport: A philosophic inquiry. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois Press, 1969.
- Weston, A. The making of American physical education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.
- Wolters, M. Models of roll-call behavior. Political Methodology, 1978, 5, 7-55.
- Zeigler, E. F. Personalizing physical education and sport philosophy. Champaign, Ill.: Stipes Publishing Company, 1975.
- Zeigler, E. F. Physical education and sport philosophy. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

**APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A**

**Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale**



INSTITUTIONAL GOALS FOR ATHLETICS SCALE

DIRECTIONS: The following columns are described by phrases which may be used in an institution's statement of goals or philosophy for its athletic program. After reading an institution's statement, check those phrases which you are able to discern. Upon completion, using this scale as a guide, classify the institution as either a 1 (low intensity), 2, 3, or 4 (high intensity). Where your overall impression differs from your tally, comment on your rationale.

Identification No. \_\_\_\_\_  
Order in review \_\_\_\_\_

Low		INTENSITY		High		COMMENTS
1	2	3	4			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School is not a member of a conference	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Athletic program personnel recruit students with demonstrated athletic ability to the school within strict institutional limits	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 10,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 20,000			<p>OVERALL CLASSIFICATION OF PROGRAM (circle one)</p> <p>1 2 3 4</p> <p>Rationale:</p>
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations less than 2,000	Athletic programs exist for the overall development of the individual	School is a member of a conference similar to the Ivy League	School is a member of a conference similar to the Big 10 or Atlantic Coast Conference			
Athletic program personnel recruit students to the school informally based on their athletic ability	Athletic participants are described as amateurs	School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 5,000	Athletic program personnel recruit students with demonstrated athletic ability to the school through a highly organized, expensive, geographically wide-reaching effort			
Athletes receive neither scholarships nor awards based on their athletic ability	Athletic participation is valued because of the opportunities for experiencing the satisfaction of achievement	School is a member of the NCAA	Athletes receive grants-in-aid based on their athletic ability			
Athletic programs exist for the overall development of the individual	Athletic participation is valued because it requires discipline	Athletic program personnel recruit students with demonstrated athletic ability to the school within strict institutional limits	In describing the athletic program the school emphasizes the number of championships earned			
Athletic participants are described as amateurs	Athletic participation is regarded as educationally beneficial	Athletes receive scholarships based on their athletic ability	In describing the athletic program there is reference to sports as entertainment			
Athletic participation is valued because of the simple joy found in competition	Athletic participation is valued because of its development of physical fitness for the participants	In describing the athletic program there is reference to the frequency of victory	In describing the athletic program the school emphasizes the frequency of victory			
Athletic participation is valued because of its development of social skills for the participant	Athletic participation is valued because of the pursuit of excellence in playing a particular sport	In describing the athletic program there is reference to the size and quality of facilities	In describing the athletic program there is reference to the size and quality of facilities			
Athletic participation is valued because of the opportunity it offers for social interactions for the participant		Athletic participation is valued because it requires discipline	Athletic programs exist for the development of school prestige			
Athletic participation is valued because of the opportunities for experiencing the satisfaction of achievement		Athletic participation is valued because of the pursuit of excellence in playing a particular sport	Athletic programs exist for the development of alumni identification			
Athletic participation is regarded as educationally beneficial		Athletic participation is valued because it requires sacrifice	Athletic participants are described as professionals			
Athletic participation is valued because of its development of physical fitness for the participants						
Athletic participation is valued because of the pursuit of excellence in playing a particular sport						

## Preliminary List of Descriptors

### INSTITUTIONAL GOALS FOR ATHLETICS SCALE

<b>DIRECTIONS</b> Place a check in each column on the right in which you think the descriptor below is applicable. One, two, three, four, or no columns may be checked for each descriptor.	INTENSITY			
	Low $\rightarrow$			High
DESCRIPTOR	1	2	3	4
<b>School related</b>				
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 20,000				
School is a member of the National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA)				
School is a member of a conference similar to the Big 10 or Atlantic Coast conference				
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 10,000				
School is not a member of a conference				
School is a member of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW)				
School is a member of a conference similar to the Ivy League				
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 5,000				
School is a member of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)				
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations over 2,000				
School is a member of a conference with schools of populations less than 2,000				
<b>Program related</b>				
Athletic program personnel recruit students to the school informally, based on their athletics ability				
Athletic program personnel recruit students with demonstrated athletic ability to the school within strict institutional limits				
Athletic program personnel recruit students with demonstrated athletic ability to the school through a highly organized, expensive, geographically wide-reaching effort				
Athletic program personnel recruit students to the school as part of an overall school recruitment program				
Athletes receive scholarships based on their athletic ability				
Athletes receive talent awards based on their athletic ability				
Athletes receive grants-in-aid based on their athletic ability				
Athletes receive neither scholarships nor awards based on their athletic ability				
In describing the athletic program there is reference to sports as entertainment				
In describing the athletic program the school emphasizes the number of championships earned				
In describing the athletic program the school emphasizes the frequency of victory				
In describing the athletic program there is reference to the size and quality of facilities				
Athletic programs exist for the development of school prestige				
Athletic programs exist for the development of alumni identification				
Athletic programs exist for the overall development of the individual				

