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ABSTRACT

LOGAN W. ROBERTS: In Pursuit of Sustainability: A Study of Marketing and Fundraising Practices within NCAA Division I Track and Field Programs
(Under the direction of Erianne Weight)

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I track and field programs have been a target of elimination in recent decades (Irick, 2011). As the money surrounding the Bowl Championship Series and the NCAA Division I Men’s basketball tournament increases, the incentives to pump resources into the sports with the largest potential for return continue to escalate, leaving nonrevenue programs in jeopardy of existing (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). Coaches can play an active role in marketing their program and fundraising to support their budgets and overcome the threat of elimination (Weight, 2010; Cooper, 2012). Quantitative and qualitative research techniques examined current NCAA Division I coach’s perceptions of track and field fundraising and marketing practices. The responses form a foundation for the strategies of the leaders in marketing and fundraising efforts in order to enhance program demand and thus facilitate increased supply and sustainability of the programs.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

An ever-present problem in intercollegiate athletics is the differential in the allocation of limited resources between nonrevenue programs and those programs that garner the most attention and spectator support (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994). The majority of financial resources that are allotted toward supporting intercollegiate athletics programs are systematically funneled toward basketball and football, the two sports that bring the most spectators to campus thereby creating revenue through ticket sales and garnering media exposure by the product on the court (NCAA, 2011). As the money surrounding the Bowl Championship Series and the NCAA Division I Men’s basketball tournament increases, the incentives to pump resources into the sports with the largest potential for return continue to escalate (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). The NCAA 2009-2010 Gender Equity Report, documents this staggering difference between football and basketball expenditures who utilize 78% of the Division I men’s sport budgets. Given that the minimum number of male varsity teams a Division I athletic department can sponsor is six, the remaining five or more men’s teams are left to split 22% of the budget.

Track and Field programs have been a target of elimination in the most recent decades despite tremendous participation and popularity for both male and female collegiate and high school participants (Irick, 2011; National Federation of State High
School Associations, 2011). In fact, track and field is the second most popular male sport by participation in high school and ranked first among most popular sports for females, yet at the Division I level, track and field leads all sports in most programs dropped since the 1988-1989 season. (Irick, 2011; NFHS, 2011).

The United States General Accounting Office (GAO) released a report in 2001 about four year college’s decisions to discontinue nonrevenue programs (e.g., insufficient student interest, gender equity, resource allocations). The GAO study also reported that in deciding to sponsor new teams, 71% of the 549 NCAA schools relied on obtaining funds from other sports (2001). This reallocation of funds to the revenue generating teams is only justified by the potential profit that might be accrued to support the nonrevenue teams, such as track and field, however this study also examined “creative strategies” that could produce revenue (e.g., fundraising, renting facilities, hosting events) and contain costs (e.g., limit team travel and roster sizes, recruit via telephone) to avoid program eliminations (GAO, 2001, p. 25). This recent research supports the notion that self-sufficient practices led by coaches will increase the chances of sustainability along with implementation of creative strategies to achieve cost-containment initiatives. The purpose of this study is to explore marketing and fundraising practices of NCAA Division I track and field programs in an effort to extrapolate and define strategies that programs can implement to encourage sustainability initiatives.

**Current State of NCAA Division I Track and Field**

As the leading girls sport and second leading boys sport by participation numbers, outdoor track and field provides sports participation opportunities for over 1 million boys
and girls each year in the United States (NFHS, 2011). Mirroring the high school data, the NCAA Division I sports participation data from 2011 quantified outdoor track and field as the source of the most participation opportunities on the women’s side and second only to football on the men’s side.

Despite the widespread popularity and participation opportunities Division I men’s and women’s teams are still experiencing eliminations. Since 2000, there have been 33 Division I men’s and women’s outdoor track and field programs and 50 indoor programs eliminated (Irick, 2011). Notable eliminations in the last decade include: West Virginia University (men; 2003); James Madison University (men; 2006); Seton Hall University (men and women; 2010); University of Delaware (men; 2011); and University of Richmond (men; 2012). University of Maryland men’s track and field faced elimination when Athletic Director Kevin Anderson announced in November 2011 that eight athletic programs would be cut to offset a $35 million debt. The athletic department faced such a large deficit due in part to undertaking a $50.8 million expansion of the football stadium in 2006 and buying out the contract of a former football coach (Giannotto, 2012). Men’s track and field head coach Andrew Valmon led efforts that saved the program for the year by raising $880,000 in less than seven months as mandated by Anderson. In order to facilitate sustainability for the following season, the program was told they must raise an additional $1.88 million, while permanent sustainability would be accomplished once $3.76 million is raised (Giannotto, 2012). Although Maryland’s case is a rare situation, spending habits of intercollegiate athletic departments on revenue teams is not (NCAA, 2010). Some coaches must now act as the
CEO of their program to improve their brand and gain key resources from stakeholders (Cooper, 2012), which in Maryland’s case was, a significant amount of funding.

Along with fundraising, successful marketing efforts can draw spectator appeal to the product on the track or field. Although the majority of intercollegiate track and field meets are not ticketed events, the NCAA records attendance at its annual outdoor championships. The 2008 NCAA meet in Des Moines, Iowa drew 41,187 which ranks second on the list of the top four-day crowds dating back to 1987 (Perelman, 2011). The same event in Des Moines experienced major drops in attendance figures for the 2011 (29,377) and 2012 championships (20,048). Eugene, Oregon played host to the championships in 2010 and garnered a record 45,847 over the four-day meet. The next three highest all-time crowds at the NCAA meet came in 1990 (Durham), 1994 (Boise), and 2003 (Sacramento) respectively. Over the last 50 years, the top five single day crowds at this meet all took place before 1990. Perelman noted that the NCAA outdoor championships has not been hosted in a top-10 market since 1976 in Philadelphia (Perelman). It is harder to attract large attendance in small markets, as Des Moines can attest. In addition to attendance difficulties, the lack of media coverage has also played a role in diminishing publicity in this sport. A two hour live-segment on CBS for the outdoor championships is the extent of television coverage that track and field receives. Only eight media outlets were present at the 2011 championships outside of the local area. Only two of those eight were nation-wide outlets: the Associated Press and ESPN.com (Perelman).

Tom Lewis, Director of Communications at the United States Track and Field and Cross Country Coaches Association (USTFCCCA), points out the importance of having a
purpose to each track and field competition in order to create spectator appeal. “Fans should be given a tangible result at the end of the meet,” he said. “You cannot expect fans to buy into the event if there is no end result for the team or school they are cheering for” (Lewis, 2012). The non-championship segment of the season has traditionally taken the form of multi-team invitationals that seek to place the most elite competitors in the same heat or flight in order to create an environment where the best marks are reached in the respective event. This format individualizes the sport without rendering a true team winner.

Recently within the last decade conferences and teams have worked toward building a fan-friendly competitive format outside of the conference and national championships to add quality and value to the event. Texas A&M University, for example, has recently played host to several conference challenges in their indoor facility that has pitted the Big 12 Conference against the Southeastern Conference. Three teams from each conference enter their top three individuals in selected track and field events to combine for a scored competition based on the top finishers in each event that renders one conference as the winner (Texas A&M, 2012). Dual meets have also been a popular installment in scheduling for fans to be rewarded with a winner and loser. If branded properly, the dual meet format could create great stakeholder buy-in, save programs money due to shorter traveling distances, and facilitate a shorter competition schedule with only two schools competing (Lewis, 2012).

Despite the demand for participation opportunities on the high school and college level, consumer demand continues to lag as proven by the inability to draw stakeholders to support track and field programs through financial means, attendance, and media
exposure. This study attempts to find ways to create demand for the sport on campuses, in communities, and around the country so that programs will not be threatened with discontinuation.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to explore marketing and fundraising practices of NCAA Division I track and field programs in an effort to extrapolate and define strategies that programs can implement to encourage sustainability initiatives.

**Research Questions**

[RQ1] What NCAA Division I track and field programs are viewed as leaders in marketing practices?

[RQ2] What marketing and fundraising strategies are utilized by leading NCAA Division I track and field coaches to garner stakeholder support and support the sustainability of their program?

[RQ3] How do NCAA Division I track and field coaches believe the sport of track and field can be enhanced in order to create a more marketable product?

[RQ 4] What changes to the core product could create and maintain demand for track and field in between Olympic years on the intercollegiate level?
Operational Definitions

- **Relationship Building** – Any activities performed by the coach to build and enhance the relationship between potential or current donors to the track and field program at that coach’s institution.

- **Marketing**: The process of communicating the value of the product to consumers.

- **Marketing Strategies**: Any process that a program performs to increase the demand for the product that is being provided.

- **Fundraising**: The process of garnering financial support.

- **Fundraising Strategies**: Any process that a program performs to accrue monetary gifts from stakeholders.

- **Leaders in fundraising/marketing practices**: Programs that successfully implement practices that reach out to stakeholders in an effort to enhance sustainability of the team.

Definition of Terms

- **Discontinued program**: An intercollegiate varsity team that an institution decides to no longer sponsor to participate in NCAA competition.

- **Donor**: Someone who gives money to a college or university’s athletic department.

- **Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)**: Subdivision of NCAA Division I comprised of institutions which provide maximum support of football by offering up to 85
scholarships. These institutions determine a champion through the Bowl Championship Series (BCS).

- **Football Championship Subdivision (FCS):** Subdivision of NCAA Division I comprised of institutions which provide reduced support of football by offering up to 63 scholarships. These institutions determine a champion through an NCAA sponsored Championship tournament.

- **Invitational:** Track and field competition with multiple teams that requires certain marks/times to be reached in order to compete in an event. This format is utilized in the regular season of competition.

- **NCAA Division I:** Highest classification of athletic department determined by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). An athletic department must sponsor 16 varsity level sports and comply with NCAA academic standards and governance requirements to be classified as a Division I athletic department.

- **Stakeholder:** An individual that has an investment or interest in the sport program by way of gift giving, attendance, student-athlete, coach, administrator or alumni.

- **Sustainability:** Ability of a sport program to exist indefinitely without the threat of being discontinued.

**Assumptions**

- The measures used to conduct this research were valid and reliable.

- Coaching staff members were the only individuals to respond to the survey instrument.
• Coaching staff members are well informed to make reliable judgments on the leading programs in marketing and fundraising practices.

Limitations

• Survey respondents may not be a representative sample of the Division I population.

• Due to the voluntary nature of the survey and the resulting response rate, there may be a non-response bias.

• Survey respondents may not have knowledge of the answers to some questions and may answer inaccurately.

Delimitations

• Only coaches from NCAA Division I track and field programs were surveyed and interviewed so results should not be generalized to other NCAA divisions.

• Fundraising and marketing staff members were not included in the sample of the study so results reflect feedback from coaching staff only.

