

University of Windsor

## Scholarship at UWindor

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, and Major Papers

---

1-1-2008

### From opposition to acceptance: The evolution of athletic scholarships within the OUA, 1970–2006.

Caitlin B. Orth  
*University of Windsor*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd>

---

#### Recommended Citation

Orth, Caitlin B., "From opposition to acceptance: The evolution of athletic scholarships within the OUA, 1970–2006." (2008). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 7154.  
<https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/7154>

This online database contains the full-text of PhD dissertations and Masters' theses of University of Windsor students from 1954 forward. These documents are made available for personal study and research purposes only, in accordance with the Canadian Copyright Act and the Creative Commons license—CC BY-NC-ND (Attribution, Non-Commercial, No Derivative Works). Under this license, works must always be attributed to the copyright holder (original author), cannot be used for any commercial purposes, and may not be altered. Any other use would require the permission of the copyright holder. Students may inquire about withdrawing their dissertation and/or thesis from this database. For additional inquiries, please contact the repository administrator via email ([scholarship@uwindsor.ca](mailto:scholarship@uwindsor.ca)) or by telephone at 519-253-3000ext. 3208.

From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the  
OUA, 1970-2006

by

Caitlin B. Orth

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
through the Department of Kinesiology  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree of Master of Human Kinetics at the  
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada  
2008

© 2008 Caitlin B. Orth



Library and  
Archives Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

*Your file    Votre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-47034-3*  
*Our file    Notre référence*  
*ISBN: 978-0-494-47034-3*

**NOTICE:**

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

**AVIS:**

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

  
**Canada**

## **Author's Declaration of Originality**

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

## **Abstract**

Athletic scholarships have been a source of considerable debate within Canadian intercollegiate athletics since the inception of intercollegiate sport. With this in mind, the purpose of this research initiative is to build on previous research, analyze the historical evolution of the debate and the compromises that have been struck, while providing insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities. Conclusions were reached through the analysis of interviews with key stakeholders along with information discovered in primary and secondary sources. Results revealed that the evolution of scholarships within the OUA has been a gradual one. The acceptance of athletic scholarships is a reflection of the institutions' desire to compete with the rest of the CIS and also to provide financial support to their student athletes. Implications are that we may see the OUA evolve to become yet another conforming regional association within the CIS.

## **Dedication**

This research study is dedicated to all of the intercollegiate athletes who are trying to maintain the athletic ideal while balancing their athletic and academic pursuits!

## **Acknowledgements**

I want to extend my thanks to everyone who has aided me in this process. I would first like to thank my advisor, Dr. Scott G. Martyn, for all of his support and guidance along the way. I would have been lost if not for the expertise and knowledge which he provided. Thank you Dr. Martyn for being patient, for encouraging me and most importantly for believing in my ability. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Glassford and Dr. Moriarty for all of the time and effort they put into my thesis. Their questions and reflections challenged me and in doing so contributed greatly to the success of my study. I would also like to thank all those who participated in my study as their insight was invaluable. Specifically, I would like to thank Mr. Ward Dilse of the Ontario University Athletics (OUA) who provided me with access to the OUA archives and an opportunity to work within the OUA organization. Moreover, many thanks must be given to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for their generous support throughout my graduate experience. To my family and friends I wish to extend my gratitude for all of your support. Dad, Mom and Cub you have always been there for me and this experience was no exception. Finally, I would like to thank the Faculty of Human Kinetics, particularly Ms. Diane Dupuis for everything she does for the graduate students within the Faculty.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

AUTHOR’S DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY .....	iii
ABSTRACT .....	iv
DEDICATION .....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	vi
LIST OF APPENDICES .....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	x
CHAPTER	
I. OVERVIEW AND BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of the Study .....	2
Significance of the Study .....	4
Assumptions.....	5
Delimitations and Limitations.....	6
Organization of the Thesis Document .....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
Literature Review Approach.....	8
Intercollegiate Athletic Scholarships Within the United States of America.....	8
Policy Development in Intercollegiate Athletics .....	12
Recruitment.....	15
Internal and External Influences in Interuniversity Athletics .....	16
The Evolution of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU).....	20
The History of Canadian Intercollegiate Athletics .....	21
The History of the Scholarship Debate .....	24
Amateurism versus Professionalism .....	26
The Scholarship Debate .....	30
Feasibility of Athletic Scholarships in Canada .....	34
Study of Athletic Scholarship Practices in Canada.....	39
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY .....	49
Research Design and Methodology .....	49
Ethical Considerations .....	52



IV. RESULTS .....	54
The Influence of NCAA Athletic Scholarship Policy.....	54
Feasibility of Athletic Scholarships at Ontario Universities.....	58
Policy Development in Intercollegiate Athletics .....	61
Athletic Scholarship Policy in Ontario .....	65
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	70
Conclusion .....	81
Recommendations.....	83
APPENDICES .....	88
Appendix A.....	88
Appendix B .....	97
Appendix C .....	99
Appendix D.....	101
Appendix E .....	105
Appendix F.....	108
Appendix G.....	110
Appendix H.....	114
REFERENCES.....	116
VITA AUCTORIS .....	119

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A .....	Interview Schedule
Appendix B .....	Recruitment Letter
Appendix C .....	Consent for Audio Taping
Appendix D .....	Consent Form
Appendix E .....	Letter of Information
Appendix F .....	List of Interviewees
Appendix G .....	Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Institutions
Appendix H .....	Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Mission

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAUC	Amateur Athletic Union of Canada
CAC	Collegiate Athletes Coalition
CAUAD	Canadian Association of University Athletic Directors
CIAU	Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union
CIAUC	Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union Central
CIS	Canadian Interuniversity Sport
COU	Council of Ontario University Presidents
NCAA	National Collegiate Athletic Association
NCAS	National Consortium for Academics and Sport
NCCU	National Conference of Canadian Universities
OQUAA	Ontario-Quebec University Athletic Association
O-QWICA	Ontario-Quebec Women's Intercollegiate Athletics
OSLAA	Ottawa-St. Lawrence Athletic Association
OUA	Ontario University Athletics
OCAA	Ontario University Athletic Association
OWIAA	Ontario Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Association
SAAC	Student Athlete Advisory Committee
UCLA	University of California, Los Angeles
WIAU	Women's Athletic Union

## CHAPTER I

### Overview and Background to the Study

#### Introduction

Intercollegiate athletics have been, and continue to be, a fundamental part of the university environment. Despite not being formally identified within an institution's academic mission, athletic programs at universities have always been an integral part of university culture in Canada. Given the importance of athletics at the university level it is not surprising that universities have begun to focus on their respective programs by ensuring that they have the best coaches, athletes and facilities available. Although each university aspires to have their athletic program identified among the best available, perhaps nothing is considered more vital to success than being able to recruit the top athletes in each sport. However, this is a difficult task for any university as recruitment of athletes entails enticing students to select and be accepted at your university over all other opportunities that exist for them. Therefore, university athletic programs have seen their focus shift to how they can possibly compete with other universities to acquire the most talented athletes available. It is at this point that the issue of money begins to creep into the mix as universities attempt to offer financial incentives for student athletes to select their particular institution over another. These financial incentives usually manifest themselves in the form of athletic scholarships, which are offered to student athletes. And so begins the debate which has existed for years in intercollegiate athletics; should athletic scholarships be awarded at universities (Harrigan, 2001)?

As mentioned, athletic scholarships have been a focus of debate since the origin of intercollegiate athletics. In particular, Canadian universities have seen this debate

polarize the regions, as historically the East and West have found themselves pitted against Ontario, which until recently had adamantly opposed athletic scholarships (Harrigan, 2001). Recently policies have changed, allowing Ontario University Athletics (OUA) institutions to provide financial assistance in the form of athletic scholarships to entering, and returning student athletes (Dalla Costa, 2006). However, “despite massive changes in universities over the last several decades there remains a conservative reticence about too much change” (Atkinson, 2006, p. 4).

### **Purpose of the Study**

When investigating recruiting, it is necessary to also explore the issue of athletic scholarships as arguably one would not exist if not for the other. However, despite the importance of student athlete recruiting for universities, “the recruiting process has received only a limited amount of empirical investigation in the research literature” (Klenosky, Templin and Troutman, 2001). This study looks closely at athletic scholarships and in doing so simultaneously investigates one of the most important components of recruiting at the university level. In fact, as Harrigan (2001) notes, athletic scholarships have been a source of debate since the inception of intercollegiate sport and as such are a significant issue for all university athletic departments to consider. The purpose of this research project is to build on previous research, analyze the evolution of the debate and the compromises that have been struck, and provide insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities.

This study addresses both the historical underpinnings of the scholarship debate at Canadian universities and the concessions that have been made over time. Furthermore, there is an examination of the current state of affairs through an extensive analysis of

interview transcripts and newspaper articles which outline the numerous debates that have further polarized each side (Hums and MacLean, 2004). Although Harrigan (2001) noted that Canadians have long restricted the giving of athletic scholarships, the past thirty years have seen an erosion of this hard stance and the acceptance of third party scholarships (government) for continuing students. Even more recently, policies have changed to allow institutions within the OUA to award scholarships to athletes who are entering or are currently studying at their institution (Dalla Costa, 2006).

Although the formation of university athletic programs, the evolution in sport governing bodies, the increase in popularity, and the controversies surrounding athletic scholarships within Canada have all been discussed to an extent, there is an identifiable need for greater exploration of this area of study. By delving deeper into the ongoing scholarship debate it is hoped that further development of research regarding the past and current state of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities will result, while providing a more complete foundation for future studies. Specifically, this enquiry is intended to bridge the gap in research that exists concerning the athletic scholarship debate at Canadian universities.

This study will conclude with an answer to the central research question by first determining the response to several sub-questions. The central question to the study being asked by the researcher is: What were the impetuses/catalysts for change in attitudes within the OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006? The research is further guided by a series of sub-questions:

- 1) What are the historical underpinnings of the athletic scholarship debate at Ontario Universities?

- 2) To what extent have academic performance factored into the awarding of athletic scholarships at OUA institutions?
- 3) What has been the protocol followed within the OUA to make athletic scholarship policy changes and who are the major decision makers in this process?
- 4) What has been the influence of internal and external factors in the awarding of athletic scholarships at Ontario Universities?
- 5) How have the policy changes in the OUA regarding athletic scholarships reflected the mission statements of both the OUA and member institution's athletic departments?

### **Significance of the Study**

This study hopes to engender an understanding of how each OUA member institution views athletic scholarships. OUA member institutions will also benefit by potentially gaining insight into the direction that the OUA is likely to take on athletic scholarships in the future.

Furthermore, by involving key stakeholders in the study the researcher is able to develop an understanding of the views and opinions of those individuals who are directly involved in the athletic scholarship debate. In addition, by employing the use of interviews with subjects, the researcher is able to gather important qualitative information that has not been examined in the research to date.

In fact, review of the literature suggests that there is an identifiable lack of information on athletic scholarships from 2000 to present day. As for the literature that does exist, it was primarily published in the 1970's and earlier. Given the limited

contemporary research, this study has focused its' attention on the time period from 2000 to present day while reviewing the years leading up to this period in university athletics. In essence, this initiative aims to fill an arguably gaping hole in the research that exists about athletic scholarships at Ontario universities, while furthering our understanding of the role of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities in the past and present.

### **Assumptions**

- 1) That the historical narrative of the athletic scholarship debate as obtained from books, articles and meeting minutes will provide a useful starting point to understanding the role of athletic scholarships from 1970-2006;
- 2) that the athletic directors that are interviewed will provide useful insight and candid responses which will shed light on the role of athletic scholarships in the past and present with intercollegiate athletics in Ontario; and
- 3) that the study, although limited to the interview sample, will provide readers with valuable information to help guide future policy and direction related to athletic scholarships at OUA member institutions.



### **Delimitations and Limitations**

The results of this study are a direct reflection of those individuals who were interviewed. Therefore, the results of this study relates to the population of Athletic Directors from each of the nineteen Ontario universities that make up the OUA in 2007. These Directors of Athletics represented the most suitable sample to interview as they are deemed to be a knowledgeable source that are able to accurately describe the current practices in the OUA. They are well equipped with the training, experience and knowledge necessary to comment accurately and passionately about the present state of intercollegiate athletics as it relates to athletic scholarship policy and procedure in Ontario. However, given that the researcher has limited the interviews to their perspective, it is acknowledged that they may not provide a complete understanding of the issue from all stakeholders involved.

The limitations of this study lies in the use of only the athletic directors as they are only a part of the whole athletic department and are therefore only able to provide their individual insight into the issue of athletic scholarships. Furthermore, given the qualitative nature of the investigation the researcher has relied on the candid responses of the interviewees to add validity and authority to this study.

## **Organization of the Thesis Document**

This preceding chapter has provided an introduction and background to the study. It has also provided a brief overview of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities. Furthermore, this chapter outlined the purpose and significance of the study while identifying the limitations, delimitations and assumptions of the investigation.

Chapter 2 contains a review of the relevant literature on the history of intercollegiate athletics, the history of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities, and the role of policy creation in intercollegiate athletics. It provides an examination of the relevant studies that exist regarding athletic scholarships at Canadian universities.

Chapter 3 presents the research strategy, design, and methods that will be used in the collection and analysis of data in the study. This chapter concludes with a discussion regarding the ethical considerations of the investigation.

Chapter 4 describes the results of the study. By providing an examination of the areas of interest as discussed earlier through the extensive review of the literature, this chapter describes the past and present climate of athletic scholarships within the OUA.

Chapter 5 provides the discussion and conclusion regarding the issue of athletic scholarships within the OUA. This chapter builds on that information by answering the central question posed in the study: What were the impetuses/catalysts for change in attitudes within the OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006?

## **CHAPTER II**

### **Review of Literature**

#### **Literature Review Approach**

The literature review contains information pertaining to the history of intercollegiate athletics, the history of the scholarship debate at Canadian universities, the importance of policy making in intercollegiate athletics and the evaluation of two pertinent studies regarding athletic scholarships at Canadian universities. To understand how Canada, and more specifically Ontario, compares to the rest of North America this section also includes a review of the literature from the seminal works written regarding intercollegiate athletic scholarships within the United States. This second chapter is divided into subsections related to the various themes that have come to the forefront through the review of the literature. The relevant literature for each theme is then discussed in the appropriate subsection.

#### **Intercollegiate Athletic Scholarships Within the United States of America**

In the United States (U.S.) the prominence of athletic scholarships is undeniable and, unlike their Canadian counterparts, in many respects, American universities have accepted this practice as both customary and unavoidable. Despite being widely accepted and awarded, athletic scholarships still find themselves at the forefront of much debate. As Bennett (1986) suggests, in order to make “an intelligent and rational judgment on the merit of granting such scholarships to athletes” (p.167) there must be a careful examination of the sordid side of intercollegiate athletics. Bennett (1986) goes on to

explain that in the U.S. the basic reason for a number of problems within intercollegiate athletics can be linked to the granting of athletic scholarships. Unfortunately, the term student athlete is quite a misnomer in U.S. colleges and universities, as athletes on scholarship are treated more like slaves than students, and as such only the exceptional individuals become scholars (Bennett, 1986).

In the U.S., scholarships, and their effects, primarily involve three different groups. The first of these groups is the coaches who are in charge of enticing athletes with promises of money and success (Bennett, 1986). Similarly, the second group (the institutions) offers the athlete promises of academic and athletic success and often bends the rules in regards to academics to do so. For example, academic integrity is often jeopardized by ensuring athletes' acceptance into their program and the continued success of the athlete, whether deserving or not (Bennett, 1986). The final role is played by the group of athletes, who, although being the integral part of the equation often end up being in the most difficult position because they are now almost like a servant to the university. Although the whole process is seemingly there to reward the athlete for his/her performance, it ends up being much more about the institution and their ability to use the athletes' talent to further their agenda (Bennett, 1986).

Unfortunately "while administrative wheels spin, the exploitation of athletes continues unabated and the recruitment of blue-chip athletes by the athletic powers becomes more intense" (Bennett, 1986, p. 176). It is for this reason, notes Bennett (1986), that proposals are made from time to time to remedy some of the problems in intercollegiate athletics, such as minimum academic entrance standards (which came into effect in 1986) or any other issues pertaining to the awarding of athletic scholarships.

However, Bennett (1986) argues that people may find solace in the knowledge that there are still institutions that do not grant athletic scholarships in any form and yet still remain competitive. Even at the more prestigious schools where certain sports award athletic scholarships, other sports recruit without the use of athletic scholarships whatsoever (Bennett, 1986). Yet, as Bennett (1986) explains for all the students who do not receive scholarships and are merely playing a sport for fun; there are those students who are scholarship athletes giving up their “freedom and sacrifices [their] education for the slave relationship with [their] coach and [their] institution of higher learning” (p. 177).

