

A STUDY OF THE OPINIONS OF IVY LEAGUE MEN'S BASKETBALL STUDENT-
ATHLETES AND COACHES ON A POTENTIAL POST-SEASON CONFERENCE
TOURNAMENT

ANDREW A. POGACH

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of
Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill
2006

Approved by

Advisor: Nathan Tomasini, Ph. D.

Reader: Barbara Osborne, Esq.

Reader: Ed Shields, Ph. D.

© 2006
Andrew A. Pogach
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Andrew A. Pogach: A Study of the Opinions of Ivy League Men's Basketball Student-Athletes and Coaches on a Potential Post-Season Conference Tournament
(Under the direction of Dr. Nathan Tomasini)

The Ivy League is the only NCAA Division I conference that does not sponsor a basketball post season championship. Missed class time and increased expenses were cited as the main reasons why a tournament has not been held in the past. Student-athletes and coaches of all eight Ivy men's basketball teams completed surveys asking questions on whether they favored adding a conference tournament. Overall, 76% were in favor of a post-season tournament, and most believed the addition of a tournament would provide an opportunity for additional games (84%) and increased television exposure (82%), while not jeopardizing academic success (67%). Coaches and student-athletes selected having each tournament game played on individual campus sites as their most preferable tournament location (53%). A traditional eight-team bracket with no byes was their most favorable tournament format option (59%).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the following people for their assistance in the completion in this project. Steve Donahue, Head Men's Basketball Coach at Cornell University for his tireless efforts in reminding the Ivy basketball coaches how important the surveys were to this study. Fran Dunphy, Head Men's Basketball Coach at the University of Pennsylvania for his interest and encouragement. The coaches and student-athletes of the eight Ivy men's basketball teams for taking the time to complete the surveys. My thesis committee for their hard work, comments and suggestions that helped shape this project. Finally, my parents for their love and support throughout this year-long process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Purpose.....	4
Research Questions.....	4
Hypotheses.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	5
Assumptions.....	6
Limitations.....	6
Delimitations.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
This History of the NCAA, College Basketball, and the NCAA Tournament.....	10
The History of the Ivy League and Ivy League Basketball.....	13
The History of Conference Tournaments.....	21
The Finances of the NCAA and the Media Exposure Associated with the NCAA Tournament.....	26
Missed Class Time and Athletics.....	34
III. METHODOLOGY.....	38
Subjects.....	38

	Instrumentation.....	39
	Procedures / Protocol.....	40
	Data Analysis.....	41
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	43
	Subjects.....	43
	Research Question 1.....	44
	Research Question 2.....	47
	Research Question 3.....	52
	Research Question 4.....	55
	Research Question 5.....	65
	Research Question 6.....	67
	Research Question 7.....	76
V.	DISCUSSION OF THE DATA.....	79
	Subjects.....	79
	Research Question 1.....	80
	Research Question 2.....	82
	Research Question 3.....	86
	Research Question 4.....	87
	Research Question 5.....	93
	Research Question 6.....	95
	Research Question 7.....	99
	Conclusion.....	100
	Future Research.....	102

IV.	APPENDIX A: Tournaments from Five Similar Conferences.....	104
V.	APPENDIX B: 2005 Division I Conference Tournaments.....	120
VI.	APPENDIX C: Current Ivy League Championship Events.....	129
VII.	APPENDIX D: Survey.....	133
VIII.	APPENDIX E: Letter to Head Coach With Survey.....	140
IX.	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	141

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Ivy League Men's Basketball Championships by School.....	18
Table 2	Ivy League Men's Basketball Playoff Games.....	20
Table 3	Student-Athletes by School and Class.....	39
Table 4	Coaches by School and Position.....	39
Table 5	Subjects by School and Class.....	44
Table 6	Survey Rate of Return by School and Class.....	44
Table 7	Approval Level of a Post-season Tournament by School.....	46
Table 8	Approval Level of a Post-season Tournament by Class.....	46
Table 9	Mean Rating of the Importance of Factors Concerning a Post-season Tournament (by school).....	48
Table 10	Mean Rating of the Importance of Factors Concerning a Post-season Tournament (by class).....	49
Table 11	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by School.....	51
Table 12	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by Class.....	51
Table 13	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by Approval Level of a Post-season Tournament.....	52
Table 14	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by School.....	54
Table 15	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by Class.....	55
Table 16	Mean Rating of the Agreement Level of Statements Compared and Ranked by Approval Level of a Post-season Tournament.....	55
Table 17	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site (by school).....	56

Table 18	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site (by class).....	57
Table 19	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Rotated Annually at Each of the Eight Schools (by school).....	58
Table 20	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Rotated Annually at Each of the Eight Schools (by class).....	58
Table 21	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at the Site of the Regular Season Champion (by school).....	59
Table 22	Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at the Site of the Regular Season Champion (by class).....	60
Table 23	Approval Level of the Tournament Quarter-finals and Semi-finals at a Neutral Site and the Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed (by school).....	61
Table 24	Approval Level of the Tournament Quarter-finals and Semi-finals at a Neutral Site and the Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed (by class).....	61
Table 25	Approval Level of the Tournament Entirely at Campus Sites with the Higher Seed Hosting each Game (by school).....	62
Table 26	Approval Level of the Tournament Entirely at Campus Sites with the Higher Seed Hosting each Game (by class).....	63
Table 27	Approval Level of the top Two Seeds Host 2-Four Team Tournaments with the Winners Meeting in the Championship Game (by school).....	64
Table 28	Approval Level of the top Two Seeds Host 2-Four Team Tournaments with the Winners Meeting in the Championship Game (by class).....	64
Table 29	Approval Level of each of the Six Tournament Location Options.....	65
Table 30	Tournament Location Options Ranking (by school).....	67
Table 31	Tournament Location Options Ranking (by class).....	67
Table 32	Approval Level of an 8-Team Bracket with No Byes (by school).....	69
Table 33	Approval Level of an 8-Team Bracket with No Byes (by class).....	69

Table 34	Approval Level of a 6-Team Bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving Byes into the Semi-finals (by school).....	70
Table 35	Approval Level of a 6-Team Bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving Byes into the Semi-finals (by class).....	71
Table 36	Approval Level of an 8-Team Bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving Double-byes into the Semi-finals (by school).....	72
Table 37	Approval Level of an 8-Team Bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving Double-byes into the Semi-finals (by class).....	72
Table 38	Approval Level of a 4-Team Bracket with the Top Four Regular Season Finishers (by school).....	74
Table 39	Approval Level of a 4-Team Bracket with the Top Four Regular Season Finishers (by class).....	74
Table 40	Acceptability of Each Tournament Format Option (by school).....	75
Table 41	Acceptability of Each Tournament Format Option (by class).....	76
Table 42	Impact of a Conference Tournament on the Basketball Operating Budget, Non-Conference Scheduling and Recruiting.....	78
Table 43	Ivy League Regular Season Finish from 2001-2005.....	80
Table A1	America East Conference Tournament Results 1996-2005.....	107
Table A2	Colonial Athletic Association Tournament Results 1996-2005.....	110
Table A3	MAAC Conference Tournament Results 1996-2005.....	113
Table A4	Northeast Conference Tournament Results 1996-2005.....	116
Table A5	Patriot League Men's Basketball Conference Tournament Results.....	119
Table B1	2005 Division I Conference Tournaments.....	125

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Ivy League is a unique athletic conference with rules and regulations that separate it from all other Division I conferences. One major difference is the Ivy League is the only Division I conference that does not hold a postseason men's basketball tournament. While all other 30 Division I conferences send their conference tournament winner to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) basketball tournament as their conference champion, the Ivy League sends its regular season champion as its conference champion. Another major difference that separates the Ivy League is their prowess for academic success. In 2006, all eight Ivy institutions are ranked among the top fifteen in the *US News and World Report America's Best Colleges 2006* (America's Best Colleges, 2005).

For the "Power Conferences" that regularly send multiple teams to the NCAA tournament; the conference tournament is not as decisive as it is for a conference such as the Ivy League, which has never sent more than one team to the NCAA tournament. The Ivy League is a "one-bid league", a conference that has traditionally sent only its conference champion to the NCAA tournament. Conference tournaments for one-bid leagues have both positives and negatives for its participants. Student-athletes and coaches have expressed interest in a tournament because of the experience they will receive in a tournament atmosphere. It also could create more interest from prospective students as well as generate excitement on campus surrounding the sport. A post-season tournament could give the

conference revenue from having their games on television and the media exposure that follows (Frankel, 1995). While Ivy Presidents have examined this issue many times, they have decided against changing the policy concerning a postseason tournament because of their concern for missed class time, extra travel and added costs associated with a tournament (Frankel, 1995). The presidents continue to stress academics and the goal for their student-athletes to be “well-rounded people” (Jacobson, 2002, para. 5).

In most conferences in Division I, the conference tournament allows teams to compete for the conference championship in a tournament format regardless of their regular season record. While there are a few conferences that do not invite all teams because they want to keep travel down (Big Sky Conference) (Big Sky Q & A, n.d.), want to limit costs to the conference and its participants (Ohio Valley Conference) (D. Canada, personal communication, October 26, 2005), or want to protect the higher seeds to advance to the NCAA tournament (Southland Conference)(T. Cheatham, personal communication, October 26, 2005), 19 conferences invited all teams to participate in their 2005 conference tournament. The conference tournament benefits schools with a poor regular season record by giving them a second chance to play well and win their conference tournament and earn their way in to the NCAA tournament. While some conferences reward top finishes in regular season play with home tournament games (Horizon League, Big Sky Conference, America East Conference, The Patriot League, Big South Conference, Northeast Conference) or a bye into a later tournament round (Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, West Coast Conference, Big West Conference, Horizon League), these top finishers still need to win at least two games on the basketball court to claim the tournament championship.

Since the Ivy League does not hold a conference tournament, the team that has the best conference record at the completion of the regular season will represent the league in the NCAA tournament. This rewards the team that plays the best basketball over the longest period of time. However, teams that get off to a slow start may not have the opportunity to recover in time to compete for the regular season title. A school that is virtually eliminated from title contention halfway through the season does not have a second chance in the Ivy League.

