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ABSTRACT

A Case Study of Organizational Communication Dynamics between Intracollegiate Departments

by

Thies Carstens

Dr. Anthony J. Ferri, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Communication Studies
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

This study examines the relationship between University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), head coaches and their respective UNLV Sports Marketing Departments. Focused interviews of all 13 head coaches at the university were used to study communicational and promotional limitations between the two parties. The purpose was to discover strengths and weaknesses existing in the lines of communication as well as in the aspect of promotional efforts.

Results showed satisfactory performances of the Sports Marketing Department with regards to several aspects of the marketing procedure, including promotional strategies. Some problems were expressed by coaches as well. One of them was the lack of initiative by the SMD to communicate problems to the coaches. The Olympic Sports Marketing Department did not fare as well in the evaluation of the coaches. Several coaches criticized the lack of communication, timeliness and efficiency. Part of the problem was the lack of personnel.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Presently, more than 20,000 students call the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, their academic home. Among them, about 400 student athletes competing nationally in 14 different intercollegiate athletic programs. These programs are marketed and promoted by employees who work in a very unique set-up - unique in that it is one of very few in the nation to divide up its marketing departments into two different entities. One, the Sports Marketing Department (SMD), is in charge of marketing and promoting the "two major sports, Football and Men's Basketball" (UNLV Sports Marketing Plan, p.2), whereas the Olympic Sports Marketing Department (OSMD) is responsible for the remaining 12 athletic programs and their marketing needs. The term 'Olympic' was chosen for its positive connotation even though it is politically incorrect since not all of the associated programs are Olympic Sports (e.g. Golf).

Aside from personal stimulations, such as the love for sports/marketing and coaching, my interests in this specific topic derived from a variety of reasons. The fact that UNLV officially divides up its Athletic Marketing Department into one promoting the 'two major sports,' and one marketing 'the rest,' intrigued me. I often wonder how I would feel if I were a coach of the so-called 'Olympic' sports - or should we say 'minor' sports? In order to find out how the coaches feel and whether or not they are satisfied with the (O)SMD's efforts I decided to go ahead with this project.
CHAPTER 2

DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Sports Marketing

Sports Marketing derived from the concept of general marketing in an effort to specialize on athletics. Two major thrusts exist: 1) the direct marketing of a sports product or service to a sport consumer, and 2) marketing of products through the use of sports promotions (B. Mullin, p. 6). This study focuses on the promotions of a service (UNLV athletics) being offered to sports consumers and, therefore, relates to the first thrust.

It is important to point out that, though minor differences exist, sport and sports marketing are the same for the purpose of this project. Mullin defines 'sport marketing' as follows: "Sport marketing consists of all activities designed to meet the needs and wants of sport consumers through exchange processes" (p. 6).

UNLV Athletic Programs

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) currently consists of 14 athletic programs competing intercollegiately. The university's 39th year of intercollegiate competition was its first as a member of the 16-team Western Athletic Conference (WAC).

---

1 Baseball, Men's Basketball, Women's Basketball, Football, Golf, Men's Soccer, Women's Soccer, Softball, Men's Swimming, Women's Swimming, Men's Tennis, Women's Tennis, Track & Field, Volleyball.
Sports Information Department (SID)

The SID is part of UNLV's Sports Marketing Department. Its purpose is to provide all athletic programs as well as the media with accurate statistical information.

Head Coaches

UNLV currently employs 13 head coaches in 14 athletic programs. Each sport can only have one head coach. However, it is possible for a coach to be in charge of more than just one program, like Jim Reitz. Appendix A lists the UNLV head coaches in accordance with their respective athletic programs. It also shows how long they have been the head coach.
CHAPTER 3

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Effective marketing and decision making is essential to any organization trying to survive the powerful trend of financial dependence. That holds true for small businesses as well as the big ones. It also becomes more and more apparent for institutions developed for higher learning: American Universities. They are realizing that they cannot escape that trend either. Sports at universities used to be recreation. Today, "it's not just a game anymore;" (Schaaf) it's a business.

Analyzing market data such as demographics, or customer behavior or satisfaction is a crucial part of business interaction. As a matter of fact, it has become so specialized that it is big business itself now. A.C. Nielson, Simmons Market Research Bureau, ProServe, DelWilber and Associates, and American Sports Data, Inc., are among the leading Professional Research Services (Mullin et al., p.98). These companies provide interested corporations with information valuable to their business interests. This may include survey data, such as consumer behavior, customer satisfaction, or a market analysis.

The University of Nevada, Las Vegas, is among those schools trying to profit from its athletic programs financially. Even if a better image nationally stands on top of the priority list of UNLV officials, financial stability plays a major role. A better image means a wider target audience and that stands for more sales of UNLV souvenirs like hats and T-shirts.
Thus, it is not surprising that decisive changes were made in the UNLV Sports Marketing Department after revenues plummeted remarkably in the early 1990s. Formerly competing against each other under the same roof, the Thomas & Mack, Sam Boyd Silver Bowl and the UNLV Athletic Department integrated to become one primary marketing department. This way, UNLV entrusted the Thomas & Mack staff to handle sales, ticketing and promotions for its two major sports, football and men’s basketball, in return for the guaranteed sum of $3.5 million in revenue from ticket sales plus a percentage of corporate sales. According to UNLV Athletic Director, Charles Cavagnaro, the total revenue for 1998 will be around $5.5 million.

The Olympic Sports Marketing Department concentrates its energy on twelve Olympic Sports at UNLV. According to the '1997-98 Olympic Sports Group Plan,' the department was created "to promote and publicize its Olympic Sports and to provide quality operations at contest venues. Further, it is the objective of the Group to achieve revenue through the sale of advertising and sponsorships that will be returned to the involved programs as budget supplements" (p. 2). The organization is overseen by the Assistant Athletics Director/Olympic Sports and employs three people: 1) Coordinator of Corporate sales, 2) Coordinator of Promotions/Publicity, and 3) Game Operations Manager. However, the Coordinator of Corporate Sales was let go in February of 1998, due to a lack of funds within the department. The position has not been filled as of yet.

Understanding the importance of market research, the university’s Sports Marketing Department finds itself in a situation where the satisfaction of its customers plays a vital role in its financial independence. The need for data gathering and analysis is inevitable. The obvious question that the UNLV (Olympic) Sports Marketing Department wants answered for itself is: ‘How well exactly are our marketing strategies working?’ This question is multidimensional in nature. The apparent research prospects are the UNLV athletics fans and their satisfaction level with the product: UNLV athletics.
However, that is not the route I am taking in this project because it has been done in the past and is still a routine procedure for all major sports marketing departments. My interest, instead, lies in the UNLV head coaches and their perception of the UNLV (Olympic) Sports Marketing Departments. The purpose of the research project is to assess the UNLV (Olympic) Sports Marketing Department's performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency. It is designed to help recognize problems existing between the head coaches and the (O)SMD, as well as point out strengths and benefits of the present relationship.

Since the undertaking's purpose is to discover strengths and weaknesses of the relationships between coaches and the (O)SMD personnel, the results of the study indicate that problems exist between the two parties. That will eventually not only help improve the interpersonal relationships between coaches and (O)SMD staff, but also point out areas that need to be worked on with respect to the promotional effort of the (O)SMD.

University head coaches play an important role in the success of the school's athletics programs. However, often times that success is not what they are measured at. The graduation rate of their players are more important to the university officials - or, at least they are supposed to be. That's what makes that job so difficult. It is basically a job that often times contradicts itself. On the one hand, players get time off of classes in case of competitions, even though it is supposedly more important to graduate. How do coaches handle these conflicts? Are there differences of opinions among UNLV head coaches? Does the (O)SMD navigate or regulate certain policies in this respect? These are questions that stimulated my interest for this topic.

In assessing the effectiveness of the UNLV (Olympic) Sports Marketing Department this study's intent is to document deficiencies as they are experienced by head coaches. The assumption that all coaches are satisfied with the current situation in the field of athletic programs marketing needs testing. Some coaches may not be happy at all, but
do not see an opportunity to get their opinions across to officials. Others may be concerned about negative consequences if they speak out. So, this project gave them a chance to let administrative officials know how they feel. Furthermore, anonymity is being kept. It is this nameless procedure that helped build confidence, so that coaches approached this project with open minds and honesty. Therefore, interesting and controversial points were being made.

At the same time, this work also pinpoints some very positive trends coaches notice in the marketing departments. Certain employees were praised highly and some projects and plans got plenty of praise. Coaches also made some favorable suggestions for different marketing approaches and various ideas for marketing strategies specific to their team. Perhaps, this kind of constructive criticism will help the two parties work together more closely in the future. Possibly, differences can be worked out and existing strengths be built upon to raise not only the level of competition but also the level of communicative interaction between the two parties.