IGAS (Concluded)

DESCRIPTOR	INTENSITY			
	Low →			High
	1	2	3	4
Participant related				
Athletic participants are described as professionals				
Athletic participants are described as amateurs				
Athletic participation is valued because of the simple joy found in competition				
Athletic participation is valued because of its development of social skills for the participant				
Athletic participation is valued because of the opportunity it offers for social interactions for the participant				
Athletic participation is valued because of the opportunities for experiencing the satisfaction of achievement				
Athletic participation is valued because it requires discipline				
Athletic participation is regarded as educationally beneficial				
Athletic participation is valued because it is work				
Athletic participation is valued because of its development of physical fitness for the participants				
Athletic participation is valued because of the pursuit of excellence in playing a particular sport				
Athletic participation is valued because it requires sacrifice				

**APPENDIX B**

**Letter to Athletic Committee of the  
University of North Carolina at  
Greensboro**

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
January 24, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in serving as a preliminary reviewer of an instrument I plan to use as a part of my dissertation research here at UNCG. Your experience as a member of the university's faculty committee on intercollegiate athletics and your subsequent perspective of the nature of athletic programs is essential. This is why I request your help.

The purpose of my research is to seek an understanding of voting behavior in sport governing bodies. An institution's goals or philosophy of athletics may have a bearing on how that institution's representative votes. My eventual need is to have each institution in the study categorized as to the intensity of its program as discerned from its statement of goals for athletics by a panel of experts in physical education. The Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale (IGAS), once developed, will serve as a guide for these experts. It is in the development of this scale that I seek your help.

As it stands now, the IGAS is but a list of descriptors. Your participation would involve completing the IGAS by checking all of the columns in which you think each descriptor is applicable. (Please note: you may think a descriptor does not apply to any of the columns. In that case, you would leave that line blank.) The columns are labeled "1," "2," "3," and "4" on a continuum of program intensity from low to high. Thus, if you think a descriptor is only applicable for high intensity athletic programs, you would check only column "4." Your responses, when completed, will then be used to illustrate the nature of programs which may fall in any of the four columns.

The IGAS is enclosed because, should you agree to participate, it best serves my interest of time. I would appreciate your response with the completed IGAS on or about January 31st in the envelope I have enclosed for your convenience. I assure you that all information you provide will be analyzed anonymously. I welcome any questions and/or suggestions you may have. Please feel free to comment on the second page of the scale. Upon your request I will be most happy to share my results with you as soon as it is possible to do so.

Regardless of your decision, I appreciate the time you have taken to consider my request. In anticipation of your willingness to serve as a reviewer I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves

**APPENDIX C****Mailing to Panel of Judges**

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
February 22, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in serving as a member of a panel of five judges as part of a study which I am conducting for my dissertation here at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Your experience with a sport governing body is most important in the classification of sport governance issues which is an integral part of my study. This is why I request your help.

The purpose of my research is to explore possible relationships among variables so as to better understand decision making in sport governing bodies. In no way is this an attempt to evaluate decisions which have been or which will be made.

Participation as a judge requires the classification of thirty-two motions made in the AIAW Executive Board meetings since January 1975. This classification requires your opinion as to whether a "yes" vote, that is a vote in favor of the motion as stated, was Conservative or Liberal. For the purpose of the study I have operationally defined those two terms as follows:

Conservative: a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e., major college sports programs; and

Liberal: a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

I ask that you keep my operational definitions in mind as you classify each motion. The Judges' Issue Classification Form has been enclosed. Your opinion should be given irrespective of any subsequent Delegate Assembly action where applicable. The ultimate classification of each motion will be determined by the majority of the judges' opinions.

The information you provide will be analyzed without reference to you individually. Your general assistance will be credited in my acknowledgments in the research report. I will be most happy to share my results with you as soon as it is possible for me to do so. Should you agree to serve as a judge, please complete the form and return to me in the envelope enclosed by March 15. Should you choose not to serve as a judge I ask that you return all materials to me by that same date.

