University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1987

A College Athletic Department - An Example of a High Performance System Existing in an Organized Anarchy Known as a University-Higher Education Organization

June Townsend Scopinich EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Townsend Scopinich, June EdD, "A College Athletic Department - An Example of a High Performance System Existing in an Organized Anarchy Known as a University-Higher Education Organization" (1987). *Dissertations*. 507.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/507>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

**A COLLEGE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT - AN EXAMPLE OF A
HIGH PERFORMANCE SYSTEM EXISTING IN AN
ORGANIZED ANARCHY KNOWN AS A UNIVERSITY-HIGHER
EDUCATION ORGANIZATION**

by

June Townsend Scoplinich

**A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Education

1987

Dissertation Committee

William P. Foster, Ed.D., Director

Patricia Lowry, Ph.D.

Wallace F. Cohen, Ed.D.

Copyrighted by
June Townsend Scopinich
May 1987

ABSTRACT

A COLLEGE ATHLETIC DEPARTMENT - AN EXAMPLE OF A HIGH PERFORMANCE SYSTEM EXISTING IN AN ORGANIZED ANARCHY KNOWN AS A UNIVERSITY-HIGHER EDUCATION ORGANIZATION

The researcher in this study sought an empirical example of a Vaill's high performance system within the university-higher education organization. This investigation will assist leaders within colleges and universities in having a greater understanding of the organizational structure of their own institutions by offering a new theoretical perception. The results will be analyzed with the prospects of utilizing this information to address such theoretical questions as: how did the athletic department achieve this high level of performance and how was the athletic department able to exist as a high performance system within the university organization that is often characterized as an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system.

This study, which extended from January, 1986 to May, 1986, was conducted using the athletic department of the University of California, San Diego. The sample consisted of forty-one subjects: the Athletic Director, ten coaches, and thirty athletes.

The research design was a case study that used the focused interview technique. An interview guide, that was designed by the researcher, was used during the interview

portion of this research. It consisted of 34 questions. Each of these questions were designed to reflect a specific criterion and/or characteristic of a high performance system as defined by Vaill. These questions were used to see if in fact the University of California, San Diego's athletic department could be defined as a high performance system.

Each of the questions were analyzed to see whether or not the response was in agreement with the response given by the Athletic Director. A 70 percent level of agreement was established. Each question had to achieve this 70 percent agreement between the Athletic Director's response and the responses off the forty coaches and athletes in order for a question to be used in the analysis of data.

The researcher concluded that the athletic department could be identified as a high performance system. In addressing the question of how the athletic department achieved this level of excellence the findings suggest that the environment outside the university played a significant role in influencing the successful development of the department. The findings also suggest that the athletic department was able to exist as a high performance system within the university organization because of the ability of an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system to tolerate novel solutions, local accommodations, and a great deal of ambiguity while still maintaining its own unique identity.

DEDICATION

TO

My family

**They have enriched my life
with their love and support.**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this dissertation was not without credit to the many people who were such a valuable resource.

I am grateful to Dr. William Foster for his direction and support of my research. In addition, I am grateful to Dr. Patricia Lowry for her input and sensitivity. Finally, I thank you, Dr. Wallace Cohen, for your pragmatic evaluation of this research.

A special thanks to JoAnn Forbes, who is the coordinator of the microcomputer lab at Southwestern College, for assisting in the editing and in printing the final copy of this dissertation. To Dr. Barbara Blourock, thank you for all the effort you gave in reviewing and verifying my tape recordings.

I wish to thank Judy Sweet, the Athletic Director at the University of California, San Diego, for her support and effort regarding this research. I am also grateful to the coaches and athletes of UCSD who gave of their time during the interview portion of this study.

I especially wish to thank Nan Haugen for her personal and professional support. To the support group, Barbara, Jean, Marilyn, and Sue, a special thanks. Lastly, I wish to thank my parents and sisters who have remained loving and supporting throughout my entire personal and professional career.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	11
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	111
LIST OF GRAPHS	
LIST OF APPENDICES	
 CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Research Questions	7
Implication for Educational Leadership	8
Definition of Terms	9
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
The University: Traditional Views	17
The University: Contemporary Theory	28
Organized Anarchy	28
Loose Coupling	39
The University as an Organization	45
The Educational Organization and the Environment	49
Athletics in the University	55
Athletics in America	67
Excellence and High Performance	82
The Athletic Dilemma: High Performing System or Anarchy	88

III. METHODOLOGY	92
The Case Study	92
Limitations of the Case Study Method	94
Limitations of the Study	96
The Sample	96
Development of the Instrument	98
Interviews	98
Data Gathering	100
Data Analysis	100
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	104
Research Questions 1 and 2	106
Interview Question 1	106
Interview Question 3A & B	108
Interview Question 4	111
Interview Question 5A & B, 7	114
Interview Question 10C	119
Interview Question 11A	122
Interview Question 6A & B	125
Interview Question 12A & B	125
Interview Question 12C	126
Interview Question 14A	136
Interview Question 14B & C	137
Interview Question 15A	145
Summary	147
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	152
Summary of the Purposes of the Case Study	152

Conclusions: Research Questions 1 and 2	153
Conclusions: Research Question 3	154
Conclusions: Research Question 4	163
Implications of the Findings on Present Theory	168
Recommendations for Future Research	171
Summary of Research	172
REFERENCES	173
APPENDICES	190

LIST OF GRAPHS

Graph		Page
1	Interview Question #1: How would you compare the performance of your <u>athletic department</u> (or <u>team</u>) with other Division III <u>departments</u> (or <u>teams</u>)?	112
2	Interview Questions #3A & B: How would you compare the <u>athletic department</u> (or <u>your team</u>) now to where it was when you first arrived at UCSD? Do you feel there has been a leveling off, or a decrease in development?	115
3	Interview Question #4: Has <u>the athletic department</u> (or your team) <u>ever been judged</u> by others to be better than other Division III <u>departments</u> (or <u>teams</u>)?	118
4	Interview Questions #5A & B: What is the budget <u>the athletic department</u> (or <u>your team</u>)? Based on your knowledge do you feel that it's above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III <u>athletic departments</u> (or <u>teams</u>)?	120
5	Interview Question #7: How would you compare the athletic facilities at UCSD with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average?	123
6	Interview Question #10C: Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole?	126
7	Interview Question #11A: What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of UCSD?	128
8	Interview Question #6A: <u>As a department is there</u> (or <u>As a coach is there</u> or <u>Does your coach make</u>) a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes?	132
9	Interview Question #6B: Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent represented by the student/athletes <u>in the athletic department</u> (or <u>on your team</u>) is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III <u>departments</u> (or <u>teams</u>)?	134

LIST OF GRAPHS (Cont'd)

Graph		Page
10	Interview Question #12A: Do you feel that <u>the UCSD athletic team coaches</u> (or <u>you as a coach</u> or <u>your coach</u>) give extra effort beyond what is expected of <u>them</u> (or <u>you</u> or <u>him/her</u>)?	136
11	Interview Question #12B: How committed do you feel <u>the coaches are</u> (or <u>you are</u> or <u>your coach is</u>) to your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department?	138
12	Interview Question #12C: How would you describe the motivation of the coaches? (coaches only How motivated are you?)	140
13	Interview Question #14A: How often do you meet your direct <u>supervisor</u> (or <u>the individual whose responsibilities include the athletic department</u>)? (Omit this question for the team members.)	144
14	Interview Question #14B: How much autonomy do you have in your position? Are you often reviewed?	146
15	Interview Question #14C: As a <u>department</u> (or <u>coach</u>), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either formal or informal contacts?	149
16	Interview Question # 15A: How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives the athletic department?	152

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

- A Copy of the questions in the interview guide
- B Copy of the data sheet
- C Copy of the regional and national championships
UCSD's athletic teams participated in or won
from 1981 through 1985
- D Copy of the regional and national championships
UCSD's athletic teams participated in or won
during the 1985-86 school year
- E Copy of a significant article from the UCSD's
school newspaper
- F Copies of the Response Analysis Forms used in the
data analysis
- G List of questions not used in the analysis of
and the percent of agreement achieved
- H Letter from Dr. Barbara Blourock varifying the
accuracy of the transcription of the tapes of
the interviews

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Most colleges and universities give the appearance as being rationally organized institutions that are guided by well educated men and women in leadership positions. These institutions can be characterized by their clearly stated goals and purposes that are contained in most of their catalogues. The presidents of these organizations suggest to all that they are both knowledgeable and capable of running these rationally oriented institutions. Combined into the administrative structure of most university-higher education systems are such organizational roles as vice-presidents, deans, assistant deans and department chairs. These roles are delegated to individual members that help the President run the institution and implement the policies. At the bottom of this traditional hierarchy are the many faculty members organized into different departments by various academic disciplines. All seem, to the uninitiated, to be united in their prescribed tasks toward achieving the institution's goals and purposes.

Many organizational theorists, however, view these educational organizations as being nonrational in nature. Many of them think of university-higher education

institutions as being organized anarchies (March & Olsen, 1979) that exhibit loosely coupled characteristics (Weick, 1982) and reflect fundamental ambiguities. Viewing these organizations as organized anarchies and loosely coupled assemblages implies that the components or units within the organization are weaker and have fewer common elements than previously thought (Weick, 1978, p.57).

Although these theorists describe the university organization in compatible, non-rational terms, the ambiguity that is central to both theories is also central to their results. They do not tell us why or how the exhibited organized anarchy or loosely coupled characteristics occur. Thus, they seem to eliminate much of the practical application of their theories. Torbert seems to agree with this thought when he states that Cohen and March's

findings...(describes) what education currently does not do... the findings hold no logical implications or empirical clues about: (1) what education ought to do, (2) how education might do what it ought to do, or (3) which of their aims, strategies or behaviors educational practitioners would need to reform in order to educate more successfully (1981, p.143).

The inability of these theorists to explain educational institutions in more clearly definable terms is an issue involved in this research.

There are various concepts about organizations and education that are also central to this research. Contemporary organization theory is abandoning a rational-model approach to organizations and beginning to adopt social, political and cultural perspectives (Sergiovanni, 1984). The major propositions of contemporary theory are:

1. That the loose coupling and organized anarchy theories should not be viewed as competing but rather as overlapping and compatible theories.
2. That educational leaders are hampered by the inadequacy of present organizational theory.
3. That our lack of understanding of organizations is perpetuated by the simplicity of the myth of organization as a monolith (Bennis, 1985, p.49).
4. That part of this problem is the lack of understanding of the various "organizational selves" or substructures that exist in all organizations (Bennis, 1985, p. 48, 50)
5. That organizational analysis of universities should be viewed from a cultural perspective that acknowledges that within the university there exists various subcultures, each seeking to promote and maintain its own values (Sergiovanni, 1984, p.1,8).
6. That schools do not exist in a static world but that because their environment is in a constant state of flux the

relationship between the school and its environment must be continuously refined (Abbott, 1975, p.176).

7. That education is one of the major institutions in America today. As such, education is firmly established within the basic fiber of our society and culture. Therefore, education can be considered an instrument of cultural needs allowing society to get the type of education it wants (Goodman, 1962, p.26; Ross, 1958, p.9).

8. That, although the standard portrait of schools many times depicts weak ineffective organizations, educational institutions, unlike other types of organizations, fail infrequently. Perhaps, as some authors suggest, the faulty analysis is due, in part, to the researchers having the wrong model in mind (Meyer, Scott & Deal, 1983, p.49; Welck, 1982a, p.673).

9. That, "in most large organizations different subunits face different environments...The more diverse the environments that different units face, the more differentiation in structure is needed" (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.47).

10. That external environment is a powerful determinant on designing internal structure and process (Jackson & Morgan, 1982, p.260).

11. That loose coupling of structural elements may cause departmental units to vary independently and "provide a more sensitive mechanism to detect environmental variation" (Welck, 1982, p.387).

12. That as organizational environments become more diverse, the need for horizontal communication increases (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.42).

13. That communication is significant to the success and failure of human systems (Capalle, 1979, p.8).

14. That in loosely coupled systems flawed feedback, or the inability of the various units to communicate, is often the major source of looseness (Weick, 1982, p.402).

15. That ambiguity can occur because information is incomplete or ambiguous or is interpreted in different ways by different people (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.12).

In the past, many of these perspectives have been absent from the research of university-higher education organizations. These propositions, however, guided this research toward taking a more multi-faceted approach in the study of collegiate institutions as organizations. Although such theorists as Cohen, March, and Weick describe organizations as ambiguous, loosely coupled entities, the multi-faceticity of these organizations seems to need additional explanation in order to provide the practical guidelines that so many educational leaders seek.

One theorist who has proposed a relatively new concept that could help explain the collegiate organization in clearer terms is Vaill (1982). Vaill sees organizations as high performance systems. Although this model seems in direct opposition to the theories of Cohen, March, and Weick the question posed by this research is are these models of organizations really incompatible? Or, can high performance

systems exist within an ambiguous, loosely coupled system? The research will demonstrate that the latter option is true by showing how a high performance system- an athletic department- exists within a loosely coupled environment. Further, this research shows what ingredients contribute to the development of this high performance system by doing an analysis of interviews with members of the subsystem within a higher education organization.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Two theories about university-higher education organizations have been developed-- organized anarchy and loose coupling. These two theories are not incompatible but rather are intertwined in their descriptive analysis of the nonrational nature of educational organizations. One purpose of this study is to look beyond these descriptive terms and find a possible explanation of how excellent performance can occur in an organization described as anarchic and loosely coupled. The case: an athletic department which year after year produces excellence despite the so-called anarchic quality of higher education organizations. This also might be true of other university departments, but the focus of this research will be on an athletic department.

Another purpose of this study is to demonstrate empirically that an example of Vail's high performance system exists within the university-higher education organization. Although this model is not now used to

describe the university and therefore can be considered a competing way of looking at the organization and how it performs, it is hoped that by finding an empirical example of this model within the university its organizational structure will be given greater clarity of understanding. Perhaps the ambiguity shown by educational institutions could then be explained by the existence of different types of organizational systems making up the different parts of university; i.e., an athletic department defined as a high performance system. The exhibited ambiguity may be caused by the differences between the goals and purposes of each of the individual parts and the stated goals and purposes of the university as a whole. Perhaps, then, this would offer one explanation as to why the university, as an organization, shows such ambiguity and complexity and is so difficult to define.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Can an athletic department be found, within the university-higher education organization, that can be characterized as a high performance system?
2. If so, what makes it a high performance system?
3. If an athletic department is found to have characteristics of high performance systems, how did it achieve this level of excellence?
4. How can a high performance system exist in an organization described as an organized anarchy and/or a loosely coupled system?

IMPLICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Leadership is a process whereby the leader with certain motives and purposes mobilize resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of the followers in order to realize mutually held goals (Burns, 1978, p.18). This process is exercised in a condition of competition and conflict in which the leader's appeal to the motive bases of potential followers. Leaders, then, induce the followers to act for certain goals that represent the values and motivation of both the leader and the followers (Burns, 1978, pp.18-19).

It is within this reciprocal process, inherent in leadership, that the importance of this research becomes apparent. Basic to this concept is that the leader either satisfies mutually held goals or induces the followers to act for certain goals. If, then, an empirical example of a high performance system can be found within the university-higher education organization, it would have to be acknowledged that there were at least two organizations with different goals functioning within the same institution. The organized anarchy with its vague inconsistent goals is quite different from a high-performance system that is characterized by clear purposes and objectives. Leadership, because of its reciprocal process, would be directly effected by this possibility of different parts of the educational organization having differing goals because in order to lead

and change goals for the benefit of the whole institution the leader must approach the various parts of the university organization. One part might be in complete accord with his/her stated goals while another part might be in complete opposition.

In the university-higher education organization, it is usually the President who must be concerned with the institution as a whole. Because of this possibility of two organizations perceived as one, it is the President who must deal with two units exhibiting different goals and purposes. But, instead of this ambiguity being masked by the label of organized anarchy, this research could help the President to better understand the university-higher education organization. Also, as the leader, it would aid him/her in understanding just what his/her followers' goals and objectives really are. Only then will the President be able to lead his/her university and transform the followers by comprehending their differing goals.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Ambiguity signifies that there are four major kinds of opaqueness in organizations: intention, understanding, history, and organization (March & Olsen, 1979).

Culture is a pattern of basic assumptions- invented, discovered, or developed by a given group as it learns to cope with its problems of external adaptation and internal integration- that has worked well enough to be considered

valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems (Schein, 1985).

Discrediting means that all past experience has lots of surplus meaning and there is no reason to think that we have exhausted the meanings of that experience by how we currently process it (Weick, 1977a).

Division I refers to a specific classification of four-year intercollegiate programs by the N.C.A.A. In order to be classified Division I an institution must meet the following criteria:

1. Must sponsor a minimum of six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division I.
2. Must sponsor six varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams in Division I.
3. May award financial aid based on athletic ability.
4. Must place an annual limit of athletic based awards on the following sports: 15 awards for men's basketball, 15 awards for women's basketball, 10 awards for women's gymnastics, 8 awards for women's tennis, and 12 awards for women's volleyball.
5. May administer 137 awards to all other men's sports and 92 awards to all other women's sports based on athletic ability.

6. All awards based on athletic ability must not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1985).

Division II refers to a specific classification of four-year intercollegiate programs by the N.C.A.A. In order to be classified Division II as institution must meet the following criteria:

1. Must sponsor a minimum of four varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-male teams or mixed teams of males and females in Division II.
2. Must sponsor four varsity intercollegiate sports involving all-female teams in Division II.
3. May award financial aid based on athletic ability.
4. Must place an annual limit of athletic based awards on the following teams: 45 awards for men's football and 12 awards for men's basketball.
5. May administer 57 awards to all other men's sports and 110 awards to all other women's sports based on athletic ability.
6. All awards based on athletic ability must not exceed the value of commonly accepted educational expenses at that institution (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1985).

Division III refers to a specific classification of four-year intercollegiate programs by the N.C.A.A. In order

to be classified Division III an institution must meet the following criteria:

1. An institution shall not award financial aid to any student/athlete except to those showing a financial need.

2. All forms of financial assistance to student/athletes shall be handled through the regular college agency or committee that administers aid for all students.

3. Shall not utilize any form of a letter of intent or similar form of commitment when recruiting a student/athlete (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1985).

High-performance systems refers to human systems that perform at levels of excellence far beyond those of comparable systems (Vaill, 1982 & 1984).

Joint optimization is a stream of processes in a work system in which the various elements are behaving according to, but not beyond, the limits set by the laws that govern their behavior, and in which the behavior of any particular element is not preventing some other element from behaving in accordance with the laws that govern it (Vaill, 1978).

Loose coupling conveys the idea that even though coupled events are responsive they preserve their own identity and offer evidence for their own physical or logical separateness (Weick, 1976).

N.C.A.A. refers to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1985).

Organizational roles are names given clusters of component tasks which the agency has decided to designate to individuals (Argyrus, 1978).

Organized anarchy refers to organizations that can be characterized as having vague and inconsistent goals, unclear technology, and fluid participation (Weiner, 1979).

Purposing refers to that continuous stream of actions by an organization's formal leadership which have the effect of inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the organization's basic purposes (Valll, 1982).

Subculture is the set of cultural patterns that sets a group apart from larger society or a larger organization (Phillips & Schaefer, 1976).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational organizations are created to produce schooling for corporate society... As their purposes and structures are defined and institutionalized in the rules, norms, and ideologies of the wider society, the legitimacy of schools and their ability to mobilize resources depend on maintaining congruence between their structure and these socially shared categorical understandings of education (Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p.94-95).

Thus, the very character of the organizational structure of universities and colleges are linked to the meaning society gives these institutions (Kamens, 1977, p.217). Although influenced and formed by American culture, the structure of educational organizations resist classification in terms of any model (Gross & Brambsch, 1974, p.5). Traditional models portray the American university as being pluralistic in nature, as being a multiversity, and as being characterized by intense disciplinary

specializations. However, contemporary organizational theory uses the organized anarchy theory and the loosely coupled systems model to describe the ambiguity and looseness exhibited by universities and colleges as they exist in their modern complex world.

These various concepts and important aspects involving the higher educational organization are central to the issue being researched in this dissertation. Both traditional and contemporary organizational theory describe certain processes inherent in higher education organizations but not others. The question is why? Why is the complexity that is exhibited by these organizations so difficult to define? To explore these questions and the ideas used to describe the processes and their effect on the higher education organizations, both traditional and contemporary theories will be discussed. These theories will be discussed first because they are central to present-day conceptualization of higher education organizations.

Literature concerning the university as an organization will also be reviewed in order to provide a theoretical basis for the research involved in this dissertation. Particular attention will be given to the organizational qualities of the university, the environment surrounding educational institutions, and the effect of the environment on the very structure of the higher education organization.

However, as previously stated these theories and analyses do not explain higher education organizations clearly enough to remove contradictions and confusion.

Whether the authors discuss higher education organizations using traditional or contemporary theory they all seem to acknowledge the complexity and ambiguity surrounding these organizations. Perhaps, by studying the patterning of the processes that effect the structure of academic institutions these organizations could be better explained. Weick (March, 1976) seems to agree with this when he stated that it is not the existence or nonexistence of loose coupling that is crucial to determining the functioning of organizations but, rather the patterning of the couplings (p.363).

Because the central focus of this research is to provide a better understanding of the university as an organization, one particular disciplinary area will be studied to possibly help provide a greater understanding of its organizational patterning. Athletics, which is so deeply rooted in the university structure and such a persistent part of every institution of higher learning, will be used as an example of a disciplinary specialization. A review of literature will be conducted involving athletics in the university.

Scott (1983) states that organizations are imprinted by the forces that surround them at the time of their creation. Therefore, organizations formed during one time period tend to assume a specific character that is carried forward during their entire organizational life (p.169). Assuming this is true, the effect of American culture on the athletics in higher education will be reviewed in order to

have a greater understanding of athletics and how it came to have the specific organizational characteristics it seems to display at the university level.

Finally, athletics will be studied as an organization that stresses and demands a high level of success from the people involved in its activities. Probably there is no other area in the university that demands such a high performance level from both the faculty member and the student. The coach must win in order to get and keep his/her job. The student/athlete must have displayed above average ability and performance levels in order to be a member of most university teams. Can these performance expectations label the athletic department as a high performance system? A review of literature will be conducted to explore what is meant by a high performance system.

II. THE UNIVERSITY: TRADITIONAL VIEWS

One of the most important organizational features that influence the diversity found in American universities is the environment in which the institution exists. The environment includes such things as the relations with other social institutions, context of financial support, and formal control. Because of this encompassing nature, the environment is very important in determining the institution's decision making process (Baldrige et al, 1977b, p.53). Meyer and Rowan support the view of the environment shaping the structure of the organization. The

authors state that universities have become very pluralistic in nature because they have had to adapt to the complexity of their environments (1983, p.89). The Stanford Project on Academic Governance demonstrated how pluralistic the American university really has become. The study found that universities can be placed in different categories that reflect different organizational features and different patterns of professional autonomy for their faculties (Baldridge et al., 1977b, p.42). In supporting this pluralistic view, McConnell (1976) states that "many universities were essentially collections of relatively autonomous professional schools and specialized departments; these loosely connected parts were in the university but not of the university" (p.277). It is because of this extreme pluralism in the environment of the American university that causes the organization to be loosely coupled (Meyer et al., 1983, p.63).

In envisioning the American university as having an inconsistent, disjointed and pluralistic nature, it is Kerr (1976) that has popularized the term "multiversity" to describe the university's organizational structure. The author used this term in order to call attention to a new view of the university as a multiversity rather than the older vision of the university as a unified community of scholars and students (p.277).

The multiversity is an inconsistent institution. It is not one community but several- the community of the undergraduate and the community of the graduate; the

community of the social scientist, and the community of the scientist; the community of the professional schools; the community of the professional schools; the community of all the nonacademic personnel; the community of the administrators. Its edges are fuzzy- it reaches out to alumni, legislators, farmers, businessmen, who are all related to one or more of these internal communities (Baldrige, 1971, p.118; Kerr, 1972, p.18).

The multiversity, then, has many publics that identify less with the university as a whole and more with their own subgroups or subcultures. Some examples of subcultures are faculty, collegiate, and athletes (Kerr, 1972, p.41). "It is helpful to think of these various groups as political parties, each with its own special orientations, values and goals" (Baldrige, 1971, p.122). Internally, then, universities contain interdependent subunits which compete with each other because of their own self-interests (Sergiovanni, 1984, p.6).

The development of these subcultures can be traced to the intense disciplinary specialization that occurs in the American university. As specializations increase, lines of connection between disciplines become more tenuous. Specialization, then, fractures the university organization (Baldrige, 1971, p.120; Bennis, 1976, p.24). This fracturing also occurs within the organization's communication network. This is very important for the educational institution because it allows it to meet the

demands placed upon it by its conflicting and inconsistent environment (Meyer, 1983b, p.191). The structure of the organization becomes more complicated as higher levels of specialization are achieved (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.37). Thus, the university seems to experience the same obstacles to common purpose as most modern organizations encounter. This lack of common purpose is due to their complexity and differentiation. Therefore, universities have difficulty establishing common vision of purpose (Harrison, 1984, p.108).

Probably the most important fact concerning the fragmentation and complexity that occurs in the multiversity is the fact of multiple subcultures within the university. These subcultures make the governance of the institution complicated and difficult (Baldrige, 1971, p.122; Clark, 1965, p.237). Because the governance of the multiversity must take into account the conflict due to the interaction of its various parts and subcultures, the power within the organization is greatly fractionalized (Kerr, 1972, p.140). The net effect is no one is able to consolidate enough power to take positive leadership in developing the university into an integrated organization (McConnell, 1976, p.277). In fact, Kerr (1972) states that the multiversity is mainly held together by administrative rules and powered by money (Kerr, 1972, p.140 & p.20).

This system of subcultures exists within the social structure of the university. The university, though, has other relationships external to its internal social setting

(Baldridge, 1971, p.123). These external relationships between the university's subsystems and the other specialized subsystems of the larger external system, to which the organization belongs, helps define the character of the organization (Parsons, 1956, p.66). Thus, the education organization can be conceptualized as a subsystem of the broader social system to which it belongs. However, conceptually it must be viewed as a differentiated subsystem of the broader social system in which it is embedded. This implies that the institution is differentiated from the broader social system because of the particular functions that the organization is expected to perform for the general good of the social system (Abbott, 1975, p.176).

As Meyer and Rowan (1978) state, "modern schools produce education for society, not for individuals or families...education becomes the central agency defining personnel...for the modern state and economy" (p.92). The organization, then, is designed as a technical implement of society for mobilizing and directing human energies toward set societal aims (Selznick, 1957, p.5). Therefore, the university should be looked upon as an organization that is biased in what it emphasizes and what it values (Olsen, 1979, p.311).

The organizational characteristics of the American university is thus linked to the meaning that society attaches to university attendance (Kamens, 1977, p.217).

"...the major function of colleges and universities is symbolic- to redefine graduates as possessing special

qualities or skills...this is done through legitimizing myths about the quality of education that are validated by the organizational structure of the institution (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.170).

Additionally, societal specifications emanating from the environment defines organizational structure in the form of the categorization of pupils, qualifications of teachers, size of classes, and so forth (Meyer, Scott & Deal, 1983, p.62). Therefore, the organizational characteristics exhibited by the university are causally linked to the meaning that society gives to university attendance. In fact, to put it more strongly, changes in the societal produced concept of the student will produce changes in the organizational structure of the educational institution (Kamens, 1977, p.209). Bennis (1976) agrees with this when he states that another way to change an organization is through external events which are the forces of society impinging on the organization (p.90).

It seems, then, that many organizational theorists agree that attention must be given to the relationship between the university and society. Clark (1965) supports this contention when he states that the education system is probably the most important single issue in American society today. Further, he states that social forces in our modern society recast education as part of the political and economic institutions of society (p.228). Millet (1962) feels a college or university cannot very well ignore these institutions because higher education is influenced by and

draws financial support from various specific areas of society. These areas of influence include religion, the economy, philanthropy, and government (p.60). The financial support provided by these groups, in many cases, is the difference between whether or not certain areas of the university community receives favorable support from the central university committee or not. In this way the dominate value of the almighty dollar that pervades American society has begun to dominate the values of the university itself (Mooney, 1963, p.45).

Thus, powerful external forces appear to be affecting the very foundation of institutions of higher learning in the United States today. Baldrige et al (1977a) concurs with this opinion and feels that because academic institutions are people-processing organizations these external influences cannot be separated from the university. Clients with specific needs enter the university helping bring these forces to bear. These clients, in form of interest groups holding conflicting values with the many of the stated values of the university, have made their demands, wishes, and threats known to the faculties and administrators of individual institutions. Thus, they have been able to obtain a significant input into the organizational decision making process (p.4 & 6).

Paradoxically, then, there is no institution in America that is more dependent upon, and more vulnerable to, external forces than the university. Universities have become more politicized due to their permeability to these

outside forces. In fact, the author goes on to state, the higher education organization is an example of an institution that has diffused the main purposes for which it was established. This is the result, he feels, of an increased dependence and proliferation on external patronage organizations (Bennis, 1976, p.8-9 & 149).

It is helpful to think in terms of various "publics" that bring pressure to bear on the university, that provide it with services and support, and that indirectly shape its destiny. As the university assumes a critical societal role these external influences encroach more and more into academic hall, always pushing and pulling the university toward some particular image (Baldrige, 1971, p.123).

These specialized groups or publics develop boundary roles in which their principle job is to provide a link between the university and the outside society. The link is an important one to the university. The groups reach out to world outside the university and provide a gatekeeper role for the institution. This, however, creates positions of power for the leaders of these groups. Therefore, the leaders become powerful and politically significant within the university because of their role of gatekeepers (Baldrige, 1971, p. 124). These specialized groups include alumni, board of trustees, researchers involved with governmental agencies, foundations, surrounding industries, and outside athletic interests (Millet, 1962, p.151; Gross & Grambsch, 1974, p.7; Kerr, 1972, p.122).

Many critical decisions, then, are being influenced from outside the educational organizations themselves. These powerful external forces in form of specialized groups are impinging upon the university on all sides (Baldrige et al, 1977b, p.54). Millet (1962) feels that power is shared by different constituent groups that come from within and outside the university. Each group possesses substantial power (p.62). The ever-increasing role of these outside groups in the academic matters of the university is gradually wearing down the internal governance structure of the institution. As the effective leadership is weakened, the power and initiative which was formerly solely within the university flows even more rapidly to the agencies outside (Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982, p.89).

Educational organizations have been able to achieve success by satisfying these diverse external constituents and their respective agencies. Although the actual activity of the organization is not disrupted, the external demands have caused a great deal of adaptation and change (Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.92). This change and adaptation, though, need not follow the traditional ideas of organization theory. Millet (1962) seems to agree with this contention when he states, "I believe strongly that a college or university has little if any resemblance to the generalized conceptions of organization which may be applicable to certain types of governmental administrative agencies and certain types of business entities" (p.27). Further, the

author states that colleges and universities are different from these generalized organizations in institutional setting, in operation, in purpose, and thus in internal organization (p.31).

With academic power and operational responsibility divided and subdivided, again and again, the image of the university as an integral community progressively dissipates (Mooney, 1963, p.49)

Because of the very nature of the academic profession in higher education, the emphasis placed on academic specialization creates within the university a sense of disciplinary rather than local or community identity (Millet, 1962, p.70). Lutz (1982) suggests that this disciplinary or subsystem identity could possibly been encouraged by the tradition of academic freedom that is a central tenet of the higher education organization. Given academic freedom, the subsystem has complete academic license that many times may lead to the unaccountability of the subsystems actions (p.667). There is a tendency of these units in the university organization "to exaggerate the importance of their own contribution and to think of the whole organization in terms of the goals of the particular unit" (Gross, 1968a, p.8).

