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ABSTRACT

The number of reported campus offenses at public and private four-year non-profit institutions increased 22.9% from 2014 to 2015 (United States Department of Education, 2017). In recent years, several publicized incidents of sexual assault and interpersonal violence involving student-athletes have increased pressure on the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) to use its institutional power to help improve the safety of all students. The creation of a guide, *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), resulted from NCAA initiatives. Thus, the purpose of this study was to examine the ASAIV including its content and historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to its development.

I conducted interviews with the ASAIV’s key contributors and performed a thematic analysis of the guide’s content. I identified six themes: (a) key messages, (b) defining athletics, (c) deflection, (d) student-athletes, (e) coaches, and (f) addressing sport culture. I discuss how the NCAA positioned student-athletes as change agents and, in part, deflected culpability for sexual assault and interpersonal violence away from intercollegiate athletics. For athletic stakeholders and sport scholars, findings contribute to the understanding of how seriously the NCAA views sexual assault as a problem for its student-athletes and institutions, as well as the NCAA’s process for finding a solution.
This dissertation is the product of my love for sport and desire to create a better sports world for my son to enjoy over a lifetime. Further, I was deeply affected by the athletic sexual assault scandal that unfolded at my alma mater, Baylor University. While I acknowledge that sexual assault on college campuses is an epidemic, I felt that I could create some knowledge that may help the Baylor community heal, learn, and improve for generations of students to come.

In examining the NCAA’s efforts to address sexual assault, I sincerely hope that knowledge I share may inspire the development of future awareness, education, and training to best serve the needs of student-athletes, college coaches, and university administrators seeking to provide a safe academic environment for all students. I believe that many passionate people are working toward solving the social problem of sexual assault, but we cannot become idle.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION** .......................................................................................................................... 1

Statement of the Problem .......................................................................................................................... 4
Purpose of the Study .................................................................................................................................. 6
Significance of the Study .......................................................................................................................... 7
Research Questions ...................................................................................................................................... 8
Limitations ..................................................................................................................................................... 9
Delimitations ................................................................................................................................................ 9
Definitions of Selected Terms ..................................................................................................................... 10

**CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW** ............................................................................................................. 15

History of the NCAA ...................................................................................................................................... 15
Sexual Violence .............................................................................................................................................. 16
NCAA Policy Research ................................................................................................................................ 22

**CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY** .................................................................................................................. 27

Positionality .................................................................................................................................................. 27
Theoretical Frameworks ................................................................................................................................ 35
Sources and Participants ............................................................................................................................. 40
Procedures .................................................................................................................................................... 41

**CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS** ............................................................................................................................... 53

Development of the ASAIV .......................................................................................................................... 53
Theme One: Key Messages ......................................................................................................................... 62
Theme Two: Defining Athletics .................................................................................................................... 67
Theme Three: Deflection ............................................................................................................................... 68
Theme Four: Student-Athletes ...................................................................................................................... 71
Theme Five: Coaches ..................................................................................................................................... 75
Theme Six: Addressing Sport Culture ........................................................................................................ 77
ASAIV Summary: Analysis and Findings ......................................................................................................... 79

**CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION** ............................................................................................................................. 81

Key Messages ................................................................................................................................................ 83
Defining Athletics ......................................................................................................................................... 92
Deflection ..................................................................................................................................................... 94
Student-Athletes ......................................................................................................................................... 96
Coaches ...................................................................................................................................................... 101
Addressing Sport Culture ............................................................................................................................ 105
Study Purpose and Research Questions ..................................................................................................... 107
Implications ................................................................................................................................................ 114
Limitations ................................................................................................................................................ 119
Recommendations for Future Research ..................................................................................................... 122
Conclusion .................................................................................................................................................. 123

**REFERENCES** ............................................................................................................................................... 126

**APPENDICES** ............................................................................................................................................... 142

Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter .................................................................................................................... 143
APPENDIX B: TIMELINE/FLOWCHART FOR PROCEDURES ................................................................. 144
APPENDIX C: ASAIV HIGHLIGHTED CATEGORIES/NOTE .............................................................. 145
APPENDIX D: PARTICIPANT RECRUITMENT EMAIL ..................................................................... 146
APPENDIX E: PRELIMINARY INTERVIEW GUIDE MAIN QUESTIONS .......................................... 146
APPENDIX F: INFORMED CONSENT FORM .................................................................................. 149
APPENDIX G: REFLEXIVITY JOURNAL ENTRY SAMPLE ................................................................. 151
APPENDIX H: TIMELINE OF SELECTED EVENTS ........................................................................ 152
APPENDIX I: TABLE OF THEMES/SUB-THEMES ....................................................................... 153
APPENDIX J: EXAMPLE OF KEY MESSAGES IN THE ASAIV ...................................................... 154
APPENDIX K: ADDITIONAL RESOURCES LISTED IN THE ASAIV (2014, P. 49) ....................... 155
VITA ........................................................................................................................................... 156
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

In 2014, the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) published
*Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), a 51-page guide “to assist intercollegiate athletics administrators and those who provide educational programming to student-athletes in developing their own approaches to preventing or reducing the incidents of sexual assault or other acts of interpersonal violence on their campuses” (Wilson, Kirkland, & Hephner LeBanc, 2014, p. 5). The ASAIV provides an overview of sexual assault as campus phenomenon and information for facilitating compliance and collaboration to prevent and respond to sexual assault. Several historical, political, and organizational factors contributed to its development. A sport psychologist, Dr. Deborah Wilson, served as primary author; higher education experts and NCAA staff provided other writing contributions. The ASAIV covered several topics: (a) an overview of the scope of campus sexual assault, (b) institutional adherence to federal regulations, (c) student-athlete perspectives, (d) the importance of campus-wide collaboration, and (e) educational programming recommendations (Wilson et al., 2014). The document was made available as a PDF resource on the NCAA website.

The guide asserted “there is no evidence that participation in athletics or any particular sport causes participants to become perpetrators of violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 11); however, student-athletes have been found to be overrepresented in campus judicial affairs/police sexual assault reporting (Crosset, McDonald, & Benedict, 1995) and in survivor reporting (Fritner & Rubinson, 1993). Additionally, a pattern of highly
publicized sexual assaults perpetrated by male student-athletes has persisted since the 1990s. University of Nebraska running back Lawrence Phillips remained a star from 1993 to 1996, despite a pattern of sexual assault and domestic violence (Scales, 2009); in 2001, University of Colorado (UC) football prospects sexually assaulted UC student Lisa Simpson at an event hosted by current student-athletes (Crosset, 2007); numerous rape allegations against University of Montana football players between 2008 and 2010 prompted a federal investigation leading to at least one conviction (Wagner, 2015). In 2012, former Florida State University (FSU) quarterback Jameis Winston was accused of rape by classmate Erica Kinsman. A lengthy, inefficient investigation by the university and local authorities did not result in a criminal conviction (Bogdanich, 2014); however, Kinsman later won a Title IX lawsuit against FSU (Nocera, 2016) and a civil settlement against Winston (Tracy, 2016). Coincidentally, the ASAIV, which developed as the Winston case unfolded, conceded that football and baseball players demonstrated an association with aggressive behavior beyond the sport compared to other student-athletes (Wilson et al., 2014). Winston played football and baseball at FSU.

Political and organizational factors occurred seemingly in lockstep with sexual assault perpetrated by student-athletes. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) was enacted by President Bill Clinton in 1994, dedicating federal funds to the investigation and prosecution of crimes against women and laying the foundation for the Office on Violence Against Women (Orloff & Kelly, 1995). In 2001, the Office of Civil Rights asserted that a school can be liable for monetary damages when a student harasses another student under Title IX protection (examined in more detail later). Further, in
2005, President George W. Bush reauthorized a version of VAWA that included additional support for sexual assault survivors (Laney, 2005). Additionally, a *Dear Colleague Letter* (DCL) (Ali, 2011) issued by the federal government reminded institutions of their Title IX responsibility to provide a safe learning environment for men and women. Specifically, the DCL encouraged institutions to train coaches and student-athletes about sexual violence. Finally—and perhaps the most influential legislation on the creation of the 2014 NCAA guide—was the passage of the Campus Sexual Assault Elimination Act of 2013 (Campus SaVE Act). The Campus SaVE Act mandated campuses to increase protocol diligence “by requiring schools to create plans to prevent this violence, to educate victims on their rights and resources, and to detail processes that are taken after a report of sexual assault is made” (Schroeder, 2014, p. 1). The following year, the NCAA Executive Committee adopted a resolution whereby member institutions accepted responsibility for compliance with sexual assault protocol and education of student-athletes, coaches, and staff (Wilson et al., 2014).

Despite more than two decades of public and media scrutiny, legislative, and organizational efforts to reposition intercollegiate athletics as a part of the solution to campus sexual assault (including those perpetrated by student-athletes), the problem still persists. Statistics provided by the United States Department of Education (2017) show that the number of reported general student offenses at public and private four-year non-profit institutions that fall under the purview of VAWA increased 22.9% from 2014 to 2015. Further, according to the National Institute of Justice (2005), only about four in 10 school offer sexual assault training. Given the continued prevalence of sexual assault and
interpersonal violence on college campuses and the evolving level of education and awareness integration by campus constituencies like intercollegiate athletics, the purpose of this paper is to examine the ASAIV and its development, supplemented by interviews with key contributors. To do so, I employed a contextual constructivist historical paradigm (Booth, 2005). In this chapter, I provide a brief literature review of NCAA organizational history, sexual assault, and its manifestation in intercollegiate sports. Next, I discuss the significance and implications of the study. Finally, I list guiding research questions, delimitations, limitations, and important definitions.

**Statement of the Problem**

Sexual violence on college campuses is a persistent historical phenomenon (Holmstrom & Burgess, 1983; The University of Texas, 2017). Yet, despite two decades of federal legislation and years of investment into education and prevention initiatives by the NCAA (culminating with the creation of ASAIV), the issue of campus sexual assault remains prevalent (Sinozich & Langton, 2014). Furthermore, NCAA student-athletes are overrepresented as an offending university subculture (Crosset, McDonald, & Benedict, 1995). In addition to the ASAIV, the NCAA (2017) provided a specific webpage that keeps various constituencies abreast of all its anti-violence efforts, but persistent headlines about student-athlete misconduct may indicate a disconnect between the NCAA’s messages and the application of those awareness and prevention efforts by its member institutions. In 2016, an internal report by Baylor University (Kelderman & Wilson, 2016) revealed:
the Baptist university’s failures to respond properly to numerous reports of sexual assault on the campus over three academic years, especially those involving its powerhouse football team. The board’s summary of findings, by investigators from the law firm Pepper Hamilton LLC, concluded that Baylor's processes for dealing with such complaints were “wholly inadequate,” and that high-level administrators and athletics staff members had “directly discouraged” students from reporting assaults and, in one case, had retaliated against a student who reported an incident. (p. A6)

Most recently, an investigation into Michigan State University’s (MSU) sexual assault allegation response protocol resulted from the criminal conviction of Dr. Larry Nassar for multiple counts of sexual assault committed against gymnasts. Nassar served as the team doctor for USA gymnastics and treated several athletes at an MSU campus clinic. While MSU offers an NCAA women’s gymnastics team, the investigation did not identify victims who were current student-athletes at the time of victimization. However, allegations claimed that MSU officials (including a gymnastics coach) received complaints about Nassar as early as the 1990s. The Nassar case spawned a broader look at MSU’s handling of sexual assault claims in other areas of its athletic department. Specifically, questions arose about mishandling of claims by MSU head football coach, Mark Dantonio, and iconic men’s basketball coach, Larry Izzo. In the wake of these investigations, MSU’s athletic director (Solari, 2018) and university president resigned (Almasy, 2018) amid pressure from university constituencies.
Despite similar pressure from the media (Carter & Brown, 2017) and government 
(Sexual violence on campus, 2014) to be more punitive with universities that enable 
sexual violence, the NCAA has responded inconsistently regarding its responsibility to 
ensure the ethical conduct of its student-athletes. NCAA President Mark Emmert initially 
placed responsibility for handling sexual assaults on individual institutions (“NCAA boss 
Mark Emmert,” 2014). However, two years later, he asserted that the NCAA should have 
direct power to punish such cases (“Mark Emmert wants rules,” 2016). To date, the only 
administrative stance taken by the NCAA was a resolution passed by its Executive 
Committee that challenged institutions to comply and cooperate with campus and legal 
authorities during sexual assault investigations (NCAA, 2014). The ASAIV accompanied 
the resolution, providing a rare policy for examination on how the NCAA responds to 
sexual assault. In October of 2016, the NCAA supplemented the ASAIV with another 
publication, Sexual Violence Prevention: An Athletics Tool Kit for a Healthy and Safe 
Culture (SVP), intended to “help NCAA member schools develop and promote a culture 
on campus that is free from violence – one that values, respects and defends the dignity 
of all people and upholds the inherent value of each individual” (NCAA, 2016, p. 3). 

**Purpose of the Study**

Some legal scholars have recommended what the NCAA could be doing to stem 
sexual violence committed by student-athletes, such as create a uniform conduct code for 
all student-athletes (Gutshall, 2007), allow “in-sport punishment” for civil misconduct 
(Tracy, 2009), or remove athletic eligibility from student-athletes found responsible for 
extraordinary powers, so if it had rules against sexual assault, they would be highly significant” (p. 225). However, thus far no studies have examined the organization’s efforts to reduce sexual assault committed by student-athletes. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the NCAA’s (2014) ASAIV, including the content and historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to its development. Related to this examination is a discussion of the role of the NCAA’s power to address sexual assault and interpersonal violence and the responsibility of athletics within it.

**Significance of the Study**

As noted above, the prevalence of sexual violence on campuses, in general, and the prevalence of sexual violence committed by student-athletes, in particular, are significant issues. As arguably the most influential and powerful governing body in intercollegiate sport (Chu, Segrave, & Becker, 1985; Koch, 1973), the NCAA plays an important role in addressing athletics’ responsibility in preventing sexual assault and interpersonal violence on college campuses. To date, the ASAIV has been the most substantial contribution to the NCAA’s prevention efforts.

Despite the NCAA’s power to influence stakeholders in intercollegiate sports and academia, documents published by the organization have rarely been examined. Epstein and Anderson (2009), for example, explored the NCAA Manual as a potential teaching tool for sport studies students. Likewise, examinations of ASAIV could provide readers with:

- discussions of the way in which any business or organization responds and adapts to changing times, terms, and technologies. It also allows for the students and
instructor to consider and analyze whether the NCAA has drafted effective and enforceable internal rules, regulations, or policies. (Esptein & Anderson, 2009, p. 110)

Additionally, I interpret the ASAIV as an ideological apparatus, as described by Althusser (1971). The ASAIV represents an educational conduit by which an ideology is reproduced, maintaining a status quo. As such, examination of the ASAIV may reveal ideologies obscured by the NCAA’s mission and resolutions.

For practitioners, findings from this study might inform development of future sexual assault education and prevention guides and improve adoption and application by member institutions. Finally, context provided by the guide’s authors revealed new NCAA organizational insight and subtext toward the issue of sexual violence committed by student-athletes.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. How did Wilson et al. (2014) discuss athletics’ role in support of healthy and safe campuses?
   a. How did historical, political, and organizational factors contribute to the development of the ASAIV?
   b. Why did the NCAA create the ASAIV?

2. How has the NCAA used its power to address sexual assault and interpersonal violence?
Limitations

The role of the researcher and implicit biases influences the interpretation of sources, such as interviews and documents. Thus, Booth (2005) noted that the construction of “history is a constantly shifting process of interpretation” (pp. 40-41). White (1995) wrote, “the relation between facts and events is always open to negotiation and reconceptualization, not because events change with time, but because we change our ways of conceptualizing them” (pp. 239-240). Further, a priori knowledge and social theories frame interpretations and impose meanings (Booth, 2005). Whereas these influences on interpretation can be regarded as either a limitation or a strength of qualitative research (Coakley, 2007), availability and validity of sources has more commonly been regarded a limitation (Booth, 2005). This includes the trustworthiness of participants, including their ability and willingness to recall the past accurately (Booth, 2005; Ritchie, 2003).

Inability to guarantee participant confidentiality might have limited what participants shared in interviews. I selected participants based on their contribution to the development of the ASAIV. Therefore, I prioritized contextualization of the information they provided with a description of the circumstances.

Delimitations

1. The unit of analysis is restricted to a singular document, the ASAIV.

2. I collected historical and contextual data strictly from 2011 to present, reflecting the general timeline of the development of the ASAIV.
3. I arbitrarily chose three confirmed interview participants as a satisfactory number, although I reached out to five total prospective participants. Thus, I delimited by interview sample size.

**Definitions of Selected Terms**

*Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE):* A provision of VAWA, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act “increases transparency on campus about incidents of sexual violence, guarantees victims enhanced rights, sets standards for disciplinary proceedings, and requires campus-wide prevention education programs” (Know Your IX, 2017, para. 2).

*Constructionism:* “a model of historical enquiry that looks for patterns, processes, and relationships as a way of explaining the past (compared to reconstructionism that attempts to reconstruct the past as it actually was, and deconstructionism that focuses on the role of language in making history)” (Booth, 2005, p. 302).

*Contextualization:* “an approach in which the historian attempts to understand phenomena by placing them in the circumstances in which they occurred” (Booth, 2005, p. 302).

*Deconstructionism:* “a model of historical inquiry that questions the assumptions of truth and objectivity that underpin reconstructionism (a model that emphasises reconstructing the past as it actually was) and constructionism (a model that examines patterns, processes, and relationships to explain the past) and focuses on the role of language, especially discourse in shaping the content of history” (Booth, 2005, p. 302).
Empiricism: “a method of knowledge in which the latter is gained by observation and experience. Empiricism is usually accompanied by the corollary that objective observation provide access to reality” (Booth, 2005, p. 302).

Explanatory paradigm: “a mode of practice” (Booth, 2005, p. 303), specifically “an interactive structure of workable questions and the factual statements which are adduced to answer them” (Fischer, 1979, xvi). “Context” is a commonly used explanatory paradigm in sport history (Booth, 2005).

Method: “a mode of procedure to obtain an object. The historical method includes the techniques and strategies employed to gather and interrogate data and to acquire knowledge about the past. The methods of reconstructionism focus primarily on gathering and interrogating materials from the past, those of constructionism include the development of concepts and theories, and those of deconstructionism involve deep interpretation” (Booth, 2005, p. 304).


National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA): The NCAA is an association of 1,273 universities, athletic conferences, and related associations organized with the intent of protecting student athletes, emphasizing excellence in academics and athletics. The NCAA is comprised of three separate divisions: Division I, Division II, and Division III (NCAA, 2012).
**Policymaking:** “a purposeful course of action taken by an individual or organization that results in movement toward operating goals” (Rockwood, 1980, p. 190).

**Positionality,** “the stance or positioning of the researcher in relation to the social and political context of the study—the community, the organization or the participant group” (Rowe, 2014, p. 628).

**Power:** Weber (1968/1922) classically defined power as “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which the probability rests” (p. 53).

**Race:** Race is a division of humans categorized by inherited physical characteristics such as skin color or hair type. Once thought to be entirely based on genetics, the definition is contested among biologists and scholars of other disciplines (Bamshad & Olson, 2003).

**Rape:** The World Health Organization (2013) defined rape as “physically forced or otherwise coerced penetration—even if slight—of the vulva or anus, using a penis, other body parts or an object” (p. viii).

**Rape myth:** Burt (1980) defined rape myths as “prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists” (p. 217).

**Rape supportive attitude:** Also referred to as an Attitude Toward Rape (ATR), Feild (1978) summarized an ATR as an opinion or belief that diminished rape, rape victims, and excused rapists.

**Reconstructionism:** “a model of historical enquiry that emphasises the use of empiricism to reconstruct the past (compared with constructionism that looks at patterns,
processes and relationships to explain the past, and deconstructionism that focuses on the role of language in making history)” (Booth, 2005, p. 305).

**Reflexivity**: “an awareness of the self in the situation of action and of the role of the self in constructing that situation…distinct from reflectivity in its focus on the constitutive role of the self” (Bloor & Wood, 2011, p. 146).

**Sexual assault.** Sexual assault is “any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. Falling under the definition of sexual assault are sexual activities as forced sexual intercourse, forcible sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape” (Department of Justice, 2017, para. 1).

**Sexual harassment:** The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (2017) defined sexual harassment as “unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical harassment of a sexual nature” (para. 1).

**Sexual violence:** For the purposes of this study, sexual violence is identified as “any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work” (World Health Organization, 2002, p. 149).

**Sport-related violence (SRV):** Young (2012) defined SRV as “(a) direct acts of physical violence contained within or outside the rule of the game that result in injury to persons, animals or property; and (b) harmful or potentially harmful acts
conducted in the context of sport that threaten or produce injury or that violate human justices and civil liberties” (p. 15).

**Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA):** Passed in 2013, this federal act dedicated federal funds to increased awareness of domestic violence and other sex crimes, provision of support to victims, improved investigative and prosecutorial resources (Sacco, 2015).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

To thoroughly examine the NCAA’s *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), it is prudent to regard the history of its guiding organization. This literature review begins with a brief historical overview of the NCAA. The following section examines the phenomenon of sexual violence deductively. First, I define and examined sexual violence in a global and American lens. Next, I explain the prevalence of sexual violence on American college campuses. Finally, this section explores how sexual violence and intercollegiate culture intersect.

History of the NCAA

Though not uncontested (Nixon, 2014), among the governing bodies in US intercollegiate sports, the NCAA has long been regarded as “the most powerful and the most prestigious” (Koch, 1973, p. 135) and “the most influential” (Chu, Segrave, & Becker, 1985, p. xi). Academic and journalistic concerns about cheating in sports, compromised classroom integrity, and college football brutality, coupled with the social reform awareness of the Progressive Movement, led to the creation of the NCAA (Smith, 2011). The organization was originally conceived as the Executive Committee on the New Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States at a meeting on December 28, 1905 in New York City. Representatives from 68 institutions attended the meeting and reformation of college football rules to reduce severe injuries was the only major ratification resulting from the quorum. The NCAA’s original purpose was the regulation of intercollegiate sports to maintain the “ethical plane” and purpose of higher education.
Smith (2011) noted that beyond the initial radical convention, the NCAA was nothing more than a faculty debate club for the better half of the 20th century. Very few rules created by the NCAA were enacted unilaterally among institutions. However, there was strength in the organization’s ability to provide a national platform for the discussion of intercollegiate issues.

