Please accept the changes to the manuscript entitled: *Examining the Support of Modern Athletic Reform Proposals Developed by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics in Response to Higher Education Athletic Reform: A Case Study to Determine Predictors of Success.*  We addressed many of the suggestions made by the reviewers and have added our notations to the comments below in maroon. Thank you for the opportunity to make the revisions and assisting us in strengthening the manuscript.

Reviewer Comments #1

Pg 4- Prior to the Theoretical Framework section I need to know “why this is important” “so what?” “what is the relevance today” “why should I care/be interested?” Who is the audience? Added a paragraph in the introduction section to clarify why this study is important

Pg 5- “ There are many reasons for the inclusion of athletics in higher education.” What are the reasons? List out. Listed reasons in a paragraph on page 6

Give examples or qualify the “tangible resources” Added human resources and financial resources as examples of the tangible resources

What specifically has allowed successful athletic programs an advantage? Within the paragraph added to page 6

Pg 6- Specify who the stakeholders are when they are first mentioned Added head coaches, athletic directors, faculty athletic representatives, faculty senate members to the stakeholders

“Many” is an empty adjective. Be more specific. Fixed

P.7- “…utilizing purposeful sampling, the researcher was able to target key informants who had direct involvement with the diffusion of the paper at the school” -Why is this important to know/understand? Clarified to mean the focus of this paper is on the characteristics of a particular population.

-Why are the types of questionnaire/tools used relevant/important? Reader may not have knowledge of tool – this is within the expanded reason as to how the CBAM is used on page 8

-“It allows researchers”-what is “it”? Expand. Expanded pg. 8.

-Questions from interview need to be provided in an Appendix

Pg 11-What “documents” mentioned were analyzed? Listed documents analyzed, and they were listed again on page 9. Also added the results of the document analysis to the paper.

Reviewer Comments #2

-Needs clear introduction and purpose of study needs to be addressed earlier in the paper – put the purposes of the study on page 5 right before the theoretical framework section

-Indication of this being a case study needs to be indicated sooner – within the purpose on page 5

-No theories are addressed, and no literature review is provided that mentions past or current research – added more literature throughout the paper.

-Audience and methodology related to the sample size is not clear – made more clear by adding case study to the purpose and added this in the method on page 12.

-Lack of support for ways of gathering and analyzing of the data – we felt that the method for collecting data was addressed from the use of CBAM and other qualitative methodologies

-Consider importance/significance of topic and contribution to the field of education – added in lit. review, specifically on pages 10 & 11.

-Use less redundant statements to begin paragraphs. Statements must be clearer and present stronger arguments - fixed

-“Athletics arm race” needs to be explained in more detail as reader may not understand reference – clarified on pages 10 & 11

-Conclusion leaves the reader hanging – we felt that is was good and did not change anything in the conclusion as another reviewer found it to be sound

Reviewer Comments #3

-Sample size was too small and non-representative (ex: coaches were from non-revenue sports, only 3 faculty members were included) – provided a rational for the small sample size on page 12. We recognize it is a small sample, but there was no going back to collect additional data.

-Need to provide more information on the Stages of Concern instrument to make reader more aware of its importance and to better discuss results – more information is added on page 13 and also added more information about the document analysis results

-Information about facilities and athletes academic progress was mentioned on pages 11-12 but does not seem to be integrated enough into paper. Should fit in better or be removed. - removed

-Include more information from interviews such as what questions were asked and why added interview protocol as an appendix

-On page 13, expand on the views of athletic personnel and faculty senate - expanded

-In the conclusion, the third sentence “participants…[were] progressing to levels of concern beyond those associated with the management of the innovation.” does not seem to be consistent with the results earlier. It is prescriptive and does not match the purpose of the study. It needs to be clearly stated if there were policy implications that came from the data this was an oversight on our part! We left out the word “not” – it is now fixed.

-The last sentence in the last paragraph was nicely phrased is a good handle that can be used to revise the paper and accurately represents the data
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