ORGANIZATIONAL SILOS WITHIN NCAA DIVISON I ATHLETIC DEPARTMENTS

Robert H. Stewart

A thesis proposal 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
2014

Approved by:

Erianne Weight

Coyte Cooper

Mary Rob Plunkett

ABSTRACT

Robert Stewart: Organizational Silos Within NCAA Division I Athletic Departments
(Under the direction of Erianne Weight)

The use of the term "silos" in business is a metaphor used to describe a situation where different departments do a poor job of communicating and working together, essentially making their job harder. These barriers that are formed can have dangerous consequences to the life of any sizable organization (Lencioni, 2006). Due to this evolution in the industry of intercollegiate athletics, and accompanying growth within athletic organizational charts, it is important to examine how prevalent silos are within athletic departments. This survey of over 400 NCAA Division I athletic department employees revealed that 88% of employees felt that silos existed within their athletic departments. Additionally, the study determined factors that could potentially lead to the formation of silos. The athletic department functional area, the title of executive staff member versus non-executive staff member, if the department was in a BCS conference or non-BCS conference were not found to have a significant impact on the perception of silos. The results of the study will add to literature examining the current state of NCAA Division I athletic departments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The use of the term "silos" in business is a metaphor used to describe a situation where different departments do a poor job of communicating and working together, essentially making their job harder. These barriers that are formed can have dangerous consequences to the life of any sizable organization (Lencioni, 2006). Some of these potential consequences could be lack of cooperation, internal competition, and a breakdown in communication (Cote, 2002). Unfortunately, silos have become very common in businesses of all sizes. Many scholars and practitioners believe that Collegiate Athletics have begun to operate as a business, which makes athletic departments in universities susceptible to silos.

The history of Collegiate Athletics can be traced back to the mid-1800s when the first intercollegiate contests took place. In 1852, Harvard defeated Yale in the first intercollegiate crew meet. Seven years later, Amherst College and Williams College met in what is considered the first intercollegiate baseball game. Ten years following that, the first football game was played between Princeton and Rutgers (Smith, 2010). As popularity of these events arise, as well as disagreements between schools over who should be allowed to participate, it became clear that a need for regulation existed. In 1906, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States was founded (renamed 1910 the National Colligate Athletic Association, which still stands today). According to the official NCAA website, the original reason the NCAA was founded

was to "protect young people from the dangerous and exploitive athletic practices at the time" ("History-ncaa.org," 2012).

In the early 1970s, the NCAA developed a three tier system which would split the member institutions into three divisions. This was done to help with the competitive balance of the NCAA (Fizel, 2004). With the tier system, the NCAA was given more authority, which brought more criticism for the way they used that authority. There was increased concern especially from university presidents. These concerns arose from two main issues. The first was that as athletic departments grew, some presidents were beginning to see athletic departments as an expense. The second was that presidents were starting to believe that their reputations as university presidents were being directly tied to the success of their athletic programs. This caused the presidents to be very wary of the NCAA and their enforcement power (Smith, 2001).

Over the years, college athletics has transformed into to a multi-billion dollar business. In 2000, the NCAA signed a $6.2 billion deal with Columbia Broadcasting Service which granted CBS the television rights to the men's NCAA basketball tournament for eleven years. The NCAA defended this deal by explaining that the funds will help subsidize the $4 billion spent every year by NCAA member institutions (Rosenthal, 2003). In 2010, NCAA reached a 14-year agreement with CBS and Turner Sports for the TV rights to the tournament for nearly $11 billion.

It addition to the television rights deals, athletic departments have also grown in size. It has become common for coaches and athletic directors to make annual salaries that exceed one million dollars. Universities are also investing in multi-million dollar athletic facilities. It's clear that college athletics has become a major business, and athletic departments across the country are treating it as such.

Significance of the Study

Due to this evolution in the industry of intercollegiate athletics, and accompanying growth within athletic organizational charts, it is important to examine how prevalent silos are within athletic departments.

This study will examine current employees' beliefs about silos within NCAA Division I athletic departments. It will also identify potential causes for silos or lack of silos within the athletic department. Additionally, the research will seek to determine whether the perception is changed by the size of the athletic department, the individual department units that the participant works in, or the current position that the participant holds within the athletic department.

Once the study is complete, athletic directors will be able to examine the data and use it in a number of ways to prevent the development of silos through a greater understanding of their prevalence and causes within intercollegiate athletics.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the prevalence and impact of organizational silos within NCAA Division I athletic departments.

Research Questions

[RQ1] How prevalent are silos within NCAA Division I athletic departments?

[RQ2] What are the biggest factors in the creation of silos within a division I athletic department?

[RQ3] Is there a difference in perceived silos between [a-c]?

    a. Executive level administration and non-executive level administration.

    b. Functional areas within athletic departments.

c. High-Major and Mid-Major athletic departments.

Definition of Terms

- NCAA: The National Collegiate Athletic Association, often referred to as the NCAA, is a membership-driven organization consisting of mostly colleges and universities, The NCAA works with its members to create the framework of rules for fair and safe competition.

- Division I: One of the three NCAA divisions, which generally has the largest student bodies, manage the larges athletics budgets, and offer the most generous number of athletic scholarships.

- Organizational Silo: The barriers that exist between departments within an organization, causing people who are part of the same team or organization to lack the desire or motivation to coordinate with other entities in that same organization. May also be referred to as silo.

- Executive Level Administrators: Includes staff members within an Athletic Department who serve on the Athletic Directors "Executive Staff" or staff members with the title of "Athletic Director", "Deputy Athletic Director", Executive Associate Athletic Director", or "Senior Associate Athletic Director".

- Non-Executive Level Administrators: Includes staff members within an Athletic Department who do not fall into the category of Executive Staff as defined by this study.

- High-Major: Any university or college which participates athletically in one of the following NCAA Division I conferences: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pacific 12 Conference, or Southeastern Conference.

These schools and universities typically have larger staff sizes and more funding for their athletic departments.

- Mid-Major: Any university or college which participates athletically in NCAA Division I in a conference other than the following: Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pacific 12 Conference, or Southeastern Conference. These universities and colleges typically have smaller staff sizes and less funding for their athletic departments.

- Functional Area: An individual operational unit within an athletic department, for example: marketing, compliance, fund raising, etc.

Assumptions

- Athletic Department staff members are the only individuals to participate.

- All participants understand all questions and answer the questions truthfully and accurately.

- All participants will complete the survey voluntarily.

Limitations

- Survey respondents may not be a representative sample of all Division I universities and colleges.

