

AN ANALYSIS OF COACH PERSPECTIVES ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS
SCHOLARSHIP MODELS

Jonathan A. Teich

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration)

Chapel Hill
2016

Approved by:

Erianne Weight

Barbara Osborne

Robert Malekoff

ABSTRACT

Jonathan A. Teich: An Analysis of College Coach Perspectives on the Current College Scholarship Model
(Under the direction of Erianne Weight)

This study explored NCAA Division I coach perceptions of the current scholarship model in regards to scholarship limits, head count and equivalency sports, and modifications to the distribution of scholarship dollars. There were 349 head and assistant coaches from Division I Power-5 conferences who shared their insights toward this purpose. The results reveal a number of key findings which can be a valuable addition to the discussion on providing scholarships to student-athletes. These key findings include: coaches are least satisfied with the overall NCAA scholarship model and the equivalency sport scholarship allocation model, headcount and revenue sport coaches were more satisfied with the four aspects of the scholarship model, and coaches that were more knowledgeable of other sports' scholarship limits were less satisfied with the current scholarship model. This is relevant in the current landscape of intercollegiate athletics as coaches have not been included in the discussions on potential changes to the scholarship model.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	V
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction	1
Purpose of Study	2
Research Questions	2
Significance of Study	3
Definition of Terms	3
Limitations	4
Delimitations	4
Assumptions	4
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
College Athletic Scholarships	5
History	5
Title IX and Financial Aid	7
Current Scholarships	9
Criticisms of the current Scholarship Model	10
Scholarships as a Violation of Antitrust Law	10
Pay-for-Play	12
Suggestions to Improve the Scholarship Model	14
Referent Cognitions Theory	16
CHAPTER III: METHODS	20

Subjects	20
Instrumentation	20
Data Analysis	21
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	22
Demographics	22
Coaches Satisfaction with Current NCAA Scholarship Model	23
Coaches Feedback on the Current NCAA Scholarship Model.....	25
Strengths of the Headcount Model	25
Areas the Headcount Model Could Be Improved.....	27
Strengths of the Equivalency Model.....	28
Areas the Equivalency Model Could be Improved.....	29
Impact of Knowledge of Scholarship on Satisfaction Level with Scholarship Model..	30
Potential Alternative Models	31
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	33
Satisfaction with Current Scholarship Model	33
Feedback on the Current Scholarship Model.....	32
Impact of Knowledge on Satisfaction with the Scholarship Model	34
Future Studies	35
APPENDIX A: CURRENT NCAA SCHOLARSHIP LIMITS	38
APPENDIX B: THESIS SURVEY	40
APPENDIX C: THESIS INVITATION EMAIL	44
REFERENCES	45

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Demographics Table	22
Table 2 Satisfaction with current NCAA scholarship model.....	24
Table 3 Strengths of the current headcount sport scholarship allocation model	27
Table 4 Improvements to the current headcount scholarship allocation model.....	28
Table 5 Strengths of the current equivalency sport scholarship allocation model	29
Table 6 Improvements to the current headcount sport scholarship allocation model.....	30
Table 7 Preferred alternative model.....	32

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

As intercollegiate athletics grew in popularity and took a foothold within the American academy in the 1930s, debates about professionalism became prevalent. Although athletic scholarships were not approved by the NCAA until 1956, the concept of a grant-in-aid became common in the 1940's as schools that could not compete with the prestige of the Big Ten and Ivy League would try to attract recruits with the promise of a free education (Gibson, 2012). Attempts to reform intercollegiate athletics began with the 1929 Carnegie Report, then the 1949 NCAA Sanity Code, and the American Council on Education Report in 1972 (Ridpath, 2008). These reform efforts have been continued by groups such as the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and faculty groups like The Drake Group and The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. The goal of these groups is to align athletics with the mission of higher education. With discussions about compensating student-athletes, full cost-of-attendance, and antitrust laws, these reform groups and scholars have tried to determine the best balance for awarding scholarships at the NCAA level.

There are many critics who believe that full scholarships are not adequate compensation for student-athletes (Goplerud, 1997; Hakim, 2000; Miller, 2011; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996). A body of literature advocates that current scholarship limits violate antitrust laws, student-athletes should be paid a salary, and the current amateur model disbanded (Acain, 1998; Chin, 1993; Kahn, 2007; Kreher, 2006; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996).

However, despite these criticisms and suggested reforms to the present scholarship model there is a lack of research including input from those who are significantly impacted, coaches. This

research examines the coach's perception of the current scholarship model, and also provides a framework to collect coaches suggestions to modify the current scholarship model.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to explore NCAA Division I coach perceptions of the current NCAA scholarship model in regards to scholarship limits, head count and equivalency sports, and modifications to the distribution of scholarship dollars. Additionally, this study will facilitate a voice to provide suggestions for modifications to the current NCAA scholarship model.

Research Questions

Based on the review of literature, the following research questions were formed for this study:

RQ 1: How satisfied are Division I coaches with the current NCAA scholarship model in regards to scholarship limits, head count and equivalency sports, and the distribution of scholarship dollars?

RQ 2: What suggestions for modification to the current NCAA scholarship model do Division I head coaches suggest (if any)?

RQ 3: Are there differences in satisfaction about the current NCAA scholarship model between coaches in the following categories?

- a) Revenue Sports
- b) Non-revenue Sports
- c) Headcount Sports
- d) Equivalency Sports

RQ4): Does knowledge level of the scholarship model have a significant impact on satisfaction level with the current scholarship model?

Significance of Study

This study is relevant in today's college athletic landscape because it adds a new perspective to the previous literature on the criticism of athletic scholarships in intercollegiate athletics—the perspective of head coaches. Although there has been some research discussing reforms to the current scholarship model, there is little research that examines the insights of coaches about the current NCAA scholarship model. This study seeks to add to the research base by providing the perspective of coaches on scholarship reform and provide new information that can help the NCAA understand how its coaches and administrators feel about scholarships. One hope is the results will spark more focused and informed discussions about examining the current scholarship model and determining if it is the best model for the intercollegiate athletics today. The discussions may include looking at scholarships from a non-traditional perspective and bring about new models that better fit the needs of the institutions and the student-athletes currently.

Definition of Terms

- 1. National Collegiate Athletic Association** - A voluntary organization composed of various universities and colleges that compete in intercollegiate athletics. It is also the governing body that creates and enforces the rules for all of its members.
- 2. Scholarship model** – The structure of scholarship limits assigned to each sport based on NCAA legislation.
- 3. Power-5** – The Power Five represents the conferences within the NCAA that have decision-making autonomy. It includes the Atlantic Coast Conference, Big 10 Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pac 12 Conference, and the Southeastern Conference.
- 4. Revenue Sports** – Sports such as football, men's basketball, and women's basketball which are most commercially visible and historically have the most likelihood of generating revenue through sponsorship and ticket sales for an athletic department.

5. **Non-Revenue Sports** – Olympic sports that generally operate at a financial loss and garner less media attention and spectator attendance than revenue sports.
6. **Head Count Sports** - Sports that have a limit to the total number of counters in an academic year (NCAA Manual, 2015).
7. **Equivalency Sports** - Sports that have a limit on the value of financial aid awards that an institution may provide in an academic year to scholarship athletes (NCAA Manual, 2015).
8. **Counters** – An individual who is receiving financial aid that is countable against the aid limitations in a sport (NCAA Manual, 2015).

Limitations

1. This study is limited to coaches at NCAA Division I universities in Power 5 conferences with a published email address.
2. There is the possibility of non-response bias, depending on the response rate, because of the nature of a voluntary study.

Delimitations

1. This study is delimited to full time employed NCAA Division I coaches in Power 5 conferences during the 2015-2016 academic year and therefore results may not be generalized to coaches in the NCAA Divisions II or III.

Assumptions

1. The completion of this study is voluntary for all subjects.
2. All subject who complete this study will answer the questions honestly and completely.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

College Athletic Scholarships

History

In 1905, President Theodore Roosevelt commissioned an organization to oversee the conduct and various issues that had been occurring with the growth of college football (Smith, 2011). This group was originally known as the Intercollegiate Athletic Association, but in 1910 the name was changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Smith, 2011). The NCAA could recommend policies, but could not enforce them until the 1940's (Oriard, 2012). Reform discussions were frequent throughout the 1920's; the Carnegie report sparked discussion about reform in college athletics because of the focus on the commercialism of college football and eligibility concerns (Oriard, 2012). These issues all took place prior to the concept of athletic scholarships, which were not put in place until 1956 (Oriard, 2012).

Although athletic scholarships were not approved by the NCAA until 1956, scholarships were an issue in the 1930's as debates about "professionalism" became prevalent. The southern conferences became the first to approve scholarships while the Big Ten and Pacific Coast Conference did not provide scholarships but gave the athletes money through on-campus jobs or alumni (Oriard, 2012). Both groups disagreed with what the other was doing, as the Big Ten and PCC claimed the southern schools were making their athletes professionals. The southern schools believed the Big Ten and PCC should just give scholarships (Oriard, 2012). In 1939, the NCAA first attempted to regulate financial aid came when it created a policy stating athletic aid had to go through the same process as aid for the rest of the student population (Noll, 2013). That same policy also stated aid could not be based on athletic participation and could not be taken away for

not participating (Noll, 2013).

