

PRIORITIES AND PREFERENCES FOR COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC GOALS AND PROCESSES IN SOUTH KOREA

WEISHENG CHIU
Keimyung University
JUNG-SUP BAE AND KWANG-YONG LEE
Yonsei University
DOYEON WON
Liverpool John Moores University

We assessed priorities and preferences regarding athletic goals and approval of processes for achieving those goals in South Korean collegiate athletics students. Using a convenience sampling method, we collected data from 730 college students (580 general students and 150 student-athletes) at 4 South Korean universities. We found significant differences between subgroups divided by gender and student status (general students and student-athletes). Female students were more concerned than male students were with the process of creating gender equality and the goal of a diverse organizational culture. Student-athletes were more likely than general students were to consider that athletic departments should focus more on performance goals (e.g., winning) and processes (e.g., attracting athletes) than on athlete well-being. Our findings provide useful information for South Korean athletic administrators to help develop goals and processes that meet the priorities of the key stakeholder group of students.

Keywords: intercollegiate athletics, collegiate athletes, athletic goals, athletic processes, sports, South Korea.

Weisheng Chiu, Department of Sports and Leisure Studies, Keimyung University; Jung-sup Bae and Kwang-Yong Lee, Department of Sport Industry Studies, Yonsei University; Doyeon Won, School of Sport Studies, Leisure and Nutrition, Liverpool John Moores University.

Kwang-Yong Lee is now at the Department of Sport Management, Kyonggi University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Doyeon Won, School of Sport Studies, Leisure, and Nutrition, Liverpool John Moores University, Barkhill Road, Liverpool L176BD, U.K. Email: d.won@ljmu.ac.uk, or Kwang-Yong Lee, 54-42 Gwanggyosan-ro, Yeongtong-gu, Suwon 16227, Republic of Korea. Email: guifarro@naver.com

Developing goals is critical to realizing the future envisioned by an organization (Ramasamy, 2010), and the importance of well-defined goals is also recognized in intercollegiate athletics (Sack & Kretchmar, 2011; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000, 2002). Trail and Chelladurai (2000) suggested that collegiate athletic departments need to analyze their goals and the process of achieving those goals to ensure a program's success. Specifically, the importance attached to goals and the degree of approval for the associated processes should be measured so that athletic administrators gain support for their programs (Trail & Chelladurai, 2002). Intercollegiate athletics is "instrumental in shaping the institutional image and the image of its students and graduates, as well as in building bonds of community among supporters" (Roy, Graeff, & Harmon, 2008, p. 15). Moreover, institutions of higher education can benefit from the success of athletic programs that attract students and large alumni donations for academic or athletic purposes (Hutchinson & Bennett, 2012; Won & Chelladurai, 2016).

Korean collegiate sports are currently transitioning to becoming more systematic in terms of establishing goals and processes for achieving these. Before 2010, Korean collegiate sports did not have a governing body such as the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The first governing body of South Korean collegiate athletics, the Korea University Sport Federation (KUSF), was established in 2010 to develop a healthy, systematic program for South Korean collegiate athletes. While the KUSF has steadily improved in recent years, it has been criticized for failing to provide clear goals and to achieve developmental aspects of those goals, such as academic success or career preparation (Chung & Won, 2011). Moreover, South Korean collegiate athletes often face conflicts and confusion between their athletic and academic roles (Chung, Lee, & Won, 2011; Chung & Won, 2011). Therefore, establishing and prioritizing goals should be the first step in developing a healthier and more systematic program of collegiate athletics in South Korea. Hence, our main purpose was to investigate priorities and preferences for collegiate athletic goals and approval of the associated processes in South Korea.