Page 2 of 2

Regardless of your decision I appreciate the time you have taken to consider my request. In anticipation of your willingness to serve as a judge, I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*  
Ellen C. Greaves



## GREAVES' STUDY ON SPORT GOVERNANCE

## Judges' Issue Classification Form

Directions: Place a check in the appropriate column according to your opinion as to whether a "yes" vote, that is a vote in favor of the motion as stated, is conservative or liberal. Please be mindful of the following definitions as you categorize:

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
1975	11	That a transfer student be required to continue normal progress toward graduation between seasons.		
1975	12	That the previous motion [that the first issue date of the letter of intent may not be prior to April 1] be amended to read "That the first issue date of the letter of intent may not be prior to March 15."		
1975	13	That all letters of intent be signed by June 15.		
1975	14	That a student be required to complete her four years of eligibility within five years of undergraduate academic work.		
1975	15	That AIAW co-sponsor a field hockey tournament with USFHA in 1975 provided that individuals or AIAW member institutions not be required to join USFHA.		
1975	16	That the Executive Board may impose the following disciplinary measures, either individually, or in combination form upon any region, committee or other substructure of AIAW depending upon the severity of the infraction: 1. Reprimand and censure (the region or committee), 2. Regional disqualification from National Championships, 3. Monetary fine, 4. Loss of membership on the Executive Board (region) or AIAW or NAGWS Committees, 5. Permanent loss of membership on the Executive Board (region) or AIAW or NAGWS Committees. An appeal process should be established.		
1975	20	That a 1976-1977 Field Hockey Intercollegiate Championship be jointly sponsored by AIAW and USFHA; further, that institutions may enter the championship through membership in either AIAW or USFHA.		
1975	21	That the Executive Board formulate a report to be distributed to the membership for this year's [1976] Delegate Assembly to include the Executive Board position on each of four specific concepts of restructuring. This motion is to be reflected as a formal Board action and debate on each of the four concepts shall be limited to ten minutes.		
1975	22	National Championships should be offered on a divisional basis where interest and level of sport development warrant. For the experimental period the three divisions should be: 1. JC/CC (non-baccalaureate degree granting institutions) 2. Division I--High intensity programs--four-year institutions 3. Division II--Low intensity programs--four-year institutions All four-year member institutions would self-determine their placement in Division I or II. Each sport committee in its respective sport, has veto power over the choice of division of any institution.		

## Issue Classification Form 2

Conservative (column G): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOPE	
			G	L
1975	19	That AIAW continue to adopt and endorse regulations rather than guidelines for the control of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level.		
1975	23	That priority for utilizing \$900 or any portion thereof in unbudgeted income of AIAW for 1975-76 be given to the Affiliated Board of Officials for expenses incurred by the National Rating Team (NRT).		
1975	24	That if the dues for the 1976-77 school year remain at \$500.00, a hardship allowance should be made whereby, upon showing proof of hardship, an institution could join for \$250.00.		
1976	27	That the Executive Committee and staff of AIAW be directed to study and implement by September 1, 1976, an effective staffing pattern which would separate staff assignments from overlap with NAGWS.		
1976	26	That a committee be appointed to examine and prepare for the membership the pros and cons of having a permanent site for the National Championship.		
1976	31	That there be the addition of Student Representative-elect position to the Executive Board in an official but non-voting capacity.		
1976	32	That payment of the "future" meet director's expenses be part of the Championship expenses and be included in the National Championship budget.		
1976	38	That AIAW change its divisional structure to incorporate a division for small 4-year institutions with fewer than 800 undergraduate women students. This division will not participate in National Championships but may participate in Regional non-qualifying events.		
1976	39	That the expenses of the technical expert on AIAW sport committees be paid by AIAW to attend the national championship.		
1976	40	That an institution must file a statement reflecting the precise institutional standard for normal progress. The statement of normal progress must be verified by the registrar's office.		
1976	41	That eligibility requirements of student athletes must be verified by the registrar's office.		
1976	45	That the following recommendation be approved: C. Policy regarding television receipts derived from televising of games, matches or events between AIAW member institutions other than national championships and special events 1. AIAW shall be the exclusive agent for all non-local television coverage and shall be entitled to 10% of television receipts from these events. 2. 60% of the first \$10,000 of gross revenue from an event and 40% of the gross revenue over \$10,000 shall be divided between member schools participating in the televised event; and (motion continued)		

## Issue Classification Form 3

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
		3. all monies remaining after the payments specified in 1 and 2 above shall be accumulated in the Reserve Fund according to the stipulations defined in the policy approved by the 1976 Delegate Assembly.		
1977	53	As of the 1978-79 membership year, all members of state and/or regional AIAW organizations shall be members of AIAW, provided that new members of state and regional AIAW organizations shall be permitted to hold membership in such associations for a period of two years without becoming members of AIAW.		
1977	54	That AIAW thank Mr. Sugarman for his effort on AIAW's behalf and accept the contracted guarantee of \$25,000 for the second year of the two-year contract.		
1977	55	That the AIAW Executive Board approve the request of the AIAW Track and Field Committee to name to the AIAW All-Collegiate Team each competitor that places in the top three (3) places at the AIAW Track and Field Championship.		
1977	56	That the Executive Board approve the deletion of the phrase "student-athlete" in the Student Nomination and Operating Procedures and insert "student who is directly involved with the women's intercollegiate athletic program."		
1977	59	That the AIAW Executive Board approve the following financial arrangements for a one-year trial period (1977-78) for the sport of large College Basketball: AIAW shall receive 50% of the profit from each of the four satellite championships and 50% of the profit from the final round of the Championship. The amount budgeted as projected income from the National large College Basketball Championship in the amount of \$10,000 shall be subtracted from the total profit received. The remaining profit, if any, shall be shared among the four teams proceeding to the final round of the Championship to offset one-half of their expenses or portion thereof as allowable from profit remaining. If the remaining profit exceeds that required to offset one-half of the team's expenses, that money shall remain with the AIAW in a contingency fund to be used to serve the total membership of AIAW.		
1977	60	That special financial aid awards to student-athletes by a particular organization or sport group may be awarded for one year as long as the organization or group making the award is not associated with the institution where the athlete plans to compete. The award would still have to be given through the financial aid office and would count on the total number of athletes on-aid in a sport, but renewal would not be essential.		