While goals for each basketball team at the beginning of the year differ, winning the conference and advancing to the NCAA tournament is often the ultimate goal for “one-bid” programs similar to the Ivy League. Besides claiming a conference crown, playing in the NCAA tournament may increase revenue, media exposure, and increase applicants for participating schools. Schools such as Ball State University (Shaner, 2000) and Central Connecticut State University (Shaner, 2000) have received increased applications while Utah State University (Falk, 2004) and Butler University (Rovell 2003) have gained increased media exposure that comes with appearing in the NCAA men’s basketball tournament.

From 1989-2005, men’s basketball in the Ivy League has been dominated by two schools, the University of Pennsylvania (Penn) and Princeton University (Princeton). In addition, since 1970, Penn or Princeton has won the Ivy League every year except for two (1986 and 1988). The other six schools in the Ivy League have not earned the opportunity to participate in the NCAA tournament during this time span and may have a second chance to compete in the NCAA by winning a conference tournament. From 1997-2005, Harvard University, Dartmouth College, Brown University, Yale University and Cornell University have all finished in second place (Men’s Ivy League Basketball Champions, 2005).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to obtain opinions from Ivy League coaches and student-athletes regarding a potential Ivy League conference tournament including the factors that influence their decisions as well as opinions on tournament location and format options. Factors that may influence their decisions include the opportunity to compete in a tournament atmosphere, the opportunity to play additional games, the extra travel involved with a conference tournament and the additional missed class time involved with a conference tournament.

Research Questions

1. Are Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in favor of a post-season conference basketball tournament?
2. What factors are most important to Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in their decision on whether they are in favor of a post-season tournament?
3. Would the addition of a conference tournament lessen the importance of each regular season game and the regular season champion?
4. What tournament location options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?
5. What is the preferred tournament location for Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?
6. What tournament format options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?
7. According to Ivy League Coaches, what is the impact of a conference tournament on the basketball operating budget, non-conference scheduling and recruiting?

Hypotheses

All hypotheses will have a null hypothesis of H_0 = no relationship and H_1 = there is a relationship.

Definition of Terms

The Ivy League: A NCAA Division I athletic conference sponsoring 33 championships.

Each of the eight following schools do not offer athletic scholarships.

Brown University, Providence, RI

Columbia University, New York, NY

Cornell University, Ithaca, NY

Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

Princeton University, Princeton, NJ

Yale University, New Haven, CT

Automatic bid: The winners of each of the 31 Division I conferences receive an automatic bid to the NCAA tournament. This is given to the conference tournament champion in 30 conferences and the regular season winner in the Ivy League

At-large bid: The NCAA men's basketball committee chooses 34 schools to join the 31 conference champions who receive automatic bids in the NCAA tournament. These at-large schools can come from any conference and are selected on criteria such as winning percentage and strength of schedule.

Conference tournament: A post-season basketball tournament in which members of a conference compete to determine the automatic bid to the NCAA tournament

Major Conferences: The 11 conferences that comprise Division I-A football which include the 6 Power Conferences (defined below) as well as Conference USA, Mid-American Conference, Mountain West Conference, Sun Belt Conference and Western Athletic Conference (WAC). The Atlantic Ten Conference is also considered a Major Conference for the sport of basketball.

Power Conferences: The six former “BCS” conferences: Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), Big East Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big 12 Conference, Pacific Ten Conference (Pac-10) and Southeastern Conference (SEC).

NCAA Tournament: Division I men’s basketball tournament containing 65 schools from 31 athletic conferences across the country.

Neutral Site: A location for a conference tournament that is not on the campus of any of the eight conference schools

One-bid League: This is an unofficial term given to Division I conferences that usually send only their conference champion to the NCAA tournament.

Assumptions

1. All subjects were honest in reporting their opinions regarding an Ivy League conference tournament and the factors surrounding their choices.
2. Each student-athlete and coach was not influenced in their opinions by athletic administrators or other members of the community.

Limitations

This study was limited by:

1. Varying knowledge about the subject matter by student-athletes and coaches.

2. The day the survey is to be administered, not all subjects may be able to attend. If that is the case, the survey will be attempted to be administered at another time.
3. Each school will have varying numbers of players and staff members. For instance, Harvard has just 2 assistants while Columbia, Penn and Princeton have 3 assistants and a Director of Basketball Operations.

Delimitations

The study was delimited to:

1. Men's basketball student-athletes and coaching staff members from each of the eight Ivy League institutions. This number is approximately 146 and will fluctuate depending on the number of student-athletes on each team's roster.
2. Each survey question will have a Likert scale with answer choices from 1-5 depending on how strongly each subject agrees or disagrees with a question.
3. The surveys will be mailed to the head coach of each school and will be administered at each school by the coaching staff.

Significance of the Study

This study may be significant because the results of the surveys may quantify opinions of student-athletes and coaching staff members in regards to a post-season conference tournament. These results will aid athletic administrators and conference officials in their decision to consider a post-season tournament. While articles in *Sports Illustrated* (Wahl, 2002) and university student newspapers (Bochner, 2005; Burrick; 2004; Krishnamurthy, 2005) have been written about this topic, the opinions published have been mainly those of coaches, administrators and university presidents. The results of this study

may help influence a decision from conference officials and university administration on conducting an Ivy League conference tournament.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter, the researcher reviewed the literature regarding a possible Ivy League conference tournament. Research focused on the NCAA, the history of college basketball and the Ivy League as well as post-season tournaments in other conferences.

This chapter has five sections. The first section provides a history of the NCAA and college basketball including a timeline of the history of the organization and current status and goals. In addition, this section will focus on the NCAA's decision to restructure the organization into Divisions I, II, and III and then further divide into Divisions I-A, AA and AAA. Finally, this section will examine how college basketball and the NCAA men's basketball tournament have risen to the billion dollar enterprise that it is today.

The second section includes an examination of the current structure of the Ivy League, including the basic principles on which the League was founded, the proud history it represents, and Ivy-specific rules that help explain the reasons the conference does not sponsor a post-season tournament. In addition, this section includes member athletic accomplishments of the past to their accomplishments of today. This chapter also studies the history of Ivy League basketball including the play-off games that have occurred when two or more teams have finished tied for first place in the regular season.

The third section examines conference tournaments in other leagues in NCAA Division I. It describes the problems and decision-making that led the Pacific Ten (Pac-10) and Big Ten conferences to add post-season tournaments.

The fourth section researches the finances and media exposure of the NCAA and conference tournaments. It explains the widening gap between the power conferences and conferences such as the Ivy League in Division I-AA. This section examines the financial data of NCAA conferences as well as the basketball fund that has resulted from the \$6 billion deal between the NCAA and CBS. This section also studies the media exposure associated with the NCAA basketball tournament including leagues and schools that have benefited from the exposure associated with making a trip to the NCAA tournament. Finally, this section details the media attention the Ivy League has received in regards to being the only conference without a post-season tournament.

The fifth section examines the academic aspect of college sports and the impact of missed class time on athletes. This section includes a study on the academic treatment of athletes vs. non-athletes, opinions by Ivy League student-athletes and administrators on the current Ivy-specific rules as well as a review of what Division II has decided to do with their conference tournaments in order to lessen missed class time for their student-athletes.

The History of the NCAA, College Basketball and the NCAA Tournament

The History of the NCAA

On March 31, 1906, the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS) was formed by 62 colleges looking to create reforms in college athletics. Four years later, this group changed their name to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) as it is known in 2005. The IAAUS was originally formed to discuss football rules

after many colleges and universities dropped the sport because of serious injuries and deaths to its participants (The History of the NCAA, n.d.). By 1921, the first NCAA championship was held in the sport of Track and Field and more committees involving different sports were being formed within the organization. In the late 1940's member institutions began to see issues arising revealing inequities among the schools in the areas of financial aid, recruiting, and the televising of games. It became necessary for the NCAA to maintain control and implement rules to keep order among its constituents (The History of the NCAA, n.d.). In 1951, Walter Byers was named the first executive director of the NCAA and a national headquarters was established in Kansas City, MO.

In 1973, the NCAA was divided into three divisions for legislative and competitive purposes, Divisions I, II, and III (Historical Outline, n.d.). In 1978, Division I divided into three groups, I-A, I-AA and I-AAA. Divisions I-A and I-AA consisted of football playing schools with I-AA schools having strong athletic programs but not major football programs. Division I-AAA were Division I caliber athletic programs that did not sponsor football (Division I, n.d.). With this restructuring, Division I schools were given the majority of the seats on the major committees overseeing the organization. The NCAA Executive Committee is comprised of 19 members of which six are not from Division I schools. In 2005, the Executive Committee consisted of nine Division I-A members, two members from each of Division I-AA and I-AAA and three members from each of Division II and III (Executive Committee n.d.).

Today in 2006, the NCAA is headquartered in Indianapolis under the leadership of President Dr. Myles Brand. The NCAA is the governing body of more than 1200 institutions across the United States. It is a voluntary organization with the purpose of “maintaining

intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body (NCAA Manual, 2005, p. 1).” The NCAA has an extensive legislative structure with cabinets and committees comprised of member and conference representatives that are responsible for implementing intercollegiate championships, supervising the conduct of its members, publishing rules of their sports, preserving athletic records and legislating new rules and bylaws. In addition to these roles, the NCAA has an extensive legislative structure with cabinets and committees comprised of member schools (NCAA Manual, 2005 p. 1).

