

# STUDENT AND EMPLOYEE SURVEYS ON IPFW DIVISION I ATHLETIC PROGRAM

Peter Iadicola  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

## Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	Page 2
II. Introduction	Page 3
III. Methods	Page 4
IV. Representativeness of Student Sample to Student Population	Page 7
V. Analysis Plan for Surveys	Page 10
VI. Division I Student Athletes and Non-Division I Students Perceptions of Benefits of the Division I Athletic Program.	Page 11
VII. Weighing the Cost and Benefits of Division I Athletics at IPFW	Page 31
VIII. Summarization of Areas of Agreement and Disagreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Division I Student Athletes	Page 36
IX. Representativeness of Employee Sample to Employee Population	Page 40
X. Administrators, Faculty, and Staff Perceptions of Benefits of the Division 1 Athletic Program	Page 44
XI. Administrators, Faculty, and Staff Weighing the Cost and Benefits of Division I Athletics at IPFW	Page 81
XII. Summarization of Areas of Agreement and Disagreement, between Administrators Faculty, and Staff on D-I Athletics at IPFW	Page 91
XIII. Areas of Agreement and Disagreement between Students and Employees	Page 93
XIV. Conclusions	Page 95
Index of Tables	Page 99
Appendix A – Letters for Students and Employees	Page 104
Appendix B – Surveys	Page 107
Appendix C – Frequencies for Combined Student Group	Page 129
Appendix D – Cross-tabulations by student and student athlete groups	Page 141

## Executive Summary

A survey of students and employees was conducted over a two week period beginning with the second week in the semester. The survey was conducted to complete the research that was conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee on Division I Athletics that was formed by the University Resources Committee. Students who were enrolled in the capstone course for the major in sociology designed the survey and survey instruments. The survey was designed to measure student and employee opinions on the benefits of the division I athletic program and whether the benefits are worth the costs. The respondents were organized into the following stakeholder groups for analysis of the findings; division I student athletes, students who were not division I athletes, administrative employees, faculty employees, and staff employees. Frequencies of response and cross-tabulation with calculations of Chi Square statistics were used to present the findings.

The survey indicated that there are important areas of agreement as measured by the majority opinion across all stakeholder groups regarding the benefits of the division I athletic program. The benefits identified by majority within each stakeholder group included the role the program plays in creation of community and school spirit, creating student oriented events, and contributing to a positive image for the university in the local community and the state of Indiana. Across both student stakeholder groups there is agreement on the contributions of the division I program including student recruitment, health and wellness, and creating diversity. The majority of both student stakeholder groups also see that the athletic program does contribute to the prestige of the university.

There are important differences in perceptions between division I students athletes and the students who are not division I athletes. Many of these differences are purely a result of the different roles that the athlete's play compared to students who are not division I athletes. However, many of the differences may be a result of the different roles of these positions and how they intersect with the division I program.

The report concludes with some suggestions as to how to spread the benefits of the program more broadly across the various stakeholder groups.

## **Introduction**

This survey was conducted to complete a study of the cost and benefits of IPFW's continued participation in division I athletics. As required by IPFW Senate document 12-25, Continue Participation in Summit League, the University Resources Policy Committee assembled a task force representative of all major stakeholders to the university and athletic program for completion of an assessment of the cost and benefits of IPFW's participation as a Division 1 university and to issue a report to the Senate by the February 2014 meeting. The task force was composed of representatives from the various stakeholder groups of IPFW and its division I athletic program. This included representatives from faculty (a male and female representative), student government, from the alumni, from the administration as selected by the Chancellor, and a representative from the athletic program. The committee was composed of the following representatives; Professor Peter Iadicola, committee chair and representing faculty, Professor Christine Erickson, representing faculty, Ms. Kelley Hartley Hutton, Athletic Director, Mr. Steven Sarratore, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, Ms. Pone Vongphachanh, representing IPFW Alumni, and Mr. Christopher Hinton, student representative.

The University Resources Policy Committee report from the task force was issued to the senate on March of 2013 (see Senate Reference No. 13-38). The task force had discussed the development of a survey of stakeholder groups including students, university employees, and alumni but unfortunately ran out of the necessary time to develop and execute the survey before the report was due to the senate. During the fall semester, I took on the task of completing this survey. Thus, this survey content and its results are solely my responsibility and not the responsibility of the task force.

During the fall semester, I incorporated the project of a survey on the perceived benefits of the stakeholders identified by the task force as a research project to be designed by the graduating seniors who were enrolled in the capstone course for the sociology major. Under my supervision, the students and I discussed the research on the costs and benefits of division I athletics to universities and identified key areas for

question development for a survey. We also discussed the pros and cons of various methodologies to assess the opinions of the various stakeholder groups. Students were divided into four workgroups to propose what areas needed to be measured, subject selection methodology and development of items for the various questionnaires. The methodology that was developed is a product of this class project. Planning and execution of the surveys was completed with the assistance of representatives of the Office of Chancellor, Professor Stanley Davis, Mr. Kirk Tolliver, Ms. Jennifer Oxtoby, Special Projects Coordinator Office of the Chancellor, Ms. Joleen Downs, secretary of the Office of Chancellor, Ms. Janet Shilling, Administrative Assistant to Office of Financial Affairs, Ms. Kim De Leon, Analyst from Student Information Services, Ms. Debra Boggs from Alumni Relations, Dean of Students Eric Norman, Chief Communications Director, Mr. John Kaufeld, and Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs David Wesse. The design originally planned for execution was a simple random sample. As a result

## **Methods**

Two Qualtrics online surveys were conducted of students and employees over a two week period beginning January 23. Students and employees received an email addressed to them personally asking them to participate in a survey on the division athletic program at IPFW. One week prior to the sending out of the email there were announcements of the upcoming survey in the online university publication, Inside IPFW. A reminder to complete the survey was sent to all who had not responded by the end of the first week. Data collection ended on February 16<sup>th</sup>. The survey conducted was on the population of students as defined as all active (registered or eligible to register) students who were registered for classes during the spring, 2015 semester. Removed from the list of students were guest students, collegiate connection high school students, and students who were taking a class but were students at another institution (ICN students). Also removed all students who graduated with any kind of certificate or degree in fall 2014 and were no longer students at IPFW. The total population of students contacted via email to be surveyed were 12,737. Of those, 1,963 completed the survey, or 15% of the student population.

The faculty and staff survey included all current full and part time employees of IPFW. The link was sent to 1,504 individuals and 678 completed the survey, or 45% of the population. A third survey of IPFW alumni was planned but because the email mailing list of alumni respondents was not received until after the data collection was completed for the first two survey. Because the list had incomplete information and was outside of the original timeline for the project, I made the decision to not conduct this part of the project.

Students, faculty and staff received a letter that provided them with information from the findings of study committee formed by the Senate University Resources Committee that was composed of six members including the Athletic Director, representatives from the Chancellor' Office, Alumni, Students, and two faculty members. It was discovered after the first wave of letters went out and data collection was underway that there was an error in one of the statistics described in the letter on the cost of D-1 program in student fees. The second bullet point in the letter stated; "Student fees of \$1,920,419 covered approximately 25% of the total annual costs. Currently 65% of the \$12.70 students pay per credit hour as their student service fee (sometimes referred to as student activities fee) goes to finance IPFW Division 1 Athletics." This statement was correct. The next statement derived from this statement was incorrect. "Students who complete a 120 credit hour bachelor's degree at IPFW will pay in student fees \$1524.00 to directly subsidize the Division I athletic program. "Students who complete a 120 credit hour bachelor's degree at IPFW will pay in student fees \$1524.00 to directly subsidize the Division I athletic program." The correct amount of student fees going to subsidize the Division I athletic program should have read \$990.60 or 65% of the \$1,524.00 for 120 credit hours. The letters that were sent out had a link which took the recipient to the Qualtrics designed questionnaire. This information was not repeated once they began the survey. Copies of letters that were sent to survey recipients can be found in appendix A. Another potential biasing factor was that all but one of the questions were written in the positive and that the questions were not randomized for each questionnaire. Given the positive orientation of the questions, it is doubtful that this would have much of an impact. Nevertheless, there is no way to assess the potential impact on responses, although, I would suspect quite minimal.

There was also a concern raised in class discussions on the development of the surveys and solicitation of respondent participation that those who were either strongly in favor or strongly opposed to IPFW's participation in Division I Athletics, may attempt to submit more than one survey for the study. A technique was employed in the solicitation of respondents that prevented respondents from submitting more than one response to the survey, or "ballot stuffing." Each of the recipients of the email requesting their participation received a unique link to the Qualtrics Online survey for them to complete.

Originally it was planned to be a survey sent out to a random sample of participations. In discussions about the execution of the survey, it was decided to limit advanced publicity about the survey for fear of raising an alarm about the university plans for its athletic program. Because of the potential lessening of participation in the survey it was decided to send the surveys to the entire populations of students and employees and then test for their representativeness of their respective populations. There was an announcement of the survey . . . An email message was also sent out to all program directors to inform faculty to inform their students about the upcoming survey. Copies of both the student and employee surveys are found in appendix B.

## Student Survey Results

### Representative of the Student Respondents to the Student Population.

#### Representativeness by Class Standing

In comparing the demographic characteristics of the student sample with the population of students at IPFW, we find some important differences. In regard to the student survey respondents, as noted above, approximately 15% of the population participated in the survey. In comparison with the student population data available from Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, for degree seeking students; approximately 30.6% of students were classified by the Office of the Registrar as freshmen, 23.3% as sophomores, 16.5% as juniors, 24.5% as seniors, and 5% as graduate students. The survey respondents were less likely to be freshmen (16% of respondents, instead of 30.6%) and sophomores (20% instead of 23.3%) and more likely to be juniors (21% instead of 16.5%), seniors (35% instead of 24.5%), and graduate students (8% instead of 5%) than represented in the population. See Table 1 below for breakdown on student standing.

Table 1: Frequencies of Student Response to “What is your class standing?”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Freshmen	316	16.2	16.4	16.4
	Sophomore	383	19.6	19.8	36.2
	Junior	411	21.1	21.3	57.5
	Senior	669	34.3	34.6	92.1
	Graduate Student	152	7.8	7.9	100.0
	Total	1931	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	19	1.0		
Total		1950	100.0		



### Representativeness by Division Athletes/Non-Division I Students

Also, the student respondents were more likely to be student athletes than what would be expected given the population parameters. See Table 2 below. According to the Tim Heffron, Senior Associate Athletic Director, there were 250 Division I student athletes who were degree seeking students at IPFW during the spring semester of 2015, approximately 1.9% of the degree seeking student population. In terms of those who responded to the survey, there was a 4 times greater representation of athletes than represented in the student population. Given this over-representation in the population, I will report the results separately for division I student athletes and students who were not division I student athletes. The respondents are a more accurate representation of these two groups separately than the student population as whole. Frequency distributions are presented in the text for the student sample. Only statistically significant results based on the use of two tail test of significance calculating chi square statistics will be reported. The cross-tabulations along with the Chi Square Tests of Significance for the entire student sample can be found in Appendix C.

Table 2: Frequencies of Student's Response to "Are you a Division I Student Athlete?"

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	147	7.5	7.6	7.6
	No	1777	91.1	92.4	100.0
	Total	1924	98.7	100.0	
Missing	System	26	1.3		
Total		1950	100.0		

### Representativeness by Gender

As to the representative of the student responses to the gender distribution in the student population, there were slightly more females respondents than representative in the population. According to Institutional Research 2014 report, 55% of the degree

seeking students were female, while they were 57.6% of the respondents. The percentage of males in the population was 45% and in the respondent group it was almost 42%. See Table 3 below

Table 3: Frequencies of Overall Student Responses to the Question “What is your gender?”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	806	41.3	41.7	41.7
	Female	1114	57.1	57.6	99.2
	Other	15	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	1935	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	15	.8		
Total		1950	100.0		

Representativeness by Ethnicity

As to the comparison of the respondents to the student population on ethnicity the respondents were representative of the student population. According to the statistics from Institutional Research – Institutional Profile for 2014/2015, 82.6% of the degree seeking students identified as white or Caucasian as compared to 82.3% for the respondent population, 4.8% were Black or African American compared to 3.8% for the respondent population, 5% were Hispanic as compared to 3.9% for the respondents, 2.5% for Asian students compared to 2.9% of the respondents, and .3% of the student population is Native American compared to .5% for the respondents.

Table 4: Frequencies of Student’s Response to “To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you most identify?”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	African-American (non-Hispanic)	75	3.8	3.9	3.9
	Asian/Pacific Islanders	57	2.9	2.9	6.8
	Caucasian (non-Hispanic)	1604	82.3	82.8	89.6
	Latino or Hispanic	76	3.9	3.9	93.5
	Native American or Aleut	10	.5	.5	94.0
	Other	116	5.9	6.0	100.0
	Total	1938	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.6		
	Total	1950	100.0		

### Analysis Plan

The research question that this survey was designed to ask is what is the opinion of the identified stakeholder groups as to the benefits of the division I program and whether the program should be continued. An analysis providing the frequencies of responses across the different stakeholder who participated in the survey provides the most direct answers to this question. Cross-tabulations and Chi Square statistics were calculated to draw comparisons between the two student stakeholder groups identified and comparisons between the different employment groups. Cross-tabulations tables and Chi Square statistics for each comparison are found in Appendix D. Five distinct stakeholder groups received the survey; division I student athletes, students who were

not division I athletes, and employees who identified themselves as IPFW administrators, IPFW faculty, and IPFW staff. Comparison across groups on the same or similar survey items was also an important aspect of the results that are deemed important to defining the opinions of the university community.

### **Division I Student Athletes and Non-Division I Students Perceptions of Benefits of the Division I Athletic Program.**

There were a series of questions on the survey that asked the respondent the perceived benefit for the university as a whole and the benefits that they saw to themselves because of the IPFW Division I Athletic Program. Overall there are the greatest difference in response between division I student athletes and students who are not division I athletes on questions asking about their own experience. This may suggest that the benefits of the program are most felt by the athletes themselves compared to the general student population.

#### Role in student recruitment

Students were asked whether “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.” When comparing students who identified themselves as Division I athletes to those who did not, there is a significant difference, 97.9% of student athletes responded “agree” or “strongly agree” that the Division I Athletic Program plays an important role in recruiting students, while a smaller percentage of students agreed with the statement, 59.7% of the non- athletes “agree” or “strongly agree” to the statement that “the Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.” Nevertheless, the majority of both student groups see that the program does play an important role in student recruitment. See Table 5 below for distribution of responses.