For the organization’s first 90 years, faculty representatives held most of the power, but that changed in the mid-1990s (Smith, 2011). In 1997, university presidents seized the lions’ share of the legislative power; however, the Knight Commission of 2001 would reinstitute some faculty representative power. As currently constructed, the NCAA (2017) is comprised of over 1,100 institutions, nearly 100 athletic conferences, and almost 40 affiliated organizations. The governance structure allows for the input of “presidents and chancellors, directors of athletics, athletics administrators, coaches, faculty representatives, conference personnel and student-athletes” (NCAA, 2017, para. 3).

Sexual Violence

Violence against women is a global phenomenon; thirty-five percent of the world’s women will be victimized by an intimate partner in their lifetime (World Health Organization, 2017). More discouraging is the likelihood that prevalence of violence against women is underestimated. Violence against women came to the forefront of American consciousness when President Barack Obama signed the Violence Against Women Act in 2013, which included the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE) (S. Res. 128, 2013). SaVE called for campuses to improve sexual violence
awareness, prevention, and reporting. Further, President Obama (2014) asserted that meeting with intercollegiate athletic organizations would be a specific aim of an anti-sexual-violence task force because they are “external stakeholders” in the problem of campus sexual assault.

**Sexual violence.** For the purposes of this study, sexual violence is identified as: any sexual act, attempt to obtain a sexual act, unwanted sexual comments or advances, or acts to traffic, or otherwise directed, against a person’s sexuality using coercion, by any person regardless of their relationship to the victim, in any setting, including but not limited to home and work. (World Health Organization, 2013, p. viii)

Sexual violence, which includes rape, is often used interchangeably with sexual assault, sexual harassment, domestic violence and dating violence and can overlap, a concept Hamby and Grych (2013) deemed *co-occurrence*. However, domestic violence specifically refers to acts (not necessarily sexual) between intimate partners or other familial relationships (e.g., child abuse) (Miethe & Diebert, 2007); dating violence indicates acts within a dating relationship (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).

**Sexual violence on campus.** Colleges are high-risk communities for sexual assault, particularly for women (Moynihan et al., 2010). Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) surveyed 4,446 women enrolled at two or four-year colleges and found that 4.9 percent were victimized in a particular calendar year. Krebs et al. (2009) conducted a survey of 5,446 undergraduates found that 20 percent of college women have experienced attempted or completed sexual assault since enrolling. According to
McMahon, Postmus, and Koenick (2011), between 20 and 25% of American college women experienced attempted or completed rape during their college tenure based on a literature review of the issue. Most recently, 15% of undergraduate women at the University of Texas, a campus of 50,000 students, reported being raped during their attendance there (The University of Texas, 2017).

Sexual violence committed by student-athletes. Research on the relationship between men’s sport culture and violence against women began in the 1980s (Sabo & Runfola, 1980). Ehrhart and Sandler (1985) found that 30% of group rape incidents \(n = 50\) reported to a university over a 2-year period involved athletes; however, academic focus on intercollegiate athletic culture and sexual assault fully emerged in the 1990s. Melnick (1992) posited several contributors to sexual assault committed by student-athletes, including attitudes related to violent sports and “big man on campus syndrome.” Further, he suggested solutions: a more expedient punitive process, preventative education for student-athletes, integrations of student-athletes into general student residence halls, and a total reconstruction of the male sport culture, among others. Examinations of sexual assault committed by student-athletes are overwhelmingly quantitative and few studies have pursued the phenomenon during the last 15 years (McCray, 2015).

Fritner and Rubinson (1993) examined alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership as factors in sexual misconduct among college students. In a survey of 925 randomly selected women at a large Midwestern university, over 27% self-reported being a victim of various levels of sex crimes. Of those, over 22% self-reported that the
perpetrator was a student-athlete, despite male student-athletes representing less than 2% of the total male student population.

Crosset, Benedict, and McDonald (1995) went to great lengths to tap a yet unused source of data: campus police records and campus judicial affairs records. They scoured police records of 20 Division I institutions and judicial affair office records of 10 Division I institutions. They found that, while student-athletes are overrepresented in both domains, student-athletes are only significantly more represented than non-student-athletes in judicial affairs reports. Crosset, Ptacek, Benedict, and McDonald (1996) focused solely on the judicial affairs reports to include battery with sexual assault, reaffirming that student-athletes were significantly overrepresented compared to non-student-athletes. The study sampled records at 10 institutions, yielding 90 total reports of sexual assault. Student-athletes comprised 35% of the reported cases, despite representing only 3% of the student population. In addition to prevalence of sexual violence committed by student-athletes, their sexual aggression and attitudes have also been examined.

**Student-Athletes. Aggression and Attitudes.** Koss and Gaines (1993) examined alcohol, fraternity participation, and athletic participation as predictors of sexual aggression in a survey of 530 undergraduate men at an institution with a highly successful athletic department. Athletic participation was found to be a predictor of sexual aggression, but the authors conceded that alcohol and nicotine use were stronger predictors. Boeringer (1996, 1999) supplemented prior research on student-athletes’ actions and behaviors with studies on their attitudes toward sexual aggression. For
example, in a survey of 477 undergraduate men at a large Southeastern university, student athletes were found to have a greater rape-supportive disposition (Boeringer, 1996, p. 134). It is important to note, however, that the survey was hypothetical in nature: it asked what sexually aggressive strategies would be used if the student knew he would not be caught. Boeringer (1999) followed with an additional examination of rape-supportive attitudes using the same sample and found that student-athletes display a significantly greater belief in several rape-supportive myths such as “drunk women at a party are fair game for everyone.” Sawyer, Thompson, and Chicorelli (2002) examined rape myth acceptance in a convenience sample consisting of 704 intercollegiate student-athletes across five universities. Results revealed that male student-athletes, particularly those in team sports, displayed a higher acceptance of rape myths.

**Title IX deficiencies.** Title IX asserted, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance” (S. Res. 86, 1972). Further, courts have determined that sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination and is included in Title IX protection (Connolly & Marshall, 1989). Several legal scholars have pointed out that athletic department involvement in Title IX sexual assault investigations has been slow, inadequate, and gives preferential treatment to accused athletes (Moorman & Osborne, 2016; Parent, 2003; Scales; 2009).

Moorman and Osborne (2016) asserted “student-athletes and athletics administration are often centrally involved in cases involving sexual violence” (p. 577).
Davis and Parker (1998) revealed pursuing Title IX litigation is slow, but “student-athlete violence against women, when combined with institutional indifference, sets the stage for women victims to meet the requisite evidentiary burdens” of proving non-compliance (p. 116). Until recently, accusers needed only to provide a preponderance of evidence to meet the burden of proof in campus sexual assault claims, but in September of 2017, Betsy DeVos, the current U.S. Secretary of Education, announced interim guidance that included a shift toward clear and convincing evidence in adjudicating such cases (Department of Education, 2017). The change was intended to increase fairness for the accused in campus sexual assault cases.

Additionally, Parent (2003) asserted that institutional Title IX liability for sexual assault allegations against football players begins with their recruitment. Football players are sometimes recruited from difficult, violent backgrounds. Parent (2003) interviewed Dr. Earl Smith, an African-American sociologist, to provide context on sexual assault as a potentially racial issue. Smith asserted football programs are increasingly recruiting “from bad areas where violence, rape, sexual assault and murder are part of their everyday lives” (as cited in Parent, 2003, p. 640). Further, there is an altruistic notion that giving these athletes an opportunity in athletics may prevent them from a life of crime; some coaches blindly believe they can put a troubled student-athlete on a better path. However, a coach may be unwittingly placing a troubled student-athlete in an environment where opportunities for sexual assault may be more frequent.

Parent (2003) offered four “prescriptions” for Title IX deficiencies and addressing alleged football sexual violence transgressions: (a) education, (b) accountability, (c)
independence, and (d) consistency. Finally, Scales (2009) observed athletic departments have a vested interest in keeping student-athletes on the field (as coaches’ and athletic administrators’ jobs are ultimately predicated on winning) and other departments who may handle student misconduct, such as student life, are often not sufficiently equipped to provide adequate Title IX procedures.

**NCAA Policy Research**

Several scholars have addressed NCAA policy development (Ananiades, 2012; Covell & Barr, 2001; Franklin, 2005; Gutshall, 2007; LaForge & Hodge, 2011; Staurowsky, 2007; A. Tracy, 2009). LaForge and Hodge (2011) examined institutional implications for the NCAA’s 2003 policy to utilize student-athlete graduation rates as a measure of compliance. Staurowsky (2007) examined White power and privilege implications of the NCAA’s decision to bar display of Native American mascots and imagery at NCAA events. Franklin (2005) examined and criticized the Native American mascot policy as a violation of anti-trust law. These studies shed light on the processes by which NCAA policy is created and the struggle to both protect the interests of the organization and the rights of the individual institutions and its student-athletes. However, few studies have examined NCAA policy regarding sexual assault and athletics.

Perhaps no individuals have more power to influence sexual assault policy change than college presidents, as the most influential policymaking personnel of the NCAA and presumably the most influential individuals on their campuses. Indeed, college presidents have historically asserted their power when it comes to student-athletes and their athletic eligibility (Covell & Barr, 2001). It is perhaps expected that college presidents would
prioritize educational standards; however, athletics policy that may make academic environments safer for women has not been a priority. I question why college presidents have not been similarly active to expand their power to legislate student-athlete policy for sexual assault to create safer academic environments for women, which is a specific intention of Title IX. The argument could be made that to enact policy specifically toward student-athletes would be unfair. However, given that many student-athletes are visible representatives of a university who often enjoy resources not provided to the rest of the student body (e.g., reduced academic admission requirements, full scholarships, room and board, stipends, free athletic apparel, and special access to athletic training and nutrition), it would not be unreasonable to mandate a higher level of behavior in return.

In two recent sexual assault scandals involving athletes at Baylor University and Michigan State University, both college presidents lost their position as a part of the fallout. Baylor president Ken Starr was ousted by university regents (Ambrose & Tarrant, 2016) and MSU president Lou Anna Simon resigned (Svrluga, 2018). Perhaps such continued executive-level culpability, whether actual or symbolic, might encourage college presidents to take a more active role in athletic sexual assault policy on their own campuses and with their votes in the NCAA. By definition, a resignation is an act of agency, but university president resignations are commonly a result of pressure from leadership, faculty, alumni, or other constituencies. Hopkins (2003) viewed such “corporate accountability” as an avenue of punitive policy that the NCAA should pursue. The ASAIV is a preventative approach to sexual violence committed by student-athletes. By contrast, punitive approaches, particularly for responsible individuals, have yet to be
fully explored by the NCAA. Perhaps this is because, as Hopkins (2003) warned, it is challenging to punish an individual student-athlete without unfairly hurting the rest of the team and false allegations do occur.

For example, the 2006 Duke lacrosse scandal featured undeserved punishments for individuals and the team, as several student-athletes were falsely accused of rape and the team’s remaining schedule was canceled (Taylor, 2007). Nonetheless, false accusations of sexual assault are rare (Wilson et al., 2014) and universities and athletic departments administer judicial proceedings and punishment for responsible individuals inconsistently. Such inconsistencies raise the issues of whether alleged perpetrators should be able to compete while an investigation is ongoing and to what extent a student-athlete found guilty should be able to return to competition. Gutshall (2007) addressed both issues while calling for a uniform NCAA policy for student-athlete misconduct. Specifically, the author recommended that allegations of sexual assault, which can be classified as serious misdemeanor or felony level violations, must be investigated within four days of the alleged event and that student-athletes be suspended from official team or sport activities until the review is completed. Further, Gutshall (2007) argued serious misdemeanor violations should result in a student-athlete being suspended from 50% to 100% of remaining competitions, while felonies should result in immediate dismissal from the team, including loss of any financial aid. Such a policy would also remove the burden from member institutions and eliminate the risk that a university would apply punishment on a case by case basis. Additionally, a uniform policy would reaffirm the
NCAA’s commitment to providing a level playing field, as student-athletes at different universities would be punished equally for committing the same violation.

Similarly, Ananiades (2012) argued that the NCAA is in a better position to police sexual assault than its member institutions, citing its responsibility “to ensure the health and safety of student-athletes, as well as the espoused principles of intercollegiate athletics” (p. 466). A primary facet of the suggested policy mandated that student-athletes found guilty of sexual assault should lose athletic eligibility immediately and prevent them from transferring schools and competing elsewhere. However, Gutshall (2007) asserted that immediate suspension of athletic eligibility for student-athletes accused of sexual assault would not be realistic due to the possibility, though small, of a false allegation. Further, the Dear Colleague Letter (2011) allows for a sixty-day investigation. I argue that immediate athletic suspension for accused student-athletes should be considered because it would encourage schools to expedite an investigation and make the accused student-athlete more available to investigators during the process.

Historically, the NCAA has been reluctant to issue policy specifically addressing sexual assault; however, upon recommendations made by the NCAA’s Commission to Combat Sexual Violence, in 2017 the Board of Governors (formerly known as the Executive Committee) mandated that each year every university president/chancellor, athletic director, and Title IX coordinator must attest that:

The athletics department is fully knowledgeable about, integrated in, and compliant with institutional policies and processes regarding sexual violence prevention and proper adjudication and resolution of acts of sexual violence.
The institutional policies and processes regarding sexual violence prevention and adjudication, and the name and contact information for the campus Title IX coordinator, are readily available within the department of athletics, and are provided to student-athletes.

All student-athletes, coaches and staff have been educated on sexual violence prevention, intervention and response, to the extent allowable by state law and collective bargaining agreements. (NCAA, 2017, p. 2)

The following chapter discusses the methodology of this study.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I first provide a summary of my positionality, which includes identities, experiences, and how they intersect the topic of this study. Next, I lay out theoretical frameworks that inform this study. Further, I discuss the ontological and epistemological assumptions. Finally, I conclude this chapter with a data collection and analysis overview.

Positionality

In this section, I discuss my positionality, or “the stance or positioning of the researcher in relation to the social and political context of the study—the community, the organization or the participant group” (Rowe, 2014, p. 628). As Greenbank (2003) concluded, “researchers should adopt a reflexive approach and attempt to be honest and open about how values influence their research” (p. 791). I view reflexivity as “an awareness of the self in the situation of action and of the role of the self in constructing that situation…distinct from reflectivity in its focus on the constitutive role of the self” (Bloor & Wood, 2011, p. 146) Thus, I describe elements of my upbringing, demographic markers, educational experiences, and my relationship with sport. All of these place me in a particular position in relation to the topic of this study.

I am a 39-year-old White man living in the Midwestern region of the United States, although I conducted a majority of this study while living in the Southeast. I have lived in predominately White neighborhoods most of my life. Because of my predominately White social spheres, I have recognized how my race enjoys advantages when it comes to avoiding criminal punishment. Fifty-seven percent of sexual assault
perpetrators are White (RAINN, 2018); however, in intercollegiate sport, which is increasingly racially diverse, stories presented by the media make it feels as though most student-athletes accused of sexual assault are African-American. I observe that most headlined student-athlete sexual assault accusations involve major Division I NCAA schools that often feature African-American-dominated rosters for men’s basketball and football, which seem to be the most likely sports involved.

I cannot remember life without sport in it. My earliest childhood memories are dominated by tee-ball games and attending collegiate football games with my father. I have had easy access to higher education: I hold a bachelor’s degree in film and digital media, a master’s degree in education, and I am working toward a doctoral degree in sport socio-cultural studies.

**Where I come from.** I grew up in Waco, Texas. Because my mother was mostly a single mother and a teacher, my brothers and I lived in many different apartments and homes, depending on what places offered the best rent from year to year. I can recollect living in at least six different homes between ages five and twelve years old. Texas is a very diverse state. I was very fortunate to have many minority friends growing up during my childhood. Texas is, however, a very conservative region, highly influenced by Southern Christian traditions; so my exposure to different politics and philosophies was limited. Nonetheless, being a Texan is very much a unique identity that is dominated by a sense of state pride acquired at a very young age. However, my perception of what it means to be a Texan is skewed by my racial privilege, as being a Mexican-American or undocumented citizen in Texas may feel oppressed or marginalized. Further, I am
squarely middle-class and I identify as heterosexual, therefore my sense of pride in Texas is far more positive than someone who experienced poverty or marginalization on the basis of a different sexuality.

**Sport influences.** My father is a former NCAA football player and college football referee. So my love of football started early and was encouraged throughout my childhood. My mother was a high school cheerleader, but learned to love tennis in college. She was still playing doubles when she was eight months pregnant with me. At 77, she continues to play competitive team tennis. My parents divorced when I was five and I played catch more often with my mom as I lived only with her most of my childhood. I also have three older brothers who were good athletes; escaping the influence of sport was near impossible.

I grew up learning much of life’s lessons through the lens of being an athlete and fan. Between my father, stepfathers, older brothers and coaches, there was never a single, monolithic father-figure in my life. Despite the constant carousel of homes and schools, the constant in my life was sport. And often, coaches were the most consistent, influential figures in my life. As a youth who had everything he needed to be successful (in addition to the rewards inherent with being a White male), being an athlete was my way of finding a struggle, something hard from which to gain confidence, strength and accomplishment from success, failure and burning thighs and lungs. I did not have a Great Depression or a Great War, but I had to learn to hit a curveball and absorb a bone-crushing tackle without fumbling the football. These were ways I could show resolve and be masculine. Despite involuntary indoctrination into Texas Baptist tradition and adhering to the Golden Rule,
sport was my Church of Life. I was a late-bloomer, but I enjoyed the discovery that when you ran harder and longer, you became faster, when you lifted weights more, you became stronger. Certainly, I translated this work ethic into other aspects of my life, as a student and employee, and now as a father. I strongly believe that being an athlete—the training, the coaching, the underdog victories, and unexpected defeats—can prepare one to be successful in non-sport spheres.

It did not take me long to recognize that being an athlete, primarily in high school baseball and football in Texas, afforded me luxuries that non-athletes (and athletes in other sports) did not enjoy. The only drawback of athletic affiliation was the oft oppressive practice and training requirements. For example, I dreaded two-a-day practices in the sweltering August heat. Football is a religion in Texas and many town businesses shut down early on Friday nights so that everyone in the community can go to the game. I was popular, in large part, because I wore a jersey in the hallways on Fridays before game days. I was not sexy (at least, not in a heteronormative way), but being an athlete probably earned me a few romantic encounters I would otherwise not have received. I also learned more about sex from older, “more mature” teammates on away game bus rides than from my parents: reaching second base meant more than just hitting a double, apparently. While I was far from a trouble-maker, I observed those who played football, especially starters and superstars on my team, partied harder than non-athletes, yet were less likely to get into major trouble because of their status. Second chances were plentiful for those who scored many touchdowns or made may tackles. I also realized, however, that the power and influence of being an athlete came with responsibilities. You
no longer just represent yourself; you represent a team and a school. Charles Barkley (1993) once claimed he was not a role model (“I'm not a role model”); however, I experienced that athletes, whether they want to be or not, are role models. I remember elementary school boys and girls waiting to give me high fives after games. And I wasn’t even that good.

In addition to my experiences as an athlete, I also spent many Saturday afternoons watching my father officiate college football games from the sidelines in the old Southwest Conference. I stood next to giant coaches and players, who spit, scratched, cussed, threw Gatorade coolers, and then prayed after games. I wondered why what was not acceptable off the field was the norm between the whistles and white lines. I was enthralled by amazing athletic performances on the field, but I had a hard time reconciling them when my heroes got in trouble off the field. They weren’t just heroes, actually. They were superheroes to me. I found that as a high school and recreational athlete in college, I sometimes exhibited some of this bad behavior on and off the field. I remember watching a Major League Baseball player breaking a bat over his head. I learned this cannot be done with an aluminum bat when you are 11 years old. Was I emulating those I watched? Or did I think being an athlete afforded me the latitude to be deviant? Why could men act like boys on a gridiron or diamond, but not at a job or in a household?

I had opportunities to play baseball at smaller colleges, but wisely, I chose to focus on studies—and to have fun being a regular college kid—at Baylor University in Waco, Texas. However, I spent more time playing intramural sports than I did on my film
degree. My undergraduate GPA reflected that. My first job upon graduation was sports broadcasting for a fledgling internet company in the early 2000s. I spent a season of Fridays in small Texas towns with my play-by-play partner, watching terrific high school football and the adoration heaped upon the athletes. And the mood of these communities driven by wins or losses. I noticed that it didn’t matter if a town was struggling economically. If it had a good football team, all was right with the world. Great teams gave their towns something to rally around—or sometimes to mourn. I also experienced what it meant to create heroes and villains through the airwaves; I believe this is still an objective of contemporary media. The internet broadcasting company flopped, however, and I began a near-decade working in higher education a few years later.

**Sport research influences.** I returned to Baylor University in 2003 as an admissions counselor, someone who helped guide prospective high school students and parents through the application process. In June of that year, a Baylor basketball player, Patrick Dennehy, was murdered by teammate, Carlton Dotson (Aydelotte, 2005). The basketball program was subsequently embroiled in a scandal that led to the resignation of the head coach and massive penalties incurred by the NCAA. I wondered how teammates, those who fight for each other, could fight against each other and how a head coach could try to spin a murder as a drug deal gone bad to protect his reputation. I wondered how a Christian institution of higher learning could be so naïve—or so apathetic. In retrospect, however, I fully believed the Dennehy murder was an aberration—a level of scandal that could never happen at Baylor again. Later in my admissions career, I earned the opportunity to help Baylor coaches entertain and guide
prospective athletes on campus. I would frequently give tours to high school athletes and their families. I oversaw several high-profile athletes’ admissions files. I saw their grades and SAT/ACT scores and wondered how they could possibly succeed at a rigorous institution. Of course, I soon learned how standardized testing practices are stacked against minorities (Reese, 2017), but I also wondered how non-athlete minorities might feel about someone else getting admitted simply because of athletic ability. I also had the opportunity to advise, on a voluntary and non-paid basis, Baylor’s athlete hosting program. This all-women’s group wore dresses and cowboy boots to football games as they were paired with prospective student-athletes. All of them were heteronormatively attractive. Even a Christian university was not below selling sex (or the hope of sex) to entice athletes. Working in admissions garnered entrée (albeit a small outsider’s glimpse) into intercollegiate athletic clockwork that left much up to ethical debate. Was the aim of intercollegiate athletics to provide students an opportunity to earn a college degree via sport, or was it—as is the case at the professional level—simply revenue-generating entertainment provided to students and alumni?

