

Essential Content Area For An Undergraduate Sports Law Course

Andy Pittman
Baylor University

This study was designed to determine the content areas to be included in an undergraduate sports law course by surveying members of NASPE and the NAGWS/NASPE Joint Committee on Legal Issues. The subjects (N=454) were a systematic random sample of the September, 1990 NASPE membership (n=379) and the entire list of the March, 1990, NAGWS/NASPE Joint Committee on Legal Issues Resource list (n=75).

Each respondent was sent a questionnaire to be completed by a specified date. The 14-item questionnaire was designed to measure each subject's attitude on a scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree toward eight content areas (administrative law, constitutional law, contract law, judicial system, legal research, products liability, risk management, and tort law) to be included in an undergraduate sports law course. Respondents were also asked to provide demographic data concerning their gender, employment area, educational level, and racial/ethnic background.

A chi-square test of association was performed to determine if there was a significant difference between the various demographic groupings. This was followed by a multiple discriminant analysis for the purpose of testing the accuracy of predicting a respondent's group based on the characteristics of that group. Means and standard deviations were computed to determine the relative importance of each dependent variable. Comments to the content areas were solicited and were analyzed.

■ DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLE

Of the original sample of 454, twelve names were eliminated from the NASPE list for the following reasons:

- 1 - Was an association and not a person
- 1 - Name appeared on both lists
- 6 - No/Incorrect address
- 4 - No longer members of NASPE
- 12

From this sample of 442, a total of 403 responded (91.2%). Of the 367 NASPE members, 332 (90.5%) responded. Seventy-one of seventy-five (94.7%) experts responded.

Forty-nine states were represented (Hawaii was the only omission), as well as the District of Columbia, Canada, and Puerto Rico. The NASPE members were systematically randomly selected by zip code. This sample size was derived from the following formula (McNamara, 1978):

$$n = Npq : [(N-1)D + pq]$$

n = required sample size

N = the population size

p = the population proportion. When no reliable prior information is available, p is usually set at 0.50 (McNamara, 1978).

$$q = 1 - p$$

$$D = B^2/A$$

B = the bound on the error of estimate expressed as a proportion (tolerance or precision). The value of B was established at 0.05.

A = the table value of chi-square for one degree of freedom at the desired significance level (accuracy). Statistical significance was set at an Alpha level of 0.05 resulting in a formula value of 3.84.

Approximately every 66th member ($25,200 \div 379$) was selected. Because of its relatively small size, the entire experts list was surveyed.

Approximately 60 percent of the sample are female. Nearly 40 percent are employed in college or university settings, over 20 percent each in elementary and secondary school settings, and over 17 percent in all other employment categories. Almost 75 percent have graduate degrees, and over 90 percent are white.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of the Respondents

| Gender | % | n | Employment | % | n | Education | % | n | Race | % | n |
|--------|---------|-----|----------------|---------|-----|-----------|---------|-----|----------|---------|-----|
| Female | 58.1 % | 234 | Elementary | 23.3 % | 92 | Doctorate | 31.3 % | 125 | American | | |
| Male | 41.9 % | 169 | Secondary | 20.5 % | 81 | Masters | 41.4 % | 165 | Indian | 1.0 % | 4 |
| | | | Junior College | 2.0 % | 8 | Bachelors | 23.8 % | 95 | Asian | 0.5 % | 2 |
| | | | University | 38.5 % | 152 | Other | 3.5 % | 14 | Black | 2.8 % | 11 |
| | | | Agency | 3.0 % | 12 | | | | Hispanic | 1.3 % | 5 |
| | | | Other | 12.7 % | 50 | | | | White | 94.0 % | 373 |
| | | | | | | | | | Other | 0.5 % | 2 |
| | 100.0 % | 403 | | 100.0 % | 395 | | 100.0 % | 399 | | 100.1 % | 397 |

Note: Some columns do not total to 403 because of missing information. Percentages may not add to 100% because of rounding.

■ RANKING OF CONTENT AREAS

To determine the relative ranking of the content areas, weighted averages to the response categories were computed ($SA=1$, $A=2$, $D=3$, $SD=4$). Those responding N, No Opinion, were not included in the mean values to prevent distortion of the data.

Table 2: Mean Values and Standard Deviations of the Content Area Responses

| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>Mean</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 1. Tort Law | 398 | 1.42 | 0.75 |
| 2. Products Liability | 399 | 1.43 | 0.65 |
| 3. Risk Management | 400 | 1.51 | 0.88 |
| 4. Administrative Law | 401 | 1.82 | 0.81 |
| 5. Contract Law | 400 | 1.92 | 0.95 |
| 6. Constitutional Law | 400 | 2.08 | 1.07 |
| 7. Judicial System | 398 | 2.39 | 1.07 |
| 8. Legal Research | 398 | 2.68 | 1.15 |
| M = | 1.91 | | |

As expected, based on a review of the literature, the areas of tort law, products liability, and risk management ranked lower in terms of mean values than did the other areas. The relatively low standard deviations for the three areas (0.75, 0.65, and 0.88, respectively) indicate that the respondents were in agreement about these three areas. Administrative law, contract law, and constitutional law received mean rankings of 1.82, 1.92, and 2.08 respectively, which indicates that most respondents agree that these areas should be included. The higher mean values reported for a study of the judicial system and legal research, 2.39 and 2.68 respectively, are supported by the comments offered by the respondents to the content areas (Appendix K). The comparatively large standard deviations of 1.07 for the judicial system and 1.15 for legal research indicate a wider divergence of opinion among the respondents as to the importance of the two content areas.

■ EXPERTS VERSUS PRACTITIONERS

In a chi-square test of association between those designated as experts (n=71) and practitioners (n=332), several significant differences were discovered as revealed in Table 3.