Significance of Study

In a time when budgets for track and field programs are seeing cuts and reallocation of monies, it has never been more imminent for coaches to engage in the cultivation of relationships in order to build a positive brand and enhance fundraising and marketing of their programs (Cooper, 2012). Although most Division I athletic departments have a designated fundraising and marketing staff, these skills, if performed effectively by a coach, can enhance the long-term viability of the program. By surveying
all Division I NCAA track and field coaches, this study identifies leaders in the field as defined by their peers, sport-specific practices that can contribute to the sustainability of the sport, and perceptions surrounding the state of the sport on the intercollegiate level. The findings in this study add to the literature related to Olympic Sport marketing practices and equip coaches in their efforts toward being effective marketers and fundraisers for their programs. Combined, these findings provide a foundation for enhancing the sustainability and marketability of intercollegiate track and field.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Impact of the Arms Race on Nonrevenue Sports

In 2003, Marburger and Hogshead-Makar studied the trends behind the elimination of men’s Division 1-A sports. They contended that the decisions to cut sports were “driven by profit-motivated athletic departments and not tight budgets” (p. 65). They point out that the lucrative pay outs from bowl games and post-season basketball tournaments have given departments financial incentive to pour resources into those sports that will bring in revenue. They argue the incentives of profit-driven athletic administrators might lead to the point of cutting all nonrevenue sports to limit funding strictly to those two sports in order to maximize revenue. However, current NCAA sport sponsorship and federal gender equity statutes prevent this possibility. These regulations, while providing safety for minimum program offerings don’t eliminate the financial motive to reduce the number of nonrevenue sports toward the minimum in order to reserve and allocate resources to maximize profit. If an athletic department supports fewer teams, sneaking closer to the minimum number allowed, fewer dollars have to be reallocated away from the revenue-producing sports which in turn allows an athletic department to pour resources back into the programs that are producing them.

Marburger and Hogshead-Makar have classified Division I athletic directors as “profit-maximizers” based off of the philosophy statement of Division I which outlines,
among other requirements, that members should sponsor at the “highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition one or both of the traditional spectator-oriented, income-producing sports of football and basketball” (Division I Manual, 2012, p. 340).

Nonrevenue sports benefit from subsidization of their programs made possible by the revenues that are generated from basketball and football (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). Salaries of athletic staff take up over a third of the expenses of the athletic department while football and basketball pay their coaches the highest amount (Fulks, 2011). FBS athletic departments continue to increase in their reliance on football generated revenues every year as a function of the arms race in intercollegiate athletics (2011). On average, FBS football programs have more than doubled their generated revenue since 2004 to over $16 million annually while they have also represented slightly under sixty percent of the expenses for men’s sports (Bracken & Irick, 2012).

Athletic directors can attempt to increase their chance of profiting from their revenue sports by spending more to enhance the chances of success of that team in post-season competition which is the source of large championship and bowl game payouts. As long as the ticket sales and television contracts produce more revenue than the amount spent on the teams, athletic directors can justify the allocation of resources (Margurber & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). Therefore, trends in spending would create a drain on the money that goes toward nonrevenue sports because no profit is gained from that expenditure and it would benefit the athletic department to phase out nonrevenue sports entirely (Margurber & Hogshead-Makar). One can see the importance placed on fundraising for nonrevenue coaches in light of the aforementioned factors of the arms race. Nonrevenue coaches must not fully rely on the athletic department for a fully-
funded budget. Marketing and development initiatives become vital in preventing a program from being eliminated.

**Fundraising in Intercollegiate Athletics**

In order to find resources outside of those that are allocated directly from the athletic department and university, programs can improve their chances of sustainability by engaging in fundraising. One of the main components of fundraising is the cultivation of relationships to convey to your donors that your projects and goals are worthy of their financial support (Leonhardt, 2011). Wedgeworth stated that, “the process of creating and maintaining a relationship is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign” (p. 536, 2000). Lowman and Bixby also stressed the importance of building relationships with the community to develop good will and raise the possibility of future gifts (2011).

Specifically, gaining support from alumni and campus constituencies can be achieved through a clear mission that supports [athletics] and the university (Lowman & Bixby, 2011). To guide the mission statement into action, developing a strategic plan is also important in the organization’s efforts in fundraising (Leonhardt, 2011). By including a clear mission statement in your strategic plan, the targeted constituencies can play a part in helping to reach the goals of your organization (Lowman & Bixby, 2001). For nonprofits, such as athletic departments, the goals include enticing, retaining, and upgrading donors (Warwick, 2011). No matter the strategic plan, Warwick claims that any effective campaign will “break through the media clutter and fix simple ideas firmly in the minds of the audiences for whom they’re intended” (2011, p. 31).
Integrated Fundraising

Integrated fundraising, involving e-mail, the Web site, telemarketing, and direct mail, is an effective means of communicating a consistent message, strengthening donor relationships and increasing revenue over a period of time (Warwick, 2011). Utilizing the internet to drive donors to a website and communicate through email is vital in the nonprofit organization’s attempt to reduce inconsistencies in communicating an organization’s message and increasing the convenience of giving (Warwick). Warwick explains that giving donors the option to communicate through a phone call, direct mail, or the internet increases the likelihood of receiving gifts from all demographics depending on their preference (2011).

Using email, one part of integrated fundraising, to connect with donors not only allows a way for the fundraisers to “know” their donor base, but also gives them easy access to feedback (Olsen & Frazier, 2001). Olsen and Frazier state that e-mail is “the core communication tool for online donor development” (p. 60, 2001). It is cost-effective, saves time compared to phone calls, can be easily measured, creates an open dialogue, and is considered to be more effective than a website (Olsen & Frazier, 2011; Olsen, Keevers, Paul & Covington, 2001).

Warwick points out that you must consider the donor’s point of view if he/she prefers direct mail over email (2001). It is also vital to keep a clear, consistent message despite the ease with which emails can be sent out. The versatility allows organizations to decide what segment they want to target, what message they are attempting to convey, and what response they want to garner (Olsen, Keevers, Paul & Covington, 2001). Once
email correspondence is established, phone and face to face contact can proceed at the
donor’s request (Olsen & Frazier, 2001).

**Donor Service**

In a study of charitable donors, Sargeant identified three main factors of service
quality: responsiveness, feedback and effectiveness (2001). The research showed that
service quality had a significant impact on donor longevity. Specific to intercollegiate
athletics, Shapiro was the first to investigate donor perceptions of service quality using a
sample of college athletic donors (2010). The results of this study showed that although
service quality had no significant influence on donor longevity or gift amount, it did have
an influence on donor satisfaction. The study also provided evidence of a relationship
between the three factors of service quality identified by Sargeant (2001). Shapiro
suggests specific ways to practice these factors including thanking donors for their gift,
communicating how contributions are being used, and assuring donors the importance of
their contribution regardless of the size (2001). Gifts of all kinds and sizes should be
acknowledged by the fundraisers with thank you letters (Leonhardt, 2011).

In hard economic times donors are being more selective with their income, yet
Shapiro points out the factor that the athletic departments can control:

Improving or maintaining the level of service provided to donors can be a cost-
effective cultivation strategy for college athletic departments. Athletic
departments can focus attention on providing a consistent level of service
regardless of team performance in order to take advantage of service quality
effects on overall donor satisfaction (p. 163, 2010).

Shapiro also noted the unique culture of intercollegiate athletic fundraising with certain
motivation factors for giving related to tangible benefits (2010).
Donor Motivation

There is substantial literary foundation exploring why donors give to athletic departments. Research points to factors such as visiting college campuses, renewing old friendships, potential to meet coaches and players, and benefits of obtaining tickets as motivation to donate to an athletic department (Staurowsky, Parkhouse & Sachs, 1996). Other donors are motivated by priority seating, special parking, and/or special recognition (Isherwood, 1986; Verner, Hecht & Fansler, 1998). Philanthropic motives have also been identified such as contributing to the academic success of student-athletes and promoting the image of the university and state (Comstock, 1988; Hammersmith, 1985). Verner, Hecht and Fansler also found that some donors give in order to receive inside information on athletics that non-donors would not have access to (1998). Some of the most recent research shows that donors are motivated by a desire to improve and support the athletic program (athletic programs, coaches, facilities, recruiting, and conference membership) and ticket-oriented benefits (referring to the link between donations and the ability to buy season tickets, keep season tickets, and improve the seat location of season tickets) (Gladden, Mahony & Apostolopoulou, 2005). Since track and field meets are rarely ticketed on the campus level, this study will be able to gauge coach’s perceptions on what strategies are useful to motivate donors to give. The data collected will likely be useful to nonrevenue coaches alike that have to create an experience and benefit to giving directly to a program.

Role of the Coach in Nonrevenue Sport Sustainability

Weight (2010) was one of the first to take a thorough look at the role of the coach in the financial sustainability of nonrevenue sports. Her study examined the beliefs of
Division I athletic directors regarding the influence of a wrestling coach on whether or not their program is discontinued and what activities a coach can do to enhance a program’s chance of vitality. Athletic directors credited coaches with holding a moderate amount of influence on whether or not their sport is cut. In response to what activities a coach could do to enhance a program’s vitality, several common themes were repeated among athletic director respondents.

Relationship building was mentioned several times as a key practice in order to build buy-in with key decision-making individuals in the campus and community. A complimentary coaching staff led by an entrepreneur with the ability to fundraise, promote the sport, build a positive brand, promote the program’s public perception, and build relationships with stakeholders is what Weight defines as “complimentary entre-relationship promotion” which could decrease the likelihood of being eliminated (2010, p. 27). If nonrevenue coaches can take advantage of the community surrounding each program, the demand that is created can give athletic directors one less reason to eliminate their program. Weight proposes that the marketing efforts of the entrepreneurial coach are a key step in creating demand for nonrevenue sports. Although this study was specific to wrestling coaches, much can be learned and applied toward all nonrevenue coaches.

**Relationship Marketing**

The literary foundation in fundraising points out that developing relationships is important to gain financial and stakeholder support (Wedgeworth, 2000). In light of Weight’s (2010) research, relationships must be formed with consumers of sport teams to create buy-in and a foundation to ask for money. Past research has supported that
consumer relationships exist on a continuum from transaction to relational (Dwyer, Schurr & Oh, 1987). This trio of scholars posed that transactional exchanges depend on extrinsic factors such as money and giveaways in exchange for a good or service whereas relationship exchanges focus on cooperation and interactions resulting from shared values. Anderson and Narus suggested that organizations should practice both, however, transactional relationships were a short-term solution and relational exchanges offered a chance to develop into long-term relationships (1991). The term relationship marketing has evolved out of these approaches to refer to marketing activities that are “directed toward establishing, developing, and maintaining successful relationship exchanges” (Morgan & Hunt, 1994, p. 22). Sheth and Parvatiyar later described relationship marketing as ongoing cooperative behavior between the marketer and the consumer (2000).

Factors such as involvement, trust, and values play into consumer behavior and attitudes toward relationship formation (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Sport consumers show their commitment through repeat purchase of tickets, continued attendance at sporting events, and purchase of sport-related products (Bee & Kahle). Trust is influenced by shared values and often required prior to building a relationship (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Bee and Kahle propose that trust is based on consumer expectations about the reliability and competency of the players, teams, and organization. Values have also been identified as an important foundation to relationship building and when shared between sports consumers and sports organizations, teams, and players, should lead to a stronger commitment (Bee & Kahle; Morgan & Hunt).
In terms of sports marketing, “relationships are likely to become long-term and endure when the values of the sports organization, team, marketing entity, or players connect to those of their target consumer” (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Morgan and Hunt (1994) found that shared values lead to trust and committed relationships. Kahle (1996) also found that many relationships and marketing activities are improved when values of the consumers are treated with maximum importance. Homer and Kahle (1988) showed that values influence attitudes, which influence behaviors of consumers. Fan behavior can be predicted and influenced when fans believe the team or athletes represent their values, therefore, organizations should try to match values of target consumers with those of the teams and organizations (Bee & Kahle).