I began my MSEd in Sport Management in 2011. I had seen student-athletes manipulated and discarded, yet in hearkening to my athletic experiences, still saw a benefit in the endeavor. I wanted to use my observations and experiences to help them. At Baylor, the largest Baptist University in the world, spirituality (or the pursuit thereof) was omnipresent—in the curriculum, steeple-like features on campus buildings and in the distinctively Southern prayers before virtually every university-sponsored event. I wondered if the religious environment helped athletes adjust to college, or perhaps helped
them cope with defeat and injury. I examined the religiosity of NCAA student-athletes and how it might relate to their performance on the field and in the classroom (Evans, 2013). Two studies I read posited that religion could be a preventative factor in risky sexual behavior (Hill, Burdette, Ellison, & Musick, 2006; Hill, Ellison, Burdette, & Musick, 2007). In the recent wake of the ubiquitous Ray Rice and Adrian Peterson domestic violence and child abuse scandals, respectively, I wondered what elements could help athletes avoid these situations. Athletes do not commit sexual violence at a statistically significant higher rate than the general population, but on college campuses, they trail only Greek men in the same category (Crosset, 1999). As a critical humanist, however, I believe that the individuals involved in hypermasculine sports structures that often harbor sexual violence possess the agency to liberate themselves and others from “dominating and imprisoning social processes” (Rossman & Rallis, 2012, p. 44). My research seeks to raise awareness about the issue of sexual violence committed by student-athletes and what can be shared and learned in preventing its frequency and, further, positioning student-athletes as stakeholders in the fight against sexual violence within and out of the sports sphere. I believe my experiences as insider (athlete) and outsider (fan, intercollegiate athletics support staff, and scholar) can serve me well and provide diverse insight into this endeavor; I can connect with student-athletes and sports administrators alike.

**Ethical commitments.** With regard to this study and critical theory, my ethical commitments include to use my power to discover and apply knowledge that will
contribute to holistic student-athlete development, as well as to maintain that the NCAA has an obligation to use all of its power to protect student-athletes.

**Theoretical Frameworks**

Two frameworks inform this study: contextual constructivism and critical theory. Based on Munslow’s (1997) models of historical inquiry, Booth (2005) outlined three commonly used models in sport history: reconstructionism, constructionism, and deconstructionism. In this context, a model is “a descriptive term for a strand of inquiry… [that] systematically frames the analysis of a core set of empirical or theoretical problems” (Booth, 2005, p. 304). For the analysis of the development of *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), this study was largely informed by the constructionist model.

Booth’s (2005) sport history models differ from each other in objective, epistemology, and presentation. In terms of objectives, I aspired to interpret how historical patterns have influenced the development of the ASAIV and the NCAA’s use of power in addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence (constructionist). Constructionism privileges empiricism,

- a method of knowledge in which the latter is gained by observation and experience. Empiricism is usually accompanied by the corollary that objective observation provide access to reality. (Booth, 2005, p. 302)

As Booth (2005) explained, constructionism is an “evidence-based, objectivist-inspired model” that encourages historians to create accurate, truthful tellings of the past. (p. 10). Additionally, constructionism embraces a priori knowledge (i.e., theory) and mediates
assumed objectivity with theory and concepts (e.g., critical theory and power).

Integration of theory is fundamental for several reasons, including that the volume of historical evidence mandates selection and identifying patterns in history involves abstraction as well as theoretical application and interpretation (Booth, 2005).

In addition to a constructionist historical model, an explanatory paradigm of context guided this study (Booth, 2005). “More specific than a mode, yet less prescriptive than a method,” an explanatory paradigm is “a mode of practice” (Booth, 2005, pp. 13, 303), specifically “an interactive structure of workable questions and the factual statements which are adduced to answer them” (Fischer, 1979, xvi). In other words, explanatory paradigms frame questions and answer, as well as structure arguments (Booth, 2005). Constructionist historians commonly adopt the context paradigm. It highlights the interrelationship between sport and society and allows for political, social, and economic contexts to both explain and legitimize the study of sport (Booth, 2005).

Based on Marwick’s (1998) work, Booth (2005) considered four main components within the context paradigm: (a) major forces and constraints, (b) events; (c) human agents; and (d) convergences and contingencies. Major forces and constraints can be structural (e.g., economic), ideological (e.g., amateurism), and institutional (e.g., the NCAA or individual universities). Under events fall those “that have effect and consequences” (p. 18) (e.g., the passing of Title IX). Human agents produce similar outcomes (e.g., university presidents). Lastly, convergences and contingencies are “interrelationships between events and human agents that generate unforeseen events and circumstances” (p. 18).
As noted above, constructionist historians adopt a priori knowledge, such as social theories and concepts, to guide their understanding of historical developments. Thus, for this study, I used a critical theory perspective. Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) asserted critical theorists produce “undeniably dangerous knowledge, the kind of information and insight that upsets institutions and threatens to overturn sovereign regimes of truth” (p. 279). According to Allan (2005), critical theory is generally “directed toward changing the existing society in some way. It is contrasted with descriptive theory that seeks only to describe things as they are. Critical theory generally deconstructs social relationships or arrangements to reveal the underlying ideology” (p. 397). To be sure, education and prevention plays a part in reducing sexual assault committed by student-athletes, but current models are not having significant impact on sexual assault prevalence (United States Department of Education, 2017). I suspected that findings from this study would echo the aforementioned assertions about critical theory.

Critical theory emerged from scholars associated with the Institute of Social Research in post-World-War-I Frankfurt, Germany (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011, p. 279). Exposed to the extreme polarity of Nazi anti-Semitism and American culture, Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, and Theodor Adorno developed an approach they felt could “describe and accurately measure any dimension of human behavior” (Kincheloe, McLaren, & Steinberg, 2011, p. 280). Further, Kincheloe et al. proposed a contemporary strand of critical theory that breeds “resistance” —an inquiry “committed to social criticism and the empowerment of individuals” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 37-38).
This iteration of critical theory displays an ontology that embraces history as situated by social, political, cultural, and economic values (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Acknowledging that there is a considerable spectrum among critical theories, Kincheloe, McLaren, and Steinberg (2011) pointed out several common assumptions that support (a) “all thought is fundamentally mediated by power relations that are social and historically constituted” and (b) “facts can never be isolated from the domain of values or removed from some form of ideological inscription” (p. 164). According to Coakley (2007), critical theorists generally assume that the “social order is negotiated through struggles over ideology, representation, and power” and “social life is full of diversity, complexities, and contradictions (p. 29). I anticipated this study would reveal ideological struggles between college presidents, NCAA administration, and athletic personnel, as the NCAA negotiated efforts to protect its image and acknowledge sexual assault in college athletics as a serious problem.

Power, here, can broadly be understood as “the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests” (Weber, 1968, p. 53). In other words, power is “an ability to influence people and achieve goals, even in the face of opposition from others” (Coakley, 2007, p. 448). In the context of this study, for example, the NCAA has considerable power to impose its ideology and policies on member institutions, including their representatives and student-athletes. Based on French and Raven (1959), Anderson (2010) postulated five different forms of power:
1) *legitimate*, defined as power given by one’s elected or appointed status; 2) *coercive*, defined as power because of one’s ability to take something away; 3) *reward*, defined as power derived from the ability to give something desired; 4) *expert*, defined as power accorded individuals who have undergone formal training; and 5) *referent*, defined as power given because of the respect [and individual or institution] might have as an inspiration or mentor. (p. 48)

The NCAA and its representatives arguably hold all five of these forms of power. As an institution, the NCAA is perceived as a legitimate organization that is upheld by its member organizations. NCAA representatives, in turn, also have legitimate power as they are elected or appointed. The governing body exercises coercive power, for example, through its ability to assign the “death penalty,” which under the 1985 repeat violator rule can bar member organizations from competition for repeated major rule violations (Grundy & Rader, 2015). The ability to select member institutions as hosts for prestigious tournaments is an example of the NCAA’s rewarding power. Further, NCAA representatives might benefit from being perceived as experts, given their training and expertise (expert power), and might be given respect as inspirations (referent power). The latter might also apply to the organization to the extent that it might be regarded as an honorable institution that governs the wellbeing of student-athletes.

Using critical theory heightened my awareness about the power of people, institutions, and their interrelationship as I examined the ASAIV and interviewed its contributors. The NCAA is, as Kincheloe et al. (2011) described, a “sovereign regime” and when possible, I sought to deconstruct the development of the ASAIV in hopes of
finding the “underlying ideology” behind the NCAA’s approach to sexual assault, as Allan (2005) suggested. Ultimately, I anticipated that the NCAA’s power has become so monolithically bureaucratic that major policymaking, even with best intentions, becomes a problematic process. With so many institutions harboring a range of conflicting agendas (or perhaps a collective overemphasis on financial gain and reputation protection), I suspect it is difficult to reach consensus with major sexual assault policies. My hope was that in taking a critical approach to the development of the ASAIV, I would reveal knowledge that might empower individuals (e.g., college coaches) to reduce sexual violence in college athletics where a governing body like the NCAA may seem powerless or uncommitted to do so.

**Sources and Participants**

The primary written source for this study was the NCAA’s (2014) document *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), a 51-page document that summarized the NCAA’s position on sexual assault and interpersonal violence and provided educational best practices. The document was selected because it encompasses one of the NCAA’s few formalized responses to sexual assault and interpersonal violence to date (Wilson et al., 2014; NCAA, 2016; NCAA Board of Governors, 2017).

To examine why and how the NCAA developed the ASAIV, including the historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to the development, I conducted topical interviews with key informants (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). All the
interviewees were selected because of their previous involvement in the development of the ASAIV, based on criteria provided by Rubin and Rubin (1995):

They should be knowledgeable about the cultural arena or the situation or experience being studied; they should be willing to talk; and when people in the arena have different perspectives, the interviewees should represent the range of points of view. (p. 66)

After obtaining approval for the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (see Appendix A), I obtained permission to interview ASAIV contributors.

**Procedures**

I employed the following procedures to collect and analyze information about the ASAIV. A timeline/flowchart of the study and its procedures is found in Appendix B.

**Content analysis.** First, I conducted an analysis of the ASAIV’s content. Guided by critical theory, this analysis informed the development of the subsequent topical interviews (see below). Krippendorff (2013) defined content analysis as “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (p. 24), and provided a six-step design. However, for this study, only five steps need be applied as only one document was examined: (a) unitizing, (b) recording/coding, (c) reducing, (d) inferring, and (e) narrating. *Sampling* was omitted as a step because it is only necessary when multiple texts are being studies (Krippendorff, 2013).
First, *unitizing* is the process by which the researcher makes distinctions (units) of analysis within an “observational field” (Krippendorff, 2013). Units are subjective, dependent on iterative readings by the researcher. According to Krippendorff (2013), this act crucially depends on the analyst’s ability to see meaningful conceptual breaks in the continuity of his or her reading experiences, on the purposes of the chosen research project, and on the demands made by the analytical techniques available to date. (p. 99)

Examination of the ASAIV revealed categorical distinctions in the form of key initiatives outlined in the document’s prologue (Wilson et al., 2014, NCAA Executive Committee Resolution section). Examples of units derived from this study include *Compliance* and *Collaboration*, which were two of the nine sections outlines in the ASAIV (Wilson et al., 2014).

Next, *recording/coding* warranted the initial and repeated search for patterns in the text. Krippendorff (2004) asserted that because texts vary wildly, there is no “a standard or optimal form [the observed patterns] should take” (p. 144). However, this content analysis process recommended simple numbered and tabulated categories (Krippendorff, 2004). Hence, I conducted multiple stages of color coding using four different highlighter colors on a physical, printed copy of the ASAIV. To my knowledge, the NCAA only shared PDF versions of the ASAIV, but I chose to use a physical copy for analysis as it made iterative reading more convenient and I could both highlight patterns and quickly make notes in the margins (see Appendix C). However, I did occasionally employ the PDF version to make searching for words or terms (e.g., culture)
and copying/pasting more efficient and accurate. As repeated readings occurred, I numbered and labeled categories and created a spreadsheet to which I copied and pasted coded text. Nominal categories and subcategories immerged. Next, reducing was the process of paring down data for efficient representation in findings (Krippendorff, 2004). I expanded two of my initial categories. For example, I expanded the student-athlete victimization category into a broader category (e.g., student-athletes) that encompassed several subcategories of which student-athlete victimization became a sub-category. Additionally, I separated the coach/staff category into two separate categories; coaches became an exclusive category, while the staff component would be combined into the eventual culture category. The purpose of reduction was to “reduce the diversity of text to what matters” most (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 85).

Then, inferring referred to the movement from the actual text analysis to contextual phenomena. Krippendorff (2004) asserted abductive inferring “bridges the gap between descriptive accounts of texts and what they mean, refer to, entail, provoke, or cause. It points to unobserved phenomena in the context of interest to an analyst” (p. 85). Simply, inferring seeks to discern meaning, explicit or implicit, from the content. I accomplished this by invoking my knowledge about sexual assault committed by student-athletes and by connecting codes and their meanings to discover ideologies. My grasp of sexual assault literature while being cognizant of ongoing, current events (e.g., MSU scandal) was essential to this step.

Finally, narrating is the process whereby interpreted meanings are transformed into answers of the research questions (Krippendorff, 2004). This kind of narration,
however, can manifest in more than one way. For example, Krippendorff (2004) explained, “Sometimes, this means explaining the practical significance of the findings or the contributions they make to the available literature. At other times, it means arguing the appropriateness of the use of content analysis rather than direct observational techniques” (p. 85). Throughout the analysis of the ASAIV and the interviews, Dr. Lars Dzikus, my advisor, served as a a “critical friend,” asking challenging questions about the data analysis and adding further perspectives regarding their interpretation (Eley, 2012).

**Participant recruitment.** Following approval of the study by the University’s Institutional Review Board (IRB), I contacted potential participants via email and/or phone to invite them to participate in the study. Generally, the ASAIV’s list of authors, contributors, and those “who provided direction and expert advice” comprised a majority of the initial prospective participant pool (Wilson et al, 2014, p. 50). The invitation to potential research participants is provided in Appendix D. Five prospective participants responded to the invitation and three agreed to participate.

**Semi-structured topical interview guide.** I developed the topical semi-structured interviews after the analysis of the ASAIV. Topical interviews “explore what, when, how, and why something happened” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 196). The objective of these topical interviews “is to piece together from different people a coherent narrative that explains” how and why the NCAA developed the ASAIV (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 196). These interviews served as a form of oral history, which “collects memories and
personal commentaries of historical significance through recorded interviews… [through a] dialogue between interviewer and interviewee” (Ritchie, 2003, p. 19).

As mentioned above, the analysis of the ASAIV’s content was a critical step in preparation for the topical interviews. I felt that initial categories developed during the analysis would enable me to create the most revelatory questions for participants. Further, I ultimately became more familiar with the ASAIV than the individual contributors, which became invaluable when they had a chance to ask me questions or needed a reference point (e.g., page, topic, or section in the ASAIV) during the interview. I had my highlighted physical copy of the ASAIV on-hand for every interview and was able to find passages quickly. I further prepared by gathering information about the ASAIV’s contributors by reading their published works as they pertain to the topic and their online profiles, regarding their relationship with the NCAA. This type of background work helps with “learning which interviewees are most likely to know the material you need to find out” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 198). Given that interview partners had varying degrees of involvement and different insights into the development of the ASAIV, I adjusted interview questions based on who was being interviewed. Based on what I learned during each interview, prepared questions often evolved. Further, insights from interviews conducted earlier in the study informed questions asked in later interviews (Ruben & Rubin, 1995).

Since participants might provide conflicting or contrasting accounts of the past, it is important to construct interview questions that “allow different renditions of the same events to be compared and woven together” (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 196.)
interviews typically feature main questions, probes, and follow-ups (Rubin & Rubin, 1995). For a list of preliminary interview questions see Appendix E.

**Interviews.** I conducted phone interviews to overcome geographical and logistical limitations (Lo Iacono, Symonds, & Brown, 2016). Interviews took place at a time and place that was convenient and safe for participant and interviewer. For example, I conducted one interview in a soundproof recording room while the participant participated in a private office. Before the start of the interview, I gave participants time to read the informed consent form and reviewed it with them verbally. I explained to participants that I preferred to use their names because it would add credibility and accountability to responses. Given the public nature of the document under investigation (i.e., the ASAIV) and the small number of contributors, it would be difficult to promise confidentiality. Thus, the informed consent form included an agreement to publish the participants’ actual name in connection with the study with their consent (see Appendix F). Initially, all the participants seemed willing to allow the use of their names in the study, but one participant changed her mind once the interview was concluded and she had been given the transcript. That meant it was not feasible to use the actual names of two participants and a pseudonym for the third. Thus, I used pseudonyms for the three participants (e.g., Participant A). Pseudonyms were assigned randomly and are in no way a reflection of authorship status. Because all interviews took place via telephone, I sent the informed consent form via email prior to the interview. After answering any questions, I asked the participant to sign and return the form. The interviews lasted 39, 47, and 66 minutes. In need for further clarification, I contacted two participants for
follow up questions. Each interview was audio recorded via digital recorders and I transcribed them immediately after each interview. However, I omitted filler words (e.g., um and uh) to improve readability. Upon completion of the study, I deleted the audio recordings.

**Member checking.** To enhance the accuracy and trustworthiness of this study (see Merriam, 1995; Morrow, 2005), I invited participants to review the transcript of their interview to ensure that everything was captured accurately (Patton, 2014). After participants received the email invitation, they were given at least one week to reply with any corrections, subtractions, and additions. I conducted follow-up phone calls to ensure each participant was aware of the opportunity to review the transcripts and emailed them password protected copies for their review. None of the participants responded with feedback.

**Interview analysis.** As soon as possible after an interview, I wrote down first impressions in an electronic notebook, which were a part of a reflexivity journal (Ahern, 1999). The reflexivity journal also included additional ideas generated through continued literature review and current events (for an example of a journal entry, see Appendix G). I followed this initial step on the analytic process with transcribing the interview, which helped me to familiarize myself with the content of the interview and further reflect on it. The outcome of those reflections informed subsequent interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 1995).

After the transcription process, my advisor joined in the analysis of the interviews and we met periodically to compare and discuss notes. Dr. Dzikus is an experienced
qualitative researcher with expertise in conducting and analyzing oral history interviews. As the interviews unfolded, we also co-created a preliminary timeline of events and questions for future interviews (for a timeline of selected events, see Appendix H). At that point we also extracted preliminary “factual” answers to what, where, when questions and compared those answers across interviews. Identifying conflicting information allowed me to ask for clarification in follow-up interviews and in subsequent interviews.

Based on Rubin and Rubin (2012), the coding and analysis process consisted of two major phases. The first involved identifying relevant concepts, themes, and events in the interviews. Here codes were developed and applied to later retrieve pertinent passages. In the second phase, I compared concepts and themes across the interviews or combine separate events to formulate a description of the setting” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 201).

In the analysis, researchers break down interviews into data units, i.e., “exchanges on a single subject” or “blocks of information that are examined together” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, pp. 202, 203). Examples of data units are descriptions of events, which can take up several pages of transcripts, or an explanation of a concept, which can consist of just a few words. Researchers use those data unites to combine those that pertain to “the same topic, both within single interviews and across the entire set of interviews” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 203). Researchers then examine all data units from the interviews that relate to each other to reconstruct how and why an event took place (Rubin & Rubin, 2012).
Rubin and Rubin (2012) outlined several overlapping steps for the coding and analysis process. The first is *recognition*, which involves identifying “concepts, themes, events, and topical markers in your interviews” (p. 207). In this context, a concept is “a word or term that represents an idea important to your research problem” (p. 207). Themes “are summary statements and explanations of what is going on” (p. 207). And topical markers “are names of places, people, organizations, pets, numbers—such as dates, addresses, or legislative bills—or public laws” (p. 207). The second step is to *clarify, elaborate, and integrate*, which entails the systematic examination of all interviews “to clarify what is meant by specific concepts and themes and synthesize different versions of events to put together your understanding of the overall narrative” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 207). Next is the *development of codes and a coding scheme*. A code is “a distinct label … for each concept, theme, event, or topical marker” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 207). I coded each data unit. The codes expressed the concept, theme, events, or topical marker in one word or a short phrase that conveys the underlying idea. When possible, I used In Vivo codes by “assigning a label to a section of data… using a word or short phrase taken from that section of the data” to keep the codes closely connected to the voices of the interviewees (King, 2012, p. 473). The development of the final coding scheme depended on clear and consistent definitions for codes used across all interviews (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). According to Rubin and Rubin (2012),

> Once you have found a concept, theme, event, or topical marker and worked out what you think it means, you look for these same ideas elsewhere in all the interviews. You compare instances of the same idea and progressively define,
refine, and label these emerging concepts. You continue doing so until you are comfortable that you have worked out a consistent understanding of each concept and theme and have noted most. (p. 216)

This process lead to clear definitions for each code. Rubin and Rubin (2012) suggested the following format/example:

*What am I going to call it (label it)?* Empowerment.

*How am I defining it?* Empowerment is a feeling that individuals have when they believe they can accomplish chosen goals. It is also political or organizational strength that enables people to collectively carry out their will.

*How am I going to recognize it in the interviews?* When people explicitly say they feel empowered, when they accomplish something new and important, especially against opposition, or when they succeed in areas in which they have failed in the past.

*What do I want to exclude?* Empowerment must emerge out of an activity carried out by the individuals or the groups in which they are involved. If others (such as supportive politicians and charities, etc.) provide the benefit or do the activity for people, it is not empowerment.

