

VITA

Tonya L. Gimbert

EDUCATION

- 2013 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
Ph.D. in Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology
- 2009 Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana
M.S. in Recreation and Sport Management
- 2007 Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana
B.S. in Elementary Education

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- 2012-Present Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
Adjunct Instructor
- 2010-Present Indiana State University
NCAA Compliance Coordinator
- 2009-Present Indiana State University
Adjunct Instructor
- 2008-2010 Indiana State University
Compliance Intern
- 2007-2009 Indiana State University
Graduate Assistant

NCAA COMPLIANCE: AN EXAMINATION OF NCAA DIVISION I COMPLIANCE
OFFICERS' PERCEPTIONS ON THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS

A Dissertation

Presented to

The College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Indiana State University

Terre Haute, Indiana

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

Tonya L. Gimbert

December 2013

© Tonya L. Gimbert 2013

Keywords: athletics, compliance, curriculum, intercollegiate, NCAA

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Committee Co-Chair: Susan Kiger, Ph.D.

Professor of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology

Indiana State University

Committee Co-Chair: Thomas Sawyer, Ed.D.

Professor of Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport

Indiana State University

Committee Member: Jay Gatrell, Ph.D.

Dean of the College of Graduate and Professional Studies

Indiana State University

ABSTRACT

A review of the literature indicates an absence of studies about compliance officers working in higher education institutions belonging to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The current qualitative study explored the perceptions of compliance officers in the field of intercollegiate athletics at NCAA Division I institutions in regards to a need for a formalized compliance curriculum. Limited information is currently available about NCAA Division I compliance officers or their perceptions. One research study was conducted with the Pacific-10 conference compliance officers on morality and moral reasoning. In this study, semi-structured telephone interviews were conducted with a sample of nine participants from diverse backgrounds. The research was conducted and analyzed over an eight-month period. The primary themes that emerged from the study were (a) experiential learning, (b) hard and soft skills, (c) curricula, (d) image, (e) complexity, (f) interpersonal skills, (g) unnecessary certification, and (h) physical environment. Recommendations for future research included expanding the sample incorporating NCAA Division I conference compliance commissioners and developing a compliance curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Over the years I have received support and encouragement from a great number of individuals. To my dissertation committee, thank you for taking a chance on me. Thank you for time and countless emails of support and feedback. Dr. Kiger, thank you for sharing your wealth of qualitative research knowledge and various insights to this process. You have inspired me to continue conducting qualitative research. Dr. Gatrell, thank you for your prompt and direct feedback. Your guidance and encouragement over the years has inspired me to pursue bigger and better positions. Dr. Sawyer, thank you for you. You have been the driving force from day one. Words cannot explain your constant commitment to pushing me and seeing me succeed. You continue to inspire me each and every day to make a difference in the lives of students.

Over the past 28 years of my life, the support and continuous guidance from my parents has been tremendous. You have always pushed me to pursue my dreams and have supported me all along the way. Thank you for your countless words of encouragement and love.

Thank you to my mentor, colleague, and friend, Joel McMullen, who gave me a chance. You have supported me 100% over the past five years, so thank you. Your faith in my abilities and continuous guidance has inspired me to remain in the field of NCAA compliance over the years.

Thank you to my participants for your time and willingness to take part in my study. Without your enthusiasm to participate, this study could not have been conducted.

Thank you to those teachers and professionals who have inspired me along the way.

Thank you to my professors at Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College for believing in me and inspiring me to be a teacher. Thank you, Deanna Bradley, for your support and friendship over the years.

Finally, thanks to my mentor who has been by my side for the past six years. Thank you for guiding and pushing me to work harder each and every day. Thank you for your passion of teaching and working to make a difference in the lives of students each day. Thank you for your contributions to the field, to the institution, and to the community. Thanks for encouraging me to be a better teacher, colleague, and professional. I will forever appreciate and love all that you have done and continue to do for me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Theoretical Framework.....	4
Purpose and Significance of the Study	5
Research Questions.....	5
Limitations and Delimitations.....	6
Definitions of Terms.....	6
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
The National Collegiate Athletic Association	12
History of Rules Violations	19
Consequences of Athletics Noncompliance.....	21
The Evolution of the Intercollegiate Athletic Compliance Field.....	23
Curriculum	27
Curriculum Development.....	28
METHODOLOGY	34
Qualitative Research	34
Theoretical Framework.....	35

Methodology	36
Research Questions	36
Researcher as Instrument	37
Population	38
Data Collection	39
Coding	42
Data Analysis	43
Summary	45
RESULTS	46
Data Collection Review	46
Findings	50
Research Questions	56
Summary	57
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	58
Overview of Chapters 1 through 4	58
Conclusions	59
Discussion	59
Emergent Themes	60
Investigator Reflections	65
Entering the Compliance Field	65
Compliance Courses	68
Recommendations	69
POSTSCRIPT	71

Certification Pathway.....	71
Conclusion	72
REFERENCES	74
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL	81
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE.....	82
APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT CONSENT AGREEMENT	84

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

According to Higgs and Reisch (2002), “collegiate sports is big business in the United States” (p. 95). Other researchers in the field, such as Cooper and Weight (2011), have argued that the purpose of intercollegiate athletics is to integrate intercollegiate athletics into higher education so that the educational experience of student–athletes is vital. Researchers Toma and Kramer (2011) said that “people want to associate themselves with organizations that others know and respect, and being on television, even during brief sports highlights, makes an institution more prominent” (p. 41). Over 1,200 higher education institutions across the United States belong to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). In intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA requires its members to adhere to the various rules and regulations established by the membership. These rules and regulations apply to institutions’ student–athletes, coaches, and staff and vary across sports. The NCAA comprises three divisions: I, II, and III. Each division has its own rule book and guidelines.

The NCAA rules apply to its member institutions. Adhering to NCAA rules is also known as being compliant, defined by the NCAA as having *institutional control*. Compliance personnel are staffed at each institution to help ensure its coaches, student–athletes, and staff are abiding by the NCAA’s rules and regulations. Compliance offices are incorporated into the

institution's athletic department along with athletic media relations, marketing, business operations, and facility management, for example.

Compliance is the act of abiding by, conforming or yielding to, or meeting certain rules and regulations set forth by many companies, organizations, or associations. Compliance is necessary in order to maintain order and fairness. Maintaining an NCAA-compliant atmosphere on member campuses is achieved through the athletic compliance office or other personnel designated on each campus. The specific duties of each institution's compliance department component may vary between institutions. However, each has the responsibility of assuring its coaches, staff, student-athletes, boosters, and university personnel abide by the rules and regulations of the NCAA (NCAA, 2011d; Weston, 2011).

According to Pierce, Lawrence, and Kaburakis (2011), athletics compliance administrators hold the institution's reputation in their hands and their responsibilities seem endless. Each institution's president is responsible for maintaining institutional control of its intercollegiate athletic department (NCAA, 2011a).

Each NCAA member institution has a compliance office on campus responsible for assuring compliance with NCAA, conference, and institutional rules and regulations. Positions within a compliance office may include associate athletic director for compliance or assistant athletic director for compliance, compliance coordinator, and compliance assistant. Three to five years of working experience in compliance is also required for many such leadership positions (NCAA, 2011d; Wong, 2009).

A system of checks and balances among various departments on the institution's campus, as well as periodic external and internal audits, are part of the responsibility of the compliance office ("Setting a Course to Rules Compliance," 1992). Compliance offices, by their very nature,

work closely with various departments on campus. Major areas of focus include but are not limited to the following: amateurism, eligibility, extra benefits, financial aid, and recruiting (NCAA, 2011d). Throughout those major areas, infractions occur and are displayed throughout various media outlets.

Infractions occur when coaches, student–athletes, prospective student–athletes, and boosters break the rules. The rules and regulations were created to maintain an even playing field for everyone. According to Chelladurai (2009), “rules are to ensure that the actions of individual members are consistent with the goals of the organization and coordinated toward the attainment of those goals” (p. 60). Lack of institutional control and failure to monitor are two serious issues that occur when institutions do not have systems in place. Stories in the media tell of gambling, point-shaving scandals, recruiting violations, cheating, and plagiarism, for example (French, 2004). One of the most well-known incidents in college basketball was the point-shaving scandal involving the City College of New York in 1951. Three players were arrested for manipulating point spreads during that season. In 1978, Boston College players were found to be involved with small-time gamblers for point-shaving. Then in 1994 and 1995, Arizona State University and Northwestern University had players involved in point-shaving schemes (Killinger, 2012).

The compliance office has three primary functions on a routine basis: monitoring, enforcing, and educating. Compliance is responsible for monitoring and ensuring that all coaches, staff, student–athletes, boosters, and institutional employees abide by all applicable rules and regulations. Monitoring may be conducted in a variety of ways. One method employed is the use of paper forms. For example, some institutions post compliance forms on their athletic websites and refer coaches to the site in order to retrieve the correct form. If there is a rule, there is usually a corresponding form that must be filled out. Enforcement is another primary

responsibility of a compliance office. Enforcement of rules and regulations is done a daily basis. Upon discovery of a possible infraction, the compliance staff inquires of the specifics to determine what type of violation has occurred, if any, and the severity of the potential infraction. If a violation has occurred, it must be documented properly and sent to the institution's conference office and/or to the NCAA directly, depending on the nature and seriousness of the infraction (NCAA, 2011d; Potuto, 2010). Pierce et al. (2011) indicated that most compliance directors use student workers to assist them throughout the compliance office. Furthermore, they indicated there were four types of student workers: graduate assistants, graduate interns, undergraduate interns, and student volunteers.

Statement of the Problem

A formal, standardized NCAA compliance curriculum is currently non-existent throughout academia. Upon review of sport management curricula in the United States, NCAA compliance is taught in some capacity in some programs but not all. Given the impact non-compliance has on athletic programs and their fostering institutions and the apparent absence of a formal, standardized educational program for compliance officers, it is useful to understand the perceived importance of such as well as the perceived need for educative content within any form of curricular construct.

Theoretical Framework

The lens through which the qualitative study was conducted is a participatory worldview approach. An advocacy/participatory worldview perspective produces an action agenda for reform that may change the lives of the participants as well as the institutions in which the individuals work or live. The researcher begins the study with a focal point; in this study it is NCAA compliance. Through this research, participants help with designing questions, collecting

data, and analyzing information. This type of advocacy research hopes to provide a voice for the participants, raising participant consciousness or advancing an agenda for change to improve their lives (Creswell, 2009). Because a curricular construct does not currently exist, this study is the first attempt at establishing one.

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to (a) identify whether or not there was a perceived need for pre-service or in-service NCAA compliance education, (b) identify compliance officers' perceptions of current educational initiatives, and (c) identify competencies that compliance officers believe should inform educative initiatives. The significance of the study was to define whether or not there is a need for an undergraduate-level or graduate-level curriculum or certification in NCAA compliance. Because a current curriculum did not exist at the initiation of the study, the insights of those who work in the field of NCAA compliance were sought to confirm or deny the need. Compliance officers provided insights to guide and inform the generation of a construct and curricular content of a projected educative process.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the national perceptions of a need for a curricular construct for current and future compliance officers?
2. What competencies and/or skills do these groups believe should inform the curricular construct?
3. Should the educative process be an undergraduate or graduate concentration, or a certification, or both?

Limitations and Delimitations

Inherent personality differences and the varying backgrounds of the participants may have affected their responses. Not all participants were equally articulate, perceptive, or educated. Indirect information was filtered through the views of the participants. The study was delimited to compliance personnel currently employed at NCAA Division I institutions. The study only examined NCAA Division I and did not take into consideration NCAA Division II or III, junior colleges, or National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics institutions. The focus of the study was on the educative process of compliance personnel.

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions are provided to avoid misunderstanding while reading this dissertation. Background information is also provided to further enhance the reader's knowledge of the study. Although these terms appear generalized, they are used in various contexts and hold different meaning. These definitions also provide further insight into the field of NCAA compliance.

Amateurism

In order for students to compete at any NCAA Division I, II, or III institution, they must remain amateurs. An amateur is someone who competes without compensation and because he or she enjoys the sport. Prior to a student's initial full-time enrollment at an NCAA institution, the NCAA Eligibility Center¹ (EC) determines a prospective student-athlete's (PSA) amateur status. Before this can happen, the PSA must answer various amateurism questions when they register with the EC. PSAs may participate in amateur sports clubs as long as they do not receive expenses in excess of travel, lodging, or equipment for practice or competition (NCAA, 2011a).

¹ The NCAA Eligibility Center is designed for students who wish to participate in athletics at an NCAA sponsored Division I, II, or III institution (<http://www.eligibilitycenter.org>).

Boosters

According to Higgs and Reisch (2002), booster club activity can be an area which causes schools trouble and may be notorious in the popular press. The term *booster* is defined as a representative of athletics interests. Once identified as a booster, that identity remains indefinitely. The definition of a booster is fairly broad but includes any individual, independent agency, corporate entity, or other organization that is known or should be known by the institution's executive or athletics administration to meet any of the following criteria:

- (a) Have participated in or to be a member of an agency or organization promoting the institution's intercollegiate athletics program;
- (b) Have made financial contributions to the athletics department or to an athletics booster organization of that institution;
- (c) Be assisting or have been requested (by the athletics department staff) to assist in the recruitment of prospective student-athletes;
- (d) Be assisting or to have assisted in providing benefits to enrolled student-athletes or their families; or
- (e) Have been involved otherwise in promoting the institution's athletics program (NCAA, 2013, pp. 44-45).