Historically, academic freedom was one of the most important goals of the university in America (Gross, 1968b, p.542). But being the complex organization it is today, the university does not just stress this one goal. The university has one of the most complex goal structures of

any modern organization. Probably unique to the educational process is the number of output goals each university exhibits (Gross, 1968a, p.16; Gross, 1968b, p.526).

Output goals are those goals of the university which, immediately or in the future, are reflected in some product, service, skill or orientation which will effect (and is intended to affect) society (Gross, 1968a, p.13).

These goals involve output to the surrounding society. They can possibly be best explained in terms of system linkages. In this sense, because organizations are subsystems of society, the output goal of one subsystem becomes the input of a different subsystem. Using this approach necessitates the need to relate organizations to each other and their surrounding society. When defining goals, in this way, individuals within the organization have limited freedom to set the goals of their organization. They will be forced to accept what outsiders can be persuaded to accept (Gross, 1968b, p.520).

Gross and Grambsch (1977) have another interesting theory of university goals and how they could effect the power and leadership structure of the institution. It is their contention that certain goals may attract a particular kind of power holder or make it easier for these people to achieve certain positions within the university. If, in fact, the goal structure helps facilitate the accretion of power to these people, it could be said that instead of goals being caused by power holders, goals could cause

certain kinds of power structures to emerge within an institution (p.27).

III. THE UNIVERSITY: CONTEMPORARY THEORY

ORGANIZED ANARCHY

An organized anarchy can be characterized by vague and inconsistent goals or preferences, unclear technology, and fluid participation (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972, p.1; Cohen & March, 1974, p.3; Weiner, 1979, p.225; Sproul, Weiner, & Wolf, 1978, p.5; Scott, 1981, p.272). In an organized anarchy the organization appears to operate with a number of ill-defined goals that lack a coherent structure and can be better characterized as a loose collection of changing ideas. These goals are usually discovered through the normal everyday operation of the organization rather than enacted before the activities begin (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972, p.1; Cohen & March, 1974, p.3). An unclear technology is one in which the members do not understand the processes inherent in what the organization does. The organization operates on the basis of the residue of past experience, simple trial-and-error procedures, and practical inventions of necessity (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972, p.1; Cohen & March, 1974, p.3). Because of this unclear technology, the members of the organization have little probability of developing or identifying courses of action that might have an effect on a specific problem (Sproul et al., 1978, p.5). Fluid participation occurs when the participants in the organized anarchy vary the amount of

time and effort they devote to the different domains within the organization. The involvement of each individual varies from one time to another. This variation in participation is a result of the individual having other demands on their time. As a result, the boundaries of the organized anarchy appear to be uncertain and changing (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972, p.1; Cohen & March, 1974, p.3). Fluid participation, then, recognizes that because of limited resources of time and energy individuals both inside and outside the organization cannot give continuous or stable attention to particular issues within the organization (Sproul et al., 1978, p.5).

Other authors have also identified additional characteristics of an organized anarchy. Available organizational resources allow individuals within the organization to go in different directions without being controlled or directed by a central authority (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker and Riley, 1977a, p.8). Therefore, as Cohen and March (1976) state, it is a mistake for any participant within the organization to become absolutely committed to any one plan (p.270). Also, despite the organized anarchy's immediate problems of vague and inconsistent goals, unclear technology and fluid participation the real subtlety of the organization is its ability to continually rearrange and update its structure without ever having a need for a major redesign (Weick, 1977a, p.41).

Educational organizations are frequently characterized as organized anarchies (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972, p.11;

Padgett, 1980, p.583; Scott, 1981, p.272; Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.29). "Organized anarchy helps capture the spirit of the confused organizational dynamics in academic institutions: unclear goals, unclear technologies, and environmental vulnerability" (Baldridge et al., 1977a, p.8). The college or university organization is the prototype of an organized anarchy.

It does not know what it is doing. Its goals are either vague or in dispute. Its technology is familiar but not understood. Its major participants wander in and out of the organization. These factors...make it a problem to describe, understand, and lead (Cohen & March, 1974, p.3).

Thus, because the university higher-education organization is described as an organized anarchy, each individual in the university is seen as making independent decisions. Professors decide what is to be learned. Legislators and financial supporters decide what and when to support the institution. Resources are allocated by whatever process emerges and without guidance from organizational goals. The "decisions" of the institution are a consequence of the system but are controlled by no one (Cohen & March, 1974, p.33). The goals of educational institutions, then, are indeterminate in nature and do not guide or evaluate individual performance (Weick, 1982a, p.673). As Sproul et al. (1978) state, if goals are measurable in an organized anarchy they are not usually agreed to; if however they are

acceptable to all members then they are neither operational nor measurable (p.5).

When an organization's goals are vague, inconsistent, or ambiguous, the organization and its leaders have difficulty completely understanding the nature of the organizational processes that transform inputs into outputs. It is often difficult for the leaders to anticipate which choices in the decision making process are important and which are unimportant (Weiner, 1979, p.226). Sproul et al. (1978) suggest that the very meaning of the decisions change as different problems enter and leave the decision process. The way these different problems enter and exit the organized anarchy is as much a function of the emotional state of the decision-makers and the uncontrolled external events as it is of rational analysis of goals. In an organized anarchy, then, the decision-making process aids the individual and the organization to arrive at socially generated interpretations of what they are doing and helps identify who is important in the organization (p.5). This seems, then, to encourage more ambiguity and difficulties for the institutional decision makers.

There are, in organized anarchies, five properties of decision making: low salience, high inertia, garbage can, overload, weak information base (Cohen & March, 1974, p.206; Cohen & March, 1976, p.266-269; Cohen & March, 1983, pp.343-344; Goodman, 1982, p.33; Olsen, 1979, p.134; Weiner, 1979, p.245). Low salience occurs because most people are not as interested in the content of the issue but rather in

its symbolic significance for themselves and the group to which they belong. The organized anarchy organization also has the property of high inertia. It is a system that requires a coordinated effort to start or stop and is not likely to be started or stopped. Thus, high inertia in organized anarchies make the organizational control and power ambiguous. The garbage can property of decision making refers to the fact that any decision can become a garbage can for any problem. The issues discussed in relationship to the decision making process depends less on the problems or decisions involved and more on the timing of the coming together of these problems and decisions. Because of the importance of timing in matching problems and decisions, the decision making processes of choices and, thus outcomes, become more separated from the formal process involved with organizational decisions. In other words, "a garbage can is an organization that is a collection of choices looking for problems, issues and feelings looking for decision situations in which they might be aired, solutions looking for issues to which they might be the answer, and decision making looking for work" (Cohen, March & Olsen, 1972, p.2).

The fourth property of decision making in an organized anarchy is overload. Overload impairs the processes of choice. When the system builds up problems beyond its capabilities for exercising and resolving problems, the organizational decision outcomes tend to become increasingly separated from the formal decision making processes. The

fifth property, weak information bases, characterizes an organization where past events and decisions are not often retained and information about current activities is almost nonexistent. Decision making in organized anarchies, then, occurs in an organization that can be characterized by these properties and by the extreme ambiguity present in organizational environment (Goodman, 1982, p.33).

Bolman and Deal (1984) also feel that most organizations are ambiguous (p.12). They state that, because of the exhibited organizational ambiguity, individuals within the organization search for meaning, predictability, and order. The organizational structure and processes, then, "serve as myths, rituals, and ceremonies that promote cohesion inside organizations and bond organizations to their environment" (1984, p.189). In other words, the structure and processes try to provide a sense of order to the individuals that have to exist in this state of ambiguity. To Weick (1977a), ambivalence in organizations is the most favorable condition for compromise. When something is clear, organizational actors should doubt those things. When things are unclear, individuals should treat them as if they are clear (p.42).

Organizational literature suggests that ambiguity can be dependent on and can be a function of various aspects of an organization. Some theorists suggest that ambiguity may be a function of the structure of the organization (House & Rizzo, 1972, p.473; Schuler, 1977, p.67). Additionally, Schuler (1977) feels that ambiguity may not be the result of

the structure but perhaps the result of the lack of appropriateness of the structure with the organization's technology (p.67). Bolman and Deal (1984) suggests that ambiguity is deliberately created in order to avoid conflict and conceal problems (p.12).

What exactly, then, is meant by ambiguity? The term, as used by March & Olsen, tends to mean four important kinds of opaqueness in organizations: intention, understanding, history, and organization. Ambiguity of intention can be characterized by inconsistent and ill-defined objectives. The ambiguity of understanding involves the obscure view of the causal world that many organizations have. Organizational ambiguity of history stresses the importance of the past but it is not easily interpreted or fixed. Finally, ambiguity of organization is the pattern of uncertain and changing participation in the organization (1979a, p.12).

Ambiguity is a major quality of most educational organization's decision making processes (Cohen & March, 1976, p.263; March & Olsen, 1979a, p.12; March & Olsen, 1979b, p.67). Academic institutions provide few examples of "real" data. They have nothing closely analogous to production figures of sales and profit (Cohen, 1979, p.195). Thus, almost any course of action or decision can seem plausible because of inherent ambiguity that is basic to the university's technology and objectives (Cohen & March, 1979, p.182). Additionally, during the decision making process, dependent upon the subject matter being discussed,

occurring different groups are represented in the process. Groups involved in minor decisions are different from the group involved in major decisions (March & Olsen, 1979c, p.39).

March and Romelaer (1979) offer the following metaphor in order to illustrate decision making in a university.

Consider a round, sloped, multi-goal soccer field on which individuals play soccer. Many different people (but not everyone) can join the game (or leave it) at different times. Some people can throw balls into the game or remove them. Individuals while they are in the game try to kick whatever ball comes near them in the direction of goals they like and away from goals that they wish to avoid. The slope of the field produces a bias in how the balls fall and what goals are reached, but the course of a specific decision and actual outcomes are not easily anticipated (p.276).

The top decision maker in university-higher education systems is the institution's president and it is the president that must contend with four fundamental ambiguities:

purpose. In what terms can action be justified? What are the goals of the organization?

power. How powerful is the president? What can he/she accomplish?

experience. What is learned from events of the presidency? How does the president make inferences about his/her experience?

success. When is a president successful? How does he assess his pleasures? (Cohen & March, 1974, p.195; Cohen & March, 1976, p.262).

Ambiguity of purpose occurs in a university where efforts to specify a set of shared goals, from the actions or activities of the institution, usually show signs of inconsistency. Ambiguity of power is best illustrated by the presidents of the university and their request to others to understand the unique situation that they are in. Although they have the prestige of office, in actuality the presidents have the countervailing power of other groups to contend with. Ambiguity of experience centers on the world the president must live in. First, because the university world is relatively complex, factors that influence presidential actions are not only uncontrolled but are many times unobserved. Second, the academic world is changing so fast that despite the speed at which the president gathers information the situation has the potential for false learning. Finally, an administrator knows that he/she has been successful when promoted to a better job. In the case of the presidency, few individuals are promoted out of the job. If new offers are presented, the best opportunity a typical president can expect is a version of administrative semiretirement (Cohen & March, 1974, pp.195-201; Cohen & March, 1983, pp.333-340). Although it is the President of the university-higher education institutions that must contend with these four fundamental ambiguities, it is the entire institution that is weakened "by the ambiguity of

goals, by the lack of clarity in technology, and by the transient character of many participants" (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1979, p.25).

University-higher education organizations exist in an environment that is both in a constant state of flux and diverse in nature. The need, therefore, for horizontal communication increases (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.42). Thus, at a time when increased communication is needed, the ambiguity inherent in these organizations seems to cause the communication within the organization to break down because the information provided is either incomplete or ambiguous, or interpreted in different ways by different people (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.12). Thus, educational organizations frequently act on incomplete information without being conscious of all the alternatives (March & Olsen, 1979, p.54).

Communication is the central phenomena in organizations. Communication links members of the organization together in a variety of ways. It serves as the means by which organizations are firmly established in their environments. And, it provides a means of interpreting the inputs and outputs of the organization (Guetzkow, 1965, p.534). As Barnard (1939) states, "in an exhaustive theory of organization, communication would occupy a central place, because the structure, extensiveness, and scope of the organization are almost entirely determined by communication techniques" (p.91).

Communication...can be verbal (oral or written) or nonverbal (the medium is the message). It involves both content (the overt information transmitted) and process (the ways and means of transmitting the message). Communication can occur along cognitive (thinking, conceptual), affective (feeling, emotional) and behavioral (behaving, doing) channels (Capalle, 1979, p.8).

In an organization, once a pattern of communication has become established it will effect not only the decision making processes but will also effect the informal organizational activities. The communication network is both planned and developed in response to social functions and the type of information it is asked to process. Within an organization, it is most difficult to communicate about nonstandardized objects and intangible objects. Hence, the communication system is most ineffective when it is asked to communicate aspects of unclear tasks and problems not yet well defined (March & Simon, 1958, pp.164-168).

Communication would then seem to be most ineffective or flawed in an organized anarchy with its unclear tasks or technology and vague and inconsistent goals. Weick feels that this flawed feedback or the inability of various units within an organization to communicate, is often the major source of looseness within the organization (1982b, p.402).

LOOSE COUPLING

It is the exhibited looseness or the less tight coupling of organizational parts that Welck (1979) feels is one of the main reasons why the concepts of loose coupling and organized anarchy received so much attention so quickly from the various academicians studying organizational theories (p.54). The organized anarchy assumes a loosely connected organizational world (Cohen & March, 1974, p.34). Organized anarchy is also the governance system of the loosely coupled organization. Although by definition an anarchy is not a system of government but rather an absence of government, a organized anarchy is a negation, a term indicating that no one in the organization is accountable (Lutz, 1982, p.656). Lutz (1982) further states that loosely coupled organizations and organized anarchies are also better able to adapt to their environments because they permit more flexibility in the behavior of their structural subsystems. The basic assumption of loose coupling and organized anarchy, then, is that the other organizational models and theories fail to account for many of the behaviors observed in organizations (p.653).

Could the causation of ambiguity and loose coupling in organized anarchies, then, suggest that there are different subsystems or substructures all functioning under what had previously thought to be one organizational system or structure? Welck (1976) seems to suggest that this could possibly occur in a large system if all of the elements are

loosely coupled to one another. Being loosely coupled, "the elements can adjust and modify a local unique contingency without affecting the whole system...the identity, uniqueness, and separateness of elements is preserved, the system potentially can retain a greater number of mutations and novel solutions" (p.360-361).

Weick (1974) is also concerned that organizational theorists have not paid enough attention to the possibility "that organizations have analogous or variable connections, flexible frameworks, and sliding bonds" (p.380). Loose coupling exists:

...if A affects B (1) suddenly (rather than continuously), (2) occasionally (rather than constantly), (3) negligibly (rather than significantly), (4) indirectly (rather than directly), and (5) eventually (rather than immediately).

Connections may appear suddenly, as in the case of a threshold function; may occur occasionally, as in the case of partial reinforcement; may be negligible, as when there is a damping down of response between A and B due to a constant variable; may be indirect, as when a superintendent can affect a teacher only by first affecting a principal; and may occur eventually, as when there is a lag between legislator voting behavior and response by his or her electorate (Weick, 1982b, p.380).

Much of the literature that discusses loose coupling suggests that the structural features of organizations can

vary independently of processes and of outcomes (Scott & Meyer, 1983, p.149) It is this independent or nonrational aspect of loose coupling that indicates why people cannot predict what happens within their organization (Weick, 1982b, p.380). Weick (1976) further states that loose coupling can occur either in one system or two separate systems. If some parts of one system are weak compared to other parts within the same system or if two systems are joined by a few common or weak common parts, then it can be said that the systems are loosely coupled. What loose coupling means is that if the parts or variables of a system are disturbed, the disturbance will either be limited or will take a long period of time to effect the other parts of the system or the effects on the system will be weak (p.358). In other words, the system is said to have structural looseness (Weick, 1979, p.185).

It appears, then, that a loosely coupled organization has many characteristics:

1. A loosely coupled system is not a defective system. It is a solution to constant environmental change (Weick, 1982b, p.405). Additionally, it is the loose ties in the organization that allows the individuals to successfully cope with serious change in the environment (p.378). In fact, the more open the system is the harder it is to distinguish the system from its environment (Scott, 1981, p.50). Thus, although a loosely coupled system has less necessity for major change, if in fact large scale change becomes a necessity it is more difficult to achieve because

of the inherent looseness within the organization (Weick, 1982b, p.387). Rubin (1983) supports this when she states that looseness buffers the system from short-term change but hinders the organization from determining and coordinating response to internal and external environmental stresses (p.200).

2. In loose coupling the structural elements seem to be very adaptive for the organization. (Scott, 1981, p.50). Loose coupling allows the system to adapt opportunistically to small changes in a diverse and segmented environment (Scott, 1981, p.248; Weick, 1979, p.120; Weick, 1982a, p.674; Weick, 1982b, p.387). Moreover, the adaptation that occurs is one of localized adaptation. The problems, that develop in one unit and that cause this local adaptation, are sealed off from affecting the other units of the organization. This allows for the rest of the organization to perform in a stable manner (Weick, 1976, p.360; Weick, 1982a, p.674). While the organization may thus contain new solutions for the problems inherent in the adaption, the very structure of loose coupling stops these mutations from being diffused throughout the entire system (Vaill, 1978, p.361).

3. Loose coupling in systems adds to the stability of the entire organization by allowing the system to persist (Glassman, 1973, p.83; Weick, 1979, p.111; Weick, 1983, p.21). Although the system faces variables that normally would disturb the behavior of a system, the weak ties that are inherent in a loosely coupled system promote and

insulate the system from continual minor changes to events (Weick, 1979, p.112). While loose coupling may promote persistence, it is not selective in what is perpetuated. Thus, "archaic traditions as well as improvisations may be perpetuated" (Weick, 1976, p. 360).

4. Change in a loosely coupled system is continuous, small scale, improvisational, accommodative, and local. Change diffuses slowly through the loosely coupled system allowing the components of the system to create their own solutions or die (Weick, 1982b, p.390). The current state of the system is the result of continuous change that moves the system away from some original state. The direction of the change need not be toward orderliness (Weick, 1979, p.120). Therefore, centralized change seldom reaches the different parts of the loosely coupled system (Weick, 1982b, p. 398).

5. Differential participation is common in a loosely coupled system (Weick, 1982b, p.398). As Pfeffer (1978) states, "organizations are loosely coupled, in part because few participants are constantly involved or care about every dimension of the organization's operation" (p.37).

6. Confidence in the structural elements in a loosely coupled system allows an organization to continue its daily routines within a decoupled structure. This confidence is maintained through three practices: avoidance, discretion, and overlooking (Weick, 1982b, p.392).

7. Linkages in an organization can be described as either tightly or loosely coupled. Coupling defines the

nature of the connectedness between the units of the organization. It also refers to the degree to which events that are occurring in one section of the organization can be felt by other parts of the system (Stern, 1979, p.245). Because the type of coupling is loose, there is an absence of tight and rigid connections among the various parts of the organization. Organizationally, because of the looseness, it can be assumed that parts of the system are capable of autonomous functions (Scott, 1981, p.53).

8. Loosely coupled systems are viewed as "interlocked behaviors". This allows the individuals within the system to have a great latitude in interpreting and implementing orders (Scott, 1981, p.118). One reason why we call this structure a loosely coupled system is that people in the system are interdependent. But, these ties or interdependencies are different than in other forms of organizations. They are weaker, more unpredictable, and more intermittent (Weick, 1982a, p.676). Thus, "loose coupling...(is) anything that may be tied together either weakly or infrequently or slowly or with minimal interdependence (Weick, March 1976, p.360).

9. Leadership, in a loosely coupled system is diffused rather than concentrated. In order to be effective in such a system, the educational administrator must make use of symbolic management to tie the system together (Weick, 1982a, p.675).

10. Different people, in a loosely coupled system, have different goals. The goals that exist are developed to

satisfy local circumstances (Weick, 1982a, p.676). Weick (1976) states that loose coupling provides the organization with sensitive sensing mechanism to local environments. These independent sensing elements know their environments better because they have fewer externally constrained, independent parts (p.360).

11. The relationship among the various work groups in an organization is also effected by the looseness of the system (Scott, 1981, p.108). In fact, Ouchi (1978) states that the idea of loose coupling becomes quite plausible when the organizational hierarchy is not thought to be based on authority but rather grounded in the ideas of an ordered set of units or work groups resting within larger units within the organization (p.265). Weick (1979) feels that these small units are important to understanding the major workings of the organization (p.236). One way a system maintains loose coupling is by having subsystems tightly coupled by the common variables they share (Glassman, 1973, p.84 & 91).

IV. THE UNIVERSITY AS AN ORGANIZATION

Organizational researchers of higher education institutions have accepted the loose coupling model and the organized anarchy theory as accurate descriptions of universities and colleges in the United States (Bennis, 1976, p.26; Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.220; Cohen & March, 1976, p.263; Lutz, December 1982, p.653; Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p79; Sergiovanni, 1984, p.4; Sproul et al., 1978, p.6; Weick,

1982a, p.673). Two most common coupling mechanisms in organizations are the technical core of the organization and the authority of office. Neither of these mechanisms are prominent in institutions of higher education found in the United States (Weick, March 1976, p.359). Loose coupling in educational organizations, then, means that the structure of the organization is detached from the technical activity and its effects. Thus, the loose coupling of the technical or instructional activity within the university permits groups, both inside and outside the institution, to perceive that they have more power in the instructional activities of the organization than in other policy decisions. It also permits education organizations to closely adhere to the ritual categories of education but offer little control or coordination over instructional activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1983, pp.71-94; Scott, 1981, p.255; Weick, March 1976, p.354).

Consider, then, the ways that universities and colleges are loosely coupled with their institutional activities of evaluation, curriculum and technology, and authority. The actual work of teaching in the university takes place in the isolation of the individual classrooms located throughout the institution. Not only are the classrooms effectively removed from organizational controls but the teaching that is occurring is not really subject to inspection or evaluation. Thus, the professor is relatively hidden from administrators and fellow educators and, therefore, free to use broad discretionary powers within the confines of

his/her classroom. Also, missing from the education institution is a guide describing the teaching technology to be followed or a detailed instructional program. Finally, administrators of these institutions have little direct authority over the instructional work being accomplished (Bidwell, 1965, p.975; Meyer, 1983a, p.239; Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p.81; Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.73).

Even though, in an overall sense, educational organizations are characterized by lack of control and loose coupling, universities may exhibit some very tightly organized parts which may be completely bureaucratic, while at the same time keeping communities of self-governing academicians. These communities or groups are not necessarily entirely without relationship to each other. Some of these groups may be connected into recognizable or meaningful groups or departments. "The various departments concerned with physical health, for example, express their unity in their proximate physical location...other clusters...having buildings...such as engineering" (Gross & Grambsch, 1974, p.6). A college or university may have difficulty proving that their graduates have been well taught but may well be able to show that its cafeteria service is cost-effective (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.149).

Tight coupling, then, does occur within the educational organization. It usually occurs when the organization tries to maintain its agreed upon function of defining the societal myths surrounding the institutional rules for higher education. These rules define the ritual

classifications: teacher, student, curricular topic, and type of school. There are various levels of teachers: elementary, high school and college. Each level has its own specifications, categories of specialists, and credentials. Student classifications are tightly controlled. Students are separated by level or grade, units or programs completed, major area of specialization, and by special abilities. Each institution has its own set of curricular topics. These topics are organized in the university and assigned to professors, students, space, and funds. Finally, the professors, students, and topics are arranged into formal units by a precise and very elaborate set of rules (Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p.84; Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.76; Weick, 1982a, p.673). Tight coupling also occurs between the educational organization and its environment. While, universities are characterized as loosely coupled systems, it is their conformity to broad institutional rules (e.g. accreditation) that links the institution to the environment (Meyer, 1983a, p.239; Meyer, 1983b, p.183).

Although linked tightly to certain aspects of their environments, it is the university's inherent looseness that allows the organization to respond more effectively than tightly coupled organizations to the surrounding environment pressures and changes (Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p.105; Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.93). This more sensitive response to the environment may in fact be due to the loosely coupled nature of the organization, allowing the separate units within the institution to pursue contradictory and unrelated programs.

It is these programs that make the university more responsive to its environment (Meyer, Scott, & Deal, 1983, p.59). Weick (1982a) feels that there is a risk involved in the loosely coupled system as that individuals within the organization become captives of local groups because of the organizations response to the environment. Thus, the system can make increasing accommodations to the personal interests of outside groups undercutting the educational aims of the organization. He states, though, that this is many times more formative than substantive. In actuality, the educational organization becomes buffered, and therefore unmodified, from the community because of its characteristics of loose coupling (p.673-676). Thus, decoupling seems to be very effective for organizations that are located in environments that impose conflicting requirements of it (Scott, 1981, p.256).

THE EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Educational organizations are highly responsive to their local environments and the demands that these environments make upon them. The organization attempts to retain a high level of support and legitimacy by linking itself with the surrounding community. The institution is constantly creating and renewing elements that will further reinforce this linking process (Meyer et al., 1983, p.55). Meyer and Rowan (1978 & 1983) feel that educational organizations are more responsive because they are buffered from their own internal technical activity. This environmental position

allows internal and external constituent groups to perceive that they have more power in the institution than is true in constituent groups in other types of organizations (p.105; p.93). It is these external forces that Baldrige (1977) states that can make revolutionary changes in the organization (p.129).

But education organizations do not just respond to local environments. Like most organizations they are embedded in a much larger system of environmental relationships. Five of the most commonly observed levels of organizational unit development are: national or society wide offices and associations, regional or multistate agencies and associations, state offices and associations, area wide district offices and councils, and local units and branch offices. Interestingly, Scott and Meyer (1983) further feel that organizations carrying out those activities at the local level would become more complex organizations because they reflect their more complex environments (pp.142-150).

Bennis and Nannus (1985) have tried to clarify the complex environment of modern organizations. They have divided the organizational environment into primary and secondary environments. It is their contention that "the organization itself chooses all of the primary environments and many of the secondary environments with which it must deal...In fact, the positioning decisions of an organization are very much concerned with the design of an appropriate niche" (p.158). An analysis of academic governance in the

higher education system of the United States seems to support this contention of the organization choosing its environment.

There are many different institutional forms, different sets of environmental pressures, different professional configurations, and different goals...examples...major universities, community colleges, medical schools, technical schools, institutions with graduate schools, liberal arts colleges, massive multiversities, proprietary business schools (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977b, p.42).

Diversity, then, seems to be the earmark of modern higher education organizations. This diversity has not been just identified between organizations but has also been increasing within institutions. Perhaps the increased size of universities have been the main reason for the increased internal diversity (Baldrige et al, 1977b, p.47). Meyer and Rowan (1983) seem to feel that the diversity seen is because that part of an organization can respond relatively independently to its environment (p.94). In a study reported by Scott (1981), it was found that the structure of an organization was altered by creating separate departments to confront the diversity in the environment. It was also found that the more differentiated the organization's departments were, the more likely conflicts and disagreements would develop and the more difficult it was to integrate and coordinate the work (p.247).

Although there have been a few theorists that have taken specific note of organizational environment, most organizational theorists have spent little time or attention studying the relations between organizations and their environments (Baldridge, 1971, p.124). There have been a few that have proposed theories or models that try to more clearly bring together the organizational behavior and structure the environment. The social-learning theory model states that the changing external environment and the specific institutional environment are prime determinants of the behaviors that cause effective school performance (Martinko & Gardner, 1984, p.145). The natural selection model emphasizes that the social organizations move toward a better fit with their environment. This environmental perspective, then, posits that the factors in the environment chooses those organizational characteristics that best fit the environment (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976, p.79). The resource dependence model proposes that organizations are not able to internally produce all the resources or functions required to maintain themselves. Therefore, they must embark into relations and transactions with the environment to supply these needed resources and services (Aldrich & Pfeffer, 1976, p.83). Scott & Meyer (1983) propose an alternate version of the interorganizational field model. The organizational field model stresses horizontal connections among groups of organizations in a limited geographic area. These authors propose that contemporary organizations are connected to and

affected by connections that emphasize vertical and extralocal relationships among organizations (p.131). Finally, both in the closed and open systems view of organizations the systems are seen as encountering the environment at their boundaries (Meyer & Rowan, 1978, p.109; Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.96). The organization is seen as having a continuous series of relationships between the organization and its environment. Basic to this approach are the ideas of suprasystem and subsystem (Abbott, 1975, p.176).

Scott (1983) feels that it is necessary to distinguish three classes of elements in order to make a useful assessment of organizational environments: network, cultural, and historical elements. Organizations are affected by the structure of the relationships of interorganizational systems and by the societal system with in which they are located. These relational connections between organizations consist of network elements expressed as flows or linkages and are best described by their shared participants. The historical elements help increase organizational understanding by calling attention to the relevance of past events in order to better comprehend the present and future of the organization. The author differentiates between three environmental levels: interorganizational field, societal, world-system contexts.

Further, Scott (1983) states that the social and cultural environment of an organization can shape the organizational activities and structures as significantly as

its technological environment. Stogdill (1971) takes this concept even further, when he states that when considering organizational form and purpose, the social environment must be considered a far more influential force than the physical environment (p.41). Therefore, organizations can be regarded as an exchange agent of the environment. However, the author concedes that educational organizations seem to make more of an impact on its social system than the other way around (p.44). Evan (1971) states that because the organization is embedded in an environment it is in actuality a subsystem of the social system of society (p.175). It is this very unique social position of educational organizations that would make it very difficult to shield their activities from their environment. Educational organizations are organizations that are easily penetrated by their environments (Meyer et al, 1983, p.41). The environmental factor, then, is the relationship between the clients of education and the organization itself (Carlson, 1975, p.188).

The author has examined both traditional and contemporary organizational theory and the relationship of these theories to universities. Now review of literature will turn to athletics and examine both its place and role in the American university.

V. ATHLETICS IN THE UNIVERSITY

Only in America has sport become an important part of the university structure. In most countries around the world, athletics forms a very small part of the activities of the educational system (Chu, 1982, p.53; Sage, 1970, p.54). In this country, though, college athletics have evolved from an institution that was universally opposed by educators in the nineteenth century to one that was tolerated as a necessary evil to a final stage at the turn of this century where it was recognized that athletics was something special and should be established as part of a comprehensive university program (Cozens, 1970, p.65). Given its special status within the curriculum, the American higher educational system has sponsored an intensive program of spectator sports to explicitly train athletes for higher levels of competition (Nelson, 1980, p.30).

Athletics, as a distinctly American institution, was incorporated into the formal structure of the university. Chu (1982) feels that this was the result of the diverse opinions that historically evolved concerning what is the proper curricula, programs, and resource acquisition procedures appropriate for a university (p.56). Scott (1971) states, that the unique place that athletics has attained within the higher education system is because it is the only activity that serves as a basis of community on the individual campuses (p.169). Whatever the cause for its incorporation, lacking a clear understanding of what exactly

higher education is trying to accomplish, the development of a winning athletic program has become an important formal concern of universities (Chu, 1982, p.64).

In the 1980's, scientific research and mass entertainment in sports have strengthened the dependency of major universities on public resources. Regardless of the institutions educational mission, universities have experienced financial constraints that have induced them to respond to the market forces inherent in American society. As a result, the relationship between the university and the economic system has been fundamentally changed (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.XII & 76). Thus, this unclear understanding of the purpose of higher education has lead the business-minded leadership of the universities to use athletics as a financial survival mechanism. Lack of guaranteed funding and other needed resources have forced business managers to look for other areas that might generate needed income. The enlargement of the athletic department offerings was one such vehicle for the acquisition of needed resources. The acquisition of funds and students through the intercollegiate athletic program may be seen as a diversification of the business of the university into new market areas within the American economy (Chu, 1982, p.53 & 65 & 64).