In 1997 the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) took a step towards allowing additional monies for student athletes when they approved legislation allowing student athletes on scholarship work to earn enough money to cover the cost of attending the institution (Masteralexis, Barr and Hums, 2005). The result saw student athletes now able to receive money in addition to their scholarships, thus easing some of the burden inflicted over costs that are not covered under scholarships such as: room and board, books, and tuition (Masteralexis, et al., 2005). Beyond this legislation in 1997 there has been more change on the pay for play front as athletes have increased pressure on the NCAA to allow them to receive more money at the university. As mentioned in Materalexis et al. (2005), some athletes have even attempted to receive endorsement money from sponsors when they play professional sports that are different from the sport they take part in at the university. Although some athletes have even tried to go as far as filing lawsuits challenging the NCAA, the courts have traditionally sided with the NCAA stating that athletes may be professionals in another sport however as long as they are also amateur athletes in collegiate sports they may not receive any form of endorsements

(Masteralexis et al., 2005). Despite being denied in regard to endorsements, student athletes continue to fight for their right to receive more financial support. In fact, as Masteralexis et al. (2005) point out, in January 2001 Ramogi Huma, a former football player at The University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), founded the Collegiate Athletes Coalition (CAC). Huma did so in an attempt to give student athletes more rights and a stronger voice at their respective institutions. Masteralexis et al. (2005) argues that an even stronger statement was then made in California when senate-approved Bill 193, nicknamed the student athlete's Bill of Rights, was passed prohibiting state colleges and universities from being members in any organization whose rules restrict student athlete grants in aid. This initial Bill began a trend for similar legislation in other states such as Nebraska, Iowa and Texas (Masteralexis, et al., 2005). These Bills beyond just addressing 'pay for play' issues, also address health insurance coverage, agent relationships, and issues with transferring to another institution without penalty for student athletes (Rosenberg, 2004). With the changes in legislation along with the increased power wielded by the student athlete voice (CAC, etc.), the NCAA Student Athlete Advisory Committee (S.A.A.C.) is now suggesting that athletic scholarships should increase to include incidental costs such as: telephone bills, personal travel and other items (Rosenberg, 2004). Rosenberg argues that significant financial and administrative implications will result for universities and colleges by increasing athletic scholarships by 2,000 to 3,000 dollars and enacted more Bills similar to Bill 193. In essence, Rosenberg (2004) and Masteralexis (2006) note that athletic scholarships have been and continue to be a bone of contention for both student athletes and athletic departments at the university and college level.

### **Policy Development in Intercollegiate Athletics**

As previously mentioned, athletic scholarships have been a significant source of debate in intercollegiate athletics for many years. As such, athletic scholarships can be identified as an issue given that an issue is broadly defined as “an idea or activity about which there is debate” (VanderZwaag, 1998, p. 14). VanderZwaag (1998) describes an issue as being a result of people having opposing viewpoints on the manner in which an activity is carried out or the understanding of an idea. It is important to note that both parties have legitimate grounds for their position, and as such, there becomes a need to develop policy to decide the approach that will be taken on the issue (VanderZwaag, 1998). Therefore policy implementation requires an organization to come to a consensus or compromise over an issue, before proceeding to take action.

Policies are related to the total system or organization, and as such, do not just guide the work of only an individual or part of a group (VanderZwaag, 1998). Policies also tend to have internal and external ramifications because although they are “developed to guide activities within an organization, they are often directed at affairs with external import” (VanderZwaag, 1998). Policies are also developed to make standing decisions on important and recurring matters (VanderZwaag, 1998). In essence, when a policy is made, it has both internal and external implications over an extended period of time. “A final characteristic of policy development is that it is directed toward a dynamic social process in a changing environment” (VanderZwaag, 1998, p. 10).

Beyond having an appropriate environment and a need for policy, there are also other characteristics that need to be considered when approaching policy development.

First, the organization must consider the basic mission of the policy and ensure that the purpose is clearly stated (VanderZwaag, 1998). The next important characteristics to note are the objectives or the goals that the organization hopes the policy will achieve as they will help to refine the mission (VanderZwaag, 1998). How the policy fits with the total scheme of things and whether or not it fills a gap where an organization lacks a sound policy must also be considered (VanderZwaag, 1998). Finally, the organization must consider the strategies for implementation of this policy and the roles that individuals will play when the policy is brought into fruition (VanderZwaag, 1998).

The OUA follows the aforementioned reasoning for policy formation suggested by VanderZwaag when tackling issues and problems that arise within the league. In fact, it is part of their mandate to provide “policy direction for university sport and govern[ing] sanctioned interuniversity sport competition in Ontario on behalf of its member institutions” (OUA, About Us, 2005). Given that their mandate focuses directly on policy formation, the OUA must be dynamic while staying current to ensure that they are able to compete and contribute to the Canadian Sport System. Their policies are intended to be a reflection of their vision, mission and mandate and, as such, the OUA must ensure that they keep these characteristics in mind when developing policy.

For example, the concept of the student athlete is central to the OUA’s vision. Therefore it is necessary for their policies to reflect that notion. Acknowledging the concept of student athlete as central to the OUA’s vision is therefore necessary when the contentious issue of athletic scholarships is discussed. In fact, as the issue of athletic scholarships comes to the forefront time and time again it has been, and continues to be,



an ongoing policy concern. The challenge for the OUA is primarily due to its vision of an athlete being a student first and athlete second.

Historically, the ideal of the student athlete has been the reason for which the OUA has tried to steer clear of athletic scholarships and policies which involved the paying of athletes. OUA member institutions have seen athletic scholarships as a dangerous foray which could spell the end of the academics, since the focus would then be, in their opinion, solely on athletics. The second concern of the OUA has been the sentiment that by providing athletic scholarships the OUA would in fact be making intercollegiate athletes into professionals rather than amateurs.

However, these traditionally negative views of athletic scholarships have seen opposition in the last ten years. Accordingly, the OUA has responded with a careful evaluation of the policy currently in place. As suggested by Vanderzwaag (1998), when there are opposing viewpoints on a recurring matter within a changing environment, it becomes necessary to develop new policy, or adapt existing policy within the organization. The OUA is no exception to this rule, responding with the creation of a new policy regarding athletic scholarships. This new policy reflects the shift which the OUA member institutions have had over the last ten years and attempts to foster the consensus reached over the recurring issue.

Despite the good intentions of the OUA in the creation of new policy regarding athletic scholarships, its members must consider the problems which may be born out of its' creation. First, as VanderZwaag (1998) advises policy must reflect your organizational goals and must be carefully thought out to ensure that there are strategies for implementation, and that the individual roles of all those involved are clearly laid out.

This is perhaps an area which the OUA will need to pay particular attention to in the near future. Furthermore, the OUA must also consider the internal and external ramifications of the policy as mentioned earlier. Although it may be argued that the issue of athletic scholarships had become one which necessitated the creation of new policy, it must also be acknowledged that perhaps this policy was not ready to be fully implemented.

### **Recruitment**

One concern which the OUA may face as they enter the world of athletic scholarships is that of recruiting. Given that as the “competition to recruit talented student athletes is often as fierce as the actual contests between the schools’ athletic teams” (Klenosky, Templin and Troutman, 2001, p. 95), it is necessary to consider the ramifications of introducing athletic scholarships to this environment. With scholarships becoming more and more of a recruitment tool across the country, it is difficult to address one without considering the other. However, as Klenosky et al. (2001) argues “while the recruitment of student-athletes is a serious and important consideration for universities, the recruiting process has received only a limited amount of empirical investigation in the research literature” (p. 95). Furthermore, the receipt of a scholarship, and its amount, are key factors influencing student athletes when coming to decisions about what university to attend (Klenosky et al., 2001). Although athletic scholarships are identified as being important to student athletes when selecting a university, the reason for which certain factors are important, and even integral within recruitment have yet to be investigated (Klenosky, et al., 2001). Although Klenosky, et al. attempt to delve into the subject of recruiting in their 2001 study, their research is limited to intercollegiate athletics at

American universities and as such does not broach the issue at Canadian universities. Consequently, although Klenosky et al. (2001) have added to “the limited body of research in the athletic recruiting literature” (p. 104) their work does not fill the gap in the literature which exists in recruitment regarding Canadian intercollegiate athletics. As Klenosky et al. (2001) suggest, by delving into research regarding recruitment, a systematic study would aid institutions in “helping shape the messages used in a school’s recruiting efforts” (p.104). Furthermore it would fill a gap found in the current literature regarding recruitment, specifically the use of athletic scholarships at Canadian academic institutions.

### **Internal and External Influences in Interuniversity Athletics**

As noted by Inglis (1991) there are both internal and external influences which affect decision making practices among athletic administrators. Given the internal and external interest in issues pertaining to intercollegiate athletics, it is not a surprise that athletic administrators often find themselves having to make difficult decisions on behalf of their institutions. In essence, as Lucas and Smith (1978) in Inglis (1991) point out, “interuniversity athletic programs have been and continue to be a subject of interest, study and debate” (p. 18). Lucas and Smith go further to identify the key areas of interest within intercollegiate athletics as including, but not being limited to, the recruitment and payment of athletes, as well as the emphasis of athletics over academics (Inglis, 1991).

Given the interest and debate which exists surrounding athletic programs, it is not surprising that many people want to weigh in on the issues and decisions being made in athletic departments. As Inglis (1991) explains, athletic programs in Canada and the

United States have varying degrees of internal and external involvement by various constituent groups (Inglis, 1991). Governance over athletic programs at Canadian universities at the internal level includes: the athletic department, the President, and the university Board of Directors. Externally, the programs are governed by such entities as “sponsors, media, and informal alumni groups that have the ability to influence athletic programs” (Inglis, 1991, p. 19). Therefore, Inglis in her 1991 study was able to ascertain the effect of both internal and external factors on decision making within university athletic programs. This research sheds light into the complexity of intercollegiate athletics and the various pressures which are exerted on athletic departments when they face challenges or issues of debate.

Although Inglis (1991) found that athletic directors were key actors along with other athletic administrators, the reality saw university Presidents playing a very integral role as well. Until Inglis’ foray into this subject area there was little research done on the issue of perceived pressure exerted on athletic directors when making serious decisions. This study assessed the perceived influence that was exerted by outside groups while examining whether the university presidents and athletic directors perceptions of influence corresponded (Inglis, 1991). While the university Presidents are not involved in day to day management of the programs, Inglis (1991) noted that they nevertheless were important when speaking of governing bodies, reporting structures and policy making. In essence, and despite the fact that Presidents are situated outside the athletic department, Inglis (1991) argued that they still play a crucial role in the governance of the athletic programs. In contrast, Atkinson (2006) argues that senior executive and the Council of Ontario University (COU) members (council made up of university

Presidents) show little if any interest in university sport unless it is a specific issue of great importance, and even then it will only be tacked on to the end of the agenda.

Atkinson goes on to further state that although the mandate of the Ontario Commission on Interuniversity Athletics, which he currently chairs, is to oversee the OUA sport in a broad sense, in actuality it only deals with potential infractions of the rules. In essence, unlike Inglis' conclusions, Atkinson (2006) argues that those individuals in management or positions of influence are in fact not using their influence within the university sport setting when it comes to issues of importance such as athletic scholarships.

Inglis (1991) comments that high degree of influence by external factors may be of concern for university personnel as a link can be made to problems and criticisms related to athletics and external groups. Given this fact it is a definite issue of concern as "recently it appears that Canadian athletic programs have experienced greater influence from external sources" (Inglis, 1991, p. 20). In particular growth in commercialization, recruitment, funding and promotion have brought about the need for increased interaction between the athletic departments and external groups (Inglis, 1991). Albeit a necessary relationship to ensure intercollegiate athletic department success, the dependency created allows constituent groups much more influence and power over the decision making process than what the athletic administrators would like (Inglis, 1991). In Inglis' (1991) study she identified several groups as having the potential to exert influence including the COU, the Ontario University Athletic Association (OUAA), the Ontario Women's Interuniversity Athletic Association (OWIAA), the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU), alumni and corporate sponsors. Given that the study was conducted in 1991, it is important to recognize that these external groups have changed. The OWIAA

no longer exists as it was amalgamated with the OUAA to form what is now the OUA and the CIAU is now termed Canadian Interuniversity Sport (CIS). Despite these aforementioned changes the newly formed organizations along with the COU, alumni and sponsors are just as influential, if not arguably more influential in the decision making process in the realm of intercollegiate athletics (Inglis, 1991).

While Atkinson (2006) concludes that Presidents and university administration have little to do with the issues in athletics, Inglis, on the other hand, provided data in her 1991 study that in fact Athletic Directors and university Presidents perceive many of the same influences in regards to external pressure. In fact, Inglis (1991) suggested that the OUAA, OWIAA, CIAU and COU all exert pressure on the athletic department. Specifically, it was the OUAA (now the OUA) which was perceived to be the most influential, largely due to the large amount of contact occurring between athletic departments and their respective governing body (Inglis, 1991). In contrast, both alumni and corporate influence were rated low, suggesting little control by these two groups (Inglis, 1991). However, Inglis argued that as athletic programs continue to grow so to will the influence from outside agencies. Therefore, it is not surprising that Atkinson (2006), whose comments are more recent, discusses the important and prominent role of the media within intercollegiate athletics. In essence, the influence in and around athletic programs is important to understand and acknowledge when considering the future direction and policy making of Ontario university athletics (Inglis, 1991).

## **The Evolution of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union (CIAU)**

Although a Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union Central (CIAUC) existed as far back as 1906 it was not until 1961 that a “truly national intercollegiate association was born with the amalgamation of the CIAUC, The Western, Atlantic and Ontario-Quebec Associations” (Harrigan, 2001, p. 143). From 1906-1955 the CIAUC was comprised of universities only from Ontario and Quebec and governed the rules and regulations of campuses across central Canada (Reed, T.A., 1945). The CIAUC oversaw the growth of university sport in the early years and enjoyed relative stability between the two World Wars. However, the CIAUC faced tumultuous times following 1944 as it marked a point when growth in the organization to nineteen members resulted in a large group with diverse philosophical, academic, and athletic values trying to come together to create policy (CIS, History, 2002). Given the large number of institutions and the varied wants and needs of these institutions ultimately the CIAUC was forced to collapse and divide into two smaller organizations, the Ontario-Quebec University Athletic Association (O-QUAA) with twelve members and the Ottawa-St. Lawrence Athletic Association (OSLAA) with eight members (CIS, History, 2002).

At the same time that the CIAUC was dividing there was a growth of women competing in sport resulting in an identifiable need for an organization in women’s intercollegiate athletics. Formed in 1923, the Women’s Athletic Union (WIAU) existed to provide athletic competition for females in Ontario, while the Ontario-Quebec Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics (O-QWICA) organized programs for females in Ontario and Quebec (CIS, History, 2002). By 1971 these two organizations combined to form the OWIAA which was the only organization in existence for women in

intercollegiate athletics until it joined forces with its male counterpart the OUAA in 1998 (CIS, History, 2002).

As mentioned earlier, the CIAU was not formed until there was a need for a national intercollegiate association to govern all university sport within Canada. It was at this point that there was dissolution of various smaller organizations and the formation of a national governing body to allow for the implementation of national championships. The establishment of the CIAU was a huge step in the right direction for university athletics. Previously there had been many different associations attempting share in competition, despite not sharing similar values or policies concerning intercollegiate athletics. In 1978, the CIAU developed an even larger membership base when the Canadian Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Union joined the CIAU, bringing with them much needed funding from the federal government (Sport Canada formerly Fitness and Amateur Sport) (CIS, History, 2002). The final, amalgamation occurred in 1997 when the OUAA and the Ontario Women's Intercollegiate Athletic Association (OWIAA) formed the newly titled OUA (OUA, About Us, 2005). This amalgamation brought a close to the evolution of the CIAU, and by June 2001 the CIAU, in its previous form, morphed into what it is now known today as the CIS (CIS, History, 2002).

### **The History of Canadian Intercollegiate Athletics**

“The first formal organization of university athletics took place in 1906 with the formation of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union...” (OUA, About Us, 2005, para. 4). Although it was termed the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union it in fact



only had three active members; Queen's University, McGill University and University of Toronto, all of which were institutions in Ontario (VanVilet, 1965).

During its initial years the organization was fraught with internal inconsistencies as there were different standards and philosophies from one member institution to another. These differing views coupled with the appearance of numerous other athletic associations across the country resulted in a review of the organization's name. The result saw the Central Intercollegiate Athletic Union disbanded in 1955 making way for two separate; but appropriately named, organizations: the Ontario-Quebec Athletic Association and the Ottawa St. Lawrence Intercollegiate Athletic Association that had nine and ten members respectively (OUA, About Us, 2005).

By 1961 University of Waterloo had joined the formerly nine member O-QUAA along with Assumption College (Windsor), who joined in 1952, bringing the organization membership to eleven (VanVilet, 1965). It was then expanded to thirteen in 1968 with the addition of Carleton University and the University of Ottawa. Following the expansion, in 1968 it was again deemed necessary, as in the past, to separate this organization into two divisions (East and West) to facilitate scheduling (OUA, About Us, 2005). Despite the separation its effectiveness only worked until in 1971 when the O-QAA again found itself reduced from thirteen members to ten with the departure of all Quebec based universities (Laval, McGill, Montreal) to the newly formed Quebec University Athletic Association (OUA, About Us, 2005). Following the departure of these out of province universities, reorganization meetings led to the renaming of the organization from the O-QAA to the OUAA. However, despite the reorganization it was

decided that all trophies and records from the O-QUAA would be recognized by the newly formed OUAA (OUA, About Us, 2005).

By 1972 the OUAA membership included Carleton University, University of Guelph, McMaster University, University of Ottawa, Queen's University, University of Toronto, University of Waterloo, University of Western Ontario, University of Windsor Brock University, Laurentian University, Ryerson Polytechnical University, Trent University, Waterloo Lutheran University and York University (OUA, About Us, 2005). In 1973 Waterloo Lutheran University changed its name to become Wilfrid Laurier University and The Royal Military College in Kingston was also added to the OUAA. The next couple years saw Loyola (now Concordia), Bishops and McGill receive playing privileges in the OUAA for football, and by 1980 these schools along with Carleton, Queen's and Ottawa made up the Ontario-Quebec Intercollegiate Football Conference (OQIFC) (OUA, About Us, 2005). The acceptance in 1987 of Trois Rivieres, Concordia and McGill into the OUAA hockey league along with a similar move in 1988 with the acceptance of Concordia, McGill and Bishops into OUAA basketball marked yet another period of growth in the OUAA (OUA, About Us, 2005). Also in 1988 full membership was granted to Lakehead, followed five years later by the granting of full membership to Nipissing University.