*What is an example?* One example is a protest in which a neighborhood forces government to provide extra policing on Friday nights. (pp. 216-217)

The fourth step included the *coding* process itself. Here, I reviewed all transcripts and applied codes “to each data each data unit where the matching concept, theme, event, or topical marker appears” (p. 219). These codes allowed me to retrieve relevant passages
and organize statements by the respective concept, theme, or event (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Given the relatively small number of interviews, I applied codes in the Word documents of the transcripts using bracketed bolded text in-line (e.g., [Title IX]). Next, I conducted an analysis of coded data, which in topical studies includes comparing and weighing contrasting descriptions of events to work out your own interpretation of what happened” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 224). It also involved sorting and summarizing information. I sorted passages with the same code into one computer file and searched “for patterns and linkages between the concepts and themes or draw together different events and their alternative versions to form a rich descriptive narrative” (Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 224). Upon conclusion of the analysis, I summarized the content of each file. This step also entailed weighing and combining, as I integrated information from various participants “to describe and explain what happened” (p. 227). Weighing information was particularly important because participants provided conflicting versions of events. In those cases, I had “to weigh the evidence from different interviewees to check out how credible each report” appeared to be (p. 228). The final step was writing the narrative. Based on Rubin and Rubin (2012), “at this stage of analysis in a topical study, you can put together events in chronological order or work out your own explanatory narratives” of how and why an event unfolded or a program was developed (p. 230). In the resulting discussion section, I made connections to previous literature and discussed broader implications of the findings.

Memos and reflexivity journal. As noted above, researcher bias and the use of a priori knowledge (i.e., social theory and concepts) might be regarded as a limitation.
Constructionist historians approach objectivity as “mediated by theory, concepts and evidence” (Booth, 2005, p. 8). As such, congruent with a critical theory perspective, all knowledge is situated in particular circumstances that include the positionality of the researcher and theoretical commitments (Haraway, 1988). According to Morrow (2005), to improve the trustworthiness and “in order to deal with biases and assumptions that come from their own life experiences or in interactions with research participants, which are often emotion-laden, qualitative researchers attempt to approach their endeavor reflexively” (p. 254). To this end, I kept a reflexivity journal throughout the research process (Ahern, 1999). As Ahern (1999) noted,

The ability to put aside personal feelings and preconceptions is more a function of how reflexive one is rather than how objective one is because it is not possible for researchers to set aside things about which they are not aware. (p. 408)

I shared and discussed relevant excerpts of the reflexivity journal in the final report of this study.

In this chapter, I summarized the methodology, including my positionality, theoretical frameworks, procedures, and ethical commitments. In the next chapter, I introduce my findings.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to examine the NCAA’s *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV), including its content and the historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to its development by employing a critical theorist approach and conducting topical interviews as described in Chapter Three. Analyzing the ASAIV’s content, I identified six themes that revealed ideologies as well as socially and historically constituted power relations related to the NCAA: (a) key messages, (b) defining athletics, (c) deflection, (d) student-athletes, (e) coaches, and (f) addressing sport culture. Before I discuss themes in detail, the next section describes the development of the ASAIV.

Development of the ASAIV

Information provided in the ASAIV and topical interviews with key contributors produced a comprehensive narrative of its development. Prior to 2014, NCAA efforts to address sexual violence were sparse. One participant described earlier initiatives that broached sexual violence awareness and prevention:

> There was not a national or concerted effort that would have put out a national guidance from the NCAA. There was an effort through the project called the CHAMPS Life Skills project that the NCAA sponsored. And this was a project that supported, in many ways, those life skills coordinators on campus that worked with athletics departments. This is no longer a project, so I’m speaking in past tense, but their role on campus was to assure that student-athlete personal well-being was attended to and that they would coordinate campus-wide efforts to
benefit student-athletes on personal well-being and that got defined broadly. But many of those projects did address violence prevention sexual responsibility. It was really up to each individual campus to address student-athlete well-being in the way they determined that met need, so they would do their own needs-assessment, determine what areas they wanted to address.

The NCAA began developing the Challenging Athletes’ Minds for Personal Success (CHAMPS) Life Skills program in 1991 and deployed it in 1994 to “support the student-athlete development initiatives of NCAA member institutions and to enhance the quality of the student-athlete experience within the context of higher education” (NCAA, 2008, p. 1). The program took a holistic approach to student-athlete development, addressing athletic and academic excellence, personal and career development, and service (Goddard, 2004). Violence prevention was only a subtopic of the program, which also addressed student-athlete manners and etiquette, media relations, and nutrition. While the NCAA provided CHAMPS guidance materials, program administrators had the latitude to implement it as they saw fit. According to Goddard (2004), no specific curriculum was provided. As of 2003, all Division I NCAA programs were required to implement life skills programming (Goddard, 2004).

Concurrently in the early 1990s, the NCAA partnered with the Apple Training Institute for substance-abuse training, whose “purpose is to help that institution create a strategic plan to address substance abuse prevention and student-athlete wellness. And those training conferences did incorporate sexual violence prevention” (Participant B). Since 1991, over half of NCAA institutions have attended at least one Apple Training
Institute seminar (Apple Training Institute, 2018). In 2008, the NCAA partnered with the Step Up! Bystander intervention program, which it had developed with the University of Arizona beginning in 2006 (Bell, personal communication, 2018). The Step Up! Program addressed intervening in potential instances of relationship abuse (Step Up!, 2018).

The ASAIV was a culmination of efforts made by the NCAA beginning in 2010 (Wilson et al., 2014). As noted in the acknowledgments section of the ASAIV, the NCAA’s Executive Committee deemed interpersonal violence and its prevention an organizational focus in the summer of 2010. The actual process launched “when the NCAA Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct (CSEC) began discussing a series of incidents reported in the national media” that involved student-athletes as perpetrators of sexual assault and interpersonal violence (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 50). Several national stories reported in 2010 met that description.

Former University of Missouri swimmer Sasha Menu Courey reported to an athletic administrator that she had been raped by at least one University of Missouri football player in February of 2010 (Farrey & Noren, 2015). No reports were filed with local law enforcement. She committed suicide in June of 2011. Further, in May of 2010, University of Virginia men’s lacrosse player George Huguely was charged for the fatal battering University of Virginia women’s lacrosse player Yeardley Love (Flaherty & Johnson, 2010). He was convicted two years later (Ng, 2012). Additionally, former University of Missouri football player Derrick Washington was charged with sexually assaulting a former tutor in August of 2010 (“Derrick Washington charged”, 2010). He was found guilty in September of 2011 (David, 2011). The 2010 year continued to be
tragic for the NCAA and college communities. In September, Lizzy Seeberg, a student at St. Mary’s College, committed suicide after reporting being raped by University of Notre Dame football player, Prince Shembo. Notre Dame authorities did not report the incident to police and Seeberg received threatening texts from at least one other football player prior to her suicide (St. Clair & Lighty, 2010).

Although the ASAIV does not specify which incidents sparked the discussion about sexual violence and interpersonal violence, John Blanchard, then Senior Associate Director of Athletics at the University of North Carolina and Chair of the CSEC, stated at the Summit on Violence in the spring of 2011 that the June 2010 decision to focus on the issue responded to “the tragic loss of a precious life at the University of Virginia”—presumably the Yeardley Love case (NCAA, 2011). Two study participants confirmed that the Love case was highly influential in the NCAA’s sexual violence initiatives (Participant B; Participant C). Participant C added that in the wake of the Love case, “the development of the guide, that was going to be probably the most significant focus of [the CSEC].” The 2011 Summit on Violence did not focus solely on sexual violence, but the tone and personnel of the attendees gravitated toward the issue. One participant recalled thinking, “Are we talking just about sexual assault and violence or are we talking about all kinds of violence?”

In 2012, a panel discussion was held at the NCAA National Convention, “Addressing Violence: Cross Campus Solutions” (Wilson et al., 2014). Later in 2012, student-athlete representatives on the CSEC facilitated a peer discussion on the issue at the Student-Athlete Advisory Council (SAAC) Leadership Conference. The NCAA
sponsored a Violence Prevention Think Tank in fall 2012; Mark Emmert “flew in in order to open that think tank and assured the members of the importance of their role and the commitment of the NCAA to look at this issue” (Participant C). The Think Tank involved around 20 national experts in “higher education, research, victim advocacy, policy, legislation and then of course college athletics and the NCAA” (Participant C). Most of the experts were from non-athletic career fields.

It is clear that the NCAA, in its development of the ASAIV, demonstrated legitimate, expert, referent forms of power as described by French and Raven (1959). College presidents and athletic directors who are appointed to their positions within their universities and the NCAA contributed to the process, as did highly educated and respected consultants from a variety of backgrounds. The ideology of the ASAIV was clearly to protect the NCAA’s most valuable assets, the student-athletes. My sense, however, was that the population who may have had the most to contribute due to their proximity to sexual assault and unique voice as survivors or bystanders, the student-athletes, were a minimal part of the process by comparison. Beyond recognition that select members of the SAAC were involved, participants could not recall specific student-athletes who participated, the specific input they provided, or if SAAC input was integrated into the actual content of the ASAIV. However, results from the 2012 Student-Athlete Social Environment study were referenced several times in the ASAIV; the study did not focus solely on sexual assault and interpersonal violence.

**Selection of ASAIV contributors.** Given the NCAA’s vast resources and connections in athletics and academia, I felt it was important to examine how they vetted
and chose ASAIV contributors. In June 2013, the CSEC “recommended the development of [the ASAIV] to inform the efforts by member institutions to make a meaningful difference in addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence” in college campuses and athletic departments (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 50). One participant believed Dr. Deborah Wilson, who is listed as primary author and editor in the document, was tabbed to spearhead the ASAIV because she was a licensed psychologist who had some experience dealing with sexual assault victims on campus. Additionally, Dr. Wilson had eight years of college coaching experience, which provided awareness of the power and influence that athletics wielded over student-athletes and the campus at large. Further, a participant added that Dr. Wilson was “a natural leader on that because she was chairing during that committee [CSEC].” Dr. Wilson possesses immense legitimate, referent, and expert power as a former NCAA coach and current faculty member (French & Raven, 1959).

According to one participant, Dr. Brandi Hephner LeBanc, listed as a contributing author of the ASAIV, attended the Summit on Violence and joined the ASAIV team as a consultant. Another participant added that Dr. Hephner LeBanc contributed to the appendices. One participant noted that Connie Kirkland, another contributing author, “did a tremendous amount of work in helping [redacted] with editing” and also contributed to the appendices. Wilson et al. (2014) listed Mary Wilfert of the Sport Science Institute and Karen Morrison of the Office of Inclusion as NCAA Staff Editors and were the sole NCAA employees named as directly involved in the ASAIV. According to one participant, Wilfert was influential in encouraging Wilson to lead the authorship. Further,
the Sport Science Institute was responsible for producing the 2012 Student-Athlete Social Environment Study, which was cited heavily in the ASAIV. Another participant added that Morrison had Title IX expertise and connections to other Title IX sources.

Creating the ASAIV content. The process of creating the actual ASAIV content began with contributors’ efforts to raise their education and awareness about sexual violence. One participant started with available academic literature, studies conducted by the NCAA, and “talking to people who worked in the field, who had some experience and you just tried to pick their brains and see what they had done”. According to one participant, selecting precise terminology was an early priority:

Remember, our focus is prevention. It’s not a legal focus, it’s prevention. And so we wanted to use terms that were commonly and most frequently being used and then credit the sources that they came from, if they came from any type of federal legislation. But we weren’t looking for a lawyer’s understanding. We really were looking for those people who were on the frontline trying to do prevention, people in athletics who were trying to become educated so that they could do meaningful programming. What kind of terminology made sense for them? And that’s how we settled on the terminology that we used for the guide.

Another participant approached the process from a campus-wide perspective, seeking to integrate experience and resources from other departments like counseling and student affairs into the athletic department’s contributions.

Additional efforts included talking to student-athletes about the issue. Participant B affirmed that the NCAA pursued input from the Student-Athlete Advisory Committee
(SAAC), comprised of about 100 representatives for each of the Division I, II, and III athletic conferences. One participant observed that those representatives were given materials to review and provide feedback in a face-to-face setting. Additionally, contributors were anxious to learn what SAAC representatives knew about sexual assault and what they were willing to do about it. Further, SAAC representatives held discussions with their peers about sexual assault and interpersonal violence. SAAC representatives were listed as “other contributors” in the ASAIV.

Campus athletics administrators were also listed as “other contributors” in the ASAIV. In talking to them, one participant was startled at the misunderstandings about proper sexual assault response protocol:

I think the other surprises that came up for me and I’m not gonna name institutions, but it surprised me that there were actually quite a few…athletic departments that thought it was ok for them to handle these matters internally. The participant added that some athletic administrators were saying the right things, but were inconsistent with actions. Participant C noted, “some of it is people are overworked, they’re stretched too thin, they have limited budgets, but still you have to look for where is the evidence of the support behind the rhetoric”.

In preparing to write for the ASAIV, one participant sensed a disconnect between athletics and campus support programming:

I saw this as a resource guide that would be going to athletics staff, particularly athletic directors and this was an opportunity to explain that, you know, you have really, you have really highly trained partners on your campus. Turn to them …
reinforcing reporting of incidents, and stuff like that…just because you attend one training doesn’t make you [athletic personnel] an expert.

According to another participant, the NCAA did not provide any parameters or restrictions on the document; however, the final draft went through a battery of oversight:

I don’t know who you would say actually signed off on it. You’d have to ask somebody there. It had to go through everything. It had to go through legal multiples times. It had, you know, just the what was going to be the title of the guide. Was, oh, my, gosh, we went round and round on that one. Some of the wording and different sections. It had to go through the public relations area…it had to go through the inclusion office. There were so many different parts of the NCAA that had to be involved before it actually came to publication. I mean anytime you deal with a major association like that, there are just so many different aspects that have to be considered before they put their name or their brand on it.

The topical interviews supplemented information provided in the ASAIV and added perspective when determining themes from the content. For example, interviews revealed a pivotal interpersonal violence event between student-athletes and the media fallout that ultimately pushed the development of the ASAIV. Content analysis of the ASAIV identified six themes, which I discuss in the following sections (a table of main themes and sub-themes is found in Appendix I).
Theme One: Key Messages

The ASAIV’s authors and editors used the document’s formatting to visually highlight key messages throughout the document (see examples in Appendix J). These messages were printed in blue italicized font, lists in large, blue font labeled as “bottom line”, or occasionally as standalone comments in large, blue font above section titles (e.g., “Athletics should work with campus colleagues to support a safe and caring campus community.”) (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 5). Sometimes, a key message simply repeated a statement found in the body content, duplicated and embedded in larger black font, with the body content wrapped around it (e.g., “When a student shares information with a campus administrator—be it staff, coach, or other official of the institution—that report must be formally shared with the appropriate institutional staff to ensure that required protocol is followed.”) (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9).

Not surprisingly, most of the key messages reaffirmed resolutions adopted by the NCAA’s Executive Committee in August of 2014 and listed in the prologue of the ASAIV: compliance/cooperation with institutional authorities and federal/state laws and education of “all student-athletes, coaches and staff about sexual violence prevention, intervention and response” (Wilson et al., 2014, NCAA Executive Committee Resolution section). For example, “Compliance with federal laws, state laws and institutional policies is more than a recommendation—it is a requirement and the foundation of responsible practice in all matters relevant to addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 13). Additionally, “Therefore, all athletics staff” (including staff in events management, athletic trainers and others) and particularly any
staff in leadership positions should receive training and be required to report allegations of sexual harassment and violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 14). Other prevalent sub-themes found in the key messages include: (a) intercollegiate athletic culture: a part of the solution; (b) collaboration; (c) sexual assault and interpersonal violence: a general cultural problem; (d) response protocol; (e) sexual assault characteristics: perpetrators, victims, and effects; and (f) student-athlete risk reduction. Each of these themes are discussed further in the following subsections.

**Intercollegiate athletic culture: A part of the solution.** Using highlighted key messages, the authors of the ASAIV reinforced the notion of intercollegiate athletics as a potential part of the solution to sexual assault several times in. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) stated in the ASAIV:

> The majority of male and female student-athletes want to have healthy relationships and be part of a campus that is safe for all students. And though most campus sexual assaults are perpetrated by men, most men are not perpetrators and can be effective cultural change agents. (p. 7)

Further, “athletics has a unique platform on most campuses from which it can visibly and vocally support its colleagues across campus who are working to make the campus safer for all students” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8). In the conclusion section of the ASAIV, a key message asserted, “athletics can be a powerful and effective partner in changing the culture of our college campuses” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 33).

**Collaboration.** Given that the NCAA suggested addressing campus collaborations and provided an outline to ASAIV contributors (Participant A), it was not
surprising that a key message emphasized the importance of collaboration between the
athletic department and other institutional departments. Additionally, one participant
deemed collaboration an important guiding principle of the document. Collaboration
appeared early in the ASAIV, as Wilson et al. (2014) asserted, “athletics should work
with campus colleagues to support a safe and caring campus community” (p. 5).
Moreover, “collaboration maximizes the use of resources as the members of the
collaboration team understand how they can support one another’s efforts” (Wilson et al.,
should adopt a cross-campus collaborative approach to addressing sexual assault and
interpersonal violence” (p. 25).

**Sexual assault and interpersonal violence: A general cultural problem.** In key
messages, the authors of the ASAIV consistently positioned sexual assault and
interpersonal violence as a problem that extends far beyond the realm of athletics. One of
the first key messages in the document read, “Nobody in our culture is untouched or
immune to the effects of sexual assault and interpersonal violence” (Wilson et al., 2014,
p. 7). Likewise, Wilson et al. (2014) emphasized, “The causes of sexual assault and
interpersonal violence are too embedded and reinforced in our culture for it to change
significantly without a concerted, coordinated, well-informed, committed, comprehensive
and long-term campus effort” (p. 21).

**Response protocol.** The authors of the ASAIV dedicated much of the document
to highlighting sexual assault and interpersonal violence protocol, which featured
frequently in key messages. Reporting of incidents was a particularly common theme. For
example, “when a student shares information with a campus administrator—be it staff, coach or other official of the institution—that report must be formally shared with the appropriate institutional staff to ensure that required protocol is followed” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9). Similarly, “athletics must report to appropriate campus offices for resolution and must protect those individuals from retaliation from a student, student-athlete or staff in athletics” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 15). Further, “athletics staff, including coaches, have a duty to report incidents to the appropriate institutional staff members—those who are responsible for providing intervention and treatment, investigating, and adjudicating cases of sexual assault” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 28).

**Sexual assault characteristics: Perpetrators, victims, and effects.** Wilson et al. (2014) thoroughly described the nature and effects of sexual assault in key messages. College perpetrators of sexual assault were described as a small percentage of repeat-offending men who accounted for a large percentage of offenses (Wilson et al., 2014). However, Wilson et al. (2014) reaffirmed that “the overwhelming majority of male college student-athletes are not rapists and will never sexually assault anybody” as a key message (p. 19). Additional characteristics of sexual assault presented as key messages included the overwhelming presence of alcohol, the prevalence of victims knowing the identity of the perpetrator, and isolated environments like dorm rooms as common scenarios (Wilson et al., 2014). Wilson et al. (2014) also described victims in key messages. For example, “LGBTQ students were more frequently targets of sexual assault and interpersonal violence than their heterosexual peers” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9).
Further, college-aged men and women were described as being at the greatest risk of being stalked.

The effects of victimization were also highlighted in key messages. For example, “the effects of sexual assault and interpersonal violence cause real and often lasting emotional, cognitive, physical and other types of damage to its victims” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8). Similarly, the authors noted, “students who are survivors of violence often experience a negative impact on their academic performances, relationships with peers and the ability to be involved in or benefit from campus life” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9).

**Student-athlete risk reduction.** Several key messages focused on reducing the risk of sexual assault and interpersonal violence specifically for student-athletes. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) stated:

> Athletics departments can employ life skills programs to mitigate some of the factors that increase the risk of committing violence programs to improve anger management, to address attitudes about power, control and masculinity, and to define healthy relationships. Other strategies may be employed to attend to issues of previous history. (p. 10)

Additionally, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted:

> Coaches and athletics administrators have a responsibility to help their student-athletes understand the situational appropriateness of aggressive behaviors and that what is allowable and even desirable during an athletic practice or competition has no part in social relationships or “off the field” behavior. (p. 11)
Theme Two: Defining Athletics

The authors of the ASAIV frequently used the term *athletics*; however, they did not define what constitutes *athletics*. Wilson et al. (2014) clarified that the intended audience of the ASAIV included “intercollegiate athletics administrators and those who provide educational programming for student-athletes in developing their own approaches to preventing or reducing the incidents of sexual assault and other acts of interpersonal violence on their campuses” (p. 5) and student-athletes are implied as a part of the athletic community, but other athletics positions were addressed. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) stated:

> Therefore, all athletics staff (including staff in event management, athletic trainers and others) and particularly any staff in leadership positions should receive training and be required to report allegations of sexual harassment and violence.

(p. 14)

*Athletics* appeared most frequently in the ASAIV as a stand-alone noun or as *intercollegiate athletics*, but it also appeared as a descriptor (e.g., *athletics culture/subculture, athletics department, athletics staff, athletics administrators, athletics director, or athletic personnel*). Further, in general, *athletics* was positioned as a monolithic institution often juxtaposed with other individual campus entities. For example, “athletics should work with campus colleagues to support a safe and caring campus community” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 5). As a collective noun, *athletics* takes a singular verb in American English. This further reinforced the notion of athletics as a singular entity. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted, “intercollegiate athletics is
uniquely positioned to positively influence the development of hundreds of thousands of young adult male and female college students” (p. 7). Likewise, “athletics has campus partners who are highly trained, skilled and eager to assist in developing and delivering such a plan” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 22).