Key sports events give a university opportunities to gain political resources. In connection with such events a university president may establish or strengthen ties to local politicians, businessmen,

alumni, and other contacts in the community...As the university nurtures these contacts via sports events, the distinction between the university's values and corporate values diminishes, with the result that university and the business world become interdependent (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.75).

Thus, the interdependency between business and higher education has developed a new athleticism centered on business values and embedded into a new production system that has the capacity to penetrate the surrounding society. Hart-Nibbrig and Cottingham (1986) use the term corporate athleticism to refer to the influence of business values on this new athletic system (p.14 & 1).

Corporate athleticism is the product of the decentralized administrative structures in the universities and aggressive, commercially oriented athletic departments. Without these weak decentralized structures high power athletic departments could not have developed. However, corporate athleticism does not constitute an institutional distortion of the American higher education system. On the contrary, this form of university athletics is the culmination of commercial trends that have been present in the university for a long period of time (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.115 & 116).

Perhaps, though, the most significant change in athletics at the collegiate level is that there is a new system with even stronger links to political and social forces outside the university. This new corporate form is

both inside and outside the university. Because of this relationship, collegiate sports are no longer subject to or really controlled by those amateur norms historically connected to higher education and collegiate athletics (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.XII & 15). Being subject to these new social and business norms and forming strong relationships outside the university structure, perhaps athletics has developed new and unique organizational structures in response to these nontraditional pressures.

Although not going as far as saying that athletic departments have developed new organizational structures some authors have definitely referred to athletic organizations within the university as being so far from the educational framework that they remain not only functionally separate but are entities unto themselves (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.10; Mathews, 1972, p.420; Wolf, 1972, p.449).

In most cases, institutions following the semiprofessional model have developed administrative structures "separated" from the traditional academic organization of the university...(this) "semi-autonomous" character...gives athletic directors easy and special access to educational administrators directly responsible for the financial futures of the athletic departments; and needless to say, it allows for coordination and planning of presidential

strategies and athletic department interests

(Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.56)

Thus, it seems, the decentralized organizational structure inherent in the university helped facilitate the emergence of this new form of athletics by allowing subunits within the organizational structure substantial administrative autonomy.

This administrative autonomy has allowed various subunits of the university to carry out specialized educational missions through developing relationships with outside groups. These relationships with commercial, government, industrial and others have also been encouraged by the financial pressures due to the shrinking resource base of the university. Though many academic departments or units have developed various types of relationships with groups outside the university, it is the athletic department that has political autonomy that far exceeds the autonomy that can be achieved by the more traditional academic units of the university (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.9).

Beside providing political clout to the athletic department, these outside groups provide needed resources for the sports program. In 1969, the average contribution to athletic programs in higher education amounted to 5% of the athletic department's budget. In 1981, contributions represented 11% of the budget. Few institutions would be able to break even if these contributions were not given in support of their athletic budgets. But, those that provide these resources assume an informal control of institution's

athletic departments. Thus, colleges and universities have given control of their athletic programs to groups outside the university (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.60).

Although varied in make up, these outside groups form quasi-institutional interests that can be identified by their own individual interests: parents, fans, alumni and boosters. In most instances, it is the booster groups and their organizations that are the most influential. Booster clubs reinforce the link between alumni and their school. They also provide a way, vicariously, for school supporters to develop contact with the institution of their choice. Perhaps, though, the most important link the booster organization provides is the link between the athletic programs of the university and the business interests outside. Thus, athletics at the university is inextricably linked to this business system (Frederickson, 1969, p.95; Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.78 & 82 & 90 & 112; Sabo, 1980, p.76).

One group that can be said to have quasi-institutional interest but is not linked to the booster groups is the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The universities used the NCAA to achieve their economic and athletic goals. In return, American colleges and universities give the NCAA control over major internal functions (Stern, 1979, p.263).

In effect, the NCAA enabled universities to integrate college sports into a new system of cultural production and mass entertainment by helping them to amass

financial resources and to distribute such resources among NCAA member institutions (Hart-Nibbrig, 1986, p.99).

Originally, the NCAA was not interested in amassing financial resources or controlling mass entertainment. The NCAA can trace its beginning to the administration of Theodore Roosevelt. In 1905, President Roosevelt called representatives of Harvard, Yale and Princeton to the White House to discuss what could be done to stop the serious deaths and injuries that were occurring in the game of college football. Thus, although competition is at the center of American society, it was far from the minds of the founders of the NCAA (Falla, 1981, p.203 & 176).

In the beginning, the NCAA membership was mainly made up of scholars and educators. As an organization, then, it stressed high academic standards for institutions. For the athletes the NCAA stressed the pursuit of a full schedule of academic work (Falla, 1981, p.143). By 1918, the NCAA began to broaden its involvement in collegiate sports and in the internal organizational structure of its members. For example, the Association passed the following resolution during its 13th convention:

...that every college and university, the Department of Physical Training and Athletics should be recognized as a department of collegiate instruction, directly responsible to the college or university administration ...a corollary to which is the suggestion that coaches be made year-around staff or faculty members...lift

athletics (to)...the level of cocurricular activity
(Falla, 1981, p.55).

This involvement transformed the NCAA from a loose confederation of voluntary university members into a control agent that dominated intercollegiate athletics (Stern, 1979, p.242).

By 1951, the control that the NCAA exerted over intercollegiate athletics became more formally established. A cartel agreement was granted that gave the NCAA the authority to enforce rules of amateurism over its member colleges (Stern, 1979, p.242; Stern, 1981, p.17). As a private regulatory system, the NCAA established itself as a control agent in order to maintain and produce standards of performance, to alter competition, to control entry, and to prevent government intervention. It also directed championship events and television coverage of its contests. The revenue generated from these activities is allocated by the NCAA according to association bylaws (Stern, 1981, p.17).

It was also in the 1950's that the NCAA began to do "more to communicate to the general public and to the college community the full impact of intercollegiate athletics" (Falla, 1981, p.222). It was the NCAA's job to communicate to the public the perception that college athletics retained important values inherent in an amateur activity: fairness, honesty, and discipline (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.96). Trying to maintain its commitment to amateur athletics and at the same time fulfill the needs of those institutions that wanted to increase their

grants-in-aids to its student-athletes, in 1973 the NCAA completed a final alignment of conferences. It showed that 237 of its member institutions chose to be in Division I, 194 choosing Division II, and 233 choosing Division III (Falla, 1981, p.233).

The first real crack in the control exerted by the NCAA over collegiate athletics occurred in 1981 when 63 large football playing institutions joined together and formed the College Football Association (CFA). The purpose of this new association was to get a larger share of the television money that their teams were generating. In response, the NCAA held a special convention and split Division I into Division I-A (for the football powers) and Division I-AA (Smith, 1984, p.H-1). As Wolf (1972) had suggested, this action shows how the NCAA is controlled and run by the athletic departments of the big-time sports institutions. This is true even though the majority of the membership of the NCAA is made up of small schools which operate on a limited or nonathletic scholarship basis (p.448).

Although many groups have tried to challenge the authority of the NCAA to control collegiate athletics, the NCAA has been successful in meeting the challenge. The federal government, as an outside interest group, both has protected and challenged the NCAA's right to control athletics at the collegiate level. As stated previously, the very idea for a national organization was instituted by the executive branch of the federal government. By 1919, the federal government again stepped in to protect

collegiate athletics. It revised the recently passed revenue laws in order to abolish the Federal tax on admission to intercollegiate contests (Falla, 1981, p.204). Again in 1954, this exemption was reinforced when President Dwight D. Eisenhower signed a new Federal excise tax bill providing for a new Federal admissions tax:

The Federal admissions tax shall not apply in the case of any athletic event between educational institutions held during the regular athletic season for such event, if the proceeds therefrom insure exclusively to the benefit of such institutions (Falla, 1981, p.207).

Again in 1962, the NCAA received additional government protection and support when the United States Senate enacted a law making it a Federal offense to offer a bribe in order to influence the outcome of an athletic contest (Falla, 1981, p.208).

This mutual and supportive relationship between the federal government and the colleges continued into the 1960's and 1970's. One of the strongest bills to be passed during this period averted the competition from either filmed or live professional football on any Saturday during the collegiate football season. Interestingly, the committee reasons for pushing passage of the legislation went beyond the simple task of eliminating competition between two groups of football antagonists. "It is particularly gratifying to the Television Committee...to note this undeniable evidence of realization by the Congress

of the United States that college football is an asset to the country warranting preservation" (Falla, 1981, p.113).

In 1981, individual members of the NCAA turned to another branch of the Federal government to challenge to right of the association to control what they believed was their right to negotiate their own institution's television contracts. The University of Georgia and University of Oklahoma sued the NCAA because it prohibited individual schools from negotiating. At stake, if the suit was to be won by these schools, were contacts between the NCAA and ABC and CBS television networks worth some \$263.5-million over four years. The courts ruled that the NCAA restrictions constituted an illegal monopoly (Vance, 1984, p.27).

Although it has been only in recent years that the NCAA has been able to generate large amounts of revenue, throughout most of its history the NCAA's strength was not in the wealth it generated but rather in the influence it was able to exert. It took forty-one years (1906-1947) for the Association's general revenue to exceed \$100,000. Beginning in the 1950s and through the 1970s, the NCAA saw an ever-accelerating flow of revenue. In 1967 the Association's general revenue exceeded the \$500,000 mark. Four years later (1971) NCAA revenues topped the \$1-million mark for the first time. After seventy-five years, what would have surprised the founders most is that only one percent of the \$22,429,000 in the NCAA's annual budget came from members dues (Falla, 1981, p.217 & 288).

The previously discussed historical data suggests that one of the main reasons the NCAA was able to increase its dominance over intercollegiate athletics and control the ever increasing revenues was because of system coupling. The critical issue in respect to system coupling was the degree in which the NCAA was able to monitor and control the athletic programs of its member schools. Coupling is varied due to the mechanisms the Association used to attempt to influence the athletic programs of its members. Loose coupling occurred due to the Associations policy of local autonomy. Because of local autonomy, the NCAA was not only able to reduce the cost of administering its programs but also needed little coordination of them. Unaffiliated schools were linked to this network only by following the NCAA rules of play for all the contests they conducted. With respect to system coupling, the power that the NCAA exerted emerged through the tightening of network linkages. An example of this tight coupling is the enforcement procedures involving rule violations. These decisions represented the extreme tightening of the athletic network, and gave the NCAA a formalized dominant position (Stern, 1979, p. 254-255).

The NCAA retained the symbolic vestiges of amateurism, and the norms of amateurism, helped legitimize the transformation of college sports far beyond its amateur foundations...A whole series of NCAA actions-redshirting, more competitive recruiting, more athletic scholarships, weak enforcement procedures, the passage

of freshman eligibility, and the acceptable lax standards for athletes- all helped university sports programs to give greater scope to dynamic market forces (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.97).

Also aiding the influence of the market forces on the athletic programs was the weak and ill-defined charter of American higher education. Without a strong consensus from the American people, the purpose of the university was open to the needs and desires of America's institutions of higher learning and their constituents. This charter, though, was not a written document. Rather, it was an informal understanding. It told the people what they should expect from the entity known as a college or university. The charter was the result of contemporary and historical attitudes, values, goals, and dreams of society. Because of society and this weak charter, an atmosphere was created that allowed radically different programs to be incorporated into the academic structures of the universities (Chu, 1982, p.54).

VI. ATHLETICS IN AMERICA

...sport teams as small social systems can be viewed as microcosms of larger social systems, including society itself. They present in miniature such societal features as division of labor, a code of ethics, a government, means of communication, prestige rankings, ideologies, myths, and even religious practices (Loy, 1972, p.79).

The scientific inquiry of the sociology of sport is a fairly recent addition to those experts who study American society (Daniels, 1969, p.13). Sports permeates the many different levels of society. It influences such elements of contemporary society as status, business life, race relations, clothing styles, automotive design, the concept of hero, ethical values, and language. For better or for worse, athletics gives the very form and substance to much in modern American life (Edwards, 1976, p.21). Chu (1982) feels that it is through sport that present day culture can possibly socialize its diverse population to accept the same norms of thought and behavior (p.63).

Culture is learned. The learning takes place through the encountering of new experiences (Schein, 1985, p.8). It is through sport that this learning takes place. Sports and athletics are activities that belong with the arts of humanity. They are the expressions of human life. In this sense, sports and athletics are as fundamental a form of expression as music, poetry, and painting. They are the very essence of social cooperation (Daniels, 1969, p.15; Erbach, 1969, p.30; Frederickson, 1969, p.92).

Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham (1986) state that, as a cultural norm of modern society, athleticism grows out of the need to experience decisive outcomes. Because of the complexity inherent in contemporary society, sports is one of the few social domains in which conflict can produce closure. In an athletic contest the rules are such that there are clearly established winners and losers. There is

no compromise. It is striving for and achieving success. Success, as measured by winning, has deep roots in American society (p.98).

Cultural analysis of a society is a matter of determining the interconnections and independencies that exist within the society (Weick, 1977, p.212). Beside being able to produce decisive outcomes, other authors feel that athletics also provides other interconnections and independencies within American culture. Chu (1982) states that intercollegiate sport is a necessary unifying vehicle because of the diversity inherent in the American population (p.63). Belsser (1970) asserts that sports are one of the last places where physical aggression has an established location in our culture. Through sports, the aggression so applauded by present day society is able to be channelled into accepted behavior patterns (p.241). Frederickson (1969) feels that any cursory review of sports and their place in the culture of man will reveal their importance of ritual within their structure. As an example he gives the singing of the Star-Spangled Banner before athletic contests as an attempt to attribute some intensely nationalistic omen to the event (p.95).

Other researchers go one step further in feeling that sport should not only be viewed as just providing interconnections and interdependencies for society but should also be seen as a subculture or social system within American culture. As a subculture, sport may be characterized by a distinguishing pattern of values and

norms, a collective identity, a set of rules, and having an implicit ideology (Loy & Kenyon, 1969a, p.349; Luschen, 1972, p.70; Phillips & Schafer, 1976, p.128). Sport, then, is primarily a cultural product (Frederickson, 1969, p.90). In this sense, intercollegiate sports not only connects the university to mass society but also to the evolving culture and values of that mass society (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.83). Thus, to truly understand sport as a subculture it is necessary to grasp its relationships to the surrounding and dominant culture (Yinger, 1960, p.629).

Culture has played a significant role in the development of intercollegiate sports in the United States. Athletics has been influenced most directly by two historical traditions that are embedded within American culture: the British tradition of sports which emphasizes the use of sport to inculcate athletes with moral character and the Spartan tradition which uses sport as a preparation for the military (Scott, 1971, p.175).

There is no question about the effect which various aspects of WWI had on sports in schools and colleges during the years between World Wars I and II. The emphasis placed upon sports as a most valuable preparation for conditioning and morale of soldiers, the tremendous spectator interest developed in France as a result of the sports competition placed before the armed forces during and after WWI, the indignation of the people at home in regard to the physical unfitness of draftees- all of these became pressures in American

culture to set the stage for the great boom in sports participation and interest which developed in the nineteen-twenties (Cozens, 1970, p.70).

Owing to this increased interest, a public demand was created that lead to the erection of huge stadiums on the campuses of many American universities. In fact, during the depression a considerable share of WPA and PWA funds were used on erecting athletic sports facilities- gymnasiums, tennis courts, swimming pools, and athletic fields. By 1937, \$75,000,000 had been spent on these projects (Cozens, 1970, p.710).

Two classes of institutions emerged from this growth period. The first was known as the university division schools. These colleges had more students, commanded more resources, and had a greater need to win. This need was caused by the necessity of attracting the revenue brought by fans watching winning teams and the success that ensued. The other division included those colleges that wanted to win but had fewer athletes. These institutions hoped to attract good athletes but wished to participate in athletics for the values obtained through competition rather than for the revenue they could produce (Stern, 1979, p.250).

These approaches worked beautifully until the post-WWII sports hysteria that began to make itself felt on certain athletic programs. It was at this time that football became central to the generation of revenue for those universities that wished to pursue winning as their primary goal. As these institutions competed for an increase share of the

financial resources they soon discovered that there were not enough good athletes to go around. The market force of supply and demand entered into the picture and the whole intercollegiate athletic system was thrown into turmoil.

As Gallico (1970) states, "the puzzle still remains as to why the universities, reputedly the fountain-head of the country's ethics, brains, and culture, were unable to meet these new conditions as honestly and successfully as they had met other not dissimilar problems" (p.112). Thus, on one level, intercollegiate athletics was perceived as an educational endeavor because of its location in American colleges and universities and on the other it was indirectly and directly influenced by specialized economic and political interests (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.82).

In the 1960's and 1970's many universities granted substantial control of their sports programs to their own semiautonomous athletic departments. Therefore, these institutions allowed well organized interest groups to control the direction that these department began to take (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.97). In the 1980's, American universities crossed another institutional threshold in respect to athletics. They became less insulated from a greater variety of cultural forces. If Hart-Nibbrig and Cottingham (1986) are correct with this analysis, the multifunctional role of the university will be enlarged. Thus, the market forces introduced a new system of stratification. This stratification is caused by the

connection between the sports markets and the university. The authors argue that universities have internalized market criteria through the role specialization of the student-athlete and through the corporate athletic infrastructure being institutionalized within the university (p.112).

To declare that sport, during the present century, has become a cultural phenomenon of great magnitude and complexity is an affirmation of the obvious...Its scope is awesome; nearly everyone has become involved in some way, even if only vicariously. As a business enterprise alone it represents an annual expenditure by the American public of over \$20 billion (Loy & Kenyon, 1969b, p.36).

Thus, a variety of economic and social events occurred within the American culture which created an environment that influenced the development of intercollegiate athletics and its athletic network. Because of the changes in the environment, two general effects arose which influenced the athletic network development. The most obvious was the increased interdependence caused by technological changes, increasing affluence, government, and public interest in intercollegiate athletics. Second, the effect of environment on the nation's colleges and universities. These factors altered the very nature of collegiate athletics in this country (Stern, 1979, p.248 & 250).

The technological changes within the environment centered around the increased effect of the mass media in

this country. As Snyder (1976) states, "sport is so much a part of the cultural air through mass media and conversation that one cannot be totally insulated from its influence" (p.5). Athletics in present day mass society functions as an integrating symbol for American culture. Sport, as presented on television, is not only an integrating symbol but is also a life-giving symbol. Since traditional symbols have lost much of their content in many of the advanced industrial societies like the United States, athletics has become a more clear symbol of mass culture (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.49).

This symbolic relationship between athletics and mass media can be best illustrated by the large amount of air time devoted to sport on American television (Sabro, 1980, p.162). Because of this media blitz, television, not higher education in the United States, is the ultimate producer of intercollegiate athletics. Television, therefore, creates the perceptions that define athletic standards. In fact, television even seems to make it difficult for viewers to discern the difference between myth and reality. Sports is one of the few areas in people's lives where heroes come to life (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.34 & 48).

A highly decentralized sports system of massive scope is now evolving in the United States. It is a total sports system, characterized by top-to-bottom integration of the corporate television system and intermediary social structures. The sports television market induces all intermediary structures-

universities, boosters, and highly competitive families- to serve market ends (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.13).

As previously discussed in this review, huge amounts of money have been generated for the athletic departments due to their television contracts. The increased revenue and affluence for the participating programs and their institutions have been caused by the environment. Thus, the environmental change modified intercollegiate athletics.

In retrospect, Hart-Nibbrig and Cottingham (1986) feel as institutional affluence increased, presidential control over the individual school's athletic program steadily weakened and athletic interests increased their resistance to that control (p.94). Farrell (September, 1984) also states that much of the blame for the current rules violations must be placed on television and the large amounts of money it pays schools with winning teams (p.29). Whether this effect television has had on intercollegiate athletics will change is doubtful. It has been estimated that 90% of future revenue will be generated by intercollegiate teams competing on television (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.69).

Another environmental change was the effect of the government on the athletic programs in higher education. As previously discussed, the government has played a protective and influential role in the creation and development of the NCAA and intercollegiate athletics. Recently, however, the federal government interventions have provided institutions

with big-time programs a mechanism for loosening the independent power of the NCAA that the government had helped to create. These dominant schools do not want to follow NCAA guidelines and share their revenue with less wealthy schools. With a favorable ruling from the Judicial branch of the Federal Government, it was ruled that revenue from activities such as televised contests are outside the NCAA controls (Stern, 1981, p.27). Local governments have also aided in changing athletics by the extensive bidding that now goes on for the privilege of some city hosting a top NCAA championship. As an example, the city of Denver pledged \$557,500 worth of improvements to its municipal sports arena if it was able to hold the 1989 Basketball Championships (San Diego Union, 1984, p.D-11).

Public interests is probably at the bottom of many of the environmental changes brought about in intercollegiate athletics. Sports occupy a unique position in American culture in that they are an accepted social activity regardless of social class (Beisser, 1970, p.242). Athletics fascinate the American public. In order to satisfy this public interest most daily newspapers devote more space to athletics than they do to art, books, education, television, or theater (Boyle, 1970, p.42). Goodhart and Chataway (1968) state that this increased national passion for sport can be seen as a commentary on the inadequacy of modern society. Because millions of people are not involved with the present-day society in which they live and work, they achieve some level of

satisfaction by passionately identifying with the participants of some sport ritual. The authors further feel that as work becomes less satisfying the ranks of these spectators are sure to grow (p.156). As the average person increases their interest and excitement for sport, sport approaches a religion in the United States today (Scott, 1971, p.170).

It is not merely like a religion...sport can and does provide its followers everything that traditional religions have provided over the centuries...many of the trappings of religion that sports has, such as myths, legends, and rituals...Sport can be used to teach values such as honesty, fair play, compassion, and discipline...it is not just a parallel that is emerging between sport and religion, but rather a complete identity. Sport is religion for a growing number of Americans (Vance, 1984, p.25).

Other authors also feel that athletics have achieved a status of a religion to many people in America today. Vance (1984) acknowledges that sport is not necessarily a religion to all people. It is a religion, though, to those spectators and athletes that rely on sports to aid them to feel the ultimate experience; and, whose lives, attitudes, personal relationships, and values are radically changed by this experience (p.26). Edwards (1976) also states that sport provides the ultimate experience for its followers. However, he feels that although sport is strongly marked by, "nonutilitarian loyalties and commitments, by much

ritualized or ceremonial behavior, by expressive symbolism, and ideological creeds...sport is essentially a secular, quasi-religious institution" (p.21).

One of the strongest symbols in collegiate athletics today is the concept of amateurism. Although it no longer plays any real part in college sports, the American public retains a strong symbolic attachment to the concept that college contests have not been changed by the commercial values that surround it. In other words, amateurism softens the commercial edges of intercollegiate athletics (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.108).

This, then, is the environment that surrounds the university and its sports program. Therefore, as an organization the university is subjected to a great variety of cultural constraints. Stodgill (1971) states that because of these constraints imposed by the cultural environment, the purpose and structure of the organization may be determined by the culture in which the organization is a part. Members take outside societal values and bring them into the organization. The organization creates at least some minimum change in these values before they are returned to the surrounding environment (p.49). It seems, then, that the environment created by American culture may not only change the collegiate athletics program but the university in which it is located.

One example of environmental change is the effect of having an athletic program on the prestige of university itself. It is clear that the more highly visible and

successful the institution's athletic program is the more prestige the university is perceived in having (McCurdy, 1984). Winning and success then, seems, to become as important as other more academic activities in providing the aura of prestige for an institution. Winning teams also provide an activity that helps the general public identify with the university (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.97). Winning programs are also more financially secure programs (Vance, September 1984, p.30).

After all, the theory behind the system is that successful (translate: winning) teams, especially in the revenue producing sports of football and basketball, can do all kinds of wondrous things for the institution of higher learning. Winning teams can mean increases in gate receipts, television contracts, alumni donations, university budgets and community acceptance. In such a system, winning is necessary...(Wolf, 1972, p.449).

This ambivalence between educational prestige and winning is probably one of the main cultural legacies that seems not to be able to be resolved to everyone's satisfaction. It represents, though, the country's own ambivalence toward how it feels about high-powered collegiate athletics (Giamatti, 1981, p.81).

Another example of environmental change, is the effect of external institutions, like business and government, on the university and its athletic program. Changing economic conditions caused by these entities effect all aspects of

the American way of life. Colleges and universities are no exception. These institutions are forced to make careful choices based on change within the surrounding economic environment. Examples of these choices are: faculty tenure, matters of student access, and all resource allocation issues. As change quickens within this external economic environment market forces are integrated within the university. Choices for resource allocation are, thus, based on economic rationality or demand criteria. Accordingly, as choices for resource allocation are made within the athletic program, funds are shifted away from the non moneymaking activities and given to the moneymaking sports. Thus, the cultural environment reinforces the strength of the economic forces in the management of the sports programs (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.76).

Thus, because of culture, business methods have become an integral part of the way the athletic department conducts its business. It was rationalized by the college leadership that the use of these methods was necessary to not only for a good public image but in order to pursue success and excellence (Chu, 1982, p.64).

In the United States great emphasis is placed of "success" and the struggle for status. Since sport is such a prominent feature of American life, and since by its very nature it represents a struggle for dominance and physical superiority, it is not surprising that sport has become the primary avenue to group status for the American male...Achievers are esteemed, and

proficiency in sport skills seen as achievement in America (Sage, 1970, p.121).

Success and excellence in sport focuses attention upon the presentation of high-quality performance. The quality of performance is as much a social concern as an institutional concern. A system of shared values oriented to both the institution of athletics and the larger society combine to attract and keep widespread public interest and attention (Edwards, 1976, p.210). Because of this societal need to see who is really the best, numerous performance measures exist. The one directly comparable measure of the performance of major competitors is the national ranking system (Stern, 1981, p.22).

The cultural induced focus on excellence has brought about other changes within the athletic organization and its programs. Hoffman and Stein (1980) found that the demand for high-level performance is so pronounced that many athletes will play with great pain, risking further serious injury (p.70). The search for excellence has also affected the coaching profession. Although in the past coaches were part of the regular university faculty, they now have been removed from this institutional structure. The coach is hired for one purpose- to win. If the coach does not produce a winning team he/she will be fired (Gallico, 1970, p.120).

It seems, then, that the only acceptable solutions for sports performance is excellence as demonstrated by a high level of success. The value placed on success, excellence,

and the competitive nature of athletics seems to be a reflection of basic values inherent in American society. Sport is an American social institution which has the primary functions of disseminating and reinforcing values and behavior and determining acceptable solutions in the secular sphere of life. "Hence, an attack upon sport constitutes an attack upon the society itself...this interpretation is affirmed by persons supportive and critical of the functioning of sport in America" (Edwards, 1976, p.21).

VII. EXCELLENCE AND HIGH PERFORMANCE

Although excellence and high performance are basic to any discussion on athletics both within American culture and within the American university, these issues have rarely been addressed by any study completed on American institutions of higher education. In the business world, though, researchers have begun to study high performance and excellence as characteristics of some companies. Two models have been developed involving high-performance.

The first model has been developed by Vaill (1982 & 1984). This model illustrates the High-Performance System Model. Vaill has defined high-performance systems as any organization or group that meets one of the following criteria:

1. They are performing excellently against a known external standard.

2. They are performing excellently against what is assumed to be their potential level of performance.

3. They are performing excellently relative to where they were at some earlier point in time.

4. They are judged qualitatively by informed observers to be doing substantially better than other comparable systems.

5. They are doing whatever they do with significantly fewer resources than it is assumed are needed to do what they do.

6. They are perceived as exemplars of the way to do whatever they do, and thus become a source of ideas and inspiration for others.

7. They are perceived to fulfill at a high level the ideas of the culture within which they exist.

8. They are the only organizations who have been able to do what they do at all, even though it might seem that what they do is not that difficult or mysterious a thing (Valll, 1984, p.86).

Valll found that the high-performance systems (HPS) have the following characteristics:

1. HPSs are clear on their broad purposes and on nearer term objectives for fulfilling these purposes.

2. Commitment to these purposes is never perfunctory although it is often expressed laconically. Motivation as usually conceived is always high.

3. Teamwork in HPSs is focused on the task.

4. Leadership in HPSs is strong and clear.

5. HPSs are fertile sources of inventions and new methods within the scope of the task they have defined and within the form they have chosen.

6. HPSs are clearly bounded from their environments, and a considerable amount of energy, particularly on the part of leaders, is usually devoted to maintaining these boundaries.

7. Proposition (6) leads to another consistent finding, that is that HPSs are often seen as a "problem" by entities in their environment, even entities which have a great deal of power over them.

8. Above all, HPSs are systems which have jelled, even though the phenomenon is very difficult to talk about (Vall, 1984, pp.86-88).

The second model, is the High Performance Programming (HPP) model. This model illustrates how an organization can be transformed into a high-performing system. The author uses the term programming to highlight the fact that past implicit and explicit operating instructions of the system directly effect the present performance of the system (Nelson, 1984, p.226).

While these models involve high performance as the central theoretical bases, implicit within each model is the theorists' view that excellence in performance is a standard feature of high performing systems. Although Peters and Waterman (1982) did not study high performance per se, they did study excellence in companies that far outperformed their underachieving competitors. The authors focused their

attention on the relationship between a company's culture and performance. The results of the study supported the authors' contention that excellent companies produce results through their strong, cohesive cultures. They found eight attributes that characterized excellent and high-performing companies:

1. A bias for action, for getting on with it.
2. Close to the customer. These companies learn from the people they serve.
3. Autonomy and entrepreneurship. The innovative companies foster many leaders and many innovators throughout the organization.
4. Productivity through people. The excellent companies treat the rank and file as the root source of quality and productivity gain.
5. Hands-on, value driven...the basic philosophy of an organization has far more to do with its achievements than do technological or economic resources, organizational structure, innovation and timing.
6. Stick to the knitting...Never acquire a business you don't know how to run.
7. Simple form, lean staff...The underlying structural forms and systems in the excellent companies are elegantly simple. Top-level staffs are lean...
8. Simultaneous loose-tight properties. The excellent companies are both centralized and decentralized (p.14-15).

Excellence and high performance appear to go hand-in-hand. Vaill's definition for high performing systems seems to support this contention. High-performance systems refers to "human systems that perform at levels of excellence far beyond those of comparable systems" (Vaill, 1984, p.85 & 1982, p.24). In high-performance systems, this focus on excellence is achieved by identifying new potentials and avenues of opportunity. To accomplish this a high energy level within the organization frees the human spirit to new levels of productivity. To the outsider this high level of energy appears, often times, to be chaotic and frenetic. Yet, to the people within the high-performance system everything seems quite normal (Nelson, 1984, p.236-238). Harrison (1984) states that studies of high-performing people, such as athletes, managers, researchers, suggest this energy can be characterized as a power of thought (p.104).