## Issue Classification Form 4

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
1977	61	That a professional athlete who wishes to be restored to amateur status must be enrolled in an institution as a full time undergraduate student before a player's appeal may be filed. If amateur status is restored after the student-athlete has been a professional under AIAW rules, she may not receive financial aid based on athletic ability until after she has completed one year of "normal progress" at the enrolled institution.		
1977	62	That due to a decrease in junior/community college membership and therefore a lack of need to offer a program for the junior/community colleges AIAW discontinue the separate junior/community college active membership category.		
1977	66	That an institution be allowed to release an athlete on athletic aid based on talent. Notification of non-renewal due by March 7th or on completion of that sports season.		
1977	67	That collegiate athletic personnel may attend a scheduled athletic event to assess talent of high school athletes, but she/he may not talk to athletes or any member of their family. Face-to-face conversations with prospective student-athletes are permissible on the institution's campus.		
1977	68	That the following resolution be sent to the 1978 Delegate Assembly for approval: Whereas, AIAW conducts twenty championships in twelve different sports for junior/community colleges, small colleges, and large colleges, and Whereas, the 1977-78 sites for the national championships have been scheduled and this prior commitment must be honored, but the Association is free to introduce questions and principles into future commitments, Be it resolved that sites for national championships after 1977-78 be scheduled within states having ratified the Equal Rights Amendment, and further, Be it resolved that AIAW urge other organizations to support this principle in the scheduling of national athletic events.		

APPENDIX D

Mailing to Panel of Experts

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
February 22, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in serving as a member of a panel of three experts on the nature of intercollegiate sport as a part of my dissertation research here at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Your demonstrated expertise with regard to the present nature of intercollegiate athletic programs throughout the United States is crucial to an aspect of my study. This is why I request your help.

The purpose of my research is to explore possible relationships among variables so as to better understand decision making in sport governing bodies. A critical aspect of my study concerns the categorization of the athletic programs involved on a four point continuum of intensity according to the public statement of goals for athletics for each institution. Participation as an expert would require the classification of between fifty and sixty such statements of institutional goals for athletics. This would be done without your knowledge of the schools. Each institution would be classified individually. The information you would provide would be analyzed without reference to you individually. Your general assistance will be credited in my acknowledgments in the research report.

To assist you in the classification responsibility I have created the Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale (IGAS). The form I have enclosed is the result of responses by the UNCG Athletic Committee to a list of descriptors which I asked them to place in any or none of the four columns to which it applied along a continuum of intensity from low to high. The descriptors are now grouped so as to provide a picture of the program typified in each of the four points on the continuum. Using the IGAS as a guide, I am asking you to classify each program in terms of intensity as either a 1 (low intensity), 2, 3, or 4 (high intensity) type program. Where your opinion differs from the tally depicted on the IGAS I request that you share your rationale with me.

Finally, should you agree to serve as an expert, I anticipate the mailing of these statements to you on or about March 20 and I request the return of your classifications on or about April 7. All mailing costs, of course, will be borne by me. I will be most happy to share my findings with you as soon as it is possible for me to do so.

Page 2 of 2

I have enclosed a postcard for your use in responding to my request. Any questions you might have I will gladly answer. Regardless of your decision I appreciate the time you have taken to consider my request. In anticipation of your willingness to serve as an expert, I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
March 27, 1978

Dear Expert,

Thank you very much for your willingness to serve as an expert on the nature of intercollegiate sport for my dissertation research. I must apologize for the delay in my follow-up, a delay compounded by the AAHPER Convention and a mechanical problem complicating the reproduction of catalogue descriptions of athletic programs necessary for your review.

Once again, I am requesting your expertise in the classification of forty-one statements of institutional goals or catalogue descriptions for athletics. Each institution is to be classified individually on the Institutional Goals for Athletics Scale (IGAS) attached to each statement. I am asking you to classify each program in terms of intensity as either a 1 (low intensity), 2, 3, or 4 (high intensity) type program. Where your opinion differs from the tally depicted on the IGAS, I request that you share your rationale with me.