The author feels strongly that the project will aid the art of communications. It is unique in that it asks coaches of their opinions about the efficiency of the marketing department, not fans. From personal experience, the author knows that a lot of questionnaires are being done with respect to the satisfaction of sports fans. Also, coaches are being surveyed about lots of aspects of their jobs, as for example performance of athletes, ranking polls, or practice techniques. However, whether or not their expectations of communicational and promotional issues are being fulfilled seems to be of minor interest.

This lack of enthusiasm can be attributed to the fact that a coach is not supposed to know marketing principles, in the author's opinion. Therefore, he or she may not be involved in the decision-making process of marketing strategies. However, the author feels that coaches know the 'product' (the team) better than anybody else. Therefore, he
should be consulted by the marketing employees. This holds especially true for college coaches since the environment is usually not as 'cold' as it is in professional sports. This sense of coziness in college athletic programs should help marketing departments and the coaches to promote their product more specifically.

With all this in mind, this study, the author believes, will be of assistance not only to the (O)SMD and coaches, but also to the athletic programs and the university as a whole. Further, the field of communications should find a stimulation in the work by recognizing the different angle taken.
CHAPTER 4

LITERATURE REVIEW

Analyzing the customer market is necessary for any business in today's commercialized world. But such data are especially crucial for sport organizations because of the fast-changing trends among sports fans and participants (Mullin, p.88). That's why research in the sports marketing field is extensive and growing rapidly.

The general questions in sports marketing research are no different than in other fields of data gathering, only related to sports events or sports "consumers." Appendix B outlines some of the standard questions used in the process of market analysis in order to determine sports consumer habits.

Sports marketing data gathering can be categorized into three main sets: 1) General Market Data, 2) Data on Individual Consumers, and 3) Data on Competitors (Mullin, p. 90). Each section emphasizes a different portion of information collection. First, the marketer needs to inquire about the environment that is being marketed, such as the total number of people living in the area, and who exactly lives in it. Such data includes income, age, gender and other factors. It is also important to understand the "purchase behaviors and certain consumption patterns" (Mullin, p. 91) of the residents. Data on individual consumers includes names and addresses, as well as their purchase frequency, payment method or use of promotional stipulations.

In order to function efficiently and cost-effectively as a sport organization, competitors and their products and strategies need to be well-known. Price lists, product lines and promotional efforts of competitive businesses must be compared and analyzed.
carefully (Mullin, p. 94). This may require a division of its own for some marketing departments. Critiquing a competitor's strengths and weaknesses is just as important as analyzing its own efforts.

While a large amount of information is available on research done by sports marketing departments, such as just mentioned, data analyzing the performances of these departments are rather insufficient. This deficiency is being amended with the introduction of new journals, though. 'Sport Marketing Quarterly' and the 'Journal of Sport Management' are examples of this genre. No study could be found matching the strategy of asking head coaches to evaluate the performance of a sports marketing department. Very few studies focus on this topic from a different perspective, namely surveying sport administrators and consumers.

A thesis by Gundogan (1997) researches the marketing effectiveness and promotional strategies in National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I basketball programs, as perceived by Sports Marketing Directors of such institutions. Its purpose was to determine a) the overall effectiveness of marketing, b) the amount of time spent on each promotional strategy, c) which strategy appeared to work best, d) whether or not a relationship existed between the time spent on a strategy and its apparent effectiveness, and e) if a relationship existed between the marketing effectiveness and the promotional strategies' effectiveness.

Results showed that the majority of institutions fell in the "good" category of overall marketing effectiveness. While most time was spent on advertising, public relations was perceived to be the most effective strategy. A strong correlation between marketing effectiveness and time spent on promotional strategies was found. The respondents also felt a strong relationship between the level of marketing effectiveness and the perceived level of effectiveness of all promotional strategies.
So, the focus of this study is on sports marketing departments' effectiveness among American universities. However, the participants are from these departments as well, which takes away from its validity. Also, the study only investigates men's basketball programs, as opposed to all of the university's athletic programs. However, the researcher investigates several universities instead of focusing on one department.

Yang's (1997) dissertation titled "A Descriptive Analysis of Sport Marketing in Selected College and University Sport Organizations in the Republic of Korea" (ROK) heads into the same direction. But while the purpose of the study parallels that of my work, its participants as well as its location distinguish the two. Yang conducts his research based on universities in the ROK, and questionnaires were distributed to 500 randomly selected sport managers and 250 "sport consumers."

Trying to find out about the roles and needs for sport marketing in the ROK, results indicate a need for such departments at universities in the ROK, and that its main purpose is to enhance ticket sales. Improvements could be made by appointing managers and implementing more focused marketing plans.

Yet another thesis investigates sports marketing contingency competencies. Smolianov (1994) examined 38 sports marketing competencies considered by 103 professionals to be important for sports marketing administrators. Using a Likert Scale, the survey revealed 11 essential sports marketing competencies. Investigated were the sources through which the competencies were acquired. They were mostly gained on the job (52.2 percent). A two-choice scale indicated which competencies were performed by the marketers and which ones were delegated. The respondents delegated 37 percent of their competencies.

The data were analyzed for four segments: sports marketing firms, amateur sports organizations, professional sports organizations, and college athletics. Demographic information included administrators' involvement in sports, education, age, gender,
income, years in sports marketing, and number of employees in their organization. Over 70 percent of the marketers were sports competitors.

Coaches surveys are a very popular form of data gathering both in professional and college sports. The best-known surveys are the so-called weekly coaches' polls establishing the number-one-team in the college rankings (football and basketball) by vote. While these polls are held on a regular basis, several other coaches' questionnaires circulate for various projects. Following are examples of the wide range of coaches surveys.

A study of labor division in college football by Williams (1975) focuses on football only. He surveys the coaches and also interviews them. Based on a sample of 30 teams that included over 1,000 players, results showed that players' race was correlated with position alignments, e.g. blacks were proportionately very over-represented in certain positions and under-represented in others. Coaches also tended to stereotype football positions based on personal characteristics and according to race. Thus, coaches were consistent in matching certain racial stereotypes with their stereotyped positions.

A survey by Nixon (1994) studied the extent to which college coaches subscribe to a set of beliefs in the culture of sport concerning risk, pain, and injury. These beliefs were derived from a prior content analysis of 'Sports Illustrated.' A secondary purpose was to consider whether gender makes a difference in how coaches think about risk, pain, and injury. A similarity between this and my study is that coaches of only one university were surveyed. This study was performed at a medium-sized (11,500 students) university in the southeastern United States. Results showed ambivalence among coaches in their views of risk, pain, and injury, which suggested the existence of a "risk-pain-injury paradox."

A study by Dale & Weinberg researched the relationship between coaches' leadership style and burnout. Similar to my study, only head coaches were surveyed. This is the only study that distinguishes between head coaches and the general term 'coaches'. A total of 302 high school and college head coaches were questioned about leader behavior,
burnout factors and demographics. A MANOVA indicated a significant relationship between burnout and leadership style in four of the six categories. Specifically, coaches who displayed a "consideration style" of leadership behavior scored significantly higher in the frequency and intensity dimensions.

Knoppers et al. (1988) researched the impact of gender ratio in coaching on social interaction and salary. For that, they surveyed NCAA Division I college coaches from both men's and women's baseball/softball, basketball, cross country/track, golf, swimming, tennis, and volleyball teams. They found that the presence of a relatively large percentage of women leads to a positive impact on women, but not on men, with respect to social interaction, and is related to higher salaries for men, but not for women.

Another study by Knoppers et al. (1990) inspects differences in organizational power in athletic departments. This difference can be found in the function of the sport (whether a sport is revenue or non revenue) or in gender. The purpose was to examine the extent to which sport or gender best explained differences in the degree of organizational power of Division I college coaches. The sample consisted of 947 coaches who responded to a questionnaire that included items dealing with their access to supplies, support, and information. The results indicated variations among the three dimensions of power. Consistently, however, female coaches of non revenue sports were most limited in their access to critical resources while male coaches of revenue sports had the most power. This led to the conclusion that an analysis on the distribution of power should examine it in the context of both gender and sport.

Pastore (1992) studied factors that influence male and female 2-year college coaches of women's teams to select and possibly leave a career in coaching. Of 200 coaches from five athletic conferences in the Mid Atlantic/New England regions, 90 (45 percent) participated in the study. Two separate MANOVAs were used to analyze each of the two sets of dependent variables (reasons for selecting and reasons for leaving
coaching) with the independent variable (gender). Results showed that females valued "helping female athletes reach their athletic potential" as a reason for being a coach significantly more than males did. Female coaches also rated significantly higher than males the factors "burden of administrative duties" and "increased intensity in recruiting student-athletes" as reasons to leave the coaching profession.