Other authors have also suggested other characteristics of high-performing organizations. Bennis and Nannus (1985) state that these organizations try to learn as much as they can concerning their changing environment. By learning as much as possible the organization can develop a sense of purpose, direction, and desired future state (p.213). Lawrence (1967) feels that high-performing organizations come closer than their less effective competitors in meeting the demands of their environment. The author, also, states that high-performing organizations have many similarities in the way in which they resolve conflict. In the three

organizations that Lawrence studied, the organizational mode of behavior used to resolve conflict relied heavily on open confrontation and open discussion which led to the optimal solution (p.134 & 146). Harrison (1984) warns, however, that high-performing organizations may have inhumanities. The author suggests that these organizations can burn people out, control private lives, ostracize those who do not share the common purpose and are frequently ruthless in all forms of dealings with those outside the organization (p.100). Peters and Austin (1985) note that fine performance in an organization occurs when the people at all levels pay close attention to organization's values, environment, and communication network and then develop skills that will help them make a contribution to the company. The authors go on to state that this recasts the detached manager into an enthusiastic, dedicated coach (p.325).

Nelson (1984) feels that it is this attention and curiosity about the potentials of the organization and the people in it that provides the major clue about the nature of high-performing organizations and high-performing leaders. The kind of leadership required in this type of organization is what the author terms holistic.

..."holistic," because high-performing leaders appreciate the larger roles played by their organizations as instruments of change in adjacent and higher systems in the environment. They look not only into their own organizations to help develop their potentials and that of their people, but to the outside

as well...they use their organizations to make contributions to the human communities and the culture in which they reside (p.237-238).

It is from this holistic understanding of the organization that the leaders make their choices about the organization's mission and purpose (Nelson, 1984, p.157).

VIII. THE ATHLETIC DILEMMA: HIGH PERFORMING SYSTEM OR ANARCHY?

The University is an organization that has been characterized as an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system but in reality has defied classification in terms of any particular model (Gross & Grambsch, 1974, p.5). Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) acknowledge that the theory of organized anarchy describes a portion of an organizations activities but not all of them (p.1). Baldrige et al (1977a) state that by identifying the university organization as an organized anarchy suggests more confusion and conflict than really exist. The authors suggest that the term organized anarchy refers to specific organizational characteristics rather than to the entire university community (p.8).

The difficulty in identifying the university seems to be caused by the great amount of ambiguity that most educational organizations exhibit. Bolman and Deal (1984) feel that the greatest amount of ambiguity may be exhibited where multiple cultures intersect (p.238). Perhaps the key to understanding and explaining this demonstrated ambiguity

of university and collegiate organizations is to identify the multiple cultures included within the institutions?

Organizations have distinct cultures (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.29). Not enough attention, though, has been given to the possibility that organizations and groups within a society may also develop their own distinguishing cultures. Schein (1985) asserts that in order to understand these organizational cultures correctly we must "understand why organizations do some of the things they do and why leaders have some of the difficulties that they have" (p.3). Schein also states that the best way to accomplish this greater understanding is through empirical research:

Whether or not a given company has a single culture in addition to various subcultures then becomes an empirical question to be answered by locating stable groups within the company and determining the shared experiences of the members of the total organization. One may well find that there are several cultures operating within the larger social unit called the company or the organization: a managerial culture, various occupationally based cultures in functional units, group cultures based on geographical proximity, worker cultures based on shared hierarchical experiences, and so on (Schein, 1985, p.7).

Perhaps, to better understand the University as an organization is to have research focus, as Schein suggests, on locating a stable group within the organization that

perhaps demonstrates its own distinctive cultural characteristics.

Individuals within the higher education organization are usually grouped by common interest; for example, departments, colleges and schools, and university agencies (Millet, 1962, p.76). The links between these parts are "typically loose, so that each level performs its own activities and is substantially disconnected from the other levels" (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.34). Hart-Nibbrig and Cottingham (1986) state that because of the type of organizational connections between the various parts of the university the institution can adjust easily to market demands (p.115). Increasing market pressures, though, makes the governance of colleges and universities more vulnerable to their environments (Baldrige et al., 1977a, p.19). Current research identifies the environment as one of the most powerful factors in influencing the structure of an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.43). As the environment changes so does the formal structure of the organization (Meyer & Rowan, 1983, p.95). Baldrige (1971) states that educational organizations cannot react to all facets of their environments. Therefore, the organization relates to the environment through the small groups within the education institution (p.128).

Using this perspective, Hart-Nibbrig and Cottingham (1986) suggest that institutionalized political economy of athletics illustrates the environmental pressures of the external environment. It is the authors belief that the

university sports program is more directly linked to the values of television and the mass-appeal of sports, than to the academic values of the university. It is the search for the entertainment dollar and the success that must precede it that is the driving force of athletics in most institutions of higher learning (p.115 & 9).

The questions posed by this research are, whether the two models that view the organizations as being an ambiguous, loosely coupled organization and as high performance systems are incompatible? Or, can a high performance system exist within an ambiguous, loosely coupled system? In order to investigate these questions, various areas of the literature were reviewed: the traditional view of the university, the contemporary view of the university: organized anarchy and loose coupling, the university as an organization, the educational organization and the environment, athletics in the university, athletics in America, excellence and high performance, and the athletic dilemma: high performing system or anarchy? Given this problem has been identified and a review of literature was completed, it is necessary now that this problem be examined empirically.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The methodology selected to investigate an example of a perceived high-performance system is the case study. This chapter contains a description of the methods and procedures used to conduct the case study. The information is presented under the following topics: the Case Study; Limitations of the Case Study Method; Limitations of the Study; the Sample; Interviews; Data Gathering; and Data Analysis.

THE CASE STUDY

In its simplest form, "the case study involves an investigator who makes a detailed examination of a single subject or group or phenomenon" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p.488). Simon goes beyond this simple definition of a case study when he states that:

case study...(is the) method of choice when you want to obtain a wealth of detail about your subject...appropriate when you are trying to find clues and ideas for further research...in this respect, it serves a purpose similar to the clue-providing function of expert opinion (1969, p.276).

Yin (1984) supports much of what Simon states in his definition of a case study but elaborates on the definition by suggesting that a case study is a distinctive form of empirical research that:

- investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context; when
- the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident; and in which
- multiple sources of evidence are used (p.23).

The case study, though, does not have to be limited to a person, an enterprise, or a particular happening. It can be a study of any bounded system that is of interest to the researcher-- an institution, a responsibility, a collection, a program or a population (Stake, 1983, p.283).

The real value of using the case study method is that case studies have the potential for generating meaningful subjective data that can aid the researcher in the development of theory and empirically testable hypotheses (Borg & Gall, 1983, p.489). In fact, Yin (1984) states that one of the main rationale for selecting a single-case rather than a multiple-case design is that a single-case study can be used as a critical test for developing significant theory (p.42).

Other reasons for using a case study as a research method are: it can provide an important way to explain the causal links in real-life situations; it is a way to investigate an empirical subject by following preset procedures or questions; and, it allows the inquiry to

retain meaningful characteristics from actual events (Yin, 1984, p.25 & 14). Case studies, then, can be the beginning for the study of new areas in the organizational, social, political, and individual occurrences (Simon, 1969, p.52; Yin, 1984, p.14). Most case studies exhibit the following characteristics:

...more suited to expansionist than reductionist pursuits...proliferates rather than narrows...attends to the idiosyncratic more than to the pervasive...adds to existing experience and humanistic understanding (Stake, 1983, p.284).

LIMITATIONS OF THE CASE STUDY METHOD

Stake (1978) believes that case studies are useful in humanistic understanding because they are not only interesting to read but get down to the basics in the study of human affairs. He acknowledges, though, that case studies are in some instances not suitable for generalizations (p.7). This is the most common criticism of the case study approach to research-- generalizability. Borg and Gall (1983) support this view when they state that it is risky to draw any general conclusions from a single case study. They acknowledge that there is no way of the researcher knowing how typical the case really is (p.488) Yin (1984) acknowledges that although the question of generalizability is not a simple one to answer he suggests that:

...case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations or universes. In this sense, the case study, like the experiment, does not represent a "sample", and the investigator's goal is to expand and generalize theories (analytic generalization) and not enumerate frequencies (statistical generalization) (p.21).

Other limitations that have been voiced concerning the use of the case study method. One of these is that a case study takes too long and results in a research report that, because of its size, becomes almost unreadable. Another criticism is the lack of rigor in the research because of sloppy and biased methodology on the investigators part (Yin, 1984, p.21).

However, the disadvantages of the case study method may become secondary to the advantage of increased understanding:

When the aims are understanding, extension of experience, and increase in conviction in that which is known, the disadvantage (of the case study) disappears...the knowledge (that is gathered) is a form of...naturalistic generalization, arrived at by recognizing the similarities of objects and issues in and out of context and by sensing the natural covariations of happenings. To generalize this way is to be both intuitive and empirical... (Stake, 1983, p.281-282)

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

(1) It is assumed that the organizational theories of organized anarchy and loose coupling, accurately represent the university-higher education organization.

(2) The size of the student body of the university selected will not be limited to any particular size. Therefore the size of the selected student population might not reflect an average size of an institution of higher learning.

(3) In order to eliminate the increased stress on performance, professionalism, and the generation of funds that can be found in most NCAA Division I and II programs and that therefore could possibly skew the results of this research, the study involves one university-higher education organization representing an NCAA Division III institution. Therefore, this will eliminate from the study a representative sample of an NCAA Division I and II institution.

THE SAMPLE

The University of California, San Diego (UCSD) Athletic Department was selected for this study. This university was selected because it was an accessible Division III institution and, because of its collegiate, university type atmosphere, would least likely exhibit high performance characteristics and more likely exhibit characteristics inherent in organized anarchies and loosely coupled systems.

The other criteria used for the selection of this institution were:

(1) A four-year college or university that has an intercollegiate athletic program associated with the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

(2) A Division III institution as defined by the National Collegiate Athletic Association

(3) An athletic department that must be a separate department within the organizational structure of the university.

(4) The athletic director must have headed the athletic department of the institution for at least two years.

Criteria used to decide which teams, coaches, and athletes were selected to be interviewed for the study are:

(1) Five men's teams and five women's teams were selected using a stratified random sampling method.

(2) Only teams with a head coach that have been at UCSD for at least two years could be used as part of the sample.

(3) Three athletes from each team were selected using a random sampling method.

A total of forty-one subjects were selected to be interviewed: the Athletic Director, five head coaches of men's teams, five head coaches of women's teams, and thirty athletes from these respective teams.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENT

A guide, designed by the researcher, was used during the interview portion of this research. It consisted of 34 questions. Each of these questions were designed to reflect a specific criteria and/or characteristic of a high performance system as defined by Vaill. These questions were used to investigate the athletic department at the University of California, San Diego to see if in fact it could be defined as a high performance system. (See Appendix A for a copy of the questions in the interview guide.)

INTERVIEWS

Data were gathered through individual interviews with the researcher serving as the interviewer. Each interview was semi-structured and used the focused interview approach. The purpose of using the focused interview technique was:

...in a focused interview the limits of relevance are largely self-defined for the interviewee by prior analysis of the situation in which subjects have been involved...Equipped in advance with an analysis of the situation the interviewer can readily distinguish the objective facts of the case from the subjective definitions of the situation...developing an interview guide, setting forth the major areas of inquiry and the hypotheses which provide criteria of relevance for the data to be obtained in the interview (Merton, Fiske, & Kendall, 1956, p.3-4).

The interviews were scheduled for a two-hour period for each of the individual coaches and the Athletic Director and a one-hour period for each of the individual athletes. Each of the interviews gathered such descriptive data on the interviewee as sex, length of time with the UCSD, and length of time involved with athletics at the UCSD. The interviews focused on the subjects' perceived goals and purposes of the institution's athletic department and areas involved in the criteria and characteristics of high-performing systems. As suggested, by Merton, Fiske, and Kendall (1956) the questions that provided a guide to the interview related to eliciting significant types of responses concerning the criteria and characteristics of high-performing systems (p.43). The subjects were encouraged to relate their perceptions about the performance of the athletic department and/or their individual teams and athletic directors performance.

During the interviews tape recordings were made. It was decided to use tape recordings because they "provide a more accurate rendition of any interview than any other method" (Yin, 1984, p.85). Also, as Torbert (1981) states:

Such records...(as) tape-recordings... allow participants or other interested persons to find post hoc clues about what else besides the defined variables and the presupposed explanations was going on in a given situation (p.149).

After the interviews were completed, the interviewer transcribed these interviews from the tapes onto a data

sheet. (See Appendix B for a copy of the data sheet.) As Borg and Gall state, " the use of recordings...permits both qualitative and quantitative data" (1983, p.491). In order, therefore, to verify the accuracy of the transcriptions that the researcher recorded from these tapes, every fifth tape was reviewed by an independent party. Dr. Barbara Blourock, who has been Dean of Counselling at Southwestern College in Chula Vista, California, and expert in the interview process, provided this needed task in order to insure both acceptable reliability and internal validity for the study.

DATA GATHERING

Additional printed material was gathered to supplement the information collected during the interview process. See Appendix C and D for a copy of the regional and national championships that the UCSD's athletic teams participated in or won during the school years 1984-85 (Before this study was conducted.) and 1985-86 (During the time this study was being completed). Appendix E contains a copy of an significant article from the University's newspaper.

DATA ANALYSIS

Most case studies are based on the premise that a case can be located that is typical of many other cases, that is , the case is viewed as an example of a class of events or a group of individuals (Borg & Gall, 1983, p.488-489).

The data for this study contained the reactions and perceptions of the team members, coaches, and the Athletic Director concerning the teams and the athletic department and their relationship to the higher-education organization, the University of California, San Diego.

The following procedure was followed in the data analysis:

(1) Each of the taped interviews was transcribed onto specially developed record sheets. (See Appendix B for copy of the data sheet.)

(2) Each item was analyzed as to whether or not the response elicited from the various subjects did in fact reflect one of the criteria or characteristics of a high performance system.

(3) Each question was further analyzed to find the most significant words in the response in relationship to the question asked. These significant words were recorded on the Response Analysis Form. (See Appendix F for copy of this form.)

(4) Each of these significant word responses was analyzed to see whether or not the response was in agreement with the response given by the Athletic Director. A 70 percent level of agreement was established. It was decided that a 60 percent level of agreement was too low while an 80 percent or higher level of agreement was too unrealistic. Each question had to achieve a 70 percent agreement between the Athletic Director's response and the responses of the

forty coaches and athletes in order for the response to be used in the analysis of data.

A 70 percentage level of agreement was established in order to reflect the nature of leadership in a high performance system. As Vaill (1984) states, "leadership in HPS is strong and clear" (p.86). In other words, there is a strong level of congruence between what the leader feels concerning what direction the organization is taking or what the organization is trying to accomplish and the understanding the people in the organization have about the direction and purpose of the organization. Thus, if the leadership is strong and clear, as Vaill suggests, there should be a high percentage of agreement between the response the Athletic Director gives concerning the athletic department and what the coaches and athletes respond to each of the interview questions. Therefore, this researcher decided that a percentage based on the level of agreement between the what the Athletic Director stated and what the coaches and athletes responded would better reflect the strong and clear leadership style that must occur within a high performance system.

(5) A Likert scale was developed for each question that received a 70 percent agreement level between the Athletic Director and the coaches and athletes. Each scale ranged the responses from those that showed the most agreement to the response that had the lowest level of congruence between the Athletic Director and the coaches and athletes.

(6) A bar graph was developed using the Likert scale in order to make the analysis and explanation of the responses to the selected questions clearer.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The primary purpose of this case study was to look beyond the descriptive terms of organized anarchy and loose coupling and find a possible explanation of how excellent performance can occur in an higher education organization usually described as anarchic and loosely coupled. The case study focused on the athletic department at the University of California, San Diego which year after year has produced excellence despite being part of such a higher education organization.

The secondary purpose was to demonstrate empirically that an example of Vaill's high performance system exists within the university-higher education organization. It is hoped that by finding an empirical example of this model within the university its organizational structure will be given greater clarity of understanding.

Finding that a high performance system does in fact exist within the higher education organization, this study will assist leaders within colleges and universities to have a greater understanding of the organizational structure of their own institutions. Basic to leadership is the understanding that there are different parts of the same

organization using different goals and purposes from those espoused by the institution as a whole. By acknowledging that these different goals and purposes could result in at least two different organizational structures functioning within one institution, leaders will be more successful in their tasks because they will approach different parts of their organizations in different ways.

Data was obtained by interviewing various members of the UCSD athletic department using an interview guide designed by the researcher. The athletic director, ten coaches, and thirty athletes were interviewed (N=41). The interview guide was used in all 41 interviews.

All responses to the questions were analyzed to see which ones achieved a 70% agreement between the athletic director and the coaches and their athletes. Responses that did not achieve this level of agreement were not used in this analysis of data. Thus, the data presented in this section represent only those responses that achieved at least a 70% agreement between the Athletic Director and her coaches and athletes.

Graphs were developed to visually illustrate the congruence of the data. Each graph shows the exact responses given by the subjects, the total number of responses that agreed with the Athletic Director's response, and the percent of agreement achieved between the coaches' and athletes' responses and the response given by the Athletic Director.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Can an athletic department be found, within the university-higher education organization, that can be characterized as a high performance system?

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: If so, what makes it a high performance system?

The following interview questions are directly related to the criteria and characteristics that Vaill has attributed to high performance systems.

Interview Question 1: How would you compare the performance of your athletic department (or team) with other Division III departments (or teams)? This question is related to Vaill's (1984) first criterion for high performance systems: They are performing excellently against a known external standard (p.86).

The Athletic Director agreed that the UCSD program contained some of the most competitive Division III teams in the country as evidenced by the number of championships the teams had either won or participated in the previous year. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-five of the forty people interviewed, or 87.5 percent, agreed with her that UCSD had one of the best Division III programs.

Graph 1 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from considering UCSD to be one of the best, if not the best Division III programs in the country, to the athletic program being designated as "good".

GRAPH 1:

Interview Question #1: How would you compare the performance of your athletic department (or team) with other Division III departments (or teams)?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- ** (A) One of the best DIII
- (B) Better
- (C) Above average
- (D) More talent
- (E) Stronger
- (F) Very Well
- (G) Good

**Athletic Director's response

Percent of agreement= .875

Total number of responses in agreement= 35 of 40

Fifteen (42 percent) of the subjects, including the Athletic Director agreed that their performance made them one of the best Division III programs or teams in the nation. Six responses (17 percent) thought that UCSD was "better" than other Division III programs or teams. Four (11 percent) of the subjects stated that they were "above average" to other Division III programs or teams. One of those interviewed (2 percent) thought that they "had more talent". Three subjects (8 percent) characterized UCSD as being "stronger". Five (14 percent) thought UCSD "did well" against Division III competition while two (5 percent) stated the program was "good".

The results of question 1 show that not only was there 87.5 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that almost one-half (42 percent) used her exact words and/or meaning and placed UCSD as performing successfully against the known standard of Division III competition. It seems, then, that all those interviewed agree with the Athletic Director that the UCSD athletic program is performing excellently against a known external standard (other Division III teams) which is one of Vaill's criteria for HPS. Visually this agreement is shown by the size of the bar A on the extreme left of graph 1.

Interview Question 3A and B: How would you compare the athletic department (or your team) now to where it was when you first arrived at UCSD? Do you feel that there has been

a leveling off, or a decrease in development? This question is related to Vaill's (1984) third criterion for high performance systems: They are performing excellently relative to where they were at some earlier point in time (p.86).

The Athletic Director stated that when she first arrived at UCSD the program was not only not competitive at the national level but had, in fact, a sports club atmosphere. She state unequivocally that there has been an improvement. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-nine of the forty people interviewed, or 97.5 percent, agreed with her that there had been an overall improvement in the athletic program since they became part of the department.

Graph 2 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from estimating that there had been a 100 percent improvement to stating that there was a bit of an increase. Two (5.5 percent) of the subjects agreed that there has been a "100 percent" improvement in the program since they first became a part of the UCSD athletic program. Twelve responses (30 percent) thought that there had been a "definite improvement". Twenty (50 percent) of the subjects, including the Athletic Director, thought that there had been an "improvement". Three (8 percent) of the subjects stated that there was "an increase in development". Two (5.5 percent) of those interviewed thought that there had been only a "slight improvement"

GRAPH 2:

Interview Question #3A & B: How would you compare the athletic department (or your team) now to where it was when you first arrived at UCSD? Do you feel that there has been a leveling off, or a decrease in development?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- **(A) 100 percent improvement
 (B) Definite improvement
 (C) Improvement
 (D) Increase
 (E) Slight improvement
 (F) Bit of increase

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .975
 Total number of responses in agreement= 39 of 40

while one (1 percent) stated there had been a "bit of an increase".

The results of question 3A show that not only was there an 97.5 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but half (50 percent) used her exact words in stating that there had been an improvement. In fact, only one of the subjects interviewed thought that there had not been an improvement. This athlete attributed the lack of improvement in his team to the number of injuries sustained during the present season. In reviewing the 97.5 percent agreement level, it can be stated that the UCSD's athletic program is performing excellently relative to where they were at some earlier point in time. Visually, this agreement becomes quite apparent by the size of the bar A and B on the left of the graph.

Interview Question 4: Has the athletic department (or your team) ever been judged by others to be better than other Division III departments (or teams)? This question is related to Valli's (1984) fourth criterion for high performance systems: They are judged qualitatively by informed observers to be doing substantially better than other comparable systems (p.86).

The Athletic Director agreed that UCSD had some of the top Division III teams in the country as verified by an NCAA report that stated that UCSD was second in the nation in participation in national championships. She also stated,

that on a more casual basis, many people from other institutions have often commented to her about the success of the UCSD program. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-four of the forty people interviewed, or 85.0 percent, agreed with her that in their opinion UCSD had a "substantially better athletic program" than other Division III athletic programs.

Graph 3 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from considering the teams from UCSD as being top in the country to that the UCSD athletic program should be in another NCAA division. Eleven of the subjects (31 percent) agreed that, "yes", they have been judged better than other Division III teams. Sixteen responses (46 percent), including the Athletic Director, thought that UCSD's athletic program contained either some of the "top Division III teams in the country" or that their particular "team was one of the top teams in the country". One subject (3 percent) stated that the program was "much better". Two subjects (6 percent) interviewed thought that UCSD was "very strong". One subject (3 percent) characterized UCSD as being "really good". Another (3 percent) thought that the "proof comes with success" while three (8 percent) stated that UCSD should be in "another, higher, NCAA division".

The results of question 4 show that not only was there an 85.0 percent of agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that

GRAPH 3:

Interview Question #4: Has the athletic department (or your team) ever been judged by others to be better than other Division III departments (or teams)?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Yes
- ** (B) One of top teams in country
- (C) Much better
- (D) Very strong
- (E) Really good
- (F) Proof comes with success
- (G) UCSD should be another division

**Athletic Director's Response

Percent of Agreement= .850

Total number of responses in agreement= 34 of 40

almost one-half (46 percent) either used her exact words and/or meaning and placed UCSD in the position of being one of the top Division III teams in the country. Judged by informed observers both outside and inside the UCSD athletic department the program can be characterized as doing substantially better than other Division III programs. Visually, agreement is quite evident by the size of bars A and B in relation to others in the graph.

Interview Question 5A & B: What is the budget for the athletic department (or your team)? Based on your knowledge do you feel that it is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III athletic departments (or teams)?

Interview Question 7: How would you compare the athletic facilities at UCSD with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average? These questions are related to Vaill's (1984) fifth criterion for high performance systems: They are doing whatever they do with significantly fewer resources than it is assumed are needed to do what they do (p.86).

The Athletic Director stated, when answering questions 5A and B, that it is her understanding based on conversations with other athletic directors that other Division III athletic programs are better funded than UCSD is for theirs. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Twenty-six of the forty people

interviewed, or 65.0 percent, held similar views that UCSD was "not funded as well" as other Division III institutions. Although the answers to this question did not receive the 70 percent overall agreement they did, however, receive a 70 percent agreement among the coaches. If in fact, you throw out the response of the coach that stated, "I can't remember", there was an 80 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the coaches. Because of the administrative nature of their job, the coaches not the athletes are usually directly involved in the formal budget process. The athletes were making their judgement based on what they were using seemingly unaware of where the equipment came from. As indicated by many of the interviewees, many of the teams raised money in order to provide the necessary equipment for their teams thereby influencing what equipment was available for team use. Thus, it seems, in response to this question, many of the athletes could not separate the university provided equipment and the equipment bought with outside funds. The coaches, however, were fully aware of the difference because of the effort it took on their part to get the additional funds to purchase this needed equipment. Therefore, the researcher decided to include this response because of the 70 percent agreement between the coaches and the Athletic Director.

Graph 4 shows how congruent the responses were for questions 5A and B. The responses ranged from "others are funded better" to "outside support comes from companies."

Graph 4:

Interview Question #5A & B: What is the budget for the athletic department (or your team)? Based on your knowledge do you feel that it's above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III athletic departments (or teams)?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

** (A) Others funded better
 (B) Below average
 (C) Really low
 (D) Outside support, companies

** Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .650
 Total number of responses in agreement= 26 of 40
 Percent of agreement for coaches= .700

The Athletic Director (4 percent) stated that other Division IIIs were "funded better". Twenty-three responses (85 percent) thought that UCSD was funded "below average" in comparison to other Division III institutions. Two (7 percent) of the subjects stated that their budget was really low". One of those interviewed (4 percent) stated that they "received their funding from outside companies".

The results of question 5A and 5B show that the UCSD Athletic Director and her coaches agree that they are being funded at a level that is below average for Division III institutions and therefore spending less money than their competition. Visually, this agreement becomes quite evident by the size of bar B that represents the below average response in graph 4.

In response to question 7, the Athletic Director stated that some of UCSD's facilities are substandard when compared to other Division III institutions and overall could be characterized as "average to below average". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty of the forty people interviewed, or 75.0 percent, agreed with her that UCSD had facilities that were either below average or average.

Graph 5 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from considering UCSD having "extremely below average" facilities to their facilities being "average". Two of the subjects (7 percent) agreed that their facilities were "extremely below average".

GRAPH 5:

Interview Question #7: How would you compare the athletic facilities at UCSD with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Extremely below average
 (B) Below average
 (C) No adequate facilities
 *(D) Average to below average
 (E) Far below average
 (F) Average

**Athletic Director's response

Percent of agreement= .750

Total number of responses in agreement= 30 of 40

Thirteen responses (42 percent) thought that UCSD was "below average". Four (13 percent) of the subjects stated that there were "no adequate facilities" for their teams. The Athletic Director (3 percent) stated that the facilities were "average to below average" when compared to other Division III institutions. Another subject interviewed (3 percent) thought the facilities were "below par". Ten of those interviewed (32 percent) stated that the facilities were "average".

The results of question 7 shows that although there was a 75.0 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed, the answers fell into groups of responses: below average or average. Visually this grouping of responses becomes quite evident by the size of bars B and F in graph 5. As stated previously, 32 percent characterized the facilities as being average. However, 68 percent of those who gave congruent responses, thought the facilities were below average.

Interview Question 10C: Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole? This question is related to Valli's (1984) seventh criterion for high performance systems: They are perceived to fulfill at a high level the ideas of the culture within which they exist (p.86).

The Athletic Director agreed that UCSD program reflected its own culture. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant

word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-three of the forty people interviewed, or 82.5 percent, also agreed with her that the UCSD athletic department reflected its own culture.

Graph 6 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from the department "definitely" reflecting its own culture to "I guess it does". Two of the subjects (6 percent) agreed that it "definitely did". Eighteen responses (53 percent), including the Athletic Director, thought that, "yes", the department reflected its own culture. Seven (21 percent) of the subjects stated that they "thought it did". Two of those interviewed (6 percent) characterized the UCSD athletic department as being "different". Three (9 percent) stated that it "probably did". One (2.5 percent) thought that "in a way" UCSD reflected its own culture while another subject (2.5 percent) "guessed it did".

The results of question 10C show that not only was there an 82.5 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that over one-half (53 percent) used the Athletic Director's exact words in agreeing that UCSD's athletic department better reflects its own culture. The athletic department is being viewed as having their own culture by a large percentage of people within the department thereby indicating that it fulfills a high level of ideas within the culture. Visually this is seen in graph 6.

GRAPH 6:

Interview Question #10C: Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Definitely
 *(B) Yes
 (C) I think so
 (D) Its different
 (E) Probably
 (F) In a way
 (G) I guess

*(Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .825
 Total number of responses in agreement= 33 of 40

Interview Question 11A: What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of UCSD? This question is related to Vaill's (1984) first characteristic for high performance systems: HPSs are clear on their broad purposes and on nearer term objectives for fulfilling these purposes (p.86).

The Athletic Director agreed that the UCSD athletic department's purpose is to provide positive opportunities and generate spirit within the university. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty of the forty people interviewed, or 75.0 percent, agreed that the purpose of the program was to "provide opportunity", in some form, and "to get people involved" in order to increase spirit.

Graph 7 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from suggesting that the athletic department "provides another way to excell" to it provides for mass "participation". Four of the subjects (13 percent) agreed that the UCSD athletic department "provides another way to excell" within a university that prides itself on excellence. Five responses (16 percent), including that of the Athletic Director, indicated that the department provided "positive opportunities and generated spirit". Eight (26 percent) of the subjects stated that the purpose was to "provide an opportunity to compete". Five subjects (16 percent) thought it was to "promote sports". Five of those interviewed (16 percent) thought that the

GRAPH #7:

Interview Question #11A: What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of UCSD?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Provide another way to excell
- ** (B) Positive opportunities & generate spirit
- (C) Opportunity to compete
- (D) Promote sports
- (E) Offering something outside of academics
- (F) To get people involved
- (G) Provide for mass participation

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .750
 Total number of responses in agreement= 30 of 40

athletic program could offer "something outside of academics" to the student/athletes. Two subjects (6.5 percent) stated the purpose is to "get people involved" while two others (6.5 percent) thought the department was there to "provide for mass participation" of student/athletes.

The results of question 11A show that there was an 75.0 percent of agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed that there were two main purposes for the athletic department. The number of responses did not fall equally between the two group of responses. Of those who answered in agreement, twenty-two or 71 percent stated that the athletic department provided "opportunities to compete" while nine responses or 29 percent thought that the main purpose was "to promote spirit". It could be stated that the people who make up the UCSD's athletic department are clear about the two main purposes of the athletic department. Their opinions, however, were varied as to what objectives were necessary in order to achieve these purposes. (See the Appendix F for the Response Analysis Form for question 11B: What objectives do you see as important to fulfilling these purposes?) Six of the forty people interviewed, or 15.0 percent, agreed with the Athletic Director that the objectives were to "provide a quality experience" and to "generate and supply information". The other 85.0 percent had differing opinions. Although these differing opinions occurred in the stated objectives by each subject, when it came to whether

or not the coaches were committed to these objectives the opinions were not as varied. In the responses given to question 12B that is discussed in the next section, it is agreed by 75.5 percent of those interviewed that the coaches were committed to the purposes and objectives as stated by the interviewees during the interview. Therefore, although there was not consensus among the subjects as to what were the exact objectives necessary to fulfill the agreed upon purposes, it was clear to thirty-one of those interviewed that they were all committed to the goals and purposes of the athletic department.

Interview Question 6A: As a department is there (or As a coach is there or Does your coach make) a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes?

Interview Question 6B: Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent represented by the student/athletes in the athletic department (or on your team) is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III departments (or teams).

Interview Question 12A: Do you feel that the UCSD athletic team coaches (or you as a coach or your coach) give extra effort beyond what is expected of them (or you or him/her)?

Interview Question 12B: How committed do you feel the coaches are (or you are or your coach is) to your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department?

Interview Question 12C: How would you describe the motivation of the coaches? (coaches only: How motivated are you?) These questions are all related to Vaill's (1984) second characteristic for high performance systems: Commitment to these purposes is never perfunctory although it is often expressed laconically. Motivation is usually conceived as high (p.86).