- Due to the voluntary nature of the survey, there may be a low response rate.

Delimitations

- The sample of the study will be focused solely on Davison I universities and colleges and thus cannot be applied to other NCAA Divisions.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Silos and Organizations

Technically speaking, a silo is defined as either "a tower that is used to store food (such as grain or grass) for farm animals" (Merriam-Webster's, 2013) or "an underground structure that is used for storing and firing a missile" (Merriam-Webster's, 2013). However, a silo is also a name for another dangerous situation that can form within organizations. According to Patrick Lencioni, silos are "nothing more than the barriers that exist between departments within an organization causing people who are supposed to be on the same team to work against one another" (Lencioni, 2006). Olivier Serrat states that a silo is "a figure of speech for organizational entities – and their management teams – that lack the desire or motivation to coordinate (at worst, even communicate) with other entities in the same organization" (Serrat, 2010). Silos are also referred to as departmental politics, divisional rivalry, turf warfare (Lencioni, 2006). They may also be referred to as Frank Sinatra Syndrome. Frank Sinatra Syndrome (FSS) is "what occurs when an area of the business takes on the approach of doing it 'my way', as opposed to the way the organization overall wishes to do things" (Thompson, 2012). Organizations, in some form or another, are driving toward a goal of serving people who use their product or services (Disney Institute, 2001). They are social arrangements to pursue a collective intent, and it is important that everyone at an organization is working together towards the common goal (Serrat, 2010). Silos not only decrease the ability to have a productive work

environment, they also affect the people who work at the organizations .Silos are produced by organizational participants to describe the cognitive and emotional quality of their often fragmented and constrained personnel (Diamond, Alcorn, & Stein, 2004).

Detriments of Silos

   Silos can detrimental to an organization regardless of their size, whither the silos occur in large global corporations or small start-up companies with as little as fifteen people (Kotter, 2011). Silos create barriers which results in blocks of knowledge that organizations need to make full use of their capabilities, which can result in increased spending from duplication of efforts as well as inconsistencies and inefficiencies among workers. If these silos are unresolved, they can devastate organizations while alienating good people. This contributes to decreased organizational commitment and increased employee turnover (Serrat, 2010). The symptoms of these silos are very easy to recognize when they occur. There is a lack of cooperation among staff members, between both each other and their superiors. There is also internal competition between departments and co-workers as well as a breakdown in communication (Shirey 2006). The result is that one division gets pitted against another, and that can have dire effects. Quite simply, silos reduce efficiency (Cote, 2002).

   Siloes within organizations makes it so that the organization has a difficult time learning new things. They have difficulty diagnoses and solving their own problems which often lead to repeating the same mistakes over and over again (Ensor, 1988). Siloed organizations cannot act quickly on opportunities that arise in a fast-paced business landscape. They are also not able to make productive decisions about how to change in order to seize these opportunities. There are three very serious consequences of silos. They destroy trust, they cut off communication, and they foster complacency (Kotter, 2011).

Destruction of Trust

Now, more than ever, trust is important in the workplace (Reina & Reina, 2006). Patrick Lencioni does an excellent job of explaining the importance trust when he states, "the essence of a cohesive leadership team is trust, which is marked by an absence of politics, unnecessary anxiety, and wasted energy. Every executive wants to achieve this, but few are able to do so because they fail to understand the roots of these problems, the most damaging of which is politics" (Lencioni, 2000). Trust is essential in the workplace for a number of reasons. Business is conducted through relationships, and trust is the foundation of effective relationships. It is also essential because people today have a need for a connection with their coworkers and trust allows that to happen. Also, when trust is present people are excited about what they do. It makes it easier to collaborate with their coworkers without being afraid of making a mistake (Reina & Reina, 2006).

Trust is so important, and silos cause trust to be destroyed. "People who spend significant time in a single department or division often develop loyalty to their immediate group and distrust in the motives of others, even if they are in the same firm. Product development may view sales with suspicion, a global subsidiary looks at the American parent with great disdain, and so on. Without trust, you cannot create teamwork across an organization, and without a team that moves quickly, organizations fall behind their competitors" (Kotter, 2011). With silos and a lack of trust, employees often notice that their colleagues in different departments or divisions are moving in different directions. This causes confusion, which turns into disappointment, which eventually becomes resentment and even hostility. It could even lead to employees working against their colleagues on purpose (Lencioni, 2006). Cote explains the connection between a lack of trust and silos more directly when he states, "Managers must learn to trust and

respect their peers and share their objectives. Mistrust and disrespect allows silos to flourish, hence, the silo effect. If managers do not trust another division and if they do not share in their objective, they will not cooperate and silos will appear" (Cote, 2002). What may be worse of all is that the lack of trust results in organizations behaving out of a foundation of mistrust, which leads to a lack of mutual concern. The individuals are uncommitted, groups are no cohesive, and there are no shared vision for people to rally around (Ensor, 1988).

Hindrance of Communication

Silos also impact communication within organizations. Communication is the human activity that links people together and creates relationships. It is at the heart of meaning-making activities in political, social, economic, and psychological areas (Duncan & Moriarty, 1998). It is also important in technical disciplines and marketing (Darling & Dannels, 2003). Communication, both spoken and electronic, are crucial to the success of an organization. Oral communication is recognized as an essential element in technical disciplines (Beaufait 1991; Bjorklund & Colbeck, 2001; Denton 1998; Yu & Liaw, 1998). Not only is oral communication important, but so is informal communication. "Informal communications we define as taking place synchronously in face-to-face settings. They are distinct from other methods of office communication such as phone, documents, memos, email, FAX, and voicemail" (Whittaker, Frohlich, & Daly-Jones, 1994). All types of communication are important in the workplace, and even impacts how safe a workplace is. Parker, Axtell, and Turner explained that communication quality is essential for people to do their jobs by feeling safe to say what they feel and by knowing all that they need to know (2001). Kotter does an excellent job of explaining how a lack of communication can be caused by silos and the dangers that can come from these silos. "Silos cut off clear communication between different business units or managerial levels. People can

fall easily into only communicating with those directly around them or those who are at the same level in the organization. When there is little or unclear communication between groups, the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. As a leader, you fall out of touch with employee sentiment, lose track of important resources at your fingertips and don't hear crucial feedback" (Kotter, 2011).

Foster Complacency

Silos also foster complacency. When silos exist and people in an organization have little contact with people from different divisions, it is easy to become inwardly focused and complacent with the status quo. This causes people to miss new opportunities that may become available, as well as miss potential hazards from the competition (Kotter, 2011). Complacency can also cause an organization to have a very attractive opportunity to be overlooked, dismissed, or lost. This is known as "missing-the-boat" (Dickson & Giglierano, 1986).