The History of College Basketball

The game of basketball was invented by Dr. James Naismith in Springfield, MA in 1892. Colleges and universities quickly adopted the sport and it was not long until intercollegiate basketball games were being played on college campuses. The first intercollegiate basketball game took place on February 9, 1895 in a contest between Hamline College and the Minnesota State School of Agriculture (College Basketball History, n.d.). In the first few years after the game was invented, teams had anywhere between seven to nine players on the court at once. It was not until 1896 when the University of Chicago played the University of Iowa that five players from each team were on the court at the same time (College Basketball History, n.d.). While many schools fielded basketball teams in the early 1900s, the first NCAA Men’s Basketball Tournament was held in 1939 with the national championship being won by the University of Oregon beating the Ohio State University 46 – 33 (College Basketball History, n.d.). The first televised collegiate basketball game took place in 1940 at New York’s Madison Square Garden (College Basketball History, n.d.). Today, college basketball generates the most revenue for the NCAA. In November of 1999,

the NCAA signed an 11-year, \$6 billion agreement with CBS to broadcast the men's basketball tournament as well as other championship events (NCAA, CBS Reach 11-year, \$6 billion agreement, 1999). The agreement began with the 2002-03 academic year and contains an average payout of \$545 million per year. The contract also included telecast, marketing, championship publication, internet, championship radio and licensing rights (1999).

The History of the Ivy League and Ivy League Basketball

The History of the Ivy League

In February of 1954, the Presidents of each of the eight Ivy schools signed an Ivy Group Agreement for all intercollegiate sports. These eight presidents wanted “the observance of common practices in academic standards and eligibility requirements and the administration of need-based financial aid, with no athletic scholarships (Ivy League Historical Timeline, n.d., para 2)” In 2005, the Ivy League sponsors championships in 33 sports and the average number of sports offered per school is 35. The Ivy League schools “approach athletics as a key part of the students’ regular undergraduate experience” with rigorous academic standards, some of the nations highest four year graduation rates and doing this all without athletic scholarships” (What is the Ivy League, 2005, para. 3). Each of the eight schools admits their student-athletes on the basis of academic achievement and their potential as students at the school. There are no athletic scholarships awarded in the Ivy League, only need-based financial aid. According to the Ivy League Admissions Statement, the League “Admits all candidates including athletes on the basis of their achievements and potential as students and on their other personal accomplishments” (Admissions Statement, 2005, para. 3).

While there are many rules and restrictions that schools in the NCAA must abide by, the Ivy League also has regulations its schools must adhere to. The Ivy League has not always adopted changes made by the NCAA. In 1971, the Ivy League became the last conference in the country to endorse freshmen eligibility. It was not until 1991 that the league allowed its freshmen to play on the varsity football team (Ivy League Historical Timeline, n.d.). In June, 2002 the Ivy Presidents decided to make additional rule changes. The first rule introduced, effective during the 2002-2003 season, was known as the “Seven Week Rule”. This rule forced each athletic team at an Ivy League school to pick seven weeks during the school year in which there would be no athletic related requirements. This is in addition to the NCAA mandated one day off per week as well as the limit of twenty hours of athletic activity per week (Council of Ivy Group Presidents, 2002). The rule was implemented by the Ivy Presidents because they said that athletes are not taking advantage of other opportunities around campus if they are spending the majority of their time on the playing field (Jacobson, 2002). David T. Roach, athletic director at Brown University said that athletes are already well-rounded and that they do have the time to participate in other activities citing a Brown baseball player who has acted in two plays on campus (Jacobson, 2002).

The seven-week rule is not the only Ivy specific rule that sets that conference apart from the rest of the NCAA. Another specific rule is the lack of post-season opportunities for football teams. While other Division I-AA conferences are able to send their champion to the annual championship tournament, the Ivy League does not. This rule was implemented in 1951 and has been an issue with Ivy coaches and administrators (Fiss, 2004). The presidents of the eight Ivy institutions have not changed this rule primarily because of

concern of the semester exam period that falls during the I-AA championship tournament (Fiss, 2004). Administrators are also concerned that allowing their football teams to participate in a post-season event would increase the pressures put on the student-athletes and could hinder their academic performance (Fiss, 2004). Coaches and athletic directors have fought this rule to no avail. Princeton athletic director Gary Walters feels that with the creation of I-AA football many of the presidents' issues have been addressed. He stated, "The Patriot League, who embraces our educational and athletic philosophy and who provides the bulk of our non-league schedule, not only participates in the playoffs but also saw a team advance to the national championship game a year ago" (Fiss, 2004, para. 6). Equity is also a concern for Ivy football coaches. Princeton coach Roger Hughes commented, "I just don't see how they can justify not having it when every other sport in the league can go. Certainly, if they want football to be treated like all the other sports, they should treat it like all the other sports and have post season play" (Fiss, 2004, para. 10).

Two other rules have impacted football teams and the personnel involved with that sport. Effective with the class of 2007, football teams can only have 120 recruited student-athletes, down from 140 and the number of football coaches employed decrease to seven full-time and three part-time, down from six full-time and six part-time (Council of Ivy Group Presidents, 2002). While Ivy football teams compete at the NCAA Division I-AA level, they face significant challenges when playing non-conference games against schools without these Ivy imposed restrictions.

While the Ivy League states they have traditional academic values, in 2000, Brown University violated the principles of the Ivy Agreement when it was found that athletics department staff members and alumni awarded scholarship money from outside sources to

several student-athletes (Tran, 2000). While no individual student-athletes were punished, the Ivy League placed sanctions on Brown's men's basketball, volleyball, men's soccer and football teams. The football team was not eligible to win the 2000 Ivy League championship, recruiting visit funding was cut by 25% for the aforementioned sports and recruiting classes were limited for football (Tran, 2000). While the NCAA had conducted their own investigation into this matter and had ruled that Brown's self-imposed sanctions were enough, the Council of Ivy Presidents did not agree, stating the "Brown athletic staff breached this pact (Ivy League agreement) when coaches from the various teams contacted outside sources for financial awards (Tran, 2000). These violations affected the recruiting practices of the teams involved and prohibited the football team from defending its Ivy League title.

Ivy League universities have a history of athletics dating back to the 1800s. Harvard and Yale competed in the first intercollegiate event on August 3, 1852 when the two schools rowed against each other in New Hampshire (Harvard Athletic Firsts, n.d.). Other notable firsts for Harvard include the first baseball catcher's mask used in 1877, the first spring football practice in 1889 and the first football scoreboard in 1893. Joseph Clark, a Harvard tennis player won the first intercollegiate tennis championship in 1883 and James Connolly won the first gold medal of the modern Olympics in Athens in 1896 (Harvard Athletic Firsts, n.d.). In 2004-05, Princeton University had a noteworthy year in their athletic program. They sent four teams to NCAA tournament Final Fours, tying UCLA and Stanford for the most in Division I (2004-05 Year in Review, 2005). Their women's soccer team was the first Ivy athletic team in any sport to reach the Final Four of a 64-team tournament. A Princeton

team or student-athlete has won a national championship for 19 straight years (2004-05 Year in Review, 2005).

The History of Ivy League Basketball.

Ivy League basketball began play in the 1955-56 school year (Men's Basketball Ivy League Champions, 2005). According to attendance figures, men's basketball along with football and ice hockey are the three most attended sports on Ivy League campuses.. In the 2004-2005 season, Ivy League schools averaged 2,101 fans per home game ranking them 23rd of 31 NCAA Division I basketball conferences. This includes both Penn (4,620) and Princeton (4,156) topping the 4,000 fan mark (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). Ivy schools are also starting to schedule games against nationally ranked teams. In 2004-2005, the other six schools have joined Penn and Princeton in playing teams ranked in the top 25 in national polls.

Penn and Princeton have combined for 48 of the 58 championships won in men's basketball. This includes years the title was shared by two or more teams. Since 1968, there have only been two years in which Penn or Princeton has failed to win the title and the last time that happened was in 1988 (Men's Ivy League Basketball Champions, 2005). Table 1 illustrates the dominance by Penn and Princeton in the number of Ivy basketball titles won. Besides Yale's co-championship in 2002, Penn or Princeton has won every league title since 1988.

Table 1:

<i>Ivy League Men's Basketball Championships by School</i>		
School	Number of Championships	Last Championship
Princeton	25	2004
Pennsylvania	23	2005
Yale	4	2002 (tie)
Dartmouth	3	1959
Brown	1	1986
Columbia	1	1968
Cornell	1	1988
Harvard	0	N/A

Note: Data compiled from the Men's Ivy League Basketball Champions Website, 2005.

Seven times in Ivy history there has been an event that resembles a league championship game. In years in which two or more teams tie for the regular season crown, there has been a one-game playoff held at a neutral site. In 1959, Dartmouth won the first Ivy playoff with a 69-68 victory over Princeton in a game held at Yale University. There have been two-way ties at the top of the Ivy standings in 1963, 1968, 1980, 1981, and 1996.

The last time there was a first place tie was in 2002, when for the first time in league history, there was a three-way tie at the top of the standings. Yale, Princeton and Penn all finished the season 11-3 and entered a three-team playoff to determine the Ivy's automatic bid to the NCAA tournament. This two-game, three-team, three-day mini-tournament was a big moment in Ivy basketball history. League executive Jeff Orleans and his staff had to operate with the playoff in a short amount of time as the first playoff game was scheduled just two days after a Penn victory over Princeton in the final regular season game clinching the three-way tie. On Thursday, March 5 2002, Yale defeated Princeton at the Palestra in Philadelphia to advance to the championship game against Penn. The Quakers earned the bye to the finals based on their 3-1 combined record against the other two squads. The

championship game on Saturday, March 7th, drew a sold out crowd of 3,651 in Lafayette College's Kirby Fieldhouse in Easton, PA (Ivy League Men's Basketball Playoff Games, n.d.). Penn ended up defeating Yale and advanced to the NCAA tournament. The three-team event gave the Ivy League office good practice for championship tournament administration. There were many issues the league office had to face including television rights, costs and revenues, as well as site location. Two years later, the Ivy League was faced with a similar situation. With only two weeks left in the regular season, four schools were in contention for the title and the unthinkable four-way playoff scenario was discussed in the Ivy League office. David Burrick, (2004) a *Daily Pennsylvanian* sports writer examined many of the issues the league faced when dealing with a potential multi-team playoff. The YES Network, a television station based in New York City held first rights to any playoff game since they had broadcast league games each weekend and had a regular season contract with the league. Executive Jeff Orleans announced that any revenue associated with the tournament would be split evenly among all eight of the Ivy schools. The biggest issue surrounding a potential playoff resided in the actual location of the games. Sites such as Lehigh, Lafayette, Stony Brook and even professional arenas in Bridgeport, CT and Trenton, NJ were all booked with events for the weekend in which the tournament would be played (Burrick, 2004). Princeton ended up winning the championship by three games over Penn and Brown and claimed the 2004 title outright. Between the 2002 three-way playoff and the potential 2004 multi-team tournament, the Ivy League has had a chance to experience postseason play. If the Ivy League ever decides to implement a post-season tournament, the 2002 three-way playoff may be the closest precedent they have to examine. Table 2 illustrates the location and final score of the eight Ivy League playoff games.