The Athletic Director said, in responding to Question 6A, that generally, "yes, the UCSD coaches make a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-two of the forty people interviewed, or 80.0 percent, agreed that there was a definite recruiting effort made.

Graph 8 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from reporting that there was a "very concentrated effort" by some of the coaches to some of the coaches were "semi-active" in the recruiting process. Two of the subjects (6 percent) agreed that there was a "very concentrated effort" to recruit. Two responses (6 percent) thought that the coaches "definitely did recruit". Twenty-four (73 percent) of the subjects, including the Athletic Director, stated that "yes, the coaches recruited". Four of those interviewed (12 percent) thought that there was a "less concentrated or limited effort" made to recruit while one stated (3 percent) that the coaches were "semi-active" in recruiting.

GRAPH 8

Interview Question #6A: As a department is there (or As a coach is there or Does your coach make) a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Very Concentrated
- (B) Definitely does
- ** (C) Yes
- (D) Limited, less concentrated
- (E) Semi-active

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .800
 Total number of responses in agreement= 32 of 40

The results of question 6A show that not only was there an 80.0 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that almost three-quarters (73 percent) used her exact word. Visually this agreement can be seen by comparing the size of bar three in relationship to the others in graph 8.

Graph 9 shows how congruent the responses actually were to question 6B. The two responses given ranged from "above average" to "higher". Thirty-six, including the Athletic Director, agreed that the talent represented by the student/athletes was "above average". One of those interviewed (3 percent) thought it was "higher". These responses show that not only was there a 90.0 percent of agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that 97 percent used her exact words to describe the represented talent. Visually this agreement becomes even more apparent when viewing the results shown in graph 9.

The Athletic Director agreed in responding to question 12A that the coaches in the athletic program were making a "fairly strong commitment" by giving extra effort to the program inspite of the fact that almost all of them are part-time and must support themselves with other positions outside the university. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-four of the forty people interviewed, or 85.0 percent, agreed that the coaches were giving extra effort beyond what was expected of

GRAPH 9

Interview Question #6B: Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent represented by the student/athletes in the athletic department (or on your team) is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III departments (or teams)?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

** (A) Above average
(B) Higher

**Athletic Director's response
Percent of agreement= .900
Total number of responses in agreement= 36 of 40

GRAPH 10:

Interview Question #12A: Do you feel that the UCSD athletic team coaches (or you as a coach or your coach) give extra effort beyond what is expected of them (or you or him/her)?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

**(A) Making a fairly strong commitment
 (B) Definitely/absolutely
 (C) Yes
 (D) I think so
 (E) To a degree

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .850
 Total number of responses in agreement= 34 of 40

them.

Graph 10 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from the coaches were making a "fairly strong commitment" to stating that to "a degree" the coaches were giving extra effort. The Athletic Director (3 percent) stated that they were "making a fairly strong commitment". Eight of the subjects (23 percent) agreed that the coaches were "definitely and/or absolutely" giving extra effort. Twenty-one (60 percent) stated that, "yes," extra effort was being given. Four of those interviewed (11 percent) responded, "I think so;" while one subject (3 percent) said that to "a degree" the coaches were giving extra effort.

The results of question 12A show that although not one of the forty coaches and athletes interviewed used the Athletic Directors exact words in responding to the question there was an 85.0 percent agreement that the coaches were in fact giving extra effort. Visually agreement becomes quite apparent when viewing bar C in graph 10.

In responding to question 12B, the Athletic Director stated that UCSD coaches were committed to the previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty of the forty people interviewed, or 75.0 percent, agreed with the Athletic Director that the coaches were committed the goals and purposes of the athletic department.

GRAPH 11:

Interview Question #12B: How committed do you feel the coaches are (or you are or your coach is) to your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Totally committed
- (B) Very committed
- ** (C) Committed
- (D) Definitely
- (E) Yes
- (F) I'm committed
- (G) Job depends on it

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .750
 Total number of responses in agreement= 30 of 40

Graph 11 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from agreeing that the UCSD coaches were "totally committed" to departmental goals and purposes to "their job depends on being committed" to the broad purposes and goals of the department. Four of the subjects (13 percent) agreed that the coaches were "totally committed". Eight responses (26 percent) thought that UCSD coaches were "very committed". Ten (32 percent) of the subjects, including the Athletic Director, stated that the coaches were "committed" to the goals and purposes of the athletic department. One of those interviewed (3 percent) thought that they were "definitely committed". Five subjects (16 percent) personalized the response by stating that "I'm committed". One person (3 percent) thought that they had better be committed because "their job depended upon it".

The results of question 12B show that not only was there an 75.0 percent of agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed but that almost one-third (32 percent) used her exact words in describing the coaches commitment. If, though, the word committed is considered, regardless whether it is the entire response or a part of a response, twenty-two people (73 percent) agree with the Athletic Director. Visually this agreement is shown in bars A, B, and C in graph 11.

The Athletic Director stated in question 12C that the coaches for the most part were "very motivated". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that

gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty-three of the forty people interviewed, or 82.5 percent, agreed with her that the coaches were motivated.

Graph 12 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from the coaches were "extremely motivated" to they are "highly motivated". Two of the subjects (6 percent) agreed that they were "extremely motivated". Eighteen responses (53 percent), including the Athletic Director, though the coaches were "very motivated". Eleven (32 percent) of the subjects stated that they were "motivated". One of those interviewed (3 percent) characterized the motivation as being "very high". Two (6 percent) thought the coaches were "highly motivated".

The results of question 12C show that although only eighteen or 53 percent used the Athletic Director's exact words in their response, if just the word motivation is used as a guide, thirty-one (or 94 percent) of those responding were in agreement with her. Visually this agreement is seen by the number of bars that show the word motivation as part of the subject's response. (See bars A, B, and C of graph 12.)

In summary, the results of questions 6A and 6B show a commitment on the part of the coaches to recruit and find the best possible athletes. The coaches indicated that they were motivated to find the best athletes so that they could win. This is not something that appears to them to be a routine activity. Their success in this endeavor is shown by the 97 percent agreement response that shows that the

GRAPH 12:

Interview Question #12C: How would you describe the motivation of the coaches? (coaches only: How motivated are you?)

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

(A) Extremely motivated
 **(B) Very motivated
 (C) Motivated
 (D) Very high
 (E) Highly

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .825
 Total number of responses in agreement= 33 of 40

student/athletes on UCSD's teams represent above average talent when compared to other Division III teams. The responses to question 12B indicate that 76.0 percent of those interviewed felt that there was a definite commitment on the coaches part to the stated purposes and objectives of the athletic department. The use of such terms as totally, very, and definitely by the interviewees, when they were describing the commitment, indicates that the commitment they were describing was not perfunctory on the coaches part. Questions 12A and 12C address the contention that Vaill makes, in his characteristic two, that the motivation as usually conceived is always high. In question 12A, 85.0 percent of those interviewed agree that that the coaches give extra effort beyond what is expected of them. Twenty-three of those who expressed agreement (or 68 percent) stated, in response to question 12C, that the coaches were either extremely, very, or highly motivated. Therefore, it can be said that the people in the UCSD athletic department are committed to the purposes of their program and this commitment should not be seen as being routine. Additionally, the members seem to see the motivation within the department as being high.

Interview Question 14A: How often do you meet with your direct supervisor (or the individual whose responsibilities include the athletic department)? (Omit this question for team members.)

Interview Question 14B: How much autonomy do you have in your position?...Are you often reviewed? (Omit this question for team members.)

Interview Question 14C: As a department (or coach), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either through formal or informal contacts? (Omit this question for the team members.) These questions are related to Vaill's (1984) sixth characteristic for high performance systems: HPS are clearly bounded from their environments, and a considerable amount of energy, particularly on the part of leaders, is usually devoted to maintaining these boundaries (p.86).

The Athletic Director stated that she has had the same supervisor for the last eleven years and that it was only this year that they are scheduled to meet on a regular basis. However, she indicated that during these monthly meetings most of the discussion often centers on the physical education department rather than on the athletic department. As for meeting anyone higher up in the administrative structure, the Athletic Director stated that she must initiate the meetings. (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Only one of the ten coaches interviewed, or 10.0 percent agreed with her that they don't meet "often enough" or they meet "rarely" with their direct supervisor.

Graph 13 shows the nine responses of the coaches that did not agree with the Athletic Director's response. The

GRAPH 13:

Interview Question #14A: How often do you meet with your direct supervisor (or the individual whose responsibilities include the athletic department)? (Omit this question for team members.)

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

(A) Once a month
 (B) Every two weeks
 (C) Weekly

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .100
 Total number of responses in agreement= 1 of 10

responses ranged from stating that they meet with the athletic director "at least once a month" to meeting with her "weekly". Three of the subjects (33.3 percent) agreed that they meet "at least once a month". Three subjects (33.3 percent) responded that they met "every two weeks". Three (33.3 percent) of the coaches stated they met with the Athletic Director weekly.

The results of question 14A showed a marked disagreement between the response the Athletic Director gave and the statements that the coaches made. These disparities, however, reinforce the suggestion by Vaill that HPS are clearly bounded from their environment. The limited contact that the Athletic Director has with other administrators outside the department could account for the lack of communication and awareness by the outside administrators. This, then, would help to more clearly define the boundaries of the athletic department. In comparison, graph 13 shows that, within the department, there is a clear attempt to maintain open channels of communication. This is accomplished by the Athletic Director and the coaches meeting often. These frequent meetings are used to disseminate departmental information and exchange personal opinions.

The Athletic Director stated, in responding to question 14B, that she had "a lot of autonomy" in leading her department. She also stated that she is reviewed "once a year and that this evaluation was conducted by the physical education faculty and chair as opposed to an administrative

GRAPH 14:

Interview Question #14B: How much autonomy do you have in your position?... Are you often reviewed? (Omit this question for the team members.)

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) Total control, annual review
 (B) Very much, annual review
 **(C) A lot, annual review
 (D) Quite a bit, annual review

**Athletic Director's response

Percent of agreement= 1.000

Total number of responses in agreement= 10 of 10

review". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Ten of the ten coaches interviewed, or 100 percent, agreed with her that they had "a lot of autonomy" in their position and in running their own program. All of the coaches stated that they are formally reviewed on an annual basis.

Graph 14 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from stating that they had "total control" and were reviewed "annually" to coaches feeling that they had "quite a bit of control" and were reviewed "annually". Four of the coaches (36.5 percent) agreed that they had "total control" of their programs and were reviewed "annually". One (9 percent) coach thought he/she had "very much" autonomy while being reviewed "annually". Four (36.5 percent) of the subjects stated that they had "a lot" of autonomy and were reviewed "annually" while two (18 percent) of the coaches characterizing themselves as having "quite a bit" of autonomy and while being reviewed "annually".

The results of question 14B show that there was a 100.0 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the coaches that all had autonomy over their own portion of the athletic program. However, this autonomy would further separate the athletic teams and the department from the surrounding university environment because of the lack of supervision and interest shown by the administrators outside of the athletic department.

In answering question 14C, the Athletic Director stated that the UCSD athletic department had the most contact with the departments under "student affairs" rather than with any of the "academic departments". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Ten of the ten coaches interviewed, or 100.0 percent, agreed with her that the athletic department had almost no interactions with any of the academic departments.

Graph 15 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from stating that there was "no relationship" with the academic departments to which non-academic department they did have a relationship with. Two of the coaches (18 percent) stated that, "no", they did not have a relationship with any academic department. One (9 percent) subject indicated that in fact they were "not welcome by the academic area". Two responses (18 percent) centered on the physical education department. These coaches felt that the only reason why they had a relationship with this department was because they "taught some classes" in the physical education department. One (9 percent) coach stated that the relationship was "not extensive". Four of those interviewed (37 percent) commented that the relationship involved the "housing and maintenance departments", while the Athletic Director (9 percent) thought that the main relationship occurred between the "athletic department and student affairs departments".

In summary, the responses of question 14C reinforces

GRAPH 15:

Interview Question #14C: As a department (or coach), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either through formal or informal contacts? (Omit this question for the team members.)

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- (A) No
 (B) Not welcome by academics
 (C) P.E. dept./no other academics
 (D) Not extensive
 (E) Maintenance and/or housing
 **(F) Student Affairs

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= 1.000
 Total number of responses in agreement= 10 of 10

the results achieved by questions 14A and 14B, that is, that a HPS is clearly bounded from their environment. In question 14A the responses suggesting the lack of interdepartmental and intersupervisory communication help to increase the nonpermeability of the interorganizational boundary of the athletic department. In response to question 14B, the coaches and athletic director all stressed the amount of autonomy they had in their jobs. In the Athletic Director's case, the autonomy she experienced comes from the lack of supervision she indicated in responding to question 14A; as well as the lack of acknowledgement, by the administrators outside the department, of what she does as the administrator of the athletic department. The Athletic Director reinforced her statement by indicating that her annual evaluation did not even warrant administrative review of the job she did as athletic director. In comparison, the coaches stated that they liked the autonomy they were given because it allowed them to do their job in the manner that they saw fit. Thus, the coaches saw the autonomy of their job as being something positive and necessary in order for them to achieve success in their positions. Finally, the responses given to question 14C show which departments, within the university, the athletic department has any daily relationship with. Most of the departments named, by those interviewed, fell into the support category rather than into an academic category. Therefore the responses given to questions 14A, 14B, and 14C, support Vaill's characteristic concerning a HPS being clearly bounded from their

environment. Whether or not the leaders devoted a considerable amount of energy to maintaining these boundaries could not be ascertained by the results of this research.

Interview Question 15A: How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives the athletic department; for example, the academic area? This question is related to Vaill's (1984) seventh characteristic for high performance systems: Proposition (6) leads to another consistent finding, that is that HPSS are often seen as a "problem" by entities in their environment, even entities which have a great deal of power over them.

The Athletic Director stated that the academic departments are into their "own world and for the most part are unaware of the athletic department". (Appendix F has the Response Analysis Form for this question that gives the significant word response for each interviewee.) Thirty of the forty people interviewed, or 75.0 percent, agreed with her that the rest of the university was not really aware of what the department does or even how many athletic teams it has.

Graph 16 shows how congruent the responses actually were. The responses ranged from the rest of the university being "unaware" of the department to they think we are a "thorn in their side". Seven of the subjects (22.5 percent), including the Athletic Director, said that the rest of the institution was either "unaware" of the

GRAPH 16:

Interview Question 15A: How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives the athletic department; for example, the academic area?

NUMBER OF RESPONSES

- **(A) Unaware/nonexistent of us
 (B) Doesn't care
 (C) Don't know/ignorant
 (D) Not a major focus
 (E) Look at sports in an academic nature
 (F) Thorn in side

**Athletic Director's response
 Percent of agreement= .750
 Total number of responses in agreement= 30 of 40

department or thought of the athletic department as being "nonexistent". Seven of those who responded (22.5 percent), thought that as an institution UCSD didn't "really care". Eleven (35 percent) of the subjects stated that the rest of the university "did not know" and were "ignorant" about the athletic department. Three of those interviewed (10 percent) agreed that athletics was "not a major focus" at UCSD. One person (3.5 percent) observed that at UCSD sports is looked upon in an "academic nature". Two subjects (6.5 percent) said that the rest of the university thought that athletics was a "thorn in their side".

The results of question 15A show that there was a 75.0 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed that the rest of the university was basically unaware of the athletic department and its activities. Although there was a consensus among those that responded that the institution was unaware of them, only two subjects thought that the athletic department was a thorn in the side of the academic departments. Although this minority agreed with Vaill's contention of a HPS often being seen as a problem by entities within their environment, most of the people interviewed indicated that the athletic department could not be seen as a problem by the university because most of people in the academic area are unaware of the department's existence.

Summary: This chapter has presented the results of the data analyses. The chapter began with a review of the

purposes for conducting this case study and a brief explanation about the data collection and why certain responses were chosen to be analyzed. Research questions one and two were then presented in order to see whether or not the data collected would either prove or disprove these hypotheses.

Of the thirty-four interview questions asked by the researcher, the responses to eighteen of the questions attained at least a seventy percent agreement rate between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed. The responses to seventeen of the questions agree with Vaill's stated criteria (one, three, four, five, seven) and characteristics (one, two, and six) concerning high performing systems. However, one question did achieve the necessary seventy percent agreement rate but did not support Vaill's seventh characteristics- HPSs are often seen as a "problem" by entities in their environment, even entities which have a great deal of power over them (1982). The subjects stated that the athletic department was not seen as a problem by the rest of the university.

Appendix G has a list of the sixteen questions not used in the analysis of data because they did not achieve a 70 percent agreement between the Athletic Director and the forty coaches and athletes interviewed. However, some of these questions could be said to support the criteria and characteristic of high performance systems if they were to be analyzed in different ways:

1. Questions 10B, 13D, and 15B had an agreement response rate of 60 percent or more (60%, 65%, and 67.5%). Respectively, they needed four people, two people, and one more person to answer in agreement in order to achieve the 70 percent level. The responses to these questions were influenced by two coaches and the six athletes that consistently disagreed with the responses given by the Athletic Director. Interestingly all these subjects were part of two of the more unsuccessful UCSD teams.

2. Question 13C had only a 12.5 percent agreement between the responses of the Athletic Director and those interviewed. But this percentage did not reflect the congruence that did occur. The Athletic Director responded "that she would like more commitment" to the task of the athletic department from the individual above her in the hierarchy. However, 88.5 percent of the coaches and athletes disagreed with her because they felt that the individual above them in the hierarchy was "committed" to the task. The individual they were talking about was the Athletic Director. Although this question did not achieve the initial necessary agreement percentage it did show a strong commitment by the Athletic Director to the task of the athletic department.

3. In answering question 8, 45 percent of those interviewed agreed with the Athletic Director that the UCSD teams' uniforms, equipment, and travel schedules were average. However, if you look just at the responses of the ten coaches, 70 percent, of them, thought that these items

were below average. As stated previously, coaches are usually more aware of what the school provides and what they purchase than the athletes. Athletes are usually unaware of what was purchased by whom. Based on this 70 percent response rate it could be said that UCSD athletic teams were using fewer resources than it is assumed they need when comparing them with other Division III teams.

4. Question 9A received a 2.5 percent of congruence. Although only one subject agreed with the Athletic Director, twenty-six others, or 65 percent, agreed that other teams respected UCSD and thought that UCSD fielded strong teams. These responses suggested that UCSD was considered an exemplar in Division III and an inspiration to others.

5. Question 2 was worded in such a way that an agreement percentage could not be calculated. Therefore, the information for this question was recorded in Appendix D. This information showed that UCSD was performing excellently against a known external standard.

Thus, in analyzing these seven questions in different ways it could be said that they support Vaill's (1982) criteria and characteristics of high performance systems. Thus, actually only nine of the thirtyfour questions asked during the interviews did not support Vaill's suggested criteria and characteristics.

Chapter V reviews the case study and examines these results. Research questions three and four will also be discussed because answers to these questions are not based on hard data but rather inferences and conclusions drawn

from the data. From this examination, conclusions are made and a new interpretation of higher education organizational theory will be presented. Chapter V ends with recommendations for future studies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V is divided into seven sections. The first section examines and summarizes the purposes of this case study. The second section addresses conclusions drawn regarding research questions one and two. The third and fourth sections discuss research questions three and four respectively. Hypotheses three and four were not examined in Chapter IV because the conclusions drawn concerning these questions are based on information gathered that did not relate to the questions asked during the interview. Rather the conclusions are suggested by inferences and incidental data given by the forty-one subjects interviewed. The fifth section discusses the implications of the findings on present theory concerning higher education organizations. Section six identifies recommendations for future research, and the last section offers a summary of the research.

SUMMARY OF THE PURPOSES OF THE CASE STUDY

One of the purposes of this case study was to look beyond the descriptive theories of organized anarchy and loose coupling and find a possible explanation of how excellent performance can occur in a higher education

organization described as anarchic and loosely coupled. This case study examined the University of California, San Diego's (UCSD) athletic department which year after year produces excellence despite the so-called anarchic quality of higher education organizations.

A second purpose of this study was to demonstrate empirically that an example of Vaill's high performance system can exist within the university-higher education organization. Although this model is not presently used to describe the university and could therefore be considered a competing way of looking at the organization and how it performs, it is hoped that by finding an empirical example of this model within the university its organizational structure will be given greater clarity of understanding.

CONCLUSIONS: RESEARCH QUESTIONS 1 AND 2

Research Question #1: Can an athletic department be found, within the university-higher education organization, which can be characterized as a high performance system?

Research Question #2: If so, what makes it a high performance system?

The questions asked the Athletic Director, coaches, and athletes of the UCSD athletic department during the interviews were directly related to Vaill's (1984) suggested criteria and characteristics of high performance systems.

Table 1 represents the findings of the research. It shows which questions/responses reflected Vaill's stated

criteria and characteristics of high performing systems. Out of the thirty-three questions asked during the interview, sixteen responses supported his criteria and characteristics. Five of the criteria and three of the characteristics were identified as existing within the UCSD athletic department.

It is Vaill's (1984) contention that a system can be defined as high performing which meets only one of his stated criteria and characteristics (p.86). Therefore, it is the conclusion of this research that, using Vaill's definition, the UCSD athletic department can be defined as a high performance system because eight criteria and characteristics were identified.

CONCLUSIONS: RESEARCH QUESTION 3

Research Question #3: If an athletic department is found to have characteristics of high performance systems, how did it achieve this level of excellence?

Educational institutions in the United States do not exist in a static world but in an environment that is influenced and framed by the events outside those organizations. The modern environment, because of the complexity of modern society, is in a continuous state of flux. Therefore, the relationship between the school and the environment must also be constantly redefined in order to keep up with this modern complexity (Abbot, 1975, p.176).

...education is one of the major institutions in American society today. As such, education is firmly

TABLE 1

VAILL'S CRITERIA:	RESEARCH QUESTION	% AGREEMENT
1.Performing excellently against external standard.	1.How compare your performance?	87.5%
3.Performing excellently relative to earlier time.	3A&B.How compare the depart- ment/team when you first arrived?	97.5%
4.Judged substantially better than compar- ative systems.	4.Judged by others to be better?	85.0%
5.Using significantly fewer resources.	5A.Budget? B.Above aver., aver., below aver.?	65.0%
	7.Athletic facilities: above aver., aver., below aver.?	75.0%
7.Fulfill a high level of ideas of culture.	10C.Athletic department reflects own culture?	82.5%
CHARACTERISTICS:		
1.Clear on broad purposes	11A.Purposes?	70.0%
2.Commitment to purposes never perfunctory.	6A.Coaches make effort to recruit?	80.0%
	6B.Talent:above aver.,aver., below aver.?	90.0%
	12A.Coaches extra effort?	85.0%
	12B.Coaches commitment?	75.0%
	12C.Motivation coaches?	82.5%
6.HPS are bounded from their environment.	14A.Meet with supervisor?	10.0%
	14B.Autonomy-reviewed?	100.0%
	14C.Interactions with other departments?	100.0%
	15A.Rest of university perceives ath.dept.?	75.0%

established within the basic fiber of our society and culture. Therefore, education can be considered and instrument of cultural needs allowing society to get the type of education it wants (Goodman, 1962, p.26; Ross, 1958, p.9).

In the area of athletics, society has historically given colleges and universities a very clear message about what it expects from their intercollegiate programs. It has been suggested by Brubacher and Rudy (1976) that the year 1880 be used as a dividing line between the earlier informal period and the rise of big-time athletics in most of the institutions of higher learning in this country. From this date onward coaches tended to become full-time employees of the university and were incorporated into the faculty structure. Athletes were offered grants-in-aid or other financial incentives to compete for an institution. No longer were athletic programs run or financed primarily by student associations but rather were funded, at least in part, by institutional or state tax funds. This new situation caused financial demands on athletic programs to rapidly increase, bringing wealthy alumni, a primary source of new financing, into a very influential position within some athletic programs. As more and more spectators were attracted to athletic contests, contractual and obligatory schedules became pro forma in order to control and generate new funds. College presidents also began to be influenced by the increased popularity of their intercollegiate teams. From the very beginning, the general belief of many of the

presidents was that "an important factor in the drawing power of any American institution of learning was the prowess of its athletic teams" (p.132).

The American emphasis on winning games for their financial or publicity value, the mass enthusiasm of college spirit, stimulated by bands and cheer leaders, the high degree of professional organization and specialization involved in the really "big-time" athletic contests, were in many ways unique in the world (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976, p.133).

Learning within American colleges and universities became organized into both informal education, such as the athletic programs, and into the formal instruction of the academic courses of study. Within this unique arrangement can be seen the powerful influence of American culture upon the patterns of higher education (Brubacher & Rudy, 1976, p.410). Thus, the increased interest and importance placed upon intercollegiate athletics by American society came to be reflected within the formal structure of collegiate organization.

This idea of external forces changing the internal structure of an organization has also been proposed by many organizational theorists. Baldrige (1977) states that many theorists have decided that one of the prime reasons for large scale change in organizations comes from external pressures (p.124). Scott (1983) proposes that organizations located in a complex and uncertain environment will exhibit more complex internal structures due to external forces

(p.172). Weick (1974) goes a step further and feels that organizations "are locked into circuits that extend beyond artificial boundaries. Environmental events cycle back inside and rearrange...the organization..." (p.358). Finally, Jackson and Morgan state that a powerful determinant on designing internal structure is the external environment (p.260). All these theorists, then, identify external environmental forces as a prime cause for internal structural change thus reinforcing what Brubacher and Rudy stated about the effect of American culture on the structure of collegiate athletics.

Athletics, in comparison to other areas within the university, seems to bring strong external environmental forces to bear upon the university and its structure. UCSD has not been exempt from these pressures. As coach #8 states, in the 1960's the UCSD students voted out football as reflection of their discontent with the establishment and what it stood for in American culture. In athletics football is the very essence of the establishment. This elimination of football as an entity on the campus of UCSD propelled the athletic program back into the realm of intramurals and play days. Slowly, the program was brought back from the intramural emphasis to a national competitive Division III athletic program. Graph 2 in Chapter 4 illustrates how the subjects interviewed viewed this change: 97.5 percent agreed with the athletic director that the program had gone from a sports club atmosphere to a national caliber Division III program.

Perhaps the cause of this change in philosophy at UCSD is that the sports interests within the university are externally linked to the market and political forces in the larger society (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, 1986, p.97). Various subjects interviewed gave examples of these forces that are presently being brought to bear on UCSD to change into an even more competitive program. Athletes #7B and #8A didn't feel that UCSD was keeping up with what the students want. What do the students want? It seems that they want to move UCSD from Division III to Division I or II. (See Appendix E which contains a significant article from the school newspaper that reflects this new philosophical change.) Fifteen of the forty subjects interviewed gave indication where this new perception could have possibly come from. They used the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), which is a Division I institution, as an example of the type of program that UCSD should have and the type of program that they wanted to be a part of. As Baldrige (1971) states:

Other education institutions form one of the most important elements in the task environment for any university...An institution's role is often shaped by its relation to others in its reference field, a field that varies greatly for different institutions (p.128). UCLA is in UCSD students' reference field. Thus, the apparent desire to move UCSD out of Division III seems related to other educational organizations and their views of athletics. This area of organizational-environmental

relationships is perhaps the least developed area in the study of organizations (Carlson, 1975, p.187). Because of these responses given during the interview process a causal relationship between change within the UCSD athletic department and the environment outside is suggested. However, if this relationship could be more clearly established, a more definitive answer might be found as to why the UCSD athletic department did reach this level of excellence.

Another possible clue as to how UCSD reached such excellence could be found in Aldrich and Pfeffer's (1976) discussion on the societal establishment of perception within a subpopulation of an organization. It is their contention that hiring personnel from the same industry promotes within an organization a common frame of reference, a shared perception (p.95). The coaches of UCSD definitely have been hired from the same "industry" and have a "common frame of reference". All the coaches were hired because of their experience within the same industry- intercollegiate athletics. Not only did all the coaches have competitive intercollegiate experience but some of them competed at professional levels as well. Therefore they came to UCSD with a perception of what athletics was like, what it was supposed to be, and how to achieve the best results. They seemed to have what Aldrich and Pfeffer state as homogenized perceptions (p.95). These congruent perceptions not only influence the unity of the athletic program at UCSD but affect the future thrust of the athletic department. Since

all of the coaches either played at the Division I or Division II level, they came into the UCSD athletic program with a high level of expectation for excellence in athletic performance because of the different emphasis on high levels of performance inherent in Division I and II programs in relationship to a Division III program.

Finally, Abbott (1975) discusses another aspect of organizations that are influenced by external factors--levels of aspiration. He states that the most important source of levels of aspiration within an organization is past performance.

When other factors are held constant, organizations tend over time to adjust their aspirations for performance to coincide with past performance (p.180).

If Abbott's contention is correct, the past level of performance would have influenced the UCSD athletic department to maintain its past low level of performance. However, this is not the case. In responding to interview question 3A, ninety-seven and a half percent of those interviewed agreed that they were performing better in relationship to their performance in an earlier point of time. However, once they achieved this high level of performance, Abbott's theory of adjusting present aspirations for performance to coincide with past performance makes more sense in explaining how they sustain their present level of excellence.

Perhaps UCSD's increase in performance excellence can better be explained by what Abbott feels is the second

source of levels of aspiration, the comparison the organization makes with other organizations.

In general organizations tend to adjust their levels of aspiration to coincide with the performance achieved by other organizations with which they compare themselves (p.180).

There has been a substantial improvement in the UCSD performance level when compared to that of other Division III schools. Eighty-five percent of the responses given to question 4A of the interview questions agreed that the athletic teams at UCSD were performing better than other Division III programs. This improvement could be linked to the stress on winning that is inherent in any athletic contest. It could also be said that UCSD adjusted its level of aspiration to coincide with the performance achieved by other Division III organizations. The only question that does not seem to be answered in discussing Abbott's theory on level of aspiration within an organization is when does one of these factors becomes dominant over the other factor, thus influencing a change in organizational performance rather than a continuation in organizational performance?

In responding to research question three, there seems to be many possible answers as to how UCSD, as a high performance system, achieved its level of excellence. From the discussion of the effect of American society and culture on the establishment of athletics as an integral part of the university to the societal establishment of perception within a subpopulation of an organization and levels of

aspiration within an organization, it is obvious that the environment outside American universities influence the very structure and subject matter taught within these institutions. It would be safe to say, then, that the environment outside UCSD played a significant role in influencing the successful development of the athletic department.

CONCLUSIONS: RESEARCH QUESTION 4

Research Question #4: How can a high performance system exist in an organization described as an organizational anarchy and/or a loosely coupled system?

In a loosely coupled system "flawed feedback, or the inability of the various units to communicate, is often the major source of looseness" (Weick, 1982, p.402). During the course of this study it became quite apparent that the people interviewed in the athletic department at UCSD did not feel that there was significant communication between their department and the other academic departments within the university. The responses given by the coaches to question 14C found that there was a one-hundred percent agreement between them and the Athletic Director that there was no formal interaction between the athletic department and the academic areas of the university. The only interdepartmental interactions that the coaches acknowledged was with such departments as student affairs and maintenance.

This research did not address whether or not flawed feedback was the cause of the lack of communication. However, this research did address the issue of how the rest of the university viewed the UCSD athletic department and program. The academic departments' view of the importance of research within a university established research as the measurement by which all departmental activities were evaluated at UCSD. Those departments whose activities did not involve research were not considered important. This institutional norm stressing the importance of research at UCSD was indicated by the subjects interviewed. One of these subjects felt that everything at UCSD was judged in relationship to the generation and quality of research and since athletics was not involved in any research the department was not considered an important entity with the university structure. Many of the other subjects interviewed agreed with this point of view and stated further that they felt that the stress on research within the university brought either negative or absent feelings to bear upon the athletic department. Some of the comments of those interviewed were:

Athletic Director: There are not a whole lot of people that pay a lot of attention to the athletic program.