Table 3: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Experts versus Practitioners Responses Toward Content Areas

| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X²</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Experts)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Practitioners)</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Administrative Law | 4 | 12.56 * | 71 | 2.00 | 0.89 | 330 | 1.79 | 0.80 |
| Constitutional Law | 4 | 12.91 * | 71 | 1.84 | 0.96 | 329 | 2.15 | 1.09 |
| Contract Law | 4 | 4.87 | 71 | 1.86 | 0.93 | 329 | 1.94 | 0.96 |
| Judicial System | 4 | 10.93 * | 71 | 2.06 | 0.92 | 327 | 2.47 | 1.09 |
| Legal Research | 4 | 8.11 | 70 | 2.39 | 1.01 | 328 | 2.75 | 1.17 |
| Products Liability | 3 | 3.52 | 70 | 1.45 | 0.50 | 329 | 1.42 | 0.65 |
| Risk Management | 3 | 13.62 * | 71 | 1.22 | 0.74 | 329 | 1.57 | 0.91 |
| Tort Law | 4 | 12.86 * | 71 | 1.19 | 0.58 | 327 | 1.48 | 0.77 |

*p<.05.

In four of the five areas (constitutional law, judicial system, risk management, and tort law) experts felt significantly more strongly about including those areas in

a sports law undergraduate course than did practitioners. Conversely practitioners indicated a significantly stronger preference for administrative law than did the experts. Practitioners' comments indicated a strong preference for emphasizing local, state and federal regulation by administrative agencies but favored deleting employment discrimination from the content area. Experts were almost equally in favor of emphasizing amateur sport governing bodies and discrimination but were in favor of deleting an analysis of the administrative hearing process.

Both groups shared the same comments regarding the content in the constitutional law area. The Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments and corresponding state constitutional laws were strongly emphasized, yet all who indicated a deletion in this area were unanimous in their elimination of the First Amendment content, freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

Neither group strongly supported a study of the judicial system. The supportive statements were limited to a brief overview of the topic. However, based on an analysis of the statements, practitioners were four times as likely as experts to favor deleting this content area.

Analysis of the comments to risk management did not indicate any underlying reasons for the difference between the two groups. Comments were very supportive from both experts and practitioners.

Experts' comments regarding the inclusion of intentional torts were mixed: two favored expanding the area by including the torts of defamation and false imprisonment and two could see no need for intentional torts. Otherwise, experts were strongly in favor of including the area. However, practitioners were decidedly against including intentional torts. All six practitioners who favored deleting an area were unanimous in their feelings toward intentional torts.

When comparing experts and practitioners and their ranking of the most important content areas, only in the area of tort law was there a significant difference (Table 4). Respondents were asked to rank the three most important content areas, with the number one being the most important, two second in importance, and three third in importance. Content areas not ranked by each respondent were not assigned values and were counted as nonresponses.

Table 4: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Experts versus Practitioners Ranking Most Important and Least Important Content Areas

| Most Important | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|-------------------------|-----------|--|
| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X²</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Experts)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Practitioners)</u> | <u>SD</u> | |
| Administrative Law | 2 | 1.52 | 13 | 2.31 | 0.75 | 89 | 2.02 | 0.78 | |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 3.60 | 28 | 2.32 | 0.74 | 69 | 2.01 | 0.74 | |
| Contract Law | 2 | 1.22 | 14 | 2.29 | 0.61 | 81 | 2.31 | 0.70 | |
| Judicial System | 2 | 3.37 | 6 | 2.83 | 0.41 | 13 | 2.31 | 0.63 | |
| Legal Research | 2 | 2.04 | 6 | 2.33 | 0.52 | 22 | 2.18 | 0.80 | |
| Products Liability | 2 | 3.25 | 30 | 2.47 | 0.57 | 219 | 2.24 | 0.66 | |
| Risk Management | 2 | 2.26 | 55 | 1.60 | 0.68 | 246 | 1.73 | 0.77 | |
| Tort Law | 2 | 6.44 * | 54 | 1.63 | 0.62 | 230 | 1.88 | 0.74 | |

* $p < .05$.

(Table 4 continued)

| Least Important | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|---|------|----|------|------|-----|------|------|
| Administrative Law | 2 | 2.21 | 37 | 2.05 | 0.81 | 108 | 2.26 | 0.75 |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 1.31 | 26 | 2.15 | 0.73 | 145 | 2.21 | 0.78 |
| Contract Law | 2 | 1.30 | 28 | 1.96 | 0.79 | 119 | 2.15 | 0.78 |
| Judicial System | 2 | 2.11 | 52 | 2.08 | 0.71 | 225 | 1.93 | 0.68 |
| Legal Research | 2 | 0.56 | 45 | 1.71 | 0.79 | 226 | 1.64 | 0.74 |
| Products Liability | 2 | 1.29 | 13 | 2.08 | 0.76 | 38 | 2.13 | 0.84 |
| Risk Management | 2 | 3.48 | 3 | 1.33 | 0.58 | 39 | 2.05 | 0.69 |
| Tort Law | 2 | 0.52 | 4 | 2.00 | 0.82 | 34 | 2.09 | 0.83 |

Open-ended responses to the ranking of most important content areas did not reveal any reasons why tort law was more important to experts than practitioners or why there were no significant differences between the two groups in the other seven content areas. Therefore, except in the area of tort law, the relative expertise of the respondent is not significant when ranking the most important content areas.

No significant differences were found when comparing the practitioners and experts rankings of the least important content areas (Table 4). Respondents were asked to rank the three least important content areas, with the number one being the least important. Content areas not ranked by each respondent were not assigned values. Open-ended responses to the least important content areas did not reveal any reasons why there were no differences in the ranking of least important content areas between experts and practitioners. Therefore, the relative expertise of the respondent is not significant when ranking the least important content areas.

Multiple discriminant analysis was performed to predict to which group a respondent belonged based on the characteristics of that group. This analysis of the expert versus the practitioner groups revealed that the risk management content area was the most important predictor variable followed in order by the judicial system, administrative law, constitutional law, tort law, products liability, and legal research. The area of contract law was of no importance in predicting the category, expert or practitioner, of a particular respondent.