Table 5: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	110	74.8	74.8	74.8
		Agree	34	23.1	23.1	98.0
		Don't Know	1	.7	.7	98.6
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	350	19.7	19.8	19.8
		Agree	706	39.7	39.9	59.6
		Don't Know	526	29.6	29.7	89.3
		Disagree	109	6.1	6.2	95.5
		Strongly Disagree	80	4.5	4.5	100.0
		Total	1771	99.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	.3		
Total			1777	100.0		

Their Student Recruitment Effect: Likely to Attend IPFW

As to the question; “I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program,” the responses are very different for division I student athletes and non – division I athletic students, 89.1% of the student athletes strongly agreed or agreed while 20.3% of student respondents who did not identify as division I student athletes either strongly agreed or agreed to the statement, while the majority of students, 67%, disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that “I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.” See Table 6 below for distribution of responses.

Table 6: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	116	78.9	78.9	78.9
		Agree	15	10.2	10.2	89.1
		Don't Know	6	4.1	4.1	93.2
		Disagree	8	5.4	5.4	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	159	8.9	9.0	9.0
		Agree	200	11.3	11.3	20.3
		Don't Know	224	12.6	12.7	33.0
		Disagree	591	33.3	33.4	66.4
		Strongly Disagree	595	33.5	33.6	100.0
		Total	1769	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.5			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Student Achievement and Retention

There were differences in opinion between student athletes and non-athletes on the role of the Division I program in student achievement and retention. For Division I student athletes, 90.5% “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement that “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement,” while for the non-division I student only 46.1% “strongly agree” or “agree.” The modal responses were quite different as well, with the modal response for student athletes being strongly agree, 61.2%, while the modal response for non-athletes being the response “don’t know,” with 38.3% of responses. Thus in reviewing the overall pattern of responses, the non-student athletes are more ambivalent in their response.

Neither the agree responses, nor disagree responses are majority responses. See Table 7 below for distribution of responses.

Table 7: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	90	61.2	61.2	61.2
		Agree	43	29.3	29.3	90.5
		Don't Know	12	8.2	8.2	98.6
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	253	14.2	14.3	14.3
		Agree	563	31.7	31.8	46.1
		Don't Know	677	38.1	38.3	84.4
		Disagree	161	9.1	9.1	93.5
		Strongly Disagree	115	6.5	6.5	100.0
		Total	1769	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.5			
Total			1777	100.0		

Similar differences are found in the responses between athletes and non-athletes on whether “the Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.” When we compare the differences in responses between Division I student athletes and those who are not, we find that 88.4% of the student athletes either “strongly agree” or “agree,” while 39.7% of non-athletes responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the above statement. The modal response for this item for non-athletes is “Don’t Know” with 37.2% of responses, and neither agree or disagree responses reached the majority. Thus again non-athlete student are ambivalent in their overall response. See Table 8 below for distribution of responses.

Table 8: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to ‘The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.’

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	90	61.2	61.2	61.2
		Agree	40	27.2	27.2	88.4
		Don't Know	13	8.8	8.8	97.3
		Disagree	3	2.0	2.0	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	210	11.8	11.9	11.9
		Agree	491	27.6	27.8	39.7
		Don't Know	657	37.0	37.2	76.9
		Disagree	255	14.4	14.4	91.4
		Strongly Disagree	152	8.6	8.6	100.0
		Total	1765	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.7			
Total			1777	100.0		

Perceived Effect on Own Retention.

When we personalized the question, asking them to respond to the statement, “I am more likely to finish my degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program,” we find even greater differences between the two groups of students. For student athletes, 92.5% “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement, while only 24.3% of non-student athletes answered either “strongly agree” or “agree” and 57.5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed.” Nevertheless, it is important to note that is a significant number of students who are reporting a retention effect, however it is not the majority who disagreed with the statement. See Table 9 below for distribution of responses.



Table 9: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics encourages me to complete my degree at IPFW.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	108	73.5	74.0	74.0
		Agree	27	18.4	18.5	92.5
		Don't Know	5	3.4	3.4	95.9
		Disagree	5	3.4	3.4	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	146	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	.7		
Total			147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	179	10.1	10.1	10.1
		Agree	252	14.2	14.2	24.3
		Don't Know	321	18.1	18.1	42.5
		Disagree	551	31.0	31.1	73.6
		Strongly Disagree	468	26.3	26.4	100.0
		Total	1771	99.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	.3		
Total			1777	100.0		

Student Diversity.

Similar differences are found on the item on bringing more diversity to the student population. For athletes, 93.8% responded “strongly agree” or “agree: that; “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.” While 63.6% of non-athletes responded either “strongly agree” or “agree.” The modal response for student athletes is “strongly agree” with 67.3% of responses, for students who were not division I athletes it was “agree” with 40.8% of the responses. Thus both groups in general agree that the program plays a role in bringing more diversity to the student population. See Table 10 below for distribution of responses

Table 10: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	99	67.3	67.3	67.3
		Agree	39	26.5	26.5	93.9
		Don't Know	6	4.1	4.1	98.0
		Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	403	22.7	22.8	22.8
		Agree	721	40.6	40.8	63.6
		Don't Know	458	25.8	25.9	89.5
		Disagree	117	6.6	6.6	96.2
		Strongly Disagree	68	3.8	3.8	100.0
		Total	1767	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

Again, when we personalized the question we get a greater difference in responses from the two groups. As to the perceived impact of IPFW’s Division I Athletic program on whether students interact with people from diverse backgrounds, student athletes reported larger percentages that strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, 95.2%. For non-division I athlete students, 37.8% strongly agreed or agreed and 41.5% disagreed or strongly disagreed. The modal response for the two groups was “strongly agree,” 67.3%, for student athletes, and “disagree,” 27.5% for non-athlete students. Overall, the pattern of responses for non-athletes indicates ambivalence overall. Although, it is important to note that 37.8% of non-division I athlete students report that they interact with students of diverse backgrounds because of the division I program. See Table 11 below for distribution of responses.

Table 11: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	99	67.3	67.3	67.3
		Agree	41	27.9	27.9	95.2
		Don't Know	1	.7	.7	95.9
		Disagree	5	3.4	3.4	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	233	13.1	13.2	13.2
		Agree	434	24.4	24.6	37.7
		Don't Know	366	20.6	20.7	58.5
		Disagree	486	27.3	27.5	86.0
		Strongly Disagree	248	14.0	14.0	100.0
		Total	1767	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Health and Wellness

There was general agreement on whether the Division I Athletic program promotes the health and wellness of students on campus. However, there are differences between student athletes and non-student athletes. Student athletes agreed more strongly to this statement than non-athlete students (95% versus 62%). Only a minority of both student athletes and students who are not division I athletes strongly disagree and disagree with the statement, 4.1% versus 12% for non-athletes. See Table 12 below for distribution of responses.

Table 12: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	100	68.0	68.0	68.0
		Agree	40	27.2	27.2	95.2
		Don't Know	1	.7	.7	95.9
		Disagree	5	3.4	3.4	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	400	22.5	22.6	22.6
		Agree	715	40.2	40.4	63.0
		Don't Know	443	24.9	25.0	88.0
		Disagree	149	8.4	8.4	96.4
		Strongly Disagree	64	3.6	3.6	100.0
		Total	1771	99.7	100.0	
	Missing	System	6	.3		
Total			1777	100.0		

### Sense of Community and School Spirit

There are differences between student athletes and non-athletes on the role of the Division I athletic program as it relates to creating a sense of community and improving school spirit. For Division I student athletes, 92.5% strongly agree or agree to the statement that “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus,” while 62.3% of non-student athletes strongly agree or agree. The modal responses for the two groups were strongly agree for athletes, 69.4%, and agree for non-athletes, 40.1%. Thus the majority of both groups agree that the division I athletic program creates a sense of community on campus. See Table 13 below for distribution of responses.

Table 13: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	102	69.4	69.4	69.4
		Agree	34	23.1	23.1	92.5
		Don't Know	6	4.1	4.1	96.6
		Disagree	4	2.7	2.7	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	391	22.0	22.2	22.2
		Agree	708	39.8	40.1	62.3
		Don't Know	378	21.3	21.4	83.7
		Disagree	218	12.3	12.4	96.1
		Strongly Disagree	69	3.9	3.9	100.0
		Total	1764	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	13	.7			
Total			1777	100.0		

Similar results are found in responses to the statement that the “Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit, however, the differences for athletes and non-athletes was less than for the item sense of community with 92.5% of division I athletes and 71.9% of non-athletes responded either “strongly agree” or “agree.” The modal responses were also similar to the last item, for athletes, 73.3% “strongly agree,” while 43.5% of non-athletes, “agree.” See Table 14 below for distribution of responses.

Table 14: Frequencies for Athletes' and Non-Athlete Students' response to "Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	107	72.8	73.3	73.3
		Agree	28	19.0	19.2	92.5
		Don't Know	6	4.1	4.1	96.6
		Disagree	4	2.7	2.7	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	146	99.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	.7		
	Total		147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	502	28.2	28.4	28.4
		Agree	768	43.2	43.5	72.0
		Don't Know	295	16.6	16.7	88.7
		Disagree	139	7.8	7.9	96.5
		Strongly Disagree	61	3.4	3.5	100.0
	Total	1765	99.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	12	.7		
	Total		1777	100.0		

### Create Student Oriented Events on Campus

There is a difference between athletes and non-athletes as to agreement with the statement "The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus." with 92.4% of student athletes strongly agree or agree that the Division I athletic program plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus. While, 62.2% of students who were not division I athletes strongly agreed or agreed to the statement. The modal responses are different as well. For student athletes, the modal response is strongly agree, 62.3%. While for non-

athletes, the modal response is agree with 43.8% of responses. See Table 15 below for distribution of responses.

Table 15: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete Student's response to "The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	91	61.9	62.3	62.3
		Agree	44	29.9	30.1	92.5
		Don't Know	8	5.4	5.5	97.9
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	146	99.3	100.0	
	Missing	System	1	.7		
Total			147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	324	18.2	18.4	18.4
		Agree	770	43.3	43.8	62.2
		Don't Know	457	25.7	26.0	88.1
		Disagree	137	7.7	7.8	95.9
		Strongly Disagree	72	4.1	4.1	100.0
		Total	1760	99.0	100.0	
	Missing	System	17	1.0		
Total			1777	100.0		

#### Following Achievements of IPFW Athletic Teams

As expected there is also a large difference in response between students who are division I athletes and those who are not. For student-athletes, 85.8% strongly disagree or disagree with the statement "I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams," while only 35.5% of non-athletes strongly disagree or disagree with this statement. For students who are not division I athletes, 57.6% either responded "strongly agree" or "agree" to this statement. The modal response for student athletes was strongly disagree with 56.5%, while for non-student athletes it was agree with 31.4% of respondents. See Table 16 below for distribution of responses.

Table 16: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Student Non-Athlete’s response to “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	6	4.1	4.1	4.1
		Agree	6	4.1	4.1	8.2
		Don't Know	9	6.1	6.1	14.3
		Disagree	43	29.3	29.3	43.5
		Strongly Disagree	83	56.5	56.5	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	463	26.1	26.2	26.2
		Agree	556	31.3	31.4	57.6
		Don't Know	120	6.8	6.8	64.4
		Disagree	492	27.7	27.8	92.2
		Strongly Disagree	138	7.8	7.8	100.0
		Total	1769	99.5	100.0	
	Missing	System	8	.5		
Total			1777	100.0		

Identification with the University and Enhancing Memories of College Years.

Students were asked to respond to the following statement, “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.” For student athletes, 91.8% of them responded “strongly agree” or “agree” that they feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program. While for non-athletes, only 31% “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement. Almost one half of non-student athletes either responded “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with the statement. The modal response for the athletes was “strongly agree” with 72.8%, while it was “disagree” for the non-athletes with 30.6% of responses. For students who were not division I athletes neither the agreement or disagreement responses reached a majority, thus I would characterize the pattern of the responses as indicating ambivalence on this statement. See Table 17 below for distribution of responses.



Table 17: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	107	72.8	72.8	72.8
		Agree	28	19.0	19.0	91.8
		Don't Know	7	4.8	4.8	96.6
		Disagree	4	2.7	2.7	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	181	10.2	10.2	10.2
		Agree	369	20.8	20.8	31.0
		Don't Know	340	19.1	19.2	50.2
		Disagree	542	30.5	30.6	80.7
		Strongly Disagree	342	19.2	19.3	100.0
		Total	1774	99.8	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.2			
Total			1777	100.0		

A similar pattern of results was found regarding the role of IPFW Division I athletic program enhancing student memories. For student athletes, 94.5% of them responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement that memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events. While for student non-athletes, only 31.1% responded “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement, and 52.2% responded that they either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement. The modal responses reveal this difference in opinion, for student athletes the modal response is strongly agree, 78.2%, while the modal response for non-athletes is disagree with 29% of responses. See Table 18 below for distribution of responses.

Table 18: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	115	78.2	78.2	78.2
		Agree	24	16.3	16.3	94.6
		Don't Know	4	2.7	2.7	97.3
		Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	204	11.5	11.5	11.5
		Agree	347	19.5	19.6	31.2
		Don't Know	295	16.6	16.7	47.9
		Disagree	512	28.8	29.0	76.8
		Strongly Disagree	410	23.1	23.2	100.0
		Total	1768	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	.5			
Total			1777	100.0		

Donations to IPFW because of IPFW Division I Athletic Program

There are also significant differences between student athletes and non-athletes as to their plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of the Division I Athletic Program. For student athletes, the percentage of agreement is much greater with 63% responding either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement, for non-athletes the percentage is only 12.4% responded “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement, 51.6% “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with the statement. The modal response for student athletes was strongly agree, 41.1%. For non-athletes, the modal response is “don’t know” with 36%. See Table 19 below for distribution of responses.

Table 19: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	60	40.8	41.1	41.1
		Agree	32	21.8	21.9	63.0
		Don't Know	43	29.3	29.5	92.5
		Disagree	5	3.4	3.4	95.9
		Strongly Disagree	6	4.1	4.1	100.0
		Total	146	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.7			
Total			147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	91	5.1	5.2	5.2
		Agree	127	7.1	7.2	12.3
		Don't Know	636	35.8	36.0	48.4
		Disagree	415	23.4	23.5	71.9
		Strongly Disagree	497	28.0	28.1	100.0
		Total	1766	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

Positive Image of IPFW at the Local, State and National Levels and University Prestige

The majority of both student athletes and non-athletes agree that IPFW’s Division I Athletic program plans an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community. For student athletes, 95.2% either responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement. For non-athletes, there were 72.1% that either responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement, only 11% disagreed in any way. The modal responses for student athletes is “strongly agree” and for students who are not division I athletes, the modal response was “agree” with 43.7% of the responses. See Table 20 on the next page for distribution of responses.