**Theme Three: Deflection**

Several statements in the ASAIV deflected culpability for sexual assault and interpersonal violence away from intercollegiate athletics. For example, the authors asserted, “The research does not show significant differences between student-athletes and their nonathlete peers on probabilities of perpetrating acts of violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 11); however, Wilson et al. (2014) did not cite a specific study in support of this statement. While it is true that no study has presented a causal relationship between being associated with athletics and perpetration of sexual violence, the Wilson et al. (2014) excerpt is the only ASAIV reference to research on the potential relationship between student-athletes and sexual misconduct. Several studies, however have observed that student-athletes are overrepresented in the perpetration of sexual violence (Crosset et al., 1995; Crosset et al., 1996; Fritner & Rubinson, 1993). For example, Fritner and Rubinson (1993) found that student-athletes committed 22.6% of sexual assaults reported in a survey of 925 randomly selected women, despite representing less than 2% of the male student body population. Wilson et al. (2014) also noted in the ASAIV that “there is no evidence that participation in athletics or any particular sport causes participants to become perpetrators of violence” (p. 11). Crosset, Ptacek, and McDonald (1995) noted that establishing causality between sport-affiliation and sexual assault is problematic
because of the difficulty in accounting for individuals with at-risk behavior (e.g., aggression) self-selecting into sport; however, this challenge could be addressed with longitudinal designs. Nonetheless, their survey of 10 NCAA Division I campus judicial affairs records over three years from 1991 to 1993 revealed that student-athletes were significantly overrepresented in sexual assault reports compared to the rest of the male student body. While reported sexual assault does not always indicate actual sexual assault, the ASAIV conceded, “deliberately false or unfounded accusations occur in an estimated 2-10% of reported sexual assault cases” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9).

Wilson et al. (2014) may have attempted to diffuse the notion that intercollegiate athletics and its stakeholders may contribute to sexual assault by positioning intercollegiate athletics as a formidable part of the solution. Wilson et al. (2014) stated:

Although sexual assault and interpersonal violence do not have their roots in college environments or in college athletics, we in athletics have an opportunity to make a difference…Athletics can be a powerful and effective partner in changing the culture of our college campuses. (p. 33)

Note that the previous statement is another example of athletics presented as a singular partner. Further, as noted in the previous theme, athletics, is presented inconsistently with varied descriptions of what the term encompasses.

However, while Wilson et al. (2014) stated that student-athletes have not been found to commit sexual assault more than non-athletes, no examples supported athletic involvement (by student-athletes, coaches, or administrators) as a preventative factor against sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Nonetheless, Wilson et al. (2014)
positioned athletics as a hypothetical part of the solution. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) stated:

If male student-athletes are confident that they will be not just accepted but supported if they speak out or act to stop sexual assaults and interpersonal violence, they can have a profound effect not only on immediate situations, but athletics culture as a whole. (p. 19)

Media reports about sexual assault perpetrated by student-athletes appear each year and studies have demonstrated overrepresentation of student-athletes in sexual assault reporting (Crosset, McDonald, & Benedict, 1995; Fritner & Rubinson, 1993). By contrast, only one story about a student-athlete intervening to prevent sexual assault received national coverage since the ASAIV was published, when University of Florida linebacker Christian Garcia thwarted a rapist outside of a bar in 2016 (Grinberg, 2016).

Moreover, the ASAIV listed 17 “Additional Resources” in an appendix, representing a variety of violence prevention organizations (see Appendix K). It should be noted that none of them were specifically geared toward athletics. Indeed, the National Coalition Against Violent Athletes (NCAVA), founded in 1998 by former University of Nebraska student-athlete and survivor of sexual assault perpetrated by a University of Nebraska football player, Kathy Redmond Brown, was absent. The NCAVA endorsed research by Crosset, McDonald, and Benedict (1995) that found student-athletes as overrepresented in sexual assaults (NCAVA, 2017). A dearth of athletics-specific resources is remarkable given the wholly athletics-related target audience of the ASAIV,
which could be regarded as another method of deflection by minimizing a need for student-athlete specific programming.

**Theme Four: Student-Athletes**

Not surprisingly, student-athletes were a prevalent theme of the ASAIV, given the student-athlete-related events that precipitated its creation and the NCAA’s resolution to ensure “student-athlete health, safety and well-being” (Wilson et al., 2014, Executive Committee Resolution section). Within discussion about student-athletes in the guide, three sub-themes emerged: (a) minimization of student-athlete perpetrators of sexual assault and interpersonal violence; (b) student-athlete victimization; and (c) student-athletes as change agents. I describe each of these sub-themes in the following sections.

**Minimization of student-athletes as perpetrators of sexual assault and interpersonal violence.** Some in both academic and journalistic spheres believe intercollegiate athletes, particularly those who play violent sports, are more likely to commit sexual assault or interpersonal violence than their non-athlete peers (Dabbs, 1997). In an assessment of risk factors, Wilson et al. (2014) emphasized that athletic association does not increase risk of violence perpetration. The authors stated, “The research does not show significant differences between student-athletes and their nonathlete peers on probabilities of perpetrating acts of violence. It appears there may be more differences among student-athletes than between student-athletes and nonathletes” (p. 11). They also added, “There is no evidence that participation in athletics or any particular sport causes participants to become perpetrators of violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 11). Although, student-athletes were positioned as no different from the rest of
the student population in terms of violence perpetration, Wilson et al. (2014) provided startling evidence that they are frequently victimized.

**Student-Athlete Victimization.** The 2010 assaults perpetrated at the University of Missouri and the University of Virginia resulted in the death of a student-athlete, either directly or indirectly (homicide and suicide, respectively) (Farrey & Noren, 2015; Flaherty & Johnson, 2010). Further, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted, “student-athletes…are targets” (p. 8). Thus, it made sense that student-athlete victimization was a common theme in the ASAIV, but extreme examples of assault like the Yeardley Love homicide were not the only concern. Wilson et al. (2014) also identified hazing as a form of interpersonal violence in the ASAIV. A survey conducted by the NCAA and Alfred University of 325,000 student-athletes revealed over 80% of them had experienced hazing (Hoover, 1999). More recently, a survey of over 11,000 undergraduates revealed that 74% of varsity athletes experienced at least one hazing behavior (Allan & Madden, 2004). Alcohol consumption dominated the ways in which varsity athletes experienced hazing (e.g., drinking games or drinking until sick or passed out). Of those varsity athletes who reported a hazing experience, 16% reported the act as performing “sex acts with opposite gender” (Allan & Madden, 2004, p. 19). The frequency of attention to such specific victimization underscored the NCAA’s concern for the safety of its student-athletes; however, it is also possible that stressing student-athletes as victims deflected readers’ recognition away from the issue of student-athletes as perpetrators of sexual assault.
The authors of the ASAIV also noted that student-athlete victimization was not restricted to women, citing a 2012 NCAA study that found “male student-athletes reported being victims of sexual assault at higher rates than their nonathlete peers” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8). Additionally, both male and female student-athletes who had experienced sexual assault had “three times higher rates of suicidal thoughts” than non-victimized peers (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9). Moreover, female student-athletes were cautioned that “their strength and confidence” may provide a false sense of invulnerability to victimization (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 10). In addition, to student-athlete victimization, the authors of the ASAIV also discussed how student-athletes might become change agents in the reduction of sexual assault and interpersonal violence.

**Student-athletes as change agents.** A common notion in the ASAIV is that student-athletes can and should be “change agents” in minimizing campus sexual assault and interpersonal violence (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 7). The NCAA’s Executive Committee challenged student-athletes to “maintain a hostile-free environment” and institutions to “educate all student-athletes…about sexual violence prevention, intervention and response” (Wilson et al., 2014, NCAA Executive Committee Resolution section). Further, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted:

*The reduction of sexual assault and violence will become manifest among student-athletes as they act together to change behaviors that perpetuate an acceptance of sexual harassment, assault and interpersonal violence. Those changes will ensue naturally as student-athletes realize the changes are expected, recognized and valued by their peers and coaches.* (p. 8)
The ASAIV provided information for how to respond when a student-athlete is victimized. For example, the ASAIV acknowledged the difficulty when an incident involves student-athletes as both perpetrator and survivor:

To better understand how to protect a student-athlete survivor, athletics will benefit from consultation with an appropriate campus partner…It is important that athletics works with the appropriate office(s) [to understand] where and how the survivor and alleged perpetrator might come in contact as they engage in their athletics-related activities. (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 15)

A study conducted by the NCAA (2012) found that student-athletes acknowledged they should be a part of the solution, but barriers remained to actual intervention. For example, the study found over 30% of student-athletes (both men and women) “believed if they intervened, they might get physically hurt, they could get in trouble, it was too much trouble, their teammates might be angry with them or people might think they were overreacting” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 17). As such, Wilson et al. (2014) recommended bystander intervention education programming as a remedy. Wilson et al. (2014) made it clear that increased student-athlete involvement was crucial, asserting, “When student-athletes are properly trained as peer educators, they can become some of athletics’ most successful presenters in reaching other student-athletes” (p. 17).

Wilson et al. (2014) confidently asserted that due to their visibility and status, student-athletes can contribute greatly to sexual assault awareness and prevention. However, mention of an invaluable role is remarkably absent: student-athlete survivors. In particular, Wilson et al. (2014) acknowledged female student-athletes as an at-risk
subgroup for sexual assault victimization, yet the value of survivor perspective did not appear in the ASAIV. In a guide published by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Dills, Fowler, and Payne (2016) recommended inclusion of “individuals and survivors who identify across the spectrum of gender identities that includes, but is not limited to male, female, transgender, and queer” in campus sexual assault prevention strategies (p. 8). As mentioned earlier, Kathy Redmond Brown’s advocacy group, NCAVA, was not listed as a resource in the ASAIV; she is a female student-athlete survivor. Additionally, as women represent an overwhelming majority of sexual violence survivor, omission of survivors’ voices could be seen as continuation of a cultural script, a powerful “technique for articulating cultural norms, values, and practices” (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 2004, p. 153). Here, the cultural norm is to minimize women’s voices. Indeed, student-athletes can be a powerful force to reduce sexual assault on college campuses. However, perhaps no role in athletics was positioned as more important in the ASAIV than coaches.

**Theme Five: Coaches**

Wilson et al., (2014) stated that its intended audience were intercollegiate athletic administrators, staff, “and those who provide educational programming for student-athletes” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 5). However, there was a consistent emphasis on the role of coaches in sexual assault and interpersonal violence prevention. Participant C indicated that the important role of coaches materialized early during initial conversations between NCAA facilitators and SAAC representatives:
They over and over and over would emphasize their coach. Did their coach know anything about this? What was the coaches’ attitude? Did the coach ever step in when off-colored jokes were being told? What had been their coaches’ response to these kinds of things?

While it might be interpreted that the mentions of staff in the ASAIV inherently included coaches, coaches and staff were addressed as separate entities early in the document. For example, the NCAA Executive Committee resolutions highlighted in the prologue addressed “all athletics staff, coaches, administrators and student-athletes” (Wilson et al., 2014, NCAA Executive Committee Resolution section).

Wilson et al. (2014) emphasized coaches’ significant presence in student-athletes’ lives:

While there may be other campus activities that give students an opportunity to get to know and work with faculty and other students, it would be rare to find social or academic programs that not only provide but require the almost daily interaction expected of student-athletes with other student-athletes, their coaches and athletics staff throughout their college years. (p. 8)

Likewise, the authors asserted, “athletics has long accepted that coaches and particularly head coaches and the coach who works most closely with a given student-athlete have a very strong if not the strongest influence on a student-athlete during his or her college years” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 19). Wilson et al. (2014) further referred to coaches’ influence as “almost continuous and strong” (p. 8).
Wilson et al. (2014) noted additional impetus on coaches’ role in monitoring athletic facilities like locker rooms and weight rooms. For example, the authors stated, “Without proper supervision that includes training for coaches, staff and student-athletes (especially team leaders), there can be no confidence that those are healthy environments” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 14).

The role coaches play in student-athletes’ behavior was also mentioned (Wilson et al., 2014):

Since aggressive and controlling behaviors are promoted in many sports for both male and female student-athletes, coaches and athletic administrators have a responsibility to help their student-athletes understand the situational appropriateness of aggressive behavior and that what is allowable and even desirable during an athletic practice or competition has no part in social relationships or “off the field” behavior. (p. 11)

The influence that coaches have on student-athletes’ behavior on and off the field contributes greatly to overall athletic culture.

**Theme Six: Addressing Sport Culture**

*Culture, cultures, or subculture, or cultural* were mentioned several times in the body of the ASAIV. The *Student-Athlete Perspective* section featured two subsections that address culture specifically (e.g., *What role do student-athletes play in changing the campus culture?* and *How can student-athletes become effective agents of violence prevention and cultural change?*) (Wilson et al., 2014). Sometimes *culture* referred to societal culture. For example, Wilson et al. (2014) stated, “nobody in our culture is
untouched or immune to the effects of sexual violence and interpersonal violence. The causes of interpersonal violence are multi-determined and embedded in our general and college cultures” (p. 7). Consistent with the title of the document, an overwhelming majority of the appearances of culture referred to general campus or college culture. For example, “This guide advocates the advancement of intercollegiate athletics as a prominent player in shifting campus cultures toward greater safety through sexual assault and interpersonal violence prevention” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 5). Additionally, the ASAIV called for the athletic community to “help student-athletes become cohesive around and committed to changing a campus culture of violence or apathy to one of safety” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8). Similarly, Wilson et al. (2014) stated, “student-athletes should be encouraged to join, support and engage with their nonathlete peers in the broader effort of changing the campus culture” (p. 17).

Additionally, eight mentions of culture referred specifically to locker room, team, or athletic culture. For example, in reference to athletics’ perceived attachment to offensive language, Wilson et al. (2014) stated, “Historically, such language (often combined with hyper-masculine or aggressive statements or behaviors) has been part of many locker room and team cultures” (p. 15). Further, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted: Because “group think” and solidarity is so strong among sports teams, if male student-athletes are confident that they will be not just accepted but supported if they speak out or act to stop sexual assaults and interpersonal violence, they can have a profound effect not only on immediate situations, but athletics culture as a whole. (p. 19)
Likewise, Wilson et al. (2014) stated:

If whole teams, including coaches and student-athletes, accept a similar commitment to reshaping attitudes and behaviors that have supported sexual assault and interpersonal violence to ones that support health and safety, the culture around those issues will change in athletics. (p. 28)

In the following section, I summarize the analysis and findings within the themes.

ASAIV Summary: Analysis and Findings

Using a critical theorist approach to content analysis, I identified six main themes to address the research questions. Theme one *key messages* underscored what messages the NCAA deemed most important to the intended audience of the ASAIV. Theme two *defining athletics* demonstrated a broad, undefined representation of athletics. Theme three *deflection* identified a potential effort to distance the cause of college sexual assault from intercollegiate athletics, framing it overwhelmingly as a broader societal issue. Theme four *student-athletes* demonstrated the NCAA’s effort to minimize student-athletes as sexual assault perpetrators, raise awareness of student-athletes as prevalent victims of sexual assault and interpersonal violence, and to position student-athletes as change agents. Theme five *coaches* demonstrated the author’s emphasis of coaches’ influence on the behavior of their student-athletes. Theme six *addressing sport culture* demonstrated the author’s positioning of sexual assault and interpersonal violence as a general cultural issue; however, intercollegiate athletic culture was presented as potentially contributory and a part of the solution. I believe these findings create a foundation for why the NCAA pursued the creation of the ASAIV, its understanding of
sexual assault and interpersonal violence, and how it resolved to address the issue. As the goal of this study was to answer specific research questions, I applied my findings to those questions in Chapter Four.
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Sexual assault on college campuses persists as a serious problem, garnering increasing attention from the public, media, institutions, and the NCAA. Wilson et al. (2014) noted that the overwhelming majority of college men will not commit sexual assault. Further, those college men who commit rape tend to be repeat offenders. Thus, a small percentage of men accounted for a disproportionately large percentage of rapes. Despite these statistics, there is a widely held belief that student-athletes are more prone to commit sexual assault and interpersonal violence, due in large part to immense media coverage of intercollegiate sports in the United States. The media reports new instances of sexual assault committed by student-athletes each year, most often involving revenue-generating sports at notable Division I institutions. Media commentators have presented a number of potential explanations for the prevalence of athletes in sexual assault stories (Blake, 1997; Brubaker, 1994; Kleinberg, 1997). Increased access to alcohol and women (compared to non-athletes) may simply create more opportunities for athletes to commit sexual assault (Blake, 1994). Kleinberg (1997) reported that athletes were frequently falsely accused by women seeking financial gain. Additionally, the legal system may judge athletes more harshly (Blake, 1997). Similarly, research suggesting that intercollegiate athletic association may be a predictor of sexual violence is scant and dated (Crosset, Benedict, & McDonald, 1995; Fritner & Rubinson, 1993). Nonetheless, the NCAA deemed the potential relationship between intercollegiate athletics and sexual assault an issue important enough to create executive resolutions and a specific guide to assist its member institutions (Wilson et al., 2014).
The NCAA was reluctant to create specific policy on sexual assault committed by student-athletes until 2017, when it mandated that universities commit to annual sexual assault education and compliance efforts (NCAA, 2017). The policy, however, was largely a repackaging of federal Title IX guidelines suggested in 2011 (Ali, 2011). Prior to the 2017 policy creation, NCAA president Mark Emmert issued vastly different statements on whether his organization or its individual members should assume responsibility for the issue ("NCAA boss Mark Emmert," 2014; "Mark Emmert wants rules," 2016). I suspect the 2017 policy was a response to Emmert’s 2016 comments calling for the NCAA to create punitive rules for sexual assault, as the policy was released less than a year after Emmert’s 2016 comments. I posit that the three years that passed between the NCAA’s 2014 sexual violence resolution and the 2017 policy may reflect a combination of the bureaucratic steps it takes to propose and approve an NCAA policy and a questionable urgency to respond to sexual violence. *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses* (ASAIV) is not a policy, but it remains one of the few concerted NCAA responses to the issue. As such, the purpose of this study was to examine the ASAIV, including its content and historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to its development. I discussed findings and major themes in Chapter IV, which included: (a) key messages, (b) defining athletics, (c) deflection, (d) student-athletes, (e) coaches, and (f) addressing sport culture. I discuss these themes and apply critical theory in the following sections.
Key Messages

I observed that Wilson et al. (2014) deemed several messages to be very important. The authors demarcated these key messages from the rest of content by displaying them in blue italicized print, listing them in large, blue font labeled as a “bottom line”, or occasionally as separated comments in large, blue font above section titles. Many of the key messages mirrored major objectives described in NCAA Executive Committee resolutions: compliance with authorities and federal laws regarding sexual assault and interpersonal violence, cooperation during sexual assault investigations, and education of the athletic community about preventing and responding to sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Beyond highlighting these objectives, Wilson et al. (2014) prioritized several other key messages: (a) intercollegiate athletic culture: a part of the solution; (b) collaboration; (c) sexual assault and interpersonal violence: a general cultural problem; (d) response protocol; (e) sexual assault characteristics: perpetrators, victims, and effects; and (f) student-athlete risk reduction. I discuss each of these key messages in the following subsections.

Intercollegiate athletic culture: A part of the solution. Wilson et al. (2014) stated that intercollegiate athletics can be a powerful factor in reducing sexual assault and interpersonal violence several times in the ASAIV, citing its significant visibility on college campuses. Athletes, in particular, have had a long history of using their visibility to advocate or protest various issues. For example, Irish runner, Peter O’Connor, waved an Irish flag in defiance of British rule after winning a silver medal in the 1906 Olympic
Games (Guiney, 1996). Similarly, Ralph Rose, an Irish-American athlete, refused to lower the American flag for the British king for the same reason (Dyreson, 1992). In addition to political causes, athletes have also used their platform for social issues.

Roberta Gibb and Kathrine Switzer ran the Boston Marathon illegally—in 1966 and 1967, respectively—as symbols of women’s quest for equality (Renick & Velez, 2013). American Olympic runners John Carlos and Tommie Smith infamously protested civil rights issues at the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games (Edwards, 1969). More recently, in 2012 the Miami Heat, an NBA team, protested the killing of African American youth, Trayvon Martin, by donning black hoodies in a photograph (Edwards, 2016). Also in 2012, Chris Kluwe, an NFL punter, advocated for same-sex marriage and believed he was fired as a result (Kluwe, 2014). Colin Kaepernick, an NFL quarterback, knelt during the national anthem in protest of American racial discrimination in 2016 (Wyche, 2016); Megan Rapinoe knelt similarly during the national anthem at a professional women’s soccer match in advocacy of freedom for all in the United States (Rapinoe, 2016).

NCAA student-athletes have also engaged in protest. For example, in 2012, University of Virginia football player, Joseph Williams, engaged in a hunger strike with other students to protest unfair wages of campus workers (Yanda, 2012). In 2013, Northwestern University, Georgia Tech, and University of Georgia football players advocated for student-athlete unionization in an effort to achieve employee status and fair compensation by wearing black wristbands during games (ESPN, 2015). With regard for sexual assault prevention, several NCAA member universities have partnered with It’s on Us, an anti-sexual assault campaign created by a presidential task force in 2014 (Us,
The campaign began during September of 2014, the same month and year that the ASAIV was published (Somanader, 2014). NCAA student-athletes contributed to the It’s on Us by creating and appearing in a series of social media videos. It is not yet clear what impact the campaign has made on the issue of sexual assault and I have found no research that indicated student-athletes have been effective in combating sexual assault. Wilson et al. (2014) asserted that athletics can be a powerful factor in reducing sexual assault throughout the document and hinted that student-athletes can be “effective cultural change agents” (p. 7). It is clear, however, that while the authors positioned student-athletes as potential factors in minimizing sexual assault and interpersonal violence, there was a concern that they may be hesitant to intervene during a violent situation. Citing a 2012 study conducted by the NCAA, Wilson et al. (2014) stated that student-athletes believed if they intervened, they might anger teammates, get in trouble, or get physically hurt. In fact, student-athletes’ reluctance to intervene during violent or potentially violent situations was a common narrative in many recent sexual assault situations involving student-athletes. While it may seem that student-athletes have been powerless to act, in actuality, they fear the repercussions of getting involved (e.g., causing a divide in the locker room).

An example of inaction occurred at Vanderbilt University, when several student-athletes were witnesses to events leading up to—and the actual rape—of a student by a football player at Vanderbilt University (“Vanderbilt rape case,” 2015). Yet, none of them reported the incident or intervened, and in some cases were encouraged to join in the act of rape. In addition to educating student-athletes on sexual assault intervention,
Wilson et al. (2014) emphasized collaboration between intercollegiate athletics and other campus departments. Wilson et al. (2014) attempted to empower student-athletes, but I sense that student-athletes have the least power in the NCAA compared to athletic directors and university presidents. I question how empowered a student-athlete may feel, when at many institutions they do not even have the power to choose their own academic major or coursework.