The fact that participation in hockey at the amateur level has increased tremendously in recent years instigated research by Chouinard & Blann (1993). Provided with more talent at the college level through a strong youth base, the authors wanted to find out issues of concern among NCAA hockey coaches. Questionnaires were sent out to all those coaches. The four top issues of concern named were "academic progress of the student-athletes, officiating, recruitment of hockey players, and the amount of physical play." The authors suggest that even though efforts towards change regarding these concerns have been made, a comprehensive, educational approach is necessary to achieve lasting change.

Rainey & Schweickert (1991) developed a study to evaluate performances of baseball umpires. Participants were 310 players, 90 coaches and 89 umpires. They were asked to fill out questionnaires indicating percentages of calls umpires get right. Another purpose of the work was to discover certain behavior after bad calls were made. Players and coaches believed umpires perform below acceptable standards, and none of the groups endorsed physical hostility towards the officials.

This wide variety of coaches' surveys indicates a popular demand for coaches' opinions with respect to all kinds of topics. Some studies are interested in college coaches only, where others emphasize professional sport coaches. Also, a combination of the two is common, even including administrative officials. Clearly, research efforts directed towards college sports marketing tends to come from within the organization, or from students at the particular university. Coaches' opinions regarding their satisfaction level
with the sports marketing department seem to be irrelevant in the research scope, despite an obvious connection between the two parties.
CHAPTER 5

METHODOLOGY

The project was based on focused interviews with each head coach at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. First, a meeting with UNLV's Athletic Director, Charles Cavagnaro, was arranged to discuss the study and its purpose in detail. After having explained the project's worth, Cavagnaro agreed to support the work by sending a letter to the head coaches asking their cooperation. Getting Cavagnaro's support not only assured better acceptance of the project with the coaches, it also added validity to the study due to his authoritative position in the UNLV athletic administration.

Appointments with each head coach were made in advance to assure sufficient time for the focused interviews. Questions ranged from timeliness over creativity to goal achievement within the Sports Marketing Departments. All coaches were asked the same questions. However, due to the differences in their answers, follow-up questions varied. Therefore, the interviews were based on the same outline of questioning, but differed in that the individual answers of each head coach were taken into account, thus granting distinct identities.

The basic concept of the interview procedure was to ask the coach a certain question that can be answered in a rather short statement. Then, the coach was asked to explain his answer in more detail (e.g. "Why do you feel this way?"). Questions 1 through 17 asked about the (O)SMD, 18 through 34 about the SID, and the last six were more general questions.
The first three questions focused on the amount of communication taking place between the two parties and the department's availability for questions and comments. They were designed to give the author an idea about the coaches' satisfaction level regarding communication habits. Questions 5 through 12 asked the coaches about organizational skills of the (O)SMD, such as timeliness, lay out of promotional strategies, or practicality. Questions 13 through 15 confronted the effectiveness and efficiency of the (O)SMD's performance. Question 16 asked for a comparison to other schools, and 17 was designed to give coaches a chance to let administrators know how often they would like to meet with a representative.

The questions for the SID were organized the same way. However, 28 and 29 tackled statistical information instead of promotional issues. Included in this section were also questions regarding relationships with the local media (questions 32 through 34). The last section of the interviews was dedicated to some general questions. The author wanted to find out about coaches priorities regarding spectators, winning games, improving the athletes' performances, or graduating players. Question 40 asked coaches how they felt about the unique system of the UNLV marketing departments. The intent was to find back a way to the marketing aspect. This way, the author felt, the coaches would be more willing to talk about some of their other concerns not mentioned yet. Thus, the last question asked if there was anything they would like to add. Appendix C shows the basic outline of the focused interviews.

After all the necessary information had been accumulated, the author sorted it by department so that a logical formulation of results was possible. Then, in the discussion section, the author outlined the results in more detail.
CHAPTER 6

RESULTS

This section shows the results for each portion of the interviews separately. Thus, it is divided into four parts: 1) Sports Marketing Department, 2) Olympic Sports Marketing Department, 3) Sports Information Department, and 4) Results from General Questions. For reasons of efficiency and, more importantly, confidentiality, all coaches are being addressed in the male gender in the 'Results' and 'Discussion' sections.

At the end of the paper four tables are included to clarify and summaries the findings of each portion of the interviews. In those tables, each answer of the head coaches is rated as satisfied (+), somewhat satisfied (+/-), or not satisfied (-). For some questions, short samples of the coaches' answers are included. Those left blank, were mostly answered by simple "yes" or "no" statements. In that case, the +/- ratings indicate the level of satisfaction.

Sports Marketing Department (SMD)

Firstly, the author will show how the football and men's basketball head coaches replied to questions regarding the SMD, the department in charge of promoting and marketing these two major sports. Despite the fact that only two sports are being marketed by the SMD, the opinions of the two coaches regarding the department's performance differed remarkably. Table 1 summarizes the findings.
While one of them rated the overall performance of the SMD as "very satisfying," the other one was not quite as pleased. He felt the department needs to "pay more attention" to his program.

One coach communicated twice a week with a SMD representative and believed it to be an adequate amount. He felt the department meets deadlines and enjoys their availability for any kind of questions and comments he might have. Coach B, who communicated once a week with the SMD, agreed that his representative is available, but added that the communication should be initiated more by the SMD (see Table 1). Both coaches agreed that their representative works efficiently.

The coaches concurred that promotional goals concerning their programs were laid out effectively as well as communicated successfully. However, the time frame of turning these plans into reality was criticized by both parties as being too late. Nevertheless, promotional efforts of the SMD were regarded as effectively by both coaches. When asked about promotional efforts with respect to other athletic programs at UNLV, opinions varied again. While one expected complaints by most of the Olympic Sports coaches about the lack of marketing and promotional efforts, the other assumed efforts to be "good."

Coach B said not all problems were being solved in a beneficial way to his program, while his coaching compatriot said he has not had any real problems yet. When it comes to practicality and creativity one coach was satisfied, the other one is not because he does not "see any creative results." He also criticized the set-up ("Marketing Department and the UNLV Athletics Department are two separate entities.") as "hindering the communications process." That's why there is a lack of practicality and a lack of proactive communication between the two departments, he said.

Coach A was confident that the employed SMD personnel is qualified to do their respective jobs. Coach B, on the other hand, was "not so sure." While most employees met appropriate qualifications, he said, some do not considering "the money spent on
them." Compared to other Division I schools in the country both coaches rated UNLV's Sports Marketing Department better than what they had experienced at previous jobs (see Table 1)

**Olympic Sports Marketing Department (OSMD)**

This section details results from interviews with 9 of 11 head coaches of Olympic Sports Programs at UNLV. Excluded are coach Dwaine Knight (Golf) because his program is fully self-funded by a "golf foundation." Therefore, his interaction with the Olympic Sports Marketing Department is minimal, thus not applicable to this project. Also, coach Staci Hendershott (Women's Soccer) is not included because she has not worked with the OSMD during a season yet, due to the fact that the fall of 1998 will be women's soccer's inaugural season. A summary of the results regarding the Olympic Sports Marketing Department's performance can be found in Table 2.

When asked "How often do you personally communicate with the OSMD in an average week?", only one of nine head coaches could give a numeric answer (three times). All other coaches, instead, were more general, such as "hardly ever," "not at all," or "if it's twice in the fall, it's a lot." Other answers were even more extreme: "I wasn't sure we still had one," or "Who is the marketing department?" (see Table 2). Only one coach felt that the amount of communication between him and the OSMD was adequate. However, he also thought the communication should be initiated more by the OSMD instead of him having to call all the time.

All coaches agreed that deadlines were not met, and only three coaches thought of the department's availability as "reasonable," against six who called it not satisfying.

One of nine coaches felt that his representative works "somewhat" efficiently, whereas five saw no efficiency in their representatives' work. Two coaches said they did
not see the representative enough to make a decision on this question, and one interviewee was not aware his program was assigned a representative.

Four coaches said the OSMD "successfully communicated its promotional goals regarding my team" before the season started. However, they also agreed that the set goals were not met to their satisfactions. The remaining five coaches pointed out that no promotional strategies regarding their team even existed to their knowledge. Two coaches regarded the effectiveness of the promotional efforts as "average at best" and "so-so." The rest considered them to be ineffective or non-existent.

When asked about promotional efforts with respect to other Olympic Sports Programs at UNLV, seven interviewees thought that all Olympic Programs are treated equally poor. Two said that holds true with the exception of baseball, which is treated better.

The Olympic Sports head coaches agreed that men's basketball and football programs have a more effective Marketing Department, mainly due to a larger amount of employees. Seven coaches felt that the two major sports deserved more marketing and promotions attention because they are the revenue sports at UNLV. Two said all sports should be treated the same, no matter whether revenue sport or not. All nine coaches concurred that the division between the SMD and OSMD is presently set up at the wrong ratio of work-effectiveness, heavily favoring the Sports Marketing Department.