Table 5: Values of Predictor Variables Ranked in Order of Importance

| Practitioner | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| <u>Rank</u> | <u>Predictor Variable</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> |
| 1 | Risk Management | 7 | 69 | 0.59 | 1.21 | 322 | 0.89 | 1.56 |
| 2 | Judicial System | 7 | 69 | 0.92 | 2.05 | 322 | 1.09 | 2.47 |
| 3 | Administrative Law | 7 | 69 | 0.87 | 2.00 | 322 | 0.79 | 1.79 |
| 4 | Constitutional Law | 7 | 69 | 0.96 | 1.84 | 322 | 1.09 | 2.14 |
| 5 | Tort Law | 7 | 69 | 0.58 | 1.18 | 322 | 0.78 | 1.47 |
| 6 | Products Liability | 7 | 69 | 0.50 | 1.44 | 322 | 0.65 | 1.41 |
| 7 | Legal Research | 7 | 69 | 1.02 | 2.39 | 322 | 1.18 | 2.75 |

Note: $X^2 = 38.377$. Significant at $p < .05$.

The effectiveness of this analysis was measured by how well it separated the respondents into the correct groups (Kachigan, 1982). The procedure for measuring accuracy of the hit percentage (the percentage of correct assignments) was to compare it to the rate expected from random guessing, 50 percent or to the rate expected without knowledge of the characteristics of the groups. This latter rate would be constructed by assuming that all respondents belong to the group which contains the largest number of respondents. However, as the ratio of group membership deviates from a fifty-fifty split, it becomes virtually impossible to do better than chance in discriminating between the groups (Kachigan, 1982). The percentage of grouped cases correctly classified was 69.57 percent (Table 6). Experts were correctly predicted at a slightly higher percentage than practitioners, 73.9 percent to 68.6 percent.

Table 6: Frequencies of Successes and Failures in Classifying Groups

| Membership | | Correctly | Incorrectly |
|------------------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>Predicted</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>Predicted</u> | <u>Predicted</u> |
| Practitioner | 322 | 221(68.6%) | 101(31.4%) |
| Expert | 69 | 51(73.9%) | 18(26.1%) |

The primary purpose of performing the multiple discriminant analysis was to develop a basis for predicting group membership on the basis of the characteristics of the group. A byproduct of this analysis is the ability to infer the relative importance of each of the characteristics used to discriminate between the different groups in the population. The analysis is performed in such a way that the first predictor variable maximally separates groups. Then a second predictor, orthogonal to the first, is found that best separates groups on the basis of information not accounted for by the first predictor variable. This procedure is continued until all possible variables are evaluated (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983).

■ FEMALE VERSUS MALE RESPONDENTS

In comparing respondents by gender, a chi-square test of association revealed significant differences in two areas: constitutional law and tort law (Table 7).

Table 7: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Female versus Male Respondents Toward Content Areas

| Content Area | df | X ² | N | M(Female) | SD | N | M(Male) | SD |
|--------------------|----|----------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|---------|------|
| Administrative Law | 4 | 4.60 | 233 | 1.76 | 0.79 | 168 | 1.93 | 0.85 |
| Constitutional Law | 4 | 10.13 * | 233 | 2.01 | 1.03 | 167 | 2.21 | 1.12 |
| Contract Law | 4 | 1.47 | 233 | 1.93 | 0.99 | 167 | 1.92 | 0.90 |
| Judicial System | 4 | 0.47 | 232 | 2.42 | 1.07 | 166 | 2.37 | 1.05 |
| Legal Research | 4 | 1.86 | 231 | 2.65 | 1.12 | 167 | 2.72 | 1.19 |
| Products Liability | 3 | 1.73 | 231 | 1.45 | 0.69 | 168 | 1.41 | 0.59 |
| Risk Management | 3 | 5.85 | 232 | 1.59 | 0.98 | 168 | 1.38 | 0.71 |
| Tort Law | 4 | 12.70 * | 232 | 1.49 | 0.76 | 166 | 1.33 | 0.72 |

*p<.05.

Females were more likely to include ($M = 2.01$) constitutional law than males ($M = 2.21$). Conversely, males ($M = 1.33$) were more likely to include tort law than females ($M = 1.49$).

The primary differences between male and female respondents in the content area of constitutional law was that males indicated a stronger preference for the Fourth Amendment drug testing issues and less support for First Amendment. Twice as many male respondents favored deleting any discussion of the First Amendment from the area of constitutional law. No significant comments in the open-ended responses either deleting or favoring Fifth Amendment (due process) or Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection) issues based on gender category were discovered.

Over three times as many female respondents favored deleting a study of intentional torts as did males. Other than more favorable comments in general supporting the study of tort law, no other differences were apparent.

When ranking the most important content areas, no significant differences were discovered (Table 8). In ranking the least important content areas, as expected, males ranked constitutional law significantly less important than females. In analyzing the open-ended comments, no reasons could be discerned why males ranked constitutional law less important than females.

Table 8: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Female versus Male Respondents Ranking Most Important and Least Important Content Areas

Most Important

| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X²</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Female)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Male)</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|-------------|
| Administrative Law | 2 | 2.87 | 65 | 2.02 | 0.82 | 37 | 2.14 | 0.71 |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 4.74 | 62 | 2.03 | 0.70 | 34 | 2.23 | 0.81 |
| Contract Law | 2 | 5.21 | 52 | 2.31 | 0.61 | 43 | 2.30 | 0.77 |
| Judicial System | 2 | 0.60 | 13 | 2.46 | 0.66 | 6 | 2.50 | 0.55 |
| Legal Research | 2 | 1.15 | 15 | 2.40 | 0.82 | 13 | 2.23 | 0.73 |
| Products Liability | 2 | 0.49 | 146 | 2.25 | 0.66 | 103 | 2.30 | 0.64 |
| Risk Management | 2 | 0.69 | 170 | 1.68 | 0.74 | 131 | 1.75 | 0.77 |
| <u>Tort Law</u> | <u>2</u> | <u>4.16</u> | <u>158</u> | <u>1.91</u> | <u>0.73</u> | <u>126</u> | <u>1.74</u> | <u>0.72</u> |

* $p < .05$.