The concept of a grant-in-aid became common in the 1940's as schools that could not compete with the prestige of the Big Ten and Ivy League would try to attract recruits with the promise of a free education (Gibson, 2012). This meant a major cost increase for those schools but it was deemed worthwhile because it increased the school's chances for a larger share of college football's revenue (Gibson, 2012). In 1948, the Big Ten schools tried to include the prohibition of grants-in-aid in the Sanity Code. But when schools who continued to offer scholarships were not being punished by the NCAA, the code was abandoned (Gibson, 2012). By 1952, with all the major football schools offering grants-in-aid to remain competitive, the Big Ten decided to adopt the idea as well (Gibson, 2012).

In 1956, the NCAA took control of grants-in-aid and regulated their distribution and what could be included (Gibson, 2012). The NCAA determined that scholarships would last a maximum of four years with most schools offering a four year "no-cut" scholarship, while caps on total grants-in-aid were determined by the the conferences (Gibson, 2012). However, it was only a matter of time until more regulations were put in place. In 1973, the NCAA eliminated four-year athletic scholarships which enabled schools to give one-year renewable scholarships (Gibson, 2012). Then in 1976, in an attempt to limit the rising costs in college athletics, the NCAA placed a cap on total scholarship numbers (Gibson, 2012). The NCAA also changed the definition of common expenses and created the current divide between a full grant in aid and full cost of attendance (Noll, 2013).

Since 1976, the NCAA has continued to make changes to financial aid for student-athletes. In 1977, student-athletes could receive Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (Pell Grants) which would count against the amount of total aid (Noll, 2013). In 1978, athletes were granted the ability to receive money from the U.S. Olympic Committee (Noll, 2013). In 1982, Pell Grants were

allowed to exceed the grant in aid cap at a limit of \$900 for Division 1. The limit on Pell Grants exceeding the cap was removed in 1996 (Noll, 2013). In 1989, the NCAA determined what additional expenses could be provided to the student-athletes. This included support services, entertainment, room and board, and travel (Noll, 2013). The majority of changes since 1989 have included what additional services can be provided to student-athletes and what expenses they can be reimbursed for. Since the NCAA's inception there have been changes made to scholarships, including the classification of sports as head-count or equivalency, although there was no reasoning provided for the classifications. Often forgotten in this discussion is federal legislation that has had a profound impact on the history of college athletics -- Title IX.

Title IX and Financial Aid

Title IX has made one of the largest impacts on the college athletics landscape. After its inception in 1972, schools were required to treat women's athletic programs equally, even though they were not a part of the current NCAA structure (Sperber, 1990). Title IX states that "no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance" (20 U.S.C §). Since college athletics are a part of universities that receive federal funding, they must comply with Title IX (Civil Rights Restoration Act, 1987).

According to George (1999), there have been two waves of Title IX litigation, the first focused on proportionality rates while the second focused on the scholarship dilemma. The first wave of litigation occurred in the 1990s and was prompted by institutions decisions to cut men's and women's teams (George, 1999). The next wave came around in 1997 when the OCR filed allegations against 25 institutions claiming they were in violation of Title IX for providing a smaller proportion of financial aid to female student-athletes (George, 1999).

Leadership relative to Title IX compliance by the NCAA has also been minimal. The

NCAA also fought to keep athletics out of Title IX regulations and filed the first lawsuit against the United States Department of Education complaining that the regulations should be invalidated (NCAA v. Califano, 1978). The NCAA did not even include women's sports in the constitution and bylaws until 1981 (Bass et al., 2015). There is also no current NCAA bylaw mandating Title IX compliance (Elliot & Mason, 2001).

One of the possible reasons the NCAA has been slow to formally support Title IX is evidenced in some of the historical concerns – particularly the increase in costs and the impact on football. In 1979, Southeastern Conference leaders were vocal about their concerns with inflation and the cost of adding sports to the program (Thelin, 2000, p. 392). Even in 1979, the Southeastern Conference athletic directors were determined to increase fundraising efforts as opposed to cutting sports, which is similar to the arms race today (Bass et al., 2015). Adding sports results in the need to provide more athletic aid to the new teams.

One of the biggest challenges in Title IX is balancing football (Bass et al., 2015). Football has around 100 participants and it would take drastic measures in order to help schools with football be compliant with Title IX (Bass et. al., 2015). One strategy currently being utilized is to add women's sports with large roster sizes (e.g. rowing, ice hockey, handball, and water polo). However, it is clear that these are not very popular sports in the United States (Bass et. al., 2015). Unfortunately, athletics administrators have chosen to remove opportunities for men's nonrevenue teams rather than increase women's participation opportunities, although there are other ways to reallocate resources (Bass et al., 2015). Title IX is a key factor in the distribution of athletic aid as institutions must comply with Federal law and provide equal opportunities for both genders. This can result in an increase in athletic scholarships as a school might have to add teams or scholarships to remain compliant with Title IX.

Current Scholarships

Bylaw 15 in the NCAA Division I Manual details all of the requirements for financial aid provided to student-athletes. This includes financial aid renewals, maximum amounts of financial aid, and limits per sport among many other regulations. “Financial aid is defined in the manual as funds provided to a student-athlete from various sources to assist in paying their cost of education,” (NCAA Manual, 2015, p.187). The bylaw states that financial aid cannot exceed the cost of attendance and consists of tuition and fees, room and board, books, and other expenses related to attending the institution (NCAA Manual, 2015).

The limits per sport are broken down into head-count and equivalency sports. A head-count sport means that there are restrictions to the number of athletes that can be on the scholarship and all athletes on scholarship receive full grant in aid (NCAA Manual, 2015). These sports include men’s and women’s basketball, football, women’s tennis, and women’s gymnastics. The remainder of sports offered by the NCAA are equivalency sports in which a set amount of scholarships are distributed amongst the participants at the coach’s discretion. Baseball is the only equivalency sport which designates a minimum amount of financial aid that can be given to a student-athlete. A baseball student-athlete on scholarship must receive a minimum of 25 percent of a full equivalency (NCAA Manual, 2015). There are also some equivalency sports which limit the number of participants as well. These include baseball (27), ice hockey (30), beach volleyball (14), and Football Championship Subdivision football (85) (NCAA Manual, 2015). Appendix A lists the scholarship limits for all sports currently offered by the NCAA in 2015-2016. These limits have remained consistent since the 1990s but more sports have been added to provide more opportunities for student-athletes. One of the biggest driving forces behind providing more opportunities was Title IX, which also plays a large role in athletic scholarships.

A recent addition to the current scholarship model is full cost of attendance. Bylaw 15.0.2

states that “cost of attendance” is an amount calculated by an institutional financial aid office that includes tuition and fees, room and board, books and supplies, transportation, and other expenses related to attendance at the institution (NCAA Manual, 2015, Bylaw 15.0.2). This is calculated by using the same policies and procedures used for students in general (NCAA Manual, 2015). Bylaw 15.02.5 now defines a full grant-in-aid (Bylaw 15.02.5) as financial aid that covers all expenses related to attendance as established in Bylaw 15.02 and 15.02.01 (NCAA Manual, 2015, Bylaw 15.02.05). Similarly, Bylaw 15.1 now states that a student-athlete can receive aid for athletics ability up to the cost of attendance at the student-athlete’s institution (NCAA Manual, 2015, Bylaw 15.1). Providing student-athletes with additional financial support may calm some critics of athletics scholarships but there are others who still find many issues with the current scholarship model.

Criticisms of the Current Scholarship Model

Despite the opportunities that scholarships can provide for student-athletes, there are still many critics who believe that scholarships are not adequate compensation for student-athletes (Goplerud, 1997; Hakim, 2000; Miller, 2011; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996). A growing body of literature has specifically amplified arguments that the current scholarship model violates antitrust laws, that student-athletes should be paid, and the NCAA should disband the current amateur model (Acain, 1998; Chin, 1993; Kahn, 2007; Kreher, 2006; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996). These criticisms have resulted in some changes to the scholarship package, such as providing student-athletes with full cost of attendance, to provide more financial support for student-athletes. But reformers would like to see even more radical changes to scholarships. This section will take a more in-depth look at these criticisms.