Recently, in 1997 the beginning of a new era was marked for Ontario University Athletics when the OUAA and the OWIAA amalgamated to form one organization known today as the OUA . The newly formed OUA opened its office in Hamilton, Ontario in 1998 shortly after appointing its first executive director (OUA, About Us, 2005). By 2001 the newly formed OUA saw the return of Queen's and Ottawa to the

Ontario football conference bringing the membership to an even ten teams. In 2004 the OUA granted full membership to Kingston's Royal Military College, and more recently the OUA grew to nineteen members with the addition of the University Of Ontario Institute Of Technology. A member since 2006, they initially competed in rowing and tennis but have indicated a desire to compete in men's and women's hockey by the 2007-2008 season (W. Dilse, personal communication, June 22, 2006).

The Atlantic, Quebec, West and Ontario associations come together in what is known today as the Canadian Interuniversity Sport. What began as a modest four team Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union has now grown to include four different associations across Canada. In fact, arguably the most powerful force in Canadian intercollegiate athletics, the OUA, now boasts nineteen members a feat that could never have been predicted in 1906 when Queen's University, McGill University and University of Toronto formally organized to become the CIAU.

### **The History of the Scholarship Debate**

As early as 1906 the CIAUC, the predecessor to the CIAU and the CIS, allowed only amateurs to compete in university athletics. An amateur was defined as those who were not receiving any form of payment related to their services as an athlete (Harrigan, 2001). By 1964 (and additionally in 1966) the CIAU enacted regulations prohibiting the use of external and internal athletic awards, further solidifying the importance of amateurism (Harrigan, 2001). Although the CIAU may have been at the forefront of the staunch opposition to athletic awards, they were not alone in their treatment of the issue. In fact, this view was mirrored by the O-QUAA who introduced a bylaw that stated that a

student would not be eligible to compete in any university competition if s/he is receiving an athletic scholarship (Harrigan, 2001). However, there was a regional divide between the West and Atlantic Provinces who were proponents of athletic scholarships, and Ontario universities, who adamantly opposed the idea (Harrigan, 2001). This regional divide was at the core of the athletic scholarship debate, and has been prevalent throughout the history of intercollegiate athletics in Canada.

Although the issue of athletic scholarships can be traced back for many years, even today it remains as a prevalent issue in intercollegiate athletics. In fact, athletic scholarships are highly sought after by most student-athletes who are currently, or about to enter into, their university career. This is not surprising given that “scholarships, grants and loans through financial assistance have provided thousands of young athletes...with access to a positive future and a prosperous career upon graduation” (Lahey, 2003, preface). In fact, a student-athlete who has a combination of a tough competitive athletic background and a strong academic base from university is a winning combination when entering the working world ( Lahey, 2003). However, in the past the term student athlete became a misnomer as the academics began to fall to the wayside with the focus being mostly on the athletic success of the individual. Too frequently the focus was on athletics and the belief is that “every young athlete should have a degree to fall back on” (Lahey, 2003, p. 155). Unfortunately, this attitude is all too common in universities, and it is this attitude that has led to negative feelings regarding athletic scholarships from a number of parties. In the U.S. the NCAA has recognized this problem and has sought to remedy it by improving the entrance requirements which must be met in order to receive athletic scholarships (Lahey, 2003). The goal of the NCAA is

to produce student-athletes who are more deserving of the title student and also more successful in their collegiate programs. The ultimate goal of the NCAA is to increase the graduation rate of student-athletes while at the same time bringing back the validity of the term student-athlete (Lahey, 2003).

Although the aforementioned efforts and examples relate to U.S. institutions and the NCAA, the same issues are now at the forefront of the ongoing debate within Canadian Intercollegiate Athletics. This is not surprising given that, as Lucas and Smith (1978) in Inglis (1991) point out “interuniversity athletic programs have been and continue to be subject of interest, study and debate” (p. 18). Furthermore, Lucas and Smith (1978) state that one of the major issues which is of interest is that of the diminishing amateur status and subsequent growth of professionalism among athletes in intercollegiate sport. In fact, one might say that they are even more prevalent in the Canadian system as athletic scholarships have been a focus of debate since the inception of organized Canadian university sport.

### **Amateurism versus Professionalism**

The issue of amateurism in intercollegiate athletics is not a new one; in fact it has been a bone of contention since the beginning of the formalization of university athletics. The U.S. and Canada have both fought with the issue over time perhaps because, as Hanford (1974) described, the pure form of amateurism was lost many years ago. Hanford (1974) goes further to describe how in 1929 the definition of amateurism was clear and indisputable which made it possible to ask for a return to that which was both describable and plausible. The same cannot be said for amateurism today as the definition

of amateurism must be embedded in degrees of non-professionalism (Hanford, 1974). In essence, the concept of amateurism is not only elusive but controversial in an era which identifies professional sport as the predominant form of athletic competition (Hanford, 1974).

Harrigan (2001) echoes the notion that there has been a “long standing concern in Canada about separation of amateur from professional sport” (p. 241). In fact in 1906 with the inception of the CIAUC there came a strong opposition to professionals competing at all in intercollegiate athletics (Harrigan, 2001). The CIAUC made it clear that no professionals would be allowed to compete and went on to define an amateur as:

a person who had not competed in any competition for a stake bet, monies, private or public, or gate receipts, or competed with or against a professional for a prize or where gate receipts are charged, who has never taught or assisted in the pursuit of any athletic exercise or sport as a means of livelihood, who has never, directly or indirectly, received any bonus or payment or consideration whatever for any service as an athlete.

(Moriarty, 1971, p. 81)

The CIAUC’s strong stance against professionalism was born out of the desire to preserve amateurism by eliminating “hired guns” (non-students) that were being added to help teams win crucial games (Harrigan, 2001). No academic institution was as committed to the amateur ideal as the University of Toronto (Harrigan, 2001). Given the University of Toronto’s loyalty to the British ideals, the British trained faculty and most importantly the large population ensuring a stable and successful athletic program, were not surprisingly staunch supporters of the amateur ideal and as such did not agree with professionals competing at the intercollegiate level (Harrigan, 2001). On the other hand, the Montreal Athletic Association voted to allow professionals to play against amateurs; however, they had to ultimately relent as they were part of the minority who deemed this

form of competition to be acceptable (Kidd, 1996). At this time athletics was student initiated, integrated but subordinate to the academic scene with faculty coaching and supervising the teams (Fairs, 1971). The amateur ideal that became solidified in this time period was later deemed class snobbism and, as such, Canadian institutions were labeled as elitist institutions (Morrow, 1986).

However, after the First World War there was increased interest in intercollegiate athletics as it was these teams that won the Grey Cup in football and the Stanley Cup in hockey (Harrigan, 2001). With the increased attention and wins on the professional stage, the debate over amateur and professional status was reborn. By 1927 in a meeting of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC), Alberta and Saskatchewan were proposing to loosen the distinctions between amateur and professional athletes (Harrigan, 2001). This was met with opposition from institutions in the west who argued that Canada was “a vast country and what is suitable for the east might not be suitable for the west” (Kidd, 1996, p. 60). Similarly, the Carnegie Foundation praised the situation in Canada as being vastly different from the U.S. as Canadian institutions valued upholding British tradition and undergraduates valued academia (Harrigan, 2001). Although the amateur ideal was still being upheld, the CIAUC began to feel the pressure of the amateurism versus professionalism debate enough to reevaluate the goals of intercollegiate athletics. This reevaluation, which took place in 1933, recognized that the goals set out in the handbook to promote health, character and citizenship had recently fallen to the wayside in the pursuit of competition, the desire to win and financial gains through gate receipts (Harrigan, 2001). Despite this revelation though, the CIAUC maintained that they would continue to emphasize the objectives which they set out and

which were steeped in “the highest ideals and traditions of British sportsmanship and fair play” (CIAUC Minutes, p. 131).

However, in spite of the CIAUC’s (made up of McGill, Queen’s and Toronto) steadfast definition of amateurism the new kid on the block, the University of Western Ontario (1929), became the first university to offer athletic scholarships from private money in the 1930s (Harrigan, 2001). Following the Second World War intercollegiate competition enjoyed prosperity; however, it was short lived as a number of events on the world stage had negative repercussions on athletics at the university level (Semotiuk, 1970). These repercussions were not limited to intercollegiate athletics; instead the Canadian Medical Association began to question the overall fitness of Canadians at large (Harrigan, 2001). At this time there was also a rising concern for national unity and it was for this reason that in 1957 the Canadian Council was established to promote Canadian culture and, similarly, in 1961 the National Fitness and Amateur Sport Advisory Council to give federal direction to sports (Harrigan, 2001). It was at this point that intercollegiate athletics became less about amateurism and professionalism and more about the strength and unity of Canadian Intercollegiate Athletics.

To this end, in 1961 the “first truly national intercollegiate athletic association in Canada (CIAU) was formed through the union of the Western, Atlantic, and Ontario-Quebec Associations” (Harrigan, 2001, p. 143). Although the CIAU was formed, it unlike its predecessor (CIAUC), took on a more managerial role using a small budget with very little control over the operations of the regional associations. In essence, the unity and consistency that was sought via establishment of the CIAU was lost as each regional association was left to its’ own devices. In fact, given that the CIAU was unable



to mandate a protocol, the regional associations could, and did, develop their own policies regarding many different aspects of intercollegiate athletics. Although many policies were implemented, perhaps none was more controversial and divisive than policy regarding athletic scholarships.

### **The Scholarship Debate**

Although there are arguments made both for and against scholarships dating back to the inception of intercollegiate athletics in Canada, Atkinson (2006) provides an interesting view suggesting that the focus should in fact be not on scholarships, but on getting more money into the system to improve the overall sporting experience. Despite this argument, the debate over athletic scholarships still remains in most discussions regarding intercollegiate athletics and more specifically recruiting practices at Ontario Universities. When discussions do take place, there are always a variety of interested parties weighing in on the issue of athletic scholarships. There are those who point to the U.S. and argue that if we have athletic scholarships, then we will have an equally corrupt system, one characterized by inferior students (Atkinson, 2006, p. 5). Similarly, these and other individuals believe that universities should concern themselves with their primary objective: academics, not sport (Atkinson, 2006). However, others such as David Atkinson argue quite the opposite, suggesting that intercollegiate athletics are central to the university experience and that universities now do many things and contribute in many ways beyond just academia (Atkinson, 2006). Supporters of this position also note that the learning outside of the classroom is equally as important as that done through labs and course work. In fact, athletics offers a special type of learning

environment that fosters self-discipline, focus and commitment, traits that are so often missing among youth today (Atkinson, 2006). If one ascribes to Atkinson's way of thinking, then athletics must be identified among the other priorities of universities. As such everything must be done to ensure that athletics are considered when creating the university's mission statement. In essence, the profile of university athletics must be raised in Canada and the best way to do this is by retaining talent through quality programs, good competition, and perhaps most controversially, through the use of athletic scholarships (Atkinson, 2006).

Athletic scholarships at Ontario universities have been a non issue in the past as up until the last decade, most OUA institutions were opposed to their initiation and saw them as an unnecessary evil. The most common and consistent argument suggested that academics would fall to the wayside and the student-athlete ideal would no longer be student first, athlete second (Harrigan, 2001). In essence, the fear of students becoming athletes who were merely in school to compete for a team and win games made the introduction of athletic scholarships unlikely in the past. Second to that argument is perhaps the issue that athletic scholarships will just widen the gap between the 'haves' and 'have nots', given the money crunch that exists because of the chronic under funding of colleges and universities (Dalla Costa, 2006).

Parity is also an issue that those who are for athletic scholarships see as a concern, because there is a lack of parity among universities across the nation related to policy. This opinion stems from the disconnect that has existed in the past between the regulations set out by CIS and the OUA. Throughout the history of the athletic scholarship debate the OUA and the CIS have had very different policies regarding the

awarding of athletic scholarships. For example, before the OUA allowed athletic scholarships in any form, the CIS made the awarding of scholarships acceptable. In fact, before May 2006 the CIS allowed first year students with an average of 80% or more to receive an athletic scholarship and allowed students who achieved 70% in their first year to get retroactive scholarships (Plouffe, 2006). However, the OUA did not provide these first year scholarships for athletes and instead allowed only upper year students to receive monies of up to \$3,500 if they received 70% or higher (Plouffe, 2006). In regards to upper year students CIS' standards differed as they only required student-athletes to achieve a 65% average to be eligible for athletic awards (Plouffe, 2006). It is perhaps this disparity that is noted as being the driving force behind the argument that athletic scholarships are necessary. It is argued that the athletes will be recruited to the schools that provide the most money and, therefore, historically the OUA has not been the best choice given the strict policy regarding athletic scholarships (Plouffe, 2006).

Beyond just the argument that athletic scholarships are necessary in Ontario to make the playing field fair within Canada, there is also the issue of having scholarships to ensure the retention of key Canadian talent that may depart to the U.S. where they will receive money (Plouffe, 2006). When speaking of Canadian born talent leaving to go to the U.S. the reason identified is that will receive money and as such be more capable of paying their way through school. Those Canadian universities who are for scholarships agree with this aforementioned claim as they recognize that most student-athletes are currently attending classes, going to practices and games and still having to work on top of all of this to ensure they have enough money to be able to stay in school (Plouffe, 2006). These demands are acknowledged as very tough for student-athletes. Responding

to these difficulties, many athletic directors have indicated a desire to have athletic scholarships to offset some of these costs for their athletes (Plouffe, 2006).

A final argument made for athletic scholarships again relates to the differing perspectives between the CIS and the OUA. The President of the CIS articulated this when she (Marg McGregor) commented that high school athletes become confused when told they can receive scholarships but that the OUA does not have the same regulations as the CIS (Plouffe, 2006). McGregor goes on to comment that students and parents are confused over the different regulations and “to that end, [a change in OUA policy] would help to get the message across” (Plouffe, 2006, p. 5) to students and parents. It is perhaps for this reason that in 2006 the OUA voted to allow the awarding of athletic scholarships of up to \$3,500 to entering students who possessed an average of over 80% beginning with the 2007-2008 season (Record Staff, 2006). David Dubois, the President of the OUA argues that “with the implementation of this new policy on the granting of Athletic Financial Awards... we will see more of Canada’s best at the doorsteps of our 19 member schools” (Moko, 2006, SP12).

On the other hand, for those who are outside the inner workings of intercollegiate athletics and continue to be against scholarships, the argument is quite simple. Although these individuals recognize that athletics are part of the university experience, they argue that athletes only represent a small portion of the population and as such putting more money into athletic systems may improve team competitiveness but will do nothing to improve the quality of education at the institution (Dalla Costa, 2006). As Dalla Costa (2006) points out, although athletic scholarships may attract a few more athletes, the majority of students do not pick their school based on the records of the athletic teams at

the university. Furthermore, the question is asked as to how universities can even think about spending more money on athletics with the money crunch that currently exists at Canadian universities (Dalla Costa, 2006). Della Costa (2006) asks if more money is in fact put into athletics then where will this additional money come from? And “if schools are allowed to raise additional money for athletic scholarships through alumni contributions, that opens the potential for abuses and places the idea of education second to athletics” (Dalla Costa, 2006, p. 2). In essence, individuals external to athletic departments who are opposed to athletic scholarships ask why someone who can play a sport should have an advantage, by not incurring debt like their peers, over those who may not be athletically talented and are just trying to get an education (Dalla Costa, 2006). Dalla Costa (2006) argues that when considering athletic scholarships at Ontario universities, university Presidents must remember that “sports are a great escape from the real world. That’s because they aren’t connected to real life or real life’s priorities” (p. 3).

### **Feasibility of Athletic Scholarships in Canada**

To date there has only been one study done on the feasibility of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities. Despite being rather extensive and thorough the study conducted by Donlevy is rather dated. Published in 1975, the study still provides an interesting perspective on athletic scholarships at Canadian Universities. In addition, it does provide a possible framework that could be followed in more current research regarding the feasibility of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities. As Donlevy (1975) noted, athletic scholarships have not been accepted universally by Canadian

universities, however, individual institutions have provided grant-in-aid programs to assist student athletes directly. For this reason Donlevy (1975) evaluated the feasibility of adopting a variety of different forms of athletic scholarships to determine how they would fair financially. Donlevy (1975) examined two four-year scholarship formats, along with a grant structure for freshmen. Administrative expenditures, recruiting costs and coaches' salaries were also evaluated, in addition to the dollars spent on the actual scholarships themselves (Donlevy, 1975). A goal of Donlevy's (1975) study was to provide info which could be used as the basis for comparison between American and Canadian interuniversity athletics. This goal, although seemingly lofty, was accepted as being achievable to some degree through the use of a variety of research tools and comparative analyses.

After careful data analysis with total costs balanced against revenue potential, Donlevy (1975) noted that "the losses in most cases would exceed income in amounts that would make implementation of athletic scholarships prohibitive for all but the largest and best endowed institutions" (p. vi). In fact, when Donlevy (1975) compared current total expenditures of the University of Alberta athletic department with various scholarship formats, there was an increase of 124% for a freshman program to 379% for a four year award. In essence, Donlevy noted that the very school he was attending (University of Alberta) while compiling data for his study would experience extreme financial hardship if athletic scholarships of any kind were adopted.

In 1975 Donlevy noted many problems with the implementation of athletic scholarships. Although the majority had been solved by 2006, the absence of a detailed and expansive legislation of athletic scholarship regulations still remains. Clearly, the

issue of athletic scholarships is not a new one within intercollegiate athletics. In fact, “the question of financial feasibility of operating an athletic scholarship program in Canada has been raised for many years by members of the CIAU, media personnel, university alumni and intercollegiate athletes” (Donlevy, 1975, p. 112). Donlevy (1975) explains that all universities would need to identify new sources of income if they were required to support the additional costs involved in the establishment of athletic scholarships. In essence, this was not a practice that could be entered into without careful consideration and attention to detail.