**Collaboration.** Wilson et al. (2014) stressed the importance of athletics’ willingness to collaborate with other campus departments in responding to sexual assault and interpersonal violence. They asserted, “the causes of sexual assault and interpersonal violence are too embedded and reinforced in our culture for it to change significantly without a concerted, coordinated, well-informed, committed, comprehensive and long-term campus effort” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 21). However, before the ASAIV addressed collaboration processes, Wilson et al. (2014) cautioned athletics departments about the risks of operating in isolation. They stated, “Until it builds a bridge to the rest of its campus community, an athletics department may find itself isolated within its own institution” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 21). Further, the authors warned about the negative perceptions such isolation can create:

> When athletics maintains separation within its own campus and incidents of interpersonal violence involving student-athletes occur, it is possible for violence to be perceived as a student-athlete issue with athletics as its complicit partner. Separatism leads to misperceptions and mistrust that increase the possibility that the campus community and public will believe athletics either ignores acts of
sexual assault and interpersonal violence or protects the “business and image of athletics,” rather than the survivors of violence. (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 24)

The “misperceptions and mistrust” of athletics departments described above have been fueled by details revealed in many recent sexual assault scenarios involving student-athletes. For example, an investigation into the alleged rape of a student by Florida State University quarterback, Jameis Winston, revealed slow and inconsistent communication between the athletics department and other campus support departments (Bogdanich, 2014). Similarly, a third-party investigation of a sexual assault scandal at Baylor University demonstrated slow and incomplete communication between the athletics department, executive leadership, and Title IX coordinators (Regents, 2015). One scholar observed that student-athletes are isolated from the rest of the student body (McCarthy, 2016), a phenomenon that seems to be increasing, particularly among big-time athletic programs. Anecdotally, for example, the Simpson Athletics and Academic complex at Baylor University is noticeably, geographically separate from the rest of campus. The building, which houses coach and administrative offices, athlete tutoring services, and the main weight room is located on the far South end of campus and across a four-lane street, serving perhaps symbolically of a growing divide between athletics and academia. Here the NCAA is challenging other campus entities (e.g., student life) to impose their power in the process of reducing sexual assault. The idea of athletics “reaching across the aisle” to engage faculty, staff, and student life struck me as contradictory, as in many other processes, the athletic departments try to maintain autonomy over other endeavors like student-athlete admissions.
Sexual assault and interpersonal violence: A general cultural problem.

Wilson et al. (2014) commented generally on sexual assault and interpersonal violence as a cultural problem beyond the scope of intercollegiate athletics and campus communities. According to a study conducted by the Department of Justice (National Crime Victimization Survey, 2015), while sexual assaults have declined dramatically since the early-1990s, they occurred steadily at nearly 30,000 incidents during the four years between 2011 and 2014. Although national statistics have remained consistent during this time, steady media coverage of has given the impression that it is still a serious problem in intercollegiate athletics. Many reports point to incorrect adherence to sexual assault response protocol as a factor in this perceived prevalence (Bogdanich, 2014; Regents, 2015).

Response protocol. In response to the NCAA Executive Committee resolution mandating athletics to “know and follow campus protocol” regarding sexual assault and interpersonal violence (Wilson et al., 2014, NCAA Executive Committee Resolution section), adherence to sexual assault and interpersonal response protocol was described as imperative for all student-athletes and personnel in athletics, especially reporting an incident. For example, a key message read, “When a student shares information with a campus administrator—be it staff, coach or other official of the institution—that report must be formally shared with the appropriate institutional staff to ensure that required protocol is followed” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 9). Wilson et al. (2014) also described the potential harm to survivors when protocol was not followed: “When survivors do not report, or when reporting does not result in appropriate protocol compliance, survivors
may not receive the resources that could alleviate their suffering and help them recover as quickly and completely as possible” (p. 9).

Student-athletes, in particular, were urged in a key message to report, as they “will be the individuals most often present across the many situations in which their peers are involved and in which acts of violence are likely to occur” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 17). During recent scandals at Baylor, Florida State, and Penn State, the inability to grasp or implement appropriate sexual assault response protocol resulted in significant victimization and perhaps indicated an effort to prioritize the well-being of athletics over the well-being of alleged or actual victims (Bogdanich, 2014; Bonesteel, 2015; Dowler, Cuomo, & Laliberte, 2014). Wilson et al. (2014) described characteristics of sexual assault perpetrators, victims, and the effects of victimization in the ASAIV, perhaps to help athletics identify when and how to respond.

Sexual assault characteristics: Perpetrators, victims, and effects. Wilson et al. (2014) thoroughly described the characteristics of sexual assault perpetrators, victims, and the effects of victimization. They described two major characteristics of sexual assault perpetrators: Predominately male and under the influence of alcohol. The hypermasculine nature of sexual assault bodes poorly for the nature of athletics. As Gregory (2004) noted, “The sports world is one of the last arenas that continues to be blatantly dominated by men” (p. 266). Alcohol was of particular concern in the ASAIV, as student-athletes self-reported as binge drinking more often than their non-athlete peers (NCAA, 2013). Alcohol use also increased victimization likelihood, along with being female, a freshman, having a prior history of victimization, and being a sexual or
religious minority (Wilson et al., 2014). Wilson et al. (2014) also warned that alcohol may enhance other characteristics linked to violence:

What is probable is that personal characteristics (like anger management and impulse control issues) combine with an environmental situation (like the consumption of alcohol) and a triggering event (like a date’s refusal to grant sexual favors) to create a flashpoint for violence. (p. 11)

While Wilson et al. (2014) indicated that student-athletes are not more prone to commit more violence than their non-athlete peers, they described violence-inducing characteristics like anger management problems, aggression, and alcohol use linked to athletic association. For example, studies have shown that student-athletes displayed a higher degree of sexually aggressive attitudes (Boeringer, 1996, 1999; Koss & Gaines, 1993). Further, while sexual minorities are only mentioned a few times in the ASAIV, athletics has also been linked to homophobia. Muir and Seitz (2004) observed that sports are a frequent arena whereby men often maintain masculinity by degrading those who are gay or lesbian. Sexual assault may be considered by some as the ultimate method of degradation. Wilson et al. (2014) described another pertinent characteristic of sexual assault victimization: athletic participation. They cited a 2012 NCAA survey that found male student-athletes were sexually assaulted at higher rates than their non-athlete peers (Wilson et al., 2014). In describing the actors involved in many sexual assaults (e.g., male perpetrators and female victims), the authors of the ASAIV underscored the hypermasculine nature of sexual assault and the shared hypermasculine characteristics of athletics that may contribute to the former’s prevalence.
Student-athlete risk reduction. Although Wilson et al. (2014) referred to factors that contributed to sexual assault perpetration (e.g., anger management issues and rape-supportive attitudes) in non-athletic terms, the authors mentioned that some of these tendencies should be monitored by athletic authorities like coaches to minimize the risk of a student-athlete committing sexual assault. Wilson et al. (2014) cited “lack of appropriate supervision” as problematic (p. 11). Another factor that was linked to sexual assault preparation was prior felony history. The criminal history of a student-athlete has become a prominent issue in recent years. One of the major controversies of the Baylor sexual assault scandal was the acceptance of a transfer football player with a prior assault history from Boise State University (Bonesteel, 2015). Some athletic conferences, such as the South Eastern Conference and the Big 12 Conference, have adopted policies that no longer allow transfers with a history of sexual assault (Dodd, 2015; Kerr-Dineen, 2015). Coaches have great reward power as described by French and Raven (1959) in this sense, as a prospective student-athlete has greater incentive to not commit sexual assault if it increases his chances of getting a scholarship with no record of such transgressions.

Despite these institutional measures, discussion from the NCAA about student-athlete specific policy to reduce student-athlete sexual assault perpetration has remained minimal.

I believe the most important takeaways from key messages were that (a) the NCAA felt it was very important to reassure its members that intercollegiate athletic culture could be a powerful advocate for sexual violence reduction; (b) the NCAA was concerned that some athletic departments were not handling allegations of sexual assault.
properly (e.g., compliance); and (c) the NCAA acknowledged that it needed help to combat sexual violence (e.g., collaboration). In the next section I discuss the second theme, *defining athletics*.

**Defining Athletics**

*Athletics* was clearly the target audience of the ASAIV and Wilson et al. (2014) specified the guide was “meant to assist intercollegiate athletics administrators and those who provide educational programming for student-athletes” (p. 5). However, it is not entirely clear what other roles may constitute *athletics*. Roles that were specifically mentioned included athletic administrators, coaches, staff (including event staff), athletic trainers, and student-athletes. Most of these roles were mentioned in the context of Clery Act mandates, which specified “campus security authorities” (CSA) who are required to receive training on sexual harassment and sexual assault (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 14). Further, CSAs “include all people who have significant responsibilities for student or campus activities” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 14).

Although athletic administrators, coaches, staff, and athletic trainers may have the most responsibilities for athletic activities, there are a few other roles that meet the Clery Act definition of CSA. For example, athletic departments utilize (either as paid or voluntary positions) students to help with recruitment or volunteers from other campus departments. These students are sometimes housed illegally in campus football office operations. Additionally, the NCAA itself concedes that boosters (officially defined as “representatives of the institution’s athletic interests”) may “assist in the recruitment process of a prospective student-athletes” (NCAA, 2017, p. para. 2). In contradiction, the
NCAA (2017) also stated, “only institutional staff members are permitted to recruit prospective student-athletes” (para. 4). Future NCAA sexual assault guides and policy should consider addressing these additional auxiliary roles.

In addition to how Wilson et al. (2014) described the components of athletics, I observed that the term is most frequently presented as a monolithic entity juxtaposed against individual campus entities (e.g., colleagues or partners). It is possible that the authors positioned athletics as an impersonal and institutional to separate its role in contributing to highly personal incidences of violence or simply that it was the most convenient way to refer to the audience (as opposed to frequently specifying coaches and administrators). Nonetheless, the NCAA may want to be more wary about how it chooses to be represented in future guides on the issue of sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Per Coakley’s (2007) recommendation for critical theorists, I interpreted this uneven presentation of athletics in the ASAIV as the NCAA’s struggle with defining who actually represents them.

I felt that the NCAA may not know, understand, or consider where its organizational boundaries are or should be. Many sexual assault cases involve persons who may not have an official affiliation with an athletic department (e.g., student recruiters or team physicians) (Mencarini, 2017; “Vanderbilt rape case”, 2015). Hence, the NCAA and its member institutions may need to reevaluate who needs to be targeted with future messages regarding sexual violence awareness and prevention. Next, I discuss the third theme: deflection.
Deflection

Wilson et al. (2014) made several assertions that deflected culpability for sexual assault and interpersonal violence away from athletics and student-athletes. Most notably, she stated that “there is no evidence that participation in athletics or any particular sport causes participants to become perpetrators of violence” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 11). At face value, this statement is incorrect. For example, participation in many contact sports like boxing, mixed martial arts, hockey, and American football often mandate that athletes in those sports commit violence (Bloom & Smith, 1996; Coakley, 2007, Messner, 1990). Some of that violence is situationally appropriate (e.g., tackling in football, checking in ice hockey, or punching an opponent in boxing). American football and ice hockey are intercollegiate sports. Messner (1990) stated:

it seems reasonable to simply begin with the assumption that in many of our most popular sports, the achievement of goals (scoring and winning) is predicated on the successful utilization of violence—that is, these are activities in which the human body is routinely turned into a weapon to be used against other bodies, resulting in pain, serious injury, and even death. (p. 203)

Further, violence caused by sport participation may not be limited to the field of play. Bloom and Smith (1996) found that as level of competition increased, the more likely an ice hockey athlete would commit violence off the ice.

It is possible, however, that Wilson et al. (2014) implied that athletic participation has not been shown to cause sexual violence. If that is the case, it is true that no studies have found a causal link between athletic participation and sexual violence. Crosset
(1999) pointed out that “arguing about whether athletes are more or less violent than nonathletes is an overly simplistic approach to understanding the issues” (p. 249). Moreover, “athletic affiliation may be too broad to be useful in explaining male athlete violence against women” (Crosset, 1999, p. 248). In other words, such a focused study could not account for all the other factors that may contribute to violent behaviors (e.g., an abusive upbringing or aggressive personalities self-selecting into violent sports). As such, he called for a continuance of nuanced approaches that examine various factors beyond athletic affiliation that may contribute to male athlete violence against women (e.g., alcohol use, head injuries, and peer support). Another suggestion was the examination of potential institutional support provided by individual universities; however, examination of governing institutions like the NFL or NCAA would also qualify.

Although there are no studies that show a causal relationship between athletic association and sexual violence, several studies show correlation between athletic association and characteristics like rape-supportive attitudes, increased likelihood to use sexual coercion, as well as victim self-report studies that identify student-athletes as frequent assailants (Fritner & Rubinson, 1993). By contrast, although Wilson et al. (2014) presented student-athletes as no more dangerous that their non-athlete peers based on research, they stated frequently that student-athletes can be a significant part of the solution. To date, no studies have shown that student-athletes to be effective in sexual assault prevention. Related studies have shown, however, that various programs can improve student-athletes’ confidence to help rape survivors (Foubert & Perry, 2007) and
effectiveness in bystander intervention (Moynihan, Banyard, Arnold, Eckstein, & Stapleton, 2010; Moynihan & Banyard, 2008).

Indeed, it can be difficult to prove causal links between association (e.g., athletic affiliation) and behavior (e.g., sexual violence); however, in the ASAIV, Wilson et al. (2014) remained reluctant to concede any connection between student-athletes and propensity to commit sexual assault. I posit that unless the NCAA assumes more accountability for student-athlete behavior, particularly off the field (or at least consider the possibility that student-athletes commit more sexual violence than non-student athletes), the organization will resist creation of stronger policies to reduce sexual assault. Development of the ASAIV was evidence that the NCAA, at minimum, recognized sexual assault and interpersonal violence as important issues; however, despite the time and resources invested into the development process, the ASAIV is ultimately an in-depth brochure and not actual policy, which raises questions about how serious the NCAA considered the issue. The following discussion further illumines how student-athletes were a focus of the ASAIV, including their role as change agents.

**Student-Athletes**

Violent incidents involving student-athletes initiated discussions within the NCAA that culminated with the publication of the ASAIV (Wilson et al., 2014). So, it was expected that student-athletes were a prominent theme in the document. In fact, of all the athletics representatives addressed or discussed in the ASAIV, only student-athletes garnered the attention necessary for a dedicated section (“Student-Athlete Perspective”) (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 17). Three sub-themes resonated within the major category: (a)
minimization of student-athlete perpetrators of sexual assault and interpersonal violence, (b) student-athlete victimization, and (c) student-athletes as change agents. Each of these sub-themes will be discussed below.

**Minimization of student-athletes as perpetrators of sexual assault.** Wilson et al. (2014) acknowledged that student-athletes were affected by sexual assault, but downplayed their role in the perpetration of sexual. First, she correctly asserted that in the general college population, very few men commit rape (Wilson et al., 2014). Further, those who do, commit a disproportionately high number of the total rapes. Citing a study by Lisak and Miller (2002), she stated,

> In a study of college students, each rapist committed an average of 5.8 rapes. In that study, the 120 male college student rapists (identified by subjects voluntarily and anonymously admitting to different acts of violence) were responsible for a combined total of 1,225 separate acts of violence. (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 10)

From this assertion, it can be interpreted that with rape being a relatively rare crime in the overall population and with student-athletes representing a small percentage of the college student population, the prevalence of rape committed by student-athletes may be extremely low. Next, Wilson et al. (2014) stated, “The research does not show significant differences between student-athletes and their nonathlete peers on probabilities of perpetrating acts of violence. It appears there may be more differences among student-athletes than between student-athletes and nonathletes” (p. 11). It should be noted, however, that rape is not the only manifestation of sexual violence and no information is provided about student-athletes’ likelihood to commit acts of stalking, sexual harassment,
or other forms of sexual violence. For example, Fritner and Rubinson (1993) found that in addition to college women’s reporting that student-athletes committed 22.6% of sexual assaults, student-athletes also perpetrated 11% of battery, illegal restraint, and/or intimidation incidences. In that study, male student-athletes only constituted 2% of the overall male student population. Here, Wilson et al. (2014) imposed expert power to assure the reader that student-athletes are not prodigious perpetrators of sexual assault. Although, student-athletes were minimized as perpetrators of sexual violence, Wilson et al. (2014) described their victimization.

**Student-athlete victimization.** Given that the murder of a student-athlete at the University at Virginia in 2010 contributed to initial NCAA discussions about sexual assault and interpersonal violence, it made sense that student-athlete victimization was a prominent topic in the ASAIV. Male student-athletes reported being victims of sexual assault at a higher rate than their non-athlete peers according to a 2012 NCAA study (as cited in Wilson et al. (2014). Further, Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, and Martin (2007) found that 6.1% of male student-athletes reported being victims of attempted or completed sexual assault. Wilson et al. (2014) also warned that student-athlete victimization risk may be increased by increased alcohol use. Abbey (2002) found that alcohol was implicated in 50-70% of college sexual assault incidents. Perhaps the most surprising statement, however, was that female athletic participation may also increase victimizations. An American College Health Association (2008) study found that women feel that being a part of a group will protect them from victimization (as cited by Wilson et al., 2014). Further, female student-athletes’ increased strength confidence may
inculcate invulnerability to victimization, according to a report by Banyard et al. (2012). Wilson et al. (2014) warned that such female student-athlete strength and confidence may increase risk of sexual assault; however, this could be construed as discouraging female student-athletes from pursuing physical strength as sport and life attributes. Further, warning against strength and confidence could perpetuate female student-athlete victim-blaming, whereby the victim of a crime is held fully or partially responsible for their victimization (Ryan, 1971). The Wilson et al. (2014) warning could be interpreted similarly to how a female might be warned not to wear provocative clothing because she is “asking for it”, a common form of sexual assault victim blaming. Ironically, Wilson et al. (2014) did warn against “blaming the victim” in the ASAIV’s educational programming section (p. 29).

Indeed, Female student-athletes have commonly been victimized in recent cases of alleged sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Yeardley Love was a women’s lacrosse athlete at the University of Virginia, Sasha Menu Courey was a former swimmer at the University of Missouri, and women’s equestrian, volleyball, and acrobatics and tumbling athletes were victimized in a series of assaults at Baylor University. The phenomenon of female student-athlete victimization may not be surprising, given that male and female student-athletes train and compete in close proximity and form social connections in the process. Additionally, female-student athletes share the same tendency to binge drink as their male counterparts (Ford, 2007). In particular, female soccer student-athletes demonstrated the highest prevalence of binge drinking (46.9%). Soccer is one of the most commonly offered sport at NCAA institutions. Wilson et al. (2014)
asserted that although student-athletes are at risk, they can also be important cultural change agents.

**Student-athletes as change agents.** Wilson et al. (2014) stated, “The majority of male and female student-athletes want to have healthy relationships and be part of a campus that is safe for all students. And though most campus sexual assaults are perpetrated by men, most men are not perpetrators and can be effective cultural change agents” (p. 7). Wilson et al. (2014) reinforced that student-athletes’ place on a powerful, visible platform like athletics may translate to powerful messages to the rest of the campus and other student-athletes. Student-athletes, particularly those who play revenue-generating sports at big-time institutions, can achieve celebrity status. Now, high-profile student-athletes can have thousands of social media followers. It is no surprise that Wilson et al. (2014) specifically addressed male student-athletes as change agents, they are often hailed as “big men on campus” (Melnick, 1992)—there is not a commonly used female equivalent. The heavy emphasis on male student-athletes as change agents in the ASAIV may indicate that reduction of sexual assault and interpersonal violence, particularly when student-athletes are involved, must begin with peer-to-peer influence.

In addition to student-athletes’ role in reducing sexual assault and interpersonal violence, Wilson et al. (2014) also stressed the importance of coaches in the process:

The reduction of sexual assault and violence will become manifest among student-athletes as they act together to change behaviors that perpetuate an acceptance of sexual harassment, assault and interpersonal violence. Those
changes will ensue naturally as student-athletes realize the changes are expected, recognized and valued by their peers and coaches. (p. 8)

In encouraging student-athletes to be agents of change, Wilson et al. (2014) called them to draw on referent power (French & Raven, 1959) as respected or admired figures on campus to engage each other and non-student-athletes on the issue of sexual assault.

Given the attention Wilson et al. (2014) gave to the subject and the immense influence of the Yeardley Love murder on the ASAIV’s development, I believe the most important finding from the student-athletes theme is the NCAA’s concern for the off-field safety of its own student-athletes. I sensed that the NCAA acknowledged that if its member institutions cannot keep student-athletes safe, then it cannot fully contribute to reduction of campus-wide sexual assault and interpersonal violence. I discuss the emphasis on coaches in the ASAIV in the next section.

**Coaches**

Of all the professional athletic personnel addressed by Wilson et al. (2014) in the ASAIV, none received more emphasis than coaches. They recognized the sheer amount of time coaches spend with student-athletes and the vast influence coaches wield over them: “a very strong if not the strongest influence on a student-athlete during his or her college years” (p. 19). Previous research reaffirmed coaches’ significant influence on student-athletes (Martens et al., 2006). Describing a coach as a “position of power,” Martens et al. (2006) stated, “a coach may have more influence over their life than any other individual on campus” (p. 314). Coaches demonstrate all five dimensions of power as described by French and Raven (1959). For example, legitimate power is inherent with
the title of “head coach”, coaches have extreme coercive/reward power over student-athletes (e.g. reduction of playing time or promotion to a starting line-up), and may wield extreme referent power if s/he is a consistent winner over time. Further, Wilson et al. (2014) urged coaches to be wary of their influence on particular behaviors. They asserted coaches “have a responsibility to help their student-athletes understand the situational appropriateness of aggressive behaviors and that what is allowable and even desirable during an athletic practice or competition has no part in social relationships or ‘off the field’ behavior” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 11). Additionally, Wilson et al. (2014) charged coaches to be wary of the “derogatory, sexist or offensive language” often associated with athletic environments (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 15). They asserted, “Unchallenged, such language makes it easier for student-athletes, coaches and other staff in athletics to persist with their unacceptable behaviors and may encourage sexual assailants to commit their crimes since they do not fear negative consequences” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 15). Such language can concurrently spur inappropriate behavior and diminish the confidence and ability of student-athletes and coaches to intervene as bystanders.