Least Important

| | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--------|-----|------|------|-----|------|------|
| Administrative Law | 2 | 3.45 | 80 | 2.31 | 0.74 | 65 | 2.08 | 0.80 |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 7.75 * | 92 | 2.25 | 0.71 | 79 | 2.15 | 0.85 |
| Contract Law | 2 | 2.30 | 91 | 2.11 | 0.75 | 56 | 2.12 | 0.83 |
| Judicial System | 2 | 2.78 | 153 | 1.92 | 0.71 | 124 | 2.01 | 0.66 |
| Legal Research | 2 | 3.72 | 152 | 1.57 | 0.72 | 119 | 1.75 | 0.77 |
| Products Liability | 2 | 0.37 | 28 | 2.18 | 0.82 | 23 | 2.04 | 0.82 |
| Risk Management | 2 | 0.28 | 31 | 1.97 | 0.71 | 11 | 2.09 | 0.70 |
| Tort Law | 2 | 0.10 | 25 | 2.08 | 0.81 | 13 | 2.08 | 0.86 |

* $p < .05$.

Multiple discriminant analysis based on gender indicated that only five

variables were important in predicting the respondent's correct gender (Table 9). The content area of risk management was most important followed in order by administrative law, tort law, constitutional law, and the judicial system. Three variables, contract law, legal research, and products liability, were of no importance in predicting a respondent's gender.

Table 9: Values of Predictor Variables Ranked in Order of Importance

| Rank | Predictor Variable | df | Female | | | Male | | |
|------|--------------------|----|--------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | N | SD | M | N | SD | M |
| 1 | Risk Management | 5 | 229 | 0.96 | 1.59 | 162 | 0.66 | 1.37 |
| 2 | Administrative Law | 5 | 229 | 0.77 | 1.75 | 162 | 0.85 | 1.92 |
| 3 | Tort Law | 5 | 229 | 0.76 | 1.49 | 162 | 0.73 | 1.32 |
| 4 | Constitutional Law | 5 | 229 | 1.03 | 2.00 | 162 | 1.11 | 2.20 |
| 5 | Judicial System | 5 | 229 | 1.10 | 2.41 | 162 | 1.04 | 2.37 |

Note: $\chi^2 = 16.280$ significant at $p < .05$.

The ability to correctly classify groups was only slightly better than random, 59.14 percent (Table 10). Prediction of groups by gender was not as accurate as that of prediction by expertise. Males were correctly predicted slightly better than 60 percent of the time and females slightly better than 59 percent. Thus, the predictor variables were more accurate in predicting group membership than the rate achieved by random guessing, 50 percent.

Table 10: Frequencies of Successes and Failures in Classifying Groups

| Membership | | Correctly | Incorrectly |
|------------------|----------|------------------|------------------|
| <u>Predicted</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>Predicted</u> | <u>Predicted</u> |
| Female | 231 | 135(58.4%) | 96(41.6%) |
| Male | 69 | 98(60.1%) | 65(39.9%) |

■ DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREAS BASED ON EMPLOYMENT

In comparing responses based on area of employment (elementary, secondary, university, and other), a significant difference was discovered in four areas: constitutional law, judicial system, risk management, and tort law (Table 11). For purposes of statistical analysis, the employment categories "junior college" (n=8) and "agency" (n=12) were combined and placed in the "other" category (n=70) (Table 1).

Table 11: Chi-Square, Mean, and Standard Deviations of Responses to Content Areas Based on Employment

| Content Area | df | X ² | N | M(Elem) | SD | N | M(Sec) | SD | N | M(Univ) | SD | N | M(Other) | SD |
|--------------------|----|----------------|----|---------|------|----|--------|------|-----|---------|------|----|----------|------|
| Administrative Law | 12 | 12.21 | 92 | 1.91 | 0.80 | 81 | 1.78 | 0.66 | 151 | 1.87 | 0.88 | 70 | 1.78 | 0.89 |
| Constitutional Law | 12 | 28.29 * | 92 | 2.28 | 1.08 | 81 | 2.30 | 1.14 | 150 | 1.86 | 0.99 | 70 | 2.18 | 1.04 |
| Contract Law | 12 | 18.79 | 92 | 2.07 | 1.03 | 81 | 2.09 | 0.98 | 150 | 1.78 | 0.84 | 70 | 1.87 | 1.01 |
| Judicial System | 12 | 21.08 * | 91 | 2.51 | 1.16 | 81 | 2.53 | 1.10 | 150 | 2.27 | 1.06 | 69 | 2.46 | 0.93 |
| Legal Research | 12 | 4.45 | 91 | 2.65 | 1.16 | 81 | 2.79 | 1.20 | 151 | 2.68 | 1.15 | 68 | 2.68 | 1.09 |
| Products Liability | 9 | 14.49 | 92 | 1.33 | 0.60 | 81 | 1.49 | 0.63 | 150 | 1.41 | 0.59 | 69 | 1.54 | 0.83 |
| Risk Management | 9 | 20.51 * | 92 | 1.72 | 1.14 | 81 | 1.65 | 0.87 | 151 | 1.34 | 0.70 | 69 | 1.40 | 0.81 |
| Tort Law | 12 | 24.01 * | 92 | 1.48 | 0.73 | 80 | 1.50 | 0.78 | 150 | 1.27 | 0.62 | 69 | 1.58 | 0.85 |

*p<.05.

Those working in university settings were significantly more likely to include all four areas than did those working in all other settings. In the area of constitutional law, the critical difference was the lack of support for First Amendment rights by those employed in non-university settings. Fourth, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendment issues received support from all groups.

Likewise, the support for a study of the judicial system was far less among those employed in non-university settings than those in university settings. The feelings among non-university employees are that this area is too ambitious for undergrads and has no practical application. Even among university employees, this area did not achieve 2.0 which would indicate agreement to include.

Respondents from all employment areas supported risk management. The vital difference seemed to be, based on the open-ended comments, that several university employees indicated this the most important area.

A common belief among all respondents is that a study of intentional torts should be removed from the area of tort law. In general, though, more positive comments were received from university employees.

In a ranking of the most important content areas, significant differences were discovered in three of the areas: products liability, risk management, and tort law (Table 12). No significant differences were discovered when ranking the least important content areas.