Scholarships as a Violation of Antitrust Law

Federal antitrust laws were put in place to prevent restraints on free competition in business

and commercial transactions (Chin, 1993). The Sherman Act prohibits conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the United States (15 U.S.C. § 1-7, 1890). There are two sections to the Sherman Act. Section 1 prohibits any action that restrains trade and section 2 addresses wrongful application of monopoly power (15 U.S.C. § 1-7, 1890) The courts analyze Section 1 complaints in two ways. First, a court may determine that certain restraints are illegal regardless of the reason for the restraints or illegal per se. More typically in sport-related cases, the court will apply a “rule-of-reason” analysis by performing a thorough review of the market impact of the restraint (NCAA v. Board of Regents, 1984). As many agreements among competitors in a marketplace restrain trade in some way, it soon became apparent the courts needed to interpret which agreements were reasonable (Goldman, 1990). Antitrust law allows agreements that enhance the market and prevents those that have a negative effect on the market (Kreher,2006). Sport cases present a unique dynamic because the opinion applied in other cases is difficult to apply to the unique competitor arrangements that are necessary in sports (Kreher,2006).The NCAA had been able to avoid applications of antitrust law because its activities were seen as noncommercial (Chin, 1993). However, this idea changed following the ruling in *Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar* (1975). The court ruled that self-regulatory organizations, such as the NCAA, were not immune from antitrust law (*Goldfarb v. Virginia State Bar*, 1975). Court precedent has established the NCAA acts in two markets: a commercial and profit-driven market and an educational market that focused on preserving amateurism (Chin, 1993). When NCAA activities are purely commercial they are subject to antitrust laws, whereas rules attempting to preserve amateurism are not subject to antitrust (Chin, 1993). Most individuals who attempt to bring a suit against the NCAA struggle to separate the commercial and noncommercial activities (Chin, 1993).

Despite the challenges of applying antitrust law to collegiate sports, there are still many critics who argue that scholarships are a clear violation of antitrust. According to Powell (2013),

“NCAA regulations violate antitrust law because they restrict price competition among schools, limit consumer choice, and lower product quality” (p.242). Further, Gibson (2012), claims that scholarship limits are a strategic way to lower costs for an athletic department. Gibson (2012) also believes that imposing one-year scholarships and per-sport limits is an example of the NCAA’s history of anticompetitive behavior. Powell (2006) strongly believes that FCS football dividing 63 scholarships among 85 student-athletes and FBS football providing a full grant-in-aid to the same amount is an example of price-fixing by the NCAA. The current rules restrict the amount of money in the form of scholarships that schools are allowed to provide their student-athletes (Powell, 2013). “The NCAA rule prevents numerous buyers and sellers (colleges and universities) from acting independently and rationally, and turns the NCAA into a price (scholarship amount) setter” (Davis & Malagrino, 2012, p.624). Davis and Malagrino (2012) also state, “To establish a natural equilibrium price, the market participants should instead base their decisions on the supply of student-athletes and the demand for student-athletes driven by available scholarship funds” (p.624). One concept that has been discussed to counteract alleged price fixing is to remove scholarships and to compensate student-athletes for their participation in intercollegiate athletics.

Pay-for-Play

Pay-for-play advocates have argued that student-athletes are exploited by the universities for which they play in order to increase financial gains for the school (Acain, 1998; Haden, 2001; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998). “Pay-for-play is predicated on the assumption that colleges enjoy huge revenues from marketing their sports programs and that the extraordinary profits resulting from these are not shared with players who perform in the arena” (Mondello & Beckham, 2003, p. 66). Although, student-athletes do receive athletic scholarships for their participation in intercollegiate athletics, these critics claim it does not provide the participant with enough to pay for other living expenses (Haden, 2001). Haden (2001) and other pay-for-play advocates (Acain, 1998; Sack &

Staurowsky, 1998) also argue that the time demands on student-athletes and other NCAA regulations prevent them from finding outside employment for additional income.

Murphy and Pace (1994) use scholarship compensations theory to demonstrate how student-athletes are exploited by the NCAA. This theory states that, “Universities claim that providing student-athletes with a scholarship and paying for their education is sufficient compensation” (Murphy & Pace, 1994, p.174). Murphy and Pace (1994) introduce a plan that would allow monetary compensation for student athletes. In the study they point out that the general student body can receive funds from their talents while a student-athlete is not able to use their skills to profit (Murphy & Pace, 1994). For example, an English literature major could write a novel and receive the profits without any institutional limitations even though the intended major was English (Murphy & Pace, 1994). These critics believe it is not fair to hold student-athletes and the general student population to different standards (Murphy & Pace, 1994). Compensation is also not equal among athletes as a superstar athlete’s value is not reflected in a scholarship (Murphy & Pace, 1994). A stand-out player is more responsible for sell-out crowds and media revenue but is still compensated the same as the student-athlete who sits on the bench (Murphy & Pace, 1994). Murphy and Pace (1994) compare it to the business world where it would be unreasonable to expect a janitor and a CEO to earn the same salary.

If pay-for play advocates had their way, the commercial/education model would be put in place to replace the current scholarship model. The commercial/education model claims that college sports are a commercial enterprise and should be treated with the same economic considerations as other industries (Acain, 1998). By establishing commercialism as a main principle of college athletics, this model would want to find ways to provide student-athletes with financial compensation (Acain, 1998). This model also sees how essential student-athletes are to college sports and should pay them for their essential part in making college athletics a successful

product (Acain,1998). One way to provide student-athletes with compensation would be to recognize them as employees (Mondello & Beckham, 2003). However, NCAA institutions fear that recognizing athletes as employees would detract from the educational mission of higher education (Mondello & Beckam, 2003). Each of these critics believe their model would be the best for college athletics and have suggested many different ideas to improve scholarships for student-athletes.

Suggestions to Improve the Scholarship Model

There have been multiple attempts by organizations such as the Knight Commission, the Drake Group and the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) to reform intercollegiate athletics in attempt to align it with the mission of higher education (Ridpath, 2008; Sack, 2009). These reform groups have also presented ideas to reform the athletic scholarship. For example, one of the main focuses of the COIA is finances and finding ways to reduce costs primarily in scholarships, squad sizes, season length, and recruitment (Ridpath, 2008). The Drake Group went even further to suggest that one-year renewable scholarships should be replaced with need-based financial aid or multi-year athletic scholarships (Ridpath, 2008).

Another popular suggestion is the elimination of athletic scholarships and the adoption of the need-based model across all the NCAA divisions. This is a practice that is used in the Ivy league as well as Division III (Sobocinski, 1996). This model does not allow student-athletes to receive funding for athletic ability but only for their financial need (Sobocinski, 1996). The intent of this model is to return the focus to academics and minimize the emphasis currently placed on athletics at universities (Sobocinski, 1996). The Drake Group believes that this demonstrates a commitment to the student-athletes whose value to the university exceeds their role in athletics (Ridpath, 2008).

With revenues continuing to increase in college athletics, researchers have also advocated

for a revenue sharing model that would give student-athletes a piece of the pie. Acain (1998) suggests that a structure be in place to share the increasing revenues with the student-athletes who are essential in producing the revenue. He proposed a revenue-sharing plan that is used in professional sports leagues and conferences to split revenues among teams or member institutions (Acain, 1998). Acain (1998) proposes allowing student-athletes to receive a percentage of the revenues produced by their team. However, the revenues would be tiered based on seniority. For example, a fourth year participant would receive 1% of revenues while a first year participant would receive .25% (Acain, 1998). If a team does not make a profit for a school year, each student-athlete would rely only on the scholarship for compensation (Acain, 1998).

Acain (1998) has three areas he feels the student-athletes should receive revenue from. First, from post season-compensation the schools could take a 65% cut and give the student-athletes 35% following a successful post-season run (Acain, 1998). Next, he suggests rewarding student-athletes for being named an athletic or academic all-american. Currently the NCAA limit is \$300 for these rewards (Acain, 1998). Acain (1998) proposes that the NCAA could find a sponsor or collect donations from all Division 1 schools to reward the student-athletes who excel on the court and in the classroom. Last, Acain (1998) believes that student-athletes should receive a share of the endorsements and merchandising a school earns.

There have even been more radical suggestions to reform scholarships, especially those proposed by Stephen Ross (2011) in the *Tulane Law Review*. Ross (2011) created four guiding principles and applied them to five articles to create major reform in college athletics, two of which focus on scholarships and the scholarship model. In the fourth article, Ross (2011) suggests that all sports assign scholarships on an equivalency basis and reduce football scholarships from eighty-five to fifty-five. Schools should be using prudent management to try to minimize costs and maximize returns (Ross, 2011). The ability to offer partial scholarships will also distribute talent

more evenly and make college football an even better product (Ross, 2011). Players will try to go where they are valued highest and that should create less of a gap between the very good and elite teams (Ross, 2011). This reform idea would limit costs, increase college football competition, and increase revenue (Ross, 2011).

Ross's fifth article suggests that scholarships range from a quarter of a scholarship to a full scholarship plus a cash subsidy to stand-out student-athletes that would not be greater than one half of the full cost of attendance at the school (Ross, 2011). The goal for this proposal is to reduce the frequency and unnecessary costs of improper payment scandals (Ross, 2011). This proposal would help limit the perception of student-athletes being exploited as well (Ross, 2011). This would allow student-athletes whose value in a free market is greater than the current scholarship to earn closer to their market worth (Ross, 2011). Ross (2011) suggests using baseball's Value Over Replacement Player (VORP) to determine how much a star player is worth and only for a few athletes would the difference between the star athlete and his or her replacement be equal to a full scholarship. This is another way a recruit could determine his value as at one school he may be offered the cash subsidy but not at another university (Ross, 2011).