Coaches are often a significant part of the narrative when alleged sexual assault or interpersonal violence situations occur (Butterworth, 2008; Schlabach & Lavigne, 2016; Tracy, 2016). Former iconic Penn State head football coach Joe Paterno was highly scrutinized for the questionable expediency and thoroughness of his response to child sex abuse claims about one of his assistant coaches (Tracy, 2016). Former University of Colorado football coach Gary Barnett used abrasive, insensitive language about Katy Hnida, then a kicker on the team, after she alleged sexual assault by a teammate
Former Baylor University head football coach Art Briles failed to properly report allegations of sexual assault committee by his student-athletes and admitted to creating a system in which he would be the last to know when a student-athlete issue occurred, purposefully removing himself from the response equation (Schlabach & Lavigne, 2016). Briles may have taken his referent power (French & Raven, 1959) as a respected, successful coach for granted in thinking that being a winner would supersede any of his players’ behavioral shortcomings. Notably, the focus of the ASAIV was to address “sexual assaults and acts of interpersonal violence that occur between college students” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8) and coach sexual misconduct was not mentioned. Yet, several recent scandals revealed coaches as perpetrators of sexual assault. Long-time assistant football coach, Jerry Sandusky, received criminal punishment in 2012 for sexually abusing several boys, often in Penn State showers, for years (Dowler, Cuomo, & Laliberte, 2014). At the University of Arizona, a track coach blackmailed a female student-athlete into a sexual relationship, then later threatened to rape and murder her to sustain the relationship (Barr & Noren, 2017). Kathy Klages, former gymnastics coach at Michigan State University, knew team doctor Larry Nassar was sexually abusing student-athletes and reportedly shielded him (Mencarini, 2017).

Many intercollegiate coaches are the highest-paid employee on their campuses (often a result of referent and reward power); in some cases, they may be the considered the most powerful employees, as well. When responding to questions about whether his head football coach could be dismissed for student-athlete-related infractions, former Ohio State University president, E. Gordon Gee, famously quipped, “I’m just hopeful that
the coach doesn’t dismiss me” (Whiteside, 2011, p. para. 2). In recent years, the media consistently raised questions about the increased distribution of power to big-time college football and basketball coaches (Bilas, 2012; Smith, 2012; Whiteside, 2011). Smith (2012) asserted, “The simple fact is that the top college football coaches are granted not just increased pay, but a centralization of power that enables and perhaps even encourages improper conduct” (para. 6). Perhaps the NCAA may be recognizing a dubious power imbalance, as well. Jay Bilas, a well-respected basketball analyst, quoted NCAA President Mark Emmert’s response to coaching power: “There's no reason why we couldn't and shouldn't look at those kinds of policies and say, ‘Look, you don't run your own admissions department. You don't run your own disciplinary program’” (Bilas, 2012, p. para. 13).

Wilson et al. (2014) also emphasized the importance of coaches’ awareness of reporting protocol when a violent situation may have occurred (as Baylor coach Briles demonstrated). They asserted:

It is critical that coaches and other departmental staff learn how to make a referral to an appropriate staff member or department on campus where survivors can have their accounts of incidents properly documented, learn of their rights and receive other services such as advocacy, counseling and medical support. (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 22)

Wilson et al. (2014) also observed coaches’ influence on athletic culture: “Because of the almost continuous and strong influence of coaches…it is possible for those relationships to significantly help student-athletes become cohesive around and
committed to changing a campus culture of violence or apathy to one of safety” (p. 8). Further, “those changes [in culture] will ensue naturally as student-athletes realize the changes are expected, recognized and valued by their peers and coaches” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 8).

Although Wilson et al. (2014) did not grant coaches their own section in the ASAIV, it was clear that the NCAA believes that coaches have one of the most important role in reducing sexual violence committed by student-athletes. Perhaps, the diffusion of coaches as an audience throughout ASAIV rather than a focused section (e.g., “Student-Athlete Perspective”) is also a misunderstanding (or refusal of admission) by the NCAA of how powerful coaches have become. I identified sport culture as the final theme, which is discussed in the next section.

**Addressing Sport Culture**

Wilson et al. (2014) mentioned sexual assault and interpersonal several times in the context of culture. Additionally, Participant C reaffirmed that the issue “may be our biggest public health crisis on our college campuses today and it is a major public health problem throughout our nation and our culture”. Although the term *culture* and its derivatives (e.g., *subculture* or *cultural*) did not appear as frequently as other major themes, I interpreted the notion that certain cultures inculcate environments or behaviors that contribute to sexual violence and interpersonal violence to be a major concern of the NCAA. Wilson et al. (2014) described culture in societal, campus, and athletic contexts. However, it was clear that athletics’ place as both a part of campus culture and its own culture loomed large in the ASAIV. For both student-athletes and non-student-athletes.
alike, athletics could be interpreted as a shared collegiate culture. For example, an intercollegiate football game brings together many different stakeholders in a college community in a shared experience: students, student-athletes, faculty, staff, and alumni. However, Wilson et al. (2014) made several indications that athletics has different characteristics from other facets of the institutional domain—many of which did not bode well for athletics’ role in sexual assault and interpersonal violence.

Behaviors linked to sexual assault and interpersonal violence were ascribed to student-athletes, derogatory and sexist language was ascribed to both student-athletes and coaches, and athletics as a whole was described as having hypermasculine tendencies. For example, “Athletics faces a particular concern in regard to derogatory, sexist or offensive language. Historically, such language (often combined with hyper-masculine or aggressive statements or behaviors) has been part of many locker room and team cultures” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 15). Similarly, “Athletics should be particularly diligent in addressing derogatory, sexist or offensive language due to its history in locker rooms and some team cultures” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 29). They further noted, “In sports, particularly in an aggressive, stereotypically masculine sport like football the team locker room can be a hostile and intolerant environment” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 30). Perhaps most ominously, Wilson et al. (2014) asserted, “For example, a presentation might be delivered to male student-athletes on how the ‘masculinization’ of males in our culture affects their perception of females and the perpetuation of a ‘rape culture’” (p. 28). Perpetuation in this sense seemed to imply that a culture already exists. I found it interesting that while Wilson et al. (2014) deflected culpability for sexual assault away
from individual student-athletes (e.g., basketball players); sport culture was admonished for harboring behavior like misogynistic language that often precedes sexual assault. It was contradictory that while Wilson et al. (2014) minimized individual student-athletes’ role in committing sexual violence, there were several comments warning against athletic cultural practices (e.g., misogynistic language) that may contribute to sexual violence. I interpreted this to mean that the NCAA conceded that athletic culture could be problematic, but not the individuals to comprise athletic culture. In the following section, I will return to the study’s purpose and research questions.

**Study Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to examine the ASAIV (Wilson et al., 2014), including its content and historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to its development. Based on the study’s findings and the previous discussion, I will now provide specific answers to the study’s research questions.

**Research Question 1. How did Wilson et al. (2014) discuss athletics’ role in support of healthy and safe campuses?**

The NCAA positioned sexual assault and interpersonal violence as societal, campus, and intercollegiate athletic concerns. As the title suggested, however, Wilson et al. (2014) framed sexual assault and interpersonal violence most often in a campus-wide context, as opposed to a specific athletic issue. In my interpretation, the authors recoiled from presenting any information that linked athletic association to perpetration of sexual assault or interpersonal violence. Similarly, one participant bristled when I questioned the exclusion of research that linked athletic association to sexual assault perpetration.
Nonetheless, Wilson et al. (2014) thoroughly described the nature of such sexual assault and interpersonal violence, including their different iterations (e.g. rape, stalking, and hazing), characteristics of sexual assault perpetrators, sexual assault victims, and the harmful effects of victimization. Appropriately, Wilson et al. (2014) discussed aspects of student-athlete victimization. To validate assertions about the issue, Wilson et al. (2014) cited several studies, which reinforced the authors’ expert power. However, it should be noted that many of the cited studies were conducted by the NCAA itself.

Wilson et al. (2014) addressed various individual athletic roles in support of healthy and safe campuses (e.g., athletic administrators, athletic trainers, and event staff); however, the authors highly prioritized student-athletes and coaches. Wilson et al. (2014) devoted an entire section to addressing the student-athlete perspective and the authors addressed coaches throughout the ASAIV in terms of their influence on student-athletes and ability to follow protocol when sexual assault or interpersonal violence allegations occurred. In general, there was a great emphasis on compliance with federal laws regarding sexual assault and interpersonal violence and the ability of athletics department and its personnel to collaborate with other campus departments in reducing and responding to sexual assault and interpersonal violence.

Research Question 1a. How did historical, political, or organizational factors contribute to the development of the ASAIV?

Historical factors. Several historical factors influenced the development of the ASAIV, most notably a series of incidents covered by the national media (Wilson et al., 2014). Wilson et al. (2014) asserted, “those incidents all involved college student-athletes
who were suspected of or charged with perpetrating sexual assaults and other types of interpersonal violence, including murder of an intimate partner” (p. 50). Several incidents met the described criteria; however, the ASAIV did not provide additional details. A thorough examination of interviews with key contributors and secondary sources revealed that the murder of Yeardley Love, a women’s lacrosse player at the University of Virginia, by her ex-boyfriend, who was a men’s lacrosse player at the University of Virginia, galvanized the NCAA’s decision to address the issue of sexual assault and interpersonal violence (Participant A; Participant B; Participant C). Love’s murder was not the first at the hand of another student-athlete (Aydelotte, 2005); thus, in addition to Couric’s coverage, I hypothesize that the University of Virginia’s status as a long-established, respected institution of higher learning magnified the need for a response. Further, its proximity to the nation’s law-making bodies and its high visibility as a competitive athletic member of a Power 5 conference made ignoring the murder difficult.

As noted in Chapter IV, the Chair of the CSEC stated at the Summit on Violence in the spring of 2011 that the June 2010 decision to focus on the issue responded to “the tragic loss of a precious life at the University of Virginia (NCAA, 2011). However, it was not confirmed that the Yeardley Love case sparked the NCAA’s discussion about athlete violence until one participant contributor revealed that Katie Couric, a nationally-known journalist and University of Virginia alum, had personally contacted the NCAA about the incident. In addition to Couric’s contact, the Yeardley Love murder received extensive national coverage on virtually every major news network and several major periodicals,
including *The Washington Post* (Flaherty & Johnson, 2010) and *Sports Illustrated* (Wertheim, 2010).

**Political factors.** Several federal laws, memorandums, and remarks by government leaders influenced the development of the ASAIV. Title IX legislation laid the foundation for information provided in the guide. Enacted in 1972, Title IX prohibited sex discrimination in educational settings that receive federal funding and included sexual harassment and sexual assault as discriminatory actions (S. Res. 86, 1972). In 2010, the US Department of Education released a memorandum, referred to as the Dear Colleague Letter (DCL), informing educators of their responsibilities regarding sexual harassment and bullying (Ali, 2010). The 2010 DCL described a scenario in which an “athletic coach” witnessed a high school student enduring unwelcome sexual comments and messages, but dismissed them as hazing (Ali, 2010, p. 6). Likewise, another DCL in 2011 addressed educators’ responsibilities to sexual violence in greater detail (Ali, 2011). However, the 2011 DCL added that “Title IX protects students in connection with all the academic, educational, extracurricular, athletic, and other programs of the school, whether those programs take place in a school’s facilities, on a school bus, at a class or training program” (Ali, 2011, p. 3). Additionally, the 2011 DCL recommended that schools implement sexual violence and harassment “training for student athletes and coaches” and to include policies and procedures in any student-athlete handbooks (Ali, 2011, p. 14). Further, a 2013 DCL addressed retaliation: “Discriminatory practices are often only raised and remedied when students, parents, teachers, coaches, and others can report such practices to school administrators without
the fear of retaliation” (Galanter, 2013, p. 1). Wilson et al. (2014) urged, “when a survivor or alleged perpetrator is a student-athlete, athletics must report to appropriate campus offices for resolution and must protect those individuals from retaliation from a student, student-athlete or staff in athletics” (p. 15). Wilson et al. (2014) included summaries of Title IX legislation and the 2010, 2011, and 2013 DCLs in the ASAIV. It is also possible that a US Senate hearing on various NCAA practices impacted the development of the ASAIV. In July of 2014, Senator Claire McCaskill chided NCAA President Mark Emmert after a report she spearheaded found that 20% of schools give oversight to athletics during sexual assault cases involving student-athletes (Berkowitz, 2014; Sexual violence on campus, 2014).

**Organizational factors.** According to a presentation given by Dr. Debbie Wilson a few days after the release of the ASAIV, she was the first to suggest the NCAA examine student-athlete violence in the wake of the Yeardley Love case in 2010 (citation forthcoming). Then a member of CSEC and a senior athletic administrator at George Mason University, the NCAA Executive Committee tabbed her as in charge of the project. Over the next four years, the NCAA spearheaded several events to promote the initiative.

In the spring of 2011, the CSEC sponsored a Summit on Violence and at the NCAA national convention in January of 2012, sponsored a panel: “Addressing Violence: Cross-Campus Solutions” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 50). Also in 2012, the NCAA Student-Athlete Advisory Committee led discussions about violence prevention. In the fall of 2012, the CSEC sponsored a Violence Prevention Think Tank in Washington, D.
C. According to Dr. Wilson, most of the attendees were experts on various elements of violence and had no athletic background. In June of 2013, the CSEC green-lit the creation of a resource and the NCAA was notified that the document was in the works at the national convention in 2014.

The media also influenced the creation of the ASAIV. A summary of its development found in the document’s acknowledgments stated, “The process began in fall 2010 when the NCAA’s Committee on Sportsmanship and Ethical Conduct (CSEC) began discussing a series of incidents reported in the national media” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 50). In particular, the media’s coverage of the Yeardley Love murder alluded to by former CSEC Chair, John Blanchard, at the NCAA Summit on Violence in 2011, highly influenced the process. All three interview participants were familiar with the Love case, but Participant B provided especially detailed reasons as to why that incident was so pivotal:

Obviously, it touched home because it was within our athletics family. Also, there was some high-profile interest in that case. Katie Couric was an alum from Virginia and had contacted the NCAA to express her concern about the broader issue, but you know what could be done. So I think that that garnered, you know, some real heightened, heightened awareness and concern at that point.

Participant C reaffirmed that because of the Yeardley Love murder, the NCAA “needed to target sexual assault and interpersonal violence as a major problem on our college campuses and effecting and involving our student-athletes.”
Katie Couric, an Emmy award-winning journalist, maintained contact with the Love family and interviewed Yeardley’s mother as recently as 2015 to promote the One Love Foundation to end relationship violence, which provides programming often shared with student-athletes (Yahoo! News, 2015). I interpret the continual coverage by the media and emergence of new violence initiatives like One Love as evidence that many outside the NCAA do not have faith that the organization will use its power appropriately—or perhaps not at all—to address interpersonal violence in college athletics.

**Research Question 1b. Why did the NCAA create the ASAIV?**

The NCAA created the ASAIV as a “natural outcome of their efforts to address sexual assault and other acts of interpersonal violence as they affect college students and student-athletes” (Wilson et al., 2014, p. 50). In adhering to Booth’s (2005) context paradigm, two major events had major “effect and consequences” (p. 18) on the process: the murder of Yeardley Love, an NCAA student-athlete, by another student-athlete in 2010 (Flaherty & Johnson, 2010), and the meeting of the CSEC just a few months later. One participant added that college presidents were beginning to discuss the issue, both in terms of general campus sexual assault and athletics-related sexual assault. Another participant simply stated, “Growing awareness.” Participant B asserted that there was NCAA recognition that sexual assault was an important issue and characterized it as “a top ten issue in my world.” Based on my findings, the creation of the ASAIV could also be characterized as a confluence of media coverage of sexual assault and increased legal pressure to protect women.
**Research Question 2.** How has the NCAA used its power to address sexual assault and interpersonal violence?

Coakley (2007) asserted that power is “an ability to influence people and achieve goals, even in the face of opposition from others” (Coakley, 2007, p. 448). In the face of opposition from the government and the media, the NCAA has asserted legitimate, expert, and referent power, as described by French and Raven (1959), to reassure the government, the media, and other constituencies that sexual assault is not more prevalent in athletic culture and that the NCAA and its institutions can, in fact, can be a large part of the solution. However, the NCAA has not fully tapped into its coercive and reward power. Specifically, NCAA policy on sexual assault has been toothless. There was no additional incentivizing in the ASAIV (beyond sexual assault reduction as its own reward) and the NCAA has yet to broach the idea of making (coercive) punishment a policy with regard to individual student-athletes who commit sexual assault.

**Implications**

This study was a qualitative content analysis of the ASAIV, contextualized by topical interviews, secondary media, and NCAA sources. The purpose of this study was to examine how historical, political, and organizational factors contributed to the development of the document. The findings of this study have implications for positive change at individual and institutional levels. Specifically, results may contribute to increased understanding and improved practices for the following stakeholders regarding intercollegiate athletics’ role in addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence: (a) intercollegiate athletic administrators, (b) coaches, (c) athletic support personnel, and (d)
sport studies scholars. The following subsections discuss the implications of the study for each of those roles.

**Intercollegiate athletic administrators.** Intercollegiate athletic administrators may be able to apply findings from this study to best practices for implementing the recommendations made by the ASAIV at their individual in. While NCAA president Mark Emmert hinted the NCAA itself may assume a larger role in creating and enforcing sexual assault policies (“Mark Emmert wants rules,” 2016), currently, the member institutions maintain most of the responsibility to educate, prevent, and respond to the issue. As such, athletic administrators wield great power to influence coaches and student-athletes. In particular, findings from this study can be applied to two of the responsibilities shared by intercollegiate athletic directors: “acting as a legal wizard to master the compliance standards expected of him and his programs by the NCAA, conference, and university” and “understanding the importance of academics to the athletic enterprise and knowing the place of athletics within the university environment” (Greenberg & Evrard, 2016, p. 736).

Certainly, compliance was inherently a major theme of the ASAIV; however, understanding the academic implications of providing a healthy and safe campus may be a challenge for athletic directors, who are increasingly products of the business world and not higher education. Additionally, mishandling a sexual assault incident within the athletic department could be a costly one, with potential loss in ticket sales, donations, and compounded by legal fees. Worst case scenarios may cause the NCAA to recognize a loss of institutional control, which can result in devastating punishments levied against a
team or entire athletic department. Athletic directors are presumably the superiors of their coaches, who also may directly benefit from the implications of this study.

**Coaches.** Coaches did not warrant a specific subsection like student-athletes did in the ASAIV; however, the content analysis revealed them to be a crucial target audience. As such, findings of this study may further heighten coaches’ awareness of their special role in addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Wilson et al. (2014) stressed that coaches have immense influence over their student-athletes. Head coaches and their assistants spend an inordinate amount of time with student-athletes compared to other institutional faculty or staff, especially during the season of a student-athlete’s particular sport. This proximity places coaches in an ideal position to reinforce positive messages about treating fellow students respectfully and intervening when violent situations may be unfolding. Yet, Wilson et al. (2014) noted in the ASAIV that coaches’ use of sexist or misogynistic behavior can have the opposite effect. Student-athletes often feed off coaches’ intensity during practices and games. The casual observer may notice the effectiveness in which a special teams coach fires up his student-athletes before a kickoff. However, such student-athlete intensity may spillover into activities after a game or practice; coaches must be mindful of how their language and actions influence the language and actions of their student-athletes.

Wilson et al. (2014) also challenged coaches with better oversight of athletic facilities. Supervision of student-athletes during practices or competition may be implied; however, Wilson et al. (2014) stressed that coaches assist in the supervision of “locker rooms, team rooms, athletic training rooms, weight and conditioning facilities, academic
support facilities, practice areas and competition venues” (p. 14). Further, victimization increases in isolated areas like residence halls. Given that many institutions earmark certain residence halls for student-athletes to inculcate team chemistry, accountability, and increase convenience to athletic facilities, coaches may also re-evaluate how residence halls are supervised or if a density of student-athletes may decrease the likelihood of a teammate intervening during a violent situation. Athletic administrators and coaches play obvious roles in sexual assault prevention and response given their power, but other athletic personnel may not understand or be willing to accept their responsibility in addressing the issue.

**Athletic support personnel.** While athletics was never fully defined in the ASAIV, Wilson et al. (2014) addressed several support staff roles “including staff in events management, athletic trainers and others” (p. 14). Wilson et al. (2014) deemed these roles as “campus security authorities” (CSA) (p. 14), as according to the Clery Act, they have “significant responsibilities for student or student activities.” Other personnel that meet the definition of CSA are volunteers. Athletics departments often rely heavily on student, university staff (who hold other paid positions outside of athletics), or community volunteers to conduct athletic events, such as with prospective student-athlete recruitment. These individuals may not receive the required training required by the Clery Act or feel powerless to report violent situations due to their volunteer status. Additionally, while Wilson et al. (2014) address “medical staff” and “licensed physicians” regarding confidentiality issues, they were not addressed specifically in terms of their designation as CSA. In light of the Larry Nassar scandal at MSU (Mencarini,
2017), it is important that team physicians be specifically included in future education and awareness initiatives.

Although “intercollegiate athletics administrators and those who provide educational programming for student-athletes” were the intended audiences of the ASAIV (Wilson et al., 2015, p. 5), it is notable that the role of NCAA staff members (e.g., President Mark Emmert) in preventing sexual assault and interpersonal violence was not mentioned in the ASAIV, beyond the introduction of NCAA-wide resolutions to address the issue. This may be indicative, however, of the NCAA’s uncertainty or unwillingness to play a more active role, and of its self-described guidance by its member institutions, (NCAA, 2018).