Given that there needed to be careful consideration before establishing athletic scholarships, Donlevy was determined to assess the feasibility of their implementation at Canadian universities. For this reason he started by first examining the history of the governing bodies of intercollegiate athletics. He noted that in 1948 concrete measures were taken to form a national intercollegiate body at the National Conference of Canadian Universities (NCCU). This conference which was comprised of University of New Brunswick, McGill University, University of Alberta, University of Western Ontario and the University of Saskatchewan started the movement towards the establishment of a national intercollegiate governing body (Donlevy, 1975). However, by 1961 there was in fact the formation of such a national intercollegiate body (CIAU) (Donlevy, 2006). More than ten years after the inception of the CIAU, Donlevy (1975) noted that the CIAU had grown in prestige and authority. Therefore, as there was a growth of intercollegiate athletics (number of national championships) there was a definite need for a stronger national organization. Although correctly noted by Donlevy in his 1975 study, growth and strength has become even more of an issue as the CIAU

has evolved over the last thirty years since this study was conducted. It is for this reason that the feasibility of athletic scholarships needs to be revisited in the present day if we are to truly understand the positive and negative effects of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities.

In order to accurately assess the feasibility of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities, Donlevy had to first define the different types of scholarships being assessed, and what they entailed. Donlevy suggested fifty athletic scholarships at each institution, awarded annually, be the basis for evaluation (Donlevy, 1975). Beyond purely suggesting the number to be awarded, Donlevy went farther by defining all inclusive scholarships and freshman scholarships as the two types of scholarships that he would assess (Donlevy, 1975). He defined the all inclusive scholarship as including all books, room and board, tuition and fees, along with incidental expenses (Donlevy, 1975). By contrast, he classified freshman scholarships as simply including tuition, fees and books (Donlevy, 1975).

Donlevy went on to suggest how these athletic scholarships may be awarded to the athletes at the individual institutions if, in fact, an athletic scholarship program of any kind was introduced. He suggested that it would be logical for sports that have the greatest revenue potential in terms of spectator support to “receive the larger proportion of the total athletic scholarships awarded” (Donlevy, 1975, p. 115). Another proposal made was to split the money among two or more students as has been done in the NCAA (Donlevy, 1975). Donlevy (1975) suggests that if athletic scholarships were to be instituted in Canadian universities, the role of coaches would be changed to include more time spent coaching, recruiting and promoting their sport to ensure that the athletic



departments had a good return on their investment. As the role of the coach changes, so too does their salary. Donlevy believed this increase, in what he called 'job burden,' would require a fifteen percent increase through fringe benefits (Donlevy, 1975). Similarly, there would be an increase in cost associated with recruiting due to travel as coaches would need to travel to meet and see prospective student athletes compete (Donlevy, 1975). Beyond the scholarship, coaching and recruiting costs, there are also increased costs which include, but are not limited to: publicity; advertising; public relations; telephone correspondence; and mailing (Donlevy, 1975). In essence, the "establishment of any type of scholarship plan, whether extensive or restrictive, would necessitate large scale expense increases in a number of areas of the total intercollegiate athletic program" (Donlevy, 1975, p. 137). Although Donlevy clearly states that costs would increase at each institution if athletic scholarships were offered, it is equally important to note that there would be increased costs to the CIAU and any regional organization (OUA, etc.) to ensure the proper monitoring and awarding of said scholarships (Donlevy, 1975). Given the increased financial demands, Canadian universities will have to rely on a stable and rather large financial source to cover the costs associated with the implementation of athletic scholarships (Donlevy, 1975). As Donlevy (1975) suggests, they will need increased funding from the university to assist the program (athletic scholarships) during the initial years.

In essence, it is undeniable that there would be an increase in costs associated with the inception of such a program at Canadian universities. By examining the individual institutions, Donlevy looks at the abovementioned costs associated with the program and compares that to the possible monies which the institutions possess or could

acquire quite readily to fuel the new program. Upon doing this Donlevy found that when looking at institutions across the board, not surprisingly smaller and financially fledging institutions would have the greatest financial risk if they were to partake in the awarding of athletic scholarships (Donlevy, 1975). In Donlevy's 1975 study it was clear that with the exception of one institution (The University of Western Ontario) the implementation of a full or partial freshman scholarship program would result in considerable deficits. In fact, Donlevy explains that deficits to individual institutions would range from \$900,000 for small universities to \$200,000 for bigger universities (Donlevy, 1975). Furthermore, Donlevy (1975) remarks that despite the belief that providing financial support to athletes allows them to perform at a higher level and provide more entertainment to fans, these outcomes have not been overwhelmingly supported. This lack of support should therefore be considered by those "observers who continue to bring pressure to bear on athletic administrators to become involved in the expansive athletic scholarship programs typical of the large United States institutions" (Donlevy, 1975, p. 165).

### **Study of Athletic Scholarship Practices in Canada**

Despite, as suggested in the literature, the apparent financial unfeasibility of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities the pressure to award them still exists. In fact, within six years of the CIAU's formal inception in 1967 it faced overwhelming public pressure on and criticism over the lack of support financially for athletes (Hargreaves, 1975). Externally, Hargreaves (1975) explained that the news media were pressuring for athletic scholarships blaming the CIAU's lack of scholarship policy as the reason for the mass exodus of student athletes to the U.S. Not surprisingly, organizations

not associated with the universities began providing financial aid programs for athletes to try and help cover some of their costs; yet, this actually may have complicated matters further (Hargreaves, 1975). As mentioned previously, external pressure was on the rise, but so, too, was internal pressure. In fact, Hargreaves (1975) explains that the climate was such that the CIAU was a loosely constructed autonomous group, who followed the administrative regulations of their respective regional associations rather than following the CIAU guidelines. He describes this autonomy as the reason for which athletes received financial support, sometimes with the knowledge of the university, and often in cooperation with alumni or an organization of friends who were responsible for acquiring funds. Knowledge of these institutional practices and the discrepancies occurring across Canada, led the CIAU to conduct surveys, enact committees and make constitutional changes.

Hargreaves (1975) showed that the external pressure forced the CIAU in 1967 to examine the reasons for which American universities were acquiring Canadian talent. The CIAU-appointed committee found that the drain of Canadian athletes was mainly due to the fact that Canadian students did not possess academic qualifications that would enable them to access Canadian universities (Hargreaves, 1975). Despite the acceptance of the 'no scholarship' policy, by 1970 the CIAU released a statement accepting the principle of third party scholarships provided the recipient was free to attend the university of their choice (Hargreaves, 1975). Although this may have appeared to be a progressive move, Hargreaves (1975) explains how this was actually a response to the inordinate number of student athletes who were receiving money 'under the table.' In effect, by allowing third party scholarships the CIAU was legitimizing the practice which

was already taking place. However, in the same release the CIAU went on to redefine its' stance against athletic scholarships if not administered by third parties (Hargreaves, 1975). In essence, the CIAU was solidifying its stance against athletic scholarships whilst trying to maintain their integrity by allowing third party scholarships to become legitimized.

After much discussion and the formation of an ad hoc committee chaired by CIAU-appointed Al Lenard (Men's Intercollegiate Director at Queen's University) there was a report submitted in 1972 at the CIAU general meeting which made suggestions to the CIAU regarding necessary athletic scholarship policy changes (Hargreaves, 1975). Despite the report being submitted, it took a full year for these proposed changes to be implemented. Along the way, however, there were a few key events that Hargreaves argues led to the changing of policy regarding athletic scholarships. In essence, although the period was marked with a number of issues related to the athletic scholarship debate, perhaps no one incident was more important than the 1973 CIAU basketball championship game. Hargreaves (1975) describes this event as the catalyst for change in CIAU policy over athletic scholarships. He explains, how as the two starting lineups took the court, there was a noticeable make-up to the starters: nine were Americans. After this shocking revelation the CIAU brought forth two motions at their annual meeting, which took place only two short months after the championship (Hargreaves, 1975). As noted by Hargreaves (1975), the first motion simply limited the number of non-Canadians which could be part of a university basketball team. The second motion, however, dealt with the underlying issue of athletic scholarships at Canadian Universities. This motion (Article VI, sec.5 of the CIAU constitution) was the focus of

his study, clearly stating that any student receiving financial aid/subsidies or scholarship from the university, or any other external organization, would not be eligible to compete in intercollegiate athletics. Again, as Hargreaves (1975) describes, the autonomous nature of the delegates led to “inherent acceptance of CIAU legislation as binding to all member institutions, thereby making a shift to a centralization of authority within the national organization” (p. 2). Although the acceptance of the aforementioned motion was a step forward for the CIAU, providing them more power and control, it was perceived as not being sufficient to remedy the problem (Hargreaves, 1975).

Despite the motion being passed, the CIAU felt more needed to be done and sponsored a study in 1973 to evaluate Canadian University Athletics (Hargreaves, 1975). The study was spearheaded by Dr. A.W. Mathews who did extensive research as well as visiting and writing different stakeholders from coast to coast (Hargreaves, 1975). Upon completion of the study, Dr. Mathews submitted his evaluation of Canadian university athletics to the CIAU (Hargreaves, 1975). The submission was in the form of a 116-page book that was given to the CIAU to peruse (Hargreaves, 1975). Although there were eight chapters in the report, two recommendations were directly related to the definition of athletic scholarships (Hargreaves, 1975). Dr. Mathews suggested that athletic ability not be one of the criteria for loans, scholarships, or other forms of university awards (Hargreaves, 1975). He also suggested that the CIAU study the extent to which federal grant-in-aid programs are serving the university students’ needs. By evaluating the aforementioned programs they believed they would be able to determine whether outside agencies should follow that model when offering third party assistance (Hargreaves, 1975).

As Hargreaves (1975) explains, Dr. Mathews' views were grounded in the belief that it would be financially ruinous to attempt to compete with the American universities. Hargreaves (1975) also noted that Mathews felt that allowing individual universities to administer athletic awards would not in fact legitimize the practice, it would just make the undesirable 'under the table' practice financially recognized. Furthermore, Mathews argued that you could not equate athletic scholarships with similar awards in drama, music, etc. as there is far more subjective judgment necessary when assessing athletic performance. In essence, it was Mathews' strong belief that funds should not be used for athletic scholarships, but instead be allocated to improving overall programs, facilities and coaching. Funneling resources and monies into these aforementioned areas, he believed, would prove to be a much more successful way to attract highly skilled athletes to Canadian universities (Hargreaves, 1975).

As mentioned, results from research done by the CIAU indicated a need for the CIAU to change their policy regarding athletic scholarships (Hargreaves, 1975). All forty-nine member institutions of the CIAU were therefore administered questionnaires and then given a second set constructed from responses from the first questionnaire, essentially taking the form of a Delphi study (Hargreaves, 1975). Upon completion of the second questionnaire, responses were then put in numerical and narrative form to facilitate the possible drafting of new legislation within the CIAU. Upon compilation of the results, Hargreaves (1975) redefined the past position of scholarships, since after his study the majority of respondents (as represented by athletic directors), were now in favour of some type of financial support for athletes.

The 1975 study, although driven by the literature which he found pertaining to the history of the athletic scholarship debate at Canadian universities, truly took shape with the surveying that was done by Hargreaves as an investigator. In essence the valuable information which can be gained from the study is mainly found in the results and conclusions that the researcher came to through the responses received on his questionnaires. The study itself included two questionnaires. The first was an opinion survey where questions were open-ended and requested respondents to list and describe known athletic scholarship practices at their respective institution (Hargreaves, 1975). This questionnaire allowed the respondents to express their reactions and views regarding the issue of athletic scholarships (Hargreaves, 1975). Following the processing of the first questionnaire, Hargreaves (1975) constructed a second survey where the questions were tailored to the respondents as they were well informed individuals who thoroughly understood the subject matter and terminology being used. The second questionnaire contained seven sections adapted from a questionnaire that had been previously used by the NCAA when they investigated the use of athletic scholarships (Hargreaves, 1975). Sections of the questionnaire related to general information, financial aid, alumni, travel, entertainment, meals and employment (Hargreaves, 1975). The general information portion was preceded by a question about how the individual respondent had voted in regards to Article VI, Section 5 allowing third party scholarships, therefore providing a context for which Hargreaves could assess the individual respondents' attitudes toward athletic scholarships (Hargreaves, 1975). The remaining questions were structured in the form of a five point likert scale that was later compressed at both ends to create three categories which answers were placed into by Hargreaves (Hargreaves, 1975). By

compressing the scale, answers were no longer in a five point scale but rather were placed in a smaller three point scale. After this tabulation Hargreaves summarized the responses in a table format, along with summarizing the position of the members in the form of a narrative (Hargreaves, 1975). Therefore, as Hargreaves (1975) notes, the use of either directors of physical education or directors of athletics ensured that “the group represented the current and future administrators of athletic scholarships” (p. 13). Hargreaves’ (1975) study focused on all forty-nine institutions with the purpose being to survey all stakeholders who played a role in the athletic scholarship debate at the time of the survey administration. Of the forty-nine institutions initially contacted, Hargreaves was fortunate enough to receive a response from forty-seven of them. The high respondent rate could potentially be attributed to the way in which the questionnaires were distributed, as the first set was sent through the CIAU office (Hargreaves, 1975). By sending the first set of questionnaires through the CIAU it provided some validity and legitimacy to the study, thus enabling Hargreaves to distribute the second set of questionnaires independently in an effort to expedite the process (Hargreaves, 1975). Upon the project’s completion the CIAU, being integral to the investigation, received the summary of replies for the semi-annual meeting in June 1973 (Hargreaves, 1975).

Hargreaves’ findings are very telling of the state of affairs that existed when the study was conducted. For example, the study found that the athletic administrators want to provide assistance to athletes but not without strict regulations and guidelines about how to provide said assistance. In essence, the athletic administrators were strongly in favour of the continuation of third party scholarships. However, they were not very supportive of the idea of individual institutions developing their own recruiting policies



independent of the CIAU, or of smaller schools being given special financial aid under legislation in order to make them more competitive (Hargreaves, 1975). Another interesting finding was that respondents felt that universities which offered a physical education program to students had a recruiting advantage. However, they were opposed to any form of legislation that would remedy the inequity (Hargreaves, 1975). Consistent with what has been seen over time related to the opposition of scholarships, respondents were also opposed to bursaries or loans that were based solely on athletic prowess and felt any financial aid should be administered by the awards office or CIAU legislation. Such a disposition would ensure no involvement of the individual athletic departments (Hargreaves, 1975). Furthermore, Hargreaves (1975) noted that respondents were very leery of alumni acting without CIAU legislation regarding financial aid, since contributions made to athletes via these individuals and their organizations were seen as potentially disreputable. Interestingly, however, there was support for employment opportunities for student athletes. That being said, the rate of pay would be the same as any other employee and the opportunity would be available to any student, not simply athletes, to ensure that campus jobs were not simply offered as a way to entice prospective student athletes (Hargreaves, 1975). Upon evaluating the results of the questionnaires it is clearly evident that one view is prominent throughout. In essence, at the time of this study, directors of physical education or athletics wished to see increased financial aid for athletes but not without strict policy enforced by the CIAU that would ensure the integrity of the universities (Hargreaves, 1975). The concern of administrators was linked to the fear that, with increased loans, bursaries, and financial aid, student athletes would become part of a corrupt system whereby academics would fall to the

wayside and athletic departments would provide athletes with preferential treatment (Hargreaves, 1975).

As illustrated, Hargreaves' 1975 study filled a gap at the time with the purpose being "to define and to describe the specific practices of athletic scholarships and subsidies which were considered to be acceptable and unacceptable to Canadian university athletic administrators" (Hargreaves, 1975, p. 2). This being said, more research is needed that explores the attitudes of stake holders who currently play a role in athletic scholarships at Canadian universities. As Hargreaves' review of the literature revealed, a large gap in research exists with only limited resources pertaining to athletic scholarships, especially when examining literature related specifically to the Canadian scene (Hargreaves, 1975). Hargreaves (1975) also notes that the source for his study mainly came through the meeting minutes and two reports written by masters' students in 1970. Despite Hargreaves' study taking place in 1975, the same gap still exists today in the literature as there is very little written about athletic scholarships, and what literature that does exist is rather dated.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to fill this gap by exploring the history of the debate and continuing on with Hargreaves' work by delving into the attitudes of stakeholders from 1970 until 2006. Furthermore, the study aims to provide an understanding of how policy has changed over the last thirty-six years to reflect the attitudinal changes over athletic scholarships at Ontario universities. More specifically, the researcher is interested in the concessions that have been made by OUA institutions over the last decade, given their historical staunch opposition to athletic scholarships in any form. It is the hope of the researcher that this study fills the gap in the literature

which currently exists by exploring how athletic scholarship policy has changed at Ontario universities and the catalysts for these changes.

## CHAPTER III

### Research Design and Methodology

The majority of literature surrounding athletic scholarships at the university level has been based upon U.S. colleges and universities. As such, there is a dearth of information which exists for stakeholders in Canadian intercollegiate athletics. Furthermore, the information that does exist regarding athletic scholarships in Canada is rather dated, with the most recent journal publication in 2001, prior to the inception of the newly formed Canadian Interuniversity Sport (formerly CIAU). Despite the lack of recent scholarly articles there does exist a plethora of primary resources in the form of organizational meeting minutes and other personal archives.

The primary form of research being done in this inquiry is broadly defined as qualitative research. This study has, through the use of qualitative research techniques, used “more general questions to guide the study proceeding in an inductive process in developing hypotheses and theory as the data unfold” (Thomas, Nelson and Silverman, 2005, p. 20). This aforementioned data has been collected through the “use of data collection tools such as: interviews and intensive first hand experience” (Thomas, et al, 2005, p. 20).