Table 2

Ivy League Men's Basketball Playoff Games

Date	Champion	Runner-up	Location
3/7/59	Dartmouth	Princeton	New Haven, CT
3/8/63	Princeton	Yale	Bronx, NY
3/5/68	Columbia	Princeton	Jamaica, NY
3/4/80	Penn	Princeton	Easton, PA
3/10/81	Princeton	Penn	Easton, PA
3/9/96	Princeton	Penn	Bethlehem, PA
3/5/02	Yale	Princeton	Philadelphia, PA
3/7/02	Penn	Yale	Easton, PA

Note: Data compiled from the Ivy League Men's Basketball Playoff Website, n.d.

Grant Wahl (2002) of *Sports Illustrated* in an article titled "For the Love of Ivy," explained that the history and philosophy behind the schools in the Ivy League has prevented a post-season tournament. Wahl (2002) stated league presidents have no interest in increased missed class time. While administrators, journalists and fans all have their opinions; the league coaches have expressed their own views publicly on the subject. Coach Fran Dunphy at the University of Pennsylvania has been a proponent of the tournament and even though his teams have won five of the last eight conference championships under the current format, Dunphy "wants to do what's best for the league" (Wahl, 2002, para.3). James Jones, head coach at Yale University, has also expressed his interest in a league tournament. He stated the tournament would bring increased exposure for the teams, recruiting opportunities and a chance to play on ESPN television. John Thompson III, former coach of Princeton University, had a different view of the way the Ivy League should run and agreed with the current format. He explained, "If you are going to send one team, you should send your best team over the length of the conference season" (Wahl 2002, para. 4). Thompson's reasoning

may be why proponents of the current system think it is still the best fit for the conference. In 49 years of Ivy basketball, no team from the league has won an at-large bid to the NCAA tournament.

The History of Conference Tournaments

During the 2004-2005 season, 330 colleges and universities representing 47 states participated in Division I NCAA basketball. These schools were divided into 31 conferences in which teams compete to become the conference champion and earn an automatic berth into the NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Championship Tournament. Each of the 31 NCAA Division I conferences are comprised of schools that consider themselves having similar geographic, financial and academic characteristics. While each conference receives an automatic berth, the teams from the "power" conferences receive most of the at-large selections (College Basketball History, n.d.).

The NCAA invites the champion of each of the 31 conferences as well as 34 "at-large" schools to their annual three-week tournament in mid-March. In 2005, thirty of the thirty-one Division I conferences held a post-season conference tournament to determine the conference champion and winner of the automatic berth into the NCAA tournament. In the 2005 NCAA tournament, 19 conferences sent only their conference champion, while 12 conferences sent their conference champions plus one or more "at-large" schools.

In 2005, the Ivy League is the only Division I conference that does not stage a post-season tournament. The winner after a double round-robin (a format in which each team plays the other teams in their conference both home and away) regular season is crowned the conference champion and has the right to represent the league in the NCAA tournament. No Ivy League team has ever received an at-large bid to the NCAA tournament. Like many of

its counterpart “one-bid leagues” winning the conference is the only way to participate in the NCAA tournament.

Prior to 2005, the Big Ten and Pacific 10 were the last two conferences to switch to a tournament format, in 1998 and 2002, respectively. Prior to hosting a conference tournament, the Big Ten Conference’s policy was because of missed class time and the strain of playing three games in three days (Decourcy, 1996). However, coaches complained their teams were not adequately prepared for the NCAA tournament and needed the conference tournament. The Big Ten coaches voted 9-2 in favor of a conference tournament. They stated the main benefits were increased revenues for the schools, a strong community and social gathering as a league, and playing in a “one and done” tournament, a format that the NCAA also uses for their championship, to get those jitters out of the way (Decourcy 1996). Tom Dienhart (1998) wrote in his *Sporting News* article titled “Winds of Change,” that the reason coaches wanted to go to a conference tournament in the Big Ten was because teams were not fairing so well in the NCAA tournament. The league was 7-10 in first round NCAA tournament games in the three years prior to the first tournament in 1998. Big Ten teams were considered “soft” in the NCAA’s because of a lack of a conference tournament. The Big Ten’s tournament, held annually at a neutral site, would bring in large crowds and would make a significant economic impact on the host city. It is estimated that each school would take home close to half a million dollars each year from the conference tournament (Dienhart, 1998).

Another reason the Big Ten coaches wanted a tournament was to try and maximize the number of league teams earning bids to the NCAA tournament (Decourcy, 1996). A so-called “bubble team” could make a strong run in the conference tournament and play their

way into the NCAA's. The Ivy League has never been in this situation because no Ivy school has ever been invited to the NCAA tournament as an at-large team.

The Pacific-Ten Conference brought back a conference tournament in 2002 after a twelve-year absence. The Pac-10 staged a tournament from 1987-1990 but it stopped because of poor crowds and a lack of fan interest (Gilmore, 2002). When the change was made, there was mixed emotions among conference coaches. Washington State head coach Paul Graham said, "It gives the have-not teams another opportunity to continue to be competitive. Without the tournament, when it's over, it's over. And sometimes the season is over for you in February. Having the tournament is good for our league and it's good for a team like Washington State because if things don't work out early in the league, you still have something else you can tell your players" (Okane, 2001, para.9). Some of the coaches of the more successful teams were not as happy with the decision. The coaches of Arizona and Stanford were the only two coaches to vote against the tournament when a vote was cast in 2000. "I don't think we're sending out the right message in terms of class attendance" said Lute Olson, coach of the University of Arizona (Okane, 2001, para.7). Mike Montgomery, coach at Stanford University, said his team skipped the pre-tournament press conference so his student-athletes could remain at school another day and take classes (Gilmore, 2002). Ben Braun, head coach at the University of California Berkeley, responded "If you're at the top of the league, you're probably not jumping up and down at the tournament because you're worried about such things as injuries or maybe losing a seeding. At the same time, it may provide that opportunity for a team that might be on the bubble" (Okane, 2001, para. 13). Most of the players were in favor of the tournament in part because of the television exposure from having every game being televised by Fox Sports Net (Okane, 2001).

Many of the same issues the Pac-10 dealt with when making the decision if they should bring back the post-season tournament are the same that the Ivy League would be dealing with. The Pac-10 coaches specifically mention missed class time and extra travel as two major issues. Arizona State head coach Rob Evans stated if there were no tournament, half of the teams would be on the road playing regular season games anyway (Okanes, 2001). Like the Big Ten conference, the addition of the Pac 10 conference post-season tournament was a big money maker for the conference and its teams. In 2002, the Pacific10 expected to receive close to \$2.5 million net after expenses. Each of the ten teams received an equal \$250,000 share. The league had in place a six-year deal with both the Staples Center in Los Angeles to host the event and Fox Sports Net to televise it (Okanes, 2001).

One of the arguments against holding an Ivy League tournament is because university officials do not believe schools would benefit financially. According to the NCAA's published report of 2005 Division I men's basketball attendance, the Big Ten led the country with an average of 12,530 fans at each game (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). They were one of four conferences to average over 10,000 fans per game. The Ivy League was 23rd on the list with an average of 2,101 fans per game. Of the Big Ten's eleven schools, all but Penn State and Northwestern averaged more than 10,000 fans per game and even Northwestern's league low of 4,825 fans per game was higher than the Ivy League's leader Penn at 4,620 fans per game (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). Big Ten games are usually on national television, while the Ivy League games are broadcast on smaller local networks. Since the Ivy League's attendance is near the bottom of Division I and they do not get the media

exposure of the power conferences, they cannot expect to bring in the same amount of revenue that a power conference does for their tournament.

Since no team from the league has received an at-large berth, the Ivy League is considered to be a “one-bid league”. This distinction is placed on the smaller conferences as being notorious for sending only the conference tournament champion to the NCAA tournament. Five of these conferences are geographically similar to the Ivy League and contain schools that play many non-conference games against Ivy teams. Each of the following five conferences have postseason tournaments and send just their tournament champion to the “Big Dance.” Each of the leagues have varying tournament formats and options that could serve as models for the Ivy League if they were to ever go to a postseason tournament.

Appendix A provides a study of five conferences similar to the Ivy League. The America East Conference, Colonial Athletic Association, Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference, Northeast Conference and Patriot League are all conferences from the northeastern part of the United States that all have their own conference tournament. Research was focused on the ten-year period between 1996-2005 on the format, location, results and future of these five conference tournaments. Appendix B examines all 30 Division I NCAA conference tournaments from the 2004-05 season. Each conference tournament’s format, location, and potential missed class time are detailed.

The Ohio Valley Conference and the Southland Conference are two one-bid leagues that do not invite their entire membership to the conference tournament. Donyale Canada, Director of Championships of the Ohio Valley Conference cites cost as the primary reason for only inviting the top eight regular season finishers to their conference tournament. She

states there would be extra costs to the conference for renting the Gaylord Entertainment Center in Nashville, TN and extra costs to the schools for per diem and travel expenses (D. Canada, personal communication, October 26, 2005). Dr. Tina Cheatham, Associate Commissioner of the Southland Conference states that finances are also the main reason that the Southland Conference invites only their top eight of 11 schools to compete in their post-season tournament. Dr. Cheatham cited six reasons that influenced their decision to limit the tournament to the top eight schools: costs of participant gifts, facility and operational costs, officiating costs, missing additional class, the protection of the higher seeds to advance to the NCAA tournament and also the fact that the lower seeded schools whose odds are not in favor of winning the tournament do not want to pay the trip costs of close to \$6,000 (T. Cheatham, personal communication, October 26, 2005).