The order in which you are to read these statements has been determined randomly. To avoid any confusion in this regard, the order of review is indicated in the upper right hand corner of each IGAS, with the statement or description of the program stapled to it. I apologize for any awkwardness this may cause!

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me collect at 919-275-3792 or use the postcard I have enclosed for your convenience. Please note, I also request your general reaction to the process on a separate sheet provided. Finally, please return these materials to me on or about April 20 in the envelope provided.

I appreciate greatly your time and energies on my behalf. A copy of the results will be mailed to you as soon as it is possible for me to do so.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves



**APPENDIX E**  
**Mailing to Subjects**

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
February, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this mailing is to request your cooperation as a subject in research I am conducting for my dissertation. You are being invited to participate because you have served as a member of an executive board of a sport governing body.

Data you provide will be analyzed without reference to you individually, your school, or the organization. As the purpose of the study is to explore possible relationships among variables so as to better understand decision making in sport governing bodies no attempt will be made to use this data to evaluate past or future decisions.

Participation in this study requires the

1. Signing of the subject consent form,
2. Completion of the Gordon Survey of Interpersonal Values, and the
3. Return of both to me in the postage paid envelope enclosed in this mailing by March 6, 1978.

The entire procedure should take no more than twenty minutes of your time. Upon your request I will be most happy to share with you my results as soon as it is possible for me to do so. Should you decide not to participate, please return the materials enclosed to me by March 6.

Regardless of your decision, I appreciate the time you have taken to consider my request. In anticipation of your favorable response, I am most grateful for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves

Margaret A. Mordy, Advisor

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM<sup>1</sup>

## Greaves' Study on Sport Governance

1. I understand that the purpose of this study is to learn more about sport governance.
2. I confirm that my participation as a subject is entirely voluntary. No coercion of any kind has been used to obtain my cooperation.
3. I understand that I may withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time during the investigation.
4. I have been informed of the procedures that will be used in the study and understand what will be required of me as a subject.
5. I understand that all of my responses, written or oral, will remain completely anonymous.
6. I understand that my responses will be used in research by the investigator in the completion of her dissertation and publication(s) subsequently based on it, and that the results will be made available to me upon my request at the investigator's earliest convenience.
7. I wish to give my cooperation as a subject.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ I request that results of this study be shared with me at the investigator's earliest convenience.

<sup>1</sup> Based on the format suggested in Locke and Spirduso, Proposals that work. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1976.

1620 W. Meadowview Road  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
February, 1979

Dear

Last year at this time you agreed to participate in research on sport governance for my dissertation here at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I have recently completed the draft of my report and am now able to share with you the results of my research.

Enclosed is your copy of an abstract which has been prepared for your information. As you can see, you provided information for one of three variables used to study personal values, institutional goals and voting behavior. My information to you in my previous mailing(s) was intentionally brief to ensure your naivety in the completion of your part.

AIAW is unique in that it reports how each Board member votes on each issue. This was why AIAW was the focus of my study. Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values was used because of its short time requirement for completion and its relatively recent revision. Your school's statement of athletic philosophy was analyzed according to an instrument developed for the purpose of this study which depicted by a list of descriptors programs of varying intensity. The issues from the AIAW minutes were categorized by five judges who were very familiar with AIAW.

As you are well aware, I am sure, human behavior research places the investigator at the mercy of her subjects and I am very grateful for such a reliable group on which to be dependent for data. I trust the enclosed answers many of your questions. More detailed reports will be submitted for publication upon the successful defense of my dissertation. I will, of course, be most happy to answer any questions you may have and/or to receive your comments.

Once again, thank you so very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves

GREAVES, ELLEN C. Personal Values, Institutional Goals and Voting on Sport Governance Issues. (1979)  
Directed by: Dr. Margaret A. Mordy. Pp. 128.

The purpose of the study was to investigate personal values, institutional goals for athletics, and voting behavior of members of the AIAW Executive Board on issues concerning the governance of athletics in the years 1975 through 1977. A total of 47 women who had served on the AIAW Executive Board completed Gordon's Survey of Interpersonal Values (SIV). The scales measured: Support, Conformity, Recognition, Independence, Benevolence, and Leadership. Subjects were assigned the status of High or Low on each of the six SIV factors; they were designated to be Conservative or Liberal in their voting behavior; and they were associated according to their institutions' goals for athletics as Conservative or Liberal.

Data were organized in crossbreak tables for analysis. Fisher's exact probability test and Chi Square were used to accept or reject each null hypothesis. The following results were obtained:

1. There was no significant difference in voting behavior between subjects with Conservative and Liberal goals.

2. Of the six SIV factors, only Recognition was related to voting behavior. High Recognition subjects tended to vote liberally and Low Recognition subjects tended to vote conservatively.