Collegiate Athletic Goals and Processes

Regardless of organizational type, setting goals is one of the major elements in evaluating organizational effectiveness, because the extent to which an organization achieves its goals is a yardstick for measuring its success (Kerr, 1991). Identifying goals benefits an athletics department by ensuring it is focusing on what is most important for its prime beneficiaries (Perrow, 1961; Sack & Kretchmar, 2011). In order to provide guidelines for collegiate athletic departments, Trail and Chelladurai (2000) identified 10 goals of intercollegiate athletics and developed the Scale of Athletic Department Goals to measure the relative importance of each to collegiate athletic departments. These were

divided into developmental and performance goal types. According to Trail and Chelladurai (2000), *developmental goals* are primarily oriented toward athletes' education and amateur athletic competition, comprising the student-athlete's academic achievement, health and fitness, social and moral citizenship, and career, and promoting a culture of diversity. *Performance goals* are mainly oriented toward winning and profits, focusing on university visibility and prestige, financial security, winning, entertainment, and national sport development. Trail and Chelladurai (2000) also showed that developmental goals were rated as more important than performance goals were for intercollegiate athletics by both faculty members and students.

Trail and Chelladurai (2000) also identified 11 processes for achieving these goals, and these were once more grouped by development and performance. *Developmental processes* comprise student-athlete social and moral education, control of academic eligibility and admissions, maintaining health and fitness, facilitating career development, and creating gender equality. *Performance processes* were attracting athletes, marketing, promoting international sports, media relations, selection of coaches, and performance/popularity-based resource distribution. Again, both faculty members and students evaluated developmental processes as more important than performance processes were for intercollegiate athletics (Trail & Chelladurai, 2000).

Few researchers have explored intercollegiate athletic goals and processes since Trail and Chelladurai's work was published (Won & Chelladurai, 2016). Existing scales for assessing priorities and preferences in relation to athletic goals and processes have been rarely used by athletic departments. Further, although Trail and Chelladurai (2000) identified the ranking of goals and processes for intercollegiate athletics in the United States, the relative importance of these goals and processes may vary in a different cultural context. In South Korea, university athletics departments have been criticized for overemphasizing the win-loss record while overlooking athletes' academic success or career preparation (Chung & Won, 2011). Gender inequality in sport has also been identified as being an issue in South Korea (Joo, 2015). In addition, scholars have found that priorities and preferences in intercollegiate athletic goals and processes differ between groups, for instance, faculty, students, and student-athletes (Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Trail & Chelladurai, 2000, 2002). Of these, students are considered the primary stakeholders because they are the main constituent group of higher education institutions and potential future donors (Woodall, Hiller, & Resnick, 2014). Therefore, we selected college students as research participants in this study. Both general students and student-athletes were included so we could investigate differences in their priorities and preferences.

On the basis of the above literature, we proposed the following research questions:

Question 1: What are the priorities and preferences for collegiate athletic goals and approval of processes in South Korea?

Question 2: What is the difference between general students and student-athletes in South Korea in terms of their priorities and preferences toward collegiate goals and processes?

Method

Participants and Procedure

The purposive and convenience sampling method was used to collect data from 730 college students (580 general students and 150 student-athletes) at four South Korean universities. These universities were chosen because each sponsors at least three athletic programs, so undergraduate students at these institutions are familiar with intercollegiate athletic issues in South Korea. We obtained responses from only 150 student-athletes because of the small size of athletic programs in South Korean universities and athletes' training and game schedules. After securing permission from athletic departments and several instructors, the questionnaires were administered to students. A statement of informed consent was given to study participants. No major differences were found based on respondents' institutional affiliation. The sample ($N = 730$) consisted of 533 male students (435 general students and 98 student-athletes) and 197 female students (145 general students and 52 student-athletes). Their ages ranged from 18 to 26 years ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.12$, $SD = 2.07$).

Instruments

The instruments used in this study included the Scale of Athletic Department Goals (SADG) and the Scale of Athletic Department Processes (SADP), both of which were developed by Trail and Chelladurai (2000). The two scales were scrutinized by a South Korean panel of three sport management professors and two collegiate athletics department administrators. Consequently, we eliminated the performance/popularity-based resource distribution items from the SADP as it was unsuitable for use in the context of South Korean collegiate athletics. This is because resources (finances, facilities, and support services) are equally and fairly distributed among South Korean university sports teams (Chung & Won, 2011).