Coach #1: The academic community probably doesn't think that we reflect the philosophy of the institution because they see no place for athletics at a school like this.

Coach #8: The academic department considers the athletic department as a thorn in their side.

Coach #10: I don't think that most of the people on campus think the athletic department has a lot to do with the culture... is considered a frivolous thing to do.

Athlete #5B: This school doesn't like athletics.

Athlete #6A: The academic area sees the athletic department as a nuisance.

Athlete #6B: The academic area don't know we exist. They don't know anything about it... how many teams... what each team did... they just wouldn't know about it.

Athlete #6C: They don't think about the athletic department at all.

Athlete #8C: The academic area really dislikes the athletic program...they don't want the athletic program here at all.

Athlete #9B: I don't think they would find it very worth while to see how the teams perform.

In view of the above responses, it could be stated that the athletic department had difficulty communicating its views and the importance of its activities to the academic portion of the university.

The Athletic Director seemed to also agree that the athletic department has difficulty communicating with the rest of the university. She stated, in response to question 11A, that she felt that one of the main purposes of the

athletic department was to generate greater visibility and spirit within the university. Seventy-five percent of those interviewed agreed with her. Thirty-two percent specifically stated that the athletic department's purpose was to generate spirit and promote the athletic program within the university. They seem to acknowledge that there is a miscommunication and therefore a certain looseness between the their department and the rest of the university.

Weick (1982b) and Scott (1981) discuss what effect looseness between departmental units has on the structural elements of an organization. It is their belief that the looseness provides each departmental unit with the ability to vary independently and be more sensitive to their local environment. This sensitive mechanism can detect variations within their immediate environment (p.387 & p.248). This theoretical perspective seems to suggest that loose coupling not only encourages unique local adaptation but that the adaptation response that does occur is not necessarily the same for each part of the organization. Ouchi (1978) seems to agree with this conclusion when he states:

Given that individual departments have needs for control that must be tailored to their specific tasks, people, histories and microenvironments, it is desirable that each department follow somewhat different protocols for control. Thus inconsistency or loose coupling through the hierarchy is to be expressed and encouraged (p.283).

Weick (1982a) also feels that loose coupling should be encouraged because it preserves the professional needs for autonomy within an educational organization by allowing novel solutions and local accommodations to occur (p.675).

Perhaps this is what Weick (1977b) calls effective anarchy:

...effective anarchy?... a unit that tolerates the fact that its technology and goals are unclear and that its personnel are transient; is it a unit that makes do inspite of these circumstances; is it a unit that never raises effectiveness issues or even uses this adjective; is it a unit that minimizes the return to the organization, or what (p.212)?

It is this concept of an effective anarchy that is central to the explanation of how a high performance system can exist within an organization described as an organized anarchy and/or a loosely coupled system. Acknowledging that one of the problems of an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system is the inability of the various units to communicate, the advantage of such systems is that they allow individual department units to vary independently in response to their environment. The ability of an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system to tolerate novel solutions, local accommodations, and a great deal of ambiguity enabled the UCSD athletic department to develop into a high performance system. The athletic department was able to respond to the performance expectations of its environment and develop a high performance system that was

able to provide the level of excellence that is expected of athletic teams by people outside the university. Thus it is because the university is an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system that this development was able to take place.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS ON PRESENT THEORY

Many present-day theorists view the higher education organization as being nonrational in nature. Many of them describe the university and collegiate organizations as being organized anarchies (March & Olsen, 1979) that exhibit loosely coupled characteristics (Weick, 1982) and reflect fundamental ambiguities (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Although these theorists describe the university organization in compatible, non-rational terms, the ambiguity that is central to both theories is also central to their theoretical results. They do not tell us why or how the exhibited organized anarchy or loosely coupled characteristics occur. Thus, they seem to eliminate much of the practical application of their theories. The inability of these theorists to explain educational institutions in more clearly definable terms is a central issue involved in this research.

Being pragmatic this researcher wanted to understand the educational organization in clearer terms in order to provide a more distinct model for those individuals who must lead these institutions during our present, complex times. This is not to say that organized anarchy or loose coupling are out-dated theoretical terms. Rather it is to realize

that they are descriptive terms that are describing what is being exhibited within educational organization but not why. As Bennis and Nannus (1985) state "part of the problem is the lack of understanding of the various 'organizational selves'... in all organizations" (p.48).

It is this researcher's belief that higher education organizations have many and varied organizational selves, and that past theoretical error has been to try to explain these organizations in simple, monolith terms. Higher education organizations have very complex organizational structures. The ambiguity exhibited by these organizations is due in part to the variety of organizational structures that can be found with in the modern American university.

Perhaps the higher education organization should be considered as an umbrella organization that provides a loose and external structure which allows its varied organizational parts to develop their own distinct structure that best fits their individual environmental needs. The UCSD athletic department developed a high performance systems structure as it adapted to the external American cultural demands that expects a winning program and excellent performance from incollegiate sports programs. Thus, the permeability of educational organizational boundaries allows the environment to intrude and help form the very substructure of the organization itself.

...in most large organizations different subunits face different environments... the more diverse the environments that different units face, the more

differentiation in structure is needed (Bolman & Deal, 1984, p.47).

What this researcher is suggesting is that there is a definite differentiation in organizational structure between the various subunits and/or departments within the educational organization. This differentiation is caused by the demands placed the external environment and by the specific tasks these subunits and/or departments are being asked to perform. These demands not only influence the structure of this umbrella organization but also its goals and the participation of its units into the activities of the whole institution.

The goals of the umbrella organization would have to be unclear in order to accommodate the different subunits' individual goals. The question is to whom are these institutional goals unclear? They could be considered general by the subunits because of their generic nature. They could be considered unclear by people outside the educational organization if these same people saw the various subunits functioning with different goals and purposes. The participation, within the umbrella organization, would have to be fluid to enable the various organizational units to participate in umbrella activities according to their own unit needs and purposes. These subunits could therefore have selective participation. A great deal of ambiguity would be exhibited as the different parts of the umbrella organization function using different goals and fluid institutional participation.

The implications on present organizational theory, of thinking of an educational institution as an umbrella organization, are clear. It will provide a theoretical basis that will assist leaders of educational organizations in having a clearer and more pragmatic view of their own organizations.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1. Future research should validate the interpretation of the higher education organization given in this research.

2. Future research should examine the different subunits and/or departments within the higher education organization to see if another empirical example of a high performance system can be found.

3. Future research should examine if all university and college athletic programs can be identified as high performance systems.

4. Future research should examine the problem created if not all athletic departments can not be identified as high performance systems: why can some athletic departments be identified as high performance systems and not others?

5. Future research should address how in an athletic department, identified as a high performance system, can portions of that department not be performing excellently.

6. Future research should examine higher education organizations to see if empirical examples of other organizational models can be identified within the organizational structure of these institutions.

7. Future research should examine which forces within the environment of a university or college have the greatest effect on the subunit structure of the organization; i.e., market or political forces, other educational institutions, or societal norms.

SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

This case study revealed that, using Vaill's suggested criteria and characteristics as a guide, the athletic department at the University of California, San Diego could be identified as a high performance system. In addressing the question of how the athletic department achieved this level of excellence, the findings suggest that the environment outside the university played a significant role in influencing the successful development of the department. The findings also suggest that the athletic department was able to exist as a high performance system within the university organization because of the ability of an organized anarchy and a loosely coupled system to tolerate novel solutions, local accommodations, and a great deal of ambiguity while still maintaining its own unique identity.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, M.G. (1975). The school as a social system: indicators for change. In J.V. Baldrige and D. Deal. Managing change in educational organizations, 176-186. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corp.
- Aldrich, H.E. & Pfeffer, J. (1976). Environments of organizations. Annual review of sociology, 2, 79-105.
- Argyris, C. & Schon, D.A. (1978). Organizational learning: A theory of action perspectives. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Baldrige, J.V. (1971). Power and conflict in the university. New York: Wiley Company.
- Baldrige, J.V. (1977). Organizational change: institutional sagas, external challenges, and internal politics. In G.L. Riley & J.V. Baldrige. Governing academic organizations, 123-144.
- Baldrige, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G.P. & Riley, G.L. (1977a). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In G.L. Riley and J.V. Baldrige. Governing academic organizations, 2-25. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Baldrige, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G.P. & Riley, G.L. (1977b). Diversity in higher education: professional autonomy. In G.L. Riley & J.V. Baldrige. Governing

- academic organizations, 42-63. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Baldrige, J.V., (1983). Organizational characteristics of colleges and universities. In J.V. Baldrige and T. Deal. The dynamics of organizational change in education, 38-59. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Barnard, C. (1939). The functions of the executive. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Beisser, A. (1970). Modern man and sports. In G.H. Sage. Sport and american society, 235-245. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bennis, W.G. (1976). The unconscious conspiracy: Why leaders can't lead. New York: AMACOM.
- Bennis, W.G. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: the strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Bidwell, C.E. (1965). The school as a formal organization. In J.G. March. Handbook of organizations, 972-1022. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T.E. (1984). Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Borg, W. & Gall, M.D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction.(ED.4). New York: Longman Inc.
- Boyle, R.H. (1970). The bizarre history of American sport. In G.H. Sage. Sport and american society, 42-53. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

- Brubacher, J.S. & Rudy, W. (1976). Higher education in transition. (Ed.3), New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Capalle, R.G. (1979). Changing human systems. Toronto, Canada: International Human Systems Institute.
- Carlson, R.O. (1975). Environmental constraints and organizational consequences: the public school and its clients. In J.V. Baldrige and T. Deal. Managing change in the educational organizations. 187-200. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (1982). The control of the campus. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation.
- Christensen, S. (1979). Decision making and socialization. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations. (ED,2). 351-385. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Chu, D. (1982). The American conception of higher education and the formal incorporation of intercollegiate sport. Quest, 34, 53-71.
- Clark, B.R. (September 1965). Interorganizational patterns in education. Administrative science quarterly, 10, 224-237.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1974). Leadership and ambiguity: The american college president. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1976). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In W.R. Lassey & R.R. Fernandez. Leadership and social change.(ED.2). 262-275. San Diego: University Associates.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1979). Decisions, presidents, and status. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 174-203. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Cohen, M.D. & March, J.G. (1983). Leadership in an organized anarchy. In J.V. Baldrige & T. Deal. The dynamics of organizational change in education. 333-365. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative science quarterly. 17, 1-25.
- Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. (1979). People, problems, solutions and the ambiguity of relevance. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 24-37. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Cozens, F. & Stumpf, F. (1970). The role of the school in the sports life of America. In G.H. Sage. Sport and american society. 56-83. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Daniels, A.S. (1969). The study of sport as an element of the culture. In J.W. Loy & G.S. Kenyon. Sport, culture and society. 13-22. New York: Macmillan & Company.

- Edwards, H. (1976). Sport as a social institution. In A.Yiannakis, T.D. McIntyre, M.J. Melnick, D.P. Hart. Sport sociology: Contemporary themes, 18-22. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Erbach, G. (1969). The science of sport and sports sociology- questions related to development- problems of structure. In J.W. Loy & G.S. Kenyon. Sport, culture and society, 23-36. New York: Macmillan & Company.
- Evan, W.M. (1971). The organization set: toward a theory of interorganizational relations. In J.D. Thompson. Approaches to organizational design, 173-191. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Falla, J. (1981). NCAA, the voice of college sports: A diamond anniversary history, 1906-1981. Mission, Kansas: NCAA
- Farrell, C.S. (September 5, 1984). NCAA admits difficulty in catching violators of recruiting and financial-aid regulation. The chronicle of higher education, 29-33.
- Frederickson, F.S. (1969). Sports and the cultures of man. In J.W. Loy & G.S. Kenyon. Sport, culture and society, 87-100. New York: Macmillan.
- Gallico, P. (1970). Last stronghold of hypocrisy. In G.H. Sage. Sport and american society, 111-120. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Giamatti, A.B. (1981). The university and the public interest. New York: Atheneum.
- Glassman, R.B. (1973). Persistence and loose coupling in

- living systems. Behavioral science, 18, 83-97.
- Goodhart, P. & Chataway, C. (1968). War without weapons. London: W.H. Allen.
- Goodman, Paul (1962). The community of scholars. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Goodman, P.S. & Kurke, L.B. (1982). Studies of change in organizations: a status report. In P.S. Goodman & Associates. Change in organizations, 1-46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Gross, E. (1968a). University goals and academic power. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.
- Gross, E. (August 1968b). Universities as organizations: a research approach. American sociological review, 33, 518-544.
- Gross, E. & Granbsch, P.V. (1974). Changes in university organization: 1964-1971. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gross, E. & Grambsch, P.V. (1977). Power structures in universities and colleges. In G.L. Riley & J.V. Baldrige. Governing academic organizations, 26-41. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Guetzkow, H. (1965). Communications in organizations. In J.G. March. Handbook of organizations, 534-573. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Harrison, R. (1984). Leadership and strategy for a new age. In J.D. Adams. Transforming work, 97-112. Alexander, Va.: Miles River Press.
- Hart-Nibbrig, N. & Cottingham, C. (1986). The Political

- economy of college sports, Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books, D.C. Heath and Company.
- Hoffman, S. & Stein, P. (1980). Sports and male role strain. In D.F. Sabro, Jr. Jock: Sports and male identity. 82-97. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- House, R.J. & Rizzo, J.R. (1972). Role conflict and ambiguity as critical variables in a model of organizational behavior. Organizational behavior and human performance, 7, 467-505.
- Jackson, J. & Morgan, C. (1982). Organization theory: A macro perspective for management. (ED. 2). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kamens, D.H. (1977). Legitimizing myths and educational organizations: relationship between organizational ideology and formal structure. American sociological review, 42, 208-219.
- Kerr, D. (1972). The uses of the university: With a "postscript- 1972". Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Lawrence, P. & Lorsch, J. (1967). Organization and environment. Boston: Division of Research, Harvard Business School.
- Loy, Jr., J.W. (1972). Reaction to Luschen paper. In M.M. Hart. Sport in the socio-cultural process. 78-88. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm.C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Loy, Jr., J.W. & Kenyon, G.S. (1969a). Sport, culture, and society. New York: Macmillan & Company.

- Loy, Jr., J.W. & Kenyon, G.S. (1969b). Toward a sociology of sport. In J.W. Loy & G.S. Kenyon. Sport, culture, and society. 36-43. New York: Macmillan.
- Luschen, G. (1972). Small group research and the group in sport. In M.M. Hart. Sport in the socio-cultural process. 67-77. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm.C. Brown Company Publishers.
- Lutz, F.W. (December, 1982). Tightening up loose coupling in organizations of higher education. Administrative science quarterly. 27, 653-669.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1979a). Organizational choice under ambiguity. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 10-23. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1979b). Organizational learning and the ambiguity of the past. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 54-68. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- March, J.G. & Olsen, J.P. (1979c). Attention and the ambiguity of self-interest. In J.H. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations (ED.2). 38-53. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- March, J.G. & Romelaer, P.J. (1979). Position and presence in the drift of decisions. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations. (ED.2). 251-176. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- March, J.G. & Simon, H.A. (1958). Organizations. New York:

John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Martinko, M.J. & Gardner, W.L. (1984). The observation of high-performing educational managers: methodological issues and managerial implications. In J.G. Hunt, D.M. Hosking, C.A. Schnesheim & R. Stewart (eds.). Leaders and managers. 142-162. New York: Pergamon.

Mathews, Jr., A.R. (1972). Student unrest and athletic dollars. In M.M. Hart. Sport in the socio-cultural process. 418-422. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm.C. Brown Company Publishers.

McConnell, T.R. (1976). The function of leadership in academic institutions. In W.R. Lassey & R.R. Fernandez (Eds.). Leadership and social change. 276-291. San Diego: University Associates, Inc.

McCurdy, J. (April, 11, 1984). Students seek to divert boosters' money to academics. The chronicle of higher education. 28, No. 7, 33 & 35.

Merton, R.K., Fiske, M. & Kendall, P.A. (1956). The Focused interview: a report of the bureau of applied social research Columbia University. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Meyer, J.W. (1983a). Innovation and knowledge use in American public education. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott. Organizational environments: ritual and rationality. 233-260. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Meyer, J.W. (1983b). Centralization of funding and control in educational governance. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott.

- Organizational environments: ritual and rationality.
179-197. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In M.W. Meyer & Associates. Environments and organizations: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. 78-109. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Meyer, J.W. & Rowan, B. (1983). The structure of educational organizations. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott. Organizational environments: ritual and rationality. 71-97. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Meyer, J.W., Scott, W.R. & Deal, T.E. (1983). Institutional and technical sources of organizational structure: explaining the structure of educational organizations. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott. Organizational environments: ritual and rationality. 45-67. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Millett, J.D. (1962). The academic community. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Mooney, R.L. (1963). The problem of leadership in the university. Harvard educational review. 33, 42-57.
- Naison, M. (1980). Sports, women and the ideology of domination. In D.F. Sabro, Jr. Jock: Sports and male identity. 60-78. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (1985). 1985-86 Manual of the national collegiate athletic association. 112-141. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic

Association.

- Nelson, L. & Burns, F.L. (1984). High performance programming: a framework for transforming organizations. In J.D. Adam. Transforming work: A Collection of organization transformation readings. 226-242. Alexandria, Va.: Miles River Press.
- Olsen, J.P. (1979). Choice in an organized anarchy. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 82-139. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Olsen, J. (1979). University governance: non-participation as exclusion or choice. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 277-313. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1978). Coupled versus uncoupled control in organizational hierarchies. In M.W. Meyer. Environments and organizations. 264-289. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Padgett, J.F. (December, 1980). Managing garbage can hierarchies. Administrative science quarterly. 25, 583-604.
- Parsons, T. (1956). Suggestions for a sociological approach to the theory of organizations. Administrative science quarterly. 1, 63-85.
- Peters, T. & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence: The leadership difference. New York: Random House.
- Peters, T.J. & Waterman, Jr., R.H. (1982). In search of

- excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies.
New York: Harper & Row.
- Pfeffer, J. (1978a). The micropolitics of organizations. In M.W. Meyer & Associates. Environments and organizations: Theoretical and empirical perspectives. 29-50. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pfeffer, J. (1978b). The ambiguity of leadership. In M.W. McCall, Jr. & M.M. Lombardo. Leadership: Where else can we go?. 13-34. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Phillips, J.C. & Schafer, W.E. (1976). Subcultures in sport—a conceptual and methodological approach. In A. Yiannakis, T.D. McIntyre, M.J. Melnick, & D.P. Hart. Sport sociology: Contemporary themes. 128-134. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Riley, G.L. & Baldrige, J.V. (1977). Governing academic organizations: New problems, new perspectives. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Rommetveit, K. (1979). Decision making under changing norms. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2). 140-155. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.
- Ross, D.H. (1958). Administration of adaptability. New York: Metropolitan School Study Council.
- Rubin, I. (1983). Retrenchment, loose structure, and adaptability in the university. In J.V. Baldrige & T. Deal. The dynamics of organizational change in education. 191-208. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

- Sabro, Jr., D. (1980a). Jock: Sports and male identity. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Sabro, Jr., D. (1980). Best years of my life. In D. Sabro, Jr. Jock: Sports and male identity, 22-36. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Sage, G.H. (1970). Sport and American society. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- San Diego Union (June 5, 1984). Colleges, D-11.
- Schein, E.H. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Schuler, R.S. (October, 1977). Role conflict and ambiguity as a function of task-structure-technology interaction. Organizational behavior and human performance, 20, 66-74.
- Scott, J. (1971). The athletic revolution. New York: The Free Press.
- Scott, W.R. (1981). Organizations: rational, natural, and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Scott, W.R. (1983). The organization of environments: network, cultural, and historical elements. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott. Organizational environments: ritual and rationality, 155-175. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Scott, W.R. & Meyer, J.W. (1983). The organization of societal sectors. In J.W. Meyer & W.R. Scott. Organizational environments: ritual and rationality, 129-153. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

- Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration. New York: Harper and Row.
- Sergiovanni, T.J. (1984). Cultural and competing perspectives in administrative theory and practice. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally. Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice. 1-11. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Simon, J.L. (1969). Basic research methods in social science: The art of empirical investigation. New York: Random House.
- Smith, S. (July, 1, 1984). NCAA reels under barrage from the courts. San Diego Union. H1,H3.
- Snyder, E.E. & Spreitzer, E. (1976). Sociology of sport: an overview. In A. Yiannakis, T.D. McIntyre, M.J. Melnick, D.P. Hart. Sport sociology: Contemporary themes. 1-11. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Sproul, L., Weiner, S. & Wolf, D. (1978). Organizing an anarchy: Belief, bureaucracy, and politics in the national institute of education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stake, R.E. (February, 1978). The case study method in social inquiry. Educational researcher. 7, 5-8.
- Stake, R.E. (1983). The case study method in social inquiry. In G.F. Madaus, M.S. Scriven, & D.L. Stufflebeam. Evaluation models: Viewpoints on educational and human services evaluation. 279-286. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff

Publishing.

- Stern, R.N. (June 1979). The development of an interorganizational control network: the case of intercollegiate athletics. Administrative science quarterly, 24, 242-266.
- Stern, R.N. (March 1981). Competitive influences on the interorganizational regulation of college athletics. Administrative science quarterly, 15-32.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1971). Dimensions of organizational theory. In J.D. Thompson. Approaches to organizational design, 2-56. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh.
- Torbert, W.R. (1981). Why educational research has been so uneducational: the case for a new model of social science based on collaborative inquiry. In P. Reason & J. Rowan. Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research, 141-152. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Vaill, P.B. (1978). Toward a behavioral description of high-performing systems. In M.W. McCall, Jr. & M.M. Lombardo (eds.). Leadership: Where else can we go?, 104-125. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Vaill, P.B. (1982). The purposing fo high-performance systems. Organizational dynamics, Autumn, 23-39.
- Vaill, P.B. (1984). The purposing of high-performance systems. In T.J. Sergiovanni & J.E. Corbally (Eds.). Leadership and organization culture: New perspectives in administrative theory and practice, 85-104. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

- Vance, N.S. (March 28, 1984). TV football past is a cooperative venture, not monopolistic, NCAA tells high court. The chronicle of higher education, 28, No. 5, 27-28.
- Vance, N.S. (May 16, 1984). Sport is a religion in America, controversial professor argues. The chronicle of higher education, 28, No. 12, 25-26.
- Vance, N.S. (September 5, 1984). San Diego State's beleaguered sports program: football losses, NCAA penalties, big deficits. The chronicle of higher education, 29, No. 2, 30.
- Weick, K.E. (1974). Middle range theories of social systems. Behavior science, 19, 357-367.
- Weick, K.E. (March, 1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative science quarterly, 21, 357-367.
- Weick, K.E. (1977a). Organization design: Organizations as self-designing systems. Organizational Dynamics, 6, 30-46.
- Weick, K.E. (1977b). Re-punctuating the problem. In P.S. Goodman & J.M. Pennings. New perspectives on organizational effectiveness, 193-225. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weick, K.E. (1978). The spines of leaders. In M.W. McCall, Jr. & M.M. Lombardo. Leadership: Where else can we go?, 37-61. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Weick, K.E. (1979). The social psychology of

organizing.(ED.2). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Welck, K.E. (1982a). Administrating education in loosely coupled schools. Phi delta kappan, June, 673-676.

Welck, K.E. (1982b). Management of organizational change among loosely coupled elements. In P.S. Goodman and Associates. Change in organizations: New perspectives on theory, research, and practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Welck, K.E. (1983). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In J.V. Baldrige & T. Deal. The dynamics of organizational change in education, 15-37. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Weiner, S.S. (1979). Participation, deadlines, and choice. In J.G. March & J.P. Olsen. Ambiguity and choice in organizations.(ED.2), 225-250. Bergen, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

Wolf, D. (1972). The growing crisis in college sports. In M.M. Hart. Sport in the socio-cultural process, 445-472. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm.C. Brown Company.

Yin, R.K. (1984). Case study research: Design and methods. Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.

Yinger, J.M. (October, 1960). Contraculture and subculture. American sociological review, 25, 625-635.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Background: How long have you been at the University?

1. How would you compare the performance of your athletic department (or team) with other Division III departments (or teams)?

2. What has been the departments (or teams) performance in N.C.A.A. regional or national competition?

3A. How would you compare the athletic department (or your team) now to where it was when you first arrived UCSD?

B. Do you feel that there has been an improvement, a leveling off, or a decrease in development?

4. Has the athletic department (or your team) ever been judged by others to be better than other Division III departments (or teams)?

5A. What is the budget for the athletic department (or your team)?

B. Based on your knowledge do you feel that it's above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III athletic departments (or teams)?

6A. As a department is there (or As a coach is there or Does your coach make) a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes?

B. Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent represented by the student/athletes in the athletic department (or on your team) is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III departments (or teams)?

7. How would you compare the athletic facilities at U.C.S.D. with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average?

8. In competing against other Division III teams, do you feel that U.C.S.D.'s athletic team's uniforms, equipment and travel schedules are above average, average, or below average in comparison to these teams?

9A. How do you feel other institutions (or coaches or teams) view U.C.S.D.'s athletic department (or specific team)?

B. Based on your experience has the U.C.S.D. athletic program influenced any other institution's athletic program in any way?

10A. Considering the athletic department is a part of the total university environment, how would you say the department reflects the ideas of culture of this university?

B. What would you think others outside of the athletic department would say concerning how the department reflects the ideas of the culture of UCSD?

C. Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole?

11A. What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of U.C.S.D.?

B. What objectives do you see as important to fulfilling these purposes?

12A. Do you feel that the UCSD athletic team coaches (or you as a coach or your coach) give extra effort beyond what is expected of them (or you or him/her)?

B. How committed do you feel the coaches are (or you are) to your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department?

C. How would you describe the motivation of the coaches? (coaches only: How motivated are you?)

13A. What do you perceive the task of the athletic department to be?

B. Do you feel that all members of the department are committed to this task?

C. Do you feel that the individual above you (or individuals below you) in the hierarchy are committed to this task? Are you committed to the task of the athletic department?

D. Have any new or innovative methods been introduced within the athletic department (or your team or the specific team) since you have been involved in the athletic program?

Omit Question #14 for team members:

14A. How often do you meet with your direct supervisor (or the individual whose responsibilities include the athletic department)?

B. How much autonomy do you have in your position?...Are you often reviewed?

C. As a department (or coach), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either through formal or informal contacts?

D. Do the coaches (or you) have other academic responsibilities besides coaching?

E. If so, who decides these academic responsibilities?

- 15A. How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives the athletic department?
- B. Would you say the athletic department represents a typical or atypical university department as you perceive it?
- C. In what way?
- D. NOTE: only ask if the person considers the department to be atypical: Would you say that the department is considered a problem by other departments in the university because of this atypical nature?
16. Would you like to add anything to the answers you that you already have given?

APPENDIX B

Background: How long have you been at the University? *in person*

QUESTIONS

*1- 1. How would you compare the performance of your athletic department (or team) with other Division III departments (or teams)?

*2- 2. What has been the department's (or team's) performance in N.C.A.A. regional or national competition?

*3- 3. How would you compare the athletic department (or your team) now to where it was when you first arrived U.C.S.D.?

Do you feel that there has been an improvement, a leveling off, or a decrease in development?

#4- 4. Has the athletic department for your team ever been judged to
others to be better than other Division III departments for
years?

Based on your knowledge do you feel that it's above
average, average, or below average in relationship to
other Division III athletic departments for years?

#5- 5. What is the budget for the athletic department for your team?

#6- 6. As a department (or coach) is there a concentrated effort to
recruit talented athletes?

Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent
represented by the student/athletes in the athletic
department (or 20-year team) is above average, average,
or below average in relationship to other Division III
departments for years?

#5 - 7. How would you compare the athletic facilities at U.C.S.D. with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average?

#6 - 8. In competing against other Division III teams, do you feel that U.C.S.D.'s athletic team's uniforms, equipment and travel schedules are above average, average, or below average in comparison to these teams?

#6 - 9. How do you feel other institutions (or coaches or teams) view U.C.S.D.'s athletic department (or specific teams)?

Based on your experience has the U.C.S.D. athletic program influenced any other institution's athletic program in any way?

#7-10. Considering the athletic department is a part of the total university environment, how would you say the department reflects the ideas of culture of this university?

Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole?

#8-not included.

What would you think others outside of the athletic department would say concerning how the department reflects the ideas of the culture of U.C.S.D.?

~~CONTACTS IN 12~~

#1-11. What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of U.C.S.D.?

What objectives do you see as important to fulfilling these purposes?

#2. 12. Do you feel that U.C.S.D. athletic team coaches (or YOU-SELF
coach) give extra effort beyond what is expected of them (you)?

How committed do you feel the coaches (or YOU-SELF) to
your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of
the athletic department?

How would you describe the motivation of the coaches?
(coaches only: How motivated are you?)

#3 13. What do you perceive the task of the athletic department to be?

Do you feel that all members of the department are
committed to this task?

#4- implied (leadership)
through similarity
of goals + purposes;
task, etc.

Do you feel that the individual above you and
individuals below you (or individuals below you) in the
hierarchy are committed to this task?
Are you committed to the task of the athletic department?

#5- Have any new or innovative methods been introduced
within the athletic department (or the specific team)
since you have been involved in the athletic program?

#6 - 14. How often do you meet with YOUR DIRECT SUPERVISOR (or the individual that whose responsibilities include the athletic department)? (omit the following questions for the chancellor and team members.)

How much autonomy do you have in you position?...Are you often reviewed?

As a DEPARTMENT (or SQUAD), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either through formal or informal contacts?

Do the STUDENT (or YOU) have other academic responsibilities besides coaching?

If so, who decides these academic responsibilities?

47 15. How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives
the athletic department?

7

Would you say the athletic department represents a
typical or atypical university department as you perceive
it?

In what way?

*if not included -
just a description*

NOTE: only ask if the person considers the department to
be atypical: Would you say that the department is
considered a problem by other departments in the
university because of this atypical nature?

16. Would you like to add anything to the answers you that you
already have given?

APPENDIX C

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO
N.C.A.A. Athletic Record: 1981-1985
Division III

WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL:

- 1981- N.C.A.A. National Champions
- 1982- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 2nd Place
- 1983- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 2nd Place
- 1984- N.C.A.A. National Champions
- 1985- N.C.A.A. Regional Tournament: Final Eight

WOMEN'S TENNIS:

- 1982- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 2nd Place
- 1984- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 2nd Place
- 1985- N.C.A.A. National Champions

MEN'S TENNIS:

- 1982- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 3rd Place

MEN'S GOLF:

- 1985- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 2nd Place

MEN'S SWIMMING:

- 1984- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 3rd Place
- 1985- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 3rd Place

WOMEN'S SWIMMING:

- 1985- N.C.A.A. Championship Tournament: 3rd Place

1984-85: 12 teams qualified for N.C.A.A. regional or national championship tournaments; 5 teams in top three nationally

Last 4 Years: average 33 All-Americans per year; 3 women volleyball players named national athlete of the year- 1985, 1984, 1983

Academic: 40 percent of all athletes achieved a 3.0 GPA or better; three student/athletes of the graduating class of 1985 were among 5 graduating seniors to be selected for the academic and extracurricular contributions award.