Table 20: Frequencies of Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	109	74.1	74.1	74.1
		Agree	31	21.1	21.1	95.2
		Don't Know	4	2.7	2.7	98.0
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	501	28.2	28.4	28.4
		Agree	770	43.3	43.7	72.1
		Don't Know	299	16.8	17.0	89.1
		Disagree	128	7.2	7.3	96.3
		Strongly Disagree	65	3.7	3.7	100.0
		Total	1763	99.2	100.0	
	Missing	System	14	.8		
Total			1777	100.0		

A similar pattern of responses is found between student athletes and non-athletes with the statement “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.” For student athletes, 95.2% responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” that the Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level. For non-athletes, 71.1% responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement. Modal responses are “strongly agree” for athletes with 74.1% and “agree” for non-athletes with 43.7%. See Table 21 on the next page for the more complete distribution of responses.

Table 21: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete's response to "The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	109	74.1	74.1	74.1
		Agree	31	21.1	21.1	95.2
		Don't Know	4	2.7	2.7	98.0
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	501	28.2	28.4	28.4
		Agree	770	43.3	43.7	72.1
		Don't Know	299	16.8	17.0	89.1
		Disagree	128	7.2	7.3	96.3
		Strongly Disagree	65	3.7	3.7	100.0
		Total	1763	99.2	100.0	
Missing	System	14	.8			
Total			1777	100.0		

The pattern of responses were similar for the statement "The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level. For student athlete's there were 91.2% responding "strongly agree" or "agree," and 60.6% of non- athletes responding "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement. The modal responses were similar to what was found in the other two questions in this series. For student athletes the modal response is "strongly agree" at 69.4% of responses. While for non-athletes, the modal response is "agree" with 37.9% of the responses. See Table 22 on the next page for a complete distribution of responses.

Table 22: Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	102	69.4	69.4	69.4
		Agree	32	21.8	21.8	91.2
		Don't Know	10	6.8	6.8	98.0
		Disagree	1	.7	.7	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	401	22.6	22.7	22.7
		Agree	669	37.6	37.9	60.6
		Don't Know	442	24.9	25.0	85.6
		Disagree	142	8.0	8.0	93.7
		Strongly Disagree	112	6.3	6.3	100.0
		Total	1766	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

There was a similar difference in responses between student athletes and students who are not division I athletes with the statement “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.” For student athletes, 95.2% responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” that the program increases the prestige of IPFW. While for non-athletes, 65.1% “strongly agree” or “agree.” The modal responses are “strongly agree” with 74.1% for student athletes, and “agree” with 43.4% for non-athletes. Only a very small percentage of each group disagreed with the statement. See Table 23 on the next page for a more complete presentation of the distribution of responses.

Table 23: Athletes and Non-Athlete's response to "The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	109	74.1	74.1	74.1
		Agree	31	21.1	21.1	95.2
		Don't Know	3	2.0	2.0	97.3
		Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	383	21.6	21.7	21.7
		Agree	768	43.2	43.4	65.1
		Don't Know	416	23.4	23.5	88.6
		Disagree	118	6.6	6.7	95.3
		Strongly Disagree	84	4.7	4.7	100.0
		Total	1769	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.5			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Contribution to the local economy

Similar differences are found between student athletes and non-athletes with level of agreement with the following statement, "IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy." For student athletes, 71.6% responded either "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement that IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy. While 51.7% of non-athletes responded "strongly agree" or "agree" with the statement. The modal responses for the two groups were also different, for athletes the modal response is "strongly agree," 54.4%, while for non-student athletes, "don't know" was the modal response with 37%. Although the majority of both groups agreed with the statement, although less agreement for non-athletes. See Table 24 below for distribution of responses.

Table 24: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete's response to "IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	80	54.4	54.4	54.4
		Agree	40	27.2	27.2	81.6
		Don't Know	20	13.6	13.6	95.2
		Disagree	5	3.4	3.4	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	296	16.7	16.8	16.8
		Agree	616	34.7	34.9	51.6
		Don't Know	653	36.7	37.0	88.6
		Disagree	125	7.0	7.1	95.7
		Strongly Disagree	76	4.3	4.3	100.0
		Total	1766	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Weighing the Cost and Benefits of Division I Athletics at IPFW

The following survey items attempt to assess the benefits relative to the perceived cost and whether IPFW should continue to have a Division I Athletic Program.

#### Same Benefits if Not Division I?

Students were asked whether they agree or disagree with the statement that "IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not a Division I program." There are significant differences in responses for division I student athletes and those who are not. For the athletes' responses, 69.9% "strongly disagreed" or "disagreed" with the statement, while for non-athletes the modal response was "don't know" with 42.7% of responses. However, more of the non-student athletes agree (31.7%) than disagree (25.6%) with the statement. In general for the students who are



not division I athletes, the pattern of response indicated an ambiguity in their opinion. See Table 25 below for complete presentation of the distribution of responses.

Table 25: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	6	4.1	4.1	4.1
		Agree	16	10.9	11.0	15.1
		Don't Know	22	15.0	15.1	30.1
		Disagree	40	27.2	27.4	57.5
		Strongly Disagree	62	42.2	42.5	100.0
	Total	146	99.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	.7		
Total			147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	210	11.8	11.9	11.9
		Agree	350	19.7	19.8	31.7
		Don't Know	756	42.5	42.7	74.4
		Disagree	310	17.4	17.5	91.9
		Strongly Disagree	143	8.0	8.1	100.0
	Total	1769	99.5	100.0		
	Missing	System	8	.5		
Total			1777	100.0		

Negative Impact of Dropping Division I Athletics.

Most student responses indicated that they thought IPFW would experience a negative effect if the university eliminated the division I athletic program. The breakdown comparing athletes and non-athletes indicates that the student athletes modal response, 78.2%, was strongly agree, while the modal response for non-athletes was agree, 35.3%. The majority of both student groups either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, 92.5% of student athletes and 59.4% for students who are not division I athletes. See Table 26 below for more complete presentation of the distribution of responses.

Table 26: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete's response to "Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	115	78.2	78.2	78.2
		Agree	21	14.3	14.3	92.5
		Don't Know	8	5.4	5.4	98.0
		Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	99.3
		Strongly Disagree	1	.7	.7	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	427	24.0	24.1	24.1
		Agree	626	35.2	35.3	59.4
		Don't Know	487	27.4	27.5	86.9
		Disagree	132	7.4	7.4	94.4
		Strongly Disagree	100	5.6	5.6	100.0
		Total	1772	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	5	.3			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Game Attendance

From looking at the non-student athlete respondent pool it looks like there would be less of an impact on student attendance if it did not have a division I program. For the non-student athlete group, we find that 43.4% responded either "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the statement, and the modal response is "don't know," 29.2% of the responses. For student athletes, 63.3% either responded "strongly agree" or "agree" that they would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program. Only 19.7% of the athletes responded either "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the statement. See Table 27 below for a more complete presentation of the distribution of responses.

Table 27: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Total			26	100.0		
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	63	42.9	42.9	42.9
		Agree	30	20.4	20.4	63.3
		Don't Know	25	17.0	17.0	80.3
		Disagree	19	12.9	12.9	93.2
		Strongly Disagree	10	6.8	6.8	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	177	10.0	10.0	10.0
		Agree	306	17.2	17.3	27.3
		Don't Know	518	29.2	29.3	56.6
		Disagree	466	26.2	26.4	83.0
		Strongly Disagree	300	16.9	17.0	100.0
		Total	1767	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.6			
Total			1777	100.0		

Division I Athletics Should Pay for Itself

Student athletes and athletes differ in their response to the statement that “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.” For student athletes 73.3% responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with the statement that the division I program should pay for itself, while only 26.9% of non-athletes responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” For non-student athletes, 42.4% either responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to this statement. The modal response for non-athlete students is “don’t know” with 30.7% of responses. The modal response for division I student athletes is strongly disagree with 39.7% of the responses. See Table 28 below for a more complete presentation of the distribution of responses.

Table 28: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete's response to "The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds."

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	9	6.1	6.2	6.2
		Agree	13	8.8	8.9	15.1
		Don't Know	17	11.6	11.6	26.7
		Disagree	49	33.3	33.6	60.3
		Strongly Disagree	58	39.5	39.7	100.0
	Total	146	99.3	100.0		
	Missing	System	1	.7		
Total			147	100.0		
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	297	16.7	16.8	16.8
		Agree	453	25.5	25.6	42.4
		Don't Know	542	30.5	30.7	73.1
		Disagree	373	21.0	21.1	94.2
		Strongly Disagree	102	5.7	5.8	100.0
	Total	1767	99.4	100.0		
	Missing	System	10	.6		
Total			1777	100.0		

IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics

Lastly, students were asked to respond to the following summary statement, "IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics." Comparing division I student athletes to students who were not division I athletes, student athletes were more likely to respond "strongly agree" to the statement with 85% of the responses being the modal response, 93.2% responding either "strongly agree" or "agree." For students who are not division I athletes, the modal response is "agree" with 37.3%, and 63.2% responding either strongly agree or agree to the statement. See Table 29 below for a more complete distribution of responses.

Table 29: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.”

Are you a Division I Student Athlete?			Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Yes	Valid	Strongly Agree	125	85.0	85.0	85.0
		Agree	12	8.2	8.2	93.2
		Don't Know	6	4.1	4.1	97.3
		Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	98.6
		Strongly Disagree	2	1.4	1.4	100.0
		Total	147	100.0	100.0	
No	Valid	Strongly Agree	458	25.8	25.9	25.9
		Agree	661	37.2	37.3	63.2
		Don't Know	448	25.2	25.3	88.5
		Disagree	106	6.0	6.0	94.5
		Strongly Disagree	98	5.5	5.5	100.0
		Total	1771	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.3			
Total			1777	100.0		

### Summarization of Areas of Agreement and Disagreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Division I Student Athletes

Table 30 below presents a summary of areas of agreement and disagreement between the majority positions of the two stakeholder student groups identified in this study. The tables in the text note the differences in levels of agreement. In general, the majority within each group recognizes the contributions of IPFW’s Division I Athletic program in a wide range of beneficial contributions to the university from student recruitment, diversity, health and wellness, a sense of community and school spirit. Both the majority of each of the stakeholder groups also recognize the role that the program plays in creating student oriented events on the campus.

Furthermore, majorities of each group of students recognize that the division I athletic program creates a positive image of IPFW on local, state, and national levels, contributes to the prestige of the university, and that it contributes to the local economy.

The majority of each student stakeholder group also agree that there would be a negative impact of dropping division I athletics at IPFW, and that IPFW should continue to participate in division I athletics. This does not deny that there may be substantial minority positions with each of the two groups, especially in the case of non-students. In general, the majorities for students who are not division I athletes is smaller than the majorities within the group of students who are division I athletes. See table 30 below for the summarization of areas of majority agreement.

Table 30: Student Survey Areas of Agreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes

Contributions of Division I Athletics	Athletes	Non-Athletes
General Role in Student Recruitment	+	+
Creating Student Diversity	+	+
Health and Wellness	+	+
Sense of Community	+	+
School Spirit	+	+
Create Student Oriented Events on Campus	+	+
Create Positive Image of IPFW (local, state, and national levels)	+	+
Create Positive Image of IPFW (state)	+	+
Create Positive Image of IPFW (national)	+	+
Contribution to the local economy	+	+
University Prestige	+	+
Negative Impact of Dropping Division I Athletic	+	+
IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics	+	+
<hr/>		
+ Majority of students answered strongly agree or agree		

There are also important areas of disagreement in perception and experience with the division I athletic program for the two groups of students. Table 31 on the next page summarizes the areas of disagreement between the two majority positions within each student stakeholder groups. When it comes to the student's own experience in recruitment, retention, and diversity, there is a significant difference in the role of division I athletics at IPFW as perceived by the two student groups. For the student athletes there is strong majority agreement in the role of the program in their own recruitment, retention, and experience with diversity. They also recognize that the division I program will enhance their memories of IPFW, that they follow IPFW division I teams, and they will

contribute to the university because of the program. If IPFW did not have a division I athletic program, the majority of student athletes would attend less games.

On the other hand, for the majority of students who are not division I athletes, the division I athletic program did not influence their recruitment to the university and it does not play a role in their own retention. Furthermore, the majority do not see the program playing a role in enhancing their own memories of IPFW. The majority of students report that they do not follow IPFW athletics, will not donate to the university because of the division I program and their attendance is less likely to change if it is not a division I athletic program.

There is disagreement but less so between the two groups in their opinions regarding the role of division I athletics in student achievement and retention in general. The majority of division I student athletes agree that the division I program contributes to student achievement, retention, identity with IPFW, and their own experience with diversity. While students who are not division I athletes pattern of responses indicates more ambivalence where “don’t know” is the modal response and the percentage of responses together with degrees of disagreement are greater than agreement on these same areas of contribution. For the two items; the same benefits can be achieved if the program was not division I and that the division I program should pay for itself, student athletes were in disagreement while the non-athlete students were more ambivalent in their responses.

Table 31: Student Survey Areas of Disagreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes

D-I Statement	Athletes	Non-Athletes
Role in Own Student Recruitment	+	--
Role in Own Retention	+	--
Enhancing my memories	+	--
Following IPFW Athletics	+	--
Donations because of athletics	+	--
Less Game Attendance if not D-I	+	--
General Student Achievement	+	0
General Student Retention	+	0
Own Identification with IPFW	+	0
Own Diversity Experience	+	0
Same Benefits if not D-I	--	0
Division I Should Pay for Itself	--	0

- 
- + Majority answered strongly agree or agree
  - 0 Ambivalence - Neither agree or disagree responses were a majority.
  - Majority answered strongly disagree or disagree
-



## **Employee Survey**

### **Methods**

Employee population included all current full and part time employees of IPFW. The link to the Qualtrics formatted survey was sent to 1,504 individuals and 678 completed the survey, a 45% response rate. For purposes of analysis, employee group will be divided into the following three stakeholder groups: administrators, faculty, and staff. Cross-tabulations and Chi Square Statistics will be reported for each area of opinion.

### **Representativeness of Respondents to Population**

#### Employment Classification Representation

Employees were asked to self-identify their principle relationship to IPFW? The question was “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” The response categories were Administrator, Faculty, and Clerical/Technical/Service Staff, and Alumni. Only 15 respondents who were employees of the university responded alumni, all but one of these cases were reclassified based on other information collected in the survey which allowed for the identification of respondents university employment position. When comparing how the respondent population differs from the employee population, we see that the respondent population has a lower percentage of administrative personnel, 10.8% compared to 13.5% as reported by Institutional Research in their 2014 - 2015 Institutional profile report. There is also a slightly smaller representative of faculty among the respondents compared to the IPFW employee population, 45.8% instead of 48.9%. On other hand, there is a higher representation of staff than the employee population, 43.4% compared to 37.6% within the employee population. See Table 32 below for the position breakdown within the respondent sample.