Eligibility

Prospective student-athletes wishing to compete at a Division I or II institution must register with the NCAA EC (formerly known as the NCAA Clearinghouse). This is a process by which students register with their demographic information, high school information, sport information, Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) or American College Testing (ACT) scores, as well as answering amateurism questions. Students must meet the NCAA EC's academic requirements in order to be deemed a *qualifier*. A qualifier is a PSA who meets all NCAA initial eligibility requirements and may practice, compete, and receive athletic aid starting his or her first year in school and is defined as a PSA who successfully passes all of the following academic requirements while in Grades 9-12: four courses of English; three courses of

mathematics; two courses of science; two courses of social science; one additional course in English, mathematics, or science; and four courses in any additional approved core course area. An approved core course is determined between the NCAA and the high school. A student is deemed a *non-qualifier* if he or she does not pass any of the following requirements to be a qualifier. Non-qualifiers must serve one year in residence at the institution they attend and may not receive athletic financial aid, practice, or compete with any team during that first year in residence (NCAA, 2011a).

Extra Benefit

The NCAA (2013) defines extra benefit as such:

An extra benefit is any special arrangement by an institutional employee or a representative of the institution's athletics interests to provide a student-athlete or the student-athlete's relative (s) or friend (s) a benefit not expressly authorized by NCAA legislation. Receipt of a benefit by student-athletes or their relatives or friends is not a violation of NCAA legislation if it is demonstrated that the same benefit is generally available to the institution's students or their relatives or friends or to a particular segment of the student body (e.g., international students, minority students) determined on a basis unrelated to athletics ability. (p. 185)

Financial Aid

Certain sports are considered "head count" sports while others are "equivalency" sports. Examples of head count sports are basketball, volleyball, and football, to an extent. Each of these teams is allotted a certain number of scholarships. When a student-athlete receives any money in these sports, it counts against the team's limit as one scholarship. In equivalency sports, the value of a scholarship is determined by dividing the dollar value of the scholarship by the value of a

full scholarship; thus, one athletic scholarship may equate to a .04 scholarship, for example. Examples of equivalency sports are baseball, softball, and track and field, as well as soccer. Student-athletes may also receive other financial aid, whether from the institution as an academic scholarship or from the state and federal government (Pell Grants and loans). Student-athletes may receive what are called *outside scholarships*, which typically come from high school booster groups, for example, and will not count against the team's limit as long as (a) there is no direct connection between the donor and the institution and (b) the student does not have to use the scholarship at a specific institution. It should be noted that the NCAA prohibits a student-athlete from receiving countable athletic aid that exceeds the value of tuition, fees, room, board, and books and can never exceed the institution's published cost of attendance (NCAA, 2013).

Institutional Control

Institutional control refers to the idea that "the control and responsibility for the conduct of intercollegiate athletics shall be exercised by the institution itself and by the conference(s), if any, of which it is a member" (NCAA, 2011a, p. 42). "Administrative control or faculty control, or a combination of the two, shall constitute institutional control" (NCAA, 2011a, p. 42).

Prospective Student-Athlete

PSA refers to any student entering the ninth grade for the first time at any school. In the sport of men's basketball, a PSA is anyone starting classes in seventh grade for the first time for camps' and clinics' purposes (NCAA, 2011a).

Recruiting

Recruiting refers to the act of soliciting the enrollment of a prospective student-athlete at an institution in any manner. Only countable coaches are allowed to recruit on and off campus at

certain times throughout the year and make contacts and evaluations as well. A countable coach is one who is counted towards the team's limits. The NCAA defines recruiting periods (quiet, contact, evaluation, and dead) at certain times throughout both the academic year and summer terms, depending on the sport. During a quiet period, coaches are allowed to have prospects on campus for an official visit² or unofficial visit;³ however, they may not leave campus to make contacts or evaluations of prospective student-athletes. A contact period is a recruiting time frame when a collegiate coach may have face-to-face contact with prospective student-athletes or their parents, watch student-athletes compete, visit their high schools, and write or telephone student-athletes or their parents. An evaluation period is a time when collegiate coaches may watch prospective student-athletes practice or compete, evaluate their academics, and write or telephone prospects. They may not have face-to-face contact with prospects during this time. During a dead period, collegiate coaches may only write or telephone PSAs, and nothing else (NCAA, 2011a).

Sports Wagering/Gambling

Staff members of an institution's athletics department, non-athletics department staff members who have responsibilities within or over the athletics department (e.g., chancellor or president, faculty athletics representative, individual to whom athletics reports), staff members of a conference office, and student-athletes may not participate in sports wagering activities or provide information to individuals involved in or associated with any type of sports wagering

² An official visit allows an institution to pay for lodging, meals, and transportation for the parents (only the recruit's airfare or bus fare can be paid for) and prospective student-athlete. The institution may not, however, pay for younger siblings or guests of the family (NCAA, 2011a, Bylaw 13).

³ An unofficial visit is exact opposite of an official visit. Coaches may not pay for meals, lodging, or travel expenses. The only benefit they may provide is transportation to institutional competition and practice sites as well as offer three complimentary admissions to home athletic events (NCAA, 2011a, Bylaw 13).

activities concerning intercollegiate, amateur, or professional athletics competition. The penalty for student–athletes caught participating in *point-shaving* activities is immediate loss of eligibility in all sports for the remainder of their collegiate careers (NCAA, 2013).

Student–Athlete

A student–athlete is a student who participates in intercollegiate athletics, enrolled typically in a full-time undergraduate program of study, at a higher education institution (NCAA, 2011a).

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Watt and Moore III (2001) stated that “college sports have become increasingly important in our society since the 1930s” (p. 8). Shulman and Bowen (2001) agreed by adding that “however one feels about them, intercollegiate athletic programs have become thoroughly institutionalized within American higher education” (p. 1). Intercollegiate athletic programs across the United States belong to associations, in particular the NCAA. According to Mitchell, Crosset, and Barr (1999), “the coaches and athletes who compete in the NCAA are not members of the NCAA; only institutions of higher education are members” (p. 219).

The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Founded in 1906, the NCAA is a diverse, voluntary, unincorporated association composed of four-year universities and colleges, conferences, affiliated associations, and other educational institutions from across the United States. It has grown to become the largest amateur organization in the United States related to the regulation of intercollegiate athletics.

The NCAA is an organization comprised of about 350 employees. It is responsible for holding 89 national championships in 23 sports (all sports except Football Bowl Subdivision). More than 400,000 student–athletes compete in Division I (DI), Division II (DII), and Division III (DIII) at over 1,000 colleges and universities in the NCAA. Each year, more than 49,000 student–athletes compete in NCAA championships in all three divisions’ sports (NCAA, 2011d;

Weston, 2011). One of the NCAA's taglines used in commercials throughout television is "There are over 380,000 NCAA student athletes, and most of us will go pro in something other than sports" (NCAA, 2011d).

History of the NCAA

The NCAA was originally established to address safety issues involved in the sport of football. Football started becoming a dangerous game in the early 1900s as mass formations and gang tackling, which is now outlawed, caused a multitude of serious injuries and deaths (Zimbalist, 1999). President Theodore Roosevelt urged the creation of an association in charge of ensuring athletic safety in amateur sports. He called for two White House conferences in December 1905 (Weston, 2011; Zimbalist, 1999). Representatives from 13 colleges made changes to football rules during the first conference. At the second conference, 62 members founded the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS). Then in March of 1906 the IAAUS constitution was ratified. In 1910, the IAAUS renamed itself the NCAA. This association acted as a discussion group and rule-making body until 1921 when it held its first national championship (NCAA, 2011d; Weston, 2011; Zimbalist, 1999).

NCAA expansion. Gradually, the NCAA expanded to hold national collegiate championships for many other sports. As the NCAA grew, discussions involving issues such as television rights and the interference of post-season play became more prominent. According to Palmer and Kobritz (2010), important reforms that emerged from these issues included the following:

- In 1951, Walter Byers was named executive director of a newly founded NCAA headquarters in Kansas City to deal with the organization's expansion issues.

- In 1973, the NCAA created three Divisions of membership that remain in effect today: Divisions I, II, and III, as well as subdivisions responsive to the capacities of the programs involved. Some schools at the NCAA Division I level are either in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) or the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), while others do not have football at all. Each Division has its own bylaws and manual consisting of a constitution and operating bylaws. The NCAA sponsors a wide variety of individual and team sports for both men and women. The specific sport an institution sponsors depends on the school and their demographics, financial capabilities, and geographical location, for example.
- Prior to 1980, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) governed women's collegiate sports in the United States. The NCAA started to include women's championships in 1980.
- By 1982, all divisions of the NCAA offered national championship events for women's athletics and most members of the AIAW joined the NCAA.

NCAA Division I. Currently, more than 300 institutions are part of the NCAA Division I (NCAA, 2011d). DI member institutions must sponsor a minimum of 14 sports with a minimum of seven sports for men and seven for women (or six for men and eight for women) with two team sports for each gender. Both men's and women's playing seasons must be represented. The institutions must meet minimum financial aid award requirements for their athletics program. There are maximum financial aid award limits for each sport that DI schools may not exceed. DI institutions also have contest and participant minimums for each sport as well as various types of scheduling criteria. For sports other than football and basketball, these institutions must play

100% of the minimum number of contests against DI opponents. Anything over the minimum number of games must be 50% at the DI level (NCAA, 2011a).

Football Bowl Subdivision and Football Championship Subdivision. Schools sponsoring football are classified as either FBS or FCS. FBS schools must meet minimum attendance requirements (average 15,000 people in actual or paid attendance per home game), which must be met once in a rolling two-year period. FCS schools do not have minimum attendance requirements (Covell & Barr, 2010; NCAA, 2011a). Example FCS institutions include but are not limited to the following: Northern Iowa University, Sacramento State University, Villanova University, Georgia Southern University, and Idaho State University. Example FBS institutions include but are not limited to the following: Oklahoma, Maryland, Iowa State University, Penn State University, and the University of Arkansas.

NCAA Division II. Currently more than 300 institutions belong to NCAA Division II (NCAA, 2011d). DII institutions must sponsor a minimum of five sports for men and five for women (or four for men and six for women). There are contests and participant minimums for each sport as well as scheduling criteria similar to DI institutions (NCAA, 2011b).

DII football and men's and women's basketball teams must play at least 50% of their games against Division II or FBS or FCS opponents. For sports other than football and basketball, there are no scheduling requirements. In football and basketball, attendance requirements do not exist. However, there are maximum financial aid award limits for each sport that these schools must not exceed (NCAA, 2011b). Example DII institutions include but are not limited to; East Central University, Grand Canyon University, Western Oregon University, and Lake Superior State University.

NCAA Division III. NCAA Division III institutions must sponsor at least five sports for men and five for women, with two team sports for each gender, and each playing season represented by each gender. There are minimum contest and participant limitations for each sport. DIII student–athletes may not receive financial aid related to their athletic ability (NCAA, 2011c). These institutions’ athletic departments are staffed and funded just as any other department in the university. Throughout DIII athletics, the primary emphases are placed on regional in-season and conference competitions. There are more than 400 NCAA DIII member institutions (Covell & Barr, 2010; NCAA, 2011d). According to Watt and Moore III (2001), both students and student–athletes in DIII level institutions are graduating at higher rates than their peers in DI and DII institutions. Example DIII institutions include but are not limited to; Whitman College, Simpson College, Louisiana College, Thomas Moore College, and Bates College. Understanding the NCAA is important; however, understanding who student–athletes are is just as important. Without student–athletes, the NCAA would not exist.

Intercollegiate Student–Athletes

The expression student–athlete is given to a student enrolled in a collegiate institution in an undergraduate-level or graduate-level program of study who also participates in and represents the institution as a member of an intercollegiate athletic team. Student–athletes are students first, athletes second; however, according to Jolly (2008), “the majority of student–athletes report that the demands of competition have prevented them from devoting as much time to the student side of their lives as they would like” (p. 147). Student–athletes constantly cope with balancing the roles of both student and athlete (Street, 1999). College student–athletes face challenges experienced by non-athletes (i.e., social adjustment, intellectual growth, and career exploration), have obligations to their coaches and teammates, and must follow rules and

regulations of the NCAA. Collegiate athletes are a unique part of the student body and have become a significant, complex, and controversial student subpopulation in higher education (Jolly, 2008; Watt & Moore III, 2001).

In order for each division to maintain organization and authority, a system of structure exists to uphold the association's membership. Each division in the NCAA has an organizational structure and authority.

The NCAAs Organizational Authority

Each of the three NCAA divisions has its own organizational structure and authority. Representatives from the separate governing bodies form the NCAA Executive Committee, the governing umbrella over all three divisions. Although the divisions maintain separate structure, the organization of each is similar. August 1, 1997 marked the beginning of this new division-specific structure: a four-level approach for DI and three-level approach for DII and DIII. A group of institutional Chief Executive Officers (CEO's)—college presidents—manages all legislation in each division. The difference between divisions for this particular tier is only in name; DI members define this group as the board of directors, while DII and DIII members refer to it as the presidents' council (NCAA, 2011d).

Each division's legislature covers a wide range of affairs; a committee was developed to aid the decision-making process of the board of directors and presidents councils. This group also provides information to the board or councils as advisors. Each division calls this group the management council, but DIII athletics strayed from the other two divisions by allowing college presidents and student-athletes to serve on the council. DI and DII institutions only allow athletics administrators and faculty athletics representatives. The management council of each division receives information from lower committee reports covering specific division activities.

The faculty athletics representative (FAR) is a person at an NCAA institution who has been designated by each institution's president to serve as the liaison between the athletics department and the NCAA. He or she is a representative of the institution in conference and NCAA affairs. Duties of the FAR are determined by the institution. He or she must be faculty a member in order to serve as this representative (NCAA, 2011a).