APPENDIX D

1985-86 NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

NCAA DIVISION III

SECOND PLACE

Men's Golf
Women's Swimming

THIRD PLACE

Men's Swimming

ADDITIONAL NATIONAL RANKINGS

#1 Women's Water Polo (USA Collegiate Nationals)
#7 Men's Soccer
#10 Women's Volleyball
#14 Men's Baseball
#15 Men's Water Polo (NCAA Open Division)
#16 Men's Volleyball (NCAA Open Division)
#19 Men's Fencing (NCAA Open Division)

Individual National Champions.....	12
NCAA All-Americans.....	29
Other All-Americans.....	4
Individual Qualifiers for NCAA Post Season Championships.....	107
Teams with Athletes in NCAA Championships.....	11

1985-86 UCSD INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

Roger Brisbane Men's Swimming	100 & 200 Yard Butterfly & 400 Yard Medley Relay
Butch Cramer Men's Swimming	400 Yard Medley Relay
Derron Fredrick Men's Swimming	400 Yard Medley Relay
Bill Kazmierowicz Men's Swimming	200 Individual Medley, 1650 Freestyle & 400 Medley Relay
Tracy Mulvany Women's Swimming	500 Yard Freestyle & 1650 Yard Freestyle
Jeff Stabile Men's Diving	One & Three-Meter Diving

SEASON RESULTS

MEN'S BASEBALL RANKED 14TH

Head Coach: Lyle Yates
Won: 22 Lost: 19 Tied: 2
Second Place at West Regional
Team MVP: Bob Natal

MEN'S BASKETBALL

Head Coach: Tom Marshall
Won: 14 Lost: 12
Team MVP: Greg Kamansky

WOMEN'S BASKETBALL

Head Coach: Judy Malone
Won: 11 Lost: 14
Team MVP: Shanda Elzy & Heidi Jungling

MEN'S CREW

Head Coach: Jon Lawson

WOMEN'S CREW

Head Coach: Jack Vallerga

MEN'S CROSS COUNTRY

Head Coach: Andy Skief
Third at West Regional
Team MVP: Chris Thomas

WOMEN'S CROSS COUNTRY

Head Coach: Andy Skief
Third at West Regional
Team MVP: Sabrina Jensen

MEN'S FENCING 19TH IN NCAA

Head Coach: Lynne Antonelli
Won: 15 Lost: 1
West Regional Champs - Epee
Team MVP: Mark Christe

WOMEN'S FENCING

Head Coach: Lynne Antonelli
Won: 8 Lost: 8
Team MVP: Leslie Richter

COED GOLF 2ND IN NCAA

Head Coach: Mike Wydra
Won: 13 Lost: 5
Team MVP: Pat Weishan

MEN'S SOCCER RANKED 7TH

Head Coach: Derek Armstrong
Won: 23 Lost: 3
West Regional Champions

WOMEN'S SOCCER

Head Coach: John Leaney
Won: 9 Lost: 10 Tied: 2
Team MVP: Adriene Clark

WOMEN'S SOFTBALL

Head Coach: Colleen Wight
Won: 29 Lost: 13
So. Cal. Softball Conf. Champion
Team MVP: Patty Campbell

MEN'S SWIMMING & DIVING 3RD IN NCAA

Head Coach: Bill Morgan
Won: 4 Lost: 4
Team MVP: Bill Kazmierowicz

WOMEN'S SWIMMING & DIVING 2ND IN NCAA

Head Coach: Bill Morgan
Won: 9 Lost: 1
Team MVP: Tracy Mulvany

MEN'S TENNIS

Head Coach: Jim Schanback
Won: 11 Lost: 12
Team MVP: John Mapes

WOMEN'S TENNIS

Head Coach: Liz LaPlante
Won: 9 Lost: 9
Team MVP: Jessica Vernon

MEN'S TRACK & FIELD

Head Coach: Andy Skief
Team MVP: Henry, Joe, John Garon

WOMEN'S TRACK & FIELD

Head Coach: Andy Skief
Team MVP: Gisele English

MEN'S VOLLEYBALL RANKED 16TH

Head Coach: Digger Graybill
Won: 14 Lost: 11
Team MVP: Eric Hallman

WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL RANKED 10TH

Head Coach: Doug Dannevik
Won: 26 Lost: 19
Team MVP: Christy Wada

MEN'S WATER POLO RANKED 15TH

Head Coach: Denny Harper
Won: 19 Lost: 15
Team MVP: Duncan Millar

WOMEN'S WATER POLO USA NAT'L CHAMPS

Head Coach: Denny Harper
Won: 19 Lost: 4
Team MVP: "The Team"

1985-86 TRITON ALL-AMERICANS

Michelle Brafman.....Women's Swimming
 Roger Brisbane.....Men's Swimming
 Mary Baylick.....Women's Water Polo
 Chris Carrillo.....Men's Swimming
 Jim Cavataio.....Men's Swimming
 Mark Christe.....Men's Fencing
 Butch Cramer.....Men's Swimming
 Shannon Delaney.....Women's Swimming
 Dave Dolotta.....Men's Swimming
 Derron Fredrick.....Men's Swimming
 Kip Fulbeck.....Men's Swimming
 Alison Gilmore.....Women's Swimming
 Dianna Gray.....Women's Swimming
 Jenny Hohne.....Women's Water Polo
 Julie Hicks.....Women's Diving
 Dave Higdon.....Men's Swimming
 Anita Hill.....Women's Swimming
 Dan Kahl.....Men's Water Polo
 Bill Kazmierowicz.....Men's Swimming
 Laura Knochenhauer.....Women's Swimming
 Janell Lowe.....Women's Water Polo
 John Mapes.....Men's Tennis
 Maggie Merickel.....Women's Tennis
 Tracy Mulvany.....Women's Swimming
 Michelle Ruble.....Women's Swimming
 Jennifer Rennick.....Women's Water Polo
 Marc Sandknop.....Men's Tennis
 Debbie Smith.....Women's Swimming
 Jeff Stabile.....Men's Diving
 Michelle Steinberger.....Women's Swimming
 Kevin Sullivan.....Men's Swimming
 Jessica Vernon.....Women's Tennis
 Pat Weishan.....Men's Golf

FOUR-YEAR ALL-AMERICANS

Butch Cramer	Men's Swimming
Alison Gilmore	Women's Swimming

THREE-YEAR ALL-AMERICANS

Michelle Brafman	Women's Swimming
Dave Higdon	Men's Swimming
Bill Kazmierowicz	Men's Swimming
Jessica Vernon	Women's Tennis
Pat Weishan	Men's Golf

TWO-YEAR ALL-AMERICANS

Kip Fulbeck	Men's Swimming
Bill Kazmierowicz	Men's Water Polo
Laura Knochenhauer	Women's Swimming
Duncan Millar	Men's Water Polo
Irene Mons	Women's Swimming
Tracy Mulvany	Women's Swimming

APPENDIX E

The UCSD

Guardian

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1986

VOLUME 57, #19

Divisional Dilemmas

By JOHN SCHACHT, GUS SANTOYO & MATT LAIT

WHEN BARRY CUNNINGHAM first came to UCSD as an assistant basketball coach in 1967, the athletic potential had Cunningham salivating. Being a part of a thriving community, a growing institution, as well as a member of the prestigious UC educational system, intercollegiate athletics at UCSD would inevitably be a vital part of college life for the athletes and student body. But after nineteen years of involvement with UCSD, many as the head basketball coach, Cunningham can only sit and wonder.

Please turn to page 12

LA problems

Continued from page 1

"The hardest part of my job of being an athletic coach was to look at this campus and see what it could be athletically and what it is — between the dream when I was first hired and the reality. That was the most difficult part of being an athletic coach at UCSD."

Cunningham's disappointment stems from the university's conservative approach to intercollegiate athletics. The philosophy of the athletic program, according to a 1986-87 budget request, has been "to allow the maximum number of students to enjoy the challenges and exhilaration of healthy athletic competition." UCSD, in adherence to this policy, has been one of the most successful athletic programs in NCAA Division III, including the winningest women's program in the nation. There are more sports available to the students at UCSD than in any other school in the UC system with over 700 athletes competing in over 28 sports.

Yet this rosy side has a flip side that does not hide some other real problems facing the athletic department: the lack of funds for facilities, equipment, and coaches salaries; scheduling conflicts — competing against schools including some roughly 50 times smaller; independent status with unlikely playoff aspirations; and competing against scholarship programs.

Add to these difficulties the phenomenal growth of the UCSD student population, which is projected to be approximately 20,000 in the year 2000, and it

UC stars in non-Conference sports, like baseball's Bob Natal (above), cannot receive all-league accolades.

may become increasingly difficult to maintain this Division III philosophy. In this two-part investigative report, we examine some of the problems that have plagued UCSD Athletics.

Item: UCSD is the largest Division III school in the nation, seven and a half times larger than any of its competition. —Registration fee intern Kary Haberkern.

•"What are you (UCSD) doing in Division III? With a school this big you ought to be cleaning up in Division III." —Former NBA star and Notre Dame All-American John Shumate, Coach of Grand Canyon College and winner of UCSD's La Jolla Classic Basketball Tournament.

•"You guys (UCSD) shouldn't be in Division III, you are too big." —Athletic director at UC Davis.

•Other schools "have no business telling us what Division we should be in." Mike Hipp, assistant athletic director.

•"I don't think our size is unfair. We're totally in compliance with Division III NCAA philosophy. Pomona-Pitzer has a budget twice of what is ours. Isn't that unfair?" —Judith Sweet, UCSD Athletic Director.

•Pomona Pitzer, with an enrollment of about 1500 raises more funds than a school of 14,000.

•"One of my greatest thrills this year was beating a school the size of UCSD." —David Appleby, basketball player at Christ College. Christ College's undergraduate enrollment is 250.

•Three years ago the NCAA defeated a proposal that sought to put an attendance ceiling of 5-6,000 students for Division III schools.

•UCLA, Division I; UC Berkeley Division I; UC Santa Barbara, Division I; UC Irvine, Division I; UC Davis, Division II; UC Riverside, Division II. Only UC Santa Cruz — with an enrollment of 7,000 — and UCSD are Division III.

Item: UCSD competes as an Independent rather than competing in a conference. Some UCSD teams compete against Division I and II schools in open divisions.

•Add Marshall: "It's tantamount that we get into a conference

even if the cost will be more."

•When a team is not in a conference, every game on the schedule counts for possible tournament play, whereas if a team is in a conference only league games matter.

•"When we lost on December 17, I might as well have stopped playing right then, technically. We had nothing more to play for. It can't be that way. Whittier and Pomona-Pitzer (teams in the SCIAC conference) can lose all their games until January 17, and it doesn't matter. They have only eight league games that count for playoffs. We have 24." —Marshall

•"The only teams that can compete as an Independent are in Division I and nationally known like DePaul, Notre Dame, Dayton and Marquette." —UCSD Basketball Coach Tom Marshall.

INDEPENDENTS

	W	L	Pct
Notre Dame	19	5	.792
Chicago St.	21	6	.778
Pan. American	18	7	.720
S. Wash.	19	8	.704
Marquette	18	8	.687
New Orleans	18	8	.687
Dayton	18	10	.615
DePaul	18	10	.600
UCSD	14	11	.560
SW Louisiana	14	11	.560
Miami (Fla.)	13	12	.520
CS S. Bernaldo	11	18	.423
USU	7	18	.280
UT S. Antonio	6	22	.216

L.A. Times Standings

•Because the baseball team was not in a conference last year, they felt they were robbed of a playoff bid.

•"Because we are a big school they are holding that against us, but that's not fair to my ballplayers. They didn't choose to be an Independent, or be in Division III — they're the ones being dealt a bad hand." —Lyle Yates, UCSD Baseball coach, May of 1985.

•"Three years ago we decided to move out of the NAIA Division, because we thought it was unfair to compete against scholarship schools." —Sweet.

•Teams like the water polo and men's volleyball have to compete in an Open Division. In an Open Division, UCSD's Division III teams compete against Division I and II schools who can give scholarships for the same national championships.

•"Every year, we knock off some of the top teams in the nation but it's tough to compete against what I call the 'professional programs' like (Division I

scholarship schools) Pepperdine and Stanford." — Water polo coach Denny Harper.

•Sweet agrees that getting UCSD into a conference is important, however, she feels the process may be slow. "We are discussing the possibilities of a conference right now. We want to develop our relationships with other Division III institutions that have academic standards similar to ours. Such AAU schools as MIT, University of Chicago, RIT, Case Western and Emory University are some of the top 50 research universities in the country, of which we are one. We can get the identity with both academic excellence and hopefully athletic excellence."

•Add Sweet: "Our geographical location is a handicap because there are not many Division III teams in the West." The basketball team has to ask the NCAA for waiver of a rule stating that a team must play fifty percent of its games against Division III institutions because of they can't schedule enough local schools.

Item: Coaching at UCSD

•Three of the main concerns of UCSD coaches are "a lack of commitment to the program on the part of the administration, lack of recognition and support by UCSD, and extremely low salaries." —Registration Fee Committee intern Katy Halberkern.

•Coaches at UCSD make between \$6,000 and \$13,000.

•Coaches do not receive benefits.

•"It's very pompous for us to beat our chests and say what a great athletic program we have with almost all part time coaches. In fact, it's ludicrous." —Barry Cunningham, physical education instructor.

•"The administration does not go out of its way to help you or

make you feel wanted." — Marshall.

•"It's frustrating to give everything you've got into a program and have constraints that keep the program from being even better. We don't have enough facilities, we don't have enough funding, and the coaches don't even have offices. I understand the position of the administration and professors, and I also feel excellence in academics is the priority. But I wish they would realize the importance of a good athletic program for the school and the students — both players and fans." Judy Malone, UCSD women's basketball coach.

•A lot of coaches that have come here with some great new ideas have been stepped on and smashed so many times that they say "Fuck it I can't take it any more. I'm busting my butt and I ain't getting shit for it." —A coach at UCSD.

•"Coaches coming into our program should realize the Division III philosophy and if they can't agree with it, there are many other Division I schools that can hire their services." — Andy Skief, assistant athletic director, and track and field coach.

•"You really can't expect any athletic program to improve without full time coaches." —Bill Morgan, UCSD swim coach.

•In order to supplement his income, soccer coach Derek Armstrong coaches the local Nomads club.

•Marshall has two other jobs to help his own finances.

•Skief is the only coach who is a full time faculty member.

Part two of this investigative report will deal with attendance, recruiting and fundraising.

Flip Harrison and Katy Halberkern contributed to this article.

APPENDIX F

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #1: How would you compare the performance of your athletic department (or team) with other Division III departments (or teams)?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: Performance defined as success?...teams...we are one of the most competitive DIII teams in the country, as evidenced by the number of championships either won or participated in the last year.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: ...we're good or better than most DIII schools.*	ATHLETE #1A: I think we have more talent and ability probably on our team.* ATHLETE #1B: ...from what I see we are better than alot of other teams.* ATHLETE #1C: ...the other teams are not bad, just aren't as strong.*
COACH #2: I can't really compare us because as far as I know, there is only one other DIII team which we compete against	ATHLETE #2A: ...thats hard to say, because our team is young... compared to the other teams we did...pretty well.* ATHLETE #2B: ...we aren't that good...about average. ATHLETE #2C: ...slightly above average.*
COACH #3: ...UCSD has a slight disadvantage mainly due to the academic standards that are required for the athlete to compete, consequently we do not get some of the better athletes.	ATHLETE #3A: I'd say of a whole we are pretty weak. ATHLETE #3B: I feel we are a little better than the rest of DIII* ATHLETE #3C: Actually, we have a fairly good DIII team.*
COACH #4: I personally feel that we are the best DIII team on the west coast.*	ATHLETE #4A: I think we are doing so much better than other DIII teams.* ATHLETE #4B: ...above average.* ATHLETE #4C: I think we are the best in the west.*
COACH #5: ...played six times- DIII teams. We beat them all pretty convincingly. We were quite a bit better.*	ATHLETE #5A: With other DIII teams we do excellent.* ATHLETE #5B: Our team is alot better and more sophisticated about playing.* ATHLETE #5C: With other DIII teams...we do very well.*
COACH #6: We are third in the nation...*	ATHLETE #6A: Pretty good.* ATHLETE #6B: Pretty much superior.* ATHLETE #6C: This year the team performed very well...3rd place.*
COACH #7: ...compared to most DIII teams we have done very well. We have been in the top five the last four years.*	ATHLETE #7A: We have usually done very well against other DIII teams.* ATHLETE #7B: ...we are a stronger team, definitely.* ATHLETE #7C: I don't think we...have been playing as well as we can.
COACH #8: For the last two years we have been the best team in California.*	ATHLETE #8A: I think we are rated...above-average for DIII schools.* ATHLETE #8B: ...we are the top for DIII teams that we play.* ATHLETE #8C: In two years have played 20 contests with DIII lost 2.*
COACH #9: The team ranks consistently since 1981, with any top four teams from DIII throughout the United States.*	ATHLETE #9A: I think that we are in the top five in DIII. If not, in the top three nationally.* ATHLETE #9B: Among the best, very high as far as competitiveness and skills.* ATHLETE #9C: ...I'd say that we were at the top.*
COACH #10: Way above average.*	ATHLETE #10A: Last year we finished second in the nation...* ATHLETE #10B: ...we played two or three contests against DIII schools and we just thrashed them...* ATHLETE #10C: ...we have done really well.*

*= response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .875 Responses that agree= 35 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #3A: How would you compare the athletic department (or your team) now to where it was when you first arrived at U.C.S.D.?
B. Do you feel that there has been a leveling off, or a decrease in development.

A.D.'S RESPONSE: We were not as competitive on a national level at all...had a sports club atmosphere. Improvement.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: There's a vast difference...So we went basically from almost last finish in the conference to one of the top teams in the country. Definitely an improvement.*	ATHLETE #1A: They didn't have much of a team...I'd say an improvement.* ATHLETE #1B: ...we work as a team now...an improvement. ATHLETE #1C: This year...we have more depth...definitely improved.*
COACH #2: We're getting stronger...constantly developing program...an improvement.*	ATHLETE #2A: We were at base level, there was no where to go but up. Increase in development.* ATHLETE #2B: ...a bit of an increase.* ATHLETE #2C: We finished 4th...high for a women's team. Improvement.*
COACH #3: An increase of 85% in participation. An improvement.*	ATHLETE #3A: ...a little weaker because people are falling out because of injuries...definitely a decrease. ATHLETE #3B: ...a definite improvement.* ATHLETE #3C: More organized and better...increase in development.*
COACH #4: Night and day...Most of the athletes on my first team would not even play on the 1986 team. Absolutely been an improvement in all aspects.*	ATHLETE #4A: ...everything seemed to jell together during the season. There has definitely been an improvement.* ATHLETE #4B: ...slight improvement.* ATHLETE #4C: I think we improved a great deal.*
COACH #5: ...We were 3-12 the first year and 10-10 last year...big improvement.*	ATHLETE #5A: ...there was an improvement overall; the players got better, the morale got better and the record got better.* ATHLETE #5B: ...its so much better its unbelievable. Its more organized, we start practicing in the summer.* ATHLETE #5C: ...just alot different...much improved.*
COACH #6: Well's it has grown tremendously...The quality of athlete has improved alot...improved every year.*	ATHLETE #6A: ...improvement.* ATHLETE #6B: I think we have improved physically.* ATHLETE #6C: ...this year, athletically better...definite development.*
COACH #7: 100% improvement. The team wasn't organized. The players on the team wouldn't even make the top players now. Improvement.*	ATHLETE #7A: I think the team has more depth...an increase.* ATHLETE #7B: ...everyone has become alot better friends, more united and everything...definitely been an improvement.* ATHLETE #7C: ...there is a little improvement, increase in motivation.*
COACH #8: There is no compariaon at all. When I came into the program there was no program...a massive improvement.*	ATHLETE #8A: There has been a definite improvement...* ATHLETE #8B: ...in the last few years the team has been a non-500 team... there has been a steady improvement.* ATHLETE #8C: Alot younger, more inexperienced...definite improvement.*
COACH #9: When I first arrived the team was basically a team of non-recruit student/athletes...it was an exaggerated intramural team...tremendous improvement.*	ATHLETE #9A: ...I think we improved alot.* ATHLETE #9B: I think 100% improvement. When I first got here it was like a new team...there was only 3 returning players.* ATHLETE #9C: I think there is an improvement.*
COACH #10: When I first took over the team we were considered a laughing stock...a huge turnaround...instead of being treated badly we are given a great deal of respect...improvement.*	ATHLETE #10A: ...We compete at a much higher level and have much lower scores...much improved.* ATHLETE #10B: Its probably been an improvement.* ATHLETE #10C: Oh, we are definitely going forward.*

* = response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement = .975 Responses that agree = 39 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #4: Has the athletic department (or your team) ever been judged by others to be better than other Division III departments (or teams)?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: NCAA report stated that UCSD #2 in nation in participation in national championships...on a casual basis, people have commented to me about the success of the program.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Yes...the people in the area. Our regional reps...*	ATHLETE #1A: ...we have been judged 2nd regionally and 11th nationally.* ATHLETE #1B: I don't know. ATHLETE #1C: Back east--insinuated we should be at a different level.*
COACH #2: ...I guess the judgement comes with proof, the winning.*	ATHLETE #2A: From other peers have heard the team in good. It's very strong...from other coaches I have heard that too.* ATHLETE #2B: ...we are not really seen as competition. ATHLETE #2C: Not very often.
COACH #3: No.	ATHLETE #3A: Yea, we have won a couple of contests.* ATHLETE #3B: I have heard that they don't think the competition is fair... they didn't have people to participate in 1/2 the events.* ATHLETE #3C: Don't have a reputation...being powerful athletic school.
COACH #4: Absolutely...unofficial survey...coaches we have played...DIII teams...they have all...said that we are the best DIII team in S. California.*	ATHLETE #4A: Yea, I've heard from opponent's fans...that we should be moved up... (instead) of playing DIII teams.* ATHLETE #4B: Yea, I think so.* ATHLETE #4C: From what I hear...DIII coaches think we are the best.*
COACH #5: Yea, the opinion among the other DIII's is that we are too strong. There is a slight reluctance among them to play us...*	ATHLETE #5A: Yea...alot of coaches...talking to us...you guys are a lot better. We are just playing you for practice.* ATHLETE #5B: Yea, alot of coaches have told our coach...a friend from another team said, you guys are coached so much better...* ATHLETE #5C: Right now...unofficially...ranked #1 in Calif. in DIII.*
COACH #6: Yes, we have a good reputation...we have been picked, by a magazine, to be better than most of the teams in the country.*	ATHLETE #6A: I'm sure it has...Yea...ranked 3rd...* ATHLETE #6B: ...we have bee 3rd each year. But, really we have been ranked higher than that...* ATHLETE #6C: I've never discussed it with anyone...we are ranked #3.*
COACH #7: Ranking? Yes, the team has been judged...one or two.*	ATHLETE #7A: Oh, I think so. Yes.* ATHLETE #7B: Yes, just from our past records...everyone wants to beat UCSD.* ATHLETE #7C: Oh, yea-I haven't asked other teams--just from our title*
COACH #8: I don't think that there is a coach in CA. that doesn't realize (we)... are either #1 or #2 in the state.*	ATHLETE #8A: ...They are out to beat us. Definitely...we are the team to beat.* ATHLETE #8B: Yea, I have to say, yea...they look at us as the DIII school.* ATHLETE #8C: Just what our coach has told us...we are much better...*
COACH #9: Most definitely.*	ATHLETE #9A: ...I know that alot of people really think we are really good...* ATHLETE #9B: We have a bad reputation...(of excellence)...everybody is always saying, "UCSD, wow!"* ATHLETE #9C: I think so...I hear people always saying, "Oh, UCSD!"*
COACH #10: Last year when we went back to the national championship and the coaches meeting, I had other coaches (7 or 8)...seeking me out to ask me what I had done to improve the program?*	ATHLETE #10A: Sure, we have a reputation...as the team to beat.* ATHLETE #10B: Not, that I know of... ATHLETE #10C: We have a pretty good reputation...amongst DIII teams.*

*= response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .850 Responses that agree= 34 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #5A: What is the budget for the athletic department (or your team)? B. Based on your knowledge do you feel that it's above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III athletic departments (or teams)?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: \$600,000 budget. Also, individual teams do fund raising...additional \$100,000 brought in. In discussions with other DIII institutions...impression that I get that their teams are funded better than we are.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1:(laugh) It varies from year to year. Usually its about \$2,500. Below average...we usually raise about \$1,500. It kind of depends on what we decide to do.*	ATHLETE #1A:I have no idea. ATHLETE #1B:Don't know. ATHLETE #1C:No, idea at all.
COACH #2:It varies a great deal...\$4,000 a year. In general above average...it is the policy of the department that the athletes contribute...	ATHLETE #2A:We have to buy some sort of equipment just to have it as a back-up. Average. ATHLETE #2B:That I don't know...way above average. ATHLETE #2C:...I can't say. About average.
COACH #3:It varies...\$2,800. Below average...from what I can observe the teams are a little bit better taken care of than we are now...our funding is very limited for the total program.*	ATHLETE #3A:No, I have no idea...It looks below average because we don't have the equipment that alot of DIII teams have.* ATHLETE #3B:Very small...I had better facilities in high school. Below average.* ATHLETE #3C:...its real low... below average.*
COACH #4:Low, lower, and lower than lower...we have to do so much fund raising in our program...just to get the proper amount of equipment and supplies. Below average.*	ATHLETE #4A:We did fund raising for our own uniforms this year...we had three different fund raisers...its below average...* ATHLETE #4B:I know we have to do alot of fund raising ourselves...I use real money for equipment...average. ATHLETE #4C:I think ...that we are under budgeted...below average.*
COACH #5:I really can't remember.	ATHLETE #5A:I don't have any idea...Compared to other DIII teams I would say its below average...sort of denied everything.* ATHLETE #5B:No...I think its probably above average when compared to other DIII teams. ATHLETE #5C:No, very little idea...
COACH #6:I have a standard bet with any DIII coach in the country, that if their budget is smaller than mine I will take them out to a nice place...I've never had to pay off. We are not way below average, we are 1 on a scale of 10.*	ATHLETE #6A:No idea. It seems to me that we could use more money. The other teams have more...we do landscaping...below average.* ATHLETE #6B:No idea. I know that we do alot of work though...take care of all the landscaping...below.* ATHLETE #6C:The majority of our money we earn of our own...below.*
COACH #7:A couple of thousand dollars. Probably average.	ATHLETE #7A:No, I don't know...the rackets and bags we get from a company...in other ways we are a little below average.* ATHLETE #7B:I have no idea...just looking at the other schools we below average or they are allocating funds to something else.* ATHLETE #7C:No idea...the budget is really, really low...*
COACH #8:...around \$6,000...but most of the money that is generated...is generated by me...through guarantees...in one year I can generate 13 to 14 thousand dollars...Oh, far below average.*	ATHLETE #8A:I have no idea...the budget is really low...* ATHLETE #8B:To be honest, no...From what I've heard...it is very low...below average.* ATHLETE #8C:We did a survey...we are so much below average...*
COACH #9:\$3,500...Below average, its below average, its below every other DIII team that I know of...It is probably less than 1/3 of the budget of the top 6 or 8 teams that we are competing with at the national level...we fund a trip of our area every year...*	ATHLETE #9A:I have no idea. I have a pretty good idea its above average because we get alot of outside support...companies.* ATHLETE #9B:I have no idea...we are average, may be a little better... ATHLETE #9C:Below average...here they don't recognize the sports.*
COACH #10:Unbelievably small in terms of how much we play...\$3,000...We are the lowest budgeted team, perhaps in the nation that has any competitive skill at all.*	ATHLETE #10A:Its getting better...A little bit below average...we don't get equipment...we provide our own equipment.* ATHLETE #10B:I heard its about \$2,500 which isn't very big...Way below average.* ATHLETE #10C:I have no idea...It seems to be alright.

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .650 % of Agreement for Coaches= .700
Responses that agree= 26 of 40/ 7 of 10

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #6A: As a department is there (or As a coach is there or Does your coach make) a concentrated effort to recruit talented athletes?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: Generally yes, some coaches are more active and better at it than others...some coaches hardly get involved and don't take the initiative.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Sure. Its limited by what we can offer them... a good education and a good program. But, it is real hard to get into school here... We go after bright kids with a good GPA so we can keep them eligible.*	ATHLETE #1A: Players do come here and check out the school... and program... they talk to the coach... semi-active recruitment.* ATHLETE #1B: We can't recruit but we try to get them interested. When I came out last year she showed me around the school & team.* ATHLETE #1C: I know the coach has gone out to watch... people play.*
COACH #2: This has been one of my strong points. But, going to the nationals is a big help. The place to recruit is back east. I made contact with H.S. coaches... goal this spring... following up these contacts.*	ATHLETE #2A: ...this year the coach is making a definite effort... to recruit.* ATHLETE #2B: Yea, I think the coach tries to recruit. I think the coach does a pretty good job.* ATHLETE #2C: Not very much... that's UCSU in general...
COACH #3: Very difficult. There is an effort... embarrassed right now to bring an athlete here to get an education and compete... because we don't have a facility that is conducive for training...*	ATHLETE #3A: I don't think the coach really does. ATHLETE #3B: As far as I know, no. ATHLETE #3C: No... pretty much takes what comes out...
COACH #4: Yes. There absolutely is... what I have done the last three years is work relationships with area coaches and J.C. coaches...*	ATHLETE #4A: ...can't really go out... coach speaks to us to see if we know of any one that wants to play... coach meets with them.* ATHLETE #4B: The coach does.* ATHLETE #4C: I think the coach does...*
COACH #5: This year I have done alot of recruiting and expect to do very, very well... I spend a great deal of time.*	ATHLETE #5A: The coach does.* ATHLETE #5B: Yea, this year the coach is.* ATHLETE #5C: Yea, the coach does.*
COACH #6: Yea, as a matter fact that's the biggest problem we have... special emils... we are still waiting to hear whether or not they have been accepted... the only way we are are going to improve is to get kids that have been offered scholarships at DI schools... we are at that level.*	ATHLETE #6A: I know the coach does.* ATHLETE #6B: The coach does.* ATHLETE #6C: Yes, the coach does... spends every waking hour.*
COACH #7: Yes, there is.*	ATHLETE #7A: If people come to talk to the coach... the coach talks to them... coach does go out and search. ATHLETE #7B: Not that I know of. ATHLETE #7C: We don't give scholarships its hard for the coach to do.
COACH #8: Very concentrated. I am in the midst of my recruiting now.*	ATHLETE #8A: Yea, yea, I think the coach does.* ATHLETE #8B: ...I think the coach does... the coach has quite a few visit.* ATHLETE #8C: The coach definitely does... tries very hard at that...*
COACH #9: Definitely.*	ATHLETE #9A: Yea, alot... From all the other team members... most of the other members were recruited on our team.* ATHLETE #9B: The coach is good at recruiting... you just don't want to go anywhere else after you talk to the coach.* ATHLETE #9C: I know that the coach has recruited... yes.*
COACH #10: Probably a little less concentrated than there be at another division level... the ones I actively sought I have pretty good sucess.*	ATHLETE #10A: Yes, the coach talks to H.S. people and transfers...* ATHLETE #10B: I'm not sure the coach is allowed to do that being this a DI school. ATHLETE #10C: I think the coach does whatever can be done.*

*= response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .800 Responses that agree= 32 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #6B: Based on your knowledge do you feel that the talent represented by the student/athletes in the athletic department (or on your team) is above average, average, or below average in relationship to other Division III departments (or teams)?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: Obviously in successful sports above average...(laugh)... above average...again in most sports...in some they are not.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Above average.*	ATHLETE #1A: I'd say our talent is above average.* ATHLETE #1B: Above average because we are pretty good.* ATHLETE #1C: Probably above average.*
COACH #2: I can't give you an answer on talent...experience, average or below average.	ATHLETE #2A: Above average.* ATHLETE #2B: ...average. ATHLETE #2C: Average to above average.*
COACH #3: It is...overall...average.	ATHLETE #3A: I'd say, overall, its below average. ATHLETE #3B: Its above average. There are some very talented members on the team.* ATHLETE #3C: Average to above average.*
COACH #4: Above average, no question...*	ATHLETE #4A: Definitely above average.* ATHLETE #4B: I would say we are above average.* ATHLETE #4C: I think we are above average.*
COACH #5: ...above average.*	ATHLETE #5A: Above average in relation to other DIII schools.* ATHLETE #5B: Above average.* ATHLETE #5C: Above average.*
COACH #6: ...way above average because we are one of the top schools in the country.*	ATHLETE #6A: Above average.* ATHLETE #6B: A little bit above average.* ATHLETE #6C: I think we are above average.*
COACH #7: Above average.*	ATHLETE #7A: I think it is above average.* ATHLETE #7B: Above average.* ATHLETE #7C: I'd say above average.*
COACH #8: Far above average. I have some of the finest DIII athletes in California.*	ATHLETE #8A: I think we are above average...definitely.* ATHLETE #8B: I think it is above average, easily.* ATHLETE #8C: I say it is definitely above average.*
COACH #9: Up until this year we had above average talent... This year I think we had average talent.*	ATHLETE #9A: I think it is above average.* ATHLETE #9B: Above average, definitely.* ATHLETE #9C: I'd say the talent is higher.*
COACH #10: Way above average...*	ATHLETE #10A: In relationship to other DIII Teams we are way above average.* ATHLETE #10B: I think the talent is above average.* ATHLETE #10C: I think we are above average.*

*= response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .900 Responses that agree= 36 Of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #7: How would you compare the athletic facilities at U.C.S.D. with other Division III institutions: above average, average, or below average?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: ...facilities are inadequate...athletics, intramurals, recreation. Consequently facilities are over crowded...average to below average.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Below average. There is no adequate facility for my sport at UCSD...we play off campus.*	ATHLETE #1A: Its below average as far as on campus...* ATHLETE #1B: ...don't really have on campus...* ATHLETE #1C: ...below average...*
COACH #2: Our facilities are limited...below average...*	ATHLETE #2A: Above average. ATHLETE #2B: Above average. ATHLETE #2C: ...average.*
COACH #3: ...extremely below average, extremely poor...*	ATHLETE #3A: ...is below average, because our facility is one of the worst I have competed in.* ATHLETE #3B: Below average.* ATHLETE #3C: ...the worse...well below.*
COACH #4: ...below average, no question...players...and me essentially the groundskeepers...*	ATHLETE #4A: I think it is outstanding...we each spend two hours every week on the facility...on our assignments. ATHLETE #4B: In certain areas its below average...* ATHLETE #4C: ...on the average scale.*
COACH #5: From the schools that we visited, its improving here but its taking time. The facilities are vastly over used...below average.*	ATHLETE #5A: I'd say below average.* ATHLETE #5B: ...I think for our facility its above average...for school as a whole. I would say below average.* ATHLETE #5C: Probably average...*
COACH #6: ...the team doesn't get to use it much...usually two or three things going on at the same time.*	ATHLETE #6A: Average.* ATHLETE #6B: I've been to other DIII's and we have been to superior to them. ATHLETE #6C: Way above average.
COACH #7: Below average.*	ATHLETE #7A: Probably a little above average. There are some schools that really have nothing. ATHLETE #7B: Below average, definitely...* ATHLETE #7C: ...I guess they are considered good.
COACH #8: ...I get two hours of block time practice...I don't get any extra time...intramurals get alot more credence at this university than intercollegiates...the facilities far, far below par...*	ATHLETE #8A: I would say above average... ATHLETE #8B: ...about average.* ATHLETE #8C: ...a little bit above average.
COACH #9: ...on a sort of par...better game facility... But, for practice we don't have a very good facility at all.*	ATHLETE #9A: ...average.* ATHLETE #9B: Probably average...* ATHLETE #9C: About average...*
COACH #10: Above average.	ATHLETE #10A: ...compared to DIII we are average.* ATHLETE #10B: I think it is probably below average.* ATHLETE #10C: I guess its probably average.*

*= response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .750 Responses that agree= 30 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #10C: Would you say the athletic department better reflects its own culture rather than the university as a whole?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: Yes...reflects more of its own.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Yes...*	ATHLETE #1A: Yes...*
	ATHLETE #1B: In a way.*
	ATHLETE #1C: I guess.*
COACH #2: I can't answer that.	ATHLETE #2A: Yes.*
	ATHLETE #2B: Not really. I think...they are pretty much influenced by the rest of the University...
	ATHLETE #2C: Probably.*
COACH #3:...I think it reflects its own culture. Athletics will always do that.*	ATHLETE #3A: I think, yea...*
	ATHLETE #3B:...its different.*
	ATHLETE #3C:...its own.*
COACH #4:...Yes...absolutely.*	ATHLETE #4A: Yea, I say it would.*
	ATHLETE #4B: Yes, I would say so...*
	ATHLETE #4C: Probably.*
COACH #5:...I don't know.	ATHLETE #5A: Yes...*
	ATHLETE #5B: Yea.*
	ATHLETE #5C: Yes, yes.*
X COACH #6: Yes.*	ATHLETE #6A:...it reflects a little.
	ATHLETE #6B: Definitely. Definitely.*
	ATHLETE #6C: Right now I it reflects the university as a whole.
COACH #7: As a whole, probably yes...*	ATHLETE #7A: I think probably so.*
	ATHLETE #7B: Probably, yes.*
	ATHLETE #7C:...has different values...*
COACH #8:...I think so right now.*	ATHLETE #8A: Yes, yes, definitely.*
	ATHLETE #8B:...no.
	ATHLETE #8C: I don't think so.
COACH #9: Yes.*	ATHLETE #9A: I think so.*
	ATHLETE #9B:...I think so.*
	ATHLETE #9C: Yes, I think so.*
COACH #10: I think it does.*	ATHLETE #10A: Yes, I think so.*
	ATHLETE #10B: Yes.*
	ATHLETE #10C: I think so.*

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .625 Responses that agree=33 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #11A: What would you say are the broad purposes of the athletic department of U.C.S.D. ?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: To provide positive opportunities for participation for student/athletes to allow them to reach maximum potential as competitors. To generate spirit and visibility for the university and to bring together as much of the student body in order to develop some sense of family.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Oh, to provide an outlet for student/athletes. To provide another way for them to excel...to provide them with social contacts.*	ATHLETE #1A:...to go out and have fun. ATHLETE #1B:...I guess to give representation to the school. ATHLETE #1C:...give a chance..opportunity to compete...*
COACH #2: To contribute to the students college experience, with the added experience that athletics provides...rounding out the person...*	ATHLETE #2A: To round off the person's personality... ATHLETE #2B: To have at least an athletic department, thats it. ATHLETE #2C:...students...enable to compete on a team.*
COACH #3: To provide the opportunity for all athletes to participate in a chosen sport.*	ATHLETE #3A:...to develop the students in other ways beside academics...* ATHLETE #3B:...basically for recreation... ATHLETE #3C:...to promote sports.*
COACH #4: To give athletes an opportunity to play in a competitive environment...not (just) intramurals...*	ATHLETE #4A: To build the program ATHLETE #4B: Just to provide an outlet for those that are athletically inclined for participation.* ATHLETE #4C: To make sure the athletic teams are running smoothly.
COACH #5: We have a kind of Dill philosophy...they look upon it as important to them, but it isn't totally 100% required.	ATHLETE #5A: To serve as many students as possible.* ATHLETE #5B:...to try to get even more people to come to the games ATHLETE #5C:...to give us the experience.*
COACH #6:...its necessary to provide an environment where these people can excel...*	ATHLETE #6A: To have a better athletic program... ATHLETE #6B:...improve their image...an incorporate athletics more into the university.* ATHLETE #6C: I think they are trying to expand and grow...
COACH #7:...to have the most participants being involved in the department...getting students involved...and having a successful program.*	ATHLETE #7A: To provide coaches and support to students who want to participate in intercollegiate athletics.* ATHLETE #7B:...just to get as many people involved...* ATHLETE #7C:...just participation, just to play.*
COACH #8: Dill philosophy is broad based- to have alot of of sports, alot of competition, and mass participation...*	ATHLETE #8A:...they are more concerned about getting people out to see what UCSD's sports is about.* ATHLETE #8B:...to provide an escape from academics...allows athletes capable of playing...to play.* ATHLETE #8C: offering something outside of the academic...*
COACH #9:...to offer a great environment for student/athletes to compete in...a very competitive environment.*	ATHLETE #9A: Just to give the students an outlet besides school... more competitive...than intramurals-get more pride in the school.* ATHLETE #9B: To get good athletes out here who...Both academically and athletically perform the best you can...* ATHLETE #9C: Stress athletics..Build emphasis..get students involved*
COACH #10:...to develop each and every individual as a well rounded person wherein he or she is a good co-mingling of both the spirit of good athletic contest and as well as academic aptitude.*	ATHLETE #10A: To give people an outlet...get people involved and have fun...* ATHLETE #10B: They give people who want to participate in sports a chance to compete...against other colleges.* ATHLETE #10C:...to get people interested...provide a study break.*

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director

% of Agreement= .700

Responses that agree= 28 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #11B: What objectives do you see as important to fulfilling these purposes?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: To provide quality experience for the participants... generating or supplying information to the campus.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: To work with the player, individually, to achieve what they want from their participation on the team.	ATHLETE #1A: To make sure...(not) too much emphasis or pressure put on winning. ATHLETE #1B: I don't know. ATHLETE #1C: No answer.
COACH #2: ...being able to fund those teams...find good coaching and consistent coaching...	ATHLETE #2A: I could answer the academic department but not the athletic department. ATHLETE #2B: To show that we have a well rounded school...just name dropping. ATHLETE #2C: Giving the students an outlet.
COACH #3: To provide an opportunity for athletes to compete.	ATHLETE #3A: ...to do a little more recruiting. ATHLETE #3B: ...more fields for more people to play...better organization. ATHLETE #3C: ...to promote sports...to get money...
COACH #4: ...everyone aware of what we have to offer... push harder for a larger budget...To give visible support during contests.*	ATHLETE #4A: To get the school to realize that we have alot of athletes that could be playing in DI and DII schools. ATHLETE #4B: ...a little more publicity about things...getting more people out...get the over-all school involved.* ATHLETE #4C: I would like to see a little more support..athl.dept.
COACH #5: ...get crowds out in large numbers.	ATHLETE #5A: What they need now is a greater number of facilities.. ATHLETE #5B: No answer. ATHLETE #5C: ...communication, keeping communication open...*
COACH #6: If this is a quality institution in academics... we have a moral responsibility to treat their coaches better ...make a better effort at changing things.	ATHLETE #6A: ...all major universities, like Berkeley and Stanford, I have good programs...build a better program. ATHLETE #6B: ...we have to get the student body to recognize the sports. ATHLETE #6C: ...to drop the DIII status...we are so much bigger.
COACH #7: Having quality coaches. Salaries for the coaches so that we can get qualified people.	ATHLETE #7A: Providing enough funds so that you are adequately supplied...to participate in the sports... ATHLETE #7B: ...the serious athlete intercollegiate is the way to go. ATHLETE #7C: No answer.
COACH #8: I kind of answered that in the last question.	ATHLETE #8A: ...establish a winning tradition... ATHLETE #8B: Basically, the academic objective of the school... ATHLETE #8C: ...move to DII or DI...
COACH #9: ...and develop ways so that they come to the gym and watch...	ATHLETE #9A: ...all sports start doing better against other schools / ...then everybody will start going to games... ATHLETE #9B: ...its a high level of play... ATHLETE #9C: ...want the teams to do well.
COACH #10: ...striking a balance between the different things a university student must be...	ATHLETE #10A: ...try to get as many people intersted in it as possible.* ATHLETE #10B: ...improve it services by asking the Regents for bigger funds. ATHLETE #10C: ...to provide a broad range of athletics for people.*

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .150 Responses that agree= 6 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #12A: Do you feel that the U.C.S.D. athletic team coaches (or you as a coach or your coach) give extra effort beyond what is expected of them (or you or him/her) ?

A.D.'S RESPONSE:...in general they are making a fairly strong commitment although most are part-time and therefore have responsibilities elsewhere...thus dilutes the opportunity for them to give as much as they might want to or I might want them to.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: I sure do.*	ATHLETE #1A: No...its not something you expect in a coach. ATHLETE #1B: Yes...* ATHLETE #1C: Yea.*
COACH #2: I do more than expected...I think a number of them do.*	ATHLETE #2A: Definitely.* ATHLETE #2B: Yes, the coach does.* ATHLETE #2C: Not really.
COACH #3: 150 percent.*	ATHLETE #3A: Not really. ATHLETE #3B: ...yes.* ATHLETE #3C: Definitely.*
COACH #4: Yes, I do.*	ATHLETE #4A: Yea, the coach does.* ATHLETE #4B: Yes.* ATHLETE #4C: Oh, yea, much more than anyone does.*
COACH #5: Definitely.*	ATHLETE #5A: Yes, the coach does.* ATHLETE #5B: Yes.* ATHLETE #5C: Yes. Definitely.*
COACH #6: Absolutely...*	ATHLETE #6A: Yea, I think the coach does.* ATHLETE #6B: I think so.* ATHLETE #6C: To a degree...*
COACH #7: Yes.*	ATHLETE #7A: I'd say so.* ATHLETE #7B: I definitely think the coach does.* ATHLETE #7C: I don't think the coach is giving extra effort...
COACH #8: I think I do...spend many, many more hours that's not accounted for...*	ATHLETE #8A: Average. I don't think the coach goes all out. ATHLETE #8B: ...everything else the coach puts out for the players. ATHLETE #8C: Yes, definitely.*
COACH #9: I think I do...yes.*	ATHLETE #9A: I think the coach does...* ATHLETE #9B: I think so...* ATHLETE #9C: Yes, I think the coach does.*
COACH #10: I do.*	ATHLETE #10A: Oh, yea. I couldn't stress that more...* ATHLETE #10B: The coach is always there if we need him...* ATHLETE #10C: I think so...*

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .650 Responses that agree= 34 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #12B: How committed do you feel the coaches are (or you are or your coach is) to your previously stated broad purposes and objectives of the athletic department?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: I think they are committed to them...sometimes they might not understand them all, but from what they understand I think they are supportive.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1:Very committed.*	ATHLETE #1A:I think the coach is committed to those purposes...*
	ATHLETE #1B:They're committed, wholly committed.*
	ATHLETE #1C:I think the coach is very committed.*
COACH #2:I think their job depends on it...*	ATHLETE #2A: Yes.*
	ATHLETE #2B:I think the coach is more the other way...trying to have us do better.
	ATHLETE #2C:I think the coach follows it.*
COACH #3:I feel that I am totally committed to that...*	ATHLETE #3A:I think this year the coach wasn't too committed.
	ATHLETE #3B:I'm not sure how the coach is involved...
	ATHLETE #3C:The coach is very committed...*
COACH #4:I think they are very much committed.*	ATHLETE #4A:He's there all the way...*
	ATHLETE #4B:I don't think he has alot of time because we are not given much help from the overall department.
	ATHLETE #4C:I'd say 100%. The coach is really behind everything.*
COACH #5:I know I'm committed to my goals. And, I know they are committed to their goals...*	ATHLETE #5A:Not very...constantly trying to manuver around the athletic dept. to get what the team needs.
	ATHLETE #5B:I think he is pretty committed.*
	ATHLETE #5C:...the coach is more committed than alot of people.*
COACH #6:I'm committed...its just disappointing there is not more commitment elsewhere...*	ATHLETE #6A:I think the coach is motivated.*
	ATHLETE #6B:I think the coach is pretty much committed.*
	ATHLETE #6C:The coach is constantly at bay with the ath.dept.
COACH #7:I don't think that is the main objective of the coaches.	ATHLETE #7A:I think the coach is very true to it.*
	ATHLETE #7B:Definitely.*
	ATHLETE #7C:Yea, I do...*
COACH #8:I understand its a Diff institution, within those guidelines I am totally committed to work within those guidelines. But, as far as the changes that I think need to be facilitated, I'm also committed to making those changes.*	ATHLETE #8A:I think the coach has really tried hard to get people out.*
	ATHLETE #8B: Real committed...*
	ATHLETE #8C:...tries very hard to influence the...department.
COACH #9:I am committed to my team more than I am committed to the total UCSD athletic program...Its hard for me to support coaches...don't put enough time in...that aren't successful.*	ATHLETE #9A:He tries...*
	ATHLETE #9B:The coach is really good about that...*
	ATHLETE #9C:The coach is really involved...really dedicated.*
COACH #10:I won't rest until we are running as good a program as we possibly can...*	ATHLETE #10A:The coach encourages everybody to come out...*
	ATHLETE #10B:It's kind of hard to say.
	ATHLETE #10C:...the coach is really involved with our team.

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .750 Responses that agree= 30 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #12C: How would you describe the motivation of the coaches? (coaches only: How motivated are you?)

A.D.'S RESPONSE: For the most part the coaches are very motivated.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1:...I'm very motivated...*	ATHLETE #1A:The coaches motivation is probably to...be out there to have fun with us... ATHLETE #1B: Its high...* ATHLETE #1C:...the team motivates the coach.
COACH #2:Pretty good...everyone seems pretty up...*	ATHLETE #2A: I'm not sure what the coaches motives are...when the coach is coaching. ATHLETE #2B:I think the coach is very well motivated.* ATHLETE #2C:I think she is more motivated..as far as the men go*
COACH #3:Right now...there has been an improvement...I'm still motivated.*	ATHLETE #3A:...its motivation just to see people do...the best that they can...* ATHLETE #3B:Its hard to see the coach with much motivation... ATHLETE #3C:The coach is not a real motivator of people.
COACH #4:...overall they are motivated for their own sport...*	ATHLETE #4A:...the coach is an average motivator... ATHLETE #4B:Very motivated.* ATHLETE #4C:Its a motivation that I like.*
COACH #5:Everyone is obviously different. I'm very impressed by some of the coaches...most of the coaches are very committed.*	ATHLETE #5A:The coach is very motivated...* ATHLETE #5B:The coach is very motivated.* ATHLETE #5C:The coach is very highly motivated.*
COACH #6:...some are very motivated...others are excited.*	ATHLETE #6A:...extremely motivated...* ATHLETE #6B:I don't think the coach could live without competition. ATHLETE #6C:Pretty unstoppable. The coach is pretty motivated.*
COACH #7:I think it is very high as a whole...*	ATHLETE #7A:I think it is pretty good.* ATHLETE #7B:...most of the coaches are trying to increase their programs...* ATHLETE #7C:...I think the coach is very motivated...*
COACH #8:Its exceptional here. All motivated...*	ATHLETE #8A:I think the coach has alot of motivation...* ATHLETE #8B:I'd say the coach is a pretty motivated person...* ATHLETE #8C:Definitely a self-motivated person...*
COACH #9:...80% I talked about are highly motivated. The other 20% are not very motivated in several areas...*	ATHLETE #9A:The coach is very motivated to play our sport.* ATHLETE #9B:Sometimes I think it gets a little bit too much...* ATHLETE #9C:...The coach is highly motivated, definitely.*
COACH #10:Quite a bit...*	ATHLETE #10A:The coach is very motivated.* ATHLETE #10B:No answer. ATHLETE #10C:The coach is real motivated.*

* Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .825 Responses that agree= 33 of 40

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #14A: How often do you meet with your direct supervisor (or the individual whose responsibilities include the athletic department)? (omit this question for team members.)

A.D.'S RESPONSE: I've had the same supervisor for eleven years. Starting this year I am meeting with the Physical Director once a month...We still get side tracked on departmental issues rather than athletic issues...only meet with the Vice-Chancellor through my initiation...

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: Usually we meet once or twice a week...her office is right next door.	ATHLETE #1A: ATHLETE #1B: ATHLETE #1C:
COACH #2: A.D.?...We have a coaches meeting once a month.	ATHLETE #2A: ATHLETE #2B: ATHLETE #2C:
COACH #3: We meet weekly in one setting and once every three weeks in another.	ATHLETE #3A: ATHLETE #3B: ATHLETE #3C:
COACH #4: I don't think I meet with the direct supervisor nearly enough...I have to initiate the contact...I feel we don't have enough meetings, communication.*	ATHLETE #4A: ATHLETE #4B: ATHLETE #4C:
COACH #5: We are suppose to have one meeting a month... individually.	ATHLETE #5A: ATHLETE #5B: ATHLETE #5C:
COACH #6: One on one? I probably initiate a meeting every two weeks.	ATHLETE #6A: ATHLETE #6B: ATHLETE #6C:
COACH #7: Individually?...Once a month there is a coaches meeting...required.	ATHLETE #7A: ATHLETE #7B: ATHLETE #7C:
COACH #8: I meet with the A.D...once or twice every two weeks...required coaches meeting once a month.	ATHLETE #8A: ATHLETE #8B: ATHLETE #8C:
COACH #9: The A.D.? I can meet with her at anytime. there is only one time I have ot meet with her and thats the end of year evaluation.	ATHLETE #9A: ATHLETE #9B: ATHLETE #9C:
COACH #10: At least on a monthly basis for coaches meetings... between monthly meeting 2 to 5 times depending on the time of year.	ATHLETE #10A: ATHLETE #10B: ATHLETE #10C:

* = Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement = .100 Responses that agree = 1 of 10

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #14B: How much autonomy do you have in your position?...Are you often reviewed? (Omit this question for the team members.)

A.D.'S RESPONSE: A lot, a lot...Reviewed? I am a faculty member, I am reviewed by my peer faculty and the Physical Education department Chair as opposed to an administrative review.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1: I would say a lot...No, we are only reviewed once a year.*	ATHLETE #1A: ATHLETE #1B: ATHLETE #1C:
COACH #2: Quite a bit...once a year.*	ATHLETE #2A: ATHLETE #2B: ATHLETE #2C:
COACH #3: I have total control of the program...once a year.*	ATHLETE #3A: ATHLETE #3B: ATHLETE #3C:
COACH #4: There's quite a bit...I like being leader of my section...We are reviewed once a year.*	ATHLETE #4A: ATHLETE #4B: ATHLETE #4C:
COACH #5: I'm pretty much left on my own...An annual review.*	ATHLETE #5A: ATHLETE #5B: ATHLETE #5C:
COACH #6: 100%...There is a review process but I would like to be reviewed more often.*	ATHLETE #6A: ATHLETE #6B: ATHLETE #6C:
COACH #7: I'm pretty much left alone, totally...Once a year.*	ATHLETE #7A: ATHLETE #7B: ATHLETE #7C:
COACH #8: As coach? Total over my team...once a year.*	ATHLETE #8A: ATHLETE #8B: ATHLETE #8C:
COACH #9: Actually, I have a great deal...every year.*	ATHLETE #9A: ATHLETE #9B: ATHLETE #9C:
COACH #10: Very much, that's probably what I enjoy about it...at least on a yearly basis.*	ATHLETE #10A: ATHLETE #10B: ATHLETE #10C:

* = Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement = 1.000 Responses that agree = 10 of 10

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #14C: As a department (or coach), do you have any interactions with other departments within the university- either through formal or informal contacts? (Omit this question for the team members.)

A.D.'S RESPONSE:Constantly. We don't hit every department, we don't hit the academic departments...have alot of contact with those departments under student affairs: admissions, registras office, health center, university events, and alumni office.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1:The physical education department because I work there too.*	ATHLETE #1A: ATHLETE #1B: ATHLETE #1C:
COACH #2:No. Not extensive.*	ATHLETE #2A: ATHLETE #2B: ATHLETE #2C:
COACH #3: I serve of various committees...Academic departments? I would probably say no.*	ATHLETE #3A: ATHLETE #3B: ATHLETE #3C:
COACH #4:I have alot of contacts...with the grounds department here...purchasing...in other sections of the campus, outside of physical education I don't have very many.*	ATHLETE #4A: ATHLETE #4B: ATHLETE #4C:
COACH #5:Really with only the physical department. I do have encounters here with the housing department...and catering...*	ATHLETE #5A: ATHLETE #5B: ATHLETE #5C:
COACH #6:Yes, all the academic departments because of the size of the team and the amount of travel and the conflicts with some of the academic schedules...also maintance.*	ATHLETE #6A: ATHLETE #6B: ATHLETE #6C:
COACH #7:The physical education department because I teach for them...Any academic department?...No.*	ATHLETE #7A: ATHLETE #7B: ATHLETE #7C:
COACH #8:No...I get no benefits for coaching here. Nothing is provided for me. Therefore, I have been never welcome in the academic side of things.*	ATHLETE #8A: ATHLETE #8B: ATHLETE #8C:
COACH #9:Alot...I'm directly involved with the housing department...Instead of academic...housing, transportation, student services, physical plant...more than the academic departments of the university.*	ATHLETE #9A: ATHLETE #9B: ATHLETE #9C:
COACH #10:Not so much with other departments. The thing I brought up earlier, the bastions of academia regard athletics as something outside their realm and as a result shy away from us and wish us to shy away from them...*	ATHLETE #10A: ATHLETE #10B: ATHLETE #10C:

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= 1.000 Responses that agree= 10 of 10

RESPONSE ANALYSIS FORM

QUESTION #15A: How would you describe how the rest of the university perceives the athletic department; for example the academic area?

A.D.'S RESPONSE: The academic departments are into their own world...they are unaware of us of the most part.

COACH'S RESPONSE	ATHLETE'S RESPONSE
COACH #1:...I'm not sure how the rest of the campus shares that feeling...at this point they are either apathetic or toward it.*	ATHLETE #1A: A lot of them don't, are ignorant about a large part of it. They don't realize how many teams we do have.* ATHLETE #1B: A lot of people don't even know about it...I don't even know if they know there are even teams.* ATHLETE #1C: A lot of people don't know a lot about what is going on.*
COACH #2:...there is part of the university that doesn't pay much attention to it...*	ATHLETE #2A: Not very well...they don't support the athletic department...they don't highly value them.* ATHLETE #2B: I don't think they think of it as any great establishment here...no big deal to be in the ath. dept. here.* ATHLETE #2C: Don't think anybody are really aware of what they do.*
COACH #3:...A certain percentage of them wouldn't care one way or another...I couldn't put a real percentage on it...I just know there is a fraction that actually wouldn't even know we had my program here.*	ATHLETE #3A: I think...a lot of students are oblivious to it.* ATHLETE #3B: It's kind of sad, people don't really care.* ATHLETE #3C: Portion of the univ. doesn't want to know about it.*
COACH #4:...A lot of them don't know much about the athletic department.*	ATHLETE #4A: I don't think that they even think about it...half the people at this school don't know where our facility is.* ATHLETE #4B: It's not really a major focus at this school.* ATHLETE #4C: ...student body leaning to stronger program-like UCLA.
COACH #5: I still think they look upon sports here in an academic nature...*	ATHLETE #5A: Between apathy and general negative feelings...either they don't know what it is or they don't know what it's doing.* ATHLETE #5B: The professors and most of the staff have no idea what's going on...too interested in the research...* ATHLETE #5C: Most of the people around here are unaware...*
COACH #6: This subject would not answer the question.	ATHLETE #6A: Most of them don't think about it. They really don't care.* ATHLETE #6B: They don't know we exist, they don't know anything about it...* ATHLETE #6C: In transition...academics are just starting to notice..
COACH #7: They would perceive us as a very strong department who is very beneficial to the school as a whole.	ATHLETE #7A: It's not that big a deal...as a club...Another little club.* ATHLETE #7B: I know some of the Professors would say a pain in the rear...think it is going to take some of their funding.* ATHLETE #7C: I have no idea what they think.
COACH #8:...a thorn in their side...As far as their concerned they could probably do very well without us.*	ATHLETE #8A: ...nonexistent...the students look at sports as big-time, like UCLA...they see this program as small & nonexistent.* ATHLETE #8B: A lot of people don't really care as far as athletics go.* ATHLETE #8C: Nonexistent. I mean they could care less.*
COACH #9: The student body would like to see a more accelerated program...the academic people would like to keep sitting on us...(they) feel athletic programs mean less emphasis on academics.	ATHLETE #9A: They don't take too much interest in the athletic department...they don't care.* ATHLETE #9B: They perceive it well. ATHLETE #9C: They don't look at us bad...OK for athletics.
COACH #10: The louder we scream for things the more its perceived that we are not understanding the academic orientation.	ATHLETE #10A: Most people don't even know we have a team like ours. I don't know if they give it much thought.* ATHLETE #10B: I don't know. ATHLETE #10C: I don't think the univ. recognizes it at all...*

*= Response that agrees with Athletic Director % of Agreement= .750 Responses that agree= 30 of 40

APPENDIX G

LIST OF QUESTIONS NOT USED IN THE
ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Question:	% Agreement
2. What has been the <u>departments</u> (or <u>your teams</u>) performance in NCAA regional or national competition?	See Appendix D
8. In competing against other DIII teams, do you feel that UCSD's athletic teams' uniforms, equipment, and travel schedules are above average, average, or below average in comparison to these teams?	45.0%
9A. How do you feel other <u>institutions</u> (or <u>coaches</u> or <u>teams</u>) view UCSD's <u>athletic department</u> (or <u>specific team</u>).	2.5%
9B. Based on your experience has the UCSD program influenced any other institution's program in any way?	52.5%
10A. Considering the athletic department is a part of the total university environment, how would you say the department reflects the ideas of the culture of this university?	10.0%
10B. What would you think others outside of the athletic department would say concerning how the department reflects the ideas of the culture of UCSD?	60.0%
11B. What objectives do you see as important to fulfilling these purposes?	15.0%
13A. What do you perceive the task of the athletic department to be?	55.0%
13B. Do you feel that all members of the department are committed to this task?	57.5%
13C. Do you feel that the <u>individuals above you</u> or <u>individuals below you</u> in the hierarchy are committed to this task?	12.5%
13D. Have any new or innovative methods been introduced within the <u>athletic department</u> (or <u>specific team</u>) since you have been involved in the athletic program?	65.0%
14D. Do the <u>coaches</u> (or <u>you</u>) have other academic responsibilities besides coaching?	40.0%

LIST OF QUESTIONS (Cont.)

- 14E. If so, who decides these academic responsibilities? 40.0%
- 15B. Would you say the athletic department represents a typical of atypical university department as you perceive it? 67.5%
- 15C. In what way? 25.0%
- 15D. NOTE: only ask if the person considers the department to be atypical: Would you say that the department is considered a problem by other departments in the university because of this atypical nature? 51.9%

APPENDIX H

April 24, 1987

Dr. William Foster
Director of Dissertation Committee
University of San Diego
Ocala Park
San Diego, CA 92110

Dear Dr. Foster:

As per the agreement in the Methodology of Ms. June Scopinich's dissertation, A College Athletic Department-- An Example of a High Performance System Existing in an Organizea Anarchy Known as a University/Higher Education Organization, I have verified the accuracy of the transcriptions that she recorded from the interview tapes and have found them accurate. I reviewed every fifth tape.

It has been a pleasure participating in a dissertation as exciting and meaningful as the aforementioned.

Cordially,

Barbara Blourock, Ph.D.

BB:slh
H3704