In 2006, Bee and Kahle examined sports consumers’ underlying motivations for engaging in and maintaining relationships through a model developed by Kelman (1961) to explain how and why consumers enter into relationships. The practice of relationship marketing attempts to predict and direct attitudes leading to behaviors, which Kelman (1958) suggested is a result of three levels of social influence: a) compliance, b) identification, and c) internalization.

Bee and Kahle explain compliance in the sports context as a consumer purchasing a product or service, attending an event, or wearing sport-related clothing to gain a social reward (punishment is a possibility) (2006). Wearing team-related clothing in public to receive recognition or refraining to avoid relationship with a team or player is an example of compliant behavior. This relationship only lasts if it continues to meet the consumers’ goal of receiving social rewards. Identification has been most notably discussed through basking in reflected glory (BIRG), originally introduced by Cialdini, Borden, Thorne,
Walker, Freeman, & Sloan in 1976. This self-esteem function, where being associated with a team or player’s success is similar to personal success and has the potential to raise self-esteem. The alternative is cutting off reflected failure (CORFing), also a self-esteem function where fans disassociates from the team or player to distance themselves from unsuccessful groups or teams. Highly identified sports fans are more likely to BIRG and maintain and engage in a successful relationship (Bee & Kahle).

The entrepreneurial coach can take relationship marketing practices and implement them into their team to reach consumers and build long-term relationships that could lead to demand for their program on campus and in the community. Initially introducing consumers through compliance, sport marketers can practice hospitality and encourage group activities (purchasing tickets or pre-game events). To lead them from compliance to identification, the connection starts with psychological attachment to the team and can be influenced through external circumstances like team success. Landing a recruit, national rankings, wins and championships can solidify identification for consumers. In turn, gifts to the program or team form a link between consumer and team, athlete, or owner and further drive identification (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Coaches that reach the internalization stage of relationships will be able to ask for more support from stakeholders and in turn they will expect sports talk that contains sports information (Bee & Kahle).

**Building a Brand**

The public perception of a university’s athletic program is a principal aspect of building the brand image of the respective team (Weight, 2010; Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). Building a favorable image should be a primary objective of any sports
entity as programs strive to become more entrepreneurial to generate additional revenues and exposure (Lee et al.; Cooper, 2012). Branding refers to names, designs, symbols, or combinations of those to differentiate themselves from competition (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2002; Shank, 2005). Brand equity, the added value associated with a brand name, is largely driven by consumer’s mental associations with a specific brand (Aaker, 1991). Weight’s (2010) study found that positive consumer perception of a team was influenced by good social conduct by student athletes and academic accomplishments, both contributors to strong brand equity. The stronger the brand equity, the less likely an athletic director will eliminate a program.

Brand equity is enhanced by the development of one’s brand awareness coupled with brand loyalty (Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). The brand exists in the consumer’s memory and is developed as other information is associated with it (Aaker, 1991). Brand awareness receives added value when consumers have a positive experience or recognize success associated with a program. For example, landing top recruits can increase awareness in the consumer’s mind about a program’s potential on the national scene. Once brand awareness exists, brand loyalty can begin to take shape (Macdonald & Sharp, 1996).

Developing a strong brand loyalty with the consumer base can build a unified stakeholder base which can, in turn, provide protection from other competitors (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2000; Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). Universities have the advantage of the built-in, natural passion associated with the college experience that through sports can be leveraged to provide a sense of distinction and loyalty to the national brand image (Toma, 2003). Sport programs can utilize brand loyalty by reaching
out to alumni constituents when celebrating reunions on campus. Recreating the atmosphere that former student-athletes experienced on campus encourages loyalty to the program and builds on team relationships and the nostalgia of the collegiate environment. Development of relationships is the foundation of most fundraising campaigns, therefore continual cultivation of alumni relations encourages gift giving and a sense of ownership in the program (Wedgeworth, 2000).

**Resource Allocation Theory**

The theory of resource allocation has been around since the late 18th century when Adam Smith described basic economic principles in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776). He explained the basic ideas of supply and demand in a market.

The market price of every particular commodity is regulated by the proportion between the quantity which is actually brought to market, and the demand of those who are willing to pay the natural price of the commodity, or the whole value of the rent, labour, and profit, which must be paid in order to bring it thither (Smith, 2007, p. 37).

Smith explains when demand exceeds the supply of a product, the price that consumers are willing to pay for that specific item increases and the supplier has increased control over the market and the product will continue to be brought to the market. Consequently, when supply exceeds demand, the supplier is forced to decrease the price to remain competitive in the market and may scale back supply. Applied to sports in an athletic department, Smith’s principles would hold that sports are being cut (or no longer being brought to market or sponsored) because there is a lack of demand. Taking into account the current economic environment, financial and demand-based justification is needed along with the inherent educational value of the sports to keep them around. The programs in question need to have stakeholders “who are willing to
pay the whole rent, labor, and profits which must be paid in order to bring the product to the market” (Smith, 2007, p. 37).

Before looking into the distribution of resources in intercollegiate athletics, it is helpful to examine a study of allocating resources as it was applied to higher education in general. Judith Hackman examined resource allocation within colleges and universities in 1985. She studied how colleges and universities allocated resources among units to work toward a practical theory of resource allocations that would explain the gains and losses in a financially difficult time. Hackman’s study proposed a theory that institutions are open systems that interact with their environment to bring in essential resources and in return, contribute services and products. The theory is based on five concepts: centrality, resource allocations, environmental power, institutional power, and resource allocation strategies. Hackman defines centrality as “how closely the purposes of a unit match the central mission of its institution” (p. 61). Resource allocation, the dependent variable, “is the relative share of internal institutional resources acquired by a unit, especially money, space, and campus location.” Environmental power is the ability of the unit to bring in outside resources from outside of the institution. Institutional power is the “unit’s relative influence within the institution, independent of its environmental power” (p. 63). Resource negotiation strategies are used by the unit leaders to accumulate resource allocations in negotiating budgets (Hackman, 1985).

The study included six institutions located in New England, all of which had budgetary problems. The first phase of research included interviews with 26 administrators while the second phase used questionnaires to over 90 administrative heads. The most relevant, significant finding from this study is the strong relationship of
environmental power, ability to acquire in outside resources, to resource allocations which could suggest “the possibility of a rational link between budget decisions and the needs of an institution, a link that may be stronger in times of financial stress than in periods which there is more budgetary slack” (Hackman, 1985, p. 74-75). If athletic departments have a scarce amount of resources to offer their sport programs, the influence of a strong environmental power could be the most important factor in considering which program should be eliminated if the athletic director uses such criteria to make the decision. Coaches can play an active role in increasing that environmental power to gain outside resources dependent of the athletic department. If such a strong link exists, it is important to examine the decision makers and the principles they are using to assess the need, which is the foundation of distributive justice research. This research is clearly linked to the theory of resource allocations within the context of intercollegiate athletics and as such will be explored to provide a thorough theoretical foundation through which the research questions within this study are explored.

**Distributive Justice**

In 1994, Hums and Chelladurai came together to develop a scale of distributive justice that was applicable to intercollegiate athletics. Relying on the foundational work of Cohen and Greenberg (1982), Hums and Chelladurai define distributive justice to be: “the application of a normative rule to the allocation of resources to recipients. That which is allocated may vary from material goods of all sorts to social goods such as status, as well as social opportunities and conditions. Recipients may be individual persons, but they may also be small groups or social organizations varying in size and complexity”(Cohen & Greenburg, 1982, pp. 1-2).
Hums and Chelladurai sought to apply this theory as a means to examine the principles that athletic departments use to allocate resources to sports teams. As the pattern of research attempts to explain where the money is coming from, where it is being distributed, and what principles are used to make such decisions, than one can come to conclusions on how to improve the current state of resource allocation.

In the application of this definition of distributive justice to intercollegiate athletics, Hums and Chelladurai (1994a) utilized, a conceptual framework that was largely influenced by Tornblom and Jonsson’s (1985,1987) to study the principles of distributive justice in athletic department resource allocation decisions through an examination of male and female coaches and athletic administrators from all three NCAA divisions (1994b). The purpose of the study was to identify a list of principles of distribution applicable to intercollegiate athletics and assess the perspectives of head coaches and athletic administrators on the justness of the identified principles. Administrators and head coaches both chose need as a principle that was most important in decisions to distribute or reallocate resources.

In only one instance divisions differed in allocation principles. Division I members rated contributions based on productivity and spectator appeal significantly higher than did Division II and III members as a means to distribute or reallocate resources. Since spectator appeal is associated with revenue generation at most Division I level institutions, this difference is not surprising and should be of concern for nonrevenue sports teams because of the amount of resources that are garnered in comparison with the revenue generating sports.
Building upon the work of Hums and Chelladurai (1994b), Mahony and Pastore (1998) utilized the framework of distributive justice in an examination of the NCAA Revenue and Expense Reports for 1973-1993 to determine whether there was evidence to support the findings of the Hums and Chelladurai (1994b) study that equality and need were the main principles affecting distributions.

In 1993 men’s nonrevenue sports contributed 4.95% of total revenue while women’s sports contributed 3.98%. At the time of this research, institutions at the Division I-A level received over 90% of their sport team revenue from football and men’s basketball. “At this level, distributions based on revenue production or spectator appeal would clearly favor football and men’s basketball” (Mahony & Pastore, p. 135).

Division I-A and I-AA men’s nonrevenue sports benefitted from 19.47% of the budget for all sports in 1973 and this budgetary allocation slightly decreased to 18.05% in 1993. Men’s revenue sports saw a steady decline in the percentage of total budget allocations from 79.78% in 1973 to 59.88% in 1993. Mahony and Pastore conclude these figures do not match up with principles that distribute resources based on equality and need. In the late 1980’s and early 1990’s, more of the money given to women’s sports has come from eliminating or downsizing men’s nonrevenue sports than from the revenue sports. Since 1981, the increase in budget for women’s sports came mostly from men’s nonrevenue sports (Mahony & Pastore, 1998).

The findings from Hums and Chelladurai’s (1994) study are inconsistent with the findings of Mahony & Pastore (1998). The elimination and cuts imposed on men’s nonrevenue teams are inconsistent with the use of need as a general principle to make distributions and retributions. The considerably large difference between budgets of
comparable sports teams also suggests that equality is ignored when making decisions. Men’s and women’s basketball, with similar operating costs, showed vastly different expenses at all levels in 1993 which would suggest that equity based on spectator appeal and revenue production is the first principle used in distributing resources (Mahony & Pastore, 1998).

Mahony et. al. (2005) continued their examination of distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics by studying how the decision makers, athletic directors and athletic board chairs, define “need,” and which types of need had the greatest impact on the decision making process. Division I respondents most readily identified reasons for a sport having great financial need to be relative to the level of resources needed by the sport team to ensure competitive success. Results showed that football was considered to be the team with the greatest financial need among men’s teams, followed by track and field, despite men’s nonrevenue sports being considered lowest in their need (Mahony, Hums, & Reimer, 2002). In regards to women’s sport, basketball, track and field, and softball were considered to have balanced needs. In light of what the decision makers claim is a principle used in determining resource distribution, the studies completed by the NCAA show different outcomes in the allocation of revenue and volume of program eliminations.

It is beneficial to get the most recent look at the NCAA Gender Equity Report (2004-2010) to compare financial data from what Mahony and Pastore (1998) found in their study. In 2009-2010 Division I FBS women’s sports were allotted 28.17% (increase of 6 percent from 1993) of the total expenses while men’s revenue sports used 57.60%
(decrease of 2 percent from 1993). The Division I FBS men’s nonrevenue sports represented 14.23% of the total expenses, down almost 4 percent from 1993.