When asked whether problems were handled in a timely manner and in a beneficial way to the programs, a lot of coaches struggled to answer. Three kept denying the existence of a marketing department for Olympic Sports at UNLV. Two replied with a simple "no," and another two said "nothing gets done." One coach mentioned that he does not confront the OSMD with his problems anymore because of the lack of success in the past. Coach#1 answered with "yes," restricting that answer to a specific person, though, the Assistant Athletics Director/Olympic Sports.
As laid out in Table 2, six coaches believed the OSMD does not work in a practical way. One coach said he did not know, whereas another coach thought "they do the best," given the personnel and financial limitations. Coach #1 said the department operates in a practical way "for the most part."

Also, according to six coaches, the OSMD does not display creative skills when needed. Two could not answer the question because they "never see" the employees. Another coach said the department has "some good ideas, but never gets anything done." Five coaches said they did not know whether the employed personnel is qualified to do their respective jobs. The other four acknowledged they thought that was not the case. All nine coaches agreed that the lack of personnel in the OSMD is a big part of the problem.

Compared to other Division I schools, UNLV's Olympic Sports Marketing Department ranks below average, according to four head coaches. Three said they did not know, and another two rated the department "o.k." in comparison to other Division I schools across the nation.

When asked how often coaches would like to meet with a representative, the answers varied from daily (one person) to once a month (two). Three coaches prefer to meet once a week, and two said "as often as it takes" to work effectively. One coach suggested "brainstorming" meetings between coaches and OSMD employees every two months.

Sports Information Department (SID)

This section shows results regarding the SID's services as perceived by 12 UNLV head coaches. Staci Hendershott (women's soccer) is excluded for above mentioned reasons. Table 3 sums up the coaches' opinions about the Sports Information Department.

Six coaches said they communicate on a daily basis with the SID. Three participants claimed to communicate about two to three times per week, and another coach
communicated three to four times weekly. Once a week was the amount of communication with the SID for two coaches. These were the in-season numbers. Eleven of twelve coaches mentioned that the amount of communication between them and the SID decreases during the off-season. One coach said it increases. All but one coach confirmed this to be an adequate amount of communication between them and the SID.

According to nine coaches, the SID meets deadlines. Two coaches said it did not perform tasks on time, while one said "sometimes." All 12 coaches agreed that their SID representative is always available for questions and comments. They also agreed on the fact that their representative works with them in a progressive way, as well as efficiently.

Of the 12 interviewees, 11 thought that problems were handled in a timely manner by the SID. One coach said that was not the case. Eleven believed that problems were always solved in a beneficial way to their program, one thought that was sometimes the case.

As mentioned in Table 3, the coaches concurred that the SID operates in a practical way, and that it displayed creative skills when needed. They also agreed that the personnel employed is qualified to do their respective jobs.

Furthermore, the SID provides an adequate amount of statistical information according to eleven participants. One coach said that is "not always" the case. While 10 coaches felt the information provided to be accurate, two coaches said the accuracy of the statistical information is "still a problem," even though it is getting better.

Compared to other Division I schools in the US, five coaches ranked UNLV's Sports Information Department above average, five more rated it as average, one said it is "the best," and also one rated it below average.

Asked to describe the relationship between the SID and the local media, six said it to be "good," and three described it as "very good." One coach thought the effort of the SID representative is there, but the "results are pitiful." Another coach said he takes the
burden of communication off of the SID's shoulders because the media wants to interact with him directly. Coach #5 rated the relationship "poor."

Five coaches said the relationship between UNLV athletics as a whole and the local media is not good. Another five described it as o.k. or good, and two said it to be very good. Describing their own relationship with the local media, seven coaches called it good or average, three said it was non-existent, and two thought it to be excellent.

**General Questions**

To conclude the interviews, the coaches were asked to rate the importance of getting spectators, winning games, improving players' athletic careers, and graduating players. Ten of twelve participants named graduating their players as their priority. Two were more focused on improving their players' athletic career. A summary of results is outlined in Table 4.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

Sports Marketing Department (SMD)

Results from the interviews with men's basketball and football head coaches indicated an overall satisfaction with the efforts of the Sports Marketing Department concerning the two major sports at UNLV. But it also gives a detailed description of problems and criticism as seen by these two coaches.

One coach felt communication should be initiated more often by the SMD representatives, especially when problems arise:

"If they don't call me I assume they are on top of it. But that wasn't the case at (a certain game). One phone call to me a week before the game could have solved a lot of problems...They should come to me more often and say 'alright, here's what we're doing.' Come to me or my staff...Let's put a game plan together and let me know what you're doing. Let me know of a problem that you foresee so that I can have some input."

This frustration about a lack of initiative carried over into other areas where the coach saw problems. The "biggest problem" he saw in the set-up of the UNLV Athletic Administration. Due to the fact that the Thomas & Mack Center and the Sports Marketing Department are combined, there seemed to be a division between those two departments and UNLV athletic programs. And this separation hinders the flow of communication between the athletic programs and the SMD, according to the coach. Part of that problem is
to figure out to whom to talk with which problem, said a coach. Too many people feel they are in charge. That just adds to the confusion. Coach A said:

"You got Charly Cavagnaro who is the Athletic Director, and then you've got Pat (Christenson, Director of Thomas & Mack Center), and then you've got Steve (Stallworth, Director of Sports Marketing). You've got three chiefs who, I think, all have their own priorities. In most schools the Sports Marketing Department and Thomas & Mack Center would be part of the Athletic Department. They wouldn't be separate entities....They would be departments within the department....The set-up here is like a bureaucracy and that's why things don't always get done because a bureaucracy hinders communication. It's not as easy to manage....Technically, who's the boss? Is it Charly (Cavagnaro), is it Pat (Christenson), is it Steve (Stallworth)? They are all bosses."

Thus, the communication between the SMD and its athletic programs needs to improve, according to the coach. This way, some of the problems would not even arise, while others would be handled more effectively as well as in a more timely manner.

Another element of criticism was the fact that one of the athletic programs was used as a vehicle to "sell" other athletic programs because of its popularity. While the coach said he understands the importance to support other programs at the university, he admitted to being aggravated having to share his sport's popularity. "They try to use my program to sell every other sport," he said. "They try to sell swimming, tennis, golf and everything else. And they do it in my season ticket package which bothers me a little bit. So I haven't heard a lot of coaches complain a whole lot about that....Their satisfaction may be my dissatisfaction." This coach felt that his program should receive priority treatment because "we're the breadwinner" of the university's athletic programs. However, he expressed his dissatisfaction with the lack of attention his program receives, given it brings in all the money through season ticket holders, scholarship donors, ticket sales and other avenues. That was the coaches' "biggest frustration."
Timeliness was another aspect of criticism. Both coaches perceived the set timelines to be too narrow, leaving no room for mistakes. Even though the promotional goals were outlined and communicated before the season, sometimes these strategies were not put into action on a timely basis. The coaches agreed that this is an important issue to the marketing department's success, as well as, the teams' performances.

One coach said that even though he praises the enthusiasm, hard work and time put into promotional efforts, he will "never be satisfied" until his "ultimate goal" of selling out every home game is achieved. He also commended the employees good intentions and the passion to achieve set goals.

Coach A found another negative at a specific game his team played this season. While "UNLVino" flyers were placed on every seat of the athletic site on game day, promoting the popular wine and cheese tasting, his team's upcoming games were not mentioned at all, even though the conference championships were up within two weeks. "I mean, how hard can it be?" (to distribute a flyer on every seat), asked the coach. His frustration was obvious. The SMD did not, in his opinion, do its job in this case. The department could have advertised the upcoming games on the same flyer as UNLVino, or done a different one and distributed it the same way - a very effective and cost-efficient marketing strategy. One could call it a lack of foresight or, in a harsher way, lack of knowledge.

Whatever one wants to call it, a mistake had been made. The important thing to remember is to learn from those mistakes, not to pound on them. In order to do that, these kinds of mistakes need to be communicated and discussed. Fingers need to be pointed, but as constructive criticism, not to insult somebody. And that's where the SMD needs to improve, according to coach A. Realize the mistakes made, and discuss different strategies to adjust, so the same mistake does not occur again. In this instance, communication is a
necessary tool, not just between the departments but also between individuals within the SMD.

Sometimes employees expect somebody else to do a job that he or she is supposed to do. If that is not communicated, the dependence on other people can lead to failure within the department. This lack of communication needs to be addressed and changed immediately. Despite the coaches' criticism in the mentioned areas, numerous positive attributes described the Sports Marketing Department's performance. Both coaches agreed that SMD employees are always available to them. Their accessibility is very good and almost taken for granted. Good relationships have developed on a professional basis.

Game entertainment was praised by both coaches as a very positive feature. They agreed that half time entertainment or promotions during time outs are well-prepared and displayed with lots of positive emotions and enthusiasm. The spectators seem to enjoy most of the activities held during game breaks, as far as the coaches could tell, even though they are busy preparing their teams for upcoming tasks at that time.