Cabinets and committees complete the four-tier structure for DI athletics. Cabinets are in charge of one specific area such as eligibility or academics. Committees report to the cabinets. Committees may have jurisdiction over one particular sport or rules within each specific area. For DII and DIII, committees exist to report to management councils and investigate specific areas. The boards of directors and presidents' councils are not the only individuals who may officially vote on policy. DI legislation allows one vote to each conference, not just to each institution, while DII and DIII still allow one representative from each institution to vote (NCAA, 2011d; Potuto, 2010).

Conferences

Divisions I, II, and III of the NCAA have associations and conferences that belong to each. Conferences are a group of institutions that share an active membership with the NCAA to allow competition in national championships and a conference membership to allow competition in conference championships. NCAA member conferences must maintain a minimum of six member institutions to be recognized as a voting member conference of the NCAA. Reasons for institutions to join a conference include revenue sharing or financial capabilities, television contracts, corporate sponsorship, regional and geographic affiliations, and scheduling advantages. NCAA DI, DII, and DIII have their own conference affiliations. Conferences associated with the NCAA have detailed sets of rules and regulations, along with mechanisms to

enforce those rules and regulations. Each conference is governed by the NCAA; therefore, conference rules may not be contradictory to any NCAA rules (Wong, 2009).

History of Rules Violations

Violations occur across the country due to a number of reasons. When the NCAA enforcement staff has a legitimate reason to believe a member school violated NCAA rules, such as receiving information alleging such a violation, the enforcement staff may initiate an investigation on its own. There is a complex set of rules governing NCAA investigations on campuses. Depending on the circumstances, an investigation may be conducted by reviewing correspondence with the school or conference or through in-person inquiries. There are three elements that will trigger the enforcement staff to review a potential rules violation. The three elements are (a) obtaining information indicating that an intentional violation has occurred, (b) recruiting or significant competitive advantage may be gained, or (c) misleading or false information was given by the institution or the enforcement staff. The NCAA categorizes violations into two categories: secondary violations and major infractions (NCAA, 2011d; Potuto, 2010).

Rules violations have been around since the NCAA's existence. Sanctions resulting from major violations are severe and can have detrimental effects on athletic programs and the participants. The stigma of a major violation may discourage or scare prospective student-athletes from attending the institution (Weston, 2011). In the early 1990s, the University of Minnesota was found to have violated NCAA rules by providing more than 400 term papers for at least 18 basketball players. In order to mislead lawyers investigating academic fraud, basketball players were told to lie. These athletes' coach was also under investigation by the NCAA for providing cash payments to players (Wells & Carozza, 2000). The NCAA banned the

University of Washington from participating in football bowl games, as well as stripped them of 20 scholarships after 15 different rules violations was found. The University of Miami was forced to forfeit 31 scholarships due to an academic advisor filing false governmental paperwork to obtain 57 Pell Grants for football players (Mitchell et al., 1999). Years later, more violations continue to be publically made known and exploited. In 2010, former football player Reggie Bush, from the University of Southern California (USC), was found to have accepted thousands of dollars in cash payments, free limousine services, expensive clothing free of cost, and a vehicle, along with several other costly items. Not only did this violation occur, but another well-publicized infraction occurred at the time as well. O. J. Mayo, a high-profile prospective student-athlete, was illegally recruited by an Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) coach. The AAU coach assured USC of Mayo's attendance at the institution, so the AAU coach accepted payments from a USC booster (Ford, 2011; Wells & Carozza, 2000).⁴

The penalties imposed upon NCAA institutions for major and minor infractions are case-sensitive and fact-dependent (Covell & Barr, 2010). According to Mitchell et al. (1999), punitive strategies in some instances work; however, punitive strategies carry their own problems, such as being difficult to implement. DeSchriver and Stotler (1996) argued that even though leagues may not have sanctions costly enough to deter a violator or that would raise sufficient concerns by the sanctions being imposed, other players or teams who are innocent may certainly be harmed.

Penalties are assessed on a case-by-case basis and vary depending on the severity of the violations. For example, if a school is found to have broken recruiting rules, it will most likely face recruiting restrictions as a potential penalty. Penalties may include the following:

⁴ See also: *Report of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I Infractions Appeals Committee*. Report No. 323, May 26, 2011.

probationary periods, recruiting restrictions, scholarship reductions, vacation of records, and bans on postseason competition. Penalties are determined by the committee on infractions, which is an independent body of representatives from member institutions and the general public. The intent of penalties is to ensure punitive measures are sufficient to deter institutions from breaking the rules again while also removing any competitive advantage a school may have gained by cheating (Higgs & Reisch, 2002; NCAA, 2011d; Potuto, 2010).

Consequences of Athletics Noncompliance

NCAA championships bring millions of dollars to institutions and promote immense pride in players, coaches, and alumni, as well as the university. However, academic fraud, recruiting violations, and secret financial compensation of student-athletes have plagued collegiate athletics since inception (Weston, 2011). According to Fuller (2009), an investigation by the NCAA for rules violations at an institution can set off a firestorm of negative attention from media and alumni alike. Ultimately, this negativity could damage the reputation of the institution. Intercollegiate athletic programs elicit strong emotions from students, fans, alumni, and boosters. These groups of people transform their passions into powerful values and ideologies that ultimately become entangled with the economics of operating an athletic department (Schroeder, 2010). Therefore, it is important to understand the various consequences that institutions may accrue when violations of NCAA rules and regulations arise.

According to Weston (2011), sanctions impact other institutions and fellow conference members. Most conferences distribute revenue from television rights fees, bowl game appearances, and Final Four tournament participation fees. According to Weston (2011), “sanctions imposed on the offending school may decrease revenue that the school may have generated for the conference, and other members of that conference receive lesser distributions

of conference revenue” (p. 568). Weston also indicated that universities benefit financially from winning programs in the major fan-interest sports, and the financial impact reaches much more than just the athletic department. Ford (2011) also asserted that “a deep run during March Madness or a victory in a high-profile FBS bowl game can mean millions of dollars both to the university and to its conference” (p. 11). From a *USA Today* sports analysis online, “major-college athletics departments increased the amount of money they generate by nearly \$385 million in 2012, but they increased operational spending by more than \$665 million” (Berkowitz & Upton, paragraph 2, 2013).

NCAA sanctions extend to the member institutions, not individual coaches, student-athletes, agents, or boosters. As a condition of membership, member institutions contract to abide by NCAA rules. Weston (2011) indicated that “the NCAA may indirectly sanction individuals, such as coaches or athletic personnel, through a penalty requiring the institution to take employment action against employed individuals or to disassociate with non-employed individuals” (p. 564). Sanctions against institutions may also have unintended impacts on member institutions. Prospective student-athletes may not attend an institution that has had a history of rules violations, which presents difficulties for coaches in the recruiting process. Current student-athletes are impacted by violations incurred by the institution as well. In the event a student-athlete would want to leave an institution because of violations, the student-athlete is subject to transfer rules and regulations. Violations also impact conference schools. Conference schools receive monies from television rights and bowl game appearances, for example. Therefore, an offending school may not generate as much money for the other conference schools as it could have if it had not incurred violations (Weston, 2011).

The Evolution of the Intercollegiate Athletic Compliance Field

NCAA compliance has been around since intercollegiate athletic existence in some capacity. Compliance officers are responsible for navigating rules interpretations, standards of review, internal staff memoranda, and a multitude of other responsibilities. According to Pierce et al. (2011), when NCAA violations occur, the institution can incur significant financial and human resource cost, including time spent preparing reports for the association, time and cost to replace personnel, loss of alumni support, and the reputation of the institution.

The Compliance Unit

According to Fuller (2009), collegiate athletic compliance directors play an important role in preventing compliance issues because they are charged with ensuring that student-athletes, coaches, and staff abide by NCAA rules. Each NCAA member institution has a compliance office or appointed designee on campus who is responsible for assuring compliance with NCAA, conference, and institutional rules and regulations. According to the NCAA's employment website, positions within a compliance office may include the following: associate athletic director for compliance or assistant athletic director for compliance, compliance coordinator, athletic compliance specialist, and compliance assistant (NCAA, 2011d). Some institutions' compliance offices employ graduate assistants as well as internship positions. Typically, larger institutions house five to 15 staff members, whereas smaller institutions are comprised of one to five staff members. The structure and duties of the compliance unit may be divided by sport or by bylaw (e.g., amateurism, eligibility, financial aid, recruiting, etc.). Each compliance department is operated differently (Wong, 2009). As Pastore et al. (1996) stated, athletic administrators play a key role in creating positive working environments and promote staff morale by supporting coaches as they carry out their responsibilities.

Job descriptions, duties, roles and responsibilities. Each institution's president is responsible for maintaining institutional control of its intercollegiate athletic department (NCAA, 2011a). The compliance staff is charged with the daily task of ensuring that institutional control is maintained. It is the compliance staff's responsibility to implement policies, procedures, and educational efforts to maintain compliance with all NCAA, conference, and institutional rules and regulations. A system of checks and balances between various departments on the institution's campus, as well as periodic external and internal audits, are part of the responsibilities of the compliance office. Compliance staffs, by their very nature, work and collaborate with various departments on campus. Major areas of focus include but are not limited to the following: amateurism (NCAA Bylaw 12); eligibility (NCAA Bylaw 14); extra benefits (NCAA Bylaw 16); financial aid (NCAA Bylaw 15); and recruiting (NCAA Bylaw 13) (NCAA, 2011a; "Setting a Course to Rules Compliance," 1992). Lockhart (2009) went so far as to say that "there are enough rules to make college compliance directors dizzy" (p. 120).

Functions. The compliance unit has three primary functions on a routine basis: monitoring, enforcing, and educating (Weston, 2011). Compliance is responsible for monitoring and ensuring that all coaches, staff, student-athletes, boosters, and institutional employees abide by all applicable NCAA rules and regulations. Lockhart (2009) affirmed that the NCAA has created hundreds of uniform rules by which all its members must abide.

Monitoring. Monitoring may be conducted in a variety of ways. One method employed is the use of paper forms. For example, some institutions post compliance forms on their athletic website and refer coaches to the site in order to retrieve the correct form. Some compliance offices are form-driven. If there is a rule, there is usually a corresponding form that must be

filled out or documented in some fashion. Enforcement is another primary responsibility of a compliance office (Potuto, 2010; Weston, 2011).

Enforcing. Enforcement of rules and regulations is done on a daily basis. Upon discovery of a possible infraction, the compliance staff inquires as to the specifics to determine what type of violation has occurred, if any, and the severity of it. If a violation has occurred, it must be documented properly and sent to the conference office of which the institution is a member and/or to the NCAA directly, depending on the nature and severity level of the infraction (Potuto, 2010). Education is another responsibility of a compliance department.

Educating. The compliance department is responsible for educating everyone on the institution's campus as well as local organizations throughout the community (i.e., boosters and local businesses) of all NCAA rules and regulations (NCAA, 2011d).⁵

Qualifications. Leaders of the compliance unit often attain degrees from higher education institutions before acquiring compliance positions. From conducting a review of the NCAA's employment section of their web site (NCAA, 2011d), it was found that those qualifying for a position in compliance must have attained at least a bachelor's degree, some a master's degree; however, a law degree is preferred at some institutions. Three to five years of working experience in compliance is also required for leadership positions. Weston (2011) indicated that someone wishing to work in the field of athletic compliance should be familiar with NCAA and conference-related policies and procedures, as well as NCAA legislation. These individuals should also possess excellent verbal, written, and interpersonal communication skills (NCAA, 2011d; Wong, 2009). Information also revealed that some institutions listed both minimum and preferred qualifications (Wong, 2009).

⁵ The NCAA hosts education sessions called Regional Rules Seminars, twice a year, in two different locations, which is open to anyone, mainly targeted to those affiliated with an intercollegiate athletics program.

Professional associations related to the field. Just as professional organizations exist throughout academia, intercollegiate athletic compliance staffs have similar professional associations. The National Association for Athletics Compliance (NAAC) and the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA) exist to serve those in the field of intercollegiate athletics administration. Compliance personnel often participate in leadership roles throughout these organizations to further enhance their background knowledge of the field of compliance. According to Weston (2011), NCAA policies are intended to improve athletic programs as well as promote opportunities for leadership. NAAC and NACDA are two educational outlets for intercollegiate athletic compliance personnel.

National Association for Athletics Compliance. The National Association for Athletics Compliance is a professional organization that fosters professional and ethical standards while providing the athletics compliance field a broad range of personal and professional advancement opportunities. NAAC provides educational opportunities to its members through conferences and other forms of media mail (NAAC, 2012).

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. The National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics is a professional organization for those in the field of intercollegiate athletics administration. NACDA provides networking opportunities, advocacy, and education opportunities to its members (NACDA, 2012).

Compensation levels. The salary ranges for compliance staffs vary from one institution to another. Typically, larger institutions that have more sports have more staff and larger budgets to pay their staff. Benefits a compliance officer may receive include but are not limited to healthcare, dental care, and a courtesy vehicle. According to Wong (2009), an FBS associate or assistant athletic director for compliance may make \$90,000 to \$110,000 per year and an FCS

associate or assistant athletic director for compliance may make \$45,000 to \$55,000 per year. From a review of the employment section of the NCAA's web site, positions in the field of NCAA compliance state that salaries are either "open" or "commensurate with qualifications and experience" (NCAA, para. 2, 2011d).