Table 32: Frequencies of Employee responses to “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Administrator	73	10.8	10.8	10.8
	Faculty	309	45.6	45.8	56.6
	Staff	293	43.2	43.4	100.0
	Total	675	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	3	.4		
Total		678	100.0		

### Gender Representation

In reviewing the gender differences between the respondents and the population of employees as reported in the IPFW Statistical Profile for 2014-2015 there are differences for each of the positions reported. For administrative classified personnel, Institutional Research reports 56% female and 44% male. Among respondents to the survey there is a higher representation of female, 64%, and lower representation of male, 36%. For those who self-identified as faculty, there is a higher representation of male, 58%, and a lower representation of females, 42%, than what is reported by Institutional Research, 52% male and 48% female classified as faculty. For the combined staff position, there is a higher percentage of those identified as male, 66%, and a lower percentage of female, 34% than reported by Institutional Research with 53% male and 47% female. See Table 33 below for gender breakdown for each of the positions for survey respondents.

Table 33: Crosstabs of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW? And What is your gender? for employees”

		What is your gender?			Total
		Male	Female	Other	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	25	44	0	69
	Faculty	169	127	5	301
	Staff	99	188	0	287
Total		293	359	5	657

## Ethnic Representation

Lastly, there are also differences between the respondents and the employee populations on ethnic group identity for each of the positions. For the respondents who identified their position as administrative with the exception of those who self-identified as Native America or Aleutian, ethnic minorities (Asian/Pacific Islanders, Latino or Hispanic, and African Americans) are under-representative. For example, there are no administrators who identified as African-American among respondents, but there are 5% in the population as reported by Institutional Research. Similar under-representations is found for Hispanic/Latino, 1.5% of administrator respondents as compared to 5% in the population and for Asian/Pacific Islanders, 0% as opposed to 5.9% in the population as reported by Institutional Research. The percentage of administrator who identified as Caucasian (non-Hispanic) is 93.9% of the respondents, while 86% of the population is Caucasian (non-Hispanic) as reported by Institutional Research.

For faculty, there is a higher percentage of those who responded “other” compared with what would be expected in the population, 9.1% as opposed to 1% reported by Institutional Research. As a consequences there is an under-representation of all other ethnic groups with the exception of Native American which institutional research reports as 0.1% compared to 1.7% among respondents. The under-representation of ethnic groups within the respondent population include African American, 3% within the population and 1% of faculty respondents, Hispanic/Latino 3% as opposed to 1.7% of faculty respondents, Asian/Pacific Islanders 10% as opposed to 5.9, and 82% as opposed to 80.5% of faculty respondents.

For the combined staff position which includes clerical, technical, and service staff, the respondents matched closely to the employee population; Native American/Aleutian 1% as opposed to 0.7% of respondents, Asian/Pacific Islanders 0.8% as opposed to 0.4% of staff respondents, African American 6% as opposed to 5.4% of staff respondents, Hispanic/Latino 2% as opposed to 2.2% of staff respondents and for Caucasian, 87% as opposed to 87.4% among staff respondents. See Table 34 on the next page for frequencies of ethnic identification by employment classification.

Table 34: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you most identify?”

			To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you most identify?					Total	
			African-American (non-Hispanic)	Asian/Pacific Islanders	Caucasian (non-Hispanic)	Latino or Hispanic	Native American or Aleut		Other
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count	0	0	62	1	1	2	66
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	0.0%	0.0%	93.9%	1.5%	1.5%	3.0%	100.0%
	Faculty	Count	3	17	231	5	5	26	287
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	1.0%	5.9%	80.5%	1.7%	1.7%	9.1%	100.0%
	Staff	Count	15	1	242	6	2	11	277
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	5.4%	0.4%	87.4%	2.2%	0.7%	4.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	18	18	535	12	8	39	630
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	2.9%	2.9%	84.9%	1.9%	1.3%	6.2%	100.0%

## **Administrators, Faculty, and Staff Opinions of the Benefits of the Division 1 Athletic Program**

### Role in student recruitment

Employees were asked two questions regarding their opinions as to the significance of the Division I athletic program's role in the recruitment of students. Employees were asked whether they strongly agree, agree, don't know, disagree, or strongly disagree to the statement that "Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program." More employees either strongly agreed (18.5%) or agreed (29.3%) or a total of 47.8% to the statement. The modal response for the all employees is "agree."

Faculty employees in general are less likely to agree in general when compared to administrators and staff. Forty one percent responded either "strongly agree" or "agree" with the statement compared to 55.6% of administrators and 53.1% of staff. The modal response for administrator is "strongly agree" with 29.2%, while the modal responses for faculty is "agree" at 30.5% and for staff is "agree" at 28.8%. See Table 35 below for cross-tabulation of employee position and response to statement "Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program."

Table 35: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.”

			Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrators	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	21 29.2%	19 26.4%	18 25.0%	8 11.1%	6 8.3%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	32 10.5%	93 30.5%	87 28.5%	61 20.0%	32 10.5%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	71 24.3%	84 28.8%	76 26.0%	50 17.1%	11 3.8%	292 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	124 18.5%	196 29.3%	181 27.1%	119 17.8%	49 7.3%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.192 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.910	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.622	1	.057
N of Valid Cases	669		

A second question on the same topic asked employees to either respond strongly agree, agree, don't know, disagree, or strongly disagree to the statement, "The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW." Overall, there is a higher level of agreement to this statement than the previous item, 55% of respondents either "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement. There are differences in the responses for the different position classifications with higher percentage of administrators agreeing to the statement with 66.6% responding either "strongly agree" or "agree" compared to 45.9% of faculty and 51.5% of staff responding in a similar manner. There are also differences in the modal responses for the three groups, for administrators, the modal response is agree with 45.8%, for faculty the modal response is "don't know" with 32.5%, and for staff the modal response was "agree" at 33.3% of responses. See Table 36 on the next page for more detailed presentation of the results.

Table 36: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	15 20.8%	33 45.8%	14 19.4%	6 8.3%	4 5.6%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	45 14.8%	95 31.1%	99 32.5%	40 13.1%	26 8.5%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	82 28.2%	97 33.3%	73 25.1%	32 11.0%	7 2.4%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	142 21.3%	225 33.7%	186 27.8%	78 11.7%	37 5.5%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	35.900 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	36.288	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.541	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	666		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.19.



## Student Achievement and Retention

IPFW employees were asked their opinions on the Division I athletic programs role in student achievement and retention. Combining all employees, 42.1% either strongly agree or agree with the statement that the “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.” However, the modal response for all employees was “don’t know,” 35.6% of responses.

Administrative staff were more likely to respond “strongly agree” and “agree” to the statement 63.9% compared with faculty 33.6% and staff 45.7%. The modal responses for the three groups were similarly different with the modal response for administrators being agree, 40.3%, for faculty “don’t know,” 37.6%, and staff “don’t know,” 37.5%. For both the faculty and staff groups, neither the category of agree or disagree responses reached a majority position. For the faculty, 33.6% responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” and 28.7% responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” For staff employees, 45.7% of the responses were either “strongly agree” or “agree”, and 16.9% responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” Therefore, it is best to refer to the pattern of response for faculty and staff as indicating a general ambivalence within each of these subgroups. See Table 37 on the next page for more detailed presentation of the cross-tabulation data.

Table 37: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	17 23.6%	29 40.3%	14 19.4%	10 13.9%	2 2.8%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	35 11.4%	68 22.2%	115 37.6%	54 17.6%	34 11.1%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	64 22.0%	69 23.7%	109 37.5%	38 13.1%	11 3.8%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	116 17.3%	166 24.8%	238 35.6%	102 15.2%	47 7.0%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	40.866 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	41.552	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.277	1	.258
N of Valid Cases	669		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.06.

Employees were also asked their opinion on the role of division I athletics and student retention. Three questions were asked on retention. A similar pattern of results was found in comparison with the previous question. The highest level of agreement overall, 44.5% of employees either strongly agree (20.9%) or agree (23.6%) that “IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics encourages students to complete their degree at IPFW.” However, the modal response for the combined employee responses is “don’t

Table 38: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics encourages students to complete their degree at IPFW:”

			IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics encourages students to complete their degree at IPFW:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don’t Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	21 29.2%	20 27.8%	14 19.4%	9 12.5%	8 11.1%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	40 13.2%	72 23.7%	89 29.3%	61 20.1%	42 13.8%	304 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	78 27.1%	65 22.6%	84 29.2%	47 16.3%	14 4.9%	288 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	139 20.9%	157 23.6%	187 28.2%	117 17.6%	64 9.6%	664 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.651 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	39.495	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.699	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	669		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.53.

know” with 28.2% of responses. Administrators were more likely to respond either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement, 57%, than faculty, 36.9% or staff 49.7%. The modal responses for the three groups were different as well, with the modal response for administrators, “strongly agree,” 29.2%, for faculty and staff the modal response was “don’t know,” 29.3%, and 29.2%, respectively. Overall, for faculty and staff there was a pattern of ambivalence where there is no majority position between the responses of agreement or disagreement and don’t know was the modal category. Pearson Chi Square values were all significant beyond the .001 level. See Table 38 for more detailed presentation of the cross-tabulation data.

A similar pattern of results are found for the other two retention questions. With the modal responses being “don’t know” overall for the combined employee group at 34.9% in response to the statement; “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.” However, for administrators and staff there was a higher level of agreement than disagreement with the statement, 51.3% and 41.4%, respectively, while for faculty there is a higher level of disagreement, 34.3% and a smaller level of agreement with 27.8% responding either “strongly agree” or “agree.” Again for faculty and staff, neither the agree or disagree category of responses reached the majority of within the employment group, therefore it reflects an ambivalence in their overall responses. See Table 39 for more complete description of the data.

Table 39: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	14 19.4%	23 31.9%	13 18.1%	14 19.4%	8 11.1%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	25 8.3%	59 19.5%	115 38.0%	57 18.8%	47 15.5%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	62 21.4%	58 20.0%	104 35.9%	49 16.9%	17 5.9%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	101 15.2%	140 21.1%	232 34.9%	120 18.0%	72 10.8%	665 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	42.229 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	44.552	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.663	1	.010
N of Valid Cases	665		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.80.

As in the previous two questions, administrators were significantly more in agreement with the statement than either faculty or staff. For administrators, 43.1% either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement. While for faculty and staff of responses that either “strongly agree” or “agree” are 21% and 34.4%, respectively. For faculty in particular there was a higher level of responses choosing either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” to these statements with 43.5% of the responses. The modal responses were different as well. For administrators, the modal response is “agree” with 29.2% of responses, while for faculty and staff the modal response is “don’t know” with 35.6% and 33.7%, respectively. Staff and Administrators had similar levels of disagreement, however, staff responded at a higher rate of “don’t know” compared to administrators, 33.7% compared to 23.6% for administrators. However, the pattern of responses for administrators, faculty, and staff is best characterized as ambivalence with neither agree or disagree responses achieving the majority within each of the employee classifications. See Table 40 for more detailed presentation of the data.

Table 40: Cross-tabulation of “IPFW students are more likely to finish their degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.”

			IPFW students are more likely to finish their degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	10 13.9%	21 29.2%	17 23.6%	16 22.2%	8 11.1%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	17 5.6%	47 15.4%	109 35.6%	71 23.2%	62 20.3%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	43 14.8%	57 19.6%	98 33.7%	70 24.1%	23 7.9%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	70 10.5%	125 18.7%	224 33.5%	157 23.5%	93 13.9%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.021 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.829	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.940	1	.026
N of Valid Cases	664		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.94.

### Student Diversity.

Employees were also asked their opinion as to whether the division I athletic program plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population. Overall, the majority of employees, 53.6%, either strongly agree or agree to the statement that “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population. The modal response for all employees combined was “agree” with 32.7% responding. However, there are significant differences between the positions as to their opinion. For administrators, 64.8% responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement, while for faculty 47.1% and for staff 57.7% “strongly agree” or “agree.”

The modal responses are also different; for administrators the modal response equally divided between “strongly agree” or “agree” with 32.4%, while for faculty the modal response is “don’t know” with 39.1% and staff modal response was “agree” with 34%. For faculty the response is more ambivalent with neither agree or disagree responses being the majority. While for both faculty and staff the majority within each category agree that the division I program plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population. Pearson Chi Square values were all significant beyond the .001 level. See Table 41 below for more detailed presentation of results.



Table 41: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	23 32.4%	23 32.4%	12 16.9%	10 14.1%	3 4.2%	71 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	47 15.5%	96 31.6%	119 39.1%	29 9.5%	13 4.3%	304 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	69 23.7%	99 34.0%	85 29.2%	34 11.7%	4 1.4%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	139 20.9%	218 32.7%	216 32.4%	73 11.0%	20 3.0%	666 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	26.511 <sup>a</sup>	8	.001
Likelihood Ratio	27.523	8	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	.780	1	.377
N of Valid Cases	666		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.13.

When employees were asked if they interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of the IPFW's division I athletic program, the overall level of agree and the agreement for each subgroup of employees is lower in comparison to the previous statement. For all employees, 36.7% responded "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement "I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW's Division I Athletic Program." While a larger percentage, 44% of employees, responded "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the statement, and the modal response was "disagree" with 29.1% of respondents.

The modal responses for the subgroups are the same for administrators, faculty and staff. The largest percentage of each group responded "disagree" with 25.4% for administrators, 30% of faculty, and 29.1% for staff. For faculty there was an overall greater percentage of respondents choosing either "strongly disagree" or "disagree," 49.1% of responses." For administrators and staff there is a higher level of agreement than disagreement to the statement with 44% and 40.5% responding either "strongly agree" or "agree," respectively. Nevertheless, in none of the subgroups was there a majority position of either agree or disagree. Therefore, the responses for all subgroups indicate ambivalence in their response pattern. See table 40 for a more detailed presentation cross-tabulation of the data.

Table 42: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.”

			I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	17 23.9%	15 21.1%	9 12.7%	18 25.4%	12 16.9%	71 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	24 7.9%	70 23.1%	60 19.8%	91 30.0%	58 19.1%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	59 20.4%	58 20.1%	59 20.4%	84 29.1%	29 10.0%	289 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	100 15.1%	143 21.6%	128 19.3%	193 29.1%	99 14.9%	663 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.782 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.395	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.724	1	.054
N of Valid Cases	663		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.60.

## Health and Wellness

Most of the employees either “strongly agree” or “agree,” 53%, to the statement that; “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.” The modal response for all employees is “agree” with 32.6% of respondents.