Given the historical component of this study and the focus on events, institutions, organizations and people, the use of historical research techniques are necessary (Thomas, et al, 2005). Moreover, this type of research lends itself to the discovery of facts that “provide more meaning and understanding of past events to explain the present state of affairs” (Thomas, et al, 2005, p. 17). Therefore, historical research is vital, since

this study focuses on analyzing the evolution of the athletic scholarship debate and the compromises that have been struck, while providing insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities. It is acknowledged that a general understanding of the history of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities is required to gain insight into the current and future role of said scholarships within the OUA.

Although historical research is necessary to the success of this project, it is not the only type of research which will be employed. Descriptive research has also been used through in-person interviews and telephone interviews when necessary. Although in-person interviews were preferred, telephone interviews were necessary “to cover the wide geographical area, which is generally a limitation in personal interviews” (Thomas et al, 2005, p. 18). Participants for said interviews were selected purposefully, which in essence means that this was a sample from which the researcher can learn the most (Thomas et al, 2005). In the case of this investigation, the researcher attempted to interview all current Athletic Directors of OUA member institutions along with, but not limited to, the president and the executive director of the OUA.

In order to be able to examine the recent developments in the athletic scholarship debate at Canadian universities it is first necessary to investigate the underpinnings of this debate. More specifically, it is essential that the researcher examine all primary data which exists, including conversations and motions that were made in the past regarding athletic scholarships at Canadian universities. Although the researcher initially examined the primary documents which exist in both the personal holdings of Dr. Richard Moriarty (archived at the University of Windsor Leddy Library) and a number of past OUA (formerly OUAA and OWIAA) minutes held in the OUA archives in Hamilton, ON, it

was necessary to revisit these documents along with others that were deemed relevant to the study. This was necessary to ensure the most complete picture of the history of athletic scholarships at Canadian universities.

The aforementioned interviews provided the researcher with the first hand experience and insight into the past (although limited by the knowledge of the Athletic Director), present and future of athletic scholarships within the OUA. By using interviews whenever possible the validity of the information collected was increased as interviews have a greater percentage of returns and are therefore more reliable than the questionnaire (Thomas et al, 2005). The identified subjects were asked to participate in semi-structured interviews. Interviews were between 30 minutes and 60 minutes depending on the depth of the participants' responses. Subjects were able to take breaks upon request during the interview process. Once the interviews had been transcribed subjects were provided with an opportunity to look over the transcription and make any changes that they wish before the investigator used the data collected. Following any editing to the transcribed interviews, the researcher analyzed the responses of the subjects and attempted to draw conclusions as to the past, present and future role of athletic scholarships within the OUA. More specifically, the researcher utilized the responses from the interviews to aid in the answering of the main research question and subquestions.

The use of closed questions were employed when establishing facts and general information about the subject and their role in intercollegiate athletics. Conversely, open-ended questions were used to gain valuable information regarding the subjects' personal experiences, feelings and opinions. For example, the open-ended approach allowed for

greater exploration into the culture and opinions of members of the OUA throughout the athletic scholarship debate. Open-ended questions also allowed the subjects to provide information about the internal struggles which were ongoing in the university sport setting. Though there was an extensive review of the literature, input from athletic directors and other important figures in the OUA was essential to the success of the project. Furthermore, by examining all available literature on the subject the validity of the interviews was enhanced. In essence, methodological triangulation was employed to establish validity of the interviews by providing corroboration for the interviewees' responses (Thomas et al, 2005). Triangulation also ensured results were more objective given that the researcher was a former employee of the OUA and a student athlete. By using triangulation and conducting interviews in a timely manner, this study was able to address the issue of athletic scholarships which is currently front and centre in the OUA, while addressing the identifiable gap in research between 2000 and 2008.

### **Ethical Considerations**

This study was conducted in accordance with the University of Windsor Guidelines on Research Involving Human Subjects. Before proposing this study, approval to conduct the research was sought and obtained from the Research Ethics Board of the Office of Research Services of the University of Windsor. In accordance with stipulations set out by the research ethics board at the University of Windsor, all ethics boards at institutions where subjects are interviewed were sent a description of the study, along with information regarding the study's approval from the Research Ethics Board at the University of Windsor. Permission to interview the participants was sought

through email, telephone, and in writing. The researcher detailed the purpose and the process of the study to prospective interviewees and explained their rights as participants in the study. Participants were provided with a letter of information which provided them with the purpose of the study and the ability to gain insight as to why their participation was critical to the success of the study. Following the letter of information, identified participants were contacted by the researcher to set up a time and place which was convenient to conduct an interview if they agreed to participate in the study. Before the commencement of the interview, subjects were given a consent form that detailed their rights as participants and it was at this time they were asked to sign a consent form to participate in the study. This consent form also outlined their right to withdraw at any time from the study. Furthermore, upon the conclusion of the interview the researcher transcribed each interview. Upon completion of the transcription, subjects were given the transcribed interview to peruse and edit as they saw fit before it was sent back to the researcher to be used in the study. By allowing participants to view the transcribed interview before it was used in the study, the responses were confirmed and therefore any omissions, errors or inaccuracies could be identified and corrected.



## **CHAPTER IV**

### **Results**

This chapter evaluates what the impetuses/catalysts were for the change in attitudes within the OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006. This evaluation is done through the answering of the five previously identified sub questions and in turn the critical evaluation of athletic scholarships at OUA institutions from 1970-2006. To accomplish this task one must also examine the areas of interest previously discussed through the review of the literature.

#### **The Influence of NCAA Athletic Scholarship Policy**

From the outset of the debate on athletic scholarships at Ontario universities there have been those who feared, and those who wished to emulate the NCAA policy regarding athletic scholarships. Those in favour believed that the NCAA could provide a successful example of how athletic scholarships can help with the recruiting and the fostering of student athletes. However, those opposed pointed out the flaws in the U.S. system, the corruption and the lowered academic standards that were a direct reflection of said scholarships.

Those Ontarians who are in favour of following an American model are not often found within OUA athletic departments but rather in the community and the media. Parents and the media have been pushing for athletic scholarships for as long as most athletic directors can remember. In fact, in the past the media did not understand why scholarships were not offered. Furthermore, they saw the OUA as an organization which did not help developing athletes and was not serious about competing with the rest of

North America for talent (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). The media and parents alike do not understand that it is the department who pays for scholarship programs and not the university as a whole, which means that already tight departmental financial resources are made even tighter (Peter Baxter, personal communication, July 20, 2007) This study reinforces the belief that those who have historically wanted to move towards an American system have been primarily those external to the OUA, because they are misinformed or not made privy to athletic scholarship information (Jennifer Brenning, personal communication, July 30, 2007).

Although the U.S. system may appear flawed to most Canadian athletic directors, there is one organization that seems to be trying to make a difference and remedy some of the academic issues that have plagued the NCAA. The National Consortium for Academics and Sport (NCAS), an organization created to ensure that student athletes complete their degree, may be one way in which the NCAA seems to be providing a good example for OUA institutions ([www.ncasports.org/dcp.htm](http://www.ncasports.org/dcp.htm), October 14, 2007). The NCAS

...was established decades ago and it was essentially to ensure that universities were committed through to graduation of the athlete. We can't lose sight of what our primary goal is and our primary goal is to graduate that student. In the States, in many schools, they would give--offer a scholarship but the courses that they took in those four years wouldn't end up having a degree so they'd have to come back to finish their degree and it would cost them an arm and a leg especially if they're out of state. So that academic consortium were universities that were committed to supporting that individual through to graduation and I believe that that's a principle that is very consistent with our belief at McMaster and with our belief within the university system

(Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007).

The NCAS, as mentioned, allows student athletes to return to university and complete their degrees at no cost to them, provided that they are making progress towards their

degree and are participating in community service and outreach programs for a minimum of ten hours a week ([www.ncasports.org/dcp.htm](http://www.ncasports.org/dcp.htm), October 14, 2007). Former athletes meet with school aged youth to discuss a variety of critical issues and, to date, through their presentations, they have reached approximately fifteen million individuals while donating more than sixteen million hours of service (Ibid, October 14, 2007). As Quigley mentions, this organization tries to make certain that student athletes end up with a degree even when their athletic career has concluded, a goal that she believes too frequently academic institutions lose sight of (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). Although this might prove to be a good example for Ontario universities, it appears to address a problem after the fact rather than focusing on maintaining academic standards throughout the career of the student athlete. In essence, this organization, although positive, is more of a solution to a current problem rather than a method to ensure that the problem does not occur in the first place.

The problem, according to Bennett (1986), is that academic integrity is often jeopardized in the NCAA in order to ensure that athletes are accepted and remain in their program. In fact, despite there being minimum academic entrance standards, it is not uncommon for institutions to “bend the rules” so that athletes may compete regardless of whether or not they are academically eligible (Bennett, 1986). The idea of the student athlete ideal is often lost in such an environment when the focus becomes only the athletic component of a student athlete’s university experience. It is this shift in focus that has been a concern for the OUA since the beginning of the debate over athletic scholarships and was once again repeated in the interviews conducted for this study. Therese Quigley, athletic director of McMaster University, clearly articulated this

concern when she described how McMaster's athletic department wanted their athletes to be the best athletes possible, but that their main objective as a department and institution was to see their student athletes' graduate and do so in good standing (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). Her view was not unique among those interviewed as all of the interviewees expressed a vested interest in the academic integrity of their institution. Thus, a concerted effort was being made by all institutions to maintain the student athlete ideal endorsed by the OUA (All interviewees, 2008). This effort is evident in the OUA's athletic scholarship policy as they continue to have higher academic standards than the rest of the CIS regarding eligibility for financial assistance. This higher standard which they hold their athletes to speaks to their wish that academic performance be factored into, and a key component of, the awarding of athletic scholarships at OUA institutions. Beyond the academic problems that seem to surface on a regular basis, there is also the sheer financial drain that a U.S.-style scholarship program would cause for Ontario universities.

As Judy McCrae, athletic director for the University of Waterloo noted, U.S. schools offer far more money than would be feasible for the OUA (The Record, February, 6, 2007). In fact, top spending universities' athletic department budgets in Canada would be considered miniscule compared to big Division I schools in the United States (Globe and Mail, January 21, 2008). As McCrae explains "One of the things I'm proud of is that we do sports differently here," a sentiment most people opposed to the American model would echo (Record, February 6, 2008). Furthermore, she argues, it is hard enough to meet current demands given the money that exists in the OUA system

(Ibid, 2008). In essence, it is very difficult to follow a model in which there is insufficient financial resources to make such a program feasible.

### **Feasibility of Athletic Scholarships at Ontario Universities**

As previously discussed the financial feasibility of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities is, and always has been, a concern for athletic directors. For example, at Wilfrid Laurier University the fear was that schools with a larger alumni base would dominate the league because smaller schools would not have the necessary money to compete (Peter Baxter, personal communication, July 20, 2007). Furthermore, if money was needed for athletic scholarships, it would be taken away from acquiring the most talented coaches, from attending the best tournaments and from building the best possible facilities (Peter Baxter, personal communication, July 20, 2007). Therese Quigley (personal communication, July 18, 2007) also focused on the opportunity cost that existed in the past when it came to athletic scholarships. She believed that there was a focus on leadership, coaching and facilities and as such athletic scholarships were just not feasible. Tom Kendall, athletic director at the University of Guelph also voiced his concern that other institutions in the CIS are "...spending excessive amounts of money on athletic awards and it is beginning to negatively affect resources that are available for their program budgets" (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). The OUA, he stated, needs to ensure they do not follow in these footsteps.

Upon interviewing the current athletic directors at Ontario universities, the same concerns seem to still exist around the opportunity cost of athletic scholarships. Liz Hoffman, of the University of Toronto, believed that fundraising would have to be

increased in order to fund the scholarships. Given the difficult nature of fundraising, she argued, there will no doubt be a change in priorities as institutions attempt to remain competitive (Liz Hoffman, personal communication, August 30, 2007). Although some universities, such as the University of Windsor, have agreed to ante up funds to help support the new athletic scholarship policy, most athletic departments are left to come up with the additional monies themselves (Mike Havey, personal communication, July 25, 2007). Following the University of Windsor's support of athletic scholarships, more pressure was put on other institutions to ensure that they were getting on board by offering money to support their respective athletic departments rather than sitting back doing nothing (Chuck Mathies, personal communication, July 19, 2007). Although much time has passed since Donlevy's (1975) study regarding the financial feasibility of athletic scholarships, his suggestion that athletic departments would need increased funding from the university, especially during the initial years, still seems to be true.

Donlevy (1975), after careful data analysis, was able to conclude that in most cases the losses would exceed the income of all but the largest and best endowed institutions, making implementation of athletic scholarships extremely prohibitive. This is still a concern of most institutions as they wait to see the financial repercussions of the inception of this year's \$3,500 athletic scholarship to entering students (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). In fact, Lorne Adams alluded to the increased pressure for revenue generation when he said that "...now that we're in this game you've added a lot of pressure to an already busy job. You've added another job to a busy life. And I think the reality of that is starting to sink home on a number of campuses, and mine included" (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). Donlevy's

conclusions, although upon initial review they may seem dated, still hold true today as institutions attempt to raise sufficient money to fund the new OUA athletic scholarship policy, understanding that if they are unable to do so the gap will continue to grow between the haves and have nots within the conference (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). In essence, Athletic Directors within the OUA understand that despite the financial hardship that might come out of the new athletic scholarship policy "...if you want to compete you have to be in the scholarship game and that's how we look at it" (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). Just as Donlevy suggested in his 1975 study, all universities need to identify new sources of income in order to support the additional costs that will be incurred as a result of the establishment of athletic scholarships. The question of where this money is coming from often points to the change in the type of varsity athletic program that is offered at OUA institutions. At the end of the day the broad based programming that OUA institutions have always prided themselves on might be compromised in order to pay for the new reality of athletic scholarships (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). In fact, in the OUA, in its' first year the implementation of the new athletic scholarship policy has led to some institutions cutting programs that they could no longer financially support (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). With new policy often comes the need for more change to facilitate its effectiveness, a process that will not be smooth or easy for all those involved.

### **Policy Development in Intercollegiate Athletics**

As mentioned, the introduction of athletic scholarships for entering students at OUA member institutions was seen as a necessary evil to many athletic directors in May 2006 when they voted for Motion #12 (OUA, 2006). The policy, which was to take effect in September 2007, was approved by sixteen of the nineteen institutions, allowing OUA institutions to grant athletic scholarships to first-year students provided they had an eighty percent average (OUA, 2006). In the past this initiative was met with much resistance within the OUA. However, VanderZwaag (1998) suggests that in most organizations, there comes a point when individuals with opposing viewpoints must come to a consensus through the implementation of a dynamic policy which results in a standing decision on a recurring issue. The debate over athletic scholarships within the OUA was no exception to the aforementioned rule regarding policy development.

Having recognized the need to come to a consensus, the OUA decided that it was necessary to establish a task force on athletic scholarships (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). The wish to better position themselves (OUA) in order to be more competitive within the CIS, combined with the fear that the OUA was losing athletes to the U.S., also supported the development of the task force (Chuck Mathies, personal communication, July 19, 2007). The task force was borne out of the wish to eliminate divisiveness by compiling the necessary information needed for the rest of the OUA to make an informed decision on the issue (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). Given the mandate of the task force the management committee appointed individuals who were for, against, and undecided on the issue to



ensure that all factions were properly represented (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007).

Despite the OUA agreeing on the need for the task force, there is significant debate over how the task force was ultimately struck. In fact, a number of the athletic directors interviewed were unsure as to how the group was selected and believed that it was made up of those who wished to take part rather than those who were selected based on their expertise. In particular, Tom Kendall voiced his concern that "...everybody on the taskforce committee is pretty important to the process. The only problem is that no one on the task force has had a lot of experience in the athletic scholarship area" (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). As Lorne Adams commented, the membership was asked to volunteer and those who were interested were then selected by the management committee (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). The task force was chaired by the President of the OUA and the Athletic Director of Brock, Lorne Adams. Other members included were Gord Grace of the University of Windsor, Luc Gelineau of the University of Ottawa, John McFarlane the former Athletic Director at Queen's University, and Therese Quigley who is not only from McMaster University but also the OUA representative on the CIS Athletic Financial Award Task Force (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). However, because it is not a standing committee the task force was only temporary and existed in order to fulfill its mandate and report its findings prior to the May 2006 Annual General Meeting. Following the presentation of its findings, and having completed its mandate, there was no longer a need for the task force to continue to exist.

By providing the necessary information to the membership the task force enabled them to come to the aforementioned decision to carry motion #12 on May 10, 2006. Interestingly, only the University of Windsor, the University of Waterloo and Trent University voted against the new athletic financial awards for entering students in the OUA (OUA, 2006). Following the vote a new policy was created, whereby, for the first time in OUA history, there would be athletic financial awards for entering students who achieved over 80% in high school (OUA, 2006). The new policy fell within Unit III, Rule 6.0-6.6 in the OUA constitution and marked a significant shift in the perception of athletic scholarships within the OUA (OUA, 2006). The new policy directly reflected the concerns that were presented by the athletic financial award task force prior to the vote. As the task force concluded, the new policy needed to reflect the OUA's attempt to align themselves more closely with the CIS and in doing so offer entering awards to help students deal with the demanding role of being student athletes (OUA, 2006). The policy, according to VanderZwaag's (1998) standards, seems to be appropriate given that it remedies an issue that has long been a source of debate, while achieving the goals that the organization set out to meet with its creation. However, in order for the policy to be appropriate and effective according to VanderZwaag (1998), the OUA and each individual institution must also determine if and how the policy fits within its mission and mandate.