Strategies for Encouraging Compliance

It is the responsibility of compliance personnel to oversee compliance. Mitchell et al. (1999) adapted six strategies to encourage compliance from Mitchell (1997). These six strategies include punitive, remunerative, preventive, generative, cognitive, and normative. Each is described in detail to provide an overall understanding. Punitive strategies usually clearly delineate the prescribed behavior, mechanisms are established to identify the behavior as or after it occurs, and mechanisms are established to impose costs on violators. Remunerative strategies attempt to create clear standards of desirable behavior, identify those engaging in it, and offer a reward to the institution for doing so. Preventative strategies seek to eliminate noncompliance. Preventative strategies also employ premonitory surveillance techniques. Generative strategies attempt to provide new opportunities rather than removing existing ones. Cognitive strategies are also known as warning labels and focus on creating and disseminating information. Normative strategies seek to alter values. These strategies focus on setting goals.

After reviewing the penalties and consequences involved, an intercollegiate athletic NCAA compliance curriculum could be developed to educate those in the field of NCAA compliance; therefore, curriculum development needs to be addressed.

Curriculum

According to Apple (2008), the usual way in which curricula are planned and made available to most institutions is through a pedagogic device. Textbooks, both required and

supplemental, are vital for several reasons. Textbooks are considered constitutive parts of the classroom. According to Apple (2008), studies indicate that homework is textbook driven as well. Textbooks are also considered to be economic, political, and cultural. Research on texts and curriculum should be done on multiple levels—how, by whom, and through what mechanisms a text is produced. It is also important to understand how curricula is regulated by the state and then sold (Apple, 2008).

John Dewey, known as the father of modern education, believed the students' core curriculum should include the students' interests (Dewey, 1916). He viewed education as hands-on and skills learned should be useful for students' everyday lives. Being a psychologist, philosopher, and educator, Dewey believed in critical thinking. Dewey's (1916) model of learning included having the ability of doing the following:

- Knowing the problem,
- Defining the problem,
- Solving the problem,
- Developing a hypothesized answer to determine the outcome, and
- Testing the solutions given.

Curriculum Development

According to Posner and Rudnitsky (1997), curriculum development “requires careful consideration of the rationale for the curriculum, decisions about what students should be expected to learn, attention to matters of organization and sequence, determination of teaching strategies, and planning for evaluation” (p. 11). Curricula are owned, developed, and implemented by the faculty of the institution (Indiana State University Handbook, 2012). When developing a curriculum, the following components should be addressed: educational

experiences being sought out, educational experiences being provided to attain purposes, the organization of the experiences, and the attainment of the purposes of the overall value of the experiences to be evaluated (Tyler, 1949; Westbury, 2008). Welner and Oakes (2008) suggested understanding the following when structuring a curriculum: the size of the school, the age of the school, grade retention, year-round schooling, distance education, tracking, special education organizational structures, and class size.

Six Strategies to Encourage Compliance

A formal, standardized compliance curriculum is currently nonexistent throughout academia. According to Mitchell et al. (1999), no standard taxonomy of compliance strategies exists in the sport management literature; therefore, one was adopted. Six strategies to encourage compliance were developed in the realm of international relations in relation to sports leagues. The six strategies include punitive, remunerative, preventive, generative, cognitive, and normative. Both punitive and remunerative strategies “manipulate the consequences a potential violator faces, making compliance and other desirable behaviors more attractive or violation and other undesirable behaviors less attractive” (Mitchell et al., 1999, p. 220). Preventive and generative strategies attempt to alter in some way a violator’s opportunities, reducing opportunities for undesirable behavior or attempts to create opportunities for desirable behavior (Mitchell et al., 1999). The last two strategies, cognitive and normative, attempt to alter “the potential violator’s perceptions of a given context, either providing information to convince potential violators that undesirable behaviors are not in their interests or normatively educating them to increase the value they attach to desirable behaviors” (Mitchell et al., 1999, p. 220). Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated that each strategy employs a unique motto and mechanism.

Punitive strategy. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated that the motto of the punitive strategy

is to “punish them” (p. 221). The mechanism by which this is accomplished is to increase negative consequences of undesirable behavior. According to Mitchell et al. (1999), “Punitive strategies usually (a) clearly delineate proscribed behavior, (b) establish mechanisms to identify such behavior as or after it occurs, and (c) establish mechanisms to impose costs on violators” (p. 221). Punishments vary in the type of penalty imposed. Mitchell et al. (1999) also stated “all punitive strategies assume a behavioral model in which violations arise from teams or players intentionally choosing to violate rules because they value the benefits of doing so more than they value the benefits of available alternatives....” (p. 221). An example of punitive strategies being employed was when the NCAA banned the University of Alabama football team from postseason competition and reduced their athletic scholarship totals by 12 after NCAA investigators found (a) one of their football players had signed with an agent, (b) their department had granted impermissible loans of money, and (c) their administration had failed to adequately investigate complaints against them (“Alabama Placed,” 1995). Punitive strategies can work in some instances and can be difficult to effectively implement (Mitchell et al., 1999).

Remunerative strategy. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated the motto of remunerative strategy is to “reward them” (p. 222). The mechanism by which this is accomplished is to increase positive consequences of desirable behavior. According to Mitchell et al. (1999), “Remunerative strategies usually (a) create clear standards of desirable behavior, (b) identify those engaging in it, and (c) reward them for doing so” (p. 222). Examples of remunerative strategies include the NCAA promoting academic excellence by rewarding postgraduate scholarships to student–athletes that were “all-Americans” and by offering financial rewards to schools that sponsor more than the required 14 sport teams (NCAA, 2011d).

Preventive strategy. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated the motto of the preventative

strategy is “lock them out” (p. 223). The mechanism by which this is achieved is to decrease opportunities for undesirable behavior (Mitchell et al., 1999). Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated that “preventative strategies seek to eliminate noncompliance as an option. Preventative strategies attempt to reduce undesirable options by (a) clearly proscribing acts that are not themselves undesirable but whose prevention precludes the ultimately undesirable behavior, (b) using “premonitory surveillance” to thwart violations before they occur, and (c) making efforts to reduce the autonomy of a potential violator to engage in the undesirable behavior” (p. 223). An example of a preventive strategy would be the NCAA rule which prohibits coaching staff from having PSAs come to their campus for official visits before they have taken the Preliminary SAT (PSAT), SAT, or ACT test (NCAA, 2013). By doing this, the NCAA is making an effort to reduce the exploitation of athletes who lack the skills to succeed in the classroom (NCAA, 2011d).

Generative strategy. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated the motto of the generative strategy is “if you build it, they will come” (p. 225). The mechanism by which this is achieved is to increase opportunities for desirable behavior (p. 225). According to Mitchell et al. (1999), generative strategies (a) target systematic or individual capacity deficits, (b) impose costs on managers, not potential violators, and (c) focus on potential violators who can’t, rather than won’t, alter their behavior. Although the transfer of resources common to many generative strategies parallels that in remunerative strategies, the former alters behavior by creating new alternatives and the latter does so by changing the consequences of existing alternatives (p. 225).

An example of a generative strategy is when the NCAA instituted a national clearinghouse (i.e., NCAA Eligibility Center) because athletes were unable to get their high school counselors to

complete NCAA academic forms during the summer prior to their freshman year in college enabling students to be cleared to play during their freshman year. The clearinghouse links college entrance results with NCAA paperwork to ensure eligibility with NCAA initial eligibility rules (NCAA, 2011d).

Cognitive strategy. The motto for the cognitive strategy is “show them it’s in their interests” (Mitchell et al., 1999, p. 226). The mechanism by which this is accomplished is to increase information about desirable and understandable behaviors (Mitchell et al., 1999). Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated that

cognitive strategies (a) lack clear behavioral prescriptions or proscriptions and (b) focus on creating and disseminating information. Cognitive strategies – the equivalent of warning labels – provide violators with new, more complete, and more accurate information to facilitate their making more intelligent decisions that favor socially desirable behaviors. (p. 226)

An example of a cognitive strategy is one employed by the NCAA which aims to educate student-athletes of the ill-effects of illegal drug use instead of just informing them of the sanctions which are imposed if they get caught for using them (Mitchell et al., 1999).

Normative strategy. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated the motto for the normative strategy is “teach them to do the right thing” (p. 228). The mechanism by which this is accomplished is to increase valuation of desirable vs. undesirable behaviors. Mitchell et al. (1999) indicated that

normative strategies (a) establish broad hortatory goals with few specific proscriptions, (b) leave opportunities and consequences unaltered, and (c) establish ongoing dialogues among league members and between league members and potential violators to promote norms. Essentially, normative strategies involve rhetorical attempts to persuade potential

violators to not merely adopt different means to their preexisting goals but to adopt new goals. (p. 227)

Examples of normative strategies include the NCAA changing all literature with the word club to *college team* and adopting the phrase *student-athlete* instead of using the terms athlete or player (Mitchell et al., 1999).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Creswell (2009) said qualitative inquiry and design is not just written; it is also performed. Thinking within the parameters of the study and balancing practical concerns are important points to consider. The actual process of qualitative research begins with the researcher as the key instrument in the entire process (Creswell, 2007, 2009). According to Atkinson and Delamont (2010), qualitative research is considered a unique form of empirical inquiry, an emergent approach that may lead researchers in new directions. Leedy and Ormrod (2001) contributed that qualitative research is a method used to describe, explore, explain, or build a theory to support an investigator's purpose.

Qualitative Research

Qualitative researchers gather multiple forms of data from sources such as interviews, documents, and observations, rather than relying on one particular data collection method. The data is then organized into categories and processed (Creswell, 2007). Themes are built from the *bottom-up*. Qualitative researchers are constantly looking for the meaning of the participants' messages. Themes emerge. Qualitative researchers view their research through different theoretical lenses (Creswell, 2009). For example, cultural, ethnography, racial, or ethnic lenses may be used to analyze and interpret data. These examples are also known as typologies. Qualitative research should be used with a problem or issues that need to be deeply explored.

Qualitative research may be much more contextually complex and detailed as opposed to quantitative research, which is statistically driven. Participants are encouraged to speak, share their stories, and the reader is set to hear their voices (Creswell, 2007, 2009). Qualitative researchers commit to extensive amounts of time in the field; to engage in the complex, time-consuming process of data analysis through sorting and finding emerging theme; to writing long passages; and to participating in a form of social and human science research. An issue that arises for qualitative researchers is the amount of participants they should use in order to get an accurate representation of the population (Creswell, 2007, 2009). This chapter identifies a descriptive qualitative approach that was implemented for the study. The theoretical framework, the data collection process along with the data analysis will be further discussed. Participant demographics are described along with the qualitative method employed.

Theoretical Framework

The lens through which the qualitative study was conducted was a participatory worldview approach. An advocacy/participatory worldview perspective produces an action agenda for reform that may change the lives of the participants as well as the institutions in which the individuals work or live (Creswell, 2007). The researcher begins the study with a focal point—here, NCAA compliance. Through this research, participants help with designing questions, collecting data, and analyzing information for example. This type of advocacy research hopes to provide a voice for the participants, raising participant consciousness or advancing an agenda for change to improve their lives (Creswell, 2009). Participatory research is also defined as participatory action research. Kemmis and McTaggart (2003) contributed that “shared ownership of research projects, community-based analysis of social problems, and an orientation to community action are examples of specific attributes found in participatory

research” (p. 337). Schwandt (2007) defined participatory action research by stating it is a cooperation and collaboration between the researcher(s) and other participants in problem definition, choice of methods, data analysis, and use of findings. Denzin and Lincoln (2003) posed that action research produces valid research results and is context centered, aiming to solve real-life problems in context.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative research method and focused on the data, which were collected from participants across the United States. The method that was used for this study was in-depth, semi-structured interviewing. As Gratton and Jones (2004) indicated, this approach uses a standard set of questions, or schedule. According to Gratton and Jones (2004), “... the researcher adopts a flexible approach to data collection, and can alter the sequence of questions or probe for more information with subsidiary questions” (p. 141). An interview protocol was developed and used for each interview (see Appendix A). Participants were interviewed by telephone. All interviews were tape-recorded, with permission from each participant, and transcribed verbatim upon completion of each interview. Gaining trust from each participant and establishing rapport were two techniques used throughout the study. This was established by having a short conversation prior to the interview and reassuring participants that their identities and responses would remain anonymous at all times.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the national perceptions of a need for an educative process for current and future compliance officers?

2. What competencies and/or skills do these groups believe should inform the educative process?

3. Should the educative process be an undergraduate or graduate concentration or a certification or both?

Researcher as Instrument

Rinehart (2005) stated, “in the personal narrative, researchers might uncover their own stories, from the point of view of the participants, or the stories of others in order to better understand attitude, context, and values within a given setting or settings” (p. 498). How I began my career in the field was through experience. I found an interest in the subject matter after hearing a guest speaker in a graduate-level sport law course. That is how my journey began into exploring the field of NCAA compliance.

I completed an internship in partial fulfillment of a Master of Science degree in Recreation and Sport Management. I was listening to a guest speaker talking about the field of NCAA compliance and found it to be interesting. Shortly after, in conversations with my advisor and mentor at the time, he suggested I talk to the speaker in regard to possibly completing an internship with him. Therefore, I set up a meeting and started working with him shortly thereafter. I started *pushing paperwork*, creating ways to monitor various rules and regulations, and anything else assigned. Once I completed the internship, I continued to work to gain more experience. Another year passed by and my supervisor at the time advocated for creating a full-time salaried position. It was approved and it has been almost five years since I started in the field. I became very passionate about my job, communicating with various groups on campus, educating coaches, staff, and student-athletes. I took on more responsibility as time went by, only to realize I had taught myself the job.