The median generated revenue from Division I FBS women’s sports stayed the same from 1993 at just under 4 percent while the men’s revenue sports increased to 91%. The men’s nonrevenue sports generated a median value of 8.15% which is a 4% increase from 1993. Notice that despite the drop in expenses distributed to the men’s nonrevenue sports, they managed to increase revenue generation with a median percentage increase larger than the revenue sports of Division I FBS institutions.

Since Division I track and field falls into the women’s sports and men’s nonrevenue categories, the previous literature is quite disconcerting. First, as the average percentage of revenue brought in by men’s nonrevenue sports has doubled in just the last twenty years, their budgets have decreased. A total of 51 women’s and men’s indoor and outdoor track and field programs were dropped in the period spanning the latest NCAA Gender Equity Report (NCAA, 2011). If the decision makers inside the athletic department are not favoring the men’s nonrevenue sports in their distribution of resources, it becomes more urgent for the programs to raise those funds and build spectator appeal and productivity to remain viable. There are a select amount of programs that have proven to be successful in these areas and the purpose of this study is to draw on the ideals and current practices that lead to sustainable track and field programs as there is limited research relative to this critical subject of inquiry (Weight, 2010). All track and field programs that are struggling to remain on campus should be able to access and benefit from the results of this study by examining and learning from these select
programs and aggregating the marketing and fundraising strategies into a model that fits their unique program.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

Overview

This research study was completed through the use of quantitative research to examine current NCAA Division I coach perceptions of track and field fundraising and marketing practices. An online survey was constructed to explore practices that programs have in place while also polling coaches on their perceptions of the core product of NCAA Division I track and field. The goal of this research was to which strategies coaches could identify as useful for the purposes of marketing and fundraising as well as to identify areas of improvement to the track and field core product in an effort to enhance program demand and thus facilitate increased supply and sustainability of the programs.

Participants

The population of interest was NCAA Division I track and field coaches to determine their perceptions of the role of marketing and fundraising at their institution and which strategies they identify as useful to create demand and enhance the sustainability of their programs.

Within the survey, peer institutions will have the opportunity to identify coaches and/or programs they view as leaders in marketing and fundraising. Any of the coaching staff members may complete the survey since the most knowledgeable staff person, as it
pertains to marketing strategies, will not necessarily be the same position in each program.

**Procedure**

The survey instrument was distributed via an email invitation to the track and field coaching staffs within every Division I institution that supports track and field. A cover letter was attached to the survey to explain the purposes of the study and instructions for which staff members may complete the survey. By including every Division I school in the survey, the sample aims to be representative of the population including schools of varying size and conference within the Division I membership. Qualtrics, an online survey tool, was used to distribute the survey and records results.

**Instrumentation & Data Collection**

The survey instrument was constructed based on a thorough review of literature while utilizing an instrument from a similar study conducted to review the core product of NCAA wrestling as a basis for instrument-development (Cooper & Weight, 2011). Survey content included six demographic questions including age, conference affiliation, marketing staff responsibility, marketing budget, coaching title, and number of track and field teams sponsored per school. These were followed with three likert scale questions seeking to gauge perceptions on marketing and fundraising practices followed by two open-ended questions to identify marketing leaders. The survey ended with a likert scale and open-ended question to gather ideas in order to create demand for the sport around the country.

The survey was tested for validity through review by a panel of experts including two sport administration professors, a member of the athletic fundraising staff at the
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, staff members of the USTFCCCA, and an expert in survey design from the Odum Institute. In an effort to enhance construct validity, a pilot study was conducted by having a select sample of coaching staff around the country complete the survey to ensure clarity and comprehensiveness of questions and to be reflective of the goals of the study. Test-retest measures were also taken by a select sample of respondents in order to measure the instrument reliability. The survey was sent to the NCAA Division I membership that sponsors at least one track and field team, totaling 325 institutions. The survey yielded a response rate of 34.2% after 111 coaches completed the survey.

**Data Analysis**

Quantitative data were analyzed utilizing Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis included basic frequencies and descriptive statistics in order to provide a framework of the wide array of schools that are represented. Additionally, t-tests and one-way Analyses of Variances (ANOVA) were run to compare the responses of the various survey recipients in order to determine whether there were significant relationships between any of the independent variables (institutional NCAA Division I sub-classification, coach age, coach staff position, and coach marketing responsibility).

Qualitative data was independently coded by two researchers and organized into categories based on the nature of the responses of open ended questions pertaining to marketing and demand-enhancing strategies. Inter-coder reliability was high for both coded narratives indicating a clear code and strong level of agreement between coders with a Scott’s Pi of .92 and 1.0, respectively.
CHAPTER IV
MANUSCRIPT

Introduction

An ever-present problem in intercollegiate athletics is the differential in allocation of limited resources between nonrevenue programs and those programs that garner the most attention and spectator support (Hums & Chelladurai, 1994). As the money surrounding the Bowl Championship Series and the NCAA Division I men’s basketball tournament increases, the incentives to pump resources into the sports with the largest potential for return continue to escalate (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). The NCAA 2009-2010 Gender Equity Report documents this staggering difference between football and basketball expenditures who utilize 78% of Division I men’s sport budgets. Given that the minimum number of male varsity teams a Division I athletic department can sponsor is six, the remaining four or more men’s teams are left to split 22% of the budget.

Track and Field programs have been a target of elimination in the most recent decades despite tremendous participation and popularity for both male and female collegiate and high school participants (Irirk, 2011; National Federation of State High School Associations, 2011). In fact, track and field is the second most popular male sport by participation in high school and ranked first among most popular sports for females,
yet at the Division I level, track and field leads all sports in most programs dropped since the 1988-1989 season (NFHS, 2011; Irick, 2011).

The United States General Accounting Office (GAO) released a report in 2001 about four year college’s decisions to discontinue nonrevenue programs (e.g., insufficient student interest, gender equity, resource allocations). The GAO study also reported that in deciding to sponsor new teams, 71% of the 549 NCAA schools relied on obtaining funds from other sports (2001). This reallocation of funds to the revenue generating teams is only justified by the potential profit that might be accrued to support the nonrevenue teams, such as track and field, however this study also examined “creative strategies” that could produce revenue (e.g., fundraising, renting facilities, hosting events) and contain costs (e.g., limit team travel and roster sizes, recruit via telephone) to avoid program eliminations (GAO, 2001, p. 25). This research supports the notion that self-sufficient practices led by coaches can increase the chances of sustainability along with implementation of creative strategies to achieve cost-containment initiatives. The purpose of this study was to explore marketing and fundraising practices of NCAA Division I track and field programs in an effort to extrapolate and define strategies that programs can implement to encourage sustainability initiatives.

**Current State of NCAA Division I Track and Field**

Between 2000 and 2010, there were 33 Division I men’s and women’s outdoor track and field programs and 50 indoor programs eliminated (Irick, 2011). Notable eliminations in this decade include West Virginia University (men; 2003); James Madison
University (men; 2006); Seton Hall University (men and women; 2010); University of Delaware (men; 2011); and University of Richmond (men; 2012).

Maryland men’s track and field faced elimination when Athletic Director Kevin Anderson announced in November 2011 that eight athletic programs would be cut to offset a $35 million debt. The athletic department faced such a large deficit due in part to undertaking a $50.8 million expansion of the football stadium in 2006 and buying out the contract of a former football coach (Giannotto, 2012). Men’s track and field head coach Andrew Valmon led efforts that saved the program for the year by raising $880,000 in less than seven months as mandated by Anderson. Although Maryland’s case is a rare situation, spending habits of intercollegiate athletic departments on revenue teams is not (NCAA, 2010). Some coaches must now act as the CEO of their program to improve their brand and gain key resources from stakeholders (Cooper, 2012), which in Maryland’s case was, a significant amount of funding.

Along with fundraising, successful marketing efforts can draw spectator appeal to the product on the track or field. Although the majority of intercollegiate track and field meets are not ticketed events, the NCAA records attendance at its annual outdoor championships. The 2008 NCAA meet in Des Moines, Iowa drew 41,187 which ranks second on the list of the top four-day crowds dating back to 1987 (Perelman, 2011). The same event in Des Moines experienced major drops in attendance figures for the 2011 (29,377) and 2012 championships (20,048). Over the last 50 years, the top five single day crowds at this meet all took place before 1990. Perelman noted that the NCAA outdoor championships has not been hosted in a top-10 market since 1976 in Philadelphia (2011). It is harder to attract large attendance in small markets, as Des Moines can attest. In
addition to attendance difficulties, the lack of media coverage has also played a role in diminishing publicity in this sport. A two hour live-segment on CBS for the outdoor championships is the extent of television coverage that track and field receives. Only eight media outlets were present at the 2011 championships outside of the local area. Only two of those eight were nation-wide outlets: the Associated Press and ESPN.com (Perelman, 2011).

Despite the demand for participation opportunities on the high school and college level, consumer demand continues to lag as proven by the inability to draw stakeholders to support track and field programs through financial means, attendance, and media exposure. This study explores ways to create demand for the sport on campuses, in communities, and around the country so that programs will not be threatened with discontinuation.

**Significance of Study**

In a time when budgets for track and field programs are seeing cuts and reallocation of monies, it has never been more imminent for coaches to engage in the cultivation of relationships and in order to build a positive brand and enhance fundraising and marketing of their programs (Cooper, 2012). Although most Division I athletic departments have a designated fundraising and marketing staff, these skills, if performed effectively by a coach, can enhance the long-term viability of the program (CITATION). By surveying Division I NCAA track and field coaches, this study identified leaders in the field as defined by their peers, sport-specific practices that contribute to the sustainability of the sport, and perceptions surrounding the state of the sport on the intercollegiate level. The findings in this study will add to the literature related to
Olympic Sport marketing practices and will equip coaches in their efforts toward being effective marketers and fundraisers for their programs. Combined, these findings will provide a foundation for enhancing the sustainability and marketability of intercollegiate track and field.

**Impact of the Arms Race on Nonrevenue Sports**

In 2003, Marburger and Hogshead-Makar studied trends behind the elimination of men’s Division 1-A sports and contended that decisions to cut sports were driven by pressure to maximize profit from sources such as lucrative pay outs from bowl games and post-season basketball tournaments. They argue athletic directors’ decisions to pour resources into basketball and football is incentivized by the potential for large financial returns. Although barriers for mass program elimination are in place by federal gender equity statutes and NCAA sport sponsorship legislation, there is still a financial motive to reduce the number of nonrevenue programs and reallocate those funds toward programs with the largest potential to generate profit.

Marburger and Hogshead-Makar have classified Division I athletic directors as “profit-maximizers” based on the philosophy statement of Division I which outlines, among other requirements, that members should sponsor at the “highest feasible level of intercollegiate competition one or both of the traditional spectator-oriented, income-producing sports of football and basketball” (Division I Manual, 2012, p. 340). Nonrevenue sports benefit from subsidization of their programs made possible by the revenues that are generated from basketball and football (Marburger & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). FBS athletic departments continue to increase in their reliance on football.
generated revenues every year as a function of the arms race in intercollegiate athletics (Fulks).