After careful consideration, the majority of subjects who partook in this study saw this new athletic scholarship policy as fitting perfectly with the mission of their institution or organization. Tom Kendall (personal communication, July 10, 2007) noted that a major part of the University of Guelph athletic department's mission is to provide

resources to varsity teams, and athletic scholarships are just a small part of the resources needed to ensure that they achieve success. Peter Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007) also feels that it fits within the mission of Wilfrid Laurier University athletics because there is an academic component, which he believes aids in the maintenance of the student athlete ideal by continuing to have a higher graduation rate within student athletes than the rest of the school population. Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007), Chuck Mathies (personal communication, 2007) and Lorne Adams (personal communication, August 16, 2007) all feel as though it fits within their institution's mission to provide an excellent program, whereby their respective departments are able to recruit the best talent and provide the best opportunity possible for their student athletes. Trent University's Bill Byrick (personal communication, July 27, 2007) felt it would allow them to be successful in their mission to provide safe quality programming, while Liz Hoffman (personal communication, August 30, 2007) of the University of Toronto said it embodied the very thing that they want to accomplish which is to be supportive of their student athletes. Therese Quigley (personal communication, July 18, 2007) pointed out that it is hard for student athletes to keep a job while trying to maintain both academics and sports. Therefore, if the mission is athletic excellence then it is easy to make a case for athletic scholarships. In fact, as she mentioned, "Myself, I don't know if I would have been able to do all that I did if I wasn't a carded athlete playing on the national team" (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007). There were, however, a couple of individuals who did not see it fitting quite so neatly within their institution's mission. Mike Havey (personal communication, July 25, 2006) of the University of Windsor believed that it could be argued, as some have, that it will

allow for better recruiting and in turn the best athletes on the roster and the ability to run better programs. On the other hand Havey (personal communication, July 25, 2007) argues that it could, in fact, lead to the erosion of OUA programs by forcing a decrease in the number and breadth of sports offered, something which has always been the mission of the OUA. Darren Cates of RMC also sees athletic scholarships as being outside of their mission given that their institution is in existence only to make better officers and as such athletic scholarships will not be awarded to their students. Their unique position also stems from the fact that RMC already pays for all of their students' expenses and actually provides the officers with a salary which would far exceed that awarded for an athletic financial award (Darren Cates, personal communication, July 13, 2007). That being said, RMC did vote in favour of athletic scholarships because as Cates (personal communication, July 13, 2007) mentioned, their unique position allows them to vote in favour of what he believes to be best for the OUA, and in this case although athletic scholarships may not fit with RMC's mission, it may fit perfectly within the OUA's. Ward Dilse (personal communication, July 24, 2007) of the OUA would definitely agree with Cates as he described athletic scholarships as fitting perfectly with the newly created mission statement that stressed "...excellence—athletic excellence".

### **Athletic Scholarship Policy in Ontario**

Given that the OUA mission now emphasizes athletic excellence (see Appendix H), it is not surprising that there has always been pressure on the organization and its member institutions to do everything in their power to recruit and retain Canada's best athletes. The pressure to do so has often come from the public via media articles. They

have consistently pressured the OUA to offer athletic scholarships, as they saw the absence of athletic scholarships within the OUA as a demonstration of their lack of commitment to Canadian athletes (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). Despite the fact that, as discussed earlier, past studies proved that athletic scholarships were not feasible there were still a large number of people who continued to push and pressure the OUA to begin awarding them. As Hargreaves (1975) suggested in his study, within six years of the CIAU's inception in 1967 the media was already pressuring for athletic scholarships as they blamed the CIAU's lack of scholarship policy as the reason for which Canadian athletes were heading to U.S. schools.

As time passed and the CIS developed policy regarding athletic scholarships, the brunt of the media pressure began to fall on the OUA as they became the only regional association who operated with a policy which differed from the CIS. The pressure for the OUA to align itself more closely with the CIS is especially strong in Windsor being that they are a border town, and according to Mike Havey, are not seen as a valid varsity program if they are not offering athletic scholarships (Mike Havey, personal communication, July 25, 2007). However, Lorne Adams (personal communication, 2007) and Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007) have felt pressure from the media to create policy which more closely resembled that of the CIS. Peter Baxter (personal communication, 2007) saw parents and alumni, in addition to the media, as applying some pressure on the Wilfrid Laurier University athletic department to provide athletic scholarships. That being said, Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007) explained, parents, alumni and media are not able to see the big picture and do not understand that the money for said scholarships is not coming from the university but

instead it must come from an already overextended athletic department budget. Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007) believes that the reason there is so much pressure and disdain for the OUA institutions in the media is that we always hear about

...the high school student that got a scholarship down in the NCAA but you never hear about it. We don't promote the fact if they're staying at Carleton because they've got an athletic award. We don't promote that and so, the media really play up on, the U.S. suggesting that it is better when they get a scholarship to the States and so we're really battling with that and I don't think we do a good enough job promoting what we do in Canada. It's almost like we're afraid to say, "Hey, this student has come to Carleton because they've got an athletic scholarship," because what are the other institutions in Ontario going to say, right? (p. 7)

Given Brenning's insights, it is not surprising that since the inception of a new athletic scholarship policy in the OUA, there has been a positive shift in the media. The pressure which they have been putting on for years has begun to subside (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). Similarly alumni has followed suit by supporting the new policy with the understanding that athletic scholarship has become part of the current landscape in university sport (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). Chuck Mathies (personal communication, July 19, 2007) sees the newfound alumni support as positive because he believes that alumni will be more likely to donate money since unlike operational costs they can see their investment on the playing field anytime they go to watch their Alma Mater play.

Although most pressure felt by athletic departments comes from external sources such as media, alumni, and parents, there is also internal pressure from those who are for and those who are against the inception of athletic scholarships. For example, coaches have exerted some pressure on athletic directors because they want to be able to compete

with other programs in the OUA and CIS (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). In particular, coaches have pressured athletic directors to bring in scholarships because they wish to be more in line with the CIS, thus enabling them to compete with Canada East schools for recruiting (Jennifer Brenning, personal communication, July 30, 2007). In contrast, senior administration and the university Presidents have historically been opposed; however, recently the majority of Presidents have seen the introduction of athletic scholarship policy as a positive initiative. Yet, unlike the coaches they do not exert pressure because they are able to voice their opinion more directly by being part of the decision making process.

Senior administration and in particular the President of the university play an active role in decisions regarding athletic scholarship policy at their respective OUA institutions because it is an important decision to make both philosophically and financially (Mike Havey, personal communication, July 25, 2007). So much so that in fact all of the subjects in this study recognized the President's role as being integral in the most recent vote for the aforementioned policy change within the OUA. Peter Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007) explained that the university Presidents have,

been well advised right through the whole process and have had an opinion on it so, obviously I go in and give the athletic directors read on it and when it came to any decisions that whether the institution was in favour of first year scholarships or maintain the status quo it was directed by the President because it's an institutional decision and to be honest most all my colleagues are in the same boat when it comes to the athletic scholarship issue. It was--it had to be an institutional decision.

In essence, when asked who was part of the decision-making process within their institution regarding new athletic scholarship policy in May 2006, all subjects agreed that although coaches and other athletic department staff had input the ultimate decision was

made by senior management including the dean of students and the President based on advice from the athletic director.

While there has been pressure on athletic directors from various sources, perhaps the most significant form of pressure is related to the financial strain which such a policy brings to bear on the athletic departments themselves. Financially, the pressure is to find a source to pay for the new initiative (Chuck Mathies, personal communication, July 19, 2007). Each institution faces pressure to generate funds because of what people perceive other institutions to have (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). Even though some universities, such as the University of Windsor, receive financial support from the institution the majority of schools are, as Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007) explained, forced to find other ways to generate revenue. For example, the past President at Carleton, David Atkinson was known for creating innovative ways to generate funds for student athletes such as: through the establishment of athletic bursaries or from the hosting of lucrative golf tournaments (Jennifer Brenning, personal communication, July 30, 2007). Yet, despite all the focus on the financial strain created by the awarding of athletic scholarships, it is critical to pay close attention to the other issues which present themselves when awarding athletic scholarships. Perhaps most importantly, it is necessary to keep in mind that OUA institutions have pressure to be the best they can be and to not lose sight of the student athlete ideal. Therefore, as Therese Quigley (personal communication, July 18, 2007) notes, quality education is, and should be, the primary goal of all OUA athletic departments.



## CHAPTER V

### Discussion and Conclusion

The results provided in the previous chapter help to describe the past and present climate of athletic scholarships within the OUA. This chapter builds on that information by answering the central question posed in the study: What were the impetuses/catalysts for change in attitudes within the OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006? Utilizing the interviews and additional information gathered from both primary and secondary sources this chapter attempts to explain the reasons the OUA has drastically changed its perspective on athletic scholarships. Interestingly, upon completion of this study it became evident that it was not simply one reason for the shift in the OUA's position relative to athletic scholarships but rather that it was a number of factors which, occurring in concert, shaped policy. Although the passage of time was frequently cited as the main reason for the change in attitude within the OUA, interviews revealed other causes for their shift in position. Interviewees cited change in personnel, change in athletic departments' missions and the change in Presidential intrigue as being the basis for new policy regarding athletic scholarships within the OUA. For example, one athletic director was called by the President of the institution minutes before the vote and instructed to vote for athletic scholarships despite being historically opposed. Additionally, the role of athletics within the university, and the wish to compete with the rest of the CIS

As previously mentioned, this study's interviewees revealed that they believed that the passage of time was the most significant factor contributing to the eventual acceptance of athletic scholarships within the OUA. The shift has been gradual and at

times came to a complete standstill, which is not unlike how it came into being within the CIS. In fact, this slow moving policy creation was described in Walter's 1979 study regarding recruiting and subsidization when Bob Pugh, Vice President of the CIAU, was interviewed. At the time he was quoted as saying that fifteen years ago when the CIAU discussed athletic scholarships there was only 10% for and 90% against, however, in 1977 those in favour of athletic scholarships made up 60% of the vote (Walter, 1979). He went on to predict that within ten years there could be a form of scholarship or grant in aid in effect within the CIAU (Walter, 1979). His comments illustrate just how long it took the CIS to form policy and perhaps helps to explain the length of time it takes from the point that an issue is initially broached to the moment that policy is created within Canadian intercollegiate athletics. One could argue that a precedent was set by the CIS when it took years to create an athletic scholarship policy. However, despite the CIS taking time to develop and implement policy it is nothing when compared to the amount of time it has taken the OUA to get a resolution where all nineteen institutions are able to award athletic scholarships to entering and continuing student athletes. The time was needed for the OUA to develop consensus given that athletic directors were divided both ethically and morally on the issue (Walter, 1979). Although, as Mike Mckenna described in his 1999 thesis, the issue has been examined on a number of occasions by the CIAU, the Canadian Association of University Athletic Directors (CAUAD), the Council of Ontario University Presidents (COU) regional governing bodies of sport in Canada and federal and provincial governments, it was not until 2006 that the OUA finally thought it was time to try and bring its members to a consensus on the issue. It was at this point that a task force was struck to delve into the issue of athletic scholarships. Formed by the

management committee, the members of the task force were appointed to reflect the general population. As such, the membership was comprised of those who were in support, those opposed, and those who were undecided about athletic scholarships (Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007). The creation of the task force marked what would be the beginning of a policy change that had, as mentioned, been slow to come to fruition. Although the passage of time has been identified as the main reason for which there had been a shift in athletic scholarship policy, there were still many other factors that contributed to the OUA's passage of Motion #12.

When the CIAU faced the same decision regarding athletic scholarships years earlier, they cited some of the same concerns that OUA institutions cited in this study, suggesting that the OUA and its' nineteen member institutions may simply take longer to get to the same policy decision as the CIS. The reasons for the want and the rationale for being in favour of providing first year athletic awards were threefold. First they wished to keep high quality athletes in Canada, rather than having them compete in the U.S. (Mckenna, 1999). The second was their wish to create a student athlete centred program and in doing so assist them in dealing with the financial constraints resulting from competition, training and reduced opportunities to work (Ibid). The final impetus for the CIAU was the wish to create positive media and public perception of CIAU sport, therefore increasing the marketability and revenue potential. These reasons were again articulated in the present study regarding athletic scholarship policy within the OUA. Upon being interviewed most of the subjects mentioned a fear of losing athletes to the U.S. as a reason for which they felt the OUA introduced a first year award. However, an even bigger impetus was the fear that Ontario was losing talented athletes to the rest of

Canada. In fact, Tom Kendall (personal communication, July 10, 2007) felt that the Canada East and West associations took the lead by providing athletic financial awards and in turn made it necessary for the OUA to follow suit if they wished to remain competitive with the rest of the CIS. Chuck Mathies (personal communication, July 19, 2007) brought up the CIAU's second motivation when he stated that there has been a realization within the OUA that to be a student athlete you have to make sacrifices and do not have the time to work. Therefore, he argued, there is a definite need to help support student athletes financially through athletic financial awards. The final cause for the CIAU's policy development was echoed by Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007) when she expressed her concern over the OUA's lack of communication and promotion of OUA athletics within the media. Although this study revealed that the OUA had a similar rationale to previously created CIS policy regarding athletic scholarships, it was made evident that there were other factors which influenced the slowed process within the OUA.

Over the time it has taken for the OUA to follow suit, many changes have occurred within OUA institutions that may well have provided the catalyst for the new athletic scholarship policy. In particular, this study's interviewees described four changes that they saw as critical for the development of the May 2006 OUA athletic financial award policy. The interviewees cited the change in personnel, the change in Presidential intrigue and the role of athletics within the university, the change in missions of athletic departments and the OUA organization, and finally the change in attitude relative to the CIS policy in order to stay competitive as the catalysts for the shift within the OUA.

As mentioned, the interviewees identified a change in personnel as a large reason for the adoption of a new policy on athletic scholarships. Mike Havey (personal communication, July 25, 2007), Peter Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007), Lorne Adams (personal communication, August 16, 2007), Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007) and Ward Dilse (personal communication, July 24, 2007) all commented that the shift in athletic scholarship policy was related to the change of personnel, in particular the change in athletic directors within the OUA. The current state of athletic directors provided a new perspective as they have not been involved in the years of OUA opposition to athletic awards. Their perspective is driven by their wish to compete with the rest of the CIS and their understanding that it is therefore necessary for the OUA to change. In essence, the new personnel within OUA athletic departments have changed the OUA culture by distancing themselves from the historical resistance to athletic financial awards. Long gone are the days of athletic directors who were former coaches or academics that moved into administration. In fact, the majority of the athletic directors are now business minded individuals with backgrounds in administration or management. Furthermore, athletic directors such as Tom Kendall have backgrounds that include working in the NCAA which gives them a different perspective on athletic scholarships (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). In essence, the change in athletic director personnel has brought about a new era of university athletic policy where a diverse group of individuals must come to consensus over issues that have historically been a source of debate, such as athletic scholarships. In addition to new athletic directors in OUA athletic departments, there have also been changes within university administration which have affected the athletic policy direction. As Bill

Byrick (personal communication, July 27, 2007), Jennifer Brenning (personal communication, July 30, 2007), Lorne Adams (personal communication, August 16, 2007), Peter Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007) and Ward Dilse (personal communication, July 24, 2007) explained, turn over has also occurred in university administration, and in particular the university Presidents. These personnel changes have greatly affected the policy direction in athletics as they see athletics as an integral part of the institution as a whole, rather than as a separate entity as it has been seen in the past. By understanding the importance of athletics and the need to be competitive, the new Presidents have taken a more active role, and as such, have helped shape the direction of athletic scholarship policy within the OUA.

In conjunction with the appointment of new athletic directors and university Presidents there have also been modifications to the missions of both the OUA and the individual institutions. In fact, as Ward Dilse (personal communication, July 24, 2007) pointed out, until four years ago there was no clearly stated mission or mandate for the OUA. The new mission and mandate that was adopted was

...to provide exemplary interuniversity sports competition experiences for student athletes with respect to the educational milieu of Ontario universities further to provide leadership with varsity sportsmanship and fair play in the pursuit of athletic excellence and the key to that is, which was a big debate over this--to prepare time to get it to come to where we were was the athletic excellence. We didn't have that in our mission before.

(Ward Dilse, personal communication, July 24, 2007).

It was modifications like that mentioned above that helped provide the impetus to change athletic scholarship policy. As Ward Dilse (personal communication, July 24, 2007) described, the mission of the OUA was the pursuit of excellence and as such the policy regarding athletic financial awards had to be revisited. The wish to be competitive and to

achieve excellence was echoed by the athletic directors interviewed as well. Therese Quigley (personal communication, July 18, 2007) described McMaster University's mission as being the striving for both athletic and academic excellence. If the mission of the athletic department is to be successful then there is a need to be clear in the mission of the department (Tom Kendall, personal communication, July 10, 2007). Although institutions, such as the University of Western Ontario, take pride in having the athletic department as part of the Faculty of Health Sciences, most universities have moved away from such an academic model (Chuck Mathies, personal communication, July 19, 2007). By separating the athletic department from academic faculties they arguably change the focus from student and athletic excellence to primarily one of athletic excellence. Furthermore, as there has been a rise in recreation within universities, athletic departments have made sure to clearly divide the recreation department from varsity athletics. Although the University of Western Ontario, along with Brock University and University of Windsor, still remain part of an academic faculty the majority of OUA schools have shifted to a more American model. Varsity athletics are now considered a business which needs to be run separately from the academic world. It is this very idea that varsity athletics are a business that may also lead to a change in the type of programming offered. As with any business there must be profits and for this very reason the OUA risks losing its broad-based programming model which it has prided itself on over the years. As Peter Baxter (personal communication, July 20, 2007), Darren Cates (personal communication, July 13, 2007), Mike Havey (personal communication, July 25, 2007), and Bill Byrick (personal communication, July 27, 2007) explained, there is a definite fear that the OUA will move away from a broad-based program as athletic

scholarships force athletic directors to cut certain sports in order to remain financially solvent. Lorne Adams described how difficult it was for him to come to the decision to cut the women's lacrosse program at his institution but that the financial resources needed "...creates a tearing de facto whether you want it or not and it is going to create some tensions when you have a broad-based program and as you've seen across the OUA, some people are shrinking programs so they can provide for what they have" (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). It is that tension that has been felt across Ontario campuses this year, the first year university athletic departments have had to struggle financially with athletic scholarships. This study clearly illustrated that with change in OUA and athletic department missions there came many other changes and perhaps none so financially crippling as the new athletic scholarship policy. With athletics taking a more business like approach, it is quite possible that the broad based programming of the OUA may quickly become a thing of the past.