These suggestions are important to the study as it provides a framework for what scholars believe are the important to change with the current scholarship model. This will allow for a comparison between the suggestions the coaches provide to see if there are any similarities or differences.

Referent Cognitions Theory

The theoretical foundation for this study is based on referent cognitions theory, which contains elements of both organizational justice and equity theory. Organizational justice refers to employee perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Rupp & Thornton, 2015). It is further broken down into three categories: procedural, interactional, and distributive. Procedural justice deals with

fairness regarding process elements. Interactional justice focuses on fairness with interpersonal interactions. Distributive justice is built around outcomes and allocations (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Ropocel, 2001). Referent cognitions theory falls under distributive justice as does equity theory.

Equity theory was one of the first to explore the processes involved in fairness judgments, with a focus on distributive judgments (Adams, 1965). This theory states people determine if they are treated fairly by examining inputs against the outputs and comparing those to another person's ratio (Cropanzano, Byrne, Bobocel, & Rupp, 2001). If another employee is putting in same effort but is receiving greater outcomes that could be deemed as unfair (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Others' outcomes are important for individuals when forming justice judgments (Kulik & Ambrose, 1992). However, equity theory has been described by some researchers as not broad enough in the determining if a situation is fair or not. First, it only considers outcomes when determining if a situation was fair (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001). Equity theory also fails to consider the impact of procedures on fairness evaluations (Folger & Cropanzano, 2001).

In order to address the concerns with equity theory, Folger developed referent cognitions theory (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Referent cognitions theory claims that an unfair judgment will result from a situation where an individual believes a more favorable outcome would have resulted from an alternative procedure that should have been used (Cropanzano et al., 2001). The referent is the awareness that there is a procedural alternative that would result in a more favorable outcome (Cropanzano et al., 2001). According to Folger, there are two types of referents: high and low. High referents are individuals who are aware of an alternative option that would lead to a better outcome. A low referent is an individual who is not aware of an alternative option that would have led to better results (Cropanzano et al., 2001). Folger also found certain situations where the level of referent did not play a role in a person's agreement with an outcome. These situations include: a

high referent outcome that will not produce injustice because it came from a fair process (Cropanzano & Folger, 1989), when a favorable outcome will be assigned in the future (Folger, Rosenfeld, Rheaume & Martin, 1983), or when an adequate justification is provided (Folger, Rosenfeld, & Robinson, 1983).

Other researchers have found similar results. If an individual perceives their intergroup situation as legitimate or stable, they will accept a situation in which they are disadvantaged. The opposite occurs if they feel the intergroup is instable or illegitimate (Cropanzano et al., 2001). If there are alternative options, that will also make people feel their situation is unfair. Folger recognized some shortcomings with his referent cognitions theory and into Folger's fairness theory. His fairness theory stated that social injustice occurs when an individual is able to hold someone else accountable for a situation when their well-being has been threatened (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998, 2001).

Goldman (2002), utilized referent cognitions theory to analyze the different legal claims filed by terminated workers. He believed that this theory was useful because referent cognitions theory is based on an individual's frame of reference. This is also important when a person decides to file a legal claim as well (Goldman, 2002). For example, a terminated employee may feel that he would have not been fired had the company used standard procedures also used by other companies (Goldman, 2002). Goldman's (2002) results showed that referent cognitions theory was the proper theory to help understand the various legal claims.

Allen, Aquino, Griffeth, and Hom (1997), examined voluntary turnover with referent cognitions theory. They believed that this theory would provide a comprehensive analysis of how justice perceptions would prompt employee withdrawal (Allen et al., 1997). The researchers hoped that adding referent cognitions theory to the existing literature, to verify the link between the processes underlying relative deprivation and employee turnover (Allen et al., 1997). The study

found encouraging results for integrating referent cognitions theory when examining voluntary turnover. The theoretical model confirmed that the relationship between referent outcomes and outcome satisfaction was negative and that the relationship between interpersonal justification and supervisory satisfaction was positive (Allen et al., 1997).

Referent cognitions theory provides a useful theoretical framework to analyze the coach's perspective on the NCAA scholarship model and judgements of satisfaction with the model. This theory allows for the opportunity to determine which coaches are high or low referents and how that may impact their ideas for modification to the current scholarship model. It also allows for the creation of a model which can determine how a coaches knowledge of alternatives relates to their satisfaction with the current scholarship model and their suggestions to modify the model. Such a model will allow the research to determine if there is a correlation between a coaches referent level and their satisfaction with the current scholarship model.

CHAPTER III: METHODS

This study collected and analyzed NCAA Division I coaches' perceptions of the NCAA scholarship model in regards to scholarship limits, head count and equivalency sports, and a potential modification for the distribution of scholarship dollars. Additionally, this study provided coaches the opportunity to suggest modifications to the current model.

Subjects

The subjects for this study are coaches at NCAA Division I institutions in the 2015-16 academic year who were invited to participate in the study. This included head and assistant coaches for the ten most sponsored sports for both genders at the NCAA Division I level. This is representative of the entire NCAA sport offering as it includes a mix of headcount and equivalency sports and allows for response from the most coaches. Coaches at the NCAA Division II and III levels were not included in this study because of the significant differences in scholarship models.

Instrumentation

Respondents completed a survey created to collect data on the scholarship issues. The survey instrument was created with the guidance and expertise of research experts who helped with structure and format. These experts included three sport administration professors. To ensure the reliability and validity of the survey, coaches and administrators were also asked to examine the instrument and provided feedback. Prior to releasing the survey, a pilot survey was conducted with coaches at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill to gather feedback and to ensure the instrument's reliability.

The survey was divided into two sections. The first section of questions focused on gathering the coach's satisfaction level with the current scholarship model. The second focused on

the suggestions coaches have to modify the current scholarship model. Each question on the survey pertains to one of the three research questions. Likert scale questions, “check all that apply”, and open-ended questions were used for this survey.

The survey was emailed to all head and assistant coaches of the selected sports at NCAA Division I institutions. Email addresses were collected from athletic department staff directories. The survey questions were entered into the online survey service provider, Qualtrics, and coaches were provided with a link to the survey. The online survey asked participants to provide demographic information and respond to various questions designed to determine their perceptions regarding the current NCAA scholarship model. Demographic information included gender, age, sport affiliation and conference affiliation.

Data Analysis

After the survey was completed, the data was analyzed utilizing Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS Version 24). The analysis included descriptive statistics, a between-subject analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine if there were significant differences between the sub-groups in research question three, and a code was created to analyze the qualitative data to determine if there were common themes between the responses. According to Saldana (2009), code in qualitative inquiry is most often a word or short phrase that symbolically assigns a summative, salient, essence-capturing, and/or evocative attribute for a portion of language-based or visual data.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Demographics

The survey was sent to 3,154 Division I Power 5 coaches and was completed by 529 for a response rate of 16.7%. Demographic information was collected using athletic department websites prior to survey distribution. The majority of participants (61%, $n = 323$) were assistant coaches and 39% (206) were head coaches. In regards to conference affiliation, most of the coaches came from the Big 10 (28%, $n = 146$), and the ACC (23%, $n = 132$). A representative majority of the coaches (92%, $n = 487$) were coaches of non-revenue sports, with 8% ($n = 42$) coaches of revenue sports. Coaches from all of the included sports participated in the survey with the most participants (18%, $n = 93$) being Cross Country/Track and Field coaches, followed by Women's Volleyball coaches (11%, $n = 56$), and then Swimming/Diving coaches (10%, $n = 55$). A complete listing of respondent demographic information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

<i>Demographic information of participants</i>		
	<i>%</i>	<i>n</i>
HeadCoach/Assistant Coach		
Assistant Coach	61%	323
Head Coach	39%	206
Conference		
Big 10	28%	146
ACC	25%	132
SEC	16%	85
Pac 12	16%	82
Big 12	14%	73
Other	2%	11
Revenue Sport/Non-Revenue Sport		
Non-Revenue	92%	487
Revenue	8%	42

Men's Team/Women's Team

Women's Team	39%	208
Men's Team	33%	172
Both	28%	149

Sport

Cross Country/ Track	18%	93
Women's Volleyball	11%	56
Swimming & Diving	10%	55
Women's Soccer	8%	40
Baseball	7%	38
Men's Golf	6%	34
Women's Golf	6%	30
Football	5%	29
Softball	5%	26
Men's Tennis	4%	21
Wrestling	4%	21
Women's Basketball	4%	20
Women's Rowing	4%	20
Men's Soccer	3%	17
Women's Tennis	3%	16
Men's Basketball	2%	13

N = 529

Coaches Satisfaction with Current NCAA Scholarship Model

Participants were asked about their satisfaction level with four different aspects of the current scholarship model utilizing a five-point Likert scale that ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). These aspects of the scholarship model that coaches ranked included: 1) the overall NCAA scholarship model, 2) head count sport scholarship allocation, 3) equivalency sport scholarship allocation, and 4) the distribution of scholarship dollars. Coaches were most satisfied with the headcount sport scholarship allocation ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.09$) and least satisfied with the overall NCAA scholarship model ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 1.16$). A full list of satisfaction levels is shown in Table 2.