**Sport studies scholars.** As McCray (2015) noted, research on intercollegiate athletes and sexual violence has greatly diminished since the early 2000s, despite the persistent presence of student-athletes as perpetrators and survivors of sexual assault. This study reignites the scholarly conversation about the issue and takes it in an emerging direction: away from student-athletes’ propensity to commit sexual assault, beliefs, and attitudes (e.g., rape myth acceptance) and toward athletic administrators’ and coaches’ roles in sexual assault prevention. This study supplements examination of the potential relationship between sport culture and sexual assault. Moreover, sports studies scholars could apply this study to future research on sexual assault and intercollegiate athletics, including NCAA decision-making processes. Further, sport studies instructors could integrate findings into sport law, ethics, communication courses and discussions.
Additionally, this study reveals more about the interworking of NCAA decision-making, hence, could also be applied to sport governance courses. For scholars interested in developing sexual assault prevention education or programming geared toward athletics, this study may illuminate a potential shift in audience prioritization. Many existing programs focus on educating student-athletes. The Mentors in Violence Prevention program, developed in 1993 and adopted by both sport and non-sport organizations (e.g., military branches) by the end of the decade, originally targeted the social status and platform enjoyed by student-athletes to raise awareness of sexual violence for peers. Additionally, the Step Up! Program developed in part by the NCAA only activates students with a bystander approach (Step Up! Program, 2018). However, with the NCAA mandating that coaches receive sexual assault training, the reaffirmation of coaches’ importance in this study may encourage scholars to address a gap in sexual violence educational programming. While the NCAA’s Sexual Violence Prevention toolkit (NCAA, 2016) intended to provide more activation than the ASAIV and addressed coaches, there is still a dearth of college coach-specific training available.

Limitations

This study was conducted using a content analysis of the ASAIV, supplemented by topical interviews with key contributors to the document. Multiple readings of the ASAIV produced themes discussed in Chapter Four, which guided semi-structured interviews that revealed more details about the historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to the creation of the ASAIV. The research method allowed me to
answer the research questions; however, there were limitations to the study which are discussed in the following subsections.

**Number of participants.** Wilson et al. (2014) provided a lengthy list of contributors to the ASAIV, including NCAA personnel, student-athletes, and consultants. I intended to interview a variety of contributors; ultimately I made contact with five potential participants, garnering three commitments to participants. However, it would have been valuable to interview student-athletes who were members of the SAAC at the time the document was being created. Further, while I did interview an NCAA staff member, an interview with a member of the NCAA Executive Committee that approved the project would have been helpful, providing insight from an actual decision-maker. Moreover, an interview with an athletic director or university president, who are typically members of the NCAA, would have been advantageous, as they are the most powerful voices in the organization and are typically very involved when sexual violence situations transpire on their campuses.

**Participant memory.** An inherent limitation of historical interviews is the memory of participants. The process of creating the ASAIV began seven years ago and participants could not remember several key details. For example, while I am confident that the murder of Yeardley Love at the University of Virginia was the lynchpin incident that sparked NCAA discussion about sexual assault and interpersonal violence, Wilson et al. (2014) cited more than one influential incident in the ASAIV. Yet, none of the participants could remember other specific incidents, even when presented with other events that met the criteria of the historical timeline provided in the document.
Additionally, participants were inconsistent and vague when describing details about the writing and collaboration process. The process of creating the ASAIV began seven years ago and it was difficult for participants to recall many of the conversations and actions that occurred. One of the participants is still working with the NCAA, so it may be possible that he/she could not be fully transparent on certain questions.

**Researcher bias/inexperience.** I began this project skeptical of the NCAA’s efforts to respond to sexual assault. Thus, I had to be constantly self-aware of my distrust at the outset. Nonetheless, a researcher with a more optimistic perspective of the NCAA’s efforts would have reached different conclusions. My skepticism paired well with critical theory; however, theoretical framework selection is inherently an additional limitation. In addition to my bias, my inexperience as an interviewer was a limitation, particularly during interviews. Sexual assault is a sensitive topic and at times, I was hesitant to challenge participants on my perceived shortcomings of the ASAIV. Several times during interviews, I felt I had to pull back from certain topics (e.g., research suggesting overrepresentation of student-athletes in sexual assault reporting) in order to maintain cooperation and collegiality with participants. In retrospect, I feel I could have been more steadfast and garnered richer feedback.

**A priori knowledge/theory.** My intent in the development of this study was to explore how the NCAA wields its power to address sexual assault and interpersonal violence; thus, selecting critical theory made sense. However, choosing another theory (e.g., grounded theory or feminist theory) or none at all, may have resulted in different conclusions.
Recommendations for Future Research

Examining the development of the ASAIV supplemented research on sexual assault, intercollegiate athletics, and sport governance. In addition to reviving discussion on sexual assault committed by student-athletes, this study illuminated contributing and motivating factors to how the NCAA developed a sexual assault and interpersonal violence awareness and prevention document for athletics departments, as well as the process of creating the document. As such, this study also provided a foundation for several recommended research directions.

NCAA Sexual Violence Prevention Toolkit. In 2016, the NCAA, citing a need for improved application on the ASAIV’s recommendations, published *Sexual Violence Prevention: An Athletics Tool Kit for Healthy and Safe Culture (SVP)*. A similar content analysis could be conducted on the SVP and a comparison could be made to this study. As a result, the evolution of the NCAA’s response to the issue could be examined. Additionally, the NCAA recently issued a new policy regarding sexual violence education accountability (NCAA, 2017). That policy and any future NCAA policies may also be examined and compared to the ASAIV.

Other sport organizational documents/resolutions/policies. Several sport organizations have formally addressed their role in sexual assault education and prevention. For example, the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), an organization that oversees intercollegiate athletics for mostly small colleges, approved a resolution that emphasized sexual assault awareness in 2014. Further, the NFL has included sexual assault within the purview of its Personal Conduct Policy in 2014, which
applies to all NFL employees. Similarly, Major League Baseball and its players’ association constructed a similar policy in 2015. Future studies could conduct similar analyses of how the historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to each approach to sexual assault and comparisons could be made between the ASAIV and other organizational documents, resolutions, and/or policies.

**Document/policy effectiveness.** A historical examination of how effective the ASAIV and accompanying documents like the SPV have been in addressing sexual assault and interpersonal violence could be conducted. For example, three years of sexual assault reporting data collected prior to the publication and dissemination of the ASAIV could be compared to three years of data post facto. Results may guide the creation of future intercollegiate athletic policy regarding the issue.

**Conclusion**

This study responded to a renewed call for academic attention to sexual assault committed by student-athletes (e.g., McCray, 2015) and a dearth of research on NCAA policymaking. I identified historical, political, and organizational influences on the creation of the NCAA guide. The research revealed a reactionary, media-inspired initiative by the NCAA to respond to sexual violence committed by student-athletes, as well as a reluctance to adopt actual, enforceable rules for transgressions involving sexual assault committed by student-athletes.

Prior to conducting the study, I made several assumptions about what a critical theory framework might reveal about the NCAA: (a) struggles about representation, (b) revelation of ideology, (c) and demonstration of French and Raven’s (1959) five
dimensions of power. First, a few elements indicated a struggle over representation. Wilson et al., (2014) emphasized collaboration, but was not clear as to who exactly comprised athletics as a collaborator. Also, a participant observed that many athletic departments did not understand the need for independent investigatory proceedings, revealing a misunderstanding of who should represent in sexual assault investigations. Second, the ASAIV represented an ideological apparatus, reproducing NCAA ideologies under the auspices of education. Althusser (1971) described education as a common conduit through which messages could be conveyed without repressive means (e.g., government or military mandate). The NCAA adopts an ideology of image-preservation and collaboration with other campus entities only when its reputation is threatened by student-athlete perpetrated sexual assault concerns. Additionally, Wilson et al. (2014) demonstrated an NCAA ideology that assigns most culpability for sexual violence to general society, some accountability to athletic culture (e.g., locker room language), but little responsibility for itself (e.g., NCAA president, its committees, or policies). Third, the NCAA strongly demonstrates legitimate, expert, and referent power, but has been reticent to exert coercive and reward power. To that end, the ASAIV does not incentivize improved sexual assault education and procedures, nor does it broach punishment for institutions that are not compliant. When I asked a participant whether or not an individual athlete should be punished for a major sexual assault scandal, she hinted that it would only be possible to punish a university if the transgression was found to have an effect on athletic competition.
Further, the content analysis of the ASAIV, contextualized by participant responses, revealed several themes: (a) key messages, (b) defining athletics, (c) deflection, (d) student-athletes, (e) coaches, and (f) addressing sport culture. The findings contribute to the areas of sport history, sport management (particularly with regard to sport governance), and sport sociology, specifically in the realm of intercollegiate athletics. Additionally, I illustrated what implications this study might have on future research. Specifically, I described how my findings contributed to the knowledge of (a) intercollegiate athletic administrators, (b) coaches, (c) athletic support personnel, and (d) sport studies scholars. Further, I included recommendations for other scholars to supplement this study by examining the NCAA Sexual Violence Toolkit and other sport organizations’ policies and resolutions regarding sexual assault, such as those created by the NAIA or NFL. Upon publishing the finding of this study, I will continue to monitor the efforts of the NCAA to respond to sexual violence committed by student-athletes. I will persist in research on the roles of coaches, student-athletes, and administrators regarding the prevention of sexual assault committed by student-athletes.
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Therefore, this letter constitutes full approval by the IRB of your application (version 1.0) as submitted, including ASAIV Informed Consent (English) (Version 1.0), ASAIV Interview Protocol (Version 1.0), and the ASAIV Participant Recruitment Email (Version 1.0). The listed documents have been dated and stamped IRB approved. Approval of this study will be valid from June 12, 2017 to June 12, 2018.
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Appendix B: Timeline/Flowchart for Procedures

- **Aug.-Oct., 2016**
  - Literature Review
  - Iterative ASAIV readings

- **Nov.-Dec., 2016**
  - Initial ASAIV thematic analysis
  - Critical friend feedback
  - Thematic analysis refinement

- **Jan.-Mar., 2017**
  - Prioritization of participant pool
  - Development of interview guide
  - Invitations sent to prospective participants
  - Final ASAIV themes determined

- **Apr.-Jun., 2017**
  - 3 Participants confirmed; informed consent forms sent
  - 2 participants return signed consent forms
  - 2 interviews scheduled and conducted
  - 2 interview transcriptions completed

- **Jul.-Oct., 2017**
  - Topical interview analysis conducted on 2 interviews
  - 3rd interview conducted and transcribed
  - 3rd topical interview analysis conducted

- **Nov. 2017-Jan. 2018**
  - Cross-comparison of interviews completed; member checking completed
  - Final analyses completed
  - Final critical friend conversation
Appendix C: ASAIV Highlighted Categories/Note
Appendix D: Participant Recruitment Email

Dear [Insert interviewee’s name],

I am conducting a research study to explore the development of *Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses*, a document published by the NCAA in 2014 (attached). You have been identified as a potential participant for the study.

If you decide to participate in the study, we will schedule an interview for a date and time that is convenient for you. The interview will take between 30 and 90 minutes. The interview will take place in person, on the phone or video conference, as long as the location is safe, conducive for interviewing, and provides reasonable privacy.

The researcher is flexible and happy to accommodate your schedule for the interview.

Please let me know if you are or are not interested in participating in the study.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Evans

Doctoral Candidate, Sport Studies

University of Tennessee  
Department of Kinesiology, Recreation, and Sport Studies  
1914 Andy Holt Avenue  
233 HPER Building  
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-2700  
P. 254.744.563z  
E.zjevans70@vols.utk.edu

Appendix E: Preliminary Interview Guide Main Questions
• How did you get involved in the development of the ASAIV?

• Why do you think you were sought out to contribute to the project?

• What can you remember about the development of the ASAIV?

• Who was the first person to approach you about creating the ASAIV?

• What boundaries or limitations were provided to authors about the creation of the ASAIV?

• What non-NCAA input contributed to the ASAIV?

• What did student-athletes contribute to the ASAIV?

• What did campus athletic department representatives contribute to the ASAIV?

• Who approved the final version of the ASAIV?

• Was there any information edited out of the document that you feel should have remained?

• What resources and experiences did you draw from in creating the ASAIV?

• Why do you think the NCAA decided to produce a document like the ASAIV?

• Did you feel this was a necessary step (to develop the ASAIV)? Why or why not?

• Can you describe the NCAA’s attitude toward sexual violence committed by student-athletes when it decided to create the ASAIV?
• To what extent do you feel the document is applicable to the current climate regarding sexual assault committed by student-athletes?

• In retrospect, how might you have written the ASAIV differently?

• In your opinion, how has the NCAA used its power to address sexual assault and interpersonal violence?

• Before we close this interview, is there anything else you would like to add?
Appendix F: Informed Consent Form

TITLE: An Examination of the Development of the NCAA Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence Guide

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Jonathan Evans
Doctoral Candidate, Sport Studies
1914 Andy Holt Avenue
233 HPER Bldg
Knoxville, TN 37996

ADVISOR: Lars Dzikus, PhD

INTRODUCTION
You are being given the opportunity to participate in this research study. The purpose of this consent form is to help you decide if you want to take part in the research study. This consent form may contain words that you do not understand. Please ask the investigator to explain any words or information that you do not clearly understand.

The purpose of this study is to examine the historical, political, and organizational factors that contributed to the development of the National Collegiate Athletic Association’s (NCAA) guide *Addressing Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence: Athletics’ Role in Support of Healthy and Safe Campuses (ASAIV)* (Wilson, 2014).

You have been selected as a participant due to your published involvement with its creation, or because another ASAIV contributor recommended you as a source. Approximately 3-5 individuals will be participating in this study.

INFORMATION ABOUT PARTICIPANTS’ INVOLVEMENT IN THE STUDY
If you decide to participate in the study, we will schedule an interview for a date and time that is convenient for you. The interview will take between 30 and 90 minutes. The interview will take place in person, on the phone, or via video conference (e.g., Skype) as long as the location is safe, conducive for interviewing, and provides reasonable privacy. The interview will be audio recorded and the recording will later be transcribed verbatim. If you wish to stop the interview at any point, you may do so without negative consequences by notifying the interviewer. You are welcome to ask questions at any point during your participation in the study. At a later point, you will receive an email invitation to provide brief, written feedback on the accuracy of the interview transcript and your views on the researchers’ interpretation of the data. You will not be required to provide this feedback.

RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION
The possible risks to participants are minimal. You can choose to not respond to any question you are not comfortable answering.

There is the potential risk of loss of confidentiality. Although unlikely, it may be possible for a reasonably determined person to identify participants due to the small number of participants in the study. Every effort will be made to keep information confidential; however, this cannot be guaranteed beyond this, there are no foreseeable risks other than those encountered in everyday life.

Participant’s Initials ______________________

IRB NUMBER: UTK IRB-17-03796-XP
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 06/12/2017
IRB EXPIRATION DATE: 06/12/2019
BENEFITS ASSOCIATED WITH PARTICIPATION
There are no anticipated direct benefits to you resulting from your participation in the research. This research may inform the development of future sexual assault education and prevention guides.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise, the information in the study records will be kept confidential. That means your actual name will not be linked to written transcripts. You will be asked to come up with a “fake name” (a pseudonym) that will be used in place of your name. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. Recordings will be stored on the researcher’s password protected computer. The recordings will be deleted after the interviews have been transcribed. Signed consent forms will be kept separate from other records in a locked filing cabinet in Dr. Dzikus’s office.

QUESTIONS AND CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study,) you may contact the researcher, Jonathan Evans (jevans70@vols.utk.edu or 865-974-3295) or Dr. Dzikus (lars@utk.edu or 865-974-6451).

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, you may contact the University of Tennessee IRB Compliance Officer at utkarlo@utk.edu or (865) 974-7697.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL
Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may decide not to participate or you may leave the study at any time. Your decision will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you are entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be deleted and destroyed.

CONSENT
I have read the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Participant’s Name (printed) __________________________________________

Participant’s Signature __________________________________________ Date __________

IRB NUMBER: UTK IRB-17-03790-XP
IRB APPROVAL DATE: 06/12/2017
IRB EXPIRATION DATE: 06/12/2019
Appendix G: Reflexivity Journal Entry Sample

Sunday 9/10/17

Watching NFL: Baltimore @ Cincinnati
- Joe Mason, former OU RB playing for Navy
- minimal talk about the assault in college; no major save from fans citing he going when he crosses the ball
- Have people forgotten?
- Do fans not care?
- If not, why?
Does his playing really send a message to college athletes?
- I feel guilty watching.
### Appendix H: Timeline of Selected Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2010 | • NCAA student-athlete Yeardley Love murdered  
      • CSEC prioritized sexual assault/interpersonal violence  
      • University of Missouri football player charged with sexual assault  
      • Notre Dame student Lizzy Seeberg committed suicide after reporting rape by Notre Dame football player |
| 2011 | • NCAA conducted Summit on Violence  
      • Sandusky/Penn State scandal became public |
| 2012 | • NCAA National Convention panel: "Addressing Violence: Cross Campus Solutions"  
      • Florida State University/Jameis Winston alleged sexual assault investigation  
      • NCAA conducted Student Athlete Social Environment Study  
      • NCAA hosted Violence Prevention Think Tank in Washington D.C. |
| 2013 | • NCAA CSEC recommended development of sexual assault and interpersonal violence guide  
      • Vanderbilt University football gang rape |
| 2014 | • ex-Baylor University football player found guilty of sexual assault  
      • NCAA issued resolutions regarding Title IX compliance and sexual violence awareness  
      • NCAA published the ASAIV and distributed it to NCAA member institutions  
      • NCAA president Mark Emmert asserted domestic violence is an individual university issue |
| 2015 | • Stanford University swimmer rape case |
| 2016 | • Texas A&M University coaches showed sexually explicit/offensive slideshow to female supporters  
      • NCAA President Mark Emmert called for NCAA punitive rules regarding sexual assault  
      • NCAA published sexual violence toolkit (SVP) |
| 2017 | • former Michigan State University team physician plead guilty to sexual assaults  
      • NCAA adopted new sexual violence policy |
## Appendix I: Table of Themes/Sub-Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Themes</th>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Key Messages</td>
<td>a) Intercollegiate athletic culture: A part of the solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Sexual assault and interpersonal violence: A general cultural problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Response protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Sexual assault characteristics: Perpetrators, victims, and effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Student-athlete risk reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2: Defining Athletics</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3: Deflection</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4: Student-athletes</td>
<td>a) Minimization of student-athletes as perpetrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Student-athlete victimization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Student-athletes as change agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5: Coaches</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6: Addressing Sport Culture</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J: Example of Key Messages in the ASAIV

assault or act of interpersonal violence include having a lack of appropriate supervision, a power- and exploitation-based belief of what it means to be male or masculine, previous felony arrests, male peers who hold rape-supportive attitudes, poor impulse control, anger management issues or past involvement in an aggression- or power-based relationship. Athletics departments can employ life skills programs to mitigate some of the factors that increase the risk of committing violence — programs to improve anger management, to address attitudes about power, control and masculinity, and to define healthy relationships. Other strategies may be employed to attend to issues of previous history.

The research does not show significant differences between student-athletes and their nonathlete peers on probabilities of perpetrating acts of violence. It appears there may be more differences among student-athletes than between student-athletes and nonathletes. Findings from the NCAA 2012 Social Environment Study indicated male student-athletes in the sports of football and baseball had a significant association with aggressive behaviors outside the sport. There were no sport-specific differences for female student-athletes on aggression.\textsuperscript{53} Since aggressive and controlling behaviors are promoted in many sports for both male and female student-athletes, coaches and athletics administrators have a responsibility to help their student-athletes understand the situational appropriateness of aggressive behaviors and that what is allowable and even desirable during an athletic practice or competition has no part in social relationships or "off the field" behavior.

What is probable is that personal characteristics (like anger management and impulse control issues) combine with an environmental situation (like the consumption of alcohol) and a triggering event (like a date’s refusal to grant sexual favors) to create a flashpoint for violence.

K. What is effective in protecting students and student-athletes from being victimized?

Having effective policies, ongoing collaboration with campus colleagues and educational programming that addresses prevention can contribute to reducing acts of sexual assault and interpersonal violence.

1. Policies: Protection begins at the top of the organization— from the president’s or chancellor’s office and leadership in each department, including from the athletics director. From that level must come clearly articulated and understood expectations, policies, procedures and sanctions regarding sexual assault and interpersonal violence. Within athletics all policies and procedures must be clearly understood for each level of the department. Student-athletes, other students working in athletics, coaches, administrators and other departmental personnel will have requirements communicated with the responsibilities of the positions they hold in the athletics department and the activities in which they are involved (tamps, recruiting, event management, etc.). Any policies adopted by the athletics department must be in compliance with federal laws, state laws and institutional policies.

2. Collaboration: Athletics must be part of a unified effort to change the campus culture. By collaborating with campus colleagues, athletics benefits from the expertise of those individuals and offices with special assignments, roles and expertise to address issues of prevention, education and intervention. In addition, when athletics collaborates with campus partners, it sends a strong message to departmental personnel of athletics’ commitment to supporting institutional policies and initiatives.

3. Educational programming: Educational programming in athletics is essential to changing the culture. In general, the individual presentations or activities that compose the overall educational program will focus on prevention, response and recovery. A more complete explanation of educational programming is found in "Section VI: Educational Programming in Athletics."

Bottom line: Effective prevention includes clear and communicated policy, collaboration with appropriate campus offices, and effective educational programming.
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Appendix K: Additional Resources Listed in the ASAIV (2014, p. 49)

Clery Center for Security on Campus: http://clerycenter.org

National Alliance to End Sexual Violence: www.endsexualviolence.org

National Center for Victims of Crime: www.ncvc.org

National Crime Prevention Council: www.ncpc.org

National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women: www.vawnet.org

National Sexual Assault Hotline: 1-800-656-HOPE (4673)

National Sexual Violence Resource Center: www.nsvrc.org

National Violence Against Women Prevention Research Center:
www.musc.edu/vawprevention

NCAA Violence Prevention Website: www.ncaa.org/health-and-safety/violence-prevention

Prevention Institute: www.preventioninstitute.org

Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network: www.rainn.org

Red Flag Campaign: www.theredflagcampaign.org

Sexual Assault Resource Service: www.sane-sart.com

Stop Sexual Violence: A Sexual Violence Bystander Intervention Toolkit:
www.health.ny.gov/publications/2040

Students Active for Ending Rape: www.safercampus.org

U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of Violence Prevention: www.cdc.gov/injury

Violence Against Women on Campus (U.S. Department of Justice): www.ovw.usdoj.gov
VITA
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