Administrators are more likely to answer “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement, 65.3%. Faculty had the lowest level of agreement with the statement with 43.1% either “strongly agree” or “agree,” and staff was in between the two positions in agreement with 61%% either “strongly agree” or “agree.” For all three groups there were more responses that chose an agree category of responses compared to disagree in their responses. The modal responses for the three subgroups is “agree” for administrators and staff with 40.3% and 33.8% of the responses, respectively. For faculty the modal response is “don’t know” with 32% of the responses. Thus compared to the other two employment categories, the pattern of responses for faculty indicated a greater level of ambivalence regarding the role of the division I athletic program and its contribution to student health and wellness. While for both administrators and staff, the majority positions is that they agree that the division I program promotes the health and wellness of students on campus. See Table 43 on the next page for a more detailed description of the cross-tabulation of responses.

Table 43: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.”

			The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	18 25.0%	29 40.3%	15 20.8%	9 12.5%	1 1.4%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	41 13.4%	91 29.7%	98 32.0%	60 19.6%	16 5.2%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	79 27.2%	98 33.8%	67 23.1%	39 13.4%	7 2.4%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	138 20.7%	218 32.6%	180 26.9%	108 16.2%	24 3.6%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.800 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	31.402	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.276	1	.039
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.59.

## Sense of Community and School Spirit

The majority of employees, 66.4% also either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement that “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.” There were differences between the three groups of employees as found in previous comparisons. For example, 79.2% of administrators responded either “strongly agree” or “agree”, while for faculty, 54.3% and staff 75.8% responded in this manner. The modal response for each group was “agree.” See Table 44 for the presentation of the cross-tabulation comparing the three groups.

Table 44: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.”

			The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count	27	30	9	5	1	72
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	37.5%	41.7%	12.5%	6.9%	1.4%	100.0%
	Faculty	Count	58	108	76	55	9	306
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	19.0%	35.3%	24.8%	18.0%	2.9%	100.0%
	Staff	Count	108	114	37	29	5	293
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	36.9%	38.9%	12.6%	9.9%	1.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	193	252	122	89	15	671
		% within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	28.8%	37.6%	18.2%	13.3%	2.2%	100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.479 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.353	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.511	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	671		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.61.

Similar results are present for employee responses to “The IPFW Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.” For all employees as a group and for each of the subgroups of employees, the majority either responded “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement. There are differences between the groups in levels of agreement. For administrators and staff, there is a higher level of agreement, with 79.2% of administrators and 77.8% of staff responded either “strongly agree” or “agree.” For faculty, although the majority chose either “strongly agree” or “agree”, the percentage was smaller with 57.9% of respondents choosing either of these categories of responses. Faculty also had a higher level of response than administrators and staff choosing either of the disagree categories or choosing “don’t know.” For faculty, 23.2% choose “don’t know” while only 9.7% of administrators and 14.5% of staff selected this response. See Table 45 on the next page for detailed presentation of cross-tabulation of employee’s responses.

### Create Student Oriented Events on Campus

As to the statement, “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus,” 63.5% of all employees either “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement. A similar pattern of differences in levels of agreement is present in this item as in the others previously discussed. Administrators are more likely to either “strongly agree” or “agree” than the other two groups. However, the majority of all classifications agreed with the statement and the modal responses for all three groups was the same, “agree.” See Table 46 for presentation of the cross-tabulation analysis.

Table 45: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.”

			Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	30 41.7%	27 37.5%	7 9.7%	7 9.7%	1 1.4%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	65 21.5%	110 36.4%	70 23.2%	47 15.6%	10 3.3%	302 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	120 41.5%	105 36.3%	42 14.5%	18 6.2%	4 1.4%	289 100.0%
Total	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	215 32.4%	242 36.5%	119 17.9%	72 10.9%	15 2.3%	663 100.0%	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	44.201 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	45.559	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	9.094	1	.003
N of Valid Cases	663		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.63.



Table 46: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	21 29.2%	37 51.4%	7 9.7%	4 5.6%	3 4.2%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	47 15.4%	123 40.2%	86 28.1%	38 12.4%	12 3.9%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	84 28.9%	113 38.8%	58 19.9%	30 10.3%	6 2.1%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	152 22.7%	273 40.8%	151 22.6%	72 10.8%	21 3.1%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	30.613 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	32.538	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.088	1	.297
N of Valid Cases	669		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.26.

### Following Achievements of IPFW Athletic Teams

In regard to the statement, “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams,” there is a bimodal distribution of responses for all employees combined, with 48.4% answering either “strongly agree” or “agree” and 47.3% answering either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” When we compare the responses of the different employee classifications, we see why there is a bimodal distribution. For administrators the majority either answered “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with 61.1% of respondents. On the other hand, the majority of faculty either “strongly agree” or “agree”, 57.9% to the statement that “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.” Staff responses are more evenly split with 40.7% either “strongly agree” or “agree” and 54.5% either answering either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” The modal responses for the three groups was “disagree” for administrators and staff with 37.5% and 32.8%, respectively, and “agree” for faculty with 33.7% responding. See Table 47 on the next page for a more detailed presentation of the data.

Table 47: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.”

			I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	10 13.9%	18 25.0%	0 0.0%	27 37.5%	17 23.6%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	74 24.2%	103 33.7%	15 4.9%	86 28.1%	28 9.2%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	48 16.6%	70 24.1%	14 4.8%	95 32.8%	63 21.7%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	132 19.8%	191 28.6%	29 4.3%	208 31.1%	108 16.2%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	33.797 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	37.784	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.996	1	.083
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.13.

### Identification with the University and Enhancing Memories of College Years.

Employees were asked to respond to the statement “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.” Again the overall results for all employees was a bimodal distribution with 38.8% of responses either “strongly agree” or “agree”, and 50% responding either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

When reviewing how the different positions responded we see a large difference between administrators and faculty with 52.8% of administrators responding “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 58.7% of the faculty responding “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” The modal response for administrators was “strongly agree” and “agree,” both with 26.4%, the modal response for faculty was “disagree” with 33.1% of responses. Staff responses are more equally divided in their responses with 46% answering either “strongly agree” or “agree,” and 43.3% responding “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” The modal response for staff is “disagree” with 29.6%. Overall, the response pattern for staff indicates more ambivalence regarding this item compared to the responses of the other two employee categories. See Table 48 on the next page for more detailed presentation of the data.

In responding to the statement that “Student memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events,” more employees were in agreement with this statement. Overall, 48.9% of all employees either “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement, while only 20.9% either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” However, the modal response for all employees is “don’t know” with 30.2% choosing this response. Differences were found between the three groups of employees with administrators more likely to “strongly agree” or “agree,” 63.9%, compared with faculty 37.4% and staff 57.4% to the statement. The modal responses for administrators and staff was “agree” with 33.3% and 32.5%, respectively. For faculty the modal response is “don’t know” with 39.3% of responses. See table 49 for a more detailed description of the findings.

Table 48: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

			I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	19 26.4%	19 26.4%	5 6.9%	17 23.6%	12 16.7%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	30 9.8%	57 18.7%	39 12.8%	101 33.1%	78 25.6%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	60 20.6%	74 25.4%	31 10.7%	86 29.6%	40 13.7%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	109 16.3%	150 22.5%	75 11.2%	204 30.5%	130 19.5%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.035 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	34.711	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.340	1	.068
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.08.

Table 49: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Student memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.”

			Student memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	22 30.6%	24 33.3%	15 20.8%	7 9.7%	4 5.6%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	36 11.8%	78 25.6%	120 39.3%	49 16.1%	22 7.2%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	72 24.9%	94 32.5%	66 22.8%	41 14.2%	16 5.5%	289 100.0%
Total	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	130 19.5%	196 29.4%	201 30.2%	97 14.6%	42 6.3%	666 100.0%	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	39.086 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	39.765	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.325	1	.250
N of Valid Cases	666		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.54.

### Made Friends as a Result of Division I Athletics

Employees were also asked to respond to the following statement, “I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics.” Most employees either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” to this statement with 53.3%. Only 26.8% either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement.

In reviewing how different employment categories responded, we see a similar pattern as noted previously with administrators more likely to either “strongly agree” or “agree,” 46.5% compared to only 16.7% of faculty and 32.4% of staff responding that they either “strongly agree” or “agree.” The modal response for administrators is “strongly agree” with 25.4% of responses, while it is “disagree” for faculty and staff with 32% and 33.4%, respectively. See Table 50 on the next page for more detailed presentation of the findings on this item.

### Donations to IPFW because of IPFW Division I Athletic Program

As to the question about future donations to support the division I athletic program at IPFW, only 17.4% of overall respondents either “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement that I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.” While 59.9% either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with the statement. The modal response for the all employees group is “strongly disagree” with 35.9%.

A similar pattern of results as found for previous questions between administrators and faculty and staff is found for this item as well. Although, the modal response for each group is the same, “strongly disagree” with the exception of staff in which their modal response is both “strongly disagree” and “don’t know.” See Table 51 for further description of the results on this item.

Table 50: Breakdown of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics.”

			I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	18 25.4%	15 21.1%	8 11.3%	15 21.1%	15 21.1%	71 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	24 8.0%	26 8.7%	61 20.3%	96 32.0%	93 31.0%	300 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	59 20.3%	35 12.1%	63 21.7%	97 33.4%	36 12.4%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	101 15.3%	76 11.5%	132 20.0%	208 31.5%	144 21.8%	661 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	57.246 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	58.862	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.842	1	.028
N of Valid Cases	661		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.16.



Table 51: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

			I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count  % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	9  12.5%	12  16.7%	16  22.2%	13  18.1%	22  30.6%	72  100.0%
	Faculty	Count  % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	12  3.9%	17  5.6%	60  19.7%	73  24.0%	142  46.7%	304  100.0%
	Staff	Count  % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	39  13.4%	27  9.2%	76  26.0%	74  25.3%	76  26.0%	292  100.0%
Total		Count  % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	60  9.0%	56  8.4%	152  22.8%	160  24.0%	240  35.9%	668  100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.033 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	47.562	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.236	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.04.

Positive Image of IPFW at the Local, State and National Levels and University Prestige

Employees responded to a series of statements regarding the role of division I athletics in creating a positive image of the university at the local, state, and national levels. For both the state and local level the majority of employees and the majority of employees within each subgroup either strongly agree or agree that “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university. The modal responses are either “strongly agree” or “agree.” See tables 52 and 53 for pattern of responses on these two questions.

Table 52: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.”

			The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	27 38.6%	27 38.6%	11 15.7%	3 4.3%	2 2.9%	70 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	72 24.2%	111 37.4%	68 22.9%	34 11.4%	12 4.0%	297 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	125 43.4%	94 32.6%	41 14.2%	22 7.6%	6 2.1%	288 100.0%
Total	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	224 34.2%	232 35.4%	120 18.3%	59 9.0%	20 3.1%	655 100.0%	

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.694 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.405	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.539	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	655		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

Table 53: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	25 35.2%	22 31.0%	17 23.9%	4 5.6%	3 4.2%	71 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	67 22.1%	94 31.0%	90 29.7%	35 11.6%	17 5.6%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	117 40.2%	84 28.9%	61 21.0%	22 7.6%	7 2.4%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	209 31.4%	200 30.1%	168 25.3%	61 9.2%	27 4.1%	665 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.694 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.405	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.539	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	655		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

For the statement, “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level,” the majority of administrators and staff in general agree with the statement. For administrators, 68% of responses are either “strongly agree” or “agree.” For staff the 62.2% either responded “strongly agree” or “agree.”

For faculty there is more ambivalence about the program’s role in this matter. Although, 44% responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” to the statement. The modal response for faculty is “don’t know” with 26.1% of the responses and 29.4% of faculty responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” to the statement. See table 54 on the next page for the breakdown of responses for all positions.

Table 54: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	23 31.9%	26 36.1%	13 18.1%	6 8.3%	4 5.6%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	58 19.1%	77 25.4%	79 26.1%	59 19.5%	30 9.9%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	96 33.0%	85 29.2%	71 24.4%	25 8.6%	14 4.8%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	177 26.6%	188 28.2%	163 24.5%	90 13.5%	48 7.2%	666 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.694 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	30.405	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.539	1	.019
N of Valid Cases	655		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.14.

On the statement that “the athletic accomplishments of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW, the majority of employees and the majority of employees within each subgroup of employees agreed with the statement. The modal response for all three groups is “agree.” See table 55 below for more details.

Table 55: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.”

			The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	23 31.9%	32 44.4%	10 13.9%	5 6.9%	2 2.8%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	52 17.2%	112 37.1%	74 24.5%	38 12.6%	26 8.6%	302 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	95 32.8%	111 38.3%	51 17.6%	25 8.6%	8 2.8%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	170 25.6%	255 38.4%	135 20.3%	68 10.2%	36 5.4%	664 100.0%

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	34.681 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	35.468	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.734	1	.030
N of Valid Cases	664		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 3.90.

### Contribution to the local economy

The majority of administrators and staff agreed that IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy. For administrators, 59.7% either "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement. While, the majority, 56.9% of staff responded either "strongly agree" or "agree" to the statement. The modal response for both groups was "agree."

For faculty, the modal response was "don't know," with 39.3% of the responses. However, a higher percentage of faculty agreed than disagreed with the statement, 38.7% responded either "strongly agree" or "agree," while 22% responded either "strongly disagree" or "disagree to the statement that IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy. See Table 56 on the next page for more detail of the responses for this item.

Table 56: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.”

			IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	18 25.0%	25 34.7%	23 31.9%	3 4.2%	3 4.2%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	32 10.7%	84 28.0%	118 39.3%	40 13.3%	26 8.7%	300 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	74 25.5%	91 31.4%	85 29.3%	32 11.0%	8 2.8%	290 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	124 18.7%	200 30.2%	226 34.1%	75 11.3%	37 5.6%	662 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	38.459 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	40.739	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	4.774	1	.029
N of Valid Cases	662		

a. 1 cells (6.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.02.



## **Weighing the Cost and Benefits of Division I Athletics at IPFW**

### Same Benefits if Not Division I?

Employees were asked in a series of questions about whether IPFW should continue participating in division I athletics. They were asked to respond to the statement that “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.” The modal response for the all employee group as well as each of the positions was “don’t know,” with 34% of the responses. There was a larger percentage of respondents overall who either strongly agree or agree with the statement, 35%, while 31% either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

When we review the results for each of the employment subgroups, we see the difference between administrators and faculty that was seen in other items with administrators slightly more likely to strongly disagree or disagree with the statement, 36.1%, while faculty were more likely to strongly agree or agree with the statement, 41.6%. For this particular item, the staff responses were more similar to administrator responses in that 37.4% either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement, and 28.5% responding either strongly agree or agree. The modal response for each of the groups was “don’t know,” with 30.6% of administrators, 34.8% of faculty, and 34% of staff responding. When reviewing the responses for all categories of employees, no group reached a majority level response for either the agree or disagree group. The overall pattern of responses indicated an ambivalence in the response pattern. See Table 57 below for detailed presentation of the data on this item.

Table 57: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.”

			IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	7 9.7%	17 23.6%	22 30.6%	14 19.4%	12 16.7%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	59 19.3%	68 22.3%	106 34.8%	46 15.1%	26 8.5%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	34 11.7%	49 16.8%	99 34.0%	58 19.9%	51 17.5%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	100 15.0%	134 20.1%	227 34.0%	118 17.7%	89 13.3%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.202 <sup>a</sup>	8	.005
Likelihood Ratio	22.683	8	.004
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.347	1	.021
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.59.

**Benefits Outweigh the Costs**

Another item asked employees to respond to the following statement, “The benefits of IPFW’s Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.” Again the modal response for all employees as well as each of the employment classifications is “don’t know.” For the all employment group 34.1% of responses were “don’t know,” while 34.5% either strongly agree or agree with the statement and 31.3% responded either strongly disagree or disagree.

The same pattern of response across employment groups that was found in the previous question is found with responses with this question. Administrators and staff employees were slightly more likely to respond with agreement than disagreement, while for faculty the responses were marginally more likely to disagree with the statement. However, overall the pattern indicates an ambivalence in the responses as to whether the benefits outweigh the costs. For none of the employment categories did the agree or disagree responses reach the majority of responses. See table 58 on the next page for more detail description of the responses.

Table 58: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The benefits of IPFW’s Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.”

			The benefits of IPFW’s Division I sports programs outweigh the costs:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	18 25.0%	13 18.1%	24 33.3%	8 11.1%	9 12.5%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	35 11.6%	46 15.2%	101 33.3%	60 19.8%	61 20.1%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	66 22.9%	51 17.7%	101 35.1%	43 14.9%	27 9.4%	288 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	119 17.9%	110 16.6%	226 34.1%	111 16.7%	97 14.6%	663 100.0%

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.232 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	29.963	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.069	1	.024
N of Valid Cases	663		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 10.53.

### Negative Impact of Dropping Division I Athletics.

There was more agreement, especially among administrators and staff that there would be a negative impact of eliminating the division I athletic program. For the all employee group 50.5% of responses were either strongly agree or agree with the statement that “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would impact IPFW negatively.” While only 23% responded that they either strongly disagree or disagree with the statement.

The differences found in the previous questions with administrators and staff agreeing more than faculty is found in this questions as well. The modal responses for the three groups are “agree” for administrators, 31.9%, strongly agree and agree, 30.5%, for staff, and “don’t know” for faculty, 31.5% of responses. Overall, the faculty response indicates an ambivalence on this item with neither the agree or disagree responses reaching a majority of responses. See Table 59 on the next page for more detailed presentation of the data on this item.

### Game Attendance

Employees were also asked whether they would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a division I program. The modal response for the entire employee group as well as each of the subgroups was “disagree” with the statement that “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program. Thus whether the program is a division I program or not would not appear to have much effect on the attendance of these three groups of employees. For all groups, employees are more likely to disagree than agree with the statement. See Table 60 for more detailed presentation of the data on this item.

Table 59: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would impact IPFW negatively.”

			Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would impact IPFW negatively:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	22 30.6%	23 31.9%	14 19.4%	8 11.1%	5 6.9%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	41 13.4%	74 24.3%	96 31.5%	53 17.4%	41 13.4%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	89 30.5%	89 30.5%	67 22.9%	36 12.3%	11 3.8%	292 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	152 22.7%	186 27.8%	177 26.5%	97 14.5%	57 8.5%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	49.299 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	51.170	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	10.641	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	669		

Table 60: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.”

			I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	11 15.3%	8 11.1%	13 18.1%	23 31.9%	17 23.6%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	16 5.3%	46 15.2%	65 21.5%	92 30.4%	84 27.7%	303 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	38 13.1%	44 15.2%	72 24.9%	87 30.1%	48 16.6%	289 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	65 9.8%	98 14.8%	150 22.6%	202 30.4%	149 22.4%	664 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	22.344 <sup>a</sup>	8	.004
Likelihood Ratio	23.230	8	.003
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.121	1	.013
N of Valid Cases	664		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.05.

### Division I Athletics Should Pay for Itself

Employees were divided in their responses to the statement, “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.” For the combined employee group, 41.8% either strongly agree or agree with the statement, while 34.5% either strongly disagree or disagree, and 23.8% “don’t know.”

As in previous items, administrators and faculty were more divided on this statement. Administrators responded either “strongly agree” or “agree” with 35.2% and responded either “strongly disagree” or “disagree” with 52.1%. While for faculty the results were the opposite with more either responding “strongly agree” or “agree,” 50%, and 25.5% responding either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” Staff were slightly more aligned with administrator responses with 34.8% either responding “strongly agree” or “agree” and 39.5 responding either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.”

Although, overall staff are more ambivalent in their responses with neither the agree or disagree responses being the majority. The modal responses for the three groups are disagree for administrators with 29.6% of responses, agree for faculty with 28.4%, and “don’t know for staff with 25.8% of responses. See Table 61 for more detailed presentation of the data on this item.



Table 61: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.”

			The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	9 12.7%	16 22.5%	9 12.7%	21 29.6%	16 22.5%	71 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	66 21.6%	87 28.4%	75 24.5%	64 20.9%	14 4.6%	306 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	31 10.7%	70 24.1%	75 25.8%	63 21.6%	52 17.9%	291 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	106 15.9%	173 25.9%	159 23.8%	148 22.2%	82 12.3%	668 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	47.691 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	50.900	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	3.468	1	.063
N of Valid Cases	668		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.72.

### IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics

Employees were asked to respond to a summary statement, “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.” In general there was more agreement than disagreement across all employee groups in response to this statement. For all employee responses, 47.9% of responses are either “strongly agree” or “agree,” while 25.5% of responses were either “strongly disagree” or “disagree.” However, the modal response for the all employee group was “don’t know” with 26.8% of responses.

As found in previous items, administrators and staff are more likely to either to respond “strongly agree” or “agree” with the statement, 54.2% and 56.5%, respectively. While faculty, although more likely to agree than disagree with the statement have the lowest percentage agreeing with 38%. The modal responses illustrate these differences. For administrators and staff, the modal response is “strongly agree” with 30.6% and 32.5%, respectively. While for faculty, the modal response is “don’t know” with 27.2% of responses. For faculty, the overall pattern of responses indicated ambivalence in that neither the agree or disagree responses were a majority of responses. See Table 62 for more detailed presentation of the data on this item.

Table 62: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.”

			IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics:					Total
			Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	Administrator	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	22 30.6%	17 23.6%	19 26.4%	6 8.3%	8 11.1%	72 100.0%
	Faculty	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	50 16.4%	66 21.6%	83 27.2%	50 16.4%	56 18.4%	305 100.0%
	Staff	Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	95 32.5%	70 24.0%	77 26.4%	34 11.6%	16 5.5%	292 100.0%
Total		Count % within What is your principal relationship to IPFW?	167 25.0%	153 22.9%	179 26.8%	90 13.5%	80 12.0%	669 100.0%

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	41.820 <sup>a</sup>	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	43.676	8	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	11.858	1	.001
N of Valid Cases	669		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.61.

### Summarization of Areas of Agreement and Disagreement between Administrators, Faculty, and Staff on D-I Athletics at IPFW

The table below lists the areas of agreement across the three category of employee stakeholder groups. The majority of employees within each employee groups agree that the division I athletic program at IPFW creates a sense of community, improves school spirit, creates student oriented events on campus, creates positive image of IPFW at the local and state levels, and increases the prestige of the university. The three groups are also ambivalent on the role the division I program has in their own experience interacting with people from diverse backgrounds, same benefits if it were not a D-I program, and whether the benefits of the program outweigh the costs.

Table 63: Employee Survey Areas of Agreement between Administrator, Faculty, and Staff

D-I Statement	Administrators	Faculty	Staff
Sense of Community	+	+	+
School Spirit	+	+	+
Create Student Oriented Events on Campus	+	+	+
Create Positive Image of IPFW (local, state)	+	+	+
University Prestige	+	+	+
Own Diversity Experience	0	0	0
Same Benefits if not D-I	0	0	0
Benefits Outweigh the Costs	0	0	0

+ Majority of students answered strongly agree or agree

0 Ambivalence - Neither agree or disagree responses were majority.

There are some important areas where there is a difference of opinion across the different employee stakeholder groups. The majority of administrators and staff agree and disagree with the majority of faculty on a number of areas as noted in the table below. The majority of administrators and staff agree that prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because of its division I program and that it plays an important role in

recruiting students to IPFW. Similarly the majority agrees that the division I program plays a role in bringing diversity to the student population, and health and wellness of students. They also agree that there will be a negative impact of eliminating the division I athletic program and that IPFW should continue to participate in division I athletics. In all these opinions, the faculty were ambivalent about the claims. In all cases, either the modal response is don't know or there is no majority opinion for degrees of agreement or disagreement or don't know.

There are also two other areas where the majority of administrators and staff agreed and disagreed in their position with faculty. For the statement that I rarely following the achievements of IPFW Athletics, the majority of administrators and staff disagree with the statement, while the majority of faculty agreed. Also, for the statement that "I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program," the majority of administrators and staff agreed with the statement, while the majority of faculty disagreed.

There are also areas where the majority of Faculty and Staff were in agreement and in disagreement with the majority of the administrators. Faculty and Staff are ambivalent in their responses on the contributions of the division I program for student achievement, keeping students in school until they graduate, and that the division I program should pay for itself. In the first two areas, the majority of administrators agreed that the division I program contributes to student achievement and in keeping students in school until graduation. On the statement that the division I program should pay for itself, the majority of administrators disagreed. In response to the statement that they plan to donate to the university in the future because of the D I athletic program, both the majority of faculty and staff either "strongly disagree" or "disagree" with the statement, while administrators were ambivalent in their response pattern.

There was one item in which the majority position was different across all three groups. On the statement that "I have made friends as a result of IPFW's participation in Division I athletics," the majority of administrators agreed with the statement, the majority of the faculty disagreed, while the staff were ambivalent about this statement regarding division I athletics at IPFW. See Table 64 below for areas on non-agreement across employee position categories.

Table 64: Employee Survey Areas of Non-Agreement between Administrators, Faculty, and Staff

D-I Statement	Administrators	Faculty	Staff
Prospective Students Likely to Attend	+	0	+
Important Role in Recruiting Students	+	0	+
Bringing Diversity to Student Population	+	0	+
Health and Wellness	+	0	+
Student Memories Enhanced	+	0	+
Negative Impact of Eliminating D-I	+	0	+
Should Continue to Participate	+	0	+
Rarely Follow Achievements of IPFW Athletics	--	+	--
Identity as a Member of IPFW Community	+	--	+
Student Achievement	+	0	0
Keep Students in School until Graduation	+	0	0
D-I Should Pay for Itself	--	0	0
Plan to donate to the university because of D-I	0	--	--
Made Friends because of D-I	+	--	0

---

+ Majority of employees answered strongly agree or agree  
0 Ambivalence - Modal response is "don't know" or no majority opinion  
-- Majority of employees answered strongly disagree or disagree

### Areas of Agreement and Disagreement between Students and Employees

When review the results across the two surveys, we can identify some areas where the majority of all stakeholder groups agree about the role of the division I program at IPFW. The majority of all stakeholder groups agree that the division I athletic program creates a sense of community at IPFW. There is also agreement that the division I athletic program helps create school spirit. Furthermore, there is agreement that the division I athletic program creates student oriented events on campus and contributes to a positive image of IPFW at both the local and state level.

There are two areas where with the exception of student athletes there is a general ambivalence about the division I program in regard to whether the same benefits could

be achieved if the athletic program was not division I and the role of the division I program in their own experience with diversity on campus. With the exception of faculty, the majority of students and administrators and staff agree that the division I program plays a role in student achievement, bringing diversity to the student population, promoting health and wellness of students, and that there would be negative impact on eliminating division I athletics and that IPFW should continue to participate in division I athletics. The majority of administrators, staff and students agree that the division I program plays a role in student recruitment. Although, for non-division I students, the majority disagree that it played a role in their own recruitment to the university. The pattern of responses for faculty indicate an ambivalence on these statements.

## Conclusions

These conclusions are solely the author of this report. It is not the opinion of the Ad Hoc Committee that was formed to study the costs and benefits of the division I program, the University Resources Policy Committee, nor the opinion of the students in the S470 course who participated in the design of this research project. These conclusion are based on findings from the report that was presented to the senate by the University Resources Committee and the findings from the surveys that were completed that solicited the opinions of student athletes, students who were not division I athletes, and administrative, faculty, and staff employees.

There is agreement among the majority of stakeholders that the division I program provides important benefits to the university. The building of a community at the university that cuts across the various segments of the campus is an important contribution. This community building also creates a positive connection to the university that is referred to as “school spirit.” There is also recognition that, related to these two points, the division I program provides student oriented events. Furthermore, there is a majority agreement across the various stakeholder groups that the program contributes to a positive image for IPFW at both the local and state levels which is very important in the politics of higher education today.

There was also important areas of agreement within the student body and within employee groups that are important to recognize that don't cut across their respective sub- groups, athletes and employees. For students there is agreement on the contributions of the division I program that were discussed previously including student recruitment, health and wellness, and creating diversity. The majority of students also see that the athletic program does contribute to the prestige of the university. All of which are important for the vitality of IPFW's student body. Across employee groups there is also shared ambivalence over whether the benefits outweigh the costs for the program and whether the same benefits could be reaped if it was not a division I program. In regard to this latter point, this ambivalence is also revealed in the pattern of responses for the students who were not division I athletes.



It is not important to focus only on the areas of agreement to appreciate the benefits of the program. Equally important is to look how there are differences in perceptions and why these differences may exist. There are important differences in perceptions between division I students athletes and the students who are not division I athletes. Many of these differences are purely a result of the different roles that the athlete's play compared to students. In this respect some of the benefits may be more isolated to them. This is indicated in the responses where there are significant disagreements such as the role of the program in their own recruitment, retention, experience with diversity on campus, and enhancing their memories of IPFW.

Leaders in these various stakeholder groups may wish to think about how these benefits that athletes are experiencing can be spread further into the student body. For example, as indicated in the report submitted by URPC, Senate Reference No. 13-38, there is an important role that the academic advisors within the athletic program play in helping athletes be academically successful. There is more intensive monitoring and intervention to support student academic success. It may be important to begin to examine the importance of this added attention and support and how it could be developed for the general student population, especially the more "at risk" students in the general student body.

There is also the fact of the high level of involvement on campus activities that student athletes' experience that is not shared by the majority of students on campus that plays an important role in student retention. Part of this involvement occurs because it is part of their activities within the division I program, but it also is in part a result that their education costs defrayed as a result of a much higher rate of scholarships. Student retention is impacted by both factors. Those students who are more engaged in campus activities are more likely to be retained by the university until graduation and those students who have to pay for their schooling and are required to work off campus are less likely to be retained.