Table 12: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Responses to Most Important and Least Important Content Areas Based on Employment

| Most Important Content Area | df | X ² | N | M(Elem) | SD | N | M(Sec) | SD | N | M(Univ) | SD | N | M(Other) | SD |
|-----------------------------|----|----------------|----|---------|------|----|--------|------|----|---------|------|----|----------|------|
| Administrative Law | 6 | 4.01 | 20 | 2.05 | 0.76 | 18 | 2.39 | 0.84 | 39 | 2.23 | 0.78 | 23 | 1.91 | 0.73 |
| Constitutional Law | 6 | 3.01 | 14 | 2.07 | 0.73 | 19 | 2.21 | 0.71 | 41 | 2.20 | 0.75 | 21 | 1.90 | 0.77 |
| Contract Law | 6 | 12.02 | 23 | 2.43 | 0.51 | 15 | 2.33 | 0.72 | 37 | 2.41 | 0.69 | 15 | 1.87 | 0.74 |
| Judicial System | 6 | 5.89 | 6 | 2.50 | 0.84 | 4 | 2.25 | 0.50 | 8 | 2.50 | 0.53 | 1 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Legal Research | 6 | 4.23 | 4 | 2.75 | 0.50 | 5 | 1.80 | 0.84 | 10 | 2.40 | 0.70 | 9 | 2.22 | 0.83 |
| Products Liability | 6 | 17.57 * | 66 | 2.17 | 0.71 | 57 | 2.26 | 0.61 | 78 | 2.49 | 0.58 | 43 | 2.05 | 0.65 |

(Table 12 cont' d)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---------|----|------|------|----|------|------|-----|------|------|----|------|------|
| Risk Management | 6 | 16.16 * | 68 | 1.72 | 0.69 | 61 | 1.80 | 0.75 | 119 | 1.58 | 0.72 | 49 | 1.82 | 0.88 |
| Tort Law | 6 | 12.59 * | 70 | 1.83 | 0.74 | 61 | 1.84 | 0.76 | 110 | 1.72 | 0.68 | 40 | 2.18 | 0.71 |

*p<.05.

Least Important

| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X2</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Elem)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Sec)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Univ)</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M(Other)</u> | <u>SD</u> |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|---------------|-----------|----------|----------------|-----------|----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Administrative Law | 6 | 8.26 | 39 | 2.26 | 0.68 | 22 | 2.27 | 0.83 | 61 | 2.08 | 0.82 | 21 | 2.43 | 0.68 |
| Constitutional Law | 6 | 5.65 | 45 | 2.11 | 0.83 | 36 | 2.17 | 0.74 | 62 | 2.27 | 0.73 | 26 | 2.23 | 0.86 |
| Contract Law | 6 | 2.10 | 42 | 2.17 | 0.82 | 33 | 2.15 | 0.76 | 48 | 2.04 | 0.77 | 23 | 2.13 | 0.81 |
| Judicial System | 6 | 5.57 | 61 | 1.92 | 0.69 | 51 | 1.88 | 0.71 | 110 | 2.00 | 0.72 | 52 | 2.00 | 0.59 |
| Legal Research | 6 | 3.05 | 55 | 1.67 | 0.72 | 54 | 1.74 | 0.78 | 109 | 1.64 | 0.75 | 49 | 1.53 | 0.71 |
| Products Liability | 6 | 8.35 | 5 | 1.60 | 0.55 | 8 | 1.88 | 0.99 | 22 | 2.18 | 0.73 | 14 | 2.21 | 0.89 |
| Risk Management | 6 | 2.83 | 11 | 2.09 | 0.70 | 13 | 2.00 | 0.82 | 12 | 2.08 | 0.67 | 4 | 1.75 | 0.50 |
| Tort Law | 6 | 3.79 | 5 | 1.80 | 0.84 | 6 | 2.17 | 0.75 | 15 | 2.00 | 0.85 | 10 | 2.40 | 0.84 |

Respondents employed in university settings had stronger feelings about the importance of risk management and tort law than did those employed in elementary, secondary, and other settings. Conversely, those employed in other settings felt significantly stronger about products liability. Based on the few (five) comments nothing significant could be derived from the open-ended statements.

Therefore, based on area of employment, only in the content areas of products liability, risk management, and tort law were there significant differences of opinion and only as it pertained to the ranking of most important content areas. In the ranking of least important content areas, employment setting is not a factor.

Multiple discriminant analysis based on the four employment categories revealed that six variables were important in predicting employment categories: risk management, constitutional law, products liability, tort law, administrative law, and contract law. Responses based on the judicial system and legal research were not important in predicting the employment category of respondents.

Table 13: Values of Predictor Variables Ranked in Order of Importance

| <u>Predictor Rank</u> | <u>Variable</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>Elementary</u> | | | <u>Secondary</u> | | | <u>Other</u> | | | <u>University</u> | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|------------------|-----------|----------|--------------|-----------|----------|-------------------|-----------|----------|
| | | | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>M</u> |
| 1 | Risk Management | 18 | 90 | 1.10 | 1.72 | 80 | 0.87 | 1.65 | 67 | 0.70 | 1.40 | 147 | 0.71 | 1.35 |
| 2 | Constitutional Law | 18 | 90 | 1.05 | 2.28 | 80 | 1.14 | 2.30 | 67 | 1.04 | 2.13 | 147 | 1.00 | 1.86 |
| 3 | Products Liability | 18 | 90 | 0.60 | 1.33 | 80 | 0.64 | 1.49 | 67 | 0.72 | 1.54 | 147 | 0.58 | 1.41 |
| 4 | Tort Law | 18 | 90 | 0.74 | 1.48 | 80 | 0.78 | 1.50 | 67 | 0.86 | 1.58 | 147 | 0.62 | 1.27 |
| 5 | Administrative Law | 18 | 90 | 0.80 | 1.91 | 80 | 0.66 | 1.78 | 67 | 0.81 | 1.78 | 147 | 0.88 | 1.87 |
| 6 | Contract Law | 18 | 90 | 0.99 | 2.07 | 80 | 0.98 | 2.09 | 67 | 0.95 | 1.87 | 147 | 0.85 | 1.78 |

Note: X2 = 54.997 significant at p<.05.