I had no formal training, only conversations with my supervisor and other colleagues in the Missouri Valley Conference. The only formal education I received on the topic was from attending the NCAA Regional Rules seminars, which are hosted annually by the NCAA. I receive educational columns and interpretations from the conference office, compliance commissioner, and the NCAA EC from time to time. Other than that, I have been all self-taught. Because I had only heard of compliance from the guest speaker, I had no idea what I was truly getting into until I was knee deep almost seven days a week, nine to 10 hours a day. That is how I learned the job and the rules.

Population

According to Guest, Bunce, and Johnson (2006), the most commonly used samples in qualitative research are purposive. Participants are chosen because of predetermined criteria that are relevant to the purpose of the research study. Participants for the study included NCAA compliance officers from NCAA DI institutions throughout the United States. Compliance officers were randomly chosen from NCAA FBS institutions, NCAA FCS institutions, and institutions that do not sponsor football. Each list of institutions was copied into a web site, <http://www.random.org>, and randomized. The first 20 institutions were selected from each list and I retrieved the contact information for the top-ranking compliance officer from each institution's athletics web site. Then, using the interview protocol script, each person was emailed, asking them to participate in the study. Out of the 60 participants who were emailed, 16 responses were received. The total number of participants interviewed was nine. Both men and women came from diverse educational backgrounds and varied in numbers of years working in the field of NCAA compliance in any capacity. Fink (2010) described this as stratified random sampling where every subject or unit has an equal chance of being selected from subgroups.

Two professional compliance commissioners who have experience in the field of NCAA compliance participated as individual experts for pilot testing the interview questions. Pilot testing assured that the interview questions could be understood by participants and ensured study participants would be able to respond to questions about their experiences without further clarification (Cooper & Schindler, 2007). The pilot test results described perceptions similar to responses obtained in the recorded telephone interviews. According to Patton (2002), in regards to sample size in qualitative research, there are no rules. Thus, I strove for a sample size that would provide sufficient detail for the study.

Data Collection

Participants were interviewed by telephone. All interviews were recorded with permission from each participant and transcribed verbatim upon completion of each interview. Creswell (2009) suggested using an interview protocol for asking questions and recording answers during a qualitative interview, which includes several components. The questionnaire included open-ended questions (see Appendix B). According to Riddick and Russell (2008), an open-ended question means the answers are not predetermined and participants do not have to choose from predetermined answers. Probing questions were used to follow-up in service of further explanatory detail. Participants were interviewed at their convenience. Specific days of the week and times were based upon the participants' schedules. Gaining trust from each participant and establishing rapport were two techniques that were used throughout the study. I was able to accomplish this by *breaking the ice* at the beginning of the phone interviews with *small talk*. I made the participants feel comfortable by reassuring them that all of their responses were completely confidential and their names and institutions would not be mentioned. I also explained to them that if they had any questions at any time, they were to ask. The overall

timeframe for conducting the interviews depended on the participants and their schedule. Ideally, according to Seidman (2006), “when the researcher can space each interview from three days to a week apart, the three-interview structure works best” (p. 21). This approach was attempted, though not relied heavily upon. Because the participants had different schedules, it was almost impossible to space each interview three days to a week apart. Two interviews were conducted in the same day, totaling four that week, and the remaining five occurred over the following five weeks, so although not evenly spaced, all nine were completed within six weeks. Seidman (2006) also indicated that this approach allows the researcher time to mull over the preceding interview, but not enough time to lose the connection between the two. Interviews were given a time frame of 90 minutes, as recommended by Seidman (2006) as well. Interviews were approximately 30 minutes in length, excluding the first few minutes used for building rapport.

Confidentiality

Prior approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board at Indiana State University. The purpose of the informed consent agreement was to protect the participants’ confidentiality and to secure concerns they had about confidentiality (Creswell, 2008). Each participant was sent the consent agreement via electronic mail and verbally agreed to it just prior the start of the telephone interview (see Appendix C). During the telephone interview, participants were notified they could withdraw from the study at any time and their identity as well as institution would be kept confidential at all times. Confidentiality of each participant was maintained throughout the study. Their names, current positions, identifying information, and institutions were not shared with anyone outside of the study. During data collection and analysis, participants were protected by assigning pseudonyms (e.g., Amy, Jon, Todd) on all materials.

Interview Questions

Fontana and Frey (2000) indicated that interviewing has been around a long time. The tradition of interviewing evolved from two trends. These trends gained widespread popularity in clinical diagnosis and counseling, and the employment of psychological testing during World War I. *Opinion polling* was another form of interviewing taking place well before the 20th century. Specific types of interviewing include: structured interviews, group interviews, and unstructured interviews. The method that was used for this study was in-depth, unstructured interviewing. Andrews, Mason, and Silk (2005) indicated that the nature of responses should be left open to the individual being interviewed.

Each participant was asked the same set of predetermined questions and in the same manner throughout each interview. I informed the participants there were no right or wrong answers prior to questioning. I also informed the participants that they could ask questions at any time and could drop out at any time if they chose to do so. The question format was not meant to be interactive other than asking for clarification or further detail. I emphasized to each participant that the focus of the interview was on their opinions and not the opinion of the researcher.

Interview Protocol

The semi-structured telephone interviews allowed for consistency (see Appendix A). I reminded the participants before recording the interview that their names, institutions, and any other identifiable information would be kept confidential throughout the study and any further publishing. The transcription service also signed a confidentiality agreement prior to transcribing the interviews. Data collection occurred during a two-month period. Each interview lasted between 25 and 45 minutes. I listened actively and took notes during each interview. The notes

helped me recall specific points of emphasis, and were looked at closely in the analyzing process.

Coding

After the data are transcribed, they are coded. According to Lewins and Silver (2007) and Creswell (2009), qualitative coding is a process by which segments of data are identified as relating to, or being an example of, a more general idea, instance, theme, or category. Codes were based on themes or topics derived from the telephone interviews as well as ideas or concepts that arose (Creswell, 2009). Language and terminology were given close attention to in order to capture the participants' responses. The categories and their labels were identified with terms taken from the vocabulary of the participants. A three-stage inductive coding approach was used. The first stage was open coding; phrases were coded in small, detailed segments. The second stage was axial coding; this was the second pass through the data when codes generated by open coding were reconsidered. The third stage was selective coding; the data and codes were revisited and grouped into illustrated themes (Lewins & Silver, 2007).

Open Coding

During the open coding stage, small segments of data, (i.e. words, lines, sentences, or paragraphs), are considered in detail and compared to one another. During this stage, a large number of descriptive codes (nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs) are generated. A codebook is also generated to maintain all of the generated codes. A color coding scheme may be used to group the codes. In addition, memos are written, (i.e., code notes), which discuss the codes. These memos assist in recollecting thought patterns (Lewins & Silver, 2007).

Axial Coding

The axial coding stage is considered an abstract process and refers to the second pass

through the data. The axial coding stage involves codes being grouped by category and properties. The fragments of data identified in the open coding stage are brought back together to explore the relationships identified between the codes which represent them. These codes are rethought in terms of similarity and differences (Lewins and Silver, 2007).

Selective Coding

During the selective coding stage, the data and codes are revisited. Instances in the data which most relevantly illustrated concepts, relationships, and themes are identified. Conclusions are validated by illustrating instances represented by and grounded in the data, which is included in the findings (Lewins and Silver, 2007).

Data Analysis

According to Creswell (2003), data analysis entails the following steps: (a) organize the data; (b) review the data; (c) code the data; (d) describe the data; (e) identify emerging themes; and (f) connect the emerging themes. The approach by Creswell (2003) was first attempted; however, the approach by Lewins and Silver (2007) was utilized more effectively. The approach by Lewins and Silver (2007) was utilized to code the data in three phases (open coding, axial coding, and selective coding phases). Each phase of the coding process is described in further detail.

The first stage of coding began with open coding, which was conducted by analyzing the data in detail, in small segments, and compared to the others. This process generated large numbers of codes, which were descriptive and conceptual in nature. The responses were analyzed by question, starting with the first question's responses; then each question's response was coded thereafter in numerical order. Codes were highlighted with various colors to depict similarities.

The second approach, axial coding, is considered to be a more abstract process (Creswell, 2007). Codes were reconsidered in this phase and were rethought in terms of similarity and differences. During the axial coding stage, codes were merged and also grouped together. Some codes were also subdivided into more detailed codes. The data were revisited and compared during this approach as well.

The third and final approach, selective coding, entailed the data and codes being reviewed. Instances in the data that most pertinently illustrated themes, concept, and relationships for example, were identified. Patterns were identified in this stage of the coding process as well. Segments of the data were chosen to quote and are further discussed in Chapter 4.

Controlling for Bias

It was difficult to control personal bias due to the fact that I work in the industry of NCAA compliance. Biases were controlled for by maintaining a neutral stance throughout the telephone interview. This was established by simply replying, “Okay,” after each participant was finished responding to each question. In the event an answer was unclear, I sought further clarification. Once the data were analyzed, participants were contacted via email as a follow-up to confirm and verify the information received in the telephone interview. Participants were asked if what was interpreted was correct and if it was not, I sought clarification. Follow-up emails were sent directly to the participants to verify the data collected throughout the interview.

Data were interpreted through various lenses. As a researcher, it is important to understand where the participants are *coming from*. Because I work in the field, I felt I had an insight in to the information. I also viewed the data from the perspective of as an outsider to the

field. I attempted to read the responses for what they were and not look any further into them for deeper meaning.

Summary

The qualitative study focused on data that were collected from participants across the United States. The method that was used for this study was in-depth, semi-structured interviewing. An interview protocol was developed and field tested prior to the study. Participants were interviewed by telephone and all interviews were tape-recorded, with permission from each participant and transcribed verbatim upon completion of each interview. Data were analyzed using a three-phase coding process. Codes were generated and analyzed throughout the process. Results are discussed in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The present study was designed to gain the perceptions of NCAA DI compliance officers in regards to whether there is a need for a formalized compliance curriculum. The subjects were both men and women. The range of experience for participants was one to 18 years. Chapter 4 includes the results of this research study. Textural descriptions in Chapter 4 show specific themes and patterns found that emerged during the analysis of collected data.

Data Collection Review

Nine qualified individuals confirmed their participation in the study. Despite my wish to conduct 36 interviews, time and cost were limiting factors in my decision to complete nine instead. To protect the identity of each participant, pseudonyms were utilized. The total number of female participants was four (Amy [non-football], Kara [FBS], Kelly [FCS], and Mary [FCS]) and the total number of male participants was five (Don [FBS], Eric [FCS], Joe [non-football], Jon [FCS], and Todd [FBS]). Three participants were interviewed from DI FBS institutions, four from DI FCS institutions, and two from DI non-football institutions. The nine respondents brought diverse viewpoints and diversity to enrich the study. According to Creswell (2005), the sample size was large enough to ensure enough data to recognize and identify emerging themes. To gain a better understanding of the participants, each is described in further detail.

Todd

Todd, a male participant, and has been working in the field of NCAA compliance, in multiple capacities for eight years. He earned a juris doctorate (JD) and a bachelor's degree in English literature. Todd began his career by securing an internship in an athletic department of the institution in which he was participating in graduate studies. Todd indicated he has continued to work in the field for "a lot of reasons," including "It's intellectually very rigorous." Todd further commented by stating,

I enjoy athletics obviously; otherwise I wouldn't have begun it. I have been fortunate to receive promotion along the way and because until fairly recently I had believed I was climbing to become an athletic director, but I'm planning on changing careers at this point.

Todd is currently employed by an NCAA DI FBS institution in the upper Midwest.

Joe

Joe, a male participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance for eight years. He is currently pursuing a doctoral degree in educational leadership and earned a master's degree and bachelor's degree in sport management. He began his career as a graduate assistant in a compliance office. He has continued to work in the field because he "really likes it a lot and enjoys it." Joe is employed by an NCAA DI FCS institution on the east coast.

Kara

Kara, a female participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance in multiple capacities for 18 years. She earned a bachelor's degree in communications. Kara began her career as an intern in the sports information department during her undergraduate work. She was also interning for the athletic director, who was the president of NAAC at the time. A

position in compliance opened up and she was hired to go into the administrative route. Kara has continued to work in compliance because “it is challenging.” She also indicated she “loves working with the student–athletes and tries helping make their experience a good one.” Kara also stated she thought that “any time you can be at an institution where they want to do the right thing, is a good role to be in.” Kara is currently working at an NCAA DI FBS institution in the Midwest.

Jon

Jon, a male participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance for one year. He earned a master’s degree in criminology and police management. He began his career in the field by contacting a vice president at an institution who happened to be looking for someone to “take over the compliance department.” Jon has continued working in the field because he has been able to “use [his] Federal Bureau of Investigation skills.” For example, Jon indicated he is “able to apply those principles in a setting that deals with student–athletes and it’s just my way to give back, as part of a second career.” Jon is currently working at an NCAA DI FCS institution in the southern region of the United States.

Kelly

Kelly, a female participant, has been working in an NCAA DI FCS institution in the southern part of the United States. She has been working in the field of NCAA compliance for eight years. She earned a master’s degree in sport management and a bachelor’s degree in history. Kelly began her career as an intern in a compliance department. A position opened in compliance in the same department, so she applied and was hired. She has continued to work in the field of NCAA compliance because it is part of her job responsibility. Kelly is also the senior women’s administrator and associate executive advisor for student services.

Mary

Mary, a female participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance, in multiple capacities, for nine years. Mary earned a JD and a bachelor's degree in economics. She began her career as a graduate assistant in a DI institution. Mary has continued to work in the field because she "loves the interaction with the coaches and the student-athletes." Mary also indicated she "likes that compliance touches a lot of different areas." She currently works in an NCAA DI FCS institution on the east coast.