3. There was no difference among groups of subjects being similarly categorized on personal values and goals.

4. Members of the Board voted conservatively on 18 issues and liberally on 14. There was no pattern on a year to year basis.

5. In 1976 and 1977, when the Board was comprised of a majority of liberally voting members, the majority voted liberally.

6. There was no pattern between institutional goals and voting behavior nor personal value systems and voting behavior on a year to year or aggregate basis.

It was concluded that, with the exception of the SIV Recognition factor, voting behavior was not related to institutional goals nor personal value systems. The findings of the study did not support the expectation that faculty representatives to AIAW vote according to their personal value hierarchy and congruently with the goals of the institutions they represent. Continued study of sport governance from a sociopolitical perspective was deemed necessary.

**APPENDIX F**

**Letter to Schools Requesting Statement of  
Philosophy or Goals for Athletics**

620 Joyner Street  
Greensboro, NC 27403  
February 1, 1978

Dear

The purpose of this letter is to request your cooperation in providing information with regard to your institution's athletic program for use in my dissertation research here at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The information I seek is a copy of your institution's statement of goals and/or philosophy for its athletic program.

The purpose of my research is to seek an understanding of decision making with regard to sport governance. In no way is this an attempt to evaluate decisions which have been or which will be made, nor is this an attempt to evaluate your program in any way. The information you will provide will be analyzed without reference to you individually or to your school.

I have enclosed a postage paid envelope by which you may respond to my request at your earliest convenience. Upon your written request I will be most happy to share my results with you as soon as it is possible to do so.

In anticipation of your cooperation, I am most grateful for your time and energies in my behalf.

Sincerely yours,

*Ellen C. Greaves*

Ellen C. Greaves



**APPENDIX G**

**Classification of Issues by Judges**

## GREAVES' STUDY ON SPORT GOVERNANCE

## Judges' Issue Classification Form

Directions: Place a check in the appropriate column according to your opinion as to whether a "yes" vote, that is a vote in favor of the motion as stated, is conservative or liberal. Please be mindful of the following definitions as you categorize:

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"Yes" VOTE	
			C	L
1975	11	That a transfer student be required to continue normal progress toward graduation between seasons.	X <sup>1</sup>	
1975	12	That the previous motion [that the first issue date of the letter of intent may not be prior to April 1] be amended to read "That the first issue date of the letter of intent may not be prior to March 15."	X	
1975	13	That all letters of intent be signed by June 15.	X	
1975	14	That a student be required to complete her four years of eligibility within five years of undergraduate academic work.	X	
1975	15	That AIAW co-sponsor a field hockey tournament with USFHA in 1975 provided that individuals or AIAW member institutions not be required to join USFHA.		X
1975	16	That the Executive Board may impose the following disciplinary measures, either individually, or in combination form upon any region, committee or other substructure of AIAW depending upon the severity of the infraction: 1. Reprimand and censure (the region or committee), 2. Regional disqualification from National Championships, 3. Monetary fine, 4. Loss of membership on the Executive Board (region) or AIAW or NAGWS Committees, 5. Permanent loss of membership on the Executive Board (region) or AIAW or NAGWS Committees. An appeal process should be established.	X	
1975	20	That a 1976-1977 Field Hockey Intercollegiate Championship be jointly sponsored by AIAW and USFHA; further, that institutions may enter the championship through membership in either AIAW or USFHA.		X
1975	21	That the Executive Board formulate a report to be distributed to the membership for this year's [1976] Delegate Assembly to include the Executive Board position on each of four specific concepts of re-structuring. This motion is to be reflected as a formal Board action and debate on each of the four concepts shall be limited to ten minutes.	X	
1975	22	National Championships should be offered on a divisional basis where interest and level of sport development warrant. For the experimental period the three divisions should be: 1. JC/CC (non-baccalaureate degree granting institutions) 2. Division I--High intensity programs--four-year institutions 3. Division II--Low intensity programs--four-year institutions All four-year member institutions would self-determine their placement in Division I or II. Each sport committee in its respective sport, has veto power over the choice of division of any institution.	X	