The Finances of the NCAA and the Media Exposure Associated with the NCAA Tournament

The diversity of conference tournament locations and formats illustrates the differences between the top conferences and those on the bottom in terms of attendance. The six power conferences were all ranked among the top seven in attendance in the 2004-05 season (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). All six used a similar conference tournament format. All six had their conference tournament championship game broadcast on national television. All six played their entire tournament at one location in large cities such as New York, Los Angeles, Washington D.C and Atlanta. These top conferences are using their tournaments to earn revenue for their athletic departments. According to the Big Ten's 2002-03 Form 990 their mission statement is "Collection of revenue from various sources and remission to member school's athletic departments" (Suggs, 2004, para. 1). Including bowl games and television contracts, the Big

Ten had revenues of \$117 million in 2002-03 with \$110 million of that going to its members. The SEC was the only other conference in 2002-03 that broke the \$100 million mark (Suggs, 2004). Conversely, the Northeast Conference which finished last in attendance in 2004-05 received only \$1.2 million in 2001-02 and spent all of it on their championships and administration with no money going back to its schools (Suggs, 2004). The six power conferences get nearly half of the proceeds from the NCAA's \$6.1 billion contract with CBS for the men's basketball tournament. The other 50% is split among the other 25 conferences, one of which is the Ivy League (Suggs, 2004).

Financially, the gap between the major athletic programs of Division I-A and the programs of I-AA and I-AAA has increased. According to Dan Fulks (2005), in 2003, the average revenues for I-A schools were \$27.2 million while the average revenue for I-AA and I-AAA schools were \$7.5 million and \$6.5 million (Fulks, 2005, p.13). On average, Division I-A teams turned a \$600,000 profit in 2003, while both I-AA and I-AAA had deficits. Division I-AA had an average athletic department deficit in 2003 of \$3.69 million while I-AAA had an average deficit of \$3.53 million (Fulks, 2005, p.13-14). The major difference between the three divisions financially lies in the number of schools that were profitable in 2003. 40% of Division I-A athletic departments turned a profit in 2003 compared to just 8-9% of Division I-AA and 11% of Division I-AAA schools (Fulks, 2005, p. 14).

According to Dan Fulks' report, there was a large gap between basketball program financial data in Division I-A and I-AA. On average, Division I-A men's basketball programs made \$4.252 million in revenues and had \$2.227 million in expenses in 2003 (Fulks, 2005, p.48). Division I-AA men's basketball programs made on average \$746,000 in revenues and had \$793,000 in expenses in 2003 (Fulks, 2005, p. 48). These numbers signify

close to a \$2 million dollar profit for basketball programs in Division I-A as compared to an average \$47,000 deficit for basketball programs in Division I-AA.

The basketball fund distributes money to conferences based on their teams' performance over the last six years of the NCAA men's basketball tournament. One unit is awarded for each game played in the tournament. In 2004-05, each basketball unit was worth approximately \$152,000 for a total of \$113.7 million. In 2005-06, each unit will be worth \$164,000 for a total of \$122.8 million (NCAA Revenue Distribution Plan, n.d.).

In 1991, when CBS and the NCAA agreed to a seven-year, \$1 billion deal, the NCAA decided to direct their payments to conferences instead of the individual schools (Rovell, 2003). According to the NCAA's Revenue Distribution Plan, "Conferences are urged, but not required, to distribute moneys from the basketball fund equally among all their member institutions" (n.d. last para.). The payments are part of a revenue distribution plan that allows the conferences to receive their pay-outs "in proportion to their postseason success over a six-year period" (Rovell, 2003, para.4). While the NCAA recommends a distribution policy for its conferences, the decision of how much conference members receive is ultimately up to each conference.

However, for many of the conferences, the majority of the money does not end up back with at the universities that made the tournament. The Horizon League, containing schools in the mid-west, pays its NCAA tournament participants 13% of the money it earned from the basketball fund as well as a \$40,000 stipend per tournament game to cover expenses (Rovell, 2003). Approximately 70% of the Horizon League's operating budget is from basketball fund monies earned by its participating schools, which leaves little to disperse to its member schools. Butler's two NCAA tournament wins in 2003 combined with the

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee's tournament appearance guarantees the conference an additional \$3 million between 2004 and 2009 (Rovell, 2003). While the conference in general may benefit from these schools' success in the NCAA tournament, the schools themselves may never see this money.

While the direct funding from the NCAA basketball fund may not trickle down to the individual schools, the exposure schools receive from competing in the NCAA tournament can make an immediate impact. John Parry, Director of Athletics at Butler University, stated, "If the NCAA didn't give the conferences any money, it would still be worth it to us. Because, it's not about the dollars, it's about the chance of exposure (Rovell, 2003, last para.)." Butler's media exposure from the 2003 NCAA tournament was valued at about \$2.8 million from Joyce, Julius and Associates, a sponsorship evaluation firm (Rovell, 2003).

According to Aaron Falk (2004), "Ask any athletic director in the NCAA and they'll tell you the name of the game is "exposure" (Falk, 2004)." Like Butler, Utah State University (USU) claimed they lost money when they go to the NCAA Tournament. USU Athletic Director Rance Pugmire stated, "We actually lose money. The NCAA covers your travel and that kind of stuff, but then they make you buy \$14,000 worth of tickets, fly you to Greenville, SC and they wonder why you can't sell them (Falk, 2004, para. 17)." Pugmire claims the exposure from competing in the NCAA tournament is the biggest benefit to the mid-major schools. "The exposure is tremendous. It helps with recruiting, fan excitement and anticipation for next year (Falk, 2004, para. 21)."

Valparaiso University benefited from the exposure received following their two victories in the 1998 NCAA tournament. Athletic Director Bill Steinbrecher noted a large increase in admissions inquiries after the team reached the "Sweet Sixteen". The benefit also

was key to scheduling games against national basketball powers. Valparaiso was able to schedule games against Notre Dame and Duke after their 1998 tournament run (Falk, 2004).

Conference tournaments are “equal parts game show and made-for-TV carnival” (Bradley, 2005, para. 3) says *Sports Illustrated* writer Michael Bradley in his March 3, 2005 article titled “BCS-esque.” He adds, “You might get the real champion, provided the top seed survives three days of assaults from jealous underdogs intoxicated by the idea of getting hot at the right time and earning a precious NCAA invitation... This is particularly damaging to the smaller conferences, whose standings are trashed for three days in March, all to get a couple hours exposure on ESPN2” (Bradley, 2005, paras. 3 &4). It is ESPN that creates their “Championship Week” around the conference tournaments for 10 days in March. From Sunday March 6 – Saturday March 12, 2005, ESPN and ESPN 2 broadcast 54 conference tournament games including the championship games of all of the lower rated conferences. ESPNU, a new network unveiled on Friday March 4, 2005, also broadcast some of the earlier rounds of these tournaments. Games were also broadcast on Fox Sports Net and local television networks.

In his article titled “BCS-esque,” Bradley (2002) continued to explain the differences between the big-time conferences and the smaller conferences. He stated, “these small time tournaments don’t net dollar one for the conferences. Have you ever seen highlights of the early rounds from these things? It could be Gold Bullion Giveaway Night and the arena still wouldn’t be one-quarter full. Why do you think they hold the championship games at the home of the highest remaining seed? To make sure the seats will be filled for the TV camera” (Bradley, 2005, para.5). Bradley stated that while the top seeds are ganged up on in their smaller conferences, the big-time conference tournaments are no better. The big-time

tournaments are just second chances for the mediocre teams to find a way into the NCAA Tournament. “Football Tech may have finished 16-11 overall and 7-9 in conference play, but it can still get into the round of 65 with a couple of tourney wins, usually over equally marginal teams... Now the Big East has seven schools in. Meanwhile, in the Mid-American Conference, a 24-4 club gets ready to host an NIT contest because it didn’t win the conference tournament” (Bradley, 2005, final para.)

Mike Decourcy, a writer from *The Sporting News*, disagreed with Michael Bradley’s assessment of conference tournaments. Decourcy (1999) explained that “Conference tournaments are a little like modern art; no one views them quite the same, but most opinions on the subject are extreme” (Decourcy, 1999, para. 3). In his 1999 article, Decourcy downplays many negative myths concerning conference tournaments stating that they do not wear down teams that take them too seriously or hurt teams going into the NCAA tournament on a down note. At the time the article was written, the PacificTen conference had not instituted their tournament. Decourcy believed that the Pacific Ten was not at an advantage in the NCAA because of their lack of tournament. In fact, he stated the reason the Big Ten started their tournament was because it was at a disadvantage to those conferences with tournaments (Decourcy, 1999). He believes that conference tournaments are not bad for mid and low major leagues. “In some instances, the best teams from these conferences are prevented from competing in the NCAAs because they lose in their league tournaments. In other instances, the tournaments provide opportunities for additional NCAA entrants from a given league (Decourcy, 1999).” Decourcy believes that these tournaments are indeed primarily for generating revenue but that the mid-major tournaments do alright because of corporate sponsorship. Even though the majority of the tournaments are no more than

“cocktail parties”, the tournaments are needed because few conferences can logistically afford to play a double-round robin regular season. The conference tournament is the only time that the schools in the big conferences can feel like they belong to the same league (Decourcy, 1999).