The satisfaction level of coaches was further analyzed using a one-way ANOVA to

determine whether there was a significant difference between the satisfaction of head count and equivalency sport coaches and between revenue sport and non-revenue sport coaches. In all four aspects of the current scholarship model headcount and revenue sport coaches were significantly more satisfied than equivalency and non-revenue sport coaches. Of note, revenue sport coaches were significantly more satisfied ($M = 3.83$) than non-revenue sport coaches ($M = 2.59$) with the overall NCAA scholarship model, $F(1, 477) = 41.10$. Similarly, head count sport coaches are also significantly more satisfied ($M = 3.60$) than equivalency sport coaches ($M = 2.38$) with the overall NCAA scholarship model, $F(1, 477) = 124.64$. A full list of satisfaction levels and sub-group differences are listed in Table 2.

Table 2

Satisfaction with current NCAA scholarship model between different coaching categories

	Overall Mean (SD)	Mean A (SD)	Mean B (SD)
Overall NCAA Scholarship Model	2.68 (1.16)		
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue		3.83 (0.85)	2.59 (1.14)
Headcount vs. Equivalency		3.60 (0.95)	2.38 (1.07)
Headcount Sport Scholarship Allocation	3.25 (1.09)		
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue		3.69 (0.79)	3.21 (1.10)
Headcount vs. Equivalency		3.84 (0.91)	3.05 (1.07)
Equivalency Sport Scholarship Allocation	2.71 (1.16)		
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue		3.29 (0.71)	2.67 (1.18)
Headcount vs. Equivalency		3.30 (0.70)	2.53 (1.22)
Distribution of Scholarship Dollars	3.64 (1.10)		
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue		4.48 (1.12)	3.58 (1.07)
Headcount vs. Equivalency		4.30 (0.99)	3.44 (1.05)

Note: Scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied.

Satisfaction with current NCAA scholarship model between different coaching categories

	Mean Difference	F	<i>p</i>
Overall NCAA Scholarship Model			
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue	1.24	41.10	0.000
Headcount vs. Equivalency	1.22	124.64	0.000
Headcount Sport Scholarship Allocation			
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue	0.48	6.56	0.011
Headcount vs. Equivalency	0.79	51.68	0.000
Equivalency Sport Scholarship Allocation			
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue	0.62	7.38	0.007
Headcount vs. Equivalency	0.77	34.73	0.000
Distribution of Scholarship Dollars			
Revenue vs. Non-Revenue	1.22	16.30	0.000
Headcount vs. Equivalency	0.86	47.70	0.000

Note: Scale from (1) very dissatisfied to (5) very satisfied.

Coaches Feedback on the Current NCAA Scholarship Model

The survey provided participants the opportunity to share thoughts about the strengths and areas that could be improved of the headcount and equivalency sport scholarship allocation models.

Strengths of the Headcount Model. From the responses about the strengths of the headcount scholarship allocation model, five categories emerged: 1) Provides equal scholarship to the entire team; 2) Facilitates easier administration of scholarships; 3) Allows for level recruiting between institutions; 4) Eliminates financial burden for the student athletes; and 5) Provides a full scholarship to the student-athlete.

Of the 221 respondents to the strengths of the headcount scholarship allocation model question, 25.3% of the coaches mentioned that the headcount scholarship model provides equal scholarship amounts to the entire team. One assistant Track and Field coach from the SEC (Southeastern Conference) stated, “*Don’t have to play let’s make a deal like you do with track and field. Partials and using other university academic money to make a team. Headcount sports have*

the money to at least field every position with a full ride” (Respondent 55). An ACC (Atlantic Coast Conference) Women’s Basketball coach wrote that she believed that the equal scholarship amongst the entire team is good for team chemistry (Respondent 245).

Of the coaches who responded, 24.4% mentioned that the headcount model allows for easier administration of scholarships. One ACC (Atlantic Coast Conference) Women’s Soccer head coach wrote, *“I like the fact that you as a coach you would only have to deal with offering or not offering a scholarship. You would not have to deal with the terms of the scholarship and working with the family to make the equivalency work for four years. The amount of time we have to spend trying to manage our scholarship equivalencies along with following new NCAA rules regarding equivalency scholarship allotments is mind boggling”* (Respondent 516).

Another common response (20.8%), was that the headcount sport scholarship allocation model allowed for level recruiting between institutions. One Big Ten Men’s Golf assistant coach wrote, *“Everyone knows what everyone has. It's black or white so the recruit will pick a school based upon what's best for him or her and not just on how much money they are getting”* (Respondent 315).

A smaller number of coaches (8.6%) thought that the headcount scholarship allocation model eliminated the financial burden for student-athletes. One Big Ten Baseball assistant coach wrote, *“It would make it easier for kids to go to college without many student loans when they come out even if receiving a scholarship”* (Respondent 356). Another small percentage of coaches (8.1%) thought the ability to provide a student-athlete with a full scholarship was another strength of the headcount scholarship allocation model. One ACC Men’s Soccer head coach wrote, *“There is enough money in those headcount sports to give the correct amount of players full scholarships”* (Respondent 516). Each of the themes and their prevalence are listed in Table 3.

Table 3

Strengths of the current "headcount sport" scholarship allocation model

Theme	<i>n</i>	%
Equal scholarship amongst an entire team	56	25.3%
Easier administration of scholarships	54	24.4%
Level recruiting between institutions	46	20.8%
Eliminates financial burden for student-athletes	19	8.6%
Provides a full scholarship to the student-athlete	18	8.1%
Other	28	12.7%

Areas the Headcount Model Could be Improved. From the responses to “improvements to the current headcount scholarship allocation model” question, five primary categories formed: 1) Make all sports equivalency; 2) Change football’s scholarship limit; 3) Nothing can be improved; 4) Increase the number of scholarships per sport; and 5) Expand the number of headcount sports.

Of the 164 respondents, 14.0% of the coaches felt that all sports should be equivalency sports. There were also a number of responses that did not fit in the five previous categories. One Big 12 Women’s Tennis assistant coach stated, *“We should eliminate Head Count Sports and make everything Equivalency. We have too many athletes on too much scholarship that could be spread out to more deserving athletes in other sports. It will also even the playing field and slow down some of the same traditional powers from continuing to dominate in a number of head count sports. Dividing up scholarships = More Parity = Better for college sports”* (Respondent 182).

There were also some coaches who wanted to see a change to football’s scholarship limit (9.1%). One Pac 12 track and field head coach emphasized a need for, *“fewer football scholarships...if the NFL only needs a 53-man roster plus seven practice players playing 16-19 games a season why does college football need 85 full scholarship players?”* (Respondent 399). A smaller percentage of coaches (8.5%) thought there were no improvements that could be made to the current headcount sport scholarship allocation model. There were also twelve coaches (7.3%)

who wanted to see more scholarships per sport in the headcount sport scholarship allocation model. Each of the themes and their prevalence are included in Table 4.

Table 4

Improvements to the current "headcount sport" scholarship allocation model

Theme	<i>n</i>	%
Not sure	43	26.2%
Make all sports equivalency	23	14.0%
Change football's scholarship limit	15	9.1%
Nothing can be improved	14	8.5%
Increase number of scholarships per sport	12	7.3%
Other	57	34.8%

Strengths of the Equivalency Model. Based on the responses to the strengths of the current equivalency sport scholarship allocation model, five categories emerged: 1) Flexibility with scholarships; 2) Opportunities for more student-athletes to receive aid; 3) No improvements; 4) Opportunities to reward student-athletes based on ability; 5) Affordability for the university and the athletic department.

Of the 211 respondents, (34.6%, $n = 73$) of the coaches mentioned flexibility with scholarships. One Big 10 Women’s Volleyball assistant coach said, “*You can spread the total amount of scholarship dollars available within the whole team. Families and athletes that need more money can receive it while families who are not in need do not*” (Respondent 519).

Another common theme (29.4%, $n = 62$) was that the equivalency scholarship model provides opportunities for more student-athletes to receive aid. One Pac-12 Women’s Soccer assistant coach wrote, “*You have the ability to provide more players a small piece of the money pool so you can help more players*” (Respondent 246). While 27 coaches felt that there were not any strengths with the current equivalency sport scholarship allocation model.