Similarly the differences in experience with diversity on campus as a result of the program appears to be more isolated within the student body. I'm sure that this is the case in general, but if the athletic program provides more diversity to the university, it may

be important to consider how to spread the benefits to larger segments of the student population. It also important to note that there were significant numbers of students who were not division I athletes, although not part of the majority opinion, who agreed that they experienced benefits from the program. It is important to appreciate the effects of the program outside of the IPFW athletic community even if it is only experienced by a minority of students.

Lastly, there are important differences across the employee group that may be important to think about as it relates to the division program's integration in other campus activities and programs. This is especially the case with the differences of opinion that faculty have regarding the program's benefits compared to administrators and staff. This difference in opinion is certainly based on the different experience that these respective groups have with the program. Although, the data needs to be analyzed on the different levels of attendance at athletic events, I would anticipate that the opinions may in part be a result of the differences in participation with the athletic program as in part measured by the question on attendance. The differences between faculty and administration and staff on the statement that "I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW athletics is also evident of this difference in involvement with the program. Faculty agreed while administrators and staff disagreed with the statement indicating that they did follow the program teams.

But this difference in perception may be based on the differences in perceived utility of the program as viewed by these different positions within the university. Administrators play a more important function in maintain the sense of community, identity, spirit or loyalty, as well as the recruitment of students than faculty are involved in as part their professional responsibilities. On the other hand, the role of faculty in education and creation of knowledge is quite separate from these other functions and more specifically more divergent from the role that athletics may have on the campus.

It may important for the leaders within the respective groups to think about how to bridge gap in function. For example, the division I athletic program may provide an important opportunity for faculty in their teaching and scholarship that is currently not being realized. Certainly we can think of a whole range of courses in which sports or

athletics is a focus. There are courses in the sociology of sport, sports medicine, sports management, sports marketing, coaching as a course is leadership and supervision, the psychology of sport, the philosophy of sport, history of sport, etc. Each of these courses could use university's athletic events and the program as a whole as part of their course curriculum. There are also degree and certificate programs that can be built on these content areas that could further use this campus resource to enhance the universities certificate and degree offerings and attract more students to the university. Lastly, there is the important role that athletics could play as a laboratory for scholarship. This certainly could be the case in the scholarship within the social and behavioral sciences. Thus, it may be important to consider how to further integrate this campus resources into areas in which faculty are more likely to reap the program's benefits.

## Table Index

- Table 1: Frequencies of Student Response to “What is your class standing?” p. 7
- Table 2: Frequencies of Student’s Response to “Are you a Division I Student Athlete?” p. 8
- Table 3: Frequencies of Overall Student Responses to the Question “What is your gender?”p. 9
- Table 4: Frequencies of Student’s Response to “To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you most identify?” p.10
- Table 5: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to I athletic “The Division program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.” P. 12
- Table 6: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.” P. 13
- Table 7: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.” P. 14
- Table 8: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.” p. 15
- Table 9: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics encourages me to complete my degree at IPFW.” p. 16
- Table 10: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.” p. 17
- Table 11: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.” P. 18.
- Table 12: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes response to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.” P. 19
- Table 13: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.” P. 20
- Table 14: Frequencies for Athletes’ and Non-Athlete Students’ response to “Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.” P. 21
- Table 15: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete Student’s response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.” P. 22
- Table 16: Frequencies for Student Athletes and Student Non-Athlete’s response to “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.” P. 23
- Table 17: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.” P. 24
- Table 18: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.” P. 25
- Table 19: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.” P. 26

Table 20: Frequencies of Athletes and Non-Athletes response to “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.” P 27

Table 21: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.” P. 28

Table 22: Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.” P. 29

Table 23: Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.” P. 30

Table 24: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.” P. 31

Table 25: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program.” P. 32

Table 26: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW.” P. 33

Table 27: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.” P. 34

Table 28: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.” P. 35

Table 29: Frequencies for Athletes and Non-Athlete’s response to “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.” P. 36

Table 30: Student Survey Areas of Agreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes p. 37

Table 31: Student Survey Areas of Disagreement between Division I Student Athletes and Non-Student Athletes P. 39

Table 32: Frequencies of Employee responses to “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” P. 41

Table 33: Crosstabs of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW? And What is your gender? for employees” p. 41

Table 34: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you most identify?” p. 43

Table 35: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.” P. 45

Table 36: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.” P. 47

Table 37: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.” P. 49

Table 38: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics encourages students to complete their degree at IPFW:” P. 50

Table 39: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.” P. 52

Table 40: Cross-tabulation of “IPFW students are more likely to finish their degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.” P. 54

Table 39: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.” P. 56

Table 42: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.” P. 58

Table 43: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.” P. 60

Table 44: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.” P. 61

Table 45: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The IPFW Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.” P. 63

Table 46: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.” P. 64

Table 47: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.” P. 66

Table 48: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.” P. 68

Table 49: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Student memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.” P. 69

Table 50: Breakdown of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics.” P. 71

Table 51: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.” P. 72

Table 52: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.” P. 73

Table 53: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.” P. 74

Table 54: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.” P. 75

Table 55: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.”

P. 77

Table 56: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.” P. 79

Table 57: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.” P. 81

Table 58: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The benefits of IPFW’s Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.” P. 83

Table 59: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would impact IPFW negatively.” P. 85

Table 60: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.” P. 86

Table 61: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.” P. 88

Table 62: Cross-tabulation of “What is your principal relationship to IPFW?” and “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.” P. 90

Table 63: Employee Survey Areas of Agreement between Administrator, Faculty, and Staff P. 91

Table 64: Employee Survey Areas of Non-Agreement between Administrators, Faculty, and Staff P. 93

## Appendix A

Dear first name of IPFW Student,

I am contacting you to ask you to participate in a very important survey about what you see as the costs and benefits of IPFW Division I program. **Completing this survey enters you into a contest for an IPAD Mini.** It is very important that you participate for the results to accurately represent the opinions of IPFW students. You will receive a unique link to the survey beginning January 20<sup>th</sup>. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All your responses are anonymous.

This survey was developed for the completion of IPFW's Senate's Report on the Cost and Benefits of IPFW's continued participation in Division I College Athletics. It has been developed by Peter Iadicola, Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology and the students in S470, Senior Seminar. We would like to ask you about your opinion as to whether the benefits of the IPFW Division I athletic program is worth the cost to the university.

- According to the information provided by IPFW to the National Collegiate Athletic Association for 2013, IPFW provided a subsidy of 77% of the total cost to pay for the Division I athletic program.
- Student fees of \$1,920,419 covered approximately 25% of the total annual costs. Currently 65% of the \$12.70 students pay per credit hour as their student service fee (sometimes referred to as student activities fee) goes to finance IPFW Division 1 Athletics.
- Students who complete a 120 credit hour bachelor's degree at IPFW will pay in student fees \$1524.00 to directly subsidize the Division I athletic program.
- In addition to student fees, 36% of the total \$8,256,631 for scholarships and fee remission funds originating from IPFW in 2011 went to student athletes.
- Overall, according to the report to the IPFW Senate last spring, university funds to support Division I athletics increased 147% from 2005 to 2012.

The report also identified benefits of the Division I athletic program including the value of national and local media coverage of athletics and the academic success of IPFW's athletes.

- Total local media coverage last year for men's basketball was the equivalent of \$466,050 in ads (figures based on costs of ¼ to ½ page ad in the newspaper and a 30-second spot during the new casts).
- IPFW athletics in national news (two ESPN games this year: exposure equivalent to \$2,000 for 30 second ad x 40 minutes/game = \$16,000 per game = \$320,000 for two games): and ESPN ticker coverage valued at \$260 per appearance = \$1,160,640 for the season.
- IPFW recruited 264 Division I student-athletes.



- IPFW Athletic Program achieves a high rate of academic success for these student athletes, as a group achieving over a 3.0 GPA for ten straight years.
- Graduation rates for student athletes was a little more than twice the rate compared to the general student population at IPFW.

If you are interested in reading the full report, it is available at

<http://www.ipfw.edu/dotAsset/5f3971aa-37dc-4bfd-aa4f-c171e7c67c0d.pdf>

Sincerely,

Peter Iadicola  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Sociology

Dear first name of IPFW faculty and staff,

I am contacting you to ask you to participate in a very important survey about what you see as the costs and benefits of IPFW Division I program. It is very important that you participate for the results to accurately represent the opinions of IPFW faculty and staff. You will receive a unique link to the survey beginning January 20<sup>th</sup>. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. All your responses are anonymous.

This survey was developed for the completion of IPFW's Senate's Report on the Cost and Benefits of IPFW's continued participation in Division I College Athletics. It has been developed by Peter Iadicola, Professor and Chair of the Department of Sociology and the students in S470, Senior Seminar. We would like to ask you about your opinion as to whether the benefits of the IPFW Division I athletic program is worth the cost to the university.

- According to the information provided by IPFW to the National Collegiate Athletic Association for 2013, IPFW provided a subsidy of 77% of the total cost to pay for the Division I athletic program.
- Student fees of \$1,920,419 covered approximately 25% of the total annual costs. Currently 65% of the \$12.70 students pay per credit hour as their student service fee (sometimes referred to as student activities fee) goes to finance IPFW Division 1 Athletics.
- Students who complete a 120 credit hour bachelor's degree at IPFW will pay in student fees \$1524.00 to directly subsidize the Division I athletic program.
- In addition to student fees, 36% of the total \$8,256,631 for scholarships and fee remission funds originating from IPFW in 2011 went to student athletes.
- Overall, according to the report to the IPFW Senate last spring, university funds to support Division I athletics increased 147% from 2005 to 2012.

The report also identified benefits of the Division I athletic program including the value of national and local media coverage of athletics and the academic success of IPFW's athletes.

- Total local media coverage last year for men's basketball was the equivalent of \$466,050 in ads (figures based on costs of ¼ to ½ page ad in the newspaper and a 30-second spot during the new casts).
- IPFW athletics in national news (two ESPN games this year: exposure equivalent to \$2,000 for 30 second ad x 40 minutes/game = \$16,000 per game = \$320,000 for two games): and ESPN ticker coverage valued at \$260 per appearance = \$1,160,640 for the season.
- IPFW recruited 264 Division I student-athletes.
- IPFW Athletic Program achieves a high rate of academic success for these student athletes, as a group achieving over a 3.0 GPA for ten straight years.
- Graduation rates for student athletes was a little more than twice the rate compared to the general student population at IPFW.

If you are interested in reading the full report, it is available at  
<http://www.ipfw.edu/dotAsset/5f3971aa-37dc-4bfd-aa4f-c171e7c67c0d.pdf>

Sincerely,

Peter Iadicola  
Professor and Chair  
Department of Sociology

## Appendix B – Surveys

### IPFW D- 1 Athletic Program Student Survey

1. The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

2. The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

3. I have made friends as a result of IPFW's participation in Division I athletics.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

4. Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

5. I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

6. The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

7. IPFW's participation in Division I athletics encourages me to complete my degree at IPFW.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

8. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

9. I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

10. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

11. IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

12. I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

13. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree

- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

14. I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW's Division I Athletic Program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

15. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

16. Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree



- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

17. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

18. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

19. The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.

- 0 Strongly Agree

- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

20. The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

21. I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

22. IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

23. I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

24. The benefits of IPFW's Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

25. IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

26. Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

27. I am more likely to finish my degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

28. The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

29. How many IPFW Division I athletic events did you attend in the past 12 months? \_\_\_\_\_

30. What is your gender?

a. Man

b. Women

c. Other

31. What is the year of your birth? \_ \_ \_ \_

32. How many credit hours are you enrolled in the current semester? \_\_\_\_\_

33. How many miles do you travel to get to campus? \_ \_ \_

34. Are you a Division I Student Athlete? Yes No

35. What is your class standing?

0 Freshman

0 Sophomore

0 Junior

0 Senior

0 Graduate Student

36. To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you *most* identify?

0 African-American (non-Hispanic)

0 Asian/Pacific Islanders

0 Caucasian (non-Hispanic)

0 Latino or Hispanic

0 Native American or Aleut

0 Other

37. Do you wish to be included in a drawing for an Apple IPAD

0 Yes

0 No

## IPFW D- 1 Athletic Program Employee Survey

1. The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

2. The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

3. I have made friends as a result of IPFW's participation in Division I athletics.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

4. Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

5. I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

6. The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

7. IPFW's participation in Division I athletics encourages students to complete their degree at IPFW.



- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

8. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

9. Prospective students are more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

10. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image

of the university at the national level.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

11. IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

12. I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

13. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

14. I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW's Division I Athletic Program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

15. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

16. Students' memories of their college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I

athletic events.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

17. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

18. The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

19. The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Don't know

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

20. The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Don't know

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

21. I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.

Strongly Agree

Agree

Don't know

Disagree

Strongly Disagree

22. IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

23. I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

24. The benefits of IPFW's Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.

0 Strongly Agree

0 Agree

0 Don't know

0 Disagree

0 Strongly Disagree

25. IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

26. Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would impact IPFW negatively.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

27. IPFW students are more likely to finish their degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

28. The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.

- 0 Strongly Agree
- 0 Agree
- 0 Don't know
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

29. How many IPFW Division I athletic events did you attend in the past 12 months? \_\_\_\_\_

30. Did you make a financial contribution to IPFW during the last 12 months because of its Division I athletic program?    Yes    No

31. What is your gender?

- a.    Man                      Women                      Other

32. What is the year of your birth?    \_\_    \_\_    \_\_    \_\_

33. How many miles do you travel to get to campus?    \_\_    \_\_

34. What is your principal relationship to IPFW?

- 0 Administrator
- 0 Faculty
- 0 Clerical/Technical/Service Staff
- 0 Alumni



35. If you are employed at IPFW, please indicate if you are;

Full time employee

Part Time employee

36. **To which racial or ethnic group(s) do you *most* identify?**

African-American (non-Hispanic)

Asian/Pacific Islanders

Caucasian (non-Hispanic)

Latino or Hispanic

Native American or Aleut

Other

Appendix C – Frequencies for Combined Student Group

Table 1C: Overall student responses to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	472	24.2	24.3	24.3
	Agree	745	38.2	38.4	62.7
	Don't Know	530	27.2	27.3	90.1
	Disagree	110	5.6	5.7	95.7
	Strongly Disagree	83	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 2C: Overall student response to ‘I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.’

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	283	14.5	14.6	14.6
	Agree	219	11.2	11.3	25.9
	Don't Know	234	12.0	12.1	37.9
	Disagree	604	31.0	31.1	69.0
	Strongly Disagree	601	30.8	31.0	100.0
	Total	1941	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 3C: Overall student response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	352	18.1	18.1	18.1
	Agree	612	31.4	31.5	49.7
	Don't Know	696	35.7	35.9	85.6
	Disagree	162	8.3	8.4	93.9
	Strongly Disagree	118	6.1	6.1	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 4D: Overall Student Responses to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	309	15.8	16.0	16.0
	Agree	535	27.4	27.6	43.6
	Don't Know	676	34.7	34.9	78.5
	Disagree	261	13.4	13.5	92.0
	Strongly Disagree	155	7.9	8.0	100.0
	Total	1936	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	14	.7		

Total	1950	100.0		
-------	------	-------	--	--

Table 5E: Overall Student response to “I am more likely to finish my degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	239	12.3	12.3	12.3
	Agree	225	11.5	11.6	23.9
	Don't Know	318	16.3	16.4	40.3
	Disagree	594	30.5	30.6	70.9
	Strongly Disagree	564	28.9	29.1	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 6F: Overall Student Responses to “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	339	17.4	17.5	17.5
	Agree	480	24.6	24.8	42.3
	Don't Know	372	19.1	19.2	61.5
	Disagree	496	25.4	25.6	87.0
	Strongly Disagree	251	12.9	13.0	100.0
	Total	1938	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.6		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 7C: Overall Student Responses to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	508	26.1	26.1	26.1
	Agree	765	39.2	39.4	65.5
	Don't Know	450	23.1	23.1	88.6
	Disagree	155	7.9	8.0	96.6
	Strongly Disagree	66	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	1944	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.3		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 8C: Overall Student Response to “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	503	25.8	26.0	26.0
	Agree	751	38.5	38.8	64.7
	Don't Know	389	19.9	20.1	84.8
	Disagree	223	11.4	11.5	96.3
	Strongly Disagree	71	3.6	3.7	100.0
	Total	1937	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	13	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 9C: Overall Student Response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	426	21.8	22.1	22.1
	Agree	820	42.1	42.5	64.6
	Don't Know	471	24.2	24.4	89.0
	Disagree	138	7.1	7.2	96.1
	Strongly Disagree	75	3.8	3.9	100.0
	Total	1930	99.0	100.0	
Missing	System	20	1.0		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 10C: Overall Student responses to “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	474	24.3	24.4	24.4
	Agree	565	29.0	29.1	53.6
	Don't Know	131	6.7	6.8	60.3
	Disagree	544	27.9	28.0	88.4
	Strongly Disagree	226	11.6	11.6	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 11C: Overall Student Response to “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	296	15.2	15.2	15.2
	Agree	402	20.6	20.7	35.9
	Don't Know	350	17.9	18.0	53.9
	Disagree	550	28.2	28.3	82.2
	Strongly Disagree	346	17.7	17.8	100.0
	Total	1944	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	6	.3		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 12C: Overall Student Response to “Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	327	16.8	16.9	16.9
	Agree	377	19.3	19.4	36.3
	Don't Know	302	15.5	15.6	51.9
	Disagree	518	26.6	26.7	78.6
	Strongly Disagree	415	21.3	21.4	100.0
	Total	1939	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	11	.6		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 13C: Overall Student Response to “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	474	24.3	24.4	24.4
	Agree	565	29.0	29.1	53.6
	Don't Know	131	6.7	6.8	60.3
	Disagree	544	27.9	28.0	88.4
	Strongly Disagree	226	11.6	11.6	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 14C: Overall Student Response to “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	152	7.8	7.8	7.8
	Agree	166	8.5	8.6	16.4
	Don't Know	691	35.4	35.7	52.1
	Disagree	421	21.6	21.7	73.8
	Strongly Disagree	507	26.0	26.2	100.0
	Total	1937	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	13	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		



Table 15C: Overall Student Response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	625	32.1	32.3	32.3
	Agree	806	41.3	41.6	73.9
	Don't Know	306	15.7	15.8	89.7
	Disagree	131	6.7	6.8	96.5
	Strongly Disagree	68	3.5	3.5	100.0
	Total	1936	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	14	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 16C: Overall Student Response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	516	26.5	26.6	26.6
	Agree	705	36.2	36.4	63.0
	Don't Know	458	23.5	23.6	86.6
	Disagree	143	7.3	7.4	94.0
	Strongly Disagree	116	5.9	6.0	100.0
	Total	1938	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.6		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 17C: Overall Student Response to “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	503	25.8	25.9	25.9
	Agree	805	41.3	41.5	67.4
	Don't Know	424	21.7	21.9	89.3
	Disagree	120	6.2	6.2	95.5
	Strongly Disagree	88	4.5	4.5	100.0
	Total	1940	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	10	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 18C: Overall Student Response to “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	382	19.6	19.7	19.7
	Agree	665	34.1	34.3	54.1
	Don't Know	680	34.9	35.1	89.2
	Disagree	130	6.7	6.7	95.9
	Strongly Disagree	80	4.1	4.1	100.0
	Total	1937	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	13	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 19C: Overall Student Response to “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	217	11.1	11.2	11.2
	Agree	369	18.9	19.0	30.2
	Don't Know	786	40.3	40.6	70.8
	Disagree	356	18.3	18.4	89.2
	Strongly Disagree	210	10.8	10.8	100.0
	Total	1938	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	12	.6		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 20C: Overall Student Response to “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	555	28.5	28.6	28.6
	Agree	651	33.4	33.5	62.1
	Don't Know	499	25.6	25.7	87.8
	Disagree	135	6.9	7.0	94.7
	Strongly Disagree	102	5.2	5.3	100.0
	Total	1942	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	8	.4		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 21C: Overall Student Response to “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	245	12.6	12.6	12.6
	Agree	342	17.5	17.7	30.3
	Don't Know	550	28.2	28.4	58.7
	Disagree	489	25.1	25.2	83.9
	Strongly Disagree	311	15.9	16.1	100.0
	Total	1937	99.3	100.0	
	Missing System	13	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 22C: Overall Student Response to “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	307	15.7	15.9	15.9
	Agree	468	24.0	24.2	40.0
	Don't Know	566	29.0	29.2	69.3
	Disagree	430	22.1	22.2	91.5
	Strongly Disagree	165	8.5	8.5	100.0
	Total	1936	99.3	100.0	
	Missing System	14	.7		
Total		1950	100.0		

Table 23C: Overall Student Response to “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.”

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Agree	596	30.6	30.7	30.7
	Agree	676	34.7	34.8	65.5
	Don't Know	459	23.5	23.6	89.2
	Disagree	109	5.6	5.6	94.8
	Strongly Disagree	101	5.2	5.2	100.0
	Total	1941	99.5	100.0	
Missing	System	9	.5		
Total		1950	100.0		

**Appendix D – Cross-tabulations by student and student athlete groups**

Table 1D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.”

Count

		The IPFW Division I Athletic program promotes the health & wellness of students on campus.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	100	40	1	5	1	147
	No	400	715	443	149	64	1771
Total		500	755	444	154	65	1918

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	155.900 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	155.699	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	100.084	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1918		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.98.

Table 2D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.”

Count

		The IPFW Division I Athletic program creates a sense of community on campus.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	102	34	6	4	1	147
	No	391	708	378	218	69	1764
Total		493	742	384	222	70	1911

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	162.435 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	145.393	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	101.250	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1911		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.38.

Table 3D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics.”

Count

		I have made friends as a result of IPFW’s participation in Division I athletics.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	125	18	1	1	2	147
	No	180	289	351	593	350	1763
Total		305	307	352	594	352	1910

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	576.959 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	433.275	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	348.176	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1910		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 23.47.

Table 4D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.”

Count

		Division I Athletic Program improves school spirit.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	107	28	6	4	1	146
	No	502	768	295	139	61	1765
Total		609	796	301	143	62	1911

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	125.815 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	117.315	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	73.497	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1911		

a. 1 cells (10.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 4.74.

Table 6D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.”

Count

		I plan to donate to IPFW in the future because of its Division I Athletic Program.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	60	32	43	5	6	146
	No	91	127	636	415	497	1766
Total		151	159	679	420	503	1912

### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	311.744 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000



Likelihood Ratio	229.216	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	227.906	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1912		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.53.

Table 7D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university in the local community.”

Count

		The Division I Athletic Program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	109	31	4	1	2	147
	No	501	770	299	128	65	1763
Total		610	801	303	129	67	1910

#### Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	133.494 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	128.994	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	82.297	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1910		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.16.

Table 8D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics encourages me to complete my degree at IPFW.”

Count

		IPFW's participation in Division I athletics encourages me to complete my degree at IPFW.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	108	27	5	5	1	146
	No	179	252	321	551	468	1771
Total		287	279	326	556	469	1917

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	458.474 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	351.869	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	316.174	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1917		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 21.25.

Table 9D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the state level.”

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	108	33	5	0	1	147
	No	468	741	364	106	86	1765
Total		576	774	369	106	87	1912

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	147.022 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000

Likelihood Ratio	144.044	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	96.604	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1912		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.69.

**Table 10D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.”**

Count

		I was more likely to attend IPFW because it has a Division I athletic program.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	116	15	6	8	2	147
	No	159	200	224	591	595	1769
Total		275	215	230	599	597	1916

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	550.134 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	386.667	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	370.628	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1916		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.50.

**Table 11D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of the university at the national level.”**

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in creating a positive image of t...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	102	32	10	1	2	147
	No	401	669	442	142	112	1766
Total		503	701	452	143	114	1913

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	156.646 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	141.419	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	97.548	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1913		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.76.

**Table 12D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.”**

		IPFW's participation in Division I athletics helps the local economy.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	80	40	20	5	2	147
	No	296	616	653	125	76	1766
	Total	376	656	673	130	78	1913

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	126.905 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	105.251	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	79.578	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1913		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.99.

Table 13D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.”

Count

		I rarely follow the achievements of IPFW Athletic teams.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	6	6	9	43	83	147
	No	463	556	120	492	138	1769
Total		469	562	129	535	221	1916

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	340.484 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	249.562	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	202.930	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1916		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 9.90.

Table 14D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the student population.”

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in bringing more diversity to the...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	99	39	6	2	1	147
	No	403	721	458	117	68	1767
Total		502	760	464	119	69	1914

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	146.127 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	136.000	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	98.063	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1914		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.30.

Table 15D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW’s Division I Athletic Program.”

Count

		I have interacted with people from diverse backgrounds because of IPFW's Division I Athletic Pro...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	99	41	1	5	1	147
	No	233	434	366	486	248	1767
Total		332	475	367	491	249	1914

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	307.849 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	270.482	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	209.025	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1914		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 19.12.

Table 16D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete” and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented events on campus.”

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in providing student oriented eve...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	91	44	8	1	2	146
	No	324	770	457	137	72	1760
Total		415	814	465	138	74	1906

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	160.434 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	140.699	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	99.644	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1906		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.67.

**Table 17D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.”**

Count

		Memories of my college years will be enhanced because of IPFW Division I athletic events.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	115	24	4	2	2	147
	No	204	347	295	512	410	1768
	Total	319	371	299	514	412	1915

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	448.669 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	348.267	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	280.627	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1915		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.95.

Table 18D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in school until they graduate.”

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in keeping IPFW students in scho...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	90	40	13	3	1	147
	No	210	491	657	255	152	1765
Total		300	531	670	258	153	1912

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	267.783 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	213.356	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	170.071	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1912		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 11.76.

Table 19D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.”

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW plays an important role in recruiting students to IPFW.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	110	34	1	1	1	147
	No	350	706	526	109	80	1771
Total		460	740	527	110	81	1918

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	234.899 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	218.961	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	146.993	1	.000



N of Valid Cases	1918
------------------	------

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.21.

Table 20D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige of IPFW.”

		The athletic accomplishment of our students in the D-1 athletic program increases the prestige o...					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	109	31	3	2	2	147
	No	383	768	416	118	84	1769
Total		492	799	419	120	86	1916

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	200.100 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	179.692	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	112.700	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1916		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.60.

Table 21D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achievement.”

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW has had a positive impact on IPFW student academic achie...					
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	90	43	12	1	1	147
	No	253	563	677	161	115	1769
Total		343	606	689	162	116	1916

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	220.395 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	187.395	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	147.567	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1916		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 8.90.

**Table 22D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic Program.”**

Count

		I feel a sense of identity as a member of the IPFW community because of its Division I Athletic...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	107	28	7	4	1	147
	No	181	369	340	542	342	1774
Total		288	397	347	546	343	1921

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	433.766 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	326.105	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	269.691	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1921		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22.04.

Table 23D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I program but of a lower less costly athletic division.”

		IPFW could achieve the same benefits of its Athletic program even if it was not Division I progr...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	6	16	22	40	62	146
	No	210	350	756	310	143	1769
Total		216	366	778	350	205	1915

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	194.239 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	145.532	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	114.115	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1915		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.63.

Table 24D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.”

		I would attend fewer IPFW athletic events if it was not a Division I program.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	63	30	25	19	10	147
	No	177	306	518	466	300	1767
Total		240	336	543	485	310	1914

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	143.067 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	107.007	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	91.733	1	.000

N of Valid Cases	1914
------------------	------

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 18.43.

Table 25D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The benefits of IPFW’s Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.”

Count

		The benefits of IPFW's Division I sports programs outweigh the costs.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	90	37	12	6	2	147
	No	221	429	768	186	169	1773
Total		311	466	780	192	171	1920

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	256.343 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	206.113	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	157.837	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1920		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 13.09.

Table 26D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.”

Count

		IPFW should continue to participate in Division I Athletics.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	125	12	6	2	2	147
	No	458	661	448	106	98	1771
Total		583	673	454	108	100	1918

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)

Pearson Chi-Square	224.746 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	207.797	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	118.531	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1918		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.66.

Table 27D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW.”

Count

		Eliminating the IPFW Division I athletic program would negatively impact IPFW.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	115	21	8	2	1	147
	No	427	626	487	132	100	1772
Total		542	647	495	134	101	1919

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	197.789 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	178.363	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	118.645	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1919		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.74.

Table 28D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “I am more likely to finish my degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.”

Count

		I am more likely to finish my degree at IPFW because it has a division I athletic program.					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	104	23	9	9	2	147
	No	126	198	307	583	557	1771
Total		230	221	316	592	559	1918

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	544.787 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	371.728	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	364.263	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1918		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 16.94.

**Table 29D: Cross-tabulation and Chi Square Test of “Are you a Division I Student Athlete and “The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additional university funds.”**

Count

		The Division I athletic program at IPFW should only exist if it can pay for itself without additi...					Total
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Don't Know	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
Are you a Division I Student Athlete?	Yes	9	13	17	49	58	146
	No	297	453	542	373	102	1767
Total		306	466	559	422	160	1913

**Chi-Square Tests**

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	237.126 <sup>a</sup>	4	.000
Likelihood Ratio	167.049	4	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	134.178	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	1913		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.21.