As long as the ticket sales and television contracts produce more revenue than the amount spent on the teams, athletic directors can justify the allocation of resources (Margurber & Hogshead-Makar, 2003). Therefore, trends in spending would create a drain on the money that goes toward nonrevenue sports because no profit is gained from that expenditure and it would benefit the athletic department to phase out nonrevenue sports entirely (Margurber & Hogshead-Makar). One can see the importance placed on fundraising for nonrevenue coaches in light of the aforementioned factors of the arms race. Nonrevenue coaches must not fully rely on the athletic department for a fully-funded budget. Marketing and development initiatives become vital in preventing a program from being eliminated.

**Fundraising in Intercollegiate Athletics**

In order to find resources outside of those that are allocated directly from the athletic department and university, programs can improve their chances of sustainability by engaging in fundraising. One of the main components of fundraising is the cultivation of relationships to convey to your donors that your projects and goals are worthy of their financial support (Leonhardt, 2011). Wedgeworth stated, “the process of creating and maintaining a relationship is at the heart of any successful fund-raising campaign” (2000, p. 536). Lowman and Bixby also stressed the importance of building relationships with the community to develop good will and raise the possibility of future gifts (2011).

Gaining support from alumni and campus constituencies can be achieved through a clear mission that supports athletics and the university (Lowman & Bixby, 2011). To
guide the mission statement into action, developing a strategic plan is an important step in the organization’s fundraising efforts (Leonhardt, 2011). By including a clear mission statement in your strategic plan, the targeted constituencies can play a part in helping to reach the goals of your organization (Lowman & Bixby, 2001). Warwick claims that any effective campaign will “break through the media clutter and fix simple ideas firmly in the minds of the audiences for whom they’re intended” (2011, p. 31).

**Integrated Fundraising**

Integrated fundraising, involving e-mail, the Web site, telemarketing, and direct mail, is an effective means of communicating a consistent message, strengthening donor relationships and increasing revenue over a period of time (Warwick, 2011). Utilizing the internet to drive donors to a website and communicate through email is vital in the nonprofit organization’s attempt to reduce inconsistencies in communicating an organization’s message and increasing the convenience of giving (2011). Warwick explains that giving donors the option to communicate through a phone call, direct mail, or the internet increases the likelihood of receiving gifts from all demographics depending on their preference (2011).

Using email, one part of integrated fundraising, to connect with donors not only allows a way for the fundraisers to “know” their donor base, but also gives them easy access to feedback (Olsen & Frazier, 2001). Olsen and Frazier state that e-mail is “the core communication tool for online donor development” (2001, p. 60). It is cost-effective, saves time compared to phone calls, can be easily measured, creates an open dialogue, and is considered to be more effective than a website (Olsen & Frazier, 2011; Olsen,
Keevers, Paul & Covington, 2001). Once email correspondence is established, phone and face to face contact can proceed at the donor’s request (Olsen & Frazier, 2001).

**Donor Service**

In a study of charitable donors, Sargeant identified three main factors of service quality: responsiveness, feedback and effectiveness (2001). The research showed that service quality had a significant impact on donor longevity (Sargeant, 2001). Specific to intercollegiate athletics, Shapiro was the first to investigate donor perceptions of service quality using a sample of college athletic donors (2010). The results of this study showed that although service quality had no significant influence on donor longevity or gift amount, it did have an influence on donor satisfaction. The study also provided evidence of a relationship between the three factors of service quality identified by Sargeant (2001). Shapiro suggests specific ways to practice these factors including thanking donors for their gift, communicating how contributions are being used, and assuring donors the importance of their contribution regardless of the size (2001). Gifts of all kinds and sizes should be acknowledged by the fundraisers with thank you letters (Leonhardt, 2011).

**Donor Motivation**

There is a substantial literary foundation exploring why donors give to athletic departments. Research has uncovered donor motivation stemming from factors such as visiting college campuses, renewing old friendships, meeting coaches and players, and obtaining tickets (Gladden, Mahony & Apostolopoulou, 2005; Staurowsky, Parkhouse & Sachs, 1996). Other donors are motivated by priority seating, special parking, and/or
special recognition (Isherwood, 1986; Verner, Hecht & Fansler, 1998). Verner, Hecht and Fansler also found that some donors give in order to receive inside information on athletics that non-donors would not have access to (1998). Philanthropic motives have also been identified such as contributing to the academic success of student-athletes and promoting the image of the university and state through supporting athletic programs, coaches, facilities, recruiting, and conference membership (Comstock, 1988; Gladden, Mahony & Apostolopoulou, 2005; Hammersmith, 1985).

**Role of the Coach in Nonrevenue Sport Sustainability**

Weight (2010) was one of the first to take a thorough look at the role of the coach in the financial sustainability of nonrevenue sports. Her study examined the beliefs of Division I athletic directors regarding the influence of a wrestling coach on whether or not their program is discontinued and what activities a coach can do to enhance a program’s chance of vitality. Athletic directors credited coaches with holding a moderate amount of influence on whether or not their sport is cut. In response to what activities a coach could do to enhance a program’s vitality, several common themes were repeated among athletic director respondents.

Relationship building was mentioned several times as a key practice in order to build buy-in with key decision-making individuals in the campus and community. A complimentary coaching staff led by an entrepreneur with the ability to fundraise, promote the sport, build a positive brand, promote the program’s public perception, and build relationships with stakeholders is what Weight defines as “complimentary entre-relationship promotion” which could decrease the likelihood of being eliminated (2010, p. 27). If nonrevenue coaches can take advantage of the community surrounding each
program, the demand that is created can give athletic directors one less reason to
eliminate their program. Weight proposes that the marketing efforts of the entrepreneurial
coach are a key step in creating demand for nonrevenue sports. Although this study was
specific to wrestling coaches, much can be learned and applied toward all nonrevenue
coaches.

**Relationship Marketing**

The literary foundation in fundraising points out that developing relationships is
important to gain financial and stakeholder support (Wedgeworth, 2000). In light of
Weight’s (2010) research, relationships must be formed with consumers of sport teams to
create buy-in and a foundation to ask for money. Not all relationships should be
cultivated and treated similarly; therefore applying certain strategies to different
individuals can guide the nature of the interaction. Past research has supported that
consumer relationships exist on a continuum from transaction to relational (Dwyer,
Schurr & Oh, 1987). This trio of scholars posed that transactional exchanges depend on
extrinsic factors such as money and giveaways in exchange for a good or service whereas
relationship exchanges focus on cooperation and interactions resulting from shared
values. Anderson and Narus suggested that organizations should practice both, however,
transactional relationships were a short-term solution and relational exchanges offered a
chance to develop into long-term relationships (1991). The term relationship marketing
has evolved out of these approaches to refer to marketing activities that are “directed
toward establishing, developing, and maintaining successful relationship exchanges”
(Morgan & Hunt, 1994, p. 22). Sheth and Parvatiyar later described relationship
marketing as ongoing cooperative behavior between the marketer and the consumer (2000).

Factors such as involvement, trust, and values play into consumer behavior and attitudes toward relationship formation (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Sport consumers demonstrate commitment through repeat purchase of tickets, continued attendance at sporting events, and purchase of sport-related products (Bee & Kahle). Trust is influenced by shared values and often required prior to building a relationship (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Bee and Kahle propose that trust is based on consumer expectations about the reliability and competency of the players, teams, and organization. Values have also been identified as an important foundation to relationship building and when shared between sports consumers and sports organizations, teams, and players, should lead to a stronger commitment (Bee & Kahle; Morgan & Hunt).

In terms of sports marketing, “relationships are likely to become long-term and endure when the values of the sports organization, team, marketing entity, or players connect to those of their target consumer” (Bee & Kahle, 2006). This finding supports previous research which cites shared values lead to trust and committed relationships (Morgan & Hunt, 1994), and many relationships and marketing activities are improved when values of the consumers are treated with maximum importance (Kahle, 1996). Homer and Kahle (1988) showed that values influence attitudes, which influence behaviors of consumers. Fan behavior can be predicted and influenced when fans believe the team or athletes represent their values, therefore, organizations should try to match values of target consumers with those of the teams and organizations (Bee & Kahle, 2006).
In 2006, Bee and Kahle examined sports consumers’ underlying motivations for engaging in and maintaining relationships through a model developed by Kelman (1961). The practice of relationship marketing attempts to predict and direct attitudes leading to behaviors, which Kelman (1958) suggested is a result of three levels of social influence: a) compliance, b) identification, and c) internalization.

Bee and Kahle explain compliance in the sports context as a consumer purchasing a product or service, attending an event, or wearing sport-related clothing to gain a social reward (punishment is a possibility) (2006). Wearing team-related clothing in public to receive recognition or refraining to avoid relationship with a team or player is an example of compliant behavior. This relationship only lasts if it continues to meet the consumers’ goal of receiving social rewards. Identification has been most notably discussed through basking in reflected glory (BIRG), originally introduced by Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan in 1976. This self-esteem function, where being associated with a team or player’s success is similar to personal success and has the potential to raise self-esteem. The alternative is cutting off reflected failure (CORFing), also a self-esteem function where fans disassociates from the team or player to distance themselves from unsuccessful groups or teams. Highly identified sports fans are more likely to BIRG and maintain and engage in a successful relationship (Bee & Kahle).

The entrepreneurial coach can take relationship marketing practices and implement them into their team to reach consumers and build long-term relationships that could lead to demand for their program on campus and in the community. Initially introducing consumers through compliance, sport marketers can practice hospitality and encourage group activities (purchasing tickets or pre-game events). To lead them from
compliance to identification, the connection starts with psychological attachment to the team and can be influenced through external circumstances like team success. Landing a recruit, national rankings, wins and championships can solidify identification for consumers. In turn, gifts to the program or team form a link between consumer and team, athlete, or owner and further drive identification (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Coaches that reach the internalization stage of relationships will be able to ask for more support from stakeholders and in turn they will expect sports talk that contains sports information (Bee & Kahle).

**Building a Brand**

The public perception of a university’s athletic program is a principal aspect of building the brand image of the respective team (Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). Building a favorable image should be a primary objective of any sports entity as programs strive to become more entrepreneurial to generate additional revenues and exposure (Lee et al., 2008; Cooper, 2012). Branding refers to names, designs, symbols, or combinations of those to differentiate themselves from competition (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2002; Shank, 2005). Brand equity, the added value associated with a brand name, is largely driven by consumer’s mental associations with a specific brand (Aaker, 1991; Keller, 1993). Weight’s (2010) study found that positive consumer perception of a team was influenced by good social conduct by student athletes and academic accomplishments, both contributors to strong brand equity. The stronger the brand equity, the less likely an athletic director will eliminate a program.

Brand equity is enhanced by the development of one’s brand awareness coupled with brand loyalty (Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). The brand exists in the
consumer’s memory and is developed as other information is associated with it (Aaker, 1991). Brand awareness receives added value when consumers have a positive experience or recognize success associated with a program. For example, landing top recruits can increase awareness in the consumer’s mind about a program’s potential on the national scene. Once brand awareness exists, brand loyalty can begin to take shape (Macdonald & Sharp, 1996).

Developing a strong brand loyalty with the consumer base can build a unified stakeholder base which can, in turn, provide protection from other competitors (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2000; Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). Universities have the advantage of the built-in, natural passion associated with the college experience that through sports, can be leveraged to provide a sense of distinction and loyalty to the national brand image (Toma, 2003). Sport programs can utilize brand loyalty by reaching out to alumni constituents when celebrating reunions on campus. Recreating the atmosphere that former student-athletes experienced on campus encourages loyalty to the program and builds on team relationships and the nostalgia of the collegiate environment. Development of relationships is the foundation of most fundraising campaigns, therefore continual cultivation of alumni relations encourages gift giving and a sense of ownership in the program (Wedgeworth, 2000).