<sup>1</sup> Denotes classification of issue by judges

## Issue Classification Form 2

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
1975	19	That AIAW continue to adopt and endorse regulations rather than guidelines for the control of women's intercollegiate athletics at the national level.	X	
1975	23	That priority for utilizing \$900 or any portion thereof in unbudgeted income of AIAW for 1975-76 be given to the Affiliated Board of Officials for expenses incurred by the National Rating Team (NRT).		X
1975	24	That if the dues for the 1976-77 school year remain at \$500.00, a hardship allowance should be made whereby, upon showing proof of hardship, an institution could join for \$250.00.		X
1976	27	That the Executive Committee and staff of AIAW be directed to study and implement by September 1, 1976, an effective staffing pattern which would separate staff assignments from overlap with NAGWS.	X	
1976	26	That a committee be appointed to examine and prepare for the membership the pros and cons of having a permanent site for the National Championship.		X
1976	31	That there be the addition of Student Representative-elect position to the Executive Board in an official but non-voting capacity.		X
1976	32	That payment of the "future" meet director's expenses be part of the Championship expenses and be included in the National Championship budget.	X	
1976	38	That AIAW change its divisional structure to incorporate a division for small 4-year institutions with fewer than 800 undergraduate women students. This division will not participate in National Championships but may participate in Regional non-qualifying events.		X
1976	39	That the expenses of the technical expert on AIAW sport committees be paid by AIAW to attend the national championship.	X	
1976	40	That an institution must file a statement reflecting the precise institutional standard for normal progress. The statement of normal progress must be verified by the registrar's office.	X	
1976	41	That eligibility requirements of student athletes must be verified by the registrar's office.	X	
1976	45	That the following recommendation be approved: C. Policy regarding television receipts derived from televising of games, matches or events between AIAW member institutions other than national championships and special events 1. AIAW shall be the exclusive agent for all non-local television coverage and shall be entitled to 10% of television receipts from these events. 2. 60% of the first \$10,000 of gross revenue from an event and 40% of the gross revenue over \$10,000 shall be divided between member schools participating in the televised event; and (motion continued)		

## Issue Classification Form 3

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and

Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
		J. all monies remaining after the payments specified in 1 and 2 above shall be accumulated in the Reserve Fund according to the stipulations defined in the policy approved by the 1976 Delegate Assembly.		X
1977	53	As of the 1978-79 membership year, all members of state and/or regional AIAW organizations shall be members of AIAW, provided that new members of state and regional AIAW organizations shall be permitted to hold membership in such associations for a period of two years without becoming members of AIAW.	X	
1977	54	That AIAW thank Mr. Sugarman for his effort on AIAW's behalf and accept the contracted guarantee of \$25,000 for the second year of the two-year contract.	X	
1977	55	That the AIAW Executive Board approve the request of the AIAW Track and Field Committee to name to the AIAW All-Collegiate Team each competitor that places in the top three (3) places at the AIAW Track and Field Championship.	X	
1977	56	That the Executive Board approve the deletion of the phrase "student-athlete" in the Student Nomination and Operating Procedures and insert "student who is directly involved with the women's intercollegiate athletic program."		X
1977	59	That the AIAW Executive Board approve the following financial arrangements for a one-year trial period (1977-78) for the sport of Large College Basketball: AIAW shall receive 50% of the profit from each of the four Satellite championships and 50% of the profit from the final round of the Championship. The amount budgeted as projected income from the National Large College Basketball Championship in the amount of \$10,000 shall be subtracted from the total profit received. The remaining profit, if any, shall be shared among the four teams proceeding to the final round of the Championship to offset one-half of their expenses or portion thereof as allowable from profit remaining. If the remaining profit exceeds that required to offset one-half of the teams' expenses, that money shall remain with the AIAW in a contingency fund to be used to serve the total membership of AIAW.		X
1977	60	That special financial aid awards to student-athletes by a particular organization or sport group may be awarded for one year as long as the organization or group making the award is not associated with the institution where the athlete plans to compete. The award would still have to be given through the financial aid office and would count on the total number of athletes on aid in a sport, but renewal would not be essential.		X

## Issue Classification Form 4

Conservative (column C): a vote which reflects the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media, i.e. major college sports programs; and  
Liberal (column L): a vote which reflects a deviance from the nature of intercollegiate athletics as presently depicted in national sports media.

YEAR	NO.	MOTION	"YES" VOTE	
			C	L
1977	61	That a professional athlete who wishes to be restored to amateur status must be enrolled in an institution as a full time undergraduate student before a player's appeal may be filed. If amateur status is restored after the student-athlete has been a professional under AIAW rules, she may not receive financial aid based on athletic ability until after she has completed one year of "normal progress" at the enrolled institution.		X
1977	62	That due to a decrease in junior/community college membership and therefore a lack of need to offer a program for the junior/community colleges AIAW discontinue the separate junior/community college active membership category.	X	
1977	66	That an institution be allowed to release an athlete on athletic aid based on talent. Notification of non-renewal due by March 7th or on completion of that sports season.		X
1977	67	That collegiate athletic personnel may attend a scheduled athletic event to assess talent of high school athletes, but she/he may not talk to athletes or any member of their family. Face-to-face conversations with prospective student-athletes are permissible on the institution's campus.		X
1977	68	That the following resolution be sent to the 1978 Delegate Assembly for approval: Whereas, AIAW conducts twenty championships in twelve different sports for junior/community colleges, small colleges, and large colleges, and Whereas, the 1977-78 sites for the national championships have been scheduled and this prior commitment must be honored, but the Association is free to introduce questions and principles into future commitments, Be it resolved that sites for national championships after 1977-78 be scheduled within states having ratified the Equal Rights Amendment, and further, Be it resolved that AIAW urge other organizations to support this principle in the scheduling of national athletic events.		X