Moreover, to minimize invalid responses due to time constraints or lack of motivation, we shortened the original two scales to 30 questions each (three per goal or process) without compromising the measures' theoretical meaningfulness. Consequently, the SADG consisted of 30 items measuring 10 collegiate athletic goals, and the SADP consisted of 30 items representing 10 athletic processes. Because the instruments were originally developed in English, we conducted a back-translation process (Brislin, 1970) to generate the Korean versions. All

survey items were evaluated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*.

Data Analysis

We used SPSS version 21.0 to conduct preliminary tests. The entire data set was scrutinized to detect missing values, invalid values, and outliers. We also calculated skewness and kurtosis statistics to examine the assumption of normality. Next, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were performed using AMOS version 20 software to assess the scales' psychometric properties. Finally, we employed a series of multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) to examine group differences between male and female students and between general students and student-athletes in their perceptions of intercollegiate athletic goals and processes.

Results

Preliminary Tests

We found no invalid cases or outliers in the data. Skewness statistics for all items ranged from -.81 to -.10, and kurtosis statistics ranged from -.73 to .25, supporting the assumption of univariate normality (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010).

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

We conducted two CFAs to assess the SADG and SADP, respectively. Both scale models fitted the data well. For SADG, chi square (χ^2) = 1305.31, degrees of freedom (df) = 394, χ^2/df = 3.31, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .06, comparative fit index (CFI) = .94, and nonnormed fit index (NNFI) = .92, and for SADP, χ^2 = 1465.28, df = 394, χ^2/df = 3.72, RMSEA = .06, CFI = .92, and NNFI = .90. Although in both cases the χ^2/df ratios exceeded the suggested value of 3.0 (Hair et al., 2010), values under 5.0 are also considered acceptable (Schumacker & Lomax, 2010).

Next, the reliability of the scales was evaluated through composite reliability analysis. All values exceeded the recommended cut-off value of .60 (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012; Byrne, 2013), supporting good composite reliability. Furthermore, the factor loadings of construct indicators were all above .50 and loaded significantly to expected factors, and the average variance extracted values were greater than .50, representing good convergent validity (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012; Byrne, 2013). In addition, discriminant validity was evidenced, such that the confidence interval by ± 2 standard errors, with correlation of each paired construct, did not include 1 (Bagozzi & Yi, 2012; Byrne, 2013). Overall, these results exhibit good reliability and validity of the measures.

Table 1. MANOVA Results for Male (n = 533) and Female (n = 197) Students

Athletic department goals	All		Male		Female		F	η_p^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Developmental goals								
Student-athlete academic achievement	5.04	1.28	4.99	1.29	5.18	1.23	3.22	.004
Student-athlete health/fitness	5.54	1.16	5.53	1.14	5.54	1.21	0.01	.000
Student-athlete social/moral citizenship	5.42	1.13	5.42	1.14	5.42	1.09	0.00	.000
Organizational culture of diversity	5.30	1.13	5.21	1.16	5.56	1.02	10.89***	.015
Student-athlete careers	5.49	1.14	5.46	1.12	5.52	1.18	0.90	.001
Performance goals								
University visibility and prestige	5.11	1.16	5.08	1.17	5.21	1.11	1.77	.002
Financial security	4.83	1.32	4.77	1.33	4.99	1.27	4.12*	.006
Winning	4.91	1.41	4.89	1.43	4.97	1.35	0.47	.001
Entertainment	5.16	1.24	5.11	1.24	5.30	1.24	3.39	.005
National sport development	5.37	1.14	5.33	1.11	5.45	1.23	1.47	.002
Athletic department processes								
Developmental processes								
Student-athlete social/moral education	4.89	1.29	4.81	1.29	4.52	1.30	0.73	.001
Control of academic eligibility and admissions	4.84	1.20	4.71	1.22	4.61	1.13	0.95	.001
Maintaining student-athlete health/fitness	5.36	1.08	5.38	1.10	5.30	1.03	0.68	.001
Facilitating student-athlete career development	4.85	1.26	4.76	1.27	5.07	1.22	8.73**	.012
Creating gender equality	5.18	1.20	5.06	1.21	5.50	1.10	20.43***	.027
Performance processes								
Attracting athletes	5.17	1.20	5.10	1.20	5.38	1.21	7.82**	.011
Marketing process	5.01	1.08	4.94	1.08	5.17	1.05	6.59*	.009
Promoting international sports	5.30	1.13	5.29	1.13	5.32	1.13	0.14	.000
Media relations	5.05	1.10	5.01	1.10	5.13	1.10	1.68	.002
Selecting/retaining coaches	4.92	1.12	4.89	1.13	5.01	1.10	1.57	.002