Within a two-week period at the conclusion of the 2004-2005 basketball season, three Ivy League newspaper sports writers decided to tackle the issue of a conference basketball tournament and Ivy League policies in general. Owen Bochner, a columnist for the *Cornell Daily Sun* wrote that the Ivy League needs to evolve. They have nationally renowned teams in ice hockey, lacrosse and rowing but not in football and basketball. He wrote they were not even close to being at the top (Bochner, 2005). Anand Krishnamurthy, a student at Columbia University and a sports writer for the *Columbia Spectator* wrote that the Ivy League is continuing to deemphasize athletics. The academic index used to quantify students’ high school achievements has turned applicants into mere numbers and not individual people. Columbia football coach Bob Shoop proposed three ideas that included the opportunity for Ivy football teams to play 11 games, an NCAA standard; an opportunity to compete in the I-AA playoffs and also the addition of a “bye” week so that league teams would not have to play on ten consecutive weekends. His plan was largely ignored by league officials (Krishnamurthy, 2005). Krishnamurthy contends that even though the Ivy League stands for integrity and principles, they have taken backwards steps in athletics. Josh Pollick, a columnist for the *Daily Pennsylvanian* offers the suggestion to league officials to discuss Ivy policies. He claims there have been no debates for decades on such league principles as the lack of athletic scholarships, post-season football and a basketball tournament solely because they have been the standard for so long. Penn Athletic Director Steve Bilsky said that the

Council of Presidents needs to reexamine core principles to determine if they are still effective and appropriate. He added that there is a tug of war between athletic directors and institution presidents. The pros and cons of sixty-year-old policies need to be reviewed. Pollick, Bilsky and Penn men's basketball coach Fran Dunphy all agree that any discussion to improve the league is a step in the right direction (Pollick, 2005).

In the fall of 1995, the Ivy President's Council reviewed a proposal for a men's and women's conference tournament. The Yale student newspaper, *The Yale Daily News* published an article by staff reporter Rich Frankel that detailed the opinions of Yale basketball players and administrators regarding the possibility of a tournament. Athletic Director Tom Beckett said, "A tournament would do a lot to generate more student interest in men's and women's sports and could create more interest from prospective students who are considering the Ivy League versus other conferences (Frankel, 1995, para. 7)." Dick Kuchen, coach of the Yale men's basketball team in 1995 commented, "A conference championship would also give teams that have a sub par regular season a chance to start over and redeem themselves (Frankel, 1995, 14)." Boe Lintz, a Yale senior men's basketball player in 1995 was in favor of the tournament and not just because it would give his team a chance to go to the NCAA tournament. Lintz was excited at the prospect of "experiencing March Madness firsthand" and also stated that the Ivy League would benefit from media exposure and revenues from getting on television (Frankel, 1995). Kuchen added that the tournament would give the student-athletes an "enriching experience they can always cherish (Frankel, 1995, para. 20)." While this article only explored the opinions of one school in 1995, the issues that the administrators, coaches and student-athletes discussed are many of the same issues that can be expected from Ivy League basketball participants today.

Missed Class Time and Athletics

The Ivy League is very interested in making sure that its student-athletes do not miss a lot of class for athletic competitions (Fiss, 2004; Jacobson, 2002). The regular season schedule is played on Friday and Saturday nights to minimize class time missed. With these weekend games, teams can go the entire conference season missing only three Fridays worth of classes. With the addition of a conference tournament, depending on the format and days games would be played on, the league could be faced with anywhere from two to four more days of missed classes.

Academic integrity and athletics has been an important issued studied in the early 21st Century. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* released results of their Survey of Public Opinion on Higher Education in 2003. More than 75% of the survey respondents stated that athletes “are not held to the same academic performance standards as other students,” and two thirds said that “four year colleges and universities place too much emphasis on athletics” (Suggs, 2003para.2) Jim Naughton (1997) in an article on the University of North Carolina’s athletic program placed a big importance on the Academic Support Program for Student Athletes (Naughton, 1997). Student-athletes’ time is so valuable with class, studying and training for their sport that they need the services offered to them. Naughton portrayed Tar Heel swimmer Richelle Fox and her rigorous schedule. Fox is either swimming, working or eating from 6 am to 6 pm.

The Ivy League’s longstanding rule of barring its football teams from competing in post-season play is based mostly on academic concern by the league’s presidents (Fiss, 2004). The seven-week rule implemented in 2002 was based on academic concern. The presidents do not want athletes to spend the majority of their time on the playing field, but to

be better-rounded people (Jacobson, 2002). The presidents want their student-athletes to try a musical instrument, join new clubs and meet new people (Jacobson, 2002). Most sports were practicing in one form or another all year long which lead to the mandated seven-weeks off for each athletic team during the year. During these seven weeks, there cannot be any required team activities, captain's practices, or priority in scheduling fields (Jacobson, 2002). Laura Leonetti, a Brown University softball team member felt her team was at a disadvantage when competing against competition from outside the Ivy League. She said the league is punishing student-athletes for "trying to be successful at more than just our studies" (Jacobson, 2002, para. 24). The presidents are taking it upon themselves to decide how much is "too much" when it comes to practices and training for its student-athletes.

The Coalition for Intercollegiate Athletics is an alliance of over forty-five NCAA Division IA faculty senates. Their recommendations are intended to apply for Division I schools (Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics, n.d.). Section four of their five section recommendation deals with time commitment and missed class time. While the NCAA has a four hour per day and 20 hour per week limit on athletic related activities, the committee believes these rules are routinely violated and that coaches and administrators should be held accountable for staying under these limits (Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics, n.d.). While the committee understands that missed class time for athletic events is beyond the control of the student-athlete, they believe that when a team misses more than a minimal amount of class time, "goals are undermined." (Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics, Section 4.2, para. 1). The COIA's recommendation 4.2.3 states, "Annual conference competition schedules should be in accord with conference principles on missed class time and be adopted only with approval by conference FARs, who

should be consulted on all conference scheduling plans and options at a point early enough that their views will affect the final plan offered for their approval” (Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics, n.d., Section 4.2.3, para. 1)

Division II basketball has dealt with the question of missed class time and their conference tournaments. Before the rule was changed in the 2001-2002 school year, conferences were not allowed to hold their championship game on Selection Sunday (Yost, 2000). This meant that tournaments had to finish on Saturday and start earlier in the week equating to more missed class time. The Division II championship committee wanted to keep Selection Sunday open so that the bids to the tournament could be decided early in the day and so that all games would be finished before the final decisions were made (Yost, 2000). The Gulf South Conference, the largest conference membership-wise in the NCAA, led the charge to change this rule. Nathan Salant, Commissioner of the Gulf South commented, “Because we are such a geographic giant, travel is costly and involves missed class time. We try to play as much as possible on weekends to cut down on missed class time” (Yost, 2000, para. 14). Before the rule change, the four round tournament started on a Wednesday, meaning teams would have to leave campus on Tuesday at the latest. While the selection committee has spent some late Saturday nights and the selections have been announced later on Sunday night, the rule change has benefited Division II conferences in that they are able to keep their student-athletes in class for an extra day (Yost, 2000).

While competing at the Division I level, the Ivy League schools are limited by the league specific rules set forth by the Ivy Council of Presidents. The Ivy League is the only conference in the country without a postseason basketball tournament and each year around the time of the NCAA tournament, debates occur on whether this stance is acceptable for the

league and its constituents (Burrick, 2004; Krishnamurthy, 2005 & Bochner, 2005). The presidents of the eight Ivy institutions create the rules and have the power to change them. In the case of sending Ivy football teams to post-season play, Princeton University president Shirley Tilghman stated, “The presidents have been very firm in their position that the appropriate thing for football is to stay within the Ivy League. No one in the three years I’ve been doing to these meetings has ever raised the possibility of postseason play” (Fiss, 2004, Final two paras.). While the presidents have expressed their disapproval with a conference tournament because of issues such as missed class time, added travel and expenses (Frankel, 1995), the student-athletes and coaches from Yale in 1995 stated they believed a conference tournament would be an exciting opportunity for the basketball program and would help raise excitement on their campuses. They also raised the point that the league itself would receive media exposure and potential revenues from ticket sales and television rights (Frankel, 1995). Whether or not a tournament is eventually implemented will ultimately be decided by the presidents, but this study will give the student-athletes and coaches of the 2005-06 Ivy men’s basketball teams the opportunity to express their opinions on a conference tournament including the importance of such factors as missed class time, extra travel and the opportunity to play on television as well as preferences for tournament location and format.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study is to obtain opinions from Ivy League coaches and student-athletes regarding a potential Ivy League conference tournament including the factors that influence their decisions as well as opinions on tournament location and format options. Factors that may influence their decisions include the opportunity to compete in a tournament atmosphere, the opportunity to play additional games, the extra travel involved with a conference tournament and the additional missed class time involved with a conference tournament. This chapter will consist of a description of the subjects, instrumentation, procedures, protocol and data analysis for the research study.

Subjects

The subjects in this study will be the population of student-athletes and coaches of men's basketball teams at the eight Ivy League institutions. Table 3 identifies the number of players and their year status of the eight 2005-2006 Ivy League institutions. The number of student-athletes varies from 14-20 at each institution and the number of members of each class varies across teams. The freshmen class has the highest number of student-athletes competing during the 2005-2006 season.

Table 3

Student-Athletes by School and Class

School	Seniors	Juniors	Sophomores	Freshmen	Totals
Brown	1	4	5	4	14
Columbia	3	0	6	5	14
Cornell	3	6	1	5	15
Dartmouth	4	2	5	8	19
Harvard	3	4	2	6	15
Penn	3	4	3	5	15
Princeton	1	4	6	5	16
Yale	2	3	4	5	14
Totals	20	27	33	43	122

Table 4 identifies the number of coaches at each Ivy League program. Because the Ivy League mandates the “third” assistant coach as voluntary, not all schools have this position. Three of eight institutions employ a Director of Basketball Operations.

Table 4

Coaches by School and Position

School	Head Coach	FT Assistants	Volunteer	DOBO	Totals
Brown	1	2	1	0	4
Columbia	1	2	1	1	5
Cornell	1	2	1	0	4
Dartmouth	1	2	1	0	4
Harvard	1	2	0	0	3
Penn	1	2	1	1	5
Princeton	1	2	1	1	5
Yale	1	2	1	0	4
Totals	8	16	7	3	34

Note: FT = Full-time, DOBO = Director of Basketball Operations

Instrumentation

Based on the review of literature, communication with two Ivy League coaches, six former student-athletes, and three professors of Sport Management, a survey was designed that will attempt to answer questions concerning a potential Ivy League basketball

tournament. The possible answers will be on a zero to five range Likert scale. The coaches and student-athletes will answer the same twenty-one questions on the survey with the coaches then answering three additional questions relating to scheduling, recruiting and the program operating budget. Coaches and student-athletes will also be allowed to write additional suggestions for any of the questions.