Promotional strategies were laid out well and communicated successfully according to both participants. Before the season started meetings were held to discuss and explain strategies regarding the upcoming season. Both coaches commended the clarifications stemming from those meetings. These kind of gatherings are necessary according to the coaches since they help them understand what to expect from the SMD. Also, the meetings aid in that they give the coaches a better chance for input - positive as well as negative criticism.

Compared to other national Division I programs, UNLV's Sports Marketing Department was rated higher by both coaches. "This is better - by far," a coach said, adding that the program he coached before was marketed by himself. However, he said, that way at least he knew who to blame. Nevertheless, both coaches enjoyed the atmosphere and the marketing efforts better than those at past jobs.
Olympic Sports Marketing Department (OSMD)

The Olympic Sports Marketing Department received more negative reviews than the SMD. As a matter of fact, it received mostly negative evaluations. One of the nine coaches was satisfied with the amount of communication between him and the OSMD, which he said to be around three times a week. However, he also thought the communication process should be started more often by the OSMD representative. Most of the time they talk it is initiated by him and he is "getting tired of running after them. I shouldn't have to guide it," he said.

The other eight coaches felt that communication lines need to be opened up between them and the OSMD. Four coaches said that no communication at all takes place between them and an OSMD representative. Others claimed it to be at a minimal level, such as "hardly ever," "not often," or twice a season. Some of the reactions to the question "How often do you personally communicate with the OSMD in an average week?" were almost cynical. Two coaches articulated they were not aware such a department still existed. Two more coaches wanted to know who the OSMD is and what they do. Another coach stated that the OSMD "does not exist per se" for his team. Other coaches simply answered "zero," "not at all," or things to that extent.

This being the first question of the interview, it became apparent very early in each interview that coaches were not at all satisfied with the OSMD's performances. The communication aspect was only a small portion of the whole spectrum. A few coaches felt they could not answer some of the questions because they did not see enough of the OSMD to make a decision. Also, two coaches kept reinforcing that such a department does not exist.
One of the most mentioned complaints was that the coaches did not know what to expect from the OSMD. It was never communicated to them what the department is supposed to do for them, and how it is going to be handled. "I'm a head coach and I don't even know what's going on with that department," said one coach. I don't know what they do. To me, at this point, it's like we don't even have (a marketing department)....Obviously there is no interest in seeing Olympic Sports having marketing." He said that it used to be better in the past. Employees used to come to him and, if not, he could confront somebody with a problem, and he could count on somebody getting it done. But not anymore, he said. "I don't even know who to talk to if I have a problem. It's a joke." Coaches complained about the lack of interest in the success of Olympic Sports. That can be seen in the fact that coaches are not being informed enough about marketing strategies for Olympic Sports.

All coaches agreed that deadlines were not met by the OSMD. Most coaches agreed that the lack of personnel is to blame to a certain point for the lack of timeliness. However, lack of organization was mentioned in this respect as well by several coaches:

I think they are behind in everything they do. (The Coordinator of Promotions/Publicity) comes to me in the middle of the season. She says 'Now we're really gonna get after (your sport).'. If you haven't done that by now it's too late....I just don't think they are organized to get it done. I don't think they have a plan to say 'Alright, this is what we're gonna do, how we're gonna do it.'

This lack of organization reflects in the availability of the OSMD to their respective coaches. According to six coaches, OSMD representatives were not available for comments or questions to their level of satisfaction. Answering the question "Is the OSMD always available for questions and comments you might have," one coach said: "They never return phone calls." Another coach followed suit: "No. At times I don't see (my
representative) until the games, where she wants to tell me something. Then it's too late 'cause I have other things to worry about."

Promotional goals were communicated to four coaches before the season started. They concurred to be pleased with that effort of communication, but also agreed that these goals were not met to their satisfaction or not met at all. The other five coaches pointed out that promotional strategies regarding their teams did not even exist, or were at least not communicated to them. A lot of these coaches felt that the OSMD is not interested in their sport and it shows. They said their sport and especially their athletes deserve more respect than they get.

Since most sports do not get enough out of the OSMD some coaches argued they would rather market their program on their own. This way, they would get more done and see better results. Also, it would take away the finger pointing because it is in their own hands to market the team. However, the way the system is set up now, coaches criticized, the money raised is distributed on a certain scale among all Olympic Sports teams. Therefore, the incentive to find sponsors for a specific team is taken away, because the hard work put into the search for donors by one individual is not rewarded accordingly. Instead of rewarding the person who found the sponsor the system rewards all Olympic programs. The following statement by a coach reinforces the disapproval:

"I'm not opposed to prioritizing the use of time and resources in that, of course, we need to put our money where we get a return. However, if that's the case I would like free range to market my sport, and that's been taken away from me since this change of management structure. In other words: I no longer have free range to go out and get a big sponsor for my (competitions) and sell those banners and reap the profits. I never get one fourteenth of whatever it is how many banners I sell. So, all of my motivation is taken away from me."
Again, the frustration of a coach comes to light. He believes the system as it is set up presently, rather hinders the marketing process of Olympic Sports programs. Various coaches were asking for more freedom to do their own marketing and promotions work. One coach suggested the introduction of an "incentive" plan, where the hired marketing employee gets paid a percentage of the money he or she brings into the programs. This way, he said, there is a stimulation to work hard because the more money that person raises, the more he or she gets paid. This incentive should be reason enough to work hard for the respective program. Also, the risk of paying someone for not doing their job is relatively low, because the main salary is set at a very low rate or does not even exist.

Another coach argued that the university would be better off to eliminate the Olympic Sports Marketing Department altogether. Instead, he said, each sport should get a percentage of the money saved (salaries, budget), and market their sports on their own. This way, the money is divided up fairly, and each program is responsible to itself. The system as it exists currently, he believed, penalizes certain sports because they do not get their fair share of the work done by the OSMD. Several Olympic programs are treated better. Not because the OSMD favors them, but because they take more time and effort to promote and set up.

Game Operations, for example, needs a lot more time, effort and manpower to put down the floor for a volleyball game than it takes to prepare a tennis match. Since there is only one person working in Game Operations, he has to divide his time efficiently among the sports. However, there are days when he needs to be at two or three different sites at the same time since some sports play on the same days at about the same time (e.g. soccer, volleyball, women's basketball). Thus, some sports get neglected more than others because they have people available on their own. Therefore, they do not get all the help from the OSMD, but still give up their financial share to all other Olympic Sports.
Understandably, coaches would rather do it on their own but also reap the benefits of doing it themselves. As of now, it does not matter how hard they work, the program does not benefit from it enough because only a small percentage of the hard work actually ends up in their program’s pockets. The rest lands in the hands of the other Olympic Sports.

Seven coaches agreed that all Olympic sports are treated equally poor. Two said baseball is treated better than other Olympic Sports and suggested the reason for that to be better chances for revenue, thus more emphasis on that particular sport.

All Olympic Sports coaches acknowledged that men's basketball and football are marketed more effectively. Several reasons for that were given, including more personnel, more communication, more emphasis on the sports, better financial resources, and better acceptance within the community. Seven coaches accepted the fact that the two major sports are prioritized. Nevertheless, they felt that the gap between the two marketing departments is too big. The ratio of work-effectiveness to revenue-making is "totally out of proportion," as one coach put it. Another coach had the following to say:

"Olympic Sports Marketing is getting (no money). That's outrageous to me. I've never seen a school that said 'O.K., Sports Marketing handles these two sports and to hell with everybody else.' That's just crazy to me, how we have a Sports Marketing Department that I can't even call and ask them to do anything. All those people and we (Olympic Sports) can't get anything out of it. That just blows my mind. They give us one person to handle (eleven sports) and expect something to be done. That's why I don't get angry at (OSMD employees), 'cause they were set up to fail. I think, it's a disgrace to Olympic Sports to separate our athletic department like that."

Five coaches criticized the way the marketing system is set up presently. They believed that the separation into two marketing departments (SMD and OSMD) is not working. The set-up is neither effective, they argued, nor efficient. And the results show
exactly that since they are "non-existent." The division of departments leads to a lack of
communication, one coach claimed, because there is not enough contact between marketing
employees and coaches and their staff. The design hinders the flow of communication
because it segments the athletic programs into their own territories, instead of bringing
them together. This way, an "us-and-them mentality" is established which further widens
the gap between the already existing void among some programs.

The other four coaches were not sure how to evaluate the system. Two said that it
is too early to judge the system, but did not like the results so far. Another coach saw
some "value" in the system but does not think it is better than the one in place before. The
last coach admitted that it is a unique system, but was not sure if he understood the
philosophy of the system. So, while some coaches do not favor the system of two separate
marketing departments at all, others do see certain advantages in it. However, the results
so far are not satisfying to any of the coaches.

Five coaches felt they could not answer whether the OSMD employs personnel that
is qualified to do their respective jobs. Some coaches were not familiar enough with the
employees or the work they do. Also, the fact that employees "come and go" was named
as a reason for not being able to answer this question. There is no stability in the hiring of
employees for the OSMD.