Given that the role of athletics has changed over the last few years it is not surprising that the interviewees described it as being one of the catalysts for the adoption of a new athletic scholarship policy. The role of athletics has changed, in part, due to the altered role that university Presidents now play in athletics. In the past, Presidents did not have a significant role in decisions affecting athletics. However, the past few years have seen Presidents adopt a more active role in all aspects of varsity athletics. With the increased profile of Canadian university sport, the importance of athletics for a university's success becomes quite clear (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). Furthermore, the caliber and level of sport has increased within the CIS (Bill Byrick, personal communication, July 27, 2007). There has also been an increase in the



national competitiveness, forcing the creation of an enhanced league schedule and thus an increase in the level of stress for student athletes (Jennifer Brenning, personal communication, July 30, 2007). The OUA recognized that to be a student athlete there had to be sacrifices made because they did not have time for jobs, and decided it was time to help support their athletes financially through athletic scholarships (Chuck Mathies, personal communication, July 19, 2007). Liz Hoffman (personal communication, August 30, 2007) echoed this sentiment when she stated that OUA institutions have seen Presidents take a leadership role in athletics, and in turn, they have begun to understand that in order to entice students to come to their respective institutions it is necessary to provide financial support. Upon deciding to take a more significant role regarding athletics, university Presidents began devoting more COU meeting time to pressing issues within athletics, namely the issue of athletic scholarships. Therefore, with the university Presidents now at the helm of the debate over athletic scholarships, it was not long before they were using their influence to get their Athletic Directors to vote for the entering year awards in 2006. In fact, all the interviewees in this study, when asked who was part of the decision making process in the May 2006 vote, indicated that the President was integral in the OUA athletic financial award policy vote. However, when it came time to ante up money to pay for the new scholarships for entering students, most Presidents faded into the background, giving the excuse that although they were for the inception of the awards they were not willing to pay for them. Interestingly, the only institution who, very publicly, promised to provide financial support to their athletic department was one of the few institutions to vote against the new policy. The University of Windsor, who voted against the entering awards in May 2006, was the first institution to guarantee that

it would provide the athletic department with 300,000 dollars yearly for the next three years, a promise that no other institution made (Mike Havey, personal communication, July 25, 2007). Despite the disparity between what the Presidents supported prior to the vote and what they actually supported financially, it can be argued that their increased role, along with the increased profile of sport within the institutions, acted as catalysts to the acceptance of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities.

With all the changes that have happened over time within the OUA, there is one consistent belief that has remained. The belief which has, and continues to be, the number one goal of the OUA is the desire to be competitive with the rest of the CIS. It is this desire to be competitive that interviewees cite as one of the major impetuses for the OUA initiation of athletic financial awards for first year students. However, it became increasingly difficult to remain competitive given that OUA member institutions began to feel pressure over student athlete recruitment, as other regional associations started to offer athletic scholarships, while the OUA remained resistant (Darren Cates, personal communication, July 13, 2007). What used to simply be pressure to follow the NCAA model of financial awards has now become pressure to compete with the rest of the CIS. What has changed is the competitive balance as Canadian schools all compete for the best athletes (Therese Quigley, personal communication, July 18, 2007).

Although the wish to compete within the CIS is cited as a driving force for the implementation of athletic scholarships within the OUA, there have been those who see the difference as reason enough to leave CIS competition, essentially making the OUA independent from national competition. Carl Totzke suggested this move in 1980 when the CIS and OUA disagreed in a vote over athletic scholarships. Although Totzke's

threat to pursue alternate competitions never went beyond a threat, it did solidify the OUAA's position against athletic financial awards. Some, such as Tom Kendall (personal communication, July 10, 2007), believe this decision was made without realizing "the impact that it was going to have on the performance of their programs in the following 15 to 20 years. It impacted them significantly. A lot of athletes started to leave the province and the performance of many of their teams deteriorated significantly". Chuck Mathies explained that years ago Totzke "...was able to convince many of the athletic directors at that time that it was best to stay away from what the CIS was doing and to have a unique system within Ontario"(personal communication, July 19, 2007). The idea to pursue alternative competitions is something that has come up time and time again within the OUA; however, it is not a very realistic option according to Ward Dilse because it could mean that even fewer athletes would come to the OUA (personal communication, July 25, 2007). Peter Baxter echoed this belief when he commented that to separate from the CIS would only hurt student athletes because they would not be able to compete outside the OUA (personal communication, July 20, 2007). Although there might be those in favour of leaving the CIS, in Jennifer Brenning's (personal communication, July 30, 2007) opinion it is only a threat because there would never be unanimous support given that people want a national championship. In fact, when it came up at a recent meeting with executive heads, Lorne Adams indicated that it would be counterproductive because you would end up with a bunch of informal Canadian championships (Lorne Adams, personal communication, August 16, 2007). Perhaps Mike Havey summed up the OUA's stance on leaving the CIS most appropriately when he commented that,

Well, I think there's always been a sense, in Ontario, and certainly at this institution that if push came to shove that the OUA could survive on its own quite well, thank you very much. I think there's a certain amount of validity to that thinking because we comprise at least 40 percent of the institutions by number in the OUA—that's a large geographic mass and so, it certainly would be possible to offer a reasonable athletic program just within the confines of the province of Ontario. It's possible—I'm not sure it's preferable but it's possible.

(Mike Havey, personal communication, July 25, 2007)

The reality is that although many years have passed since Totzke's threat to pursue alternate competitions, the idea remains even today. However, despite the suggestion coming up now and again, it is seen as an idle threat because Ontario universities see their ultimate goal as winning national championships which necessitates remaining within the CIS. It is this necessity to remain within the CIS that has most recently provided the impetus for athletic scholarships within the OUA. Today there is pressure to not only compete but align with current CIS standards.

## **Conclusion**

The results from this study help to answer the question of what the catalyst(s) were for the change in attitude within OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006. The interviews with the OUA athletic directors clearly outlined how the OUA has evolved, becoming much less reticent to change. Past research described the OUA as being opposed to athletic scholarships in any form, especially for entering students. However, recently the OUA has created their own policy separate from the CIS which encourages OUA institutions to award athletic scholarships to first year student athletes who are eligible. When exploring why there has been such a shift in attitude within the OUA, several reasons came to the forefront.

However, none were more prevalent than the issue of time. The findings of this research initiative suggest that there was not one thing that led to the acceptance of athletic scholarships, but rather it was the result of an evolution within the OUA. In essence, the passage of time allowed for many things to change within the OUA, changes that would ultimately bring the institutions to a new era of thinking.

Between 1970 and 2006 the OUA underwent many changes which helped to shape their view of athletic scholarships. In fact, those interviewed saw these transformations as being the impetuses/catalysts for change in attitudes within OUA member institutions regarding athletic scholarships from 1970-2006. Specifically, interviewees cited change in personnel, change in athletic departments' missions, change in presidential intrigue and role of athletics within the university, along with the wish to compete with the rest of the CIS as the reason for which OUA attitudes have shifted and the basis for new policy regarding athletic scholarships.

By answering the primary research question a number of other interesting findings were revealed. For example, it was noted that the OUA maintains a higher academic standard for eligibility for athletic scholarships and this was articulated as being an integral component of athletic scholarship policy given the OUA institution's desire to maintain the student athlete ideal. Findings also revealed that although the OUA policy regarding athletic scholarships continues to differ slightly from CIS policy, the gap is certainly narrowing. In fact, a significant number of interviewees suggested that in the foreseeable future the OUA will find itself in line with CIS policy regarding athletic financial awards, causing the debate which has always pitted the OUA against the rest of the CIS to further erode. Furthermore, given how the OUA has evolved and continues to

evolve in the future it is likely that the OUA will become yet another conforming regional association within the CIS.

### **Recommendations**

Throughout the investigation, many issues have come up which warrant future consideration. Although this study explored the historical underpinnings of the athletic scholarship debate, there is still much more research which needs to be done in regards to the present state of athletic scholarship policy and the future of said policy. For example, there is a need to conduct research related to the reasons for which student athletes leave Canada to explore opportunities within the NCAA. While there was an undergraduate thesis completed on the topic over a decade ago it deserves more recent attention. Through the interviews conducted in this study, it became clear that there is a difference of opinion about why student athletes find U.S. schools more desirable when pursuing post secondary education. The subjects were divided on the issue as many believed that the new athletic scholarship policy within the OUA would make Ontario universities more attractive, thus keeping student athletes in Canada. However, others interviewed believed that the U.S. would continue to attract the top Canadian athletes because they are able to provide a different experience than that available at Ontario schools. Previous findings in McKenna's (1999) aforementioned study on athletic scholarships support the idea that it is the experience, and not the scholarship money, that attracted student athletes to Canada. In fact, when interviewed, student athletes cited the experience as being the reason for wish they chose to go to the U.S. (Mckenna, 1999). With the NCAA offering better facilities, more fan support and a greater opportunity for the possibility of

a career in their respective sport, Canadian schools are unable to compete (McKenna, 1999). Therefore, as athletes explained in the 1999 study by McKenna, money is not enough. The CIS would have to provide better facilities, competition, tournaments, travel and everything else that the NCAA is able to provide, to change the opinions of athletes. Although many years have passed since the publication of McKenna's study, the sentiment expressed by those athletes is something which was again vocalized within this study. However, it is certainly an area which deserves more careful investigation so that OUA institutions are able to understand the real reasons students migrate to the U.S. and how, if at all, they may be able to keep them in Ontario.

Another issue that came up is how the media, students, parents and alumni have historically been misinformed about the OUA and athletic scholarships. Often it was not so much misinformation but rather a lack of information that led to the negative public perception of OUA athletics, especially in regards to athletic scholarships. One concern that was voiced in this study was the inadequacy of the communication regarding athletic scholarships. It was suggested that there should be a more concerted effort to focus on positive media and communication pieces which place OUA athletics in a more favourable light. Therefore, there is a definite sense that more time and resources need to be directed towards marketing and enhancing the visibility of student athletes and teams that compete within the OUA. How this is to be done, and to what extent it can be done, is something which again deserves further investigation.

Beyond looking into why student athletes head to the NCAA and how the OUA can better brand itself, there is also the issue of whether or not the new athletic scholarship policy will have a positive or negative effect on OUA athletics. While this

study attempted to begin to explore the issue, more time will have to pass before an accurate and complete analysis can be done. There will need to be a thorough investigation done regarding the financial effects that the aforementioned policy had on athletic departments, especially considering the fact that the majority of the subjects interviewed in this study feared that their budget could not withstand the demands that athletic scholarships would place on it. Beyond just the financial repercussions, there is also the fear that the new policy would require changes with the way that the OUA operates. The concern is that the financial constraints would force OUA athletic departments to get away from broad based programming in order to afford the athletic scholarships needed to recruit the top athletes. There have already been teams cut by athletic departments because they do not feel that they can afford to subsidize as many programs as they once were able to. The question then becomes whether the OUA should move away from broad based programming to a model where recruiting is focused on a few sports and athletic scholarships are provided to those student athletes who participate in the limited sports which are available.

In the future there will also need to be research done on how the student athlete experience is different with the initiation of entering awards for student athletes. For example, there will need to be an assessment of whether student athletes feel better supported by their respective institutions and whether they feel less stress and have fewer demands because they are receiving financial aid. It is therefore essential that questions are asked which assess the benefit of the athletic scholarship policy and whether it is actually achieving the objectives which the OUA set out to achieve with its creation. To assess policy effectiveness there will need to be an investigation into how effective



athletic scholarships have been at keeping Canadian athletes in Canada. Perhaps even more importantly, there needs to be research done on whether the awarding of athletic scholarships has helped keep athletes in Ontario. Furthermore, given that OUA member institutions have always prided themselves on strong academic standards, in the future there will need to be an examination of how, and if, their policy difference from the CIS regarding academic eligibility for athletic financial awards will affect their recruiting. In essence, there needs to be further evaluation of how well the new OUA policy is able to achieve the objectives that the OUA hoped it would achieve while avoiding the erosion of the student athlete ideal.

Beyond simply looking at the positive and negative outcomes of the athletic scholarship policy within the OUA, there will need to be an assessment of how well the OUA is managing the implementation of said policy. The OUA does not want to see itself in a position similar to that of the NCAA where they suffer from the abuse and misuse of athletic financial awards. Essentially, the OUA and CIS need to ensure they are policing the awarding of the athletic scholarships to the best of their ability to ensure that there is no corruption which would be to the detriment of all Canadian university athletic programs. As mentioned previously, the OUA needs to create a positive brand to attract athletes which makes the appropriate awarding of athletic financial awards extremely important. Despite the fact that this study did not address the issue of how and who would be the policing agency in the matter of athletic scholarships within the OUA, it is still a matter which merits future consideration. In the process of looking at the implementation and regulation of the new athletic scholarship policy there should also be an investigation into how gender is dealt with, within this new policy. Specifically, there

will need to be an assessment of how the financial constraints may affect growth in female sport and how assurances will be made that gender equity is achieved when awarding athletic scholarships to first-year student athletes. Although this study was able to delve into the issue of athletic scholarships at Ontario universities, there are still areas of research that have yet to be explored and thus there is exciting work to investigate in the future.

**Appendix A: Interview Schedule**



**A research study in partial fulfillment of a Masters Degree in Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor**

**Subject Profile:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone #: ( ) \_\_\_\_\_  
 E-mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Interview Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time Started: \_\_\_\_\_ AM/PM Completed: \_\_\_\_\_ AM/PM

**Briefing Paragraph:**

What will follow is approximately a 1 hour interview. Please note that you have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions. As stated in previous communication, your confidentiality will not be guaranteed as it is your input and authority that this study relies on.

**Briefing Checklist:**

Right to Refuse

*Informed*

Please answer YES or NO to the following statements.

1. I \_\_\_\_\_ (subject name) consent to participate in this interview.

Signed Consent Received:

Yes  No

Verbal Consent:

Yes  No

2. I give consent for this interview to be audio recorded.

Signed Consent Received:

Yes  No

Verbal Consent:

Yes  No

3. I would like to review a transcription of this interview material.

Review of Transcript requested:

Yes  No

4. I would like to receive a copy of the results of this study.

Feedback of Results requested:

Yes  No

Questionnaire Outline:

General Information/Background

1. What is your current role in intercollegiate athletics?

---

---

---

- Have you had any other roles in intercollegiate athletics in the past, and if so, what were they?

---

---

---

2. How would you describe your involvement in recreation and sports before your current position within intercollegiate athletics?

---

---

---

3. What is the ultimate goal (mission) of your athletic department/organization?

---

---

---

4. Historically how has your institution/organization felt about athletic scholarships?

---

---

---

- Was there ever a shift in institutional/organizational point of view and if so, at what point?

Probe: For or against?

---



---



---

### Athletic Scholarship History

5. During the 1970s when the Canadian government was pushing for grant-in-aids, was your institution awarding any type of scholarships to athletes and if so, what type?

Probe: Academic or Bursaries?

---



---



---

- By the 1980s when athletic scholarships and grant-in-aids were garnering acceptance how was your current institution dealing with the issue?

---



---



---

- Was your institution offering scholarships to athletes and if so, in what form?

---



---



---

6. Are you familiar with the vote in 1980 when the OUA voted down resolution #24 and if so what do you know about it?

---



---



---

- To your knowledge how did your institution/organization feel about the meeting in 1980 when the OUAA voted down resolution # 24 (allowing athletic scholarships at CIAU institutions with a few restrictions)?

---



---



---

- How did the institution feel about Carl Totzke's threat to pursue alternate competitions if the CIAU stuck to Resolution # 24?

---

---

---

7. Reflecting back before scholarships were allowed in any form (1970s) in the CIAU what has changed in across the league to change perceptions on the issue of athletic scholarships?

Probe: CIS and OUA?

---

---

---

- Again reflecting back before athletic scholarships were allowed in any form in the CIAU what has changed (if anything) in your department/organization's perceptions of the athletic scholarship issue?

---

---

---

8. What do you perceive to be the catalyst(s) which led to the acceptance of third party scholarships in the OUA?

---

---

---

- What do you believe to be the catalyst(s) which led to the acceptance of scholarships for continuing students (2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> yr students) in the OUA in 1999?

---

---

---

- What do you believe to be the catalyst(s) which led to the acceptance of first year entrance scholarships in the OUA in 2006?

---

---

---

The Present and Future of Athletic Scholarships in the OUA

9. Considering the mission of your athletic department/organization, how do athletic scholarships fit into this mission statement?

---

---

---

- If not, how will you adjust your mission to account for the new reality?

---

---

---

10. Does your institution/organization ascribe to the notion of the student-athlete ideal (student first athlete second)? And if so describe how your institution/organization maintains this ideal.

Probe: Describe the importance of Academics for your student athletes

---

---

---

11. What type of pressure have you felt from within your department/organization (either for or against athletic scholarships)?

Probe: Concerns or reservations over voting for or against, gender equity, parity among sports, selection process

---

---

---

- What type of pressure have you felt from university Administration regarding athletic scholarships (for or against)?