The survey itself is divided into six sections. The first section will ask the subject to rate their approval level of an Ivy League post-season tournament. The second section will ask the subject to rate the importance of a group of statements concerning a potential post-season tournament. Each statement will be concerned with factor(s) that would influence a subject's opinion of a post-season tournament. The third section will ask respondents to rate their agreement level for statements made regarding a potential post-season tournament. The fourth section will ask respondents their opinions concerning location options for a potential post-season tournament. These questions will ask the subject to rate these location options independent of each other. The fifth section will ask subjects to rank the six tournament location options from most desirable to least desirable. The sixth section will ask subjects to rate their opinion of four possible tournament format options for a potential post-season tournament. These formats are illustrated in the form of brackets that appear immediately to the right of each option on the survey. The seventh and final section includes three questions that only members of the coaching staff will answer. These questions are concerned with recruiting, scheduling and the program operating budget.

Procedures / Protocol

The survey (Appendix D) will be administered to the student-athletes and coaches at all eight schools in November, 2005. The surveys will be sent in a packet to each head coach via US Mail. Inside the packet will be a letter (Appendix E) that will explain the exact

procedure to be followed. Each coach will decide on the best time to administer the surveys to their team. This will revolve around a practice or meeting time in which the student-athletes and coaching staff will be allowed to take the survey. All team members will take the survey at the same time and then hand their completed survey back to the head coach who will place them in an envelope and return them directly back to me. The surveys will be placed directly into an envelope and sealed to protect the respondents' answers. The head coach will not read the answers of his student-athletes and coaches.

A pilot study was conducted in order to test the validity of the survey instrument. Nine subjects were chosen on their knowledge and interest of Ivy League basketball including three former players, two former coaches three former managers and one alum of Ivy League basketball programs. The subjects were asked for their responses to the survey questions in addition to any comments or suggestions they could add to the project.

A test has face validity when it “appears to measure what it’s supposed to measure (Validity and Reliability, n.d., Face Validity section ¶1).” All nine subjects of the pilot study had nothing but positive remarks about the survey and did not find any questions to be misleading or confusing. These nine subjects have all had experience in the Ivy League as a player, coach, manager or in one case an alum who has followed the league for thirty years.

Data Analysis

The data collected comes from the population of men’s basketball players and coaches at Ivy League institutions. Since the population will be completing the survey, the data can be analyzed as a population and not a sample, therefore inferential statistics are not needed. Descriptive statistics will examine the mean scores for each survey question across class (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior, Head Coach, Assistant Coach), school (Brown, Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Penn, Princeton, Yale) and in some cases approval

level of a post-season tournament. Chi square analysis will be utilized on some questions to determine relationships between school and the results of a survey question.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter will present the data from the surveys returned by the coaches and student-athletes in the Ivy League. First, a summary of the subjects will be given, analyzed by both class and year. Then, each research question will be addressed with survey results aiding in answering each question.

Subjects

The data was collected from the population of Ivy League men's basketball coaches and student-athletes participating during the 2005-2006 season. Of the 150 total members of this group, 126 returned completed surveys for a rate of return of .84. Penn and Cornell were the only schools whose entire team returned completed surveys. Of the 34 coaches competing in the Ivy League during the 2005-2006 season, 31 returned their surveys for a rate of .91. Table 5 illustrates the subject breakdown by school and class, while Table 6 depicts the rate of return for each group.

Table 5

Subjects by School and Class

School	Coach	Senior	Junior	Sophomore	Freshman	Totals
Brown	3	1	3	4	4	15
Columbia	5	3	0	4	4	16
Cornell	4	3	5	2	4	18
Dartmouth	4	3	2	4	5	18
Harvard	2	4	1	2	4	13
Penn	5	3	4	3	5	20
Princeton	4	1	4	4	0	12
Yale	4	1	1	3	4	13
Totals	31	19	25	31	40	126

Table 6

Survey Rate of Return by School and Class

School	Coach	Senior	Junior	Sophomore	Freshman	Totals
Brown	.75	1.00	.75	1.00	1.00	.88
Columbia	1.00	1.00	N/A	.67	.80	.84
Cornell	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dartmouth	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.71	.90
Harvard	.67	1.00	.33	1.00	.67	.72
Penn	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Princeton	.80	1.00	1.00	.67	.00	.68
Yale	1.00	.50	.33	.75	.67	.68
Totals	.91	.95	.80	.84	.75	.84

Research Question 1

Are Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in favor of a post-season conference tournament?

Each subject was asked to rate their approval level of a post-season tournament on a one to five Likert scale (one = strongly opposed, five = strongly in favor). Overall, the mean approval level of a post-season tournament was 4.07. Ninety-five of the 125 subjects (76%) were either “In Favor” or “Strongly in Favor” of a post-season tournament, while 16 (13%)

were either “Opposed” or “Strongly Opposed”. According to the results by team, Columbia (\bar{X} = 4.69), Brown (\bar{X} =4.60), Dartmouth (\bar{X} =4.56) and Yale (\bar{X} =4.54) had the four highest mean approval ratings of a post-season tournament. None of those schools had anyone on their team that was opposed to a tournament. Harvard had the fifth highest mean score at 4.00. While Harvard had 10 of their 13 respondents answer “In Favor” or “Strongly in Favor”, they also had 3 respondents answer they were opposed to a conference tournament. Princeton had the lowest mean score at 2.38. Nine of the thirteen Princeton respondents answered either “Strongly Opposed” or “Opposed” to a conference tournament. They were also the only school who failed to have anyone answer they were strongly in favor of a tournament. Table 7 indicates the frequencies and mean scores for each school on their approval level of a post-season tournament.

Of those student-athletes opposed or strongly opposed to a conference tournament, only one was a senior. Seniors had the highest mean score of all classes (4.21). Coaches were second on the list with a mean score of 4.16. Twenty-five of the thirty-one coaches surveyed with either “In Favor” or “Strongly in Favor” of a tournament. Sophomores (\bar{X} =4.12) and Freshmen (\bar{X} =4.10) had the next highest mean scores, while juniors had the lowest mean score at 3.70. Five of the 20 juniors surveyed were opposed to a tournament. Table 8 displays the frequencies and mean approval rating for all respondents across their class.

Table 7

Approval Level of a Post-season tournament by school (ranked by mean score)

School	Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor	Mean Score
Columbia	0	0	1	3	12	4.69
Brown	0	0	1	4	10	4.60
Dartmouth	0	0	3	2	13	4.56
Yale	0	0	1	4	8	4.54
Harvard	0	3	0	4	6	4.00
Cornell	0	3	1	8	6	3.94
Penn	0	1	6	10	2	3.68
Princeton	2	7	1	3	0	2.38
Totals	2	14	14	38	57	4.07

Table 8

Approval Level of a Post-season tournament by class (ranked by mean score)

School	Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor	Mean Score
Senior	1	0	2	7	9	4.21
Coach	1	2	3	10	15	4.16
Sophomore	0	5	1	5	14	4.12
Freshman	0	2	6	9	13	4.10
Junior	0	5	2	7	6	3.70
Totals	2	14	14	38	57	4.07

Anova Analysis

There was statistically significant data that demonstrated that Princeton's coaches and student-athletes opinions differed from each of the seven other teams. Using a one-way anova with Tukey adjusted post hoc tests and an alpha level of .05, Princeton's mean approval level for a post season tournament was statistically different than each of the other seven schools ($p < .05$). There were no other significant differences between groups.

The data demonstrated that for every six Ivy League student-athletes and coaches that are in favor of the tournament there is just one that is opposed. There are only three teams and one class below the 4.00 average mark. With the exception of Princeton, members of each Ivy League team are in favor of a post-season tournament.

Research Question 2

What factors are most important to Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in their decision on whether they are in favor of a post-season tournament?

Subjects were asked to rate the level of importance for five different factors concerning the addition of a post-season tournament on a one to five Likert scale (1= Not important at all, 5 = Very important). These factors are, “The experience of competing in a conference tournament”, “The opportunity to play on national television if your team qualified for the conference tournament championship game”, “The opportunity to compete in additional games beyond the regular season”, “The motivation to compete in the remaining regular season games after elimination from winning the regular season championship”, and “The opportunity for additional travel during the Ivy League Conference Tournament.” While all five factors were deemed at least somewhat important by receiving a mean score of over a 3.0, the two factors that scored the highest were “The opportunity to compete in additional games” (\bar{X} = 4.24), and “The opportunity to compete on national television” (\bar{X} = 4.23).

Five of eight schools (Columbia, Dartmouth, Penn, Princeton and Yale) had “The opportunity to compete on national television” as their highest rated factor while two schools (Brown and Harvard) rated “The opportunity to compete in additional games” highest. Cornell was the only school to rate “The motivation to compete in remaining games after

elimination from the regular season” as their highest factor. All eight schools had “The opportunity for additional travel” as their lowest rated factor.

Juniors and seniors rated “The motivation to compete in remaining games after elimination” as their highest factor. Coaches rated “The opportunity to compete in additional games” as their highest rated factor while sophomores rated “The opportunity to play on national television” as their highest rated factor. These two factors were tied for the highest rating from the freshman class. Table 9 illustrates the mean score of the five factors across each school while Table 10 illustrates the mean score of the five factors across each class.