APPENDIX H

Classification of Institutions by  
Panel of Experts

CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS BY  
PANEL OF EXPERTS

Key:

1 or 2-Conservative  
3 or 4-Liberal

Subject No.1	Classification by Expert			Overall Classification
	Expert 1	Expert 2	Expert 3	
01	1	2	2	Conservative
02	2	2	2	Conservative
04	3	3	4	Liberal
05	2	2	2	Conservative
08	3	3	4	Liberal
09	3	3	3	Liberal
10	1	1	1	Conservative
12	1	1	1	Conservative
13	1	1	2	Conservative
14	3	2	2	Nondescript
16	2	3	3	Nondescript
17	2	2	2	Conservative
18	3	2	3	Nondescript
19	2	2	1	Conservative
20	2	2	2	Conservative
22	4	3	2	Nondescript
23	2	2	1	Conservative
24	2	3	2	Nondescript
25	3	3	4	Liberal
27	1	2	2	Conservative
28	3	4	4	Liberal
29	3	3	4	Liberal
30	4	4	4	Liberal
31	2	2	2	Conservative
33	3	3	4	Liberal
34	3	3	4	Liberal
35	2	2	2	Conservative
36	1	1	2	Conservative
37	4	4	4	Liberal
38	2	2	2	Conservative
39	3	3	3	Liberal
40	2	2	1	Conservative
42	1	1	1	Conservative
44	2	2	2	Conservative
45	1	1	2	Conservative
46	4	3	4	Liberal
49	2	1	2	Conservative
50	2	2	1	Conservative

<sup>1</sup> Numbers missing in sequence represent those who did not return SIV.

<u>Subject No.</u>	<u>Classification by Expert</u>			<u>Overall Classification</u>
	<u>Expert 1</u>	<u>Expert 2</u>	<u>Expert 3</u>	
51	3	3	2	Nondescript
52	2	2	1	Conservative
53	2	2	2	Conservative
54	1	2	1	Conservative
55	2	2	1	Conservative
56	1	1	2	Conservative
57	2	2	2	Conservative
59	4	2	2	Nondescript
60	2	2	1	Conservative



APPENDIX I

RAW DATA

## RAW DATA

Key:

S = Support  
 C = Conformity  
 R = Recognition  
 I = Independence  
 B = Benevolence  
 L = Leadership  
 1 = Conservative  
 2 = Liberal  
 0 = Nondescript

<u>Subject No.</u>	<u>SIV Scores</u>						<u>Voting Behavior</u>	<u>Institutional Goals</u>
	<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>L</u>		
01	21	15	20	5	8	21	1	
02	11	21	5	23	23	5	1	
04	13	25	9	12	21	10	2	
05	18	10	10	14	17	21	1	
08	5	12	8	22	13	28	2	
09	16	15	14	10	16	17	2	
10	11	9	17	18	3	32	1	
12	7	14	3	27	15	24	1	
13	13	7	6	23	18	23	1	
14	22	11	12	9	13	23	0	
16	11	27	12	14	16	10	0	
17	7	13	8	18	15	29	1	
18	23	6	8	18	22	13	0	
19	6	13	13	18	12	28	1	
20	16	10	9	24	8	22	1	
22	16	23	5	23	15	8	0	
23	14	8	4	31	6	27	1	
24	15	27	13	11	19	5	0	
25	9	19	11	4	25	22	2	
27	21	11	15	11	13	19	1	
28	14	6	9	31	8	22	2	
29	25	11	13	21	10	10	2	
30	26	11	10	18	17	8	2	
31	12	29	5	11	21	12	1	
33	18	28	14	8	14	8	2	
34	20	25	7	22	9	7	2	
35	18	19	5	8	28	12	1	
36	18	4	15	16	20	17	1	
37	17	10	10	19	17	17	2	
38	14	4	3	27	22	20	1	
39	18	17	11	12	5	17	2	
40	20	15	11	23	9	12	1	
42	25	10	14	19	13	9	1	
44	22	15	9	10	26	8	1	
45	21	11	9	20	15	14	1	

<u>Subject No.</u>	SIV Scores						<u>Voting Behavior</u>	<u>Institutional Goals</u>
	<u>S</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>R</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>L</u>		
46	22	13	12	11	21	11	2	
49	6	19	11	12	11	21	1	
50	16	9	11	17	24	13	1	
51	18	5	12	20	13	22	0	
52	12	21	9	12	18	13	1	
53	22	6	13	23	11	15	1	
54	14	2	20	14	18	22	1	
55	10	16	11	21	19	13	1	
56	12	6	9	22	15	26	1	
57	19	6	11	22	11	21	1	
59	18	10	12	22	4	24	0	
60	11	7	8	15	16	23	1	