Four other coaches thought that qualifications among OSMD employees are not at a
high enough standard, with the exception of the Game Operations Manager who "works
harder than anybody on this campus" and does all he possibly can, according to the
coaches. All coaches agreed that Game Operations is run well and helps their programs as
much as possible. However, some coaches criticized the fact that they have to "share" the
Game Operations Manager on game days due to overlapping schedules. Therefore, not
getting their fair share out of that position either.
The other OSMD positions, so the four coaches, were occupied by under qualified personnel. "Lack of knowledge" in their respective fields was one of the critiques, as well as lack of results. When asked who he thought is responsible for a lack of results for Olympic Sports, a coach said: "I think it's the person that's employed. That's her job. And if they don't get it done they shouldn't have the job." Another coach followed suit with his remarks: "I feel strongly that this was just a bad hire. With the right person in there, with the opportunity to do this, it could be done and we would all be happy."

Lack of personnel was mentioned by all coaches as part of the problem. No coach, though, felt it was the main problem. Some coaches proclaimed that it might have been a result of the major problem: financial resources. The budget was too small to hire enough people, or even the most qualified persons. That's why some of the Olympic Sports coaches were even more "aggravated." The right marketing people are in the right places, they say, but they cannot use their work forces because they are part of the Sports Marketing Department, responsible to men's basketball and football only. Even if they wanted to help out Olympic Sports Programs, claimed a coach, they are not allowed to.

A lot of problems exist within the OSMD as just mentioned. It is a tough task to prioritize one single point of critique to overshadow others. And all the concerns the coaches have need to be given an equal amount of consideration. It is important to look at the criticism, though, because it comes from a very close source, the head coaches. Thus, the results are valuable in every aspect since those coaches are the one's to lead UNLV's athletic programs into a bright future.

**Sports Information Department (SID)**

This section discusses the results from interviews with all but one head coach (Staci Hendershott). Overall, the coaches praised the SID in almost every aspect of their work.
Only one coach said the amount of communication between him and the SID, once a week, is not adequate. It should be more, he said. All others felt that the amount of communication between them and the SID is sufficient. Most coaches (six) communicated on a daily basis with the department, which supports the fact that communication between the two parties is at a high level. In the off-season eleven coaches communicated less with the SID while one coach said communication goes up because of more time. Still, the amount of communication was perceived as adequate.

The 12 coaches agreed that the SID’s availability for questions and comments was excellent. Their representatives were easy to reach and if they could not be reached, phone calls were returned immediately, according to the interviewees. They also felt that the SID works in a practical way and, therefore, efficiently. Coaches believed that the SID works with them and their programs in a progressive way. No complaints at all were to be heard in these respects. Instead, high praise was given to all representatives concerning the mentioned issues. If problems arose, the SID took care of it immediately and in the best possible way, the coaches concurred. The representatives were always striving for best results, and were doing so in a beneficial way to the respective programs.

Despite the overall satisfaction with the SID, coaches expressed a few of their concerns. Two of them thought the SID did not meet deadlines. Both coaches were mainly referring to the lateness of media guides, posters and schedule cards for their programs. These materials were not available until about half way through the season according to the coaches. This delay has always been a problem, they said. Two other coaches said they used to have the same problem with their media guides, but this year was the first time they received them on time. One coach said the timeliness of the guide this year actually helped the recruiting process. He believes his media guide to be a great recruiting tool. The fact that a coach would use a media guide as a recruiting device says a lot about what he thinks of the guide:
"The job they do on our media guide is probably the most critical thing because that is really our window to the nation as who we are as a program and what we are. And it's our window to our recruits across the world that we're trying to recruit. And they do an excellent job on that. I think we've had the best media guide in the country the last few years."

All coaches were satisfied with their media guides. One coach thought the guide to be "the one area they can probably improve on." Nevertheless, he was satisfied with the overall outcome. Another coach criticized that the content of the media guide needs to improve, but was very happy with the overall layout. All other coaches had only positive comments about their media guides. Some ranked them among the best in the nation, two actually thought they are the "best in the country." Other attributes used to describe the guides included "superb," "impressive," and "always great."

Eleven coaches said that the SID provides an adequate amount of statistical information to the programs. One coach thought that was "not always" the case and needed to improve. The information provided is always accurate, according to 10 coaches, while two felt it to be inaccurate at times. One coach attributed the mistakes to inexperience in the sport and its statistical needs. Both coaches agreed that the representatives are aware that statistical errors are being made, and improvements have been made over the past years. However, not yet to the satisfaction of the coaches. Communication about mistakes is good, according to the coaches, and helps the process of eliminating mistakes.

Despite the criticism, all coaches believed the SID employs personnel qualified to do their respective jobs. No coach complained about the lack of knowledge in the field of Sports Information. All coaches spoke highly of their representatives and the work they do. Professionalism was associated with the Sports Information Department and its representatives.
Compared to other Division I schools around the nation, five coaches ranked the department above average. One of them said this department "is a step above" others. His representative "is on top of it and is always right there for us." Five more coaches rated the SID as average, while one thought it to be below average.

Six coaches described the communicative relationship between the SID and the local media as good and three as very good. They believed the SID did its part in distributing information and communicating all the necessary details to the local media. So, the SID met its responsibilities with regards to the local media, but sometimes the media did not "meet their ends" in taking the information up. However, the effort of the SID with respect to feeding the local media information was praised by coaches. One coach said he takes the communicative burden away from the SID into his own hands because the local media prefer to speak and deal with him directly, mainly due to his sport being high profile in this city. This way, the SID had one less thing to worry about, the coach said.

When asked to describe the relationship between UNLV athletics and the local media, two said it to be very good, and five felt it was good. The remaining five thought it was not as good as it should be. They felt that there is room for improvement, but it would take both, the SID as well as the media, to work on that relationship. Further, anybody involved in UNLV athletics needs to work on that relationship, according to the coaches. The more communication exists between the media and the university's athletic programs, the better the coverage will become, and the better the awareness in the community.

Five coaches expressed their concerns regarding the focus of the media on negative news about UNLV athletics. Even though it is getting better, according to the coaches, the media still "thrives on negativity." Partially, the reason for an emphasis on negative stories rather than good news lies in the university's past struggles with the NCAA compliance office, said a coach. Another coach disagreed and believes those struggles to be "behind us." He attributes that to the presence of the Director of Athletics:
"One thing I will credit (the Director of Athletics) with, is the fact that he gave us an opportunity to step back and breathe a little bit from the intense high profile constant media attention basketball had before he came in here. It seemed like all of our problems were in the press and that’s not where they need to be. And he came in and, I think, everybody stepped back. And the things (the media) needed to know about, they knew about, and things they didn’t need to know, there was less of that in the paper. And, I think, that was good for the university.

When it comes to the coaches’ relationship with the local media, descriptions ranged from excellent to non-existent. The wide spread of opinions mirrors the different degrees of coverage the athletic programs receive by the local media. Some sports did not get very much attention from the local media, whereas others were overexposed, some coaches said. One coach described his relationship with the local media as a "love-hate relationship," and is looking to improve it. Another coach called the media a "powerful necessary evil" that he has to deal with whether he wants to or not. Other coaches would love to have a relationship with the media at all. But the media's "lack of interest" in their sports prevents them from that, they said.

Overall, the SID received excellent reviews by the head coaches regarding its employees and work effectiveness. Compared to both departments, Sports Marketing and Olympic Sports Marketing, the SID fared best. One coach spoke of differences between the SMD and the SID:

"The SID's office is not a separate entity. (My representative) works for me....I feel like he's on my staff. He works for me, whereas Sports Marketing is a separate entity. The SID, I feel like they have a sense of urgency with me to make sure that everything is done in first class manners, is done properly. And that's not the case in Sports Marketing....They are gonna do what they want to do, whereas the SID is doing what I want to do."
Clearly, the coach was not trying to put down the Sports Marketing Department, but rather pointed out why he thought the SID is working more efficiently. Team work described the effort best. The SID was available to him and his staff and they listen to what he has to say. Communication goes two ways is what he was saying. It's not just about talking, but listening is part of the communications aspect as well. And that's one of the main differences between the SID and the SMD, as expressed by the coaches.

General Questions

Ten of twelve coaches stated that graduating their athletes is on top of their priority list. Two coaches thought that it is most important to see their athletes improve in their athletic careers. One of them argued that if they improve athletically, it will carry over into their academics and help them graduate eventually. Two coaches said that graduation is their number one priority, but if they don't win they lose their jobs. Thus, they thought it to be a tough task to decide. A few coaches proclaimed that graduating players is a top priority to them because it opens doors for the athlete's future. A degree is "for life," said one coach. Also, some coaches stressed the importance of helping the athletes to "grow as a person," or to "produce a good citizen." Thus, coaches were looking to improve their athletes off the field, as well as on the field.