The percentage of cases correctly classified, 38.66 percent, was higher than the random rate of 25 percent (Table 14). Those employed in university settings were correctly predicted at a percentage slightly greater than twice the random rate, 54.7

percent. Conversely, those employed in secondary settings were correctly predicted at a rate approximately two-thirds that of the random rate with the elementary and other employment categories falling between the two extremes. Thus, the predictor variables were more accurate in predicting group membership than the rate achieved by random guessing. This indicates that those employed in university settings are more homogeneous in their feelings regarding the content areas than the remaining three groups and that those employed in secondary settings display the least amount of homogeneity.

Table 14: Frequencies of Successes and Failures in Classifying Groups

| Membership | N | Correctly | Incorrectly |
|------------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| | | Predicted | Predicted |
| Elementary | 92 | 35(38.0%) | 57(62.0%) |
| Secondary | 80 | 13(16.3%) | 67(83.7%) |
| Other | 68 | 21(30.9%) | 47(69.1%) |
| University | 148 | 81(54.7%) | 67(45.3%) |

■ DIFFERENCES IN CONTENT AREAS BASED ON EDUCATION

In a chi-square test of association based on education, significant differences were discovered in two areas: constitutional law and tort law (Table 15). The education category “other” was not included in the statistical analysis because of its small size (n=14).

Table 15: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Responses to Content Areas Based on Education

| Content Area | df | X ² | DOCTOR | | | MASTER | | | BACHELOR | | |
|--------------------|----|----------------|--------|------|------|--------|------|------|----------|------|------|
| | | | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD |
| Administrative Law | 12 | 11.66 | 123 | 1.91 | 0.91 | 165 | 1.78 | 0.65 | 95 | 1.81 | 0.93 |
| Constitutional Law | 12 | 33.59 * | 122 | 1.92 | 1.00 | 165 | 2.00 | 0.99 | 95 | 2.38 | 1.15 |
| Contract Law | 12 | 9.93 | 122 | 1.84 | 0.83 | 165 | 1.98 | 1.02 | 95 | 2.00 | 1.03 |
| Judicial System | 12 | 20.31 | 122 | 2.19 | 0.99 | 164 | 2.41 | 1.03 | 94 | 2.60 | 1.19 |
| Legal Research | 12 | 10.85 | 122 | 2.25 | 1.12 | 164 | 2.70 | 1.15 | 94 | 2.76 | 1.22 |
| Products Liability | 9 | 10.19 | 122 | 1.44 | 0.69 | 165 | 1.36 | 0.55 | 94 | 1.52 | 0.74 |
| Risk Management | 9 | 15.30 | 123 | 1.34 | 0.81 | 165 | 1.57 | 0.93 | 94 | 1.59 | 0.85 |
| Tort Law | 12 | 39.79 * | 123 | 1.22 | 0.57 | 162 | 1.43 | 0.76 | 95 | 1.65 | 0.81 |

*p<.05.

Those with doctoral degrees felt significantly stronger about including both constitutional law (M = 1.92) and tort law (M = 1.22) than did those in the masters degree (2.00 and 1.43 respectively) and bachelors degree categories (2.38 and 1.65 respectively). Non-doctoral degree respondents favored deleting First Amendment issues. Even though two doctoral respondents favored deleting the First Amendment issues from the constitutional law content area, an equal number supported the

area. Doctoral and master degree respondents more strongly supported constitutional law than did bachelor degree respondents.

Respondents from all education categories favored deleting intentional torts. However, doctoral degree respondents offered more positive comments than did those with bachelor and master's degrees.

Therefore, with the exception of the content areas of constitutional law and tort law, the level of education was not a determining factor in the relative importance of the content areas. Doctoral degree respondents supported the two areas more strongly than the other respondents, especially in the area of First Amendment issues and intentional torts (assault and battery).

No significant differences were found when comparing levels of education and rankings of the most important content areas, and only one significant difference was discovered when ranking the least important content areas.

Table 16: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Responses to Most Important and Least Important Content Areas Based on Education

| Most Important Content Area | | df | X ₂ | DOCTOR | | | MASTER | | | BACHELOR | | |
|--------------------------------|---|----|----------------|--------|------|------|--------|------|------|----------|------|------|
| | | | | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD |
| Administrative Law | 6 | 6 | 3.59 | 32 | 2.22 | 0.79 | 39 | 2.05 | 0.79 | 27 | 2.00 | 0.73 |
| Constitutional Law | 6 | 6 | 7.95 | 39 | 2.23 | 0.74 | 35 | 2.06 | 0.73 | 17 | 2.12 | 0.78 |
| Contract Law | 6 | 6 | 7.20 | 25 | 2.48 | 0.65 | 36 | 2.28 | 0.61 | 28 | 2.25 | 0.75 |
| Judicial System | 6 | 6 | 5.47 | 8 | 2.63 | 0.52 | 5 | 2.40 | 0.89 | 5 | 2.40 | 0.55 |
| Legal Research | 6 | 6 | 4.01 | 10 | 2.40 | 0.71 | 13 | 2.08 | 0.86 | 4 | 2.50 | 0.58 |
| Products Liability | 6 | 6 | 7.24 | 59 | 2.39 | 0.59 | 117 | 2.27 | 0.69 | 62 | 2.18 | 0.61 |
| Risk Management | 6 | 6 | 9.91 | 95 | 1.59 | 0.72 | 124 | 1.70 | 0.78 | 70 | 1.83 | 0.72 |
| Tort Law | 6 | 6 | 9.41 | 92 | 1.74 | 0.69 | 117 | 1.87 | 0.71 | 62 | 1.81 | 0.76 |
| Least Important | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative Law | 6 | 6 | 14.80 * | 52 | 2.00 | 0.84 | 59 | 2.31 | 0.75 | 30 | 2.27 | 0.64 |
| Constitutional Law | 6 | 6 | 4.79 | 49 | 2.24 | 0.78 | 74 | 2.14 | 0.75 | 38 | 2.32 | 0.81 |
| Contract Law | 6 | 6 | 5.82 | 51 | 2.04 | 0.75 | 55 | 2.22 | 0.79 | 36 | 2.00 | 0.83 |
| Judicial System | 6 | 6 | 2.09 | 85 | 2.02 | 0.69 | 118 | 1.93 | 0.71 | 62 | 1.92 | 0.66 |
| Legal Research | 6 | 6 | 2.25 | 84 | 1.67 | 0.77 | 112 | 1.66 | 0.74 | 62 | 1.65 | 0.75 |
| Products Liability | 6 | 6 | 3.47 | 20 | 2.15 | 0.75 | 14 | 2.07 | 0.92 | 14 | 2.00 | 0.88 |
| Risk Management | 6 | 6 | 7.91 | 12 | 1.83 | 0.58 | 15 | 2.00 | 0.76 | 12 | 2.33 | 0.65 |
| Tort Law | 6 | 6 | 5.42 | 6 | 2.33 | 1.03 | 16 | 2.13 | 0.72 | 12 | 2.00 | 0.85 |