Don

Don, a male participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance in multiple capacities for eight years. Don attained a master's degree in sports management and a bachelor's degree in history. He began his career as an executive manager for a baseball team, which developed into an internship in the athletic department. He then applied for and received an assistantship in compliance while attending graduate school. He continued to work in compliance because he was offered a full-time position. He continues to work in compliance because it is "just a job I still have and I haven't pursued another job or decided to leave athletics at this time." Don currently works in an NCAA DI FBS institution in the southern region of the United States.

Eric

Eric, a male participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance in multiple capacities for 10 years. He attained a JD and a bachelor's degree in general studies, with an emphasis in political science. Eric wanted to apply his legal skills in a field that he "really enjoyed namely collegiate athletics." He has continued to work in the field because he believes "it is challenging and a very unique profession." Additionally, he indicated he gets "to work with

highly motivated people in an athletic setting as well as try to make a difference in the lives of young people.” “I enjoy the responsibility of being the person on campus that is responsible for ensuring the university’s responsibility, as a member of the NCAA, to maintain institutional control.” Eric is currently working in an NCAA DI FCS institution, located in the Midwest.

Amy

Amy, a female participant, has been working in the field of NCAA compliance in multiple capacities for eight years. She attained a master’s degree in sport management and a bachelor’s degree in business administration. Amy began her career working for a university as the administrative assistant to the athletic director, who was also the head men’s basketball coach. She was promoted to the compliance coordinator/business manager. She has continued to work in the field because she “really enjoys working in college athletics and enjoys the challenge of working in the crazy world of compliance.” Amy is currently working in an NCAA DI non-football institution in the Midwest.

Findings

The research questions guided the type of data intended for collection and restricted the interpretation and analysis of the data (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). As discussed earlier, data was coded using the open, axial, and selective coding method by Lewins and Silver (2007). Again, to protect identity, pseudonyms were assigned to each participant. Participants’ responses for questions one through four were provided in their narratives presented above. Themes are provided with each question’s responses below.

Question 5: Education

Question 5 was “What type of educational degree do you believe one should have in order to work in the field of compliance?” Overall, all participants indicated that some type of

advanced degree would be useful. Eric went into further detail, stating "...a degree that sheds light on the workings of intercollegiate athletics and that also stresses the importance of analytical thinking and technical writing are most beneficial." Todd, Joe, Kara, and Kelly all indicated "any degree" would be beneficial, while Mary felt someone should have at least a master's degree. Jon, Mary, and Don indicated that having a law degree would be helpful.

Question 6: Having Hard and Soft Skills

Question 6 was "What type of skills and characteristics should one possess to work in an NCAA compliance office?" All participants indicated having communication skills, whether "good" or "basic" was necessary. Todd began his response by stating "...that's virtually limitless in its scope and you need to be a jack of all trades." He also ended his response by stating "It really is arguably the most challenging position I've been around, to be a director of compliance in my life." Joe, Kara, Jon, and Don all stated that "patience" and "listening skills" are important to have. Amy indicated that one should possess the "ability to multi-task" and "work within a team environment." Kelly indicated, "so I think the organizational skills are [*sic*] huge." Eric added that one would, "...have to be very detail oriented, thick skinned, intelligent, organized, and effective in both writing and verbal communications. They must be fearless and unafraid of confrontation." Eric was the only one out of nine to mention "confrontation." Mary indicated that, "...having very basic skills such as basic human interaction and human management skills are really valuable."

Question 7: Image and Complexity

Question 7 was "What do you perceive are the major challenges you have been faced with throughout your compliance career?" Each participant interpreted this question differently. Each participant recalled a specific example of a situation to portray their challenges. Each

participant focused on one challenge. For example, Kelly discussed a situation where she had to make a student–athlete repay a benefit before leaving for an away game. She indicated “It can be difficult if you don’t have a good relationship at work depending....” She also made it a point to say “I am in a really good situation where it [compliance] is respected on their campus and people want to do it the right way.” Todd focused on “mastering the material,” while Eric indicated “Resistance to change and reliance upon obsolete ways of doing things has been a major hurdle we have overcome.” Don was more concerned about image in saying “...that the compliance guy is the person that just says no and the compliance guy at the university works at the NCAA, and I think that to me is the most frustrating part....” He also indicated that “...I don’t think that the compliance staff across the country is even given enough resources and funds to necessarily do enough proactive stuff.” Amy added, “I’m currently in a position where I’m the only full-time staff member in the compliance office, so that is very difficult at times because I have around 30 coaches pulling me in a million different directions.”

Question 8: Interpersonal Skills

Question 8 posed, “What do you perceive you do well in, within the compliance office?” and “Do you believe your educational background is the reason for what you have just mentioned?” Kelly and Don had similar responses in that they focused on building relationships with coaches and staff. For example, Don stated “...I worked real hard to build that relationship,” and Kelly stated “I also think some of the relationships that I built with coaches where I don’t just bring down the hammer on them all the time.” Todd and Eric focused on “dealing with” situations and “moving on.” Mary focused on being “on demand,” while Kelly focused on being approachable. All nine participants indicated that their overall experiences throughout life in general contributed to what they do well versus their educational backgrounds.

Question 9: Complexity

Question 9 was “What do you wish you knew about compliance/the job before you started in the field?” Amy indicated she “had wished she had known she was going to be perceived as a cop or a lawyer of the department.” Don would have liked to have known that “it is not a job you can simply just close your door and walk out at five o’clock or on a Friday.” Kelly wished “there were some type of training programs.” Mary indicated she wished she “knew to take advantage of other people and didn’t feel uncomfortable asking for help like calling up another school and saying, hey!”

Question 10: Experiential Learning

Question 10 was “Do you believe a series of compliance courses (some type undergraduate or graduate level classes) would be beneficial to those wishing to go into the field or currently working in the field of compliance? If so, why? If not, why not?” All nine participants agreed that some type of undergraduate-level or graduate-level class(es) would be beneficial. Whether having some type of “general knowledge” of the rules or “giving students an idea whether this career is really for them,” participants provided individual stories of why they thought it was important. Mary made reference to the upcoming program offered by NAAC. In particular, she said, “Well, I think we are all a little bit concerned about the price of it, and why, why would I repay for something when we don’t need it, if not required to have our jobs?” Todd, Don, and Joe discussed the idea of needing to have hands-on experience, not just knowledge of the rules. Kelly stated “...I think that is helpful across the board because in any job you are in, in college athletics you need to have that kind of compliance that did affect every aspect from facilities to tickets, to fund raising, and so you need to have a general understanding of what NCAA compliance is and what the rules are and how the structure and why....” Joe even geared

his response towards offering one compliance course in a coaching program either at the undergraduate level or graduate level, introducing them to the field.

Question 11: Curricula

Question 11 was “How many courses would be beneficial in the compliance series?” Participants were not sure how to respond to this question because of the way they answered the previous question. Kara, Jon, and Amy all indicated that one course would be beneficial. Kelly and Eric both thought that “breaking the courses down by each NCAA bylaw” would be beneficial. The remaining participants simply “didn’t know” and “weren’t sure” how many would be appropriate as it would depend on the institution.

Question 12: Interpersonal Skills

Question 12 was “What types of skills do you believe should or could be taught in the compliance courses to be offered?” Each participant offered various ideas. Participants indicated having the following skills in their interview: “how to interact with coaches and deal with them,” “communication,” “how to research,” “analytical thinking,” “technical writing,” “public speaking,” “web site development,” “leadership,” and “conflict management.”

Question 13: Working Knowledge of the Rules

Question 13 was “What knowledge or content should or could be taught in the compliance courses to be offered?” All participants agreed that having knowledge of the rules, the ability to research the legislative services database, and being able to operate the NCAA Eligibility Center were key knowledge and skills. Eric stated, “The key areas that I would focus on are the subjects in the NCAA manual. Although all are important, I would focus on Articles 10-17.” Amy added “The basics on how to operate LSDBi, the NCAA Eligibility Center website, and Compliance Assistant.”

Question 14: Unnecessary Certification

Question 14 was “Upon completion of the compliance courses, should a Compliance Certification be given?” All but one of the participants thought there was no need to offer a certification upon completion of the courses. Amy stated “You don’t have to be certified to be an athletic director, so why should you have to be certified in order to work in compliance?” Eric added to the sentiment by saying “Because anyone can pass a test that shows they know the rules. Compliance is much more than that. Just because you are knowledgeable does not mean you are effective in any way.” Mary was indifferent stating,

You know, I wouldn’t mind one way or the other. I have no objections to it is that became what we had to do, and we take the coaches exam anyway, and I would be confident that our staff would pass something....

Question 15: Physical Environment

Question 15 was “Should the series of compliance courses be offered through a distance education or face-to-face or hybrid model? If no, why not?” For the most part, participants indicated that these courses could be offered via distance. For example, Kara indicated “I do think some of the initial training about you knows knowledge and about office team and what the office team means could certainly be done through a distance learning type of program.” Don added

I think it is really good when conference offices get their conference members together and their compliance personnel members together, so that they can have face-to-face interaction and they can build those relationships, and so I think that when you have those, I think that does more good than necessarily sitting in the classroom and taking some test to be.

Others believed that a combination of both would be beneficial because they felt a human component was necessary.

Question 16: Unnecessary Certification

Question 16 was “Do you believe compliance staff should be required to take a NCAA Compliance Certification Examination related in order to work on an institution’s campus? If yes, why? If no, why not?” All participants except one indicated that compliance staff should not be required to take an NCAA compliance certification examination in order to work on an institution’s campus. Mary was indifferent by indicating

You know I wouldn’t mind one way or another. I have no objections to it if that became what we had to do, and we take the coaches exam anyway, and I would be confident that our staff would pass something, so I know, I think it would be fine to take something I mean if that became you know you needed whatever certification to work just like the athletic trainers or anybody else like I would be fine with it, so I would be fine if it moved in that direction.

Question 17 was “If you said yes to question 16, who would you suggest to develop the certification examination?” Participants did not answer this question.

Question 18: Added Information

Question 17 was “Is there anything else you would like to add?” Overall, participants did not have anything to add. Three participants “wished me good luck” and two thanked me for allowing them to participate in the study.

Research Questions

In regards to answering the study’s research questions, participants provided their perceptions for a need for some type of educative process. Participants provided specific

examples of skills and characteristics they felt compliance personnel should have. Participants were unsure of what type of program, whether graduate-level or undergraduate-level concentration was necessary based upon the institution at which it was being offered and the scope of the curriculum at which it would educate. In general, participants felt some type of education would benefit those wishing to either go into the field or currently working in the field of NCAA compliance. Whether or not graduate-level or undergraduate-level course(s) should be offered would be determined by the program and institution.

Summary

I interviewed nine participants. I asked the same questions were asked of each participant in the same order. Each participant's viewpoints and perceptions were recorded verbatim in order to capture direct quotes and thoughts. The results of the data analysis of participants' responses yielded emergent themes. The emergent themes consisted of the following: (a) experiential learning, (b) hard and soft skills, (c) curricula, (d) image, (e) complexity, (f) interpersonal skills, (g) unnecessary certification, and (h) physical environment.

Chapter 4 described emerged themes and patterns discovered throughout the data analysis process. Chapter 5 presents concluding comments and recommendations for future studies. Personal interpretations and reflections pertaining to the information provided by research participants are also shared.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this qualitative study using transcribed audio-taped, semi-structured interviews was to explore the perceptions of nine NCAA DI compliance officers regarding a need for a graduate-level or undergraduate-level curriculum or certification program. Participants were both men and women and had various years of experience. Participants were drawn from NCAA DI FBS, FCS, and non-football institutions. Chapter 5 includes an overview of Chapters 1-4. In Chapter 5, I present the study findings, an analysis of the data, core themes that emerged from the data, interpretations, and recommendations based on the results obtained from the completed research. The results were obtained from telephone interviews, using 18 open-ended questions.

Overview Chapters 1 through 4

Chapter 1 introduced background information on intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA, the statement of the problem, theoretical framework, purpose of the study, significance of the study, research questions, and limitations and delimitations. Definitions of terms were also provided. Chapter 2 included a comprehensive literature review that outlined the history of the NCAA, NCAA compliance, described those who work in the field, and the consequences involved with noncompliant institutions. It provided background on curricula and the development of curricula. Chapter 2 also included current research related to NCAA compliance officers.

In Chapter 3, a justification for the selection and appropriateness of the research method and design was provided. Chapter 3 described the participants along with the sampling selection criteria. The research method proposed in Chapter 3 was intended to explore the perceptions of NCAA DI compliance officers. The chapter provided: (a) a review of the research method; design, and appropriateness; (b) the guiding research questions; (c) a discussion of the population, sampling and data collection; (d) informed consent and confidentiality; and (e) interview questions, data collection, data analysis, validity and reliability issues. The research questions guided the data intended for collection and restricted the interpretation and analysis of the data (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2003). Chapter 4 presented the analysis of data derived from nine conducted telephone interviews. It also discussed the results of the nine interviews, including excerpts from each participant.

Conclusions

Gaps identified in the literature and the potential need for a compliance curriculum motivated an academic and personal interest to explore the need and implementation of such a curriculum. Qualitative research was conducted with NCAA DI compliance officers at FBS, FCS, and non-football institutions. The data collection strategy consisted of semi-structured, open-ended telephone interviews with a convenience sample of compliance officers who volunteered to participate in the study (Creswell, 2003).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to (a) identify whether there was a perceived need for pre-service or in-service NCAA compliance education, (b) identify compliance officers' perceptions of current educational initiatives, and (c) identify competencies that compliance officers believe should inform educative initiatives. The purpose of the study was addressed through the

responses provided by the nine participants. Participants expressed a need for some type of compliance education, perceptions were gathered of current educational initiatives, and competencies were also provided.