At the end of the interview each coach was asked if there was anything I forgot to ask, or if they would like to add anything. All coaches reinforced certain issues and problems important to them. Since the focus of the study was on the three departments, SMD, OSMD, and SID, most coaches grabbed the chance in this part of the interview to talk about other problems they envision in the UNLV Athletic Departments.

The focus of their dissatisfaction in this portion of the interview was on the Athletic Administration. When asked to point out the starting point of all the problems, seven coaches said that "it all starts at the top," meaning with the Athletic Director and his
associates. The administration makes poor decisions and has no management skills, said one coach. Another coach supported that statement, saying "we don't have strong leadership....Our leadership looks more to trying to avoid problems, avoid hearing about them, rather than making a proactive plan." The answer to lack of funds seems to be making budget cuts, claimed three coaches. Instead of planning ahead and foreseeing financial problems for certain projects, the Athletic Administration has a tendency to react to problems instead of preparing for them ahead of time.

As a consequence, the administration tries to locate funds within the programs. Money donated by outside boosters to certain programs that had been saved up over years of hard work and dedication by coaches has become almost useless for the coaches, said two coaches. Since the administration knows about the existence of the accounts, they believe it to be appropriate to use that money towards the annual budget. In other words, program's budgets are being cut because of the existence of extra outside funds.

On the other hand, according to a coach, "money is being wasted left and right by this athletic administration." An overload of assistant coaches for certain sports, extremely high cellular phone bills, too many awards and award ceremonies, and cars for assistant coaches, were among the issues of criticism with respect to wasting money. A coach suggested to have one media guide for all sports together to save money.

Other criticism regarding the Athletic Administration included the lack of effort towards fundraising. Coaches believed that to be a major portion of the administrations duties, yet did not see enough energy spent on that task, as one coach said: "What do they (Director of Athletics and Assistant Athletics Director) do, except for collecting their paychecks. (The Director of Athletics) should be fundraising but I don't think he does. At least I don't see it." Several coaches complained that the Athletic Administration needs to spend more time and energy raising money.
Further, one coach claimed that a bias exists in the hiring process and salary development of UNLV athletics. He said that several coaches who have been employed at the university for a while have "never really gotten a raise. You've got to be female, or, a black female to make any kind of money here....It has nothing to do with competence. That's the unwritten policy." This statement showed the extreme frustration some coaches felt towards the administration.

Coaches also complained about the relationships existing between them and the athletic executives. The environment was described as "hostile" by two coaches. They said that the top executives avoid coaches in order to avoid confrontations. They were uncomfortable with being confronted by certain coaches, a coach said, because some coaches are looked upon as "a threat" to the administration. At the same time, he said he felt like "criminal." The administration is "constantly looking over your shoulder. It's not a real comfortable environment." The coach acknowledged that it is important to comply to NCAA rules. However, he argued that it shouldn't be the "only thing (the Athletic Administration) worries about."
A few limitations need to be addressed. First of all, the fact that only head coaches are included in the study reduces the sample size to 13, a rather small number of participants. The focus on these individuals, though, allows a very intense and concentrated examination. Also, the focused interviews will enhance the interaction tremendously. And face-to-face interviews with a larger amount of people would be extremely difficult and time-consuming. Thus, the compromise of a small group of people but intensive and thorough inquiry appears justified.

Another restriction lies within the sample selection. This project does not allow me to choose the interviewees because of the decision to ask head coaches only. This leaves me no free room, and forces minor problems. The women's basketball coach resigned from her position recently, leaving Steve Corraro in charge as the interim coach. Given the fact that he has only been head coach for such a short period of time, it might take away from his credibility. Having been an assistant coach at UNLV for two years and Director of Women's Basketball Operations for another two years, though, is reason enough to include him in this project.

The same kind of problem holds true for Staci Hendershott, women's soccer coach. She was hired in August 1997 and has yet to be in charge of a competitive game at UNLV. The upcoming fall marks the inaugural season for UNLV's women's soccer team. Even though Hendershott had to deal with the marketing department with respect to the upcoming season, it is not justifiable to include her in the project. She is not familiar
enough with the marketing environment at the university yet, especially since she has not interacted with the departments during a season yet. This takes the number of participants down to 12.

Finally, having been a student athlete at the university gives me some insight into the athletics environment. While that certainly helped me for the most part of the project because of the familiarity with the coaches and the environment, it might also have influenced my objectivity - especially since I am a student worker at the soccer office. However, I think I put my personal opinions aside and became an objective observer, listener and writer for this project.

All things considered, the project's benefits clearly outweigh the limitations and risks. I felt comfortable in the role of the researcher and look forward to the participants reaction to this study.
CHAPTER 9

CONCLUSION

To conclude, the author feels strongly that this project was worth the while. Despite few limitations, the study's intent of disclosing strengths and weaknesses of the UNLV Sports Marketing Departments was accomplished. Both, positives and negatives, were expressed by the head coaches in the focused interviews. While different opinions regarding the various departments came to light, certain trends were obvious.

The Olympic Sports Marketing Department needs to improve most, mainly with respect to communications skills, but also in organizational abilities. The Sports Information Department, on the other hand, should be very happy with the coaches' evaluations. Only minor problems were reported regarding its work, often times related to the lack of timeliness. The Sports Marketing Department stands somewhere in-between the other two departments. While there was certainly plenty of praise from the coaches for the SMD and its representatives, some dissatisfactions appeared as well. The lack of initiating communication is one example thereof.

The overall experience from setting up the interviews to the progress made through every interview was quite compelling to the author. He enjoyed the chance of interviewing the head coaches extremely. Not only was it a great experience in that he was able to get some insight into the coaches' opinions on various topics. He also feels that it was helpful for his future career by having been the interviewer. Despite the fact that it was rather difficult to arrange appointments with each head coach due to several unforeseen
circumstances such as surgery, travel, and sickness, the author was pleased with the coaches' cooperation.

Altogether, the author believes, this project will help the three examined departments as well as UNLV's Athletic Administration. Awareness of mistakes and problems is the first and most important step to improvements. With this study, the first step is taken care of. Now, it lies in the hands of the administrators to move to the next level, reducing or eliminating these mistakes. If that happens, this project has done more than it was designed to do: force necessary changes within a fairly new marketing department.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Head Coach</th>
<th>Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Rod Soesbe</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball</td>
<td>Bill Bayno</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball</td>
<td>Steve Corraro(^2)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Jeff Horton</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>Dwaine Knight</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Soccer</td>
<td>Barry Barto</td>
<td>16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Soccer</td>
<td>Staci Hendershott(^3)</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball</td>
<td>Shan McDonald</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Swimming</td>
<td>Jim Reitz</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Swimming</td>
<td>Jim Reitz</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Tennis</td>
<td>Larry Easley</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Tennis</td>
<td>Ola Malmquist</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track &amp; Field</td>
<td>Karen Dennis</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Deitre Collins</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\)Interim Head Coach as of Feb. 1998  
\(^3\)Inaugural Season starts in Fall 1998
APPENDIX II

WHO
- consumes our product?
- decides to purchase (consumer, spouse, friend, family)?
- consumes our competitors' products?
- occupies specific segments (demo - psycho graphic)?
- attends with whom?

WHAT
- products compete with ours?
- benefits does the consumer seek?
- factors influence demand (price, distance traveled)?
- are important buying criteria?
- risk does the consumer perceive?

WHERE
- is the decision made to buy (home, work, club)?
- do buyers seek product information?
- do consumers buy the product?

WHEN
- do consumers buy (day of game/event)?

WHY
- do consumers buy our product (gift, business)?
- do certain clusters of consumers occur?
HOW
- do consumers use our product?
- much do customers buy?

B. Mullin (p. 90).
APPENDIX III

April 1, 1998

Dear Coach,

My name is Thies Carstens and I am currently enrolled at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in order to get a Master's degree in the field of communications. It is my goal to graduate in the spring of 1998. Thus, I am working on my thesis right now. I would like to study the UNLV Sports Marketing Department (SMD), the Olympic Sports Marketing Department (OSMD) and the Sports Information Department (SID), and find out how satisfied (or not) UNLV head coaches are with the job these departments are doing.

Therefore, I would appreciate your help in this research project. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time. This study is designed to help recognize problems existing between you and the mentioned departments, as well as point out strengths and benefits of the present relationship, so that it may be of assistance to you and your program in the future. Another purpose of the study is to assess the departments' performance of assigned duties within the standards of effectiveness and efficiency.

This interview is designed to gather the necessary data to complete the project. The information that you provide in this evaluation is important to the project, and will be handled **anonymously and with strict confidentiality.** I will be the only person evaluating the information and the coaches' names will not be mentioned in the thesis with respect to any comments made.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at the UNLV soccer office, extension 4175. You may also call the Office of Sponsored Programs (ext. 1357), or Dr. Anthony Ferri (ext. 1371), thesis Committee Chair.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Thies Carstens
The interview is divided into three parts: I. Questions regarding the Sports Marketing Department (for football and men's basketball programs only) or Olympic Sports Marketing Department (all other sports); II. Questions concerning the Sports Information Department's performance; III. General questions.