*p<.05.

Those with doctoral degrees were more likely to include administrative law (\bar{M} = 2.00) than did those with masters degrees (\bar{M} =2.31) or bachelors degrees (\bar{M} =2.27). Based on the few (eight) comments, nothing significant could be derived from the open-ended statements. Therefore, with the exception of ranking administrative law as a least important content area, the level of education is not a determining factor when ranking the most important or least important content areas.

Multiple discriminant analysis based on education indicated that six variables

were important in predicting the respondent’s correct educational level: tort law, constitutional law, products liability, administrative law, judicial system, and risk management. Contract law and legal research were not important variables in predicting group membership based on education.

Table 17: Values of Predictor Variables Ranked in Order of Importance

| Rank | Content Area | df | DOCTOR | | | MASTER | | | BACHELOR | | |
|------|--------------------|----|--------|------|------|--------|------|------|----------|------|------|
| | | | N | M | SD | N | M | SD | N | M | SD |
| 1 | Administrative Law | 12 | 119 | 0.57 | 1.22 | 160 | 0.77 | 1.43 | 94 | 0.81 | 1.65 |
| 2 | Constitutional Law | 12 | 119 | 1.00 | 1.92 | 160 | 0.96 | 2.00 | 94 | 1.15 | 2.38 |
| 3 | Products Liability | 12 | 119 | 0.61 | 1.44 | 160 | 0.55 | 1.36 | 94 | 0.74 | 1.52 |
| 4 | Administrative Law | 12 | 119 | 0.91 | 1.91 | 160 | 0.65 | 1.78 | 94 | 0.88 | 1.82 |
| 5 | Judicial System | 12 | 119 | 0.99 | 2.19 | 160 | 1.02 | 2.41 | 94 | 1.19 | 2.60 |
| 6 | Risk Management | 12 | 119 | 0.75 | 1.34 | 160 | 0.90 | 1.57 | 94 | 0.85 | 1.59 |

Note: X2 = 44.450 significant at p<.05.

The percentage of cases correctly classified, 47.2 percent was higher than the random rate of 33.3 percent. Two of the groups were predicted at a greater than 50 percent rate, doctoral degree holders at 54.2 percent and bachelor degree holders at 56.4 percent. However, the percentage of master degree holders was accurately predicted only slightly above the random rate, 36.6 percent to 33.3 percent.

Thus, the predictor variables were more accurate in predicting group membership than the rate achieved by random guessing. This indicates that there is considerable homogeneity within the three education groups, especially those with bachelor degrees and doctoral degrees and that a respondents level of education can be accurately predicted based on their responses to the content areas.

Table 18: Frequencies of Successes and Failures in Classifying Groups

| Membership Predicted | N | Correctly Predicted | Incorrectly Predicted |
|----------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------------------|
| | | | |
| Doctorate | 120 | 65(54.2%) | 55(45.8%) |
| Masters | 161 | 59(36.6%) | 102(63.4%) |
| Bachelors | 94 | 53(56.4%) | 41(43.6%) |

■ COMPARISONS OF RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS AND CONTENT AREAS

Because of the relatively low numbers of respondents in all of the racial/ethnic groups with the exception of white/caucasian, all of the minority racial/ethnic groups were clustered in one group, “Other”, so that the statistical comparisons would be more meaningful.

In a comparison of the eight content areas based on racial/ethnic group, no

significant differences were discovered (Table 19). Therefore, race is not a significant factor in determining the content area preferences of the respondents.

Table 19: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Content Areas and Racial/Ethnic Group Comparison

| <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X²</u> | <u>WHITE</u> | | | <u>OTHER</u> | | |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| | | | <u>N</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| Administrative Law | 4 | 1.14 | 372 | 1.84 | 0.83 | 24 | 1.71 | 0.55 |
| Constitutional Law | 4 | 1.61 | 371 | 2.09 | 1.09 | 24 | 2.13 | 0.95 |
| Contract Law | 4 | 1.74 | 371 | 1.93 | 0.95 | 24 | 1.88 | 0.95 |
| Judicial System | 4 | 1.90 | 369 | 2.41 | 1.08 | 24 | 2.17 | 0.87 |
| Legal Research | 4 | 6.72 | 369 | 2.71 | 1.14 | 24 | 2.25 | 1.07 |
| Products Liability | 3 | 2.46 | 370 | 1.44 | 0.66 | 24 | 1.38 | 0.58 |
| Risk Management | 3 | 7.33 | 371 | 1.49 | 0.85 | 24 | 1.92 | 1.28 |
| Tort Law | 4 | 8.66 | 369 | 1.40 | 0.74 | 24 | 1.71 | 0.86 |

In ranking both the most important and least important content areas, no significant differences were found between the two racial/ethnic categories. Therefore, race is not a significant factor in determining respondents preferences of most important or least important content areas.