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Table 2. MANOVA Results for General Students ($n = 580$) and Student-Athletes ($n = 150$)

Athletic department goals	All		Students		Athletes		F	η_p^2
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD		
Developmental goals								
Student-athlete academic achievement	5.04	1.28	4.96	1.25	5.34	1.34	10.42**	.014
Student-athlete health/fitness	5.54	1.16	5.46	1.15	5.84	1.14	13.46***	.018
Student-athlete social/moral citizenship	5.42	1.13	5.40	1.12	5.49	1.12	0.68	.001
Organizational culture of diversity	5.30	1.13	5.25	1.12	5.44	1.18	0.34	.005
Student-athlete careers	5.49	1.14	5.37	1.09	5.88	1.18	32.85***	.043
Performance goals								
University visibility and prestige	5.11	1.16	5.04	1.17	5.41	1.03	12.83***	.017
Financial security	4.83	1.32	4.65	1.31	5.53	1.11	56.32***	.072
Winning	4.91	1.41	4.66	1.37	5.95	1.11	100.81***	.122
Entertainment	5.16	1.24	4.99	1.22	5.83	1.12	58.90***	.075
National sport development	5.37	1.14	5.25	1.14	5.81	1.04	30.32***	.040
Athletic department processes								
Developmental processes								
Student-athlete social/moral education	4.89	1.29	4.93	1.23	4.33	1.39	27.29***	.036
Control of academic eligibility and admissions	4.84	1.20	4.83	1.10	4.48	1.48	9.80***	.013
Maintaining student-athlete health/fitness	5.36	1.08	5.38	1.05	5.29	1.18	0.79	.001
Facilitating student-athlete career development	4.85	1.26	4.69	1.17	5.44	1.40	44.44***	.058
Creating gender equality	5.18	1.20	5.07	1.17	5.60	1.23	23.45***	.031
Performance processes								
Attracting athletes	5.17	1.20	4.95	1.14	6.04	1.08	110.79***	.132
Marketing process	5.01	1.08	4.91	1.06	5.39	1.06	24.61***	.033
Promoting international sports	5.30	1.13	5.18	1.09	5.74	1.16	29.70***	.039
Media relations	5.05	1.10	4.96	1.06	5.40	1.20	20.20***	.027
Selecting/retaining coaches	4.92	1.12	4.83	1.09	5.28	1.20	19.60***	.026

Note. ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

Subgroup Differences

Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1, indicating that students rated student-athlete health and fitness as their top goal, followed by student-athlete careers, social and moral citizenship, and national sport development. Overall, respondents prioritized developmental goals over process goals. Table 1 also shows that maintaining student-athlete health and fitness was the most approved process, followed by promoting international sports, creating gender equality, and attracting athletes. Respondents had similar preferred levels for developmental processes and performance processes.

MANOVA results indicated significant differences between male and female students' perceptions of athletic goals, Wilks's lambda = .97, $F_{(10, 719)} = 2.47$, $p = .007$, $\eta_p^2 = .033$, and athletic processes, Wilks's lambda = .95, $F_{(10, 719)} = 4.22$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .055$. Follow-up univariate analyses, displayed in Table 1, indicated that an organizational culture of diversity accounted for most differences between male and female students' goal priorities. Further, creating gender equality accounted for most differences between male and female students' process approvals.