Part I: (Olympic) Sports Marketing Department

1. How often do you personally communicate with the (O)SMD in an average week?

2. Do you feel that's about the right amount of communication?

3. Is the (O)SMD always available for questions and comments?

Does the (Olympic) Sports Marketing Department:

4. Meet deadlines, or inform you of delays in a timely manner?

5. Communicate its promotional goals regarding your team successfully?

6. Lay out promotional strategies concerning your program effectively?
7. Work with you and your program in a progressive way?

8. Handle problems in a timely manner?

9. Solve problems in a beneficial way to you and your program?

10. Operate in a practical way?

11. Display creative skills when needed?

12. Employ personnel that is qualified to do their respective jobs?

Do you think:

13. Promotional efforts of the (O)SMD with respect to your team are effective?
14. Promotional efforts of the (O)SMD with respect to UNLV athletics as a whole are effective?

15. Your (O)SMD representative works efficiently?

16. How would you rate the (O)SMD's services compared to those of other Division I schools?

17. How often would you like to meet with (O)SMD representatives?
Part II: Sports Information Department

18. How often do you personally communicate with the SID in an average week?

19. Do you feel that’s about the right amount of communication?

20. Is the SID always available to you for questions and comments?

Does the Sports Information Department:

21. Meet deadlines, or inform you of delays in a timely manner?

22. Work with you and your program in a progressive way?

23. Handle problems in a timely manner?

24. Solve problems in a beneficial way to you and your program?
25. Operate in a practical way?

26. Display creative skills when needed?

27. Employ personnel that is qualified to do their respective jobs?

28. Provide an adequate amount of statistical information?

29. Provide accurate statistical information?

30. If you look at our SID's services, how would you rate them compared to those of other Division I schools?

31. Does your SID representative work efficiently.
32. How would you rate the communication between the SID and the local media?

33. How would you describe UNLV athletics' relationship with the local media?

34. How would you describe your relationship with the local media?
Part III: General Questions

How important is it to you:

35. To fill the stands at home games/contests?

36. To win games/contests?

37. To see your players improve in their athletic careers?

38. To have your players graduate?

39. Which one of these is most important to you? Why?

40. How do you feel about the division of the marketing departments?

Is there anything else that I should have asked but did not?
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Table 1

Summary of Results from two Head Coaches of the two Major Sports regarding the Sports Marketing Department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION#</th>
<th>+/- COMMENTS COACH A</th>
<th>+/- COMMENTS COACH B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>Once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Need more initiation of communication by SMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not always - they need to come to me with problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+ Very open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+/- Sometimes we wait too long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Can be better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Lack of foresight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Set-up hinders communication - who is the boss?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Don't always see results of creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not sure all employees are worth what they get paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>We market phones well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+/- Yes, but never satisfied until sell out every home game</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>+/- Other coaches are probably not as well off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Good, but don't use my program as vehicle to sell other UNLV programs - that bothers me a bit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Better - by far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>+ Good the way it is</td>
<td>As much as necessary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2

**Summary of Results from nine Head Coaches regarding the Olympic Sports Marketing Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#1</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#2</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Three times</td>
<td></td>
<td>Twice a season</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wasn't sure we still had one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>OK, but I should not have to guide it</td>
<td></td>
<td>Should be more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, at times you don't see them</td>
<td>+/- Reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>They are not organized and always behind</td>
<td></td>
<td>No, because they are not organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somewhat, but not successfully</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- Before season, yes, but no success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Laid out, but ineffectively</td>
<td>Too general, not specific</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not to my satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nobody talks to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Not all employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing is getting done</td>
<td>Game operations if anything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OSMD doesn't exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>For most part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Baseball better off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Not to a great deal</td>
<td></td>
<td>None whatsoever</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Not getting it done</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Average at best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>+/- OK</td>
<td></td>
<td>Don't ever see them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brainstorm every 2 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>As often as it takes to be effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#4</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#5</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hardly ever</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Should be more</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMD doesn't exist per se</td>
<td>Should be almost daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Who works there?</td>
<td>+/- Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never established working parameters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No communication at all</td>
<td>+/- Little bit at beginning of season</td>
<td></td>
<td>Before season, but not even 1/4 got met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- Laid out, yes, but nothing got done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>Game operations maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not to my satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I never see them</td>
<td>+/- Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some good ideas, but never get it done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>Not sure, but not enough people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Need two people per sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Close to non-existent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>So so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Baseball a little better</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Equally poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Other schools blow us away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not on my behalf</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Better off doing it myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>As often as it takes</td>
<td>Once/month</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COACH#7**

**COMMENTS**

None

We have yet to talk

No. Never return phone calls

No. We are not a priority

Never

Don't work with me at all

- |

**COACH#8**

**COMMENTS**

Who is the SMD?

- |

I wouldn't know. They don't call

Beginning of season a bit

- |

Almost no contact

I don't go to them - they don't come to me

- |

I couldn't tell you

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |

Don't know

Don't know

- |

Not much gets done

A go-getter can get it done

- |
Table 3

Summary of Results from 12 Head Coaches regarding the Sports Information Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#1 COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#2 COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#3 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Enough lead time, too</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Very efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Real practical</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Best Media guide in country</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Anything I need</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>A step above</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very good job</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dwell on negative stories</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>They have always treated me good. But we are not a priority</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Reasonably good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#4 COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#5 COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#6 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Not always</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to work on that</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>Media guide late</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Very thorough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Super job on media guide, but little more work on content</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>We are fortunate with our SID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Below average</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#7 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#8 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#9 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Good job on media guide</td>
<td>Very impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+/- Some problems in media guide</td>
<td>What we need</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+/- Overall average, but better than many schools</td>
<td>+/- Good, not worse</td>
<td>+ As good as anybody in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>We meet our end, but media does not want to hear the good stuff</td>
<td>+ OK. It has gotten more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OK, but media doesn't</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure, but lots of negative coverage</td>
<td>want to hear the good stuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Very open</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost no contact</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#10 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#11 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#12 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#7 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#8 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#9 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Good job on media guide</td>
<td>Very impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+/- Some problems in media guide</td>
<td>What we need</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+/- Overall average, but better than many schools</td>
<td>+/- Good, not worse</td>
<td>+ As good as anybody in the country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>We meet our end, but media does not want to hear the good stuff</td>
<td>+ OK. It has gotten more positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>OK, but media doesn't</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure, but lots of negative coverage</td>
<td>want to hear the good stuff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Very open</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost no contact</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#10 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#11 COMMENTS</th>
<th>COACH#12 COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>They provide a lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Including updates and</td>
<td>Very much so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>everything</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>The best</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>Not great but ok</td>
<td>Very</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good job and good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not too good</td>
<td>Could strengthen that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Fairly good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#1</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#2</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>It's big because it adds excitement</td>
<td>Very important. Better atmosphere</td>
<td>It's a dream. We got worst attendance in WAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Real important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Top of my list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>One of biggest things a coach looks at. Both, on and off the field</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>My priority</td>
<td>My priority</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Graduate players</td>
<td>Graduate players</td>
<td>Graduate players</td>
<td>Improve players because it carries over to other positives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>- It's not working</td>
<td>- Jury is still out, but I don't think it's a benefit</td>
<td>- Disgrace to Olympic Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#4</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#5</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Tough job</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Want to win, but it's not that important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>That's why I am here</td>
<td>I'm responsible for that</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td>Graduating players</td>
<td>My first priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Graduate players, because that's for life</td>
<td>Not sure, but I'm not happy with the results it produces</td>
<td>Not efficient at all. We need to go back to old system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>- Not working</td>
<td>- Not sure, but I'm not happy with the results it produces</td>
<td>- Not sure, but I'm not happy with the results it produces</td>
<td>- Not sure, but I'm not happy with the results it produces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#7</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#8</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+/- COMMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Important to team and moral, but not critical to success of program</td>
<td>Important for the respect of the game</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Not important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Hugely important</td>
<td>Even more important</td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Hugely important</td>
<td>See players improve</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Graduating players</td>
<td>See players improve</td>
<td>Graduating players</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>+/- It has some value, but it's not better than before</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#10 +/- COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#11 +/- COMMENTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>COACH#12 +/- COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Big time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ultimately judged on wins and losses</td>
<td></td>
<td>My job depends on it</td>
<td></td>
<td>We strive for excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>See them grow as a person</td>
<td></td>
<td>Important</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very important, Part of player's growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Number one deal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Graduating players</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduating players because a degree opens doors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduating players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>A lot of good things going on</td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate entities are not working</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not sure I can rate it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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