Twenty-five coaches (11.8%) felt that the ability to reward student-athlete’s based on

ability was a strength of the current equivalency sport scholarship allocation model. One Big Ten Wrestling head coach wrote, *“Being able to have young men increased(aid) as they grow/develop! That’s teaching the student/athlete how the real world works. You have earn more by the work ethic and discipline you demonstrate each year, in the classroom, sport, and in your social life”* (Respondent 311). Eleven coaches (5.2%) also felt that the equivalency sport scholarship allocation model was the most affordable for the university and the athletic department. Each of the themes and their prevalence are included in Table 5.

Table 5

Strengths of current "equivalency sport" scholarship allocation model

Theme	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Flexibility with scholarships	73	34.6%
Provides opportunities to more student-athletes to receive aid	62	29.4%
None	27	12.8%
Reward based on ability	25	11.8%
Affordability	11	5.2%
Other	13	6.2%

Areas the Equivalency Model Could be Improved. The responses about the improvements to the equivalency sport scholarship allocation model led to the creation of five categories: 1) More scholarships; 2) Not sure; 3) Ability to combine athletic and institutional aid; 4) Eliminate it; 5) Provide enough scholarships to match roster/starting lineup needs per sport. There were also a number of responses as that did not fit in the five previous categories.

Of the respondents, 34.5% mentioned a need for more scholarships for equivalency sports. One Big 10 Wrestling assistant coach stated, *“Having more scholarships to work with. We have 10 weight classes and only 9.9 scholarships.”* (Respondent 420). Another concept that was presented was the combination of athletic and institutional aid for a student-athlete. One ACC Track and Field assistant coach wrote, *“Allow for opportunities to combine athletic aid and financial aid*

without penalty to scholarship numbers. If student-athlete welfare is truly important, why are we limiting opportunities for students to maximize financial opportunities?” (Respondent 141).

Twenty-eight coaches (14.4%) were not sure about what improvements could be made to the equivalency sport scholarship allocation model.

Fifteen coaches (7.7%) advocated that the best way to improve the equivlanecy sport scholarship allocation model was to eliminate it. A SEC Men’s Golf head coach wrote, *“Get rid of it completely. It turns coaches into used car salesmen, parents into agents and speeds up the recruiting process to the point that everyone is making decisions based solely on money”* (Respondent 156).

A smaller percentage of coaches (6.2%) wanted to keep the equivalency sport scholarship model, but expressed an interest in having enough scholarships to meet the needs for the roster or the starting lineup. One Big 12 Men’s Tennis head coach wrote, *“Make the amount of aid correspond with the number of players in the starting lineup. We should have enough to at least put the entire starting lineup on aid. Other sports are three or four deep with players on aid”* (Respondent 176). Each of the themes and their prevalence are included in Table 6.

Table 6

<i>Improvements to the current "equivalency sport" scholarship allocation model</i>		
Theme	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
More Scholarships	67	34.5%
Not sure	28	14.4%
Ability to combine athletic and institutional aid	17	8.8%
Eliminate it	15	7.7%
Enough scholarships to match roster/starting lineup needs for sport	12	6.2%
Other	55	28.4%

Impact of Knowledge of Scholarship Model on Satisfaction Level with Scholarship Model

Participants were asked about their knowledge of the scholarship limits for sports other

than their own and also their satisfaction level with the overall NCAA scholarship model, headcount scholarship allocation, equivalency sport scholarship allocation, and the distribution of scholarship dollars) of the current NCAA scholarship model. The five-point Likert scale included 1 (not all knowledgeable) to 5 (very knowledgeable). To measure satisfaction level, a five-point Likert scale was used that included 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). A one-way ANOVA was then run between knowledge and satisfaction levels to determine if knowledge had an impact on satisfaction with the four aspects of the current NCAA scholarship model.

Participants who answered very knowledgeable of scholarship limits for sports other than their own were less satisfied with the overall NCAA scholarship model ($M = 2.09$, $SD = 1.068$), the equivalency sport scholarship allocation ($M = 2.01$, $SD = 1.10$), and the financial distribution of scholarship dollars ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.06$). There was a significant overall effect between knowledge level and satisfaction with the overall scholarship model, $F(3, 476) = 10.85$, satisfaction with equivalency sport scholarship allocation $F(3, 411) = 12.43$, and satisfaction with the financial distribution of scholarship dollars $F(3, 382) = 9.12$.

Potential Alternative Models

Finally, the participants were asked about nine possible alternative models and their interest in them as an alternative to the current NCAA scholarship model. The five-point Likert scale included 1 (not interested at all) to 5 (very interested). Means and standard deviations were calculated for the nine models. The participants were most interested in the football ratio roster size model (Appendix B) ($M = 3.07$, $SD = 1.44$) and least interested in a revenue share model ($M = 1.59$, $SD = 1.14$). A complete list of coach interest in alternative models is listed in Table 7. Definitions for the alternative models can be found in the research survey (Appendix B).

Table 7

Preferred Alternative Model

	Mean	SD
Roster size model (Football Ratio)	3.07	1.44
NCAA travel roster model (Equity Ratio)	2.64	1.31
Roster size model (Equity Ratio)	2.61	1.27
NCAA travel roster model (Football Ratio)	2.41	1.33
Starting lineup model (Football Ratio)	2.34	1.32
Starting lineup model (Equity Ratio)	1.83	1.14
Pay for play model	1.72	1.16
Need-based model	1.67	1.08
Revenue share model	1.59	1.14

Note: Scale from (1) not interested at all to (5) very interested

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Satisfaction with Current Scholarship Model

Although multiple scholars claim that the current scholarship model does not provide adequate compensation for student-athletes (Goplerud, 1997; Hakim, 2000; Miller, 2011; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996), the results of this study demonstrate that for the most part coaches are satisfied with the current scholarship model. However, there are some differences in the satisfaction level between different coaching groups and between the four aspects of the scholarship model (overall NCAA scholarship model, equivalency sport scholarship allocation, headcount sport scholarship allocation, and financial distribution of scholarships).

The results of his study demonstrate that coaches are most satisfied with the headcount scholarship allocation model ($M = 3.25$, $SD = 1.09$) and least satisfied with the overall NCAA scholarship model ($M = 2.68$, $SD = 1.16$). However, the results from all the models produced a standard deviation greater than 1 which indicates there was a wide variance in satisfaction levels between the 529 coaches who were surveyed. The results further demonstrate that satisfaction levels were also different between coaches of different sport categories. Specifically, revenue sport coaches were more satisfied with the overall NCAA scholarship model ($M = 3.83$) than non-revenue sport coaches ($M = 2.59$). Headcount sport coaches were also significantly more satisfied ($M = 3.60$) than equivalency sport coaches ($M = 2.38$). This is important as the results would suggest the current scholarship model favors the sports that are able to provide more to their student-athletes. The results indicate that sports which have to divide scholarships among more athletes feel they are at a disadvantage under the current scholarship model. This supports what was found with referent cognitions theory, which indicate if you are satisfied with the current

situation there wouldn't be a need to look for a better alternative. This was evident in Table 2, which demonstrates satisfaction levels between the coaching categories.

Feedback on the Current Scholarship Model

To fill a gap that was found in the literature review related to the suggestions for reform from groups such as the Knight Commission, the Drake Group, and the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics that did not include the coaches perspectives (Ridpath, 2008; Sack,2009), this research asked coaches to provide feedback on the current scholarship model. The feedback from coaches was centered on areas of strength and opportunities for improvement for both the headcount sport scholarship allocation and equivalency sport scholarship models.

Coaches provided feedback on the strengths of the current headcount and equivalency scholarship allocation models. The results indicate that coaches thought the ability to provide equal scholarships to the entire team and the easier administration of scholarships were the strengths of the headcount scholarship allocation, while the results demonstrate that coaches found the flexibility with scholarships and the ability to provide need based on a student-athlete's situation or need as the strengths of the equivalency model. The literature focused more on the criticisms of the current scholarship model and how it doesn't provide enough for student-athletes (Acain, 1998; Chin,1993; Kahn, 2007; Kreher, 2006; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996). The results do indicate a desire to be able to provide more for their student-athletes, however coaches indicated a desire to do it within the current framework of the amateur model.

Coaches also provided responses to potential improvements to the headcount and equivalency scholarship allocation model. The results indicate coaches were most interested in making all sports equivalency sports or changing football's scholarship limit to improve the headcount scholarship allocation model. The results demonstrate a desire for more scholarships as a way to improve the equivalency sport scholarship allocation model. These improvements do not

align with the criticisms found in the literature review that the current scholarship model violates antitrust laws, paying student-athletes, and disbanding of the amateur model (Acain, 1998; Chin, 1993; Kahn, 2007; Kreher, 2006; Schott, 1996; Sobocinski, 1996). The difference in perspectives between coaches and scholars demonstrates that the perspective of those involved with scholarship model had not been taken into account previously. It further emphasizes the need for additional research into the coach perspective on any potential changes in the current scholarship model. This research would especially helpful with input from coaches who would be considered a high referent according to Folger's referent cognitions theory. These coaches would have the highest awareness of alternative options that would best fit their needs.