Table 20: Chi-Square, Means, and Standard Deviations of Most Important and Least Important Content Areas and Racial/Ethnic Groups

| <u>Most Important</u> <u>Content Area</u> | <u>df</u> | <u>X²</u> | <u>WHITE</u> | | | <u>OTHER</u> | | |
|--|-----------|----------------------|--------------|----------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------|
| | | | <u>N</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> | <u>N</u> | <u>M</u> | <u>SD</u> |
| Administrative Law | 2 | 3.35 | 91 | 2.03 | 0.77 | 8 | 2.50 | 0.76 |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 0.88 | 88 | 2.11 | 0.75 | 5 | 1.80 | 0.84 |
| Contract Law | 2 | 0.27 | 86 | 2.30 | 0.69 | 6 | 2.33 | 0.82 |
| Judicial System | 2 | 0.95 | 18 | 2.44 | 0.62 | 1 | 3.00 | 0.00 |
| Legal Research | 2 | 1.35 | 23 | 2.22 | 0.80 | 5 | 2.60 | 0.55 |
| Products Liability | 2 | 4.27 | 233 | 2.28 | 0.64 | 15 | 2.13 | 0.83 |
| Risk Management | 2 | 0.01 | 281 | 1.71 | 0.76 | 17 | 1.71 | 0.77 |
| Tort Law | 2 | 2.06 | 268 | 1.85 | 0.73 | 15 | 1.60 | 0.74 |
| Least Important | | | | | | | | |
| Administrative Law | 2 | 3.10 | 136 | 2.23 | 0.76 | 9 | 1.89 | 0.93 |
| Constitutional Law | 2 | 0.64 | 156 | 2.19 | 0.78 | 13 | 2.23 | 0.73 |
| Contract Law | 2 | 3.03 | 141 | 2.13 | 0.79 | 5 | 1.60 | 0.55 |
| Judicial System | 2 | 1.68 | 257 | 1.96 | 0.68 | 16 | 2.00 | 0.82 |
| Legal Research | 2 | 3.10 | 257 | 1.65 | 0.74 | 11 | 1.64 | 0.92 |
| Products Liability | 2 | 0.51 | 45 | 2.13 | 0.81 | 4 | 2.00 | 0.82 |
| Risk Management | 2 | 0.40 | 35 | 2.03 | 0.71 | 6 | 1.83 | 0.75 |
| Tort Law | 2 | 2.73 | 29 | 2.00 | 0.80 | 8 | 2.50 | 0.76 |

Because of the small percentage of minorities (6%) responding, the few open-ended responses and the fact that no significant differences were discovered in the ranking of the content areas, no multiple discriminant analysis or evaluation of open-ended responses was performed. Further comparisons would be statistically meaningless because of the small number of nonwhite respondents (Wesolowsky, 1976).

■ IMPLICATIONS

On the basis of the statistical findings and the open ended comments, several conclusions seem justified:

1. A study of legal issues for undergraduate majors in physical education is a necessity. If this knowledge is not gained through a sports law course, then an undergraduate course in school law should be offered, if not required, at the undergraduate level prior to a student teaching or internship experience. Based on the results of this study, not only is it important that a student gain this knowledge, but that this knowledge be acquired prior to a practical experience.
2. Knowledge gained in a legal issues course may not necessarily reduce the number of law suits since many uncontrollable factors enter into the filing of a legal action. It is important that a student understand the interaction of these factors and what can be done to mitigate a legal action.
3. In a sports law course, primary emphasis should be given to the study of products liability law, tort law, and the development of risk management techniques. Techniques learned through a study of risk management may mitigate cases in these and other areas.
4. Studying the legal system and engaging in legal research at the undergraduate level should be given the least emphasis. Knowledge of the legal system could be gained through a political science course. Developing research skills does not seem to be an emphasis at the undergraduate level.

■ RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

1. A similar study should be conducted surveying experts on sport law course content at the graduate level in schools of education. Some differences may exist in experts' perceptions between graduate and undergraduate levels.
2. A similar study should be conducted on sport law course content in schools of law. Differences may exist because law students would have acquired some of the foundation knowledge in other courses.

■ RECOMMENDED CONTENT FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE COURSE

Realizing that the content of a sport law course will be limited by the instructor's expertise, resources, and time, the author makes the following recommendations regarding the content of an undergraduate sport law course. The areas are arranged alphabetically within each of the three areas and is not intended to indicate a relative ranking of importance:

- A. **Primary Content Areas** (Comprising up to 75 percent of the course)
1. Products Liability - the specific course content should include a discussion of breach of warranty, negligence, strict liability in tort, defenses in products liability, and the applicable state products liability laws.
 2. Risk Management - the specific course content should include a discussion of risk policy statements, risk analysis, implementing a risk management plan, and the psychology of risk taking.
 3. Tort Law - the specific course content should include a discussion of reckless misconduct, negligence, and defenses in torts.
- B. **Secondary Content Areas** (Comprising up to 25 percent of the course)
1. Administrative Law - the specific course content should include a study of federal, state, and local applicable regulatory agencies; a review of legislation relating to discrimination in employment and sport participation, and an analysis of the administrative hearing process relating to these agencies and legislation.
 2. Constitutional Law - the specific course content should include a study of the religion and speech clauses of the 1st Amendment, unreasonable searches and seizures in the 4th Amendment, due process in the 5th Amendment, the due process and equal protection clauses of the 14th Amendment, and the appropriate state constitutional laws.
 3. Contract Law - the specific course content should include contract formation and termination, contract avoidance, contract performance, breach of contract and remedies for breach, and exculpatory agreements.
- C. **Other Content Areas** (Included only if time and resources are available)
1. Judicial System - the specific course content should include a study of the structure and relationships of the federal, state, and local systems; how laws are made, and the trial system.
 2. Legal Research - the specific course content should include a review of legal textbooks, periodicals, and newsletters relating to sports law and how to find a case.

References

- Kachigan, S.K. (1982). *Multivariate statistical analysis*. New York: Radius Press
- McNamara, J. (1978). Determining sample size in decision-oriented research studies. *Planning & Changing: A Journal for School Administrators*, 9 (2), 125-127.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1983). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wesolowsky, G.O. (1976). *Multivariate regression and analysis of variance*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.