**Resource Allocation Theory**

The theory of resource allocation has been around since the late 18th century when Adam Smith described basic economic principles in The Wealth of Nations (1776). He explained the basic idea of supply and demand in a market that forms the theoretical foundation of this study.
The market price of every particular commodity is regulated by the proportion between the quantity which is actually brought to market, and the demand of those who are willing to pay the natural price of the commodity, or the whole value of the rent, labour, and profit, which must be paid in order to bring it thither (Smith, 2007, p. 37).

Smith explains when demand exceeds the supply of a product, the price that consumers are willing to pay for that specific item increases and the supplier has increased control over the market and the product will continue to be brought to the market. Consequently, when supply exceeds demand, the supplier is forced to decrease the price to remain competitive in the market and may scale back supply. Applied to sports in an athletic department, Smith’s principles would hold that sports are being cut (or no longer sponsored or being brought to market) because there is a lack of demand. Taking into account the current economic environment, financial and demand-based justification is needed along with the inherent educational value of the sports to keep them around. The programs in question need to have stakeholders “who are willing to pay the whole rent, labor, and profits which must be paid in order to bring the product to the market” (Smith, 2007, p. 37).

Before looking into the distribution of resources in intercollegiate athletics, it is helpful to examine a study of allocating resources as it was applied to higher education in general. Judith Hackman examined resource allocation within colleges and universities in 1985. She studied how colleges and universities allocated resources among units to work toward a practical theory of resource allocations that would explain the gains and losses in a financially difficult time. Hackman’s study proposed a theory that institutions are open systems that interact with their environment to bring in essential resources and in return, contribute services and products. The theory is based on five concepts: centrality,
resource allocations, environmental power, institutional power, and resource allocation strategies. Hackman defines centrality as “how closely the purposes of a unit match the central mission of its institution” (p. 61). Resource allocation, the dependent variable, “is the relative share of internal institutional resources acquired by a unit, especially money, space, and campus location.” Environmental power is the ability of the unit to bring in outside resources from outside of the institution. Institutional power is the “unit’s relative influence within the institution, independent of its environmental power” (p. 63). Resource negotiation strategies are used by the unit leaders to accumulate resource allocations in negotiating budgets (Hackman, 1985).

The most relevant, significant finding from this study is the strong relationship of environmental power, ability to acquire outside resources, to resource allocations which could suggest “the possibility of a rational link between budget decisions and the needs of an institution, a link that may be stronger in times of financial stress than in periods which there is more budgetary slack” (Hackman, 1985, p. 74-75). If athletic departments have a scarce amount of resources to offer their sport programs, the influence of a strong environmental power could be the most important factor in considering which program should be eliminated if the athletic director uses such criteria to make the decision.

Coaches can play an active role in increasing that environmental power to gain outside resources dependent of the athletic department. If such a strong link exists, it is important to examine the decision makers and the principles they are using to assess the need, which is the foundation of distributive justice research. This research is clearly linked to the theory of resource allocations within the context of intercollegiate athletics and as
such will be explored to provide a thorough theoretical foundation through which the research questions within this study are explored.

**Method**

**Instrument Design**

This study was completed through the use of quantitative and qualitative research methods to examine current NCAA Division I coach perceptions of track and field fundraising and marketing practices. An online survey was constructed to explore practices that programs have in place while also polling coaches on their perceptions of the core product of NCAA Division I track and field. The survey was tested for validity through review by a panel of experts including two sport administration professors, a member of the athletic fundraising staff at the University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, staff members of the United States Track & Field and Cross Country Coaches Association, and an expert in survey design from the Odum Institute. In an effort to enhance construct validity, a pilot study was conducted by having a select sample of coaches around the country complete the survey to ensure clarity and comprehensiveness of questions and to be reflective of the goals of the study.

The beginning of the survey included six demographic questions including age, conference affiliation, marketing staff responsibility, marketing budget, coaching title, and number of track and field teams sponsored per school. These were followed with three likert scale questions seeking to gauge perceptions related to marketing and fundraising practices followed by two open-ended questions to identify marketing leaders. The survey ended with a likert scale and open-ended question to gather ideas in order to create demand for the sport around the country.
Data Collection

The population of interest was NCAA Division I track and field coaches who were most knowledgeable about marketing strategies for their programs. By including every Division I school in the survey, the sample aimed to be representative of the population including schools of varying size and conference within the Division I membership. The study was approved by UNC-CH’s Institutional Review Board and the appropriate steps were taken to ensure confidentiality for each survey respondent. The survey was distributed via an email invitation directly to the track and field coaching staffs within each school in the NCAA Division I membership that sponsors at least one track and field team, totaling 325 institutions. Email addresses were attained from athletic department websites. Qualtrics, an online survey tool, was used to distribute the survey and records results. The survey yielded a response rate of 34.2% after 111 coaches completed the survey.

Quantitative data were analyzed utilizing Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis included basic frequencies and descriptive statistics in order to provide a framework of the wide array of respondents that are represented. Additionally, t-tests and one-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were run to determine whether significant relationships existed between any of the independent variables (institutional NCAA Division I sub-classification, coach age, coach staff position, and coach marketing responsibility).

Qualitative data was independently coded by two researchers and organized into categories based on the nature of the responses of open ended questions pertaining to marketing and demand-enhancing strategies. Inter-coder reliability was high for both
coded narratives indicating a clear code and strong level of agreement between coders with a Scott’s Pi of .92 and 1.0, respectively.

**Results**

The vast majority of survey respondents were head coaches (44.1%, n = 52) from Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) (46.6%, n = 55) institutions. Of the thirty-one NCAA Division I conferences, twenty-eight were represented including every (FBS) conference (n=11). Data analysis showed that 61.8% (n=71) of the respondents were between the ages of 30 – 49, while 15.6% (n=18) were between 20 – 29 and 22.6% (n=26) were over the age of 50.

Survey respondents were asked to identify the specific track and field teams that their athletic department sponsored. The four teams, recognized as separate sports by the NCAA, are women’s and men’s indoor and outdoor track and field. All respondents (n=116) identified women’s outdoor as a sponsored team, while 88.8% (n=103) sponsored men’s outdoor. Women’s indoor was almost equally sponsored as to women’s outdoor (99.1 %, n=115) while men’s indoor was slightly less at 82.8% (n=96).

The vast majority (79.0%, n=90) of respondents identified that responsibility of marketing their program fell on the athletic department marketing staff while 55.3% (n=63) also claimed responsibility as a coaching staff member. Of the seventy-eight respondents that indicated their annual marketing budget, 82.1% (n=64) reported less than $1,000 while ten coaches (12.8%) reported a budget between $1,000 and $4,999. Only 5.1% (n=4) reported a budget over $7,000. See Table 1 for a complete listing of demographic data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Information</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant Coach</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coach</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Bowl Subdivision</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Championship Subdivision</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division I (Non-Football)</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsored Teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Indoor</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Outdoor</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Indoor</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s Outdoor</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Department Marketing Staff</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Marketing (e.g. IMG or Learfield)</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Staff</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $1,000</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000-$2,999</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000-$4,999</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000-$6,999</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $7,000</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of marketing and fundraising to the athletic department

There were a wide range of perceptions related to the perceived importance of marketing and fundraising their programs. The mean response for marketing on a five-point scale, from “Not Important” to “Extremely Important”, was 2.79 in the slightly important range with a standard deviation of 1.48. The mode, \( n = 33 \), fell in the “2” (Slightly Important) category indicating the majority believed it was not important to the athletic department that marketing occur for their respective program. Coaches rated the importance of fundraising slightly higher – with a mean response of 3.8 while forty-six coaches labeled it very important. A complete listing of statistics relative to the importance of marketing and fundraising can be found in table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Important (1)</th>
<th>Slightly Important (2)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Moderately Important (4)</th>
<th>Very Important (5)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\( p < .05 (\mu \geq 4) \)

Coach’s perceptions of marketing strategy usefulness

In an effort to understand how useful certain marketing strategies are to gain stakeholder support, coaches were asked to rate a list of practices using a five-point scale. As shown in Table 3, a few practices were identified as moderately useful when looking at the descriptive statistics: (1) maintaining team website (\( M = 4.32; SD = 1.01 \)), (2) providing regular updates (results, upcoming competitions) (\( M = 4.16; SD = 0.98 \)), (3)
hosting home competitions/invitations (M = 4.03; SD = 1.16), and (4) sending newsletters to alumni (M = 3.94; SD = 1.12). Independent sample t-tests were conducted on each marketing strategy against a sample mean of 4 to reflect the moderately useful category. Maintaining team websites was a significant finding (p < .05) while providing regular team updates approached significance (p < .10). Other marketing strategies labeled slightly/somewhat useful in gaining support from stakeholders included: (1) hosting summer camps and clinics (M = 3.26; SD = 1.26), (2) making available printed supplementary materials (e.g. posters, schedule cards) (M = 3.24; SD = 1.11) (3) maintaining a team Twitter account (M = 3.13; SD = 1.29), and (4) sending text messages to stakeholders (M = 2.77; SD = 1.14).

Analysis of variance between independent variables of NCAA division, coaching staff position, marketing responsibility and age revealed significant interaction on three of the variables as indicated in Table 3. Of note, coaches perceptions on sending newsletters to alumni for stakeholder support differend between FCS schools (M = 4.21), who rated usefulness higher than those representing FBS schools (M = 3.48), $F(2,110) = 4.46, p = 0.011$. Additionally, assistant coaches (M = 3.89) had significantly higher perceptions than other coaching staff members (M = 2.78) on the importance of performing community service as a team, $F(4,110) = 3.42, p = 0.042$. Similarly, assistant coaches (M = 3.80) believed it was more important than other coaching staff members (M = 2.67) with values of $F(4, 109) = 4.35, p = 0.028$ for their teams to participate in community outreach.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for Stakeholder Support</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining team website**</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing regular program updates (results, upcoming competitions)*</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting home competitions/invitations</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending newsletters to alumni</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uploading videos of competition and interviews on YouTube or institutional website</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing community service as a team</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach vs. Other</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a team Facebook page</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in community outreach events (e.g. Special Olympics, after-school programs, hospital visits, etc.)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Coach vs. Other</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant Coach vs. Other</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Coach vs. Graduate Assistant Coach</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting summer camps and clinics</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making available printed supplementary materials (e.g. Posters, schedule cards)</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining a team Twitter account</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sending text messages to stakeholders</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The scale ranged from (1) “Not Useful at all” to (5) “Extremely Useful”

**p < .05 (µ ≥ 4)
*p < .10

Coach’s perceptions of fundraising strategy usefulness

Coaches were given a list of fundraising strategies to rate on a five-point scale of usefulness. Three strategies were rated significantly higher than “moderately useful” utilizing a one sample t-test against a sample mean of 4. These strategies included: (1)
maintaining communication with donors (M = 4.52; SD = 0.85), (2) maintaining an up-to-date contact database (M = 4.45; SD = 0.95), and (3) writing thank you notes/giving gifts for donations (M = 4.42; SD = 0.87). Analysis of variance revealed significant interactions between one independent variable. Coaches aged 40-49 years-old (M = 4.16) rated sending thank you notes in response to donations lower than coaches over 50 years-old (M = 4.81), F(3, 108) = 2.89, p = 0.039. A complete listing of related statistics can be seen in table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fundraising Strategies to Support Sustainability of Program</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining communication with donors</td>
<td>*4.52</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining up-to-date contact database</td>
<td>*4.45</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you notes/gifts in response to donations</td>
<td>*4.42</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40-49 vs. Over 50</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting home competitions</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining corporate sponsorships</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits for individuals who give</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing special interactions with coaches/athletes</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special giving campaigns</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket benefits to donors</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The scale ranged from (1) “Not Useful at all” to (5) “Extremely Useful” *p < .001 (µ ≥ 4)

**Identified Leaders in Division I track and field marketing**

In an effort to identify the leaders in Division I marketing, coaches were asked to list the program or programs that set a standard of excellence in the industry. Table 5 shows the frequency with which each leader was mentioned. Coaches identified
University of Oregon, Texas A&M University and Louisiana State University as the main leaders with Oregon dominating through mention in over eighty percent of responses.