Impact of Knowledge on Satisfaction with the Scholarship Model

The theoretical foundation for this study was based on referent cognitions theory. Referent cognitions theory claims that an unfair judgment will result from a situation where an individual believes a more favorable outcome would have resulted from an alternative procedure that should have been used (Cropanzano et al., 2001). The referent is the awareness that there is a procedural alternative that would result in a more favorable outcome (Cropanzano et al., 2001). According to Folger, there are two types of referents high and low. High referents are individuals who are aware of an alternative option that would lead to a better outcome. A low referent is an individual who is not aware of an alternative option that would have led to better results (Cropanzano et al., 2001).

The results of this study support this theory and demonstrate that coaches who were more knowledgeable of scholarship limits other than their own were less satisfied with four different aspects of the scholarship model (overall NCAA scholarship model, equivalency sport scholarship allocation, headcount sport scholarship allocation, and financial distribution of scholarships). This supports Folger's findings with referent cognitions theory in that individuals are less satisfied with their current situation if they believe a better option exists. This would demonstrate that as coaches

become more educated about the scholarship model the more unhappy they will be with their current situation. If more coaches educate themselves about the overall NCAA scholarship model this could create more unrest with the scholarship model and lead to dynamic changes to the NCAA scholarship model. This research provides the necessary information for this discussion by providing the concerns of coaches with the current scholarship model as well as their suggestions of how to improve the model. This information can help facilitate more educated discussions about any possible changes to the NCAA scholarship model.

Future Studies

There are multiple studies that could expand upon this thesis. The next study that would best follow this would be to replicate this study but open the survey up to all Division I head and assistant coaches, rather than limiting participants to only Power-5 head and assistant coaches. The purpose of this thesis was to gather coach perspectives of the current NCAA scholarship model. The goal was to provide a new perspective that has not existed in evaluating the effectiveness of the current scholarship model. Replicating this study and opening it up to all Division I coaches will provide insights as to the broader generalizability of the findings herein. This research demonstrated a divide between revenue and non-revenue and “head count” and “equivalency” sport coaches in the Power-5 conferences which according to some would be considered the group in college athletics who should be able to provide enough for all of their sports. These additional findings would be valuable to determining if the current scholarship model is sufficient for coaches at all NCAA Division I institutions.

Another possible study would be to have further discussion with coaches and administrators about the NCAA scholarship model and the potential alternative models presented as well. This would allow for analysis to look at the feasibility of these options both financially for institutions and legally (compliance with Title IX). Another option would be to replicate this study

for coaches at the Divisions II level and see how their thoughts and satisfaction compare with Division I coaches. Another potential study would be to compare satisfaction levels of Division I coaches and Division III coaches with their respective models and potential interest in switching to the other division's scholarship model.

This study has presented the coach perspective on the NCAA scholarship model and demonstrated that the current model tends to favor headcount and revenue sports, coaches are least satisfied with the overall scholarship model and the equivalency sport scholarship allocation, and that a coach's knowledge level of the scholarship model impacts their satisfaction level with the scholarship model. If the NCAA decides to reevaluate the current scholarship model, this research would encourage the organization to gather the opinions of coaches and other impacted parties to allow for a more educated decision making process.

APPENDIX A: CURRENT NCAA SCHOLARSHIP LIMITS

Head Count Sports

FBS Football	85	Men's Basketball	13
Women's Basketball	15	Women's Volleyball	12
Women's Tennis	8	Women's Gymnastics	12

Equivalency Sports

Men's Sports (Bylaw 15.5.3.1.1) (NCAA Manual, 2015)

Cross Country/Track and Field	12.6	Skiing	6.3
Fencing	4.5	Soccer	9.9
Golf	4.5	Swimming & Diving	9.9
Gymnastics	6.3	Tennis	4.5
Lacrosse	12.6	Volleyball	4.5
Rifle	3.6	Water Polo	4.5
Wrestling	9.9		

Women's Sports (Bylaw 15.5.3.1.2) (NCAA Manual, 2015)

Bowling	5	Skiing	7
Cross Country/Track and Field	18	Soccer	14
Equestrian	15	Softball	12
Fencing	5	Swimming & Diving	14
Field Hockey	12	Triathlon 5.5 2016-17 6.5 for 2017-18 and on	4.5

Golf	6	Water Polo	8
Lacrosse	12	Rowing	20
Rugby	12		

APPENDIX B: THESIS SURVEY

Q1) How knowledgeable are you about the numeric scholarship limits for your sport?

- Very Knowledgeable – I know the number of scholarships allowed and the related regulations.
- Somewhat Knowledgeable – I know the number of scholarships allowed but am not confident in the details of the regulations.
- Minimally Knowledgeable – I vaguely understand the numeric scholarship limits and regulations.

Q2) How knowledgeable are you about the numeric scholarship limits for sports other than your own?

- Very Knowledgeable – I know the number of scholarships for other sports allowed and the related regulations.
- Somewhat Knowledgeable – I know the number of scholarships for other sports allowed but am not confident in the details of the regulations.
- Minimally Knowledgeable – I vaguely understand the numeric scholarship limits for other sports and the regulations.

Q3) How knowledgeable are you about the sports that are listed as headcount sports?

- Very Knowledgeable – I know what sports are listed as headcount and equivalency sports in the current NCAA scholarship model.
- Somewhat Knowledgeable – I know a few of the sports that are listed as headcount and equivalency sports in the current NCAA scholarship model
- Minimally Knowledgeable – I vaguely know the sports that are listed as headcount and equivalency sports in the current NCAA scholarship model

Q4) OVERALL NCAA SCHOLARSHIP MODEL

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following scholarship allocation practice:

- Current numeric scholarship limits on the number of scholarships that can be allocated per sport as set by the current NCAA scholarship model?

Follow up – with not satisfied/neutral

Would you like to see the limits increased or decreased?

Q5) HEADCOUNT SCHOLARSHIP ALLOCATION MODEL

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following scholarship allocation practice:

- The “headcount sport” scholarship allocation model wherein all scholarship recipients in football, men’s basketball, women’s basketball, gymnastics, volleyball, and women’s tennis are counted as if each player is on a full grant-in-aid.

Follow up (All):

Would you like to see other sports be designated as “headcount sports”?

If yes, what sports?

- What are the strengths of having the current “headcount sport” scholarship allocation model?
- What could be improved upon by modifying the current “headcount sport” scholarship allocation model?

Q6)EQUIVALENCY SPORT SCHOLARSHIP ALLOCATION MODEL

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following scholarship allocation practice:

- The “equivalency sport” scholarship allocation model wherein all sports (except those listed in previous bulleted section) are given a designated number of scholarships to divide amongst the entire roster?

Follow up (All):

Would you like to see other sports be designated as “equivalency sports”?
If yes, what sports?

- What are the strengths of having the current “equivalency sport” scholarship allocation model?
- What could be improved upon by modifying the current “equivalency sport” scholarship allocation model?

Follow up (All):

In your opinion, which scholarship model treats ALL student-athletes the most fairly?

- Headcount model
- Equivalency model
- Other (Open)
- Follow up: Why?

FINANCIAL DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOLARSHIPS

Q7) What is your satisfaction level with the distribution of scholarship dollars based on the current financial and numeric scholarship limits in the NCAA scholarship model allocations?

Follow up with not satisfied/neutral: Why are you not satisfied with the current distribution of scholarship dollars?

Q8) What is your satisfaction level with the distribution of scholarship dollars between sports at your institution?

Follow up with not satisfied: Why are you not satisfied with the current distribution of scholarship dollar?

Q9) What does the average scholarship package include for your sport?

Scale

0-100% tuition

0-100% books

0-100% room

0-100% board

0-100% cost of attendance

0-100% fees

0-100% other expenses

Q10) Do you offer multi-year scholarships?

Q11) Is the NCAA scholarships limit for your program fully funded at your institution?

Q12) For your sport, what would be the ideal number of scholarships to operate a successful program?

Would you support your ideal number of scholarships if you knew the institution could not afford it, but other institutions did?

ALTERNATIVE SCHOLARSHIP MODELS

Q13) What would your interest level be in the following possible alternative models to the current scholarship model from your most preferred.

- Pay for play model – A model where student-athletes are not given scholarships but instead are compensated as if they were an employee/professional athlete.
- Revenue share model – A model where student-athletes would receive a percentage of the revenue from their program to provide them with additional compensation
- Need-based model – A model where no aid is provided for athletic ability. The only financial aid is provided from the institution for merit or need-based aid.
- Roster Size Model (Football Ratio) – A scholarship allocation model based on roster size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football's ratio (0.72) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its average roster size (117.5). (For example: Baseball's Average Roster Size is 36.1 and current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $36.1 \times .72 = 26.1$ scholarships)
- Roster Size Model (Equity Ratio) – A scholarship allocation model based on roster size. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (0.38) of total number men's and women's scholarships (440.3) to the total average roster sizes for men's and women's sports (1164.3). (For example: Baseball's Average Roster Size is 36.1 and current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $36.1 \times .38 = 13.7$ scholarships)
- NCAA Travel Roster Model (Football Ratio) – A scholarship allocation model based on travel squad limits. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football's ratio (1.42) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its travel squad size (60). (For example: Baseball's Travel Squad Size is 27 and current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $27 \times 1.42 = 38.3$ scholarships) *Does not include sports that do not have travel squad limits
- NCAA Travel Roster Model (Equity Ratio) – A scholarship allocation model based on travel squad limits. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (0.66) of total number men's and women's scholarships (380.3) to the total travel squad sizes for men's and women's sports (578). (For example: Baseball's Travel Squad Size is 36.1 and current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $27 \times 0.66 = 17.8$ scholarships) *Does not include sports that does not have travel squad limits
- Starting Lineup Model (Football Ratio) – A scholarship allocation model based on starting lineups. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on football's ratio (3.54) of numeric scholarship limit (85) to its starting lineup (24). (For example: Baseball's starting lineup is 10 and the current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $10 \times 3.54 = 35.4$ scholarships) *Does not include sports that do not have starting lineups
- Starting Lineup Model (Equity Ratio) - A scholarship allocation model based on starting lineups. Scholarship allocations for all sports would be assigned based on the ratio (0.97) of total number men's and women's scholarships (452.3) to the total starting lineups for men's and women's sports (466). (For example: Baseball's Starting Lineup is 10 and current scholarship limit is 11.7. In this model $10 \times .97 = 9.7$ scholarships) *Does not include sports that does not have starting lineup

Q14) Please provide any additional thoughts you would like to share about the NCAA scholarship model and current scholarship limits?

APPENDIX C: THESIS INVITATION EMAIL

Alternative Scholarship Models

Dear Coach (Last Name)

My name is Jonathan Teich and I am a graduate student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and currently work for the Athletic Director as the Administration Intern. My team of researchers and I are interested in examining the perspective of current college coaches on the current NCAA Scholarship Model and their thoughts on the possibility of alternative models. In order to achieve this objective, we are conducting an online survey that should take approximately 5 minutes to complete. You have been selected to represent your elite institution in the sample, and your input is critical. As data analysis is complete, we will be happy to share the study results with you if you indicate interest at the conclusion of the survey.

By clicking the link to the survey below, you agree to be a participant in this research study.

https://unc.az1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_08wrg41WzHqBfud

Your participation is voluntary, and you may skip any question for any reason. Your identity and responses will be confidential. If you have any questions or concerns about the study, please feel free to contact me directly by email (jteich6@live.unc.edu) Further, you may also contact the UNC Institutional Review Board by phone (919-966-3113) or email (subjects@unc.edu) if you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research subject referencing study # 16-0381.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Teich

REFERENCES

- Acaín, M. P. (1997). Revenue sharing: A simple cure for the exploitation of college athletes. *Loy.LA Ent.LJ*, 18, 307.
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2(267-299)
- Aquino, K., Griffeth, R. W., Allen, D. G., & Hom, P. W. (1997). Integrating justice constructs into the turnover process: A test of a referent cognitions model. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(5), 1208-1227.
- Bass, J. R., Schaeperkoetter, C. C., & Bunds, K. S. (2015). The “Front porch”: Examining the increasing interconnection of university and athletic department funding. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 41(5), 1-103.
- Chin, C. L. (1992). Illegal procedures: The NCAA's unlawful restraint of the student-athlete. *Loy.LAL Rev.*, 26, 1213.
- Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, Pub L. No. 100-259, 102 Stat. 28. et seq (2015).
- Cropanzano, R., Byrne, Z. S., Bobocel, D. R., & Rupp, D. E. (2001). Moral virtues, fairness heuristics, social entities, and other denizens of organizational justice. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 58(2), 164-209.
- Cropanzano, R., & Folger, R. (1989). Referent cognitions and task decision autonomy: Beyond equity theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 293.
- Davis Jr, C., & Malagrino, D. O. (2012). Myth of the full ride: Cheating our collegiate athletes and the need for additional NCAA scholarship-limit reform, the. *Okla.L.Rev.*, 65, 605.
- Elliott, S. A., & Mason, D. S. (2001). Gender equity in intercollegiate athletics: An alternative model to achieving title IX compliance. *J.Legal Aspects Sport*, 11, 1.
- Folger, R., Cropanzano, R., Greenberg, J., & Cropanzano, R. (2001). Fairness theory: Justice as accountability. *Advances in Organizational Justice*, 1, 1-55.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D. D., & Robinson, T. (1983). Relative deprivation and procedural justifications. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(2), 268.
- Folger, R., Rosenfield, D., Rheaume, K., & Martin, C. (1983). Relative deprivation and referent cognitions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(2), 172-184.
- George, B. G. (1998). Title IX and the scholarship dilemma. *Marq.Sports LJ*, 9, 273.
- Gibson, N. (2012). NCAA scholarship restrictions as anticompetitive measures: The one-year rule and scholarship caps as avenues for antitrust scrutiny note. *William & Mary Business Law Review*, 3, 203-242.

- Goldman, B. M. (2002). A rage for justice: An application of referent cognitions theory to legal-claiming by terminated workers. *AoM Conflict Management Division*,
- Goldman, L. (1989). Sports and antitrust: Should college students be paid to play. *Notre Dame L.Rev.*, 65, 206.
- Goplerud III, C. P. (1997). Pay for play for college athletes: Now, more than ever. *S.Tex.L.Rev.*, 38, 1081.
- Haden, C. W. (2001). Foul-the explotation of the student-athlete: Student-athletes deserve compensation for their play in the college athletic arena. *JL & Educ.*, 30, 673.
- Hakim, L. (2000). Student-athlete vs. the athlete student: Has the time arrived for an extended-term scholarship contract, the. *Virginia Journal of Sports and the Law*, 2, 145-183.
- Kahn, L. M. (2007). Markets: Cartel behavior and amateurism in college sports. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(1), 209-226.
- Kreher, P. (2006). Antitrust theory, college sports, and interleague rulemaking: A new critique of the NCAA's amateurism rules. *Va.Sports & Ent.LJ*, 6, 51.
- Kulik, C. T., & Ambrose, M. L. (1992). Personal and situational determinants of referent choice. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17(2), 212-237. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/258771>
- Miller, M. G. (2011-2012). NCAA and the student-athlete: Reform is on the horizon, the comment. *University of Richmond Law Review*, 46, 1141-1174.
- Mondello, M. J., & Beckham, J. (2003). Workers' compensation and collegiate athletes: The debate over the pay for play model: A counterpoint. *Workers' Comp.L.Rev.*, 25, 65.
- Murphy, S., & Pace, J. (1994). Plan for compensating student-athletes, A. *BYU Educ.& LJ*, , 167.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2015). *NCAA division one manual* NCAA.
- Noll, Roger G. (2013). The antitrust economics of NCAA restrictions on athletic scholarships. *Winthrop Intelligence*
- Oriard, M. (2012). NCAA academic reform: History, context and challenges. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 5(1), 4-18.
- Powell, K. C. (2013). Facade of amateurism: An examination of the NCAA grant-in-aid system under the sherman act, A. *Sports Law.J.*, 20, 241.
- Ridpath, B. D. (2008). Can the faculty reform intercollegiate athletics? A past, present, and future perspective. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 1, 11-25.
- Ross, S. F. (2011). Radical reform of intercollegiate athletics: Antitrust and public policy implications. *Tul.L.Rev.*, 86, 933.

- Rozum, K. (2003). Staying inbounds: Reforming title IX in collegiate athletics. *Wis. Women's LJ*, 18, 155.
- Sack, A. (2009). Clashing models of commercial sport in higher education: Implications for reform and scholarly research. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 76-92.
- Schott, S. M. (1996). Give them what they deserve: Compensating the student-athlete for participation in intercollegiate athletics. *Sports Lawyers Journal*, 3, 25-50.
- Sherman Antitrust Act of 1980, 15 U.S.C. § 1-7 et seq. (2015)
- Smith, R. A. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform* university of Illinois Press.
- Sobocinski, E. J. (1996). College athletes: What is fair compensation. *Marq. Sports LJ*, 7, 257.
- Sperber, M. (1990). College sports inc.: The athletic department vs. the university. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(2)
- Stafford, S. (2004). Assessing the effect of formal and informal enforcement on progress towards title IX compliance. *Social Science Quarterly*, 85(5), 1469-1486.
- Staurowsky, E.J. & Weight, E.A. (2014). Title IX literacy among NCAA administrator and coaches: A critical communications approach. *The Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 15(4), 1-29
- Thelin, J. R. (2000). Good sports? historical perspective on the political economy of intercollegiate athletics in the era of title IX, 1972-1997. *Journal of Higher Education*, , 391-410.
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20 U.S.C. § 1681 et seq. (2015)