A three-stage inductive coding approach was used. The first stage was open coding. Phrases were coded in small, detailed segments. The second stage was axial coding. This was the second pass through the data when codes generated by open coding were reconsidered. The third stage was selective coding. The data and codes were revisited and grouped into illustrated themes (Lewins & Silver, 2007). Themes emerged throughout the coding process.

Emergent Themes

The emergent themes consisted of the following: (a) experiential learning, (b) physical environment, (c) hard and soft skills, (d) curricula, (e) higher education, (f) image and complexity, (g) interpersonal skills, and (h) unnecessary certification. Questions 1 and 2 were demographic questions and Question 18 was added for the participant to add anything further in general to his or her interview.

Experiential Learning

I wanted to gain an insight as to how each participant started in the field by asking them about their backgrounds. I heard what I expected to hear: an internship or alternative position in an athletic department was the primary entrance to the field. Some participants started working directly in the field of compliance as an intern while others worked in another position within athletics and transitioned into the role once it was made available. Eric stated, "...a degree that sheds light on the workings of intercollegiate athletics and that also stresses the importance of analytical thinking and technical writing are most beneficial."

All nine participants agreed that some type of graduate-level or undergraduate-level class(es) would be beneficial. Whether having some type of “general knowledge” of the rules or “giving students an idea whether this career is really for them,” participants provided individual stories of why they thought it was important. Some participants discussed the upcoming educational program offered by the NAAC. It was interesting to hear their feedback on this program about which I already had preconceived thoughts.

Physical Environment

For the most part, participants indicated that these educational courses could be offered via distance. For example, Jon indicated, “I do think some of the initial training about you knows [*sic*] knowledge and about office team and what the office team means could certainly be done through a distance learning type of program.” Don stated, “To me it is better to have a colleague at another school that I can call and trust and bounce ideas off of them. . . .” Others believed that a combination of both would be beneficial because they felt a human component was necessary.

Hard and Soft Skills

The most common response the participants had in terms of hard and soft skills was communication. Each participant indicated it was important to learn how to communicate with coaches. Another interesting finding was all but two participants provided additional information, such as a specific instances or examples they had encountered in order to explain their answers. Those two participants listed skills, but did not provide anything further. Another comment that stood out was, “. . . ability to work with people in fast paced and potentially hectic environment.” I anticipated that other participants would indicate the same, but data indicated otherwise.

Organizational skills and multi-tasking were two attributes mentioned as well. Having these two characteristics is important due to the complexity and abundance of rules. Todd began his response by stating, "...that's virtually limitless in its scope and you need to be a jack of all trades." He also ended his response by stating, "It really is arguably the most challenging position I've been around to be a director of compliance in my life." Eric added that, "...have to be very detail oriented, thick skinned, intelligent, organized, and effective in both writing and verbal communications. They must be fearless and unafraid of confrontation." Eric was the only one out of nine to mention "confrontation." I expected the other lawyers in the participant pool to have similar responses as Eric's, but that was not the case.

Curricula

All participants agreed that some type of educational component would benefit those in the field or wishing to enter the field of compliance. As Eric indicated, "Knowledge is power," and Amy stated, "...I think everyone should have some general knowledge about the world of compliance, regardless of what area they plan to pursue in their career."

Participants were not sure exactly how to answer the question regarding a need for a specific curriculum or certification program because a formal response to the prior one had not been determined (graduate-level or undergraduate-level program or a certification program); therefore, their responses varied tremendously. Kara indicated that it would be "up to the university to decide." Some participants thought just one class on compliance would be sufficient. Some thought that a course could be taught for each bylaw of the NCAA manual.

Higher Education

Participants answered the question regarding what type of degree would be beneficial uniquely. Each participant's response was different and varied in opinion. No one person could pinpoint a specific degree or more skills he or she needed to learn and characteristics that he or she thought would be helpful to succeed. Since all of the participants attained at least a bachelor's degree, it is understandable why they would all believe having a higher level degree would be beneficial in order to work in the field of NCAA compliance.

Image and Complexity

In regards to participants being asked what they wished they had known about compliance/the job before starting in the field, Eric was the only participant who mentioned a "resistance to change." That statement either indicates all of the other schools are satisfied with the status quo, or their environments do not need changing, or this particular institution needed changing. Another statement that I expected to hear multiple times was a lack of staffing; however, it was mentioned only once. Impressions seemed to be an area the majority of the participants discussed. They viewed themselves as "trying hard" to not be a "no guy" or just the "NCAA compliance guy." For example, Amy indicated she "had wished she had known she was going to be perceived as a cop or a lawyer of the department." She also stated, "I really had no idea what I was getting in to." It was assumed others would have had the same thoughts, but that was not the case.

Mary indicated she had wished she had utilized other schools' compliance offices for assistance and advice. Eric responded in a different manner by stating, "...can be taken for granted, a great deal of time, and is underappreciated and most times underpaid for the responsibilities we shoulder." The same participant went on to make a stronger point by adding,

“Unlike most careers in athletics, if my office makes a mistake, the implications are wide-ranging, impact many individuals and ends up in the media and on sports channels like ESPN.” Don indicated, “...it is a lot of behind the scenes stuff and there is a lot of unknown people that do a lot of work....”

Interpersonal Skills

All participants indicated their approach to their jobs was something they perceived they did well. Todd indicated that when something wrong occurs, “you deal with it and move on.” “Finding ways to say yes” and supporting the coaches were two other elements participants discussed. By indicating they want to support their coaching staffs, it demonstrates a different attitude other than what most believe of their sole responsibility. Eric took it a step further by reiterating it was not just him doing the work; his staff is included in on all of the work being done. He indicated working with a team and being efficient were strong points within the office.

Participants indicated having the following skills in their interview: “how to interact with coaches and deal with them,” “communication,” “how to research,” “analytical thinking,” “technical writing,” “public speaking,” “web site development,” “leadership,” and “conflict management.” All participants agreed that having knowledge of the rules, the ability to research the legislative services database, and being able to operate the NCAA EC is important.

Unnecessary Certification

Amy, Kara, Kelly, Eric, Don, Joe, Jon, and Todd indicated there was no need to offer a certification upon completion of the courses. Amy stated, “You don’t have to be certified to be an athletic director, so why should you have to be certified in order to work in compliance?” Eric added by saying, “Because anyone can pass a test, that shows they know the rules. Compliance is much more than that. Just because you are knowledgeable does not mean you are effective in any

way.” Mary was the only participant who was indifferent stating, “You know, I wouldn’t mind one way or the other. I have no objections to it is that became what we had to do, and we take the coaches exam anyway, and I would be confident that our staff would pass something....”

Investigator Reflections

After review, the participants’ responses were in favor of creating some type of course or courses in compliance. My assumptions, outlined below, were correct for the most part. I was also surprised by some of the responses. Each question is addressed in detail for further justification.

Length of Career

Participants were asked how many years they had been working in the field to better understand why and how they answered the questions. I found that the participant who had been in the field for one year responded similarly in all areas as the participant who had been in the field for eighteen years. I thought their responses would have been different, but this was not the case. Most of the participants indicated they had been working in compliance for at least five years.

Educational Background

Participants were asked about their educational background to determine a theme or pattern. I thought their background might provide some explanation into why they responded the way they did, but I do not think that was the case. The three participants with the highest degrees (JD) responded similarly to those who had bachelor’s degrees. Their choice of words was slightly different, but overall they responded similarly.

Entering the Compliance Field

I asked participants how they entered the field of compliance in order to confirm what I had expected to hear. Just as I entered the field, the majority of the participants also had an internship. I was hoping to hear some of the participants had taken a class or training session, but that was not the case. I was under the impression that an internship was the only route into the field, but graduate assistantships are an option as well. I confirmed this by checking the NCAA's employment web site. It allows institutions to post jobs in intercollegiate athletics. This is where I learned of internships and other compliance positions, such as graduate assistantships.

Type of Degree

I asked participants what type of degree someone would need in order to work in a compliance office. I expected participants to indicate some type of sport management degree with compliance coursework or training; however, that was not the case. Each participant referred to skills and characteristics instead. Two of the participants did indicate some type of "advanced degree" should be required, but did not indicate the type of degree.

Skills and Characteristics of Compliance Personnel

Participants were asked what types of skills and characteristics one should possess to work in compliance. I assumed all participants would indicate skills and characteristics;

however, that was not the case. One participant, Eric, answered the question by responding,

When I first expressed an interest in getting into this field, my long-time mentor at Oklahoma State responded with the question, "Why would anyone want to do that?"

This career is not for everyone. There is no glory, no fame, no accolades, and no recognition for a job well done. However, when things go wrong, it almost always falls upon the shoulders of the compliance office in some fashion. Thus, compliance people

are often referred to as “Whistlegoats.” They are the “whistleblowers” for violations of NCAA rules and “scapegoats” very often when problems arise. Compliance people have to be very detail oriented, thick skinned, intelligent, organized and effective in both written and verbal communications. They must be fearless and unafraid of confrontation. At the same time they must be teachers and supporters and make themselves indispensable by learning how to be the best resource they can be to all those who rely upon their services. They must be good listeners and being a bit cynical actually is helpful. It is a fine line that we walk between being supportive of our coaches, staff, student athletes and teams while at the same time being the people that have to educate, monitor, enforce and punish those same people.

I felt this participant’s response represented the other participants’ responses.

Challenges

I asked participants what their biggest challenges were because I thought it could shed some light on what could and should be included in a compliance curriculum. It is not always about the *good*, but the *bad* as well. What better way to build content than with compliance staff that influences the field? Each participant’s challenges were unique. I had expected each of them to indicate he or she felt understaffed, but only one participant mentioned it. I also felt *buy in* from the coaches would have been another topic mentioned by all participants, but, again, this was not the case.

Accomplishments

I asked participants what they did well within the compliance office so that I could gain a perspective of positive accomplishments. I think it is important to share those ideas with others. If it works for one person, it has potential for working for others. For example, one of the

participants mentioned attending the NCAA regional rules seminar and collaborating with other colleagues on best practices in compliance. I would have agreed with this collaboration because I have attended these seminars, wishing the NCAA would provide more time for collaboration with others. Another accomplishment participants mentioned was being available to their coaching staff at any time and that the job is around the clock.

The Unknowing

I asked participants what they wished they had known before entering the field of compliance, so that I could gain another view of the job. I am not sure how it affects the creation of a compliance curriculum. It could impact those considering a career in the field. I was hoping to gain specific insight which might have informed a curricular construct.

Compliance Courses

I asked participants a series of compliance course questions. This was so that I could gain specific insight as to what they thought would be beneficial to have incorporated into a potential curriculum. Each participant's responses were unique. The question focused on those wishing to enter the field of compliance or currently working in it. Each participant agreed that some type of education should be offered. My hope was to get some idea of how many courses to offer; however, participants were not sure how to respond since the basis had not been determined (graduate-level, undergraduate-level, or certification program). Participants indicated either one course as an overview or one course per bylaw. Participants provided feedback on specific skills and characteristics they felt could or should be taught throughout the course(s). In reviewing those responses, it seems there are too many to cover in just one class. Each participant indicated that having working knowledge of the rules, being able to research the rules and communicating those rules were important. Concerning a compliance certification, one participant believed it

should be administered, another was indifferent, and the rest believed there was no reason or need to. In regards to preferring teaching the course online, face-to-face, or using a hybrid model, participants' responses varied.

Participants were asked if they thought compliance officers should be required to pass a certification exam in order to work on an institution's campus because they mentioned it was the latest idea, generated from NAAC. Most of the participants spoke of NAAC's compliance certification in their interviews when I asked this question. Participants thought that a compliance course would be too costly and would not impact their jobs; therefore, they felt a course was of little value to them. These views reflected no need from the particular position and experience the participants held in the field. This did not convey perceptions related to entry into the field.

Recommendations

Because this research is assisting in filling a gap in the literature, I recommend that further studies such as this one be conducted. The participants provided insight into the field, which is lacking. This study should be conducted with more compliance personnel across the United States. The questions should be clarified to receive more specific answers. For example, better definition for the program is (i.e. undergraduate-level, graduate-level, or certification program) should be provided. Participants should not be left wondering. It may be beneficial to conduct a survey that could be emailed to the participants, allowing them more time to respond to each question at their leisure.

My second recommendation is formulate at least one compliance course and integrate it into an undergraduate-level or graduate-level sport management program. Because all participants expressed a need for it, some type of curriculum could be developed. Participants

indicated what could be taught; however, it would be a matter of refining exactly how to do it pedagogically and in what type of setting. By further interviewing compliance personnel, data may be collected on more specific detail to implement such a curriculum. As most participants indicated, the course or curriculum would depend on what the needs are of the institution.

My third recommendation is conduct focus groups with compliance commissioners to gain their insights on the subject matter. It would be helpful to hear from them regarding what types of questions and issues they face. This may better guide the development of a curriculum. Speaking with various conference commissioners will also add to the field of literature.

Further Information

In an article recently published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Warren Zola (2013) discussed the possibility of a new Division of the NCAA, Super Division I (SDI). This division would remain under the jurisdiction and regulatory oversight of the association while abiding by its mission. According to Zola (2013), President Emmert of the NCAA has “finally recognized this dichotomy” (paragraph 2) – the distinct difference between those institutions that generate revenue and those that do not (paragraph 3). With the idea of this new Division, there may be a need for further education. It would be important that a compliance officer learn what his or her new responsibilities are or how the rules will change for them. Then the question becomes who will educate them regarding this new division? Will another manual be published? This new division could suggest the need for more or less personnel depending on the institution’s stance or the NCAA’s mandate.