Table 5
Leaders in NCAA Division I Track and Field Marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas (Austin)</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas (Fayetteville)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents could identify more than one school.

As shown in Table 6, coaches provided factors that contribute to making the identified programs leaders in marketing. The open-ended responses were coded for frequency and assigned to one of eight categories. If responses pertained to more than one category, they were counted in each respective category. These narrative responses provide insight to the important factors that help programs reach their stakeholders. The eight coding categories that were identified as important marketing strategies included: 1) institutional and athletic administration support; 2) relationship with sponsors; 3) budget and resources; 4) hosting meets and camps; 5) brand recognition; 6) support of local community; 7) history and tradition of success; and 8) cultivating alumni and fan relations. Of 119 responses, brand recognition – through prior marketing campaigns or visibility of program through media coverage, television, website, etc., was mentioned the most with over 18% (n = 22) identifying this practice as a primary strength of the marketing leaders. Not too far behind, 12.6% (n = 15) of responses, indicated that
cultivating relationships with sponsors was also an identified strength of marketing leaders.

Speaking specifically of the brand recognition and the influence of corporate sponsors at the University of Oregon, one head coach noted, “Their close affiliation with Nike makes [marketing] easier but it is undeniable that they are well received by the community and the nation. They are extremely visible and appear to be a stand-alone brand” (Respondent 6). The University of Oregon has gone so far as to brand themselves as the center of the track and field community as another assistant coach stated, “They have marketed themselves as ‘Track Town USA.’ Most people who don’t know track and field know that it is big there” (Respondent 50).

The second and third most frequently mentioned strengths of the marketing leaders were financial (marketing budget and other financial resources) and administrative support (larger support staff – institutional and athletic department). One FCS coach stated four programs (University of Oregon, University of Texas, Texas A&M University and Louisiana State University) had the “full support from their athletic administration with staffing and resources in addition to coaching” (Respondent 3).

The support of the local community was identified by 10.9% of the respondents as a result of an effective marketing plan. One assistant FBS coach described some of the University of Oregon’s strengths: “The partnerships that they develop with the community, government, local organizing committees and a vast array of other individuals and groups help attain success in attracting and hosting successful competitions in our sport. The advertising leading up to the events, coverage during, and infrastructure ensure success” (Respondent 64).
In addition to the support of the community and sponsors, coaches often cited (11.8%, n = 14) the importance of a tradition of winning, which draws the top recruits in the country as well as facilities that are capable of hosting large home competitions (10.9%, n = 13).

Lastly, cultivating alumni relations was stated as a crucial part of marketing the program for several programs. For example, respondent 58 pointed out, “They have a very cordial relationship with local and national media. The local media and community are kept up to date on the happenings of the program thereby creating ownership by the community and alumni” (Respondent 58). A complete list of aggregate qualitative results can be found in table 6.
Table 6
Factors that Establish Marketing Leaders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing Strategies</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand recognition</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior marketing campaigns, visibility of program through media coverage, television, website, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Support</strong></td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing budget and other financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Support through Institutional and Athletic Administration</strong></td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger support staff (not funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship with sponsors</strong></td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate partnerships to increase revenue and funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>History &amp; Reputation of Success</strong></td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning championships at conference and national level, producing Olympians, attracting top recruits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hosting meets and camps</strong></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting national caliber competition and camps/clinics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support of Local Community</strong></td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local media coverage, community attendance at home competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultivating Alumni &amp; Fan Relations</strong></td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing relationships with alumni and fans through marketing initiatives to gain stakeholder support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Respondents could identify more than one strategy.

Modifications to Enhance the Core Product

To understand coach’s perceptions on the current structure of the sport as it pertains to the core product, respondents were asked to rate modifications to the sport in an effort to enhance spectator appeal. Only two modifications were rated in the “somewhat useful” range including: (1) shortening the length of daily competition (M = 3.87; SD = 1.21) and (2) scoring of post-season championships (M = 3.75; SD = 1.26).
Analysis of variance revealed significant differences between coaches who reported control over marketing responsibilities who identified moderate usefulness (M = 4.12; SD = 1.13) in shortening the length of daily competition, and programs that used non-coaching staff members for marketing purposes who believed it was not as necessary (M = 3.56; SD = 1.21), $F(1,106) = 5.89; p = 0.017$. See table 7 for a complete listing of statistics related to the modification of core product questions.

Table 7  
*Modifications to Enhance the Core Product*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modifications to the Core Product</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shortening the length of daily competition</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Staff vs. Non-coaching Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoring of post-season championships</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying the order of events within a competition</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying qualifying procedures for National Championships (Indoor season- Descending order list)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modifying qualifying procedures for Preliminary rounds (Outdoor season- Top 12 in each event)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortening the length of the regular season</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The scale ranged from (1) “Not Useful at all” to (5) “Extremely Useful”  
*p < .05 (μ ≥ 4)*

*Creating Demand in Non-Olympic Years*

The survey gave the respondents an opportunity to provide input on modifications to the sport that could create demand in the years between the Olympics. Six coding categories emerged including: 1) modify and implement team scoring of regular season meets; 2) increase television coverage of competition; 3) create spectator friendly
environment; 4) improve packaging of television product; 5) increase institutional and
athletic administration support; and 6) modify NCAA Championships.

Of 65 responses, over 35% of the coaches mentioned the need to modify the team
scoring of competition in order to create demand for the sport. One assistant coach
plainly stated, “Track and field regular season meets need to be scored. Rivalries with
local schools need to be cultivated and marketed to fans, friends and alumni of programs
with an increased amount of smaller, shorter meets” (Respondent 1).

Equally important according to the respondents was catering to the spectators in a
way that creates a friendly environment. Over twenty-one percent of coaches mentioned
decreasing length of daily competition and other ways to make the sport more friendly to
spectators. Some of the notable improvements included shortening the meets, publishing
results in feet and inches instead of meters, and splitting the competitions into sections
based on the elite level of athletes (Respondents 15 & 28).

Almost one-third of responses identified the need to improve television coverage
and packaging of the track and field product on television. One coach stated the need for
“Better production on live broadcasts and more live action with less interviews. During
the long distance events they need to cut-away to field events to keep the attention of
viewers” (Respondent 40). Also highlighted, by respondent 34, was the need for “More
coverage on networks coupled with the education of the audience on rules and
procedures of the sport. Also we need to better market our top athletes to become
household names with dynamic personalities.”
Table 8
Creating Demand on Intercollegiate Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies to create demand for sport between Olympic years</th>
<th>(%)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modify and implement team scoring of regular season meets</strong></td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement dual meeting scoring with win/lose outcome, maintain head-to-head competition, instill a W/L component with rivalries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Create environment of spectator friendly competition</strong></td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease length of daily competition, refrain from reporting metric lengths in results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase television coverage of competition</strong></td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More televised competition and highlights/results of larger meets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve packaging of product on television</strong></td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market the events, knowledgeable announcers, highlight athlete personalities, variety of event coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Support Staff</strong></td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve institutional and athletic administration support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modify NCAA Championships</strong></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion & Implications**

**Athletic Department Implications**

In the first study of its kind relating to the sport of track and field, NCAA Division I coaches voiced a higher perceived importance of fundraising over marketing from their athletic department. Consistent with the findings of Marburger & Hogshead-Makar (2003), it appears that coaches understand the importance placed on financial sustainability. In order to increase stakeholder support, literature shows that implementing certain marketing strategies can lead to increased financial commitments from those stakeholders (Bee & Kahle, 2006). As increasing amounts of athletic department funding flow toward the revenue sports, it becomes increasingly important for
nonrevenue programs to find ways to reach their constituents and build relationships with stakeholders for the purpose of financial support. For when the demand is high to be associated with and contribute to the program, said program has control over the market and the product will continue to be brought to the market (Smith, 2007).

**Marketing Strategies**

Of the five strategies with the highest overall mean, four pertain to providing information to stakeholders through the team website, results, upcoming competitions, newsletters, and online content through YouTube and the institutional website. Educating stakeholders on their respective programs through these modes of media seems to be useful to coaches in order to gain interest from the community surrounding their program. Reaching the consumer before they attend a competition through these means can assist in building the brand image before they even attend a competition (Weight, 2010; Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008). As more content is available via institutional and program websites coupled with YouTube, branding begins sooner than ever before. A positive consumer perception through the marketing strategies that the coaches rated as useful can enhance the brand loyalty (Weight, 2010). On the whole, coaches rated their program’s participation in the community through service and outreach above neutral which supports Weight’s study on the positive effect these activities can have on a program’s brand (2010).

**Fundraising Strategies**

Coaches rated three fundraising strategies as more useful than the others which shared a common theme of building relationships with stakeholders and donors. Division I coaches’ place importance on these relational interactions in order to lay a foundation
strong enough to ask for assistance in funding in the future. This practice supports research in relationship marketing which has found developing relationships is important to gain financial support which would be consistent with the perceptions of coaches in this study (Morgan & Hunt, 1994; Wedgeworth, 2000). Literature suggests the practicality of maintaining a contact database to keep in contact with a large donor base (Olsen & Frazier, 2001). A database can help you track, understand, and service your donors by increasing the ease of outgoing correspondence and maintaining contact with them. Once you are in contact it becomes easier to direct donors by way of email or phone to increase the convenience of giving. (Sargeant, 2001; Warwick, 2011).

Attaining corporate sponsorships (M = 3.86; SD = 1.24) as a means to financially supplement an operating budget, rated relatively neutral yet widely varied in the overall strategies. Although not statistically significant, the younger coaches (20-39 years of age; M = 4.16; SD = 1.08) believed this strategy to be fiscally beneficial while the older age bracket (Over 50 years-old; M = 3.35; SD = 1.47) rated it closer to the neutral usefulness. As programs host larger and higher profile home competitions, which was consistently mentioned as a useful fundraising strategy, the signage in stadium and naming opportunities as well as brand association with a successful program can become a desired commodity. The younger generation of coaches appears to more fully the support the value in forming mutual partnerships with local businesses and organizations that can provide financial resources in exchange for displaying their name or logo at a stadium.