MANOVA results also revealed significant differences between general students' and student-athletes' perceptions of athletic goals, Wilks's lambda = .81, $F_{(10, 719)} = 17.23$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .193$, and athletic processes, Wilks's lambda = .78, $F_{(10, 719)} = 20.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .224$. Subsequent univariate analyses, shown in Table 2, indicate that winning accounted for most differences between general students and student-athletes' goal priorities. Further, attracting athletes accounted for most differences between general students and student-athletes' process approvals. Overall, there were differences in priorities and preferences for collegiate athletic goals and processes based on college students' gender and status.

Discussion

We explored priorities and preferences for collegiate athletic goals and the approval of associated processes in the context of South Korean university athletic departments. Respondents prioritized development-oriented goals over performance-oriented goals, which is consistent with the earlier findings of Trail and Chelladurai (2000). Collegiate athletic programs should, therefore, pay more attention to student-athletes' development, including their fitness, health, and physical well-being; preparedness for their future careers; and social, moral, and citizenship behaviors. Some scholars have argued that collegiate athletic programs could help student-athletes explore their future careers by identifying their occupational interests and developing their skills and abilities (Aquillina & Henry, 2010; Carodine, Almond, & Gratto, 2001; Lally & Kerr, 2005; Ward & Hux, 2011).

On the other hand, students did not express a clear preference for developmental or performance processes in university athletics departments. We found that the development-oriented processes of maintaining student-athlete fitness, health, and physical well-being, and of creating gender equality were important to students, but so were the performance-oriented processes of helping student-athletes participate in international competitions and recruiting excellent athletes for colleges. These findings are somewhat inconsistent with those of Trail and Chelladurai (2000), who showed that prioritizing developmental goals reflected a preference for developmental processes for achieving those goals. Moreover, Ward and Hux (2011) found that collegiate departments have higher preferences for athletes' development goals than their performance goals. However, in the current study, college students were almost indifferent in the extent to which they approved of developmental and performance processes. One explanation for our different findings is that the present sample of South Korean students may regard sports teams as a medium for promoting their universities' images and reputations (Chung et al., 2011) and, therefore, rate the importance of performance processes similarly to that of developmental processes. Our findings draw attention to the risk of overemphasizing performance (i.e., winning) while overlooking athletes' development (i.e., goals for academic success or career preparation) as not meeting the priorities of the key stakeholder group, that is, students.

Moreover, we found significant differences between male and female students in their perceptions of collegiate athletic goals and processes. Female students rated an organizational culture of diversity as the most important goal and creating gender equality as the most important process. Gender inequality in South Korean sport has become an issue (Joo, 2015), so it is not surprising that more female than male students endorsed these goals. We attribute these findings to the rise of feminist consciousness in South Korea (Suh & Park, 2014), which is leading to many collegiate athletic programs making efforts to promote gender equality.

General students and student-athletes differed in their perceptions of both intercollegiate athletic goals and processes in South Korea. Some scholars have argued that understanding student-athlete preferences for goals and processes is critical for helping athletic administrators develop suitable programs to assist athletes (Carodine et al., 2001). We found that student-athletes generally scored much higher on performance-oriented goals and processes than general students did (see Table 2). Specifically, the goal of winning differed most significantly between general students and student-athletes' priorities, being rated more highly by the student-athletes, and the process of attracting athletes differed most significantly between general students and student-athletes, with student-athletes again approving of this more. Therefore, South Korean student-athletes can be said to be more concerned than other students are about operative goals and

processes for achieving those goals, as these are directly and closely related to their athletic life in college.

Moreover, we found that students of different status ranked goals and processes completely differently. General students rated student-athlete health and fitness as the most important goal and maintaining student-athlete health and fitness as the most important process. Student-athletes, however, ranked winning as their most prioritized goal and attracting athletes as their most approved process. To a large extent, the process of attracting athletes leads to the goal of winning; thus, South Korean student-athletes consider that achieving better performance should be the first preference for athletic departments.

In sum, there were several significant differences between male and female students and between general students and student-athletes in rating the importance of goals and processes for collegiate athletics in South Korea. By providing information on matters that are important to the critical stakeholder group of students, our findings can help South Korean athletic administrators prioritize their goals and processes.