---

---

---



- What role has the president of the university/organization played in issues regarding athletic scholarships to date?

---

---

---

12. What type of pressure have you felt from outside your institution/organization (either for or against athletic scholarships)?

---

---

---

- What role have alumni played in issues regarding athletic scholarships to date?

---

---

---

- What role has the media played in issues regarding athletic scholarships to date?

---

---

---

13. With regards to athletic scholarships, who was part of the decision making process within your institution/organization in 2006?

---

---

---

- If changes have occurred within your institution/organization, how have they evolved from pre-1999, to 2006?

---

---

- 
- Who were the key people involved in the OUA athletic scholarship task force leading to the 2006 decision?

- 
- 
- 
- How was the task force struck in the OUA leading to the 2006 decision?

- 
- 
- 
14. If you were able to personally develop policy regarding athletic scholarships at OUA member institutions how would it differ from the current policy?

- 
- 
- 
15. Looking five years into the future, what do you see as being policy regarding athletic scholarships in the OUA?

- 
- 
- 
- What positive and negative effects do you predict will result from this new athletic scholarship policy commencing in 2007?

### Conclusion

16. Is there anything that relates to athletic scholarships either in the past, present, or future that you feel I did not touch upon that you would care to comment on?

---

---

---

Thank you for your time. It is greatly appreciated.

**(\*\* If participant requested opportunity to review transcript, read the following  
\*\*)**

Over the next few weeks I will transcribe this interview and forward you a copy for your review and approval. Following completion of your review, please email or mail me your approval, edits, comments, and any other information that you feel pertinent to this study.

**Appendix B: Recruitment Letter**

## **From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006**

### **Recruitment Letter**

My name is Caitlin Orth and I am currently a Master of Human Kinetics candidate at the University of Windsor. I am in my second year of the program and will graduate this year upon completion of my master's thesis. My study will address both the historical underpinnings of the scholarship debate at Canadian universities and the concessions that have been made over time by both sides. Furthermore, there will be an examination of the current state of affairs through an extensive analysis of interview transcripts and newspaper articles which outline the numerous debates that have further polarized each side (Hums and MacLean, 2004). Although Harrigan (2001) noted that Canadians have long restricted the awarding of athletic scholarships, the past thirty years have seen an erosion of this hard stance, and the acceptance of third party scholarships (government) for continuing students. Even more recently policies have changed to allow institutions within the OUA to award scholarships to athletes who are entering or are currently studying at their institution.

The primary purpose of this research project is to build on previous research, analyze the evolution of the debate and the compromises that have been struck, and provide insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario Universities. The research questions being examined are directly related to the shift in the stance of Ontario University Athletics (OUA) in regards to Athletic Scholarships from 1970-2006.

I am looking to interview all athletic directors of Ontario universities, along with other key players in the athletic scholarship debate to date. Given your current role in intercollegiate athletics I am writing to you to request an interview. This study relies on the identification of subjects for validity, objectivity, reliability and authority and as such confidentiality will not be assured. Please note that some questions may present social risks if answered. Furthermore, your views and interpretations may be disputed by others involved, with repercussions such as alienation of colleagues and administrators. I look forward to meeting with you to discuss your experiences and receive your valuable input. Your insights are important to the understanding of the past, present and future role of athletic scholarships at Ontario Universities. Your input will likely be part of my final thesis document for others to read, appreciate and reflect on in the future.

I will contact you within the next two weeks with the hope of confirming your participation and, if you choose to participate, arrange an interview time which is convenient for you. Thank you again in advance for your assistance and invaluable contributions,

Sincerely,

Caitlin Orth  
(519) 253-3000, ext. 2431  
[orth@uwindsor.ca](mailto:orth@uwindsor.ca)  
Faculty of Human Kinetics, University of Windsor  
401 Sunset Avenue  
Windsor, ON,  
N9B 3P4

### **Appendix C: Consent for Audio Taping**



## Consent For Audio Taping

Research Subject Name:

Title of the Project: From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006

I consent to the audio-taping of interviews.

I understand these are voluntary procedures and that I am free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. Tape/Digital voice recordings are filed by number only and stored in a locked cabinet. I also understand that, if requested, a written copy of my interview will be provided to me prior to any analysis by the researcher. At this point I may choose to edit the transcript or withdraw my contribution to the study.

I understand that the listening of materials will be for professional use only.

---

(Research Subject)

---

(Date)

**Appendix D: Consent Form**





## CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

### **Title of Study: From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Caitlin Orth, from the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. The results will contribute to a Masters thesis which will aid in the completion of a Masters Degree. This particular research initiative is sponsored by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact Caitlin Orth 519-253-3000 ext. 2431 or Dr. Scott G. Martyn at 519-253-300 ext. 2434.

#### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this research project is to build on previous research, analyze the evolution of the debate and the compromises that have been struck, and provide insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario Universities. The research questions being examined are directly related to the shift in the stance of Ontario University Athletics (OUA) in regards to Athletic Scholarships from 1970-2006. More specifically this study will attempt to answer the question of what the major factors have been leading to the acceptance of athletic scholarships in the OUA since 1970.

#### **PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:  
You will be asked to answer questions in an interview which will be conducted either in person or over the telephone. There will be an audio recording made of the interview which will be transcribed upon completion. You will then have the opportunity to look at the transcribed interview and make any changes you wish to your responses before the investigator uses the data collected.

#### **POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Please note that some questions may present social risks. Furthermore, your views and interpretations may be disputed by others involved with repercussions such as alienation of colleagues and administrators.

#### **POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

You will gain an understanding of how all of the OUA member institutions feel about athletic scholarships while realizing how their opinions compare to their peers. Subjects will also benefit by potentially gaining insight into the direction that the OUA is likely to take on athletic scholarships in the future.

By using subjects in the study the researcher is able to fully understand the feelings and opinions of those individuals who are directly involved in the athletic scholarship debate. Using interviews with subjects are necessary to gather important qualitative information that has not been examined in other research to date.

## **PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

You will not receive remuneration of any kind for their participation in this study.

You may experience social risk when responding to some questions. Furthermore, your views and interpretations may be disputed by others involved with repercussions such as alienation of colleagues and administrators.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Your insights and responses are critical to the success of this project. To present a historical and current picture of athletic scholarships in the OUA it is necessary to cite specific individuals as authorities on the subject to ensure the credibility of the findings. Therefore, confidentiality will not be assured to participants in the study. In essence, I may use your name when discussing your insights in the final paper and presentation. However, written records and any audio recordings will be stored in a secure locked area in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor making it inaccessible to individuals who are not directly related to this research project.

## **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

## **FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS**

You have the right to request results pertaining to their participation in the study. You will be asked prior to the interview whether you wish to be sent a copy of the conclusions of this research project (forecasted September 2007)

## **SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA**

This data may be used in subsequent studies. The data collected from you is important to the history of intercollegiate athletics in Canada and may contribute to future studies. However, if you would rather that your interview responses were not used in future studies your data will be destroyed following the conclusion of this study.

Do you give consent for the subsequent use of the data from this study?  Yes  No

## **RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

You may withdraw your consent at any time during the interview and discontinue participation without penalty. You may also withdraw your participation when you re given your transcribed interview for review. This study has been reviewed and received ethics clearance through the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916; e-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca.

**SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE**

I understand the information provided for the study: **Title of Study: From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006** as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Subject

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Subject

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR**

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Investigator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Appendix E: Letter of Information**



## LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

### **Title of Study: From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Caitlin Orth and Dr. Scott G. Martyn, from the Faculty of Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor. The results will contribute to a Masters thesis which will aid in the completion of a Masters Degree. This particular research initiative is sponsored by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact **Caitlin Orth 519-253-3000 ext. 2431** or **Dr. Scott G. Martyn at 519-253-300 ext. 2434.**

#### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The purpose of this research project is to build on previous research, analyze the evolution of the debate and the compromises that have been struck, and provide insight into the current status of athletic scholarships at Ontario Universities. The research questions being examined are directly related to the shift in the stance of Ontario University Athletics (OUA) in regards to Athletic Scholarships from 1970-2006. More specifically this study will attempt to answer the question of what the major factors have been leading to the acceptance of athletic scholarships in the OUA since 1970.

#### **PROCEDURES**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things: You will be asked to answer questions in an interview which will be conducted either in person or over the telephone. There will be an audio recording made of the interview which will be transcribed upon completion. You will then have the opportunity to look at the transcribed interview and make any changes you wish to your responses before the investigator uses the data collected.

#### **POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS**

Please note that some questions may present social risks. Furthermore, your views and interpretations may be disputed by others involved with repercussions such as alienation of colleagues and administrators.

#### **POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY**

You will gain an understanding of how all of the OUA member institutions feel about athletic scholarships while realizing how their opinions compare to their peers. You will also benefit by potentially gaining insight into the direction that the OUA is likely to take on athletic scholarships in the future.

By using subjects in the study the researcher is able to fully understand the feelings and opinions of those individuals who are directly involved in the athletic scholarship debate. Using interviews with subjects are necessary to gather important qualitative information that has not been examined in other research to date.

## **PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION**

You will not receive remuneration of any kind for their participation in this study.

## **CONFIDENTIALITY**

Your insights and responses are critical to the success of this project. To present a historical and current picture of athletic scholarships in the OUA it is necessary to cite specific individuals as authorities on the subject to ensure the credibility of the findings. Therefore, confidentiality will not be assured to participants in the study. In essence, I may use your name when discussing your insights in the final paper and presentation. However, written records and any audio recordings will be stored in a secure locked area in the Human Kinetics Building at the University of Windsor making it inaccessible to individuals not directly related to this research project.

## **PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL**

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so.

## **FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS**

You have the right to request results pertaining to their participation in the study. You will be asked prior to the interview whether you wish to be sent a copy of the conclusions of this research project (forecasted September 2007)

## **SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA**

This data may be used in subsequent studies. The data collected from you is important to the history of intercollegiate athletics in Canada and may contribute to future studies. However, if you would rather that your interview responses were not used in future studies your data will be destroyed following the conclusion of this study.

Do you give consent for the subsequent use of the data from this study?  Yes  No

## **RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS**

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3916; e-mail: lbunn@uwindsor.ca.

## **SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR**

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Investigator

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

**Appendix F: List of Interviewees**

1. Lorne Adams- Brock University- Athletic Director and OUA President
2. Peter Baxter- Wilfrid Laurier University- Athletic Director
3. Jennifer Brenning- Carleton University- Athletic Director
4. Bill Byrick- Trent University- Athletic Director
5. Darren Cates- Royal Military College- Athletic Director
6. Ward Dilse- OUA Executive Director
7. Mike Havey- University of Windsor- Athletic Coordinator
8. Liz Hoffman- University of Toronto- Athletic Director
9. Tom Kendall- University of Guelph- Athletic Director
10. Chuck Mathies- University of Western Ontario- Interim Athletic Director
11. Therese Quigley- McMaster University- Athletic Director



**Appendix G: Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Institutions**

**University of Guelph**

50 Stone Road East,  
Guelph, ON,  
N1G 2W1

**University of Ontario Institute of Technology**

2000 Simcoe St. N,  
Oshawa, ON,  
L1H 7K4

**University of Western Ontario**

1151 Richmond St.,  
London, ON,  
N6A 3K7

**University of Windsor**

401 Sunset Ave.,  
Windsor, ON,  
N9B 3P4

**University of Waterloo**

200 University Ave. W.,  
Waterloo, ON,  
N2L 3G1

**University of Toronto**

55 Harbord St.,  
Toronto, ON,  
M5S 2W6

**University of Ottawa**

125 University Ave.,  
Ottawa, ON,  
K1N 6N5

**Brock University**

500 Glenridge Ave.,  
St. Catharines, ON  
L2S 3A1

**Carleton University**

1125 Colonel By Dr.,  
Ottawa, ON,  
K1S 5B6

**Lakehead University**

955 Oliver Road,  
Thunder Bay, ON,  
P7B 5E1

**Laurentian University**

935 Ramsey Lake Rd.,  
Sudbury, ON,  
P3E 2C6

**McMaster University**

1280 Main Street W,  
Hamilton, ON ,  
L8S 4K1

**Nipissing University**

100 College Dr.,  
North Bay, ON,  
P1B 8L7

**Queen's University**

Physical Education Centre,  
Union St., Kingston, ON,  
K7L 3N6

**Royal Military College**

PO Box 17000,  
Stn Forces, Kingston, ON,  
K7K 7B4

**Ryerson University**

350 Victoria St.,  
Toronto, ON,  
M5B 2K3

**Trent University**

1600 West Bank Dr.,  
Peterborough, ON,  
K9J 7B8

**Wilfrid Laurier University**

75 University Ave. W.,  
Waterloo, ON ,  
N2L 3C5

**York University**  
4700 Keele St.,  
Toronto, ON,  
M3J 1P3

**Appendix H: Ontario University Athletics (OUA) Mission**

To provide exemplary interuniversity sport competition experiences for student-athletes which respect the educational milieu of Ontario Universities and further to provide leadership in fostering sportsmanship and fair-play in the pursuit of athletic excellence.

## References

- Atkinson, D.W. (2006, January 25). *Canadian University Athletics*. Presentation to Ontario University Athletics, Hamilton, ON.
- Barr, C. A. (2005). Collegiate Sport. In L. P. Masteralexis, C. A. Barr & M. A. Hums (Eds.), *Principles and Practice of Sport Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed) (pp. 141-162). Sudbury, Massachusetts: Jones and Bartlett Publishers Inc.
- Bennett, B. (1986). Scholars or Slaves: The Story of Athletic Scholarships. *Journal of Popular Culture*. 20 (3), 167-178.
- Dalla Costa, M. (2006, January 30). Sports Scholarships Bad Idea for OUA. *Slam Sports*, pp. 1-3.
- Donlevy, J.G. (1975). The Financial Feasibility of Implementing Selected Formats of Athletic Scholarships in Canadian Universities. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.
- Fairs, J. (1971). The Athletics-Physical Education Dichotomy: The Genesis of the Intercollegiate Athletic Movement. *Canadian Journal of History of Sport and Physical Education*. 2(1), 68-69.
- Hanford, G.H. (1974). An Inquiry into the Need for and Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Hargreaves, Douglas J.W. (1975). *Acceptable and Unacceptable Practices of Athletic Scholarships as Perceived by Canadian University Athletic Administrators*. School of Physical Education: Dalhousie University.

- Harrigan, P. (2001). The Controversy About Athletic Scholarships in Canadian Universities: A Historical Perspective. *Sport History Review*, 32, 140-168.
- Humms, Mary A., and MacLean, Joanne, C. (2004). *Governance and Policy in Sport Organizations*. Scottsdale, Arizona: Holcomb Hathaway Publishers.
- Inglis, S. (1991). Influence In and Around Interuniversity Athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*. 5(1), 18-34.
- Kidd, B. (1996). *The Struggle for Canadian Sport*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Klenosky, D.B, Templin, T.J. & Troutman, J.A. (2001). Recruiting Student Athletes: A Means-End Investigation of School-Choice Decision Making. *Journal of Sport Management*. 15(2), 95-107.
- Lahey, D. (1993). *Athletic Scholarships: Making Your Sports Pay*. Toronto, ON: Warwick Publishing Inc.
- McKenna, M. (1999). *The Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union and Athletic Scholarships: Recurring Issue*. Department of Kinesiology: Wilfrid Laurier University.
- Moko, L. (2006, May 12). OUA to entice athletes with sports scholarships. *The Hamilton Spectator*, pp. SP12.
- Moriarty, R. (1971). *The Organizational History of the Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union Central*. Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Morrow, D. (1986). A Case Study in Amateur Conflict: The Athletic War in Canada, 1906-1908. *British Journal of Sports History*. (2), 173-190.



- Plouffe, D. (2006, February 14). The Great Scholarship Debate: Taking a Closer Look at The Question of Financial Support to Athletes, Sparked by Dispute in Ontario. *The Link*, pp. 1-6.
- Record Staff. (2006, May 11). Cash on the way for frosh athletes. *The Record*, pp. D1-D2.
- Reed, T.A. (1945). *The Blue And White*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Thomas, J.R., Nelson, J.K. & Silverman, S.J. (2005). *Research Methods in Physical Activity* (5<sup>th</sup> Ed). Champaign, Illinois: Human Kinetics.
- VanderZwaag, H.J. (1998). *Policy Development In Sport Management* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed). Westport, Connecticut: Praeger Publishers.
- Van Vliet, M.L. (1965). *Physical Education in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Of Canada, Ltd.
- Ontario University Athletics. (2004). *The History of Ontario University Athletics*. Retrieved October 11, 2006, from the World Wide Web:  
<http://www.oua.ca/about/>
- Canadian Interuniversity Sport. (2001). *History*. Retrieved September 23, 2006, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.universitysport.ca/e/about/history.cfm>

## Vita Auctoris

NAME	Caitlin Bailey Orth
PLACE OF BIRTH	Kitchener, Ontario, Canada
YEAR OF BIRTH	1981
EDUCATION	Honours Bachelor of Arts in Kinesiology and Physical Education Wilfrid Laurier University Waterloo, Ontario 2000-2004  Bachelor of Education University of Western Ontario London, Ontario 2004-2005  Master's in Human Kinetics- Sport Management University of Windsor Windsor, Ontario 2005-2008
PRESENTATIONS:	Caitlin Orth. "From Opposition to Acceptance: The Evolution of Athletic Scholarships Within the OUA, 1970-2006." Paper presented at the 36 <sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the North American Society of Sport History (NASSH), Lake Placid, New York, May 23-26, 2008.
AWARDS:	University of Windsor Tuition Scholarship, 2006-2007  Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Research Grant, 2006-2007