POSTSCRIPT

As Posner and Rudnitsky (1997) stated, “a product is something produced by a process. Planning is usually a highly complex process; and a plan is the product of that process” (p. 7). As a current professional in the field of NCAA DI compliance, I am close to the subject matter and it was difficult controlling for bias because of this; therefore, planning the research process was more difficult than expected. The original plan was intended to produce specific feedback from compliance professionals in the field to shed light on the educative process to be developed. There were areas of the research for which there was overcompensation, discussed below. Although member checking was utilized, further clarification could have been provided throughout the study in order to assist in developing “richer” responses from participants.

The interview protocol could have been clearer; participant responses were not as focused as they could have been. As the interviews progressed, it became apparent that further clarification could have prompted participants to better answer the questions. Given that this research is a pilot study, various aspects of the research should be adjusted in the future to achieve more useful answers.

Certification Pathway

All participants indicated there is some type of need for compliance education. Participants indicated courses could be offered online, face-to-face, or by using a hybrid model. Participants also provided insight as to what types of skills and characteristics are necessary to work in the field of NCAA compliance. They also provided responses on the knowledge and

content that could be taught within compliance education. The suggested outline for compliance education is offered below.

Curriculum Development

In developing a compliance certification, various aspects of the field should be considered. The most frequent response participants indicated was knowledge of the rules. Therefore, one of the major components of the certification should focus on reading and understanding the rule book. This should include being able to interpret and respond appropriately to rules questions. The second area participants indicated was important was communication. They indicated that being able to effectively communicate with coaches, staff, and student-athletes was important; therefore, a communication component should be incorporated into the certification. The other areas participants responded to need further clarification due to broad questioning.

Instruction

Participants indicated various reasons for how compliance could be taught. Due to overcompensation, participants were unsure how to respond to the question. Each indicated it could be done face-to-face, online, or hybrid depending on the institution and its needs and accommodations. In future research, the question should be clarified to gain a better understanding of why participants chose a specific instructional strategy.

Conclusion

Based on the research conducted, I suggest a compliance certification should be developed based on specific competencies, suggested by participants. The certification would be less than 30 hours of academic credit. With sufficient response to certification and support from the institution and an outside governing body, the certificate could build into demand for a

degree or a minor in compliance. Perhaps this could potentially develop into an undergraduate degree. As the field of NCAA compliance evolves over time, the certification and curriculum should be adapted to meet the needs of the industry's professionals. As rules change, policies and procedures change; curriculum should reflect those changes.

REFERENCES

- “Alabama placed on probation for three years.” (August 16, 1995). *NCAA News*, p. 3.
- “Setting a course to rules compliance.” (1992) *Journal of Sport Management*, 6(1), 75-76.
- Andrews, D. L., Mason, S. S., & Silk, M. L. (2005). *Qualitative methods in sport studies*. New York, NY: Berg.
- Apple, M. (2008). Curriculum planning: Content, form, and the politics of accountability. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Curriculum and Instruction* (pp. 25-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Atkinson, P., & Delamont, S. (2010). Premise, principles, and practices in qualitative research: Revisiting the foundations. *Sage Research Methods Online: Qualitative Health Research*, 1-28. doi:10.41359780857028211
- Berkowitz, S., & Upton, J. (2013, September 4). NCAA member revenue, spending increase. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/college/2013/05/01/ncaa-spending-revenue-texas-ohio-state-athletic-departments/2128147/>
- Chelladurai, P. (2009). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity: A systems approach*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. S. (2007). *Business research methods* (10th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Covell, D., & Barr, C. A. (2010). *Managing intercollegiate athletics*. Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway.
- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative and mixed method approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, Y. S. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2003). *The landscape of qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- DeSchrive, T. & Stotler, D. (1996). An economic analysis of cartel behavior with the NCAA. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10(4), 388-400.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan Company.
- Fink, A. (2010). *Conducting research literature reviews: From the internet to paper* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J.H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.; pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ford, W. J. (2011). Even playing field? *Diverse: Issues in higher education*, 28(6), 11-12.

Retrieved from <http://diverseeducation.com/#>

French, P. A. (2004). *Ethics and college sports*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Fuller, M. (2009). Where's the penalty flag? The unauthorized practice of law, the NCAA, and athletic compliance directors. *New York School of Law Review*, 54, 495-516.

Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2004). *Research methods for sports studies*. London, England: Routledge.

Guest, G., Bunce, A., & Johnson, L. (2006). How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability. *Field Methods*, 1, 59-82. doi: 10.1177/1525822X05279903

Higgs, J. L., & Reisch, J. T. (2002). Testing NCAA compliance at Southeastern State University. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 17(1), 95-100.

Indiana State University (2012). *University handbook*. Terre Haute, IN: Board of Trustees.

Jolly, J. C. (2008). Raising the question #9: Is the student-athlete population unique? And why should we care? *Communication Education*, 57(1), 145-151.

Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2003). Participatory action research. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.; pp. 336-396). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Killinger, S. (2012). *A history of infamous point-shaving scandals*. Retrieved from <http://www.mandatory.com>.

Leedy, P. D., & Ormrod, J. E. (2001). *Practical research: Planning and design* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Lewins, A. & Silver, C. (2007). *Using software in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications, Inc.

Lockhart, T. M. (2009). The NCAA should adopt a uniform student-athlete discipline policy.

UCLA Entertainment Law Review, 16(1), 119-154.

Mitchell, R.B. (1997). International control of nuclear proliferation: Beyond carrots and sticks.

The Nonproliferation Review, 5(1), 40-52.

Mitchell, R. B., Crosset, T., & Barr, C. A. (1999). Encouraging compliance without real power:

Sport associations regulating teams. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 216.

National Association for Athletics Compliance. (2012). *NAAC purpose & overview*. Retrieved

February 3, 2012 from <http://www.nacda.com/naacc/naacc-overview.html>.

National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics. (2012). *What is NACDA and What*

does it do? Retrieved February 3, 2012 from <http://www.nacda.com/nacda/nacda-overview.html>

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011a). *2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual*.

Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011b). *2011-2012 NCAA Division II Manual*.

Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011c). *2011-2012 NCAA Division III Manual*.

Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011d). Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org>.

Indianapolis, IN.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2013). *2013-2014 NCAA Division I Manual*.

Indianapolis, IN: NCAA.

- Palmer, S. C. & Kobritz, J. (2010). Home court advantage: Which collegiate national athletic governing body is most advantageous? *Business, society and government consortium proceedings*, 30-47.
- Pastore, D. L., Goldfine, B., & Riemer, H. (1996). NCAA college coaches and athletic administrative support. *Journal of Sport Management*, 10, 373-387.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pierce, D., Lawrence H., & Kaburakis, A. (2011). Creating synergy between athletics compliance and academic programs: Students in the compliance office. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*, 5, 183-201.
- Posner, G. J. & Rudnitsky, A. N. (1997). *Course design: A guide to curriculum development for teachers*. White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers, Inc.
- Potuto, J. R. (2010). The NCAA rules adoption, interpretation, enforcement, and infractions processes: The laws that regulate them and the nature of court review. *Vanderbilt Journal of Entertainment and Technology Law*, 12, 257-332.
- Riddick, C. C. & Russell, R. V. (2008). *Research in recreation, parks, sport, and tourism* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Sagamore Publishing, L.L.C.
- Rinehart, R. E. (2005). Experiencing sport management: The use of personal narrative in sport management studies. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 497-522.
- Schroeder, P. J. (2010). A model for assessing organizational culture in intercollegiate athletic departments. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 98-118.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2007). *The Sage Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry* (3rd ed.). Urbana-Champaign, IL: Sage.

- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shulman, J. L. & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Street, J.M. (1999). Self-efficacy: A tool for providing effective support services for student-athletes. In S. Robinson (Ed.); *Gaining the competitive edge: Enriching the collegiate experience of the new student-athlete*. (pp. 96-136) Columbia, SC: National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition, University of South Carolina.
- Toma, J. D., & Kramer, D. A., III. (2011). The uses of intercollegiate athletics: opportunities and challenges of the university. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52, 246-248.
- Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Watt, S. K. & Moore III, J.L. (2001). Who are student athletes? *New Directions for Student Services* (93), 7-18.
- Wieberg, S. (1996, November 7). Schools no longer wait for NCAA to make a move. *USA Today*, p. 18c.
- Wells, J. T., & Carozza, R. B. (2000). Corruption in collegiate sports. *Internal Auditor*, 57(2).
- Welner, K. G. & Oakes, J. (2008). Structuring curriculum. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), *The sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 91-111). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Westbury, I. (2008). Making curricula. In F. M. Connelly (Ed.), *The sage handbook of curriculum and instruction* (pp. 45-65). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Weston, M.A. (2011). NCAA sanctions: Assigning blame where it belongs. *Boston College Law Review*, 52, 551-583.

Wong, G. M. (2009). *The comprehensive guide to careers in sports*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professional: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Zola, W. K. (2013). Let's give the rich and powerful their own NCAA division. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* Commentary. Retrieved June 17, 2013 from <http://chronicle.com/article/Lets-Give-the-Rich-and/139833/>

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Script: “Good morning/afternoon, this is Tonya Gimbert from Indiana State University. As I mentioned in the email asking you participate, I am conducting this research in fulfillment of a dissertation my PhD program. Thank you again for agreeing to participate. I would like to go over a couple of things before we get started:

1. Describe the project. Tell the informant about:
 - (a) The purpose of the study.
 - (b) The individuals and sources of the data being collected.
 - (c) What will be done with the data to protect the confidentiality of the informant.
 - (d) How long the interview will take.
2. Have the informant read and verbally agree to the consent form.

If you have questions at any time during the interview, please feel free to ask.”

3. Turn on the recorder and test it.

Researcher Record

Time of interview: _____

Date: _____

Informant: _____

Assigned Pseudo Name: _____

Additional Notes:

APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Are you male or female?
2. How many total years have you worked in the field of NCAA compliance, in any capacity?
3. What is the highest degree you have attained in education? What was your major at the undergraduate level and/or graduate level?
4. How did you begin your career in NCAA compliance? Why have you continued to work in this area?
5. What type of educational degree do you believe one should have in order to work in the field of compliance?
6. What type of skills and characteristics should one possess to work in an NCAA compliance office?
7. What do you perceive are the major challenges you have been faced with throughout your compliance career?
8. What do you perceive you do well in, within the compliance office?
 - a. Do you believe your educational background is the reason for what you have just mentioned?
9. What do you wish you knew about compliance/the job before you started in the field?

10. Do you believe a series of compliance courses (some type undergraduate or graduate level classes) would be beneficial to those wishing to go into the field or currently working in the field of compliance?
 - i. If so, why?
 - ii. If not, why not?
11. How many courses would be beneficial in the compliance series?
12. What types of skills do you believe should or could be taught in the compliance courses to be offered?
13. What knowledge or content should or could be taught in the compliance courses to be offered?
14. Upon completion of the compliance courses, should a Compliance Certification be given?
15. Should the series of compliance courses be offered through a distance education or face-to-face or hybrid model?
 - a. If no, why not?
16. Do you believe compliance staff should be required to take a NCAA Compliance Certification Examination related in order to work on an institution's campus?
 - a. If yes, why?
 - b. If no, why not?
17. If you said yes to question 16, who would you suggest to develop the certification examination?
18. Is there anything else you would like to add?

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT CONSENT AGREEMENT

This study is being conducted by Tonya Gimbert of Indiana State University, a doctoral student in the department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology, to examine NCAA compliance officer's perceptions of professional preparation processes within NCAA compliance.

The research method is a telephone interview. The interview questions ask my thoughts about my perceptions on compliance education. There are no right or wrong answers, only my personal views and experiences.

The telephone interview will take approximately an hour, and the overall study will be completed in about eight months. The interviews will be audio-recorded for accuracy. I will be given a pseudonym that will be used throughout the recording session to keep my identity confidential at all times. The recordings will be kept confidential and secure. This will be accomplished by uploading the audio recordings to a personal computer, which will be password protected. Immediately after uploading each file recording to the computer, the audio file will be erased from the recorder. A follow-up email will be sent to verify the data. Information transmitted via the Internet will be done through a University server and password protected email system. There is minimal risk to you as a participant in this study. However, since we will be using the Internet and a transcription service, there is no guarantee of 100% confidentiality. The transcriptionist, however, will be required to sign a confidentiality agreement.

I can ask questions at any time about the interview or the study in general.

If I wish to change any information after the interview has been conducted, or if I have any questions, I can contact Tonya Gimbert at 812-237-4173 or Tonya.Gimbert@indstate.edu, who is a dissertator at Indiana State University. I may also contact the Chair of Tonya's dissertation committee, Dr. Susan Kiger, at 812-237-2956 or Susan.Kiger@indstate.edu.

The results will be reported in a dissertation, and possibly in other presentations or professional publications. In any and all of these reports, I understand that my institution and I will remain anonymous.

Participation is strictly voluntary. I am free to withdraw my participation at any time.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Indiana State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) by mail at Indiana State University, Office of Sponsored Programs, Terre Haute, IN 47809, by phone at (812) 237-8217, or e-mail the IRB at irb@indstate.edu. You will be given the opportunity to discuss any questions about your rights as

a research subject with a member of the IRB. The IRB is an independent committee composed of members of the University community, as well as lay members of the community not connected with ISU. The IRB has reviewed and approved this study.

I have read all of the above information regarding this study. The procedures and requirements have been explained to me, and I understand them. I freely and voluntarily consent to be a participant.

For my records, I have been provided with a copy of this consent form via email.

Date: