

Chu, Donald, Jeffrey O. Segrave, and Beverly J. Becker, eds. *Sport and Higher Education*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1985. Pp. xv, 423. Notes. \$24.95.

Have we heard this before? "Intercollegiate sport is experiencing a crisis," says the preface of *Sport and Higher Education*. "Large-scaled intercollegiate sport doesn't belong as an officially institutionally financed part of the school" (p. 38) states Donald Chu, the primary editor. The desire by Chu and presumably the other two editors is to eliminate the era of "Big-Time" athletics and usher in an era of "Little-Time" athletics. The anthology of thirty-one papers followed a March 1983 conference on Sport and Higher Education at Skidmore College, the location of the three editors. Much of the collection of papers resembles the athletic muckrakers of the first decade of the twentieth century. However, there are other contributors with a rational rather than emotional approach.

The varied readings in *Sport and Higher Education* (which unfortunately lacks an index) are divided into five parts: The history of intercollegiate sports; athletic abuses; athletic governance; the rationalization of intercollegiate athletics; and reform. Of these, the section on athletic governance is the strongest with insightful articles by Robert Stern of Cornell University, James Frey of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and Derek Bok of Harvard University. Stern, examining the social structure of the NCAA while using organizational theory and historical data, shows that NCAA member institutions have maintained their autonomy while increasing interdependence, obviously a contradiction in function. Frey gives a fair and insightful analysis of the institutional control of college athletics, predicting that future organizational changes will result from court actions, not from presidential initiatives or NCAA legislation. Bok, in a well reasoned argument, however, still believes university presidents can influence college athletic directions. A study of the past, of which there is not enough in this volume, would likely favor Frey's appraisal over that of Bok.

The lack of historical accuracy is a major flaw in a number of analyses. The following statements throughout the volume detract from its usefulness while they often are used to substantiate biases of individual authors and the theme of the book. First, to state that the American college has been "historically intellectual" (p. xv) and that early colleges concentrated "solely on academics"

(p. 6) go against most historians' views that the traditional American college has had greater interest in moral or character training than education of the intellect. What was often emphasized was compulsory chapel, moral philosophy, and student discipline through the practice of "in loco parentis." Second, the statement that athletic reform has been "long ignored" (p. 2) does not take into account such reform attempts as the creation of the Big Ten (1895); the Brown Conference of "Ivy League" institutions (1898); the origin of the NCAA (1905-06); the initiation of eligibility rules, such as the banning of freshmen and graduate students in the first three decades of the twentieth century; the "Sanity Code" (1948); the beginning of enforcement of NCAA rules (1950s); and the more recent Proposition 48. The reforms may not have been greatly successful, but reform has long been a tradition in intercollegiate athletics.

There are other questions of historical accuracy. One could challenge the statement that "there can be little doubt that if the basic question of the relationship of athletics had been addressed by the presidents and faculties years ago, we would not even have to ask questions" (p. 15). This is a curious statement when history shows that nearly every college in America formed a faculty athletic committee (beginning in 1881), that the NCAA was formed of faculty representatives and presidents, and that most conferences are faculty controlled. At another point the assertion is made that "the Olympic revival of 1896 provided the basis for one justification for sport's inclusion in American college programs" (p. 212). The statement appears to be irrelevant. By 1896, the major sports emphasized in the twentieth century colleges (football, baseball, basketball, track and field, crew, and others) were already played intercollegiately, and most were well established, commercialized, and professionalized. The statement that "once the entertainment and public relations functions of sports become dominant, the need for experienced coaches arose" (p. 280) should also be questioned. The first college coaches, beginning in 1864, began before entertainment and public relations were considered. The coaches were hired by students to turn out winners-entertainment was an irrelevant variable.

Historical statements about women and blacks should have been examined more closely. The claim that "student involvement in the establishment of policies and guidelines which would determine the path of women's athletics [was] a concept unique to women's athletics" (p. 315) simply is not true. Men's intercollegiate athletics began with 100 percent student policies and control in nineteenth century and continued for a generation. Evidence in one article that disparities in black "leadership opportunities are most evident at the 'big-time' sport level" (p. 351) is disproven by the data in the same article. Statistics given show that NCAA Division III basketball teams have fewer black coaches and assistant coaches than both Division I and Division II institutions (pp. 354-355). Could one conclude that the least commercialized and professionalized of the college athletic programs are the most racist in their hiring practices?

Though one might wish for a more balanced and historically accurate view of

the place of athletics in higher education, certain entries are worthy because they cause one to consider the problems that do exist. William Beezley's piece on the 1961 Dixie Classic scandal and Tates Locke's revealing slush fund and recruiting sham at Clemson in the early 1970s show that 1980s problems are no greater than those that went before. Alan Sack and Charles Watkins researched the question of alumni gifts to colleges and their relationship to winning in football. Their evidence shows that yearly fluctuations in winning have little impact on overall alumni contributions. Nevertheless they conclude that "an attempt to eliminate college sport at a school with a strong athletic tradition might well lead to financial disaster" (p. 304). Financial survival of an institution is often on the minds of college officials and boards of trustees.

Boards of trustees are too little discussed in the articles, while college presidents' role in reform is often noted. College presidents are singled out as being the individuals who can best reform the system. Yet, historically, they generally have been ineffective in this endeavor for well over a century. Presidents do not set university policy, boards of trustees do. Athletics, and specific to this volume, "big-time" athletics, exist because board of trustees sanction them. Presidents, who enjoy the prestige and salary of their positions, do not want to jeopardize their jobs by taking positions opposed by their trustees. Ernest L. Boyer, President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, may know more about reforming college athletics than most. While his paper does not discount the role that college presidents may have, he realizes that presidents are hired (and fired) by boards of trustees. He suggests correctly, I believe, that "governing boards have an absolutely critical role to play in stopping the corruption of big-time sports." Yet he sees the problem of athletic reform when "some trustees would rather see a Heisman Trophy than a Nobel Prize on campus" (p. 409).

One of the ironies of intercollegiate athletics, not pointed out by the volume, is that nearly every outstanding American university at one time or another has had a "big-time" athletic program. Yale, for the half century beginning in the 1870s was the "jock school" of America. Harvard and Princeton were not too far behind. But other worthy academically oriented institutions of today have emphasized athletics by producing outstanding teams, building large stadiums, or paying high priced coaches. One might note California, Chicago, Columbia, Cornell, Duke, Michigan, Northwestern, Stanford, and Wisconsin. Not one of the 31 authors attempted to explain this American phenomenon. Do universities which ultimately gain recognition as outstanding institutions among the 3,000 institutions of higher education in America eventually no longer feel that need to use "big-time" athletics for survival and self-promotion? If Donald Chu, et al., have started more thinking regarding the solution to some of the problems of intercollegiate athletics, "big-time" and "small-time," the volume will have served a useful purpose.

Penn State University

Ronald A. Smith