Cause of Silos

In order to determine how to eliminate silos, it is important to first figure out the cause of silos. Silos can happen to any company, even the organizations which take a team-building approach are at risk. It would seem likely that some of today's team-oriented organizations would avoid silos, but that isn't so. Getting people who have different agendas to work together is among the biggest obstacles facing business leaders today (Stone, 2004). Silos can be caused in a number of different ways. It is possible that silos occur because leaders at the top of an organization have interpersonal problems with one another, but that is often not the case. (Lencioni 2006) One potential cause of silos could be competition within an organization. "In some organizations, people adopt a competitive and self-serving style. They band together into small groups and are inattentive, perhaps even destructive, to the needs of others." (Cropanzano,

10

Howes, Grandey, Toth) Often times, silos form not because of what executives are intentionally doing, but rather because they are not providing a compelling context for themselves and their employees for working together (Lencioni, 2006).

Phil Ensor's Indictors of the Functional Silo Syndrome

In 1988, Phil Ensor, while working as the corporate director for organization development for Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, coined the phrase "functional silo syndrome". He pinpointed five causes of silos, which he called indictors of the functional silo syndrome. The five causes are management style, organizational structure, job designs, management-union relations, and performance standards (Ensor, 1988).

For management style, top down, authoritarian bosses can cause silos by not being trusting, helpful, and empowering (Ensor, 1988). Organizational structures which have a deeply-layered hierarchy which are designed to maintain control provide an indicator for silos. These problems with these structures can be both vertical and horizontal. Instead of maintaining control, it is important to foster trust and encouraging employees to be proactive in their problem solving (Ensor, 1988). Job designs and employee tasks need to be broad, challenging, fun, and rewarding. When they are narrow, boring, or highly specialized they are easy to supervise and control which causes silos (Ensor, 1988). While not all organizations will have to deal with unions, some may be required to and the management of the relationship between the leaders of an organization and unions is extremely important. The correct approach is to build genuine mutuality by setting goals to overcome the real problems. Having a high-confrontation, legalistic focus on narrows issues and on cumulative issues of the past can create a dangerous relationship between an organization and a union which could lead to the formation of silos (Ensor, 1988). The last indictor is performance standards. Setting performance standards creates a significant

opportunity to start, sustain, and truly power an engine of change. It is a great chance to involve everyone in figuring out what reality is and what is needed. It is the very heart of the relationship between the employee and employer and therefore centers on the organization's ability to learn, improve, and compete (Ensor, 1988).

Eliminating Silos

Several scholars have researched and discovered ways to effectively reduce or eliminate silos. Silos may be reversible; however, in order to achieve this, it requires an understanding of silos as a potentially destructive organizational phenomenon (Shirey, 2006). The organization has to be willing to learn how to engage in a planned change and everyone in the organization has to be willing to realize that there is a problem and be desirous of improvement (Ensor, 1988). There are different strategies that companies can take when creating a plan to attack the silos within their organization. There have also been companies which have faced this issue in the past, and described how they addressed the situation.

Patrick Lencioni's Rallying Cry

One powerful way to attempt to eliminate silos is for leaders to create a common sense of purpose. This is what Patrick Lencioni refers to as a rallying cry. Creating a rallying cry for combating silos consists of four components: a thematic goal, a set of defining objectives, a set of ongoing standard operating objectives, and metrics (Lencioni, 2006). A thematic goal is the most important step. A thematic goal is "a single, qualitative focus that is shared by the entire leadership team – and ultimately, by the entire organization – and that applies for only a specified time period" (Lencioni, 2006). The thematic goal represents the rallying cry and aligns members of the organization around one common cause. The goal is clearly communicated to all members of the organization once the leadership teams decides on a single most important goal,

which all other activities within the organization will center around (Shirey, 2006). According Lencioni, a thematic goal is not a long-term vision. It is also not a huge audacious goal nor is it a tactical metric or measureable objective. While those are all good ideas for companies to employ, a thematic goal is somewhere in the middle of those. Which is why it is so important, because it acts as a bridge and makes visions more tangle and by giving tactical objectives more context (Lencioni, 2006).

There are four main components to a thematic goal. The first is that it is single. In an organization, there can only be one thematic goal in a given period. There can be other desires, hopes, and objectives within an organization but none of them can be attempted at the expense of the thematic goal. The thematic goal can change, but there can only be one at a single time, because every organization needs a top priority. When there is more than one top priority, there can be a lack of clarity among employees in an organization (Lencioni, 2006).

The second component of a thematic goal is that it is shared by everyone within an organization, regardless of their area of expertise or interest. It is true that some thematic goals will naturally largely fit within one particular executive's area or responsibility, it is critical that all team members take responsibility for the goal (Lencioni, 2006). Leaders and members of an organization must take off their functional hats and replace them with generic ones. In wearing the generics hats, individuals then must be willing to make suggestions and ask questions about areas in which they may have little or no expertise. In these role-reversal types of situations, some of the best and most insightful questions and ideas surface (Shirey, 2006). Members of the organization must realize that this is not a lack of trust, and that it is just sometime better to get ideas from people with a more objective and naïve viewpoint than the experts who are living and breathing an issue every day (Lencioni, 2006).

The third component of a thematic goal is that it is qualitative. Thematic goals are not numbers and are not specifically measureable. It's a statement of a desired accomplishment, a verb that rallies people to do something. Examples of verbs in thematic goals could be improve, reduce, increase, grow, change, eliminate, or accelerate (Lencioni, 2006). Qualitative goals must have a textual description of the goal and optionally an assigned priority. Qualitative goals tend to be more strategic, which is important with a thematic goal (Markovic & Kowalkiewicz, 2008). Eventually, a thematic goal will be measurable but this happens later in Lencioni's model (Lencioni 2006).

The fourth component of a thematic goal is that it is time-bound. Thematic goals do not live beyond a fixed period of time. Those would be ongoing objectives. Thematic goals are designed to be desired achievements that are particularly important during that period of time, usually three to twelve months (Lencioni, 2006).

The second component of creating a rallying cry to eliminate silos is to create defining objectives. Once the thematic goal is set, a leadership team must then give it actionable context so that members of the team know what must be done to accomplish the goal. They are called defining objectives and they serve as the building blocks which clarify exactly what is meant by the thematic goal (Lencioni, 2006). These types of objectives are kept broad in an effort to encourage involvement from members throughout the organization (Shirey, 2006). As with a thematic goal, the accompanying defining objectives should also be qualitative, shared, and time-bound. These defining objectives will change with the organization's thematic goals and should have the same time frame as them (Lencioni, 2006).

The third component of creating a rallying cry to eliminate silos is to create a set of ongoing standard operating objectives. These are the ongoing priorities of the organization which

don't go away form period to period. These standard operating objectives can include topics like revenue and expenses, customer satisfaction, or productivity (Lencioni, 2006). The standard operating objectives are independent of the thematic goal being pursued at any point in time and it is recommended that an organization only has four to six of these objectives (Shirey, 2006). Even though the standard operating objectives are independent of the thematic goals, they can still be related depending on what the thematic goals for the organization is during that period. These operating objectives can be critical to the organization's success (Lencioni, 2006).

The fourth component of creating a rallying cry to eliminate silos is metrics. These metrics are measureable targets and should only be identified once the thematic goal, defining objectives, and standard operating objectives have been established. It is important to make sure that employees understand how these metrics fit into the big picture, because not all employees are motivated solely by numbers (Lencioni, 2006). It is essential to understand up front that both tangible (quantitative, explicit) and intangible (qualitative, implicit) outcomes may be equally valuable and these collectively contribute toward organizational success and sustainability (Shirey, 2006). Sometimes metrics are not quantifiable numbers, for example they could be dates by which a given activity will be completed (Lencioni, 2006).

Association for Manufacturing Excellence's Organizational Renewal

The Association for Manufacturing Excellence is another organization that has created steps for eliminating silos. They created a study group with the goal of tearing down functional silos (Association for Manufacturing Excellence [AME]). The group featured high level executives from companies such as Motorola and Xerox and professors from Indiana University. They determined three steps to take in the elimination of silos within organizations. The first is

to establish a vision of a radically different future, the second is to mobilize all the workforce to accept this vision, and the third is to institutionalize the results by a variety of means (AME).

To successfully establish a vision, it must be clearly stated in terms of an overall organization, this is important so that every function can contribute. Top management must lead the effort to establish the vision. If they don't, each function will establish their own (AME). Mobilizing all workforce to accept a vision means that management cannot change another person for them, they must change themselves. However, along the way the management must clarify what a new organization should look like. Management must role model the new behavior once it is established, otherwise it will turn into a fad with people reverting back to their old ways (AME). The final step involves changing the details of systems that affect the roles and attitudes of people. Narrow performance measures must turn into functional based performance measures. With all of this, training is essential in order to achieve the goal (AME).

Motorola

Motorola is one organization which has released their plan to combat silos within their organization. The procedure is a list of eight actions, which are: raise levels of expectations, benchmark world-class performers from any source, create interdisciplinary teams, design for an imperfect world, abolish the not invented here attitude, structure time base goals, create supplier partnerships, and manage the mission and lead people (Pullin, 1989). Motorola stressed that these were not steps, because they can be accomplished simultaneously. These actions were put together by an interdisciplinary team with members from several different parts of the organization (Pullin, 1989).

Silos in the Canadian Sport System

Silos can occur in athletic settings and have recently become a major topic of discussion within the Canadian Sport System. The Quadrennial Planning Program was created in 1983, to facilitate the bureaucratization and professionalization of the administrative structure of sport (Slack and Hinings, 1992). Within the last decade, attention has been focused on the need to enhance the level of cooperation and integration within the sport system (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean 2007). The Canadian sport policy stated a goal to "increase collaboration, communication, and cooperation amongst the partners in the sport community, government, and the private sector, which in turn, will lead to a more effective sport system" (Sport Canada 2002). In 2000 and 2001, over 1000 stakeholders were invited to participate in a series of six regional conferences and the concept of silos continually surfaced. They used to the term to represent the enduring Canadian sport system model in which the individual organizations act in isolation from one another and static boundaries prevent sharing and partnering. It was determined that there was a need for a more cooperative and integrated sport system (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007). The results from the conferences were analyzed and the researchers uncovered three general themes concerning integration. The first was a need for resources, the second was the traditional and non-traditional organizations identified for relationships, and the third was the goals or purpose of current or desired relationships (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007). The results from the conferences indicated four methods for improvement and the elimination of silos from their sport system including the need for variations in the administrative structure of the network, the need for new network resources, a degree of system coupling, and a multiplicity of programming for the youth (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007).

The first method by which the Canadian Sport System is striving to eliminate silos is through the need for variations in the administrative structure of the network. The stakeholders who attended the conferences felt that there was a need to identify the jurisdiction of organizations and the need to clarify the roles and coordinate efforts. The lack of clear, orderly patterns of dependence up a single administrative body created some issues of concern. A more integrated network would ensure stability and continuity (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007). The second was the need for new network resources. Statements of the importance of acquiring new resources were evident in all six regions. Stakeholders felt it was important to establish new partnerships to make sure that the sport system will have adequate funding to support travel, training, and facilities. Those are all important in the continued change and development to open up communication (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007). The third was a degree of system coupling. There was an expressed need to strengthen linkages at the federal level with Human Resources Development Canada to enhance sport programs and services. There was also an expressed need to create links with different ministries responsible for youth to create better programming for the youth (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007). The last was a multiplicity of ties. The stakeholders realized that the individual sport organizations of varies regions have a great history of working together and showed that there was not a huge silo problem in those situations. The idea of having stronger relations and a greater number of relations between the regions would help improve the overall silo issue. Some examples of possible ways to achieve this were inter-locking boards of directors, coalitions, advocacy groups, and joint ventures (Barnes, Cousens, & MacLean, 2007).

Overall, the literature has shown that has shown that several organizations do suffer from silos forming and they do create barriers between employees and departments which effect. These barriers effect an organizations ability to function has effectively has they could.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the prevalence and impact of organizational silos within NCAA Division I athletic departments. The study will first examine if there is a perceived silo problem within NCAA Division I athletic departments. The study will then look at factors that often contribute to the formation of silos and determine the relationship between these factors and the perception of silos. The study will then attempt to also determine the following: if the perception is different among executive level staff and non-executive level staff; if the perception is different between individual operational units; and if the perception is different between high-major and mid-major athletic departments.

Population/Subjects

The population for this study will be current National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I athletic department staff members. For the purposes of this study, all team-specific personal will be excluded, including but not limited to: coaches, assistant coaches, director of operations, recruiting coordinators, video coordinators, administrative assistants, and directors of player relations. All non-team specific staff members of 100 randomly selected Division I athletic departments will be included in the sample.

Instrument and Data Collection

The instrument that will be utilized in this study was created in order to answer the desired research questions after a thorough review of literature. A panel of experts were consulted following the creation of this initial instrument to boost the strength of the instrument. The panel of experts included one University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Sport Administration professor, three University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Department of Athletics staff members, one current Juris Doctorate candidate at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and a specialist in survey methodology from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Odom Institute for Research in Social Science. A pilot study was then conducted to ensure that the questions were clear and that the participants understood exactly what was being asked.

In an effort to get the desired random population, all 351 colleges and universities classified as Division I for the National Collegiate Athletic Association competition will be placed into an Excel spreadsheet along with a number ranging from 1-351. A random number generator will be used to select 100 institutions. Once the colleges and universities are randomly selected, a database will then be created featuring all non-sport specific athletic department staff by using each institutions online athletic department staff directory. Once the database is created, everyone in the database will be contacted via a personalized email. Each email will contain an explanation of the purpose of the survey, a link to take the survey online, and contact information should the participant have any follow-up questions or be interested in seeing the results of the survey. After two weeks, a follow-up email will be sent to everyone in the database reminding the individuals to participate in the survey if they have not already done so.

The survey will be comprised of three main sections. The first section will only contain one question, but will address research question one. It will also address part of research questions three through five. The question will address whether the participants believe there is a silo problem within their athletic department. The second section will address research question two. It will contain different potential factors in the formation of silos and ask the participants to rank how well their athletic department performs in those areas. The third section will be used for classifying purposes. Along with section one, these questions will answer research questions three through five.

The survey will include multiple choice and Likert scale questions. It will also include one open ended question for participants to problem any additional information they would like. In order to encourage honest answers, all participants will be assured that their responses will only be used for the purpose of the study and that their responses will remain anonymous.

Data Analysis

After the survey is closed, all data will be entered into and analyzed by Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS). The data analysis will include descriptive statistics and analysis of variance to compare the responses of the various survey recipients in order to determine if there were significant relationships between any of the independent variables.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographics

The survey was completed by 409 NCAA Division I athletic department administrators. Demographic information was collected at the conclusion of the survey and was optional, which was completed by 304 participants. Of this 304, 60% (n=183) were male and 40% (n=121) were female. The majority of participants (65%, n= 196) were between the ages 23-40, with 37% (n=112) between the ages 23-30, and 28% (n=84) were between the ages of 31-40. Of the respondents, 37% (n=114) participants did not identify themselves as former student-athletes. The majority of participants have worked at their current institution for less than five years, with 35% (n=108) participants having been at their institution for less than two years and 23% (n=70) for 2-5 years. A complete listing of respondent demographic information is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic information of recruiters

	%	n
Sex		
Male	60%	183
Female	40%	121
Age		
22 or younger	1%	3
23-30	37%	112
31-40	28%	84
41-50	19%	58
51-60	12%	35

	%	n
60 or older	4%	12
Former Student-Athlete?		
Yes	37%	114
No	63%	193
Years At Current Institution		
0-2	35%	108
3-5	23%	70
6-10	15%	47
11-15	10%	32
16-20	5%	14
More than 20	12%	36

Prevalence of Silos within NCAA Division I Athletic Departments

Participants were given the following definition for silos: "the barriers that exist between departments within an organization, causing people that are on the same team to lack the desire or motivation to coordinate with other entities in that same organization (Lencioni 2006, Serrat 2010). Using that definition, participants were asked "Do you believe silos exist within your athletic department?" The vast majority of participants (87%, n=330) responded yes, they do believe silos exist within their athletic department. The remaining participants indicated they did not believe silos existed within their department.

Table 2

Perception of Silos among NCAA Division I Athletic Department Employees

	%	n
Silos		
Yes	87%	330
No	13%	46

Factors in the Creation of Silos within NCAA Division I Athletic Departments

Participants were given a list of different factors which could potentially lead to the formation of silos within an organization. Participants were asked to rate how effective their athletic department handled these different factors. The five point Likert scale included 1 (least effective) to 5 (very effective). Results from participants who felt that silos did exist within their athletic departments were separated from people who felt that silos did not exist within their athletic departments. Then, the mean results of each aspect for participants who responded that silos do exist were compared to the mean results of each aspect for participants who responded that silos did not exist. The mean differences of all aspects were then compared to determine the main causes of the creation of silos within athletic departments.

Non-work communication between the executive staff and the non-executive staff had the largest mean difference between participants who indicated that silos did exist (M=2.6, SD=1.069) and participants who indicated that silos did not exist (M=3.44, SD=1.119). Overall trust between the executive staff and the non-executive staff had the second largest mean difference between participants who indicated that silos did exist (M=3.16, SD=1.055) and participants who indicated that silos did not exist (M=3.88, SD=0.916).

Non-work communication within functional areas had the smallest mean difference between participants who indicated that silos did exist (M=3.27, SD=1.194) and participants who indicated that silos did not exist (M=3.56, SD=1.142). Use of electronic communications within functional areas had the second smallest mean difference between participants who indicated that silos did exist (M=3.94, SD=0.987) and participants who indicated that silos did not exist (M=4.25, SD=0.899). A complete list of all aspects mentioned in the survey, in order by mean difference are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Factors Leading to Silo Development within NCAA Division I Athletic Departments

	No - Silo		Yes - Silo				
	Mean	*SD*	*Mean*	*SD*	*Mean Difference*	*t*	*p*
Executive Level towards their staff - Non-Work Communication*	3.44	1.119	2.60	1.069	0.841	4.672	0
Executive Level towards their staff - Overall Trust*	3.88	0.916	3.16	1.055	0.722	4.205	0
Executive Level towards their staff - Use of Electronic Communication*	4.17	0.824	3.47	0.971	0.700	4.44	0
Executive Level towards their staff - One-on-One Communication*	3.81	1.131	3.13	1.080	0.679	3.781	0
Between Functional Areas - Non-Work Communication*	3.32	1.093	2.68	1.023	0.634	3.541	0
Between Functional Areas - Use of Electronic Communication*	4.26	0.850	3.63	0.841	0.627	4.343	0
Executive Level towards their staff - Large Meeting Communication*	3.88	0.861	3.30	0.980	0.584	3.656	0
Executive Level towards their staff - Overall Leadership*	4.07	0.921	3.49	0.948	0.577	3.694	0
Between Functional Areas - One-on-One Communication*	3.87	0.991	3.30	1.008	0.565	3.239	0.001
Within Functional Area - Overall Leadership	4.21	0.951	3.77	1.023	0.438	2.519	0.012
Within Functional Area - Functional Area Meetings Communication	4.15	0.864	3.72	1.066	0.428	2.422	0.016
Within Functional Area - One-on-One Communication	4.25	0.981	3.88	1.307	0.374	2.142	0.033
Within Functional Area - Overall Trust	4.21	0.951	3.84	1.079	0.364	1.993	0.047
Within Functional Area - Use of Electronic Communication	4.25	0.899	3.94	0.987	0.306	1.851	0.065
Within Functional Area - Non-Work Communication	3.56	1.142	3.27	1.194	0.289	1.419	0.157

Note: Scale from (1) least to (5) most

*p<.01

Silo Perception between Executive Level and Non-Executive Level Administration

There was no significant difference found between the perception of silos by executive level staff and the perception of silos by non-executive level staff as the vast majority of both felt that silos did exist. For executive level staff, 81.7% of participants felt that silos existed within their athletic department, while 88.5% of non-executive level staff participants felt they existed.

Table 4

Perception of Silos Among Executive Level and Non-Executive Level NCAA Division I Staff

	EXEC	NON-EXEC	χ^2
YES	49	216	2.025
	(-1.4)	(1.4)	
NO	11	28	
	(1.4)	(-1.4)	

Note: Adjusted standardized residuals appear in parentheses below group frequencies.

Silo Perception between High-Major and Mid-Major Athletic Departments

There was no significant difference between the perception of silos by athletic department staff members at high-major institutions and the perception of silos by athletic department staff members at mid-major institutions. For the purposes of the study, all universities that participated in the ACC, Big Ten, Big 12, Pac 12, and SEC conferences during the 2013-2014 academic year were considered high-major. All others were considered mid-majors. The vast majority of both felt that silos existed. For high-major institution participants, 85.6% felt that silos exists. 89.1% of mid-major institution participants felt that silos exit within their athletic department.

Table 5

Perception of Silos Among BCS University Employees and Non-BCS University Employees

	BCS	NON-BCS	χ^2
YES	125	139	2.025
	(-.9)	(.9)	
NO	21	17	
	(.9)	(-.9)	

Note: Adjusted standardized residuals appear in parentheses below group frequencies.

Silo Perception between Functional Areas

There was no significant difference between the perception of silos and different functional areas within an athletic department. However, viewing the differences in functional unit responses are quite illuminating. The functional areas of Ticket Office and Ticket Sales both had 30% of their participants feel that silos did not exist, while the functional areas of Business Office, and Student-Athlete Services but had 100% of their participants feel that silos did exist.

Table 6

Perception of Silos among NCAA Division I Athletic Department Employees By Functional Area

	No - Silo		Yes - Silo	
	%	*n*	%	*n*
Ticket Sales	30%	3	70%	7
Ticket Office	30%	6	70%	14
AD's Office	23%	3	77%	10
Equipment	20%	2	80%	8
Compliance	19%	4	81%	17
Academic Support	15%	5	85%	29
Event Management	13%	3	87%	21
Development	12%	4	88%	30
Marketing	8%	2	92%	24
Facilities	7%	1	93%	12
Sponsorships	7%	1	93%	12
Athletic Communications	4%	1	96%	25
Business Office	0%	0	100%	17
Student-Athlete Services	0%	0	100%	11

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Factors in the Creation of Silos within NCAA Division I Athletic Departments

The vast majority of respondents (87%) indicated they believe that silos exist within their athletic department. This result supports Lencioni when he explains that silos are common in large organizations (Lencioni, 2006). Athletic departments are continuing to grow in size, and many could be considered large organizations. This study showed that silos do exist within NCAA Division I athletic departments.

Participants were asked to rate how well their athletic department handled different aspects which could lead to the creation of silos. The results of participants who felt that silos did not exist was compared to the results of people who felt that silos did exist. This was done to determine what the biggest differences are between universities where silos are a problem, and universities where they are not a problem. These results indicated the largest differences came with relationships between the executive level and non-executive level staff members. The top four results were non-work communication, overall trust, use of electronic communication, and one-on-one communication as they relate between executive level staff to non-executive level staff. This supports different theories that the formation of silos start at the top of an organization. Phil Ensor cites management style and organizational structure as two of his five indicators of the functional silo syndrome (Ensor, 1988). Lencioni says that silos often form

when executives fail to "provide themselves and their employees with a compelling context for working together" (Lencioni, 2006).

Several participants responded to the open-ended question and supported this by stating, "There is a tremendous chasm between the executive leadership team and the rest of the department. To further complicate the matter, there is a perception that a chasm exits within the executive leadership team itself. As our department maneuvers through reorganization and restructuring, it is very troubling that decisions are made by only a few at the top with little to no input requested from those who are heavily vested in areas affected" (Respondent 38). A second respondent echoed similar statements, "Leadership is crucial to the success of any department. There are many good leaders who prevail in certain aspects of their position. It's the great leaders [who] bring along every member of their team to the finish line. Great leaders provide the vision for their department and have the ability to motivate and inspire those within the department to succeed" (Respondent 24).

After the differences between executive level staff and non-executive level staff, the biggest mean differences of the different aspects were between functional areas. Participants were asked to rate non-work communication, use of electronic communication, and one-on-one communication between functional units. While these did not show mean differences as high as the similar aspects between executive level and non-executive level staff, there was still a substantial difference in these functional area aspects between participants who felt their athletic department had silos and people who felt their athletic department did not have silos.

Often times, people in different functional areas can have tunnel vision on what they are hoping to accomplish (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, Toth). One example could be if the marketing department had an idea for a potential promotion which would take place on the field

during a game, it would be important for them to communicate with the event management and facility employees to make sure that it is feasible. Getting people to work together who have different agendas can be a huge obstacle (Stone 2004). One participant felt that this was the primary cause of silos within their athletic department. "Our silo mentality seems to be driven by department head leadership more so than executive level leadership, for example, Turf Wars" (Respondent 12).

The aspects that had the smallest mean difference were the ones within functional areas. The three aspects with the smallest mean differences were non-work communication, use of electronic communication, and overall trust within functional areas. Functional areas are smaller than the entire athletic department, which typically makes it easier for people to work together. Functional areas are also typically working towards a common goal, which helps to avoid the creation of silos (Cropanzano, Howes, Grandey, Toth).

Silo Perception between Executive Level and Non-Executive Level Administration

Occasionally when silos form within organizations, presidents, CEOs, and other executive level staff members may believe that everything in their organization is fine (Smircich and Morgan, 1982). However, their employees could feel differently. Since this is something that sometimes occurs within organizations, part of this study focused on determining if the perception of silos were different between executive level staff members and non-executive level staff members. There was a slight difference between the two levels. 81.7% of executive level staff members felt that silos existed in their athletic department, compared to 88.5% of non-executive level staff members. The vast majority of all staff members, regardless of rank, felt that silos existed within their athletic departments.

It is likely that while the two different levels both feel that silos exist, it is doubtful that they agree on the causes. As the results of this survey showed, the largest factors contributing to the existence of silos happen between the executive level staff and non-executive level staff. Several respondents stated specifically that their silos came from the top. "Main issue is boss just wants work done but doesn't care about our mental or physical state. He overworks us and when we ask for time off he gets angry" (Respondent 15). This supports Phil Ensor and his indicators of functional silo syndrome, specifically his management style and organizational structure causes (Ensor, 1988).

Silo Perception between High-Major and Mid-Major Athletic Departments

While silos can occur within an organization, generally, the larger an organization is the more likely silos will form. This study examined if there was a difference between silo perception between high-major and mid-major athletic departments because generally high-major athletic departments were larger, in terms of employees, than mid-major ones.

These results were surprising because, while the vast majority of both felt silos existed, mid-major athletic departments had a higher percentage than high-major. 89.1% of mid-major employees felt that silos existed within their athletic department, compared to 85.6% of high-major employees. Only schools with have a football program were surveyed. Universities without football tend to have even smaller athletic departments, and it is possible that if those universities' athletic department staff members were surveyed their results could be different.

Silo Perception between Functional Areas

This study also examined different functional areas of an athletic department to determine if silos were prone to one area more than another. The majority of each functional area felt that silos did exist, however some areas were more split than others. The two functional areas with

the highest percentages of participants who felt that silos did not exist were the ticket office and ticket sales. 30% of participants who identified themselves as members of the ticket office functional area indicated that they felt that silos did not exist, while 30% of participants who identified themselves as members of the tickets sales functional area felt that silos did not exist. The AD's office had the third highest percentage with 23% of their respondents indicating that they felt silos did not exist.

One possible theory for these outliers in the ticket-related functional areas is that people go to these two units when they need tickets for various events. When they approach these units for tickets, they are most likely very nice and then very appreciative after. Due to these interactions, it is possible that people in the ticket office and in ticket sales would think that less silos exist. With the AD's office, it is likely that they came in third due to the fact that sometimes people in authoritative positions do not realize that there are problems with their employees beneath them (Smircich and Morgan, 1992).

Two functional areas, the business office and student-athlete services, had all participants say that the felt silos existed within their athletic departments. For the business office, it is possible that the participants responded this way due to the nature of their job. They deal with different units, and sometimes must decide difficult financial decisions. With respondents in student-athlete services, it is possible that they responded this way because they spend the majority of their time interacting with student-athletes, and less time with other people in the department. That would explain why they feel siloed. Similarly, with the participants in athletic communications, it is likely that they spend so much time with teams that they may feel siloed from the rest of the department.

Location

One factor that could potentially cause silos, which was not included in the survey, could be the physical location of the different functional units on campus. While some universities house all of their difference functional areas in the same building, others are limited space wise. They have to have different buildings around campus house the different units. This could lead to the formation of silos because employees are not seeing each other every day. That makes it more difficult to communicate.

Several participants indicated this in the open-ended questions. One participant called the building location the biggest problem in the creation of their silos, "our problem is more of a silo due to facilities; departments are spread across four different buildings. We are all close but unfortunately the facilities create the silos more than anything" (Respondent 18). Another participant indicated that the building locations hinder effective communication, which leads to silos. "There are barriers to personal communication because our silos are spread out in several different facilities around campus (seven different buildings) so you may never have personal contact with most units" (Respondent 40).

Age

Another potential cause in the formation of silos with an athletic department could be the age of the employees. The survey did not question the participants on how they felt age differences in employees related to silos, however a few respondents mentioned it in the open-ended section. When people have are of different ages, they may look at things differently which could lead to the creation of silos. Additionally, when older employees have been at an institution for a very long time, they could get set in their ways. When younger employees try to offer new ideas, they could be rejected which would lead to the formation of silos. Older

employees may also have a difficult time communicating with younger employees due to new communication trends.

One respondent said they felt that the difference in ages resulted in a lack of trust among older employees towards younger employees. "I think that silos exist because of work environments and with age differences. Older workers are going to trust discussing items with other older employees because they might have similar beliefs but good administrators always have a younger person or two that they can use to bounce ideas off of that are from a different generation. The differences in ages within a department are great but with those differences come changing priorities in life and life balance so that can also create the silo" (Respondent 27).

Positive Silos

It is possible that some athletic administrators may not feel that silos are a negative thing in their department. Silos could be views as people focusing on what they need to get done and not worrying about other areas. While this could lead to potential conflict, some people could view it is a working efficiently. One participant stated that their AD preferred silos, "There is not much interaction between groups or even within groups. My AD likes this design. Very little communication and quite authoritarian from the top down" (Respondent 14). These respondents contradict Cote, when he states that "silos reduce efficiency" (Cote, 2002) and Kotter, when he states that silos "destroy trust, they cut off communication, and they foster complacency" (Kotter, 2011).

Eliminating Silos

The data gathered from this survey could be used to help create a plan to attack silos within athletic departments. When combating silos, this data would be best used in relationship with two theories: Patrick Lencioni's Rally Cry defense against silos and the Association for

Manufacturing Excellence's organizational renewal. Lencioni stated that the best tactic in combating silos is to create a thematic goal, which could serve as a rallying cry that members of an organization can work towards and bond around (Lencioni 2006). This is similar to AME's first step, which is to establish a vision of a radically different future (AME). This is an effective way to create a defense against silos, however based on the results of this survey it is important to make sure that leaders of an organization focus on how they deliver the thematic goal to the organization.

The data showed that the different factors between executive level staff and non-executive level staff were the biggest difference between athletic departments with silos and those without silos. If an athletic director decided to implement a new thematic goal it would be important to present it in a way that did not alienate employees. One way to make sure that it did not alienate employees, would be to seek input from all staff members. This could be done via email, which was one of the factors that needed the most improvement. This would make everyone in the department feel as if they have a voice. It would also show trust from the executive staff towards non-executive staff, which is another aspect that needed improvement. It is important that people do not feel like the thematic goal is being created because they are doing a poor job. This could lead to more silos.

If a thematic goal was created, it would also be helpful to include meetings between the different functional units. As one participants stated, "Our Athletic department has not always been as successful as it has been within the last couple years. We have really grown together, holding combined meetings (tickets, marketing, fund development and group sales/outbound) on a weekly basis and working closely together to accomplish our goals. The face to face time is really important and everyone gets a say at our meetings, keeping all areas abreast of what

everyone else is doing-for the most part" (Respondent 32). These meetings would make everyone feel included, and would allow for all employees to interact with one another. These steps could lead to the elimination of silos (Shirey, 2006).

If presented in the correct way, Lencioni's Rallying Cry and the Association for Manufacturing Excellence's Organizational Renewal can both be very successful. However, it is important that it is implanted in a way that everyone feels included and that it is well communicated. Then once one is in place, all employees can bond around it and work towards the common goal.

Future Studies

There are several ways in which this study could be expanded. One way that would be helpful would to include additional questions about age and location. These were two factors that were repeatedly mentioned in the open-ended question section. It would be helpful to get a better understanding of how all participants felt about these two questions. It would also be helpful to include a question requesting the participants' opinion on if silos were a negative thing or not, as this was indicated by multiple participants in the open-ended section. This study could also be expanded to compare how the different factors which lead to silos were rated by executive level staff members and non-executive level staff members.

The study could also be expanded to include additional universities. This study did not include any NCAA Division I institutions without football. NCAA Division I universities without football tend to be significantly smaller than those with football. It would be interesting to see how silos compared at those institutions. Additionally, the study did not include any other NCAA divisions or alternative governing body affilations. These would be interesting to study

because these institutions typically have different goals and values compared to NCAA Division I. They are also generally much smaller.

Another potential future study would involve focusing on one institution only. The survey could be administered to all current staff members. Depending on the result, a plan could be put in place to help eliminate the silos at that institution. The survey could then be administered a second time to see if the methods in eliminating silos were helpful. This would be a very important study because it could help create a specific plan of action that athletic departments could use as they attempt to eliminate silos within their department. The one drawback to this study would be that identities would be able to be determined based on the results. The entire athletic department would have to be on board with this study and feel comfortable with being honest.

REFERENCES

Barnes, M., Cousens, L., & MacLean, J. From silos to synergies: a network perspective of the Canadian sport system. *Int. J. Sport Management and Marketing*, *2*, 555-571

Beaufait, F. W. (1991). An engineering curriculum for the year 2000. Engineering Education, 80 (3), 425–428.

Bjorklund, S. A., & Colbeck, C. L. (2001). The view from the top: Leaders' perspectives on a decade of change in engineering education. Journal of Engineering Education, 90 (1), 13–19.

Côté, M. (2002). A matter of trust and respect. *CA magazine*

Cropanzano, R., Howes, J. C., Grandey, A. A., & Toth, P. (1997). The relationship of organizational politics and support to work behaviors, attitudes, and stress. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *18*(2), 159-180.

Darling, A. L., & Dannels, D. P. (2003). Practicing engineers talk about the importance of talk: A report on the role of oral communication in the workplace. *Communication Education*, *52*(1), 1-16.

Denton, D. D. (1998). Engineering education for the 21st century: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Engineering Education, 87 (1), 19–22.

Diamond, M., Allcorn, S., & Stein, H. (2004). The surface of organizational boundaries: A view from psychoanalytic object relations theory. *Human Relations*, *57*(1), 31-53.

Dickson, P. R., & Giglierano, J. J. (1986). Missing the boat and sinking the boat: a conceptual model of entrepreneurial risk. *The Journal of Marketing*, 58-70.

Disney Institute. (2001). *Be Our Guest: Perfecting the art of customer service*. New York: Disney Editions.

Duncan, T., & Moriarty, S. E. (1998). A communication-based marketing model for managing relationships. *The journal of marketing*, 1-13.

Esnor, P. (1988). The Functional Silo Syndrome. *AME Target*, *16*.

Fizel, J. (2004). *Economics of college sports*.

Kotter, J. (2011, May 5). Breaking Down Silos. . Retrieved October 21, 2013, from http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnkotter/2011/05/03/breaking-down-silos/

Lencioni, P. (2000). *The Four Obsessions of an Extraordinary Executive*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lencioni, P. (2006). *Silos, Politics, and Turf Wars*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

History-ncaa.org. (2012, August 13). Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About the NCAA/History

Markov, I., & Kowalkiewicz, M. (2008, September). Linking business goals to process models in semantic business process modeling. In *Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference, 2008. EDOC'08. 12th International IEEE* (pp. 332-338). IEEE.

Parker, S. K., Axtell, C. M., & Turner, N. (2001). Designing a safer workplace: Importance of job autonomy, communication quality, and supportive supervisors. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, *6*(3), 211.

Pullin, J. (1989). Breaking Down the Functional Silos: Motorola Paging Division "Bandit" Plant. *AME Target*.

Reina, D., & Reina, M. (2006). *Trust & Betrayal in the Workplace: Building Effective Relationships in Your Organization* (ed.). : Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Rosenthal, L. J. (2003). From regulating organization to multi-billion dollar business: The NCAA is commercializing the amateur competition it has taken almost a century to create. *Seton Hall J. Sport L.*, *13*, 321.

Serrat, O. (2010). Bridging Organizational Silos.

Smith, R. K. (2001). A brief history of the national collegiate athletic association's role in regulating intercollegiate athletics. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, *11*,

Smith, R. (2011). *Pay for Play: A History of Big-Time College Athletic Reform*. Urbana: Univeristy of Illinois Press.

silo. 2013. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved November 4, 2013, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/silo

Shirey, M. R. (2006). On intrapreneurship: From silos to collaboration. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *20*(5), 229-232.

Slack, T. and Hinings, C.R. (1992) 'Understanding change in national sport organizations: an integration of theoretical perspectives', *Journal of Sport Management*, Vol. 6, pp. 114-132

Smircich, L., & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning.*Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *18*(3), 257-273.

Sport Canada (2002) 'The Canadian sport policy', Available at: http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/index_e.cfm

Stone, F. (2004). Deconstructing silos and supporting collaboration. *Employment Relations Today*, *31*(1), 11-18.

Study Group on Functional Organization. (1988). Organizational Renewal – Tearing Down the Functional Silos. *AME Target*, *4-16*.

Thompson, A. (2012). Frank Sinatra Syndrome – Silos and What Causes Them

Whittaker, S., Frohlich, D., & Daly-Jones, O. (1994, April). Informal workplace communication: What is it like and how might we support it?. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems* (pp. 131-137). ACM.

Yu, K., & Liaw, P. (1998). Ceramic-matrix composites: An integrated interdisciplinary curriculum. Journal of Engineering Education, 87, 539–543.