The goal of all programs should be to find what motivates stakeholders to give to their program. While literature has provided a foundation for donor motivation to give to revenue programs, benefits such as tickets, premium seating, special parking hold little
value for nonrevenue sports, most of which do not charge for entry (Staurowsky, Parkhouse & Sachs, 1996). Coaches noted that ticket benefits as a means to reward donors was least useful of the strategies presented, therefore, they must create a unique experience with added value to those individuals who contribute to their program. Past research has noted that donors give to improve a program as well as for the philanthropic value which favors the nonrevenue sports, but coaches must take it one step further to enhance the donor’s experience with the program to encourage long-term relationships and giving (Gladden, Mahony & Apostolopoulou, 2005). These experiences can include exclusive interactions with athletes and coaches or apparel and special recognition for certain levels of financial commitment.

**Leaders in Marketing**

Six main schools were separated as identified leaders in marketing by their peers. The follow-up question sought to identify why these programs were selected and responses were presented in categories of emergent themes (table 6). Brand recognition, financial resources and institutional/athletic department support were cited most often as key identifiers in recognizing the marketing leaders. Relationship with sponsors was the fourth most frequently mentioned factor while almost all of those responses explicitly stated the relationship of the University of Oregon (Eugene) with Nike, whose headquarters is in nearby Portland, Oregon.

To take a closer look at what those schools have in common, a tradition of winning and hosting competition is of great relevance. Each of those six schools has won an NCAA team championship in the past ten years with 28 of the last 40 NCAA team championships (men/women, indoor/outdoor in the past ten years) won by those six
identified schools (NCAA, 2013). Each of those schools hosts a large regular season relay invitational that attracts top-tier talent each year, and all except the University of Florida have hosted a national championship in the last decade. All of those schools, with the exception of the University of Oregon, are located in the Southeastern area of the United States which is of great consequence for year-round training of track and field athletes as well as hosting large meets that attract schools from the Northeast and Midwest parts of the country with colder weather. Additionally, each of these programs has been represented in the past two Summer Olympic Games. These track programs are known around the world for producing, harboring, and developing world class talent. The mixture of the aforementioned factors produces a “formula” for a winning brand to attract talent and market a successful program.

A Successful Marketing Formula

Brand recognition was the most frequently cited factor contributing to the marketing success of these identified leaders. Past research holds that building the brand image should be a primary objective for any sports entity (Lee, Miloch, Kraft, & Tatum, 2008; Cooper, 2012). One way to do that is to build an effective marketing plan. Literature suggests that a specific, strategic marketing plan which targets the wants and needs of the stakeholders for each program is important in the success of branding a program (Lowman & Bixby, 2001; Leonhardt, 2011). Coaches agree that these programs are able to appeal to their audience because they know the demographics and tendencies of their stakeholders.

Success is a major factor identified by coaches in stakeholder’s desire to associate with a program through attendance or giving. These leaders in marketing have traditions
of winning championships which has been proven to be a strong self-esteem function for fans and spectators (Cialdini, Borden, Thorne, Walker, Freeman, & Sloan, 1976). A culture of winning creates the demand for hosting meets and camps which will attract top-tier athletes to the campus as well as potential recruits. Not only does this give coaches an opportunity to market their program, but it can provide a supplemental source of revenue.

Viewed through the lens of resource allocation theory, the sport of track and field, specifically Division I currently offers only a small number of programs that can create enough demand through brand equity, success, and national exposure from world-class talent/performances that stakeholders (sponsors) would be willing to invest in the product (home competition, budget subsidization) thereby generating revenue (Smith, 2007). It is through the “winning formula” (regional location, conference affiliation, facilities to host large meets, attracting national recruits, and producing Olympians) that stakeholders want to be associated with the brand by way of financial contributions. Even though smaller, less successful programs might not have the recognizable brand or home competition to garner corporate relationships, any local entities that choose to align with the program can strengthen the brand equity and add value to a program in the eyes of the athletic administration (Aaker, 1991). This demand-based model can create enough justification for an athletic department to not only sponsor, but provide adequate resources for a nonrevenue program decreasing the likelihood of track and field programs being eliminated (Weight, 2010).

Despite the wide array of resources across Division I track and field programs the entrepreneurial coach can take relationship marketing practices and implement them into
their plan to reach consumers and build long-term relationships that could lead to demand for their program on campus and in the community (Wedgeworth, 2000; Leonhardt, 2011). Relationships are likely to become long-term and endure when the values of the institution, program, and coach align with the stakeholder (Bee & Kahle, 2006). Success and resources may change from year to year but each program has the ability and responsibility to connect to alumni, fans, administrators and the local community in order to enhance the brand and experience associated with their program and ultimately avoid elimination (Cooper, 2012).

**Modifications to the Core Product**

Coaches only rated two modifications to the core product of track and field above neutral: shortening the length of daily competition and scoring of post-season championships. T-testing produced no significant finding which would lead one to postulate that coaches believe the core product needs to be changed in structure. However, the organization of daily competition signaled a significant finding among coaching staff members who take part in the marketing of their program. Suggestions to tackle the long, drawn out competition day include separating the elite athletes (shorter segment) from the majority (long segment) to create a two-part meet in which spectators can practice decision-making in choosing their preference. Since one of the strengths of the sport is its high participation levels, coaches can still promote inclusiveness for each competitor despite varied levels of talent, and student-athletes can take advantage of valuable competition experience. The strengths of the sport do not have to be threatened by a shortened schedule if programs implement this split-day structure.
Creating Demand for Track and Field

The sport of track and field has many opportunities to maintain interest and demand between Olympic years. According to feedback from the respondents, each program must successfully promote the sport on their campus in order to gain national exposure. The two most frequently identified enhancements involved modifying and improving the team scoring of regular season meets and creating a spectator friendly competition format. One FBS coach believes that once regular season competitions have a win or lose outcome in which fans can track as the meet progresses, fans and spectators will become more engaged in each event despite the length of competition or down time through the day (Respondent 48). When established rivalries from basketball and football can be played out on the track, programs have a better chance at gaining public interest. Any school can implement changes because there is no cost associated with changing the scoring format.

This scoring adjustment will add to the spectator-friendly environment as long as spectators are educated about the scoring system, kept up to date as the competition progresses, and given measurements in feet/inches as opposed to the widely used metric system (Respondent 15). The environment can also be enhanced with a thorough marketing plan that adapts to the facility, demographics of the spectators and nature of the competition (Bee & Kahle, 2006).

Increasing and improving television coverage for track and field was mentioned frequently as a means to create demand for the sport. Some of the solutions highlighted an improved marketing of personalities, more knowledgeable announcers presenting the product on television and showing a variety of events during broadcasts (Respondent 40).
In order for a product to bring to the market it must bring an audience and the sport has not proven it can do that. Attendance has dropped in recent national championships and the event has not been hosted in a top-10 market since 1976 (Perelman, 2011). The emergence of subscription based websites that provide live race content will continue to be a reliable indicator of the commitment of the sport’s followers. If a network can see value in producing the content and justify the costs by the amount of viewers it attracts, the sport may begin to find its way into homes all across America.

**Limitations & Future Research**

This study relied on the opinions and perceptions of the most knowledgeable Division I coach on each staff as it pertains to marketing and fundraising, however it is hard to measure who this individual would be on each staff, so it is possible that there were some respondents with little knowledge of marketing practices related to their program and/or the sport. It would be useful to expand the research to the other divisions of the NCAA. Due to variation in size, budget, and resources of the Division I membership institutions it is hard to apply each strategy to every program. However, the results from this study could form a solid foundation for future research on intercollegiate track and field.

Analyzing individual track and field program marketing plans in a case-study format could provide concrete examples of specific objectives and action steps to proactively target their consumer base. As program eliminations have become prevalent the last decade, it could be beneficial to perform a longitudinal study to document the challenges and threats of a program that is facing elimination (ex. University of
Maryland) while learning how to overcome such obstacles given fundraising ultimatums from athletic department administration.

**Conclusion**

At the core of creating demand for a nonrevenue program is the cultivation of relationships. It is through the never-ending practice of connecting with people and effectively communicating the values and importance of your program that economic challenges do not become threats to the program’s existence. Coaches that recognize the close relationship between marketing and fundraising will achieve the most success. The financial success of a program is a team effort from the student-athletes and coaches to the administrators and stakeholders. As Coach #55 pointed out of marketing leader, University of Oregon, “they involved a vast array of people and invest in the infrastructure attain success as a program.” When coaches take this team approach to their program’s sustainability, they should have little concern about elimination.
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. What is your coaching position title?
   A. Head Coach
   B. Assistant Coach
   C. Graduate Assistant
   D. Other (please specify)

2. What is your conference affiliation for track and field?

3. What teams does your athletic department sponsor (mark all that apply)?
   A. Women’s Indoor
   B. Women’s Outdoor
   C. Men’s Indoor
   D. Men’s Outdoor

4. Who is responsible for marketing your sport (mark all that apply)?
   A. Athletic department marketing staff
   B. Track and field coaching staff
   C. External marketing (example: IMG, Learfield Sports)
   D. Other (please specify)

5. What is your track and field program’s marketing budget as allotted by your athletic department?
   A. Under $1,000
   B. $1,000-$2,999
   C. $3,000-$4,999
   D. $5,000-$6,999
   E. Over $7,000

6. What is your age?
   A. 20-29
   B. 30-39
   C. 40-49
   D. Over 50

7. How important do you think it is to your athletic department administration that the following occur for your program?
   Likert Scale (1-Not important, 2-slightly important, 3-Neutral, 4-Moderately Important, 5-very important)
   A. Marketing
   B. Fundraising

8. How useful do you think the following strategies are to garner stakeholder support?
Likert Scale (1-Not at all useful, 2-Slightly useful, 3-Somewhat useful, 4-Moderately useful, 5-Extremely useful)

A. Maintaining team Facebook
B. Maintaining a Twitter account
C. Uploading videos of competition and interviews on Youtube or institutional website
D. Performing community service as a team
E. Sending newsletters to alumni
F. Making available printed supplementary materials (posters, schedule cards)
G. Maintaining team website
H. Sending text messages to stakeholders
I. Providing regular program updates (results, upcoming competitions)
J. Hosting summer camps and clinics
K. Participating in community outreach events (such as Special Olympics, after-school programs, Hospital visits, etc.)
L. Hosting home competitions/invitationals
M. Other (please specify)

9. What fundraising strategies are implemented by leading NCAA Division I track and field coaches to support the sustainability of their program?

Likert Scale (1-Not at all useful, 2-Slightly useful, 3-Somewhat useful, 4-Moderately useful, 5-Extremely useful)

A. Maintaining an up-to-date contact database
B. Maintaining communication with donors
C. Special Giving Campaigns
D. Allowing special interactions with coaches/athletes
E. Benefits for individuals who give
F. Ticket benefits to donors
G. Thank you notes/gifts
H. Hosting home competitions
I. Gaining corporate sponsorships
J. Other (please specify)

10. In your opinion what NCAA Division I track and field programs are leaders in marketing practices?

11. What makes them leaders?
12. How useful do you think the following modifications could be to enhance the appeal of stakeholders to the sport of Division I track and field? Likert Scale (1-Not at all useful, 2-Slightly useful, 3-Somehwat useful, 4-Moderately useful, 5- Extremely useful)

A. Shortening the length of daily competition  
B. Modifying the order of events within a competition  
C. Shortening the length of the regular season  
D. Scoring of post–season championships  
E. Modifying qualifying procedures for National Championships (Indoor season- Descending order list)  
F. Modifying qualifying procedures for Regional Championships (Outdoor season- Top 12 in each event from Regionals)  
G. Other (please specify)

13. In your opinion, what are some ways to create and maintain demand for track and field in between Olympic years on the intercollegiate level?
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