This study was not without limitations. Drawing participants from only four universities may limit the generalizability and representativeness of our findings to other universities in South Korea. Moreover, although both general students and student-athletes are primary stakeholders in intercollegiate athletics, other influential stakeholders, such as top-level administrators or coaches, should also be considered, and their goal orientation and approval of processes for achieving those goals assessed. This might provide more insightful implications for athletic departments.

References

- Aquillina, D., & Henry, I. (2010). Elite athletes and university education in Europe: A review of policy and practice in higher education in the European Union member states. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 2, 25–47. <http://doi.org/d7rt3v>
- Bagozzi, R. P., & Yi, Y. (2012). Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 40, 8–34. <http://doi.org/dn953s>
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1, 185–216. <http://doi.org/b99wbq>
- Byrne, B. M. (2013). *Structural equation modeling with AMOS: Basic concepts, applications, and programming* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Carodine, K., Almond, K. F., & Gratto, K. K. (2001). College student athlete success both in and out of the classroom. *New Directions for Student Services*, 93, 19–33. <http://doi.org/cfrcnp>
- Chung, J., Lee, K. Y., & Won, D. (2011). “Sorry, I am a student-athlete”: A qualitative research regarding the balance between academics and athletics. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 24, 154–160.
- Chung, J., & Won, D. (2011). The authoritarian policy in South Korean sport: A critical perspective. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20, 146–157.

- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hutchinson, M., & Bennett, G. (2012). Core values brand building in sport: Stakeholder attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics and university brand congruency. *Sport Management Review, 15*, 434–447. <http://doi.org/brp6>
- Joo, J. M. (2015). Legal and institutional proposals to realize gender equity in school sports: Application of Title IX of the U.S. [In Korean]. *The Journal of Sports and Entertainment Law, 18*, 65–93.
- Kerr, G. (1991). Improving organizational effectiveness in sport organizations. *Canadian Journal of Sport Science, 16*, 84–85.
- Lally, P. S., & Kerr, G. A. (2005). The career planning, athletic identity, and student role identity of intercollegiate student athletes. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76*, 275–285. <http://doi.org/brp7>
- Perrow, C. (1961). The analysis of goals in complex organizations. *American Sociological Review, 26*, 854–866. <http://doi.org/dr27rp>
- Putler, D. S., & Wolfe, R. A. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 16*, 301–325.
- Ramasamy, S. (2010). Goal setting—Individual, group and organization level. *International Journal of Global Management, 1*, 51–62.
- Roy, D. P., Graeff, T. R., & Harmon, S. K. (2008). Repositioning a university through NCAA Division I-A football membership. *Journal of Sport Management, 22*, 11–29.
- Sack, A. L., & Kretchmar, R. S. (2011). How to evaluate NCAA success in attaining its stated mission: Implications for athletes' rights and social justice. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport, 4*, 5–13.
- Schumacker, R. E., & Lomax, R. G. (2010). *A beginner's guide to structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Suh, D., & Park, I. H. (2014). Framing dynamics of South Korean women's movements, 1970s–90s: Global influences, state responses, and interorganizational networks. *Journal of Korean Studies, 19*, 327–356. <http://doi.org/brp8>
- Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2000). Perceptions of goals and processes of intercollegiate athletics: A case study. *Journal of Sport Management, 14*, 154–178.
- Trail, G., & Chelladurai, P. (2002). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic goals and processes: The influence of personal values. *Journal of Sport Management, 16*, 289–310.
- Ward, R., & Hux, R. (2011). Intercollegiate athletic purposes expressed in mission statements. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education, 5*, 177–200. <http://doi.org/brp9>
- Won, D., & Chelladurai, P. (2016). Competitive advantage in intercollegiate athletics: Role of intangible resources. *PLOS ONE, 11*, e0145782. <http://doi.org/brqb>
- Woodall, T., Hiller, A., & Resnick, S. (2014). Making sense of higher education: Students as consumers and the value of the university experience. *Studies in Higher Education, 39*, 48–67. <http://doi.org/brqc>