Table 9

Mean rating of the importance of factors concerning a post-season tournament

(by school)

School	Experience of competing in a conference tournament	Opportunity to play on national television	Opportunity to compete in additional games	Motivation to compete in remaining games after elimination	Opportunity for additional travel
Brown	4.27	4.33	4.47	4.00	2.93
Columbia	4.63	4.81	4.56	4.38	3.69
Cornell	3.78	3.78	4.11	4.22	3.11
Dartmouth	4.44	4.61	4.50	4.22	3.61
Harvard	3.85	4.06	4.23	3.85	3.08
Penn	3.40	4.00	3.90	3.80	2.60
Princeton	2.69	3.54	3.50	3.46	1.83
Yale	4.46	4.69	4.62	3.96	3.31
Totals	3.94	4.23	4.24	4.00	3.05

Table 10

*Mean rating of the importance of factors concerning a post-season tournament**(by class)*

Class	Experience of competing in a conference tournament	Opportunity to play on national television	Opportunity to compete in additional games	Motivation to compete in remaining games after elimination	Opportunity for additional travel
Coach	4.00	4.39	4.42	4.24	2.77
Senior	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.11	3.16
Junior	3.85	3.80	3.85	4.00	2.95
Sophomore	3.81	4.31	4.27	3.85	2.81
Freshman	4.03	4.43	4.43	3.83	3.53
Totals	3.94	4.23	4.24	4.00	3.05

The only factor that demonstrates a pattern by class is “The motivation to compete in remaining games after elimination.” The mean score increases with age (freshman class to senior class) and is highest with the coaches that responded to the survey. “The opportunity for additional travel” is the only factor that does not approach the 4.00 mean score mark and can be seen as the only factor of the five that the student-athletes and coaches do not deem important concerning a post-season tournament. The other four factors can be labeled as important with “The opportunity to play on national television” and “The opportunity to compete in additional games” being rated the most important.

Subjects were asked to rate their agreement level of the following two statements: “The amount of travel needed for a conference tournament would cause additional missed class time jeopardizing academic success of student-athletes” and “The uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is very important to me.” Both of these statements received lower mean scores than any of the first five factors. The “missed class time” statement received a mean agreement level of 2.21 while the uniqueness of the Ivy League statement received a mean agreement level of 2.33.

Penn and Princeton student-athletes and coaches, while not necessarily agreeing that a conference tournament would jeopardize academic success, had the highest and third-highest mean agreement level for that statement (Penn: 3.00, Princeton: 2.62). They also had the two highest mean agreement levels for the uniqueness of the Ivy League statement (Princeton: 3.33, Penn: 2.85). Table 11 illustrates the mean agreement level for each statement across schools.

The coaches had the lowest mean scores of all classes for both statements. Their mean score of 1.90 for the academic success statement shows the Ivy League coaches are not concerned that the addition of a conference tournament would jeopardize academic success. Freshmen had the next highest mean score for each statement, followed by seniors, sophomores and then juniors. Table 12 depicts the mean score for each statement across class.

Those student-athletes and coaches strongly in favor of a conference tournament had the lowest mean agreement level for the two statements (1.74 for each). Subjects neutral or opposed to a conference tournament also did not agree with the two statements that a conference tournament would jeopardize academic success and the uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is important. The highest mean agreement level for the “academic success” statement came from the subjects neutral towards a conference tournament ($X = 3.07$). The highest mean score for the “uniqueness of the Ivy League” statement came from those opposed to a conference tournament ($X = 3.43$). Table 13 describes the mean score for each statement across approval levels for a conference tournament.

Table 11

Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by school

School	The amount of travel needed for a tournament needed would cause missed class time jeopardizing academic success		The uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is important to me.	
		rank		rank
Brown	1.67	7	1.67	8
Columbia	2.06	4	1.81	7
Cornell	2.00	5	2.39	3
Dartmouth	2.72	2	2.33	4
Harvard	1.46	8	2.00	6
Penn	3.00	1	2.85	2
Princeton	2.62	3	3.33	1
Yale	1.69	6	2.23	5
Totals	2.21		2.33	

Table 12

Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by class

Class	The amount of travel needed for a tournament needed would cause missed class time jeopardizing academic success		The uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is important to me.	
		rank		rank
Coach	1.90	5	2.07	5
Senior	2.16	3	2.26	3
Junior	2.65	1	2.80	1
Sophomore	2.35	2	2.58	2
Freshman	2.13	4	2.10	4
Totals	2.21		2.33	

Table 13

Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by approval level of a post-season tournament

Approval Level	The amount of travel needed for a tournament needed would cause missed class time jeopardizing academic success		The uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is important to me.	
		rank		rank
Strongly In Favor	1.74	5	1.74	5
In Favor	2.39	4	2.55	4
Neutral	3.07	1	2.93	3
Opposed	2.43	3	3.43	1
Strongly Opposed	3.00	2	3.00	2
Totals	2.18		2.32	

Research Question 3

Would the addition of a conference tournament lessen the importance of each regular season game and the regular season champion?

Subjects were asked to rate their agreement level of the following statements on a one to five Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree), “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each conference game during the regular season”, and “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of the regular season champion.” While the statements are different, their mean score results were within a tenth of a point. The mean agreement level for the importance of each regular season game was 2.94, while the mean agreement level for the importance of the regular season champion was 3.02. Both results show that overall, the subjects were neutral towards both statements. However, the mean rating by team presents a more detailed picture of the results for these two statements. Princeton ($\bar{X} = 3.92$) and Penn ($\bar{X} = 3.35$) had the highest mean scores for the agreement level of “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each conference game during the regular season”. Penn and Princeton had the

lowest approval ratings for a conference tournament. The two schools with the highest approval rating for a conference tournament, Columbia and Brown, had the lowest mean scores for their agreement level of that statement (Columbia mean = 2.38, Brown mean = 2.60). This result shows an inverse relationship between approval level of a conference tournament and agreement level of “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each conference game during the regular season.” Princeton is the only school to agree with the statement, while the other seven schools are all closer to being neutral or in the case of Columbia, disagreeing with the statement.

There was also an inverse relationship between approval level of a postseason tournament and agreement level of “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of the regular season champion.” Princeton and Penn, the two schools with the lowest mean score for approval level of a post-season tournament also had the two highest mean scores for the agreement level concerning the statement above. Columbia and Brown, the two schools with the highest mean score for approval level of a post-season tournament had the lowest and fourth lowest mean rating for the agreement level of the statement above. Princeton was the only school to have a mean score of over 4 (4.23) for the agreement level of that statement. The student-athletes and coaches from Penn and Princeton on average agreed with the statement that a conference tournament would lessen the importance of the regular season champion. Columbia and Yale were the only two schools that disagreed with the statement, the other six schools had a mean result of neutral. Table 14 illustrates the mean score for each school on the agreement level of these two statements.

The mean scores by class on the agreement level of “The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each conference game,” were only separated by a

total of 0.80. Table 15 describes the mean scores for each class on the agreement level of these two statements.

In comparing the approval level of a post-season tournament to the two statements regarding the importance of each regular season game and regular season champion, there is an inverse relationship. Those strongly in favor of a conference tournament had the lowest mean scores for agreement level with the two statements, while those strongly opposed to a conference tournament had the highest mean scores for their agreement level with those two statements. Table 16 shows the mean scores by approval level of a conference tournament for each of the two statements.

Table 14

Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by school

School	The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each regular season game	The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of winning the regular season conference title	
		rank	rank
Brown	2.60	7	5
Columbia	2.38	8	8
Cornell	2.89	4	4
Dartmouth	2.72	5	6
Harvard	3.08	3	3
Penn	3.35	2	2
Princeton	3.92	1	1
Yale	2.62	6	7
Totals	2.94		3.02

Table 15

Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by class

Class	The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each regular season game		The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of winning the regular season conference title	
		rank		rank
Coach	2.84	4	3.03	3
Senior	3.11	3	3.05	2
Junior	3.30	1	3.75	1
Sophomore	3.15	2	3.00	4
Freshman	2.50	5	2.53	5
Totals	2.94		3.02	

Table 16

*Mean rating of the agreement level of statements compared and ranked by approval level of
a post-season tournament*

Approval Level	The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each regular season game		The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of winning the regular season conference title	
		rank		rank
Strongly In Favor	2.58	5	2.46	5
In Favor	2.87	4	3.08	4
Neutral	3.21	3	3.64	3
Opposed	4.07	2	4.43	2
Strongly Opposed	5.00	1	4.50	1
Totals				

Research Question 4

What tournament location options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

The subjects were asked to rate six difference tournament location options on a one to five Likert scale (1 = strongly opposed, 5 = strongly in favor. The subjects rated each option independently of the others. For the purpose of this question, anyone in favor of a location option answered with “In Favor” or “Strongly in Favor” while anyone opposed to an option answered “Opposed” or “Strongly Opposed”.

The Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site

This location option involved playing all games at one neutral site. Neutral sites are pre-determined and there is no location advantage given to the top regular season finishers. This location option received mixed ratings with 32.8% of the subjects opposed to this option while 40.0% were in favor, and 27.2% were neutral. The average mean score for this option of 3.11 shows how balanced this location option was among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches. Princeton (69.3%) and Yale (46.2%) had the highest percentage of subjects that were opposed to this format option. Dartmouth (66.7%) and Columbia (50.0%) had the highest percentage of subjects that were either in favor of or strongly in favor of this option. At 54.8%, the coaches had the largest percentage of subjects that were opposed to this option. The sophomore class was the one that had the highest percentage (53.8%) of subjects that was in favor of this option. Table 17 shows the breakdown by school of the approval level of this location option, while Table 18 describes the breakdown by class of the approval level of this option.

Table 17

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Dartmouth	5.6%	27.8%	66.7%	3.94
Columbia	18.8%	31.3%	50.0%	3.56
Cornell	33.3%	16.7%	50.0%	3.33
Harvard	15.4%	53.8%	30.8%	3.31
Yale	46.2%	23.1%	30.8%	2.77
Brown	40.0%	26.7%	33.3%	2.67
Penn	42.1%	36.8%	21.1%	2.63
Princeton	68.3%	0.0%	30.8%	2.42
Totals	32.8%	27.2%	40.0%	3.11

Table 18

Approval Level the Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Sophomore	23.1%	23.1%	53.8%	3.42
Freshman	20.0%	36.7%	43.4%	3.33
Senior	21.1%	42.1%	36.9%	3.21
Junior	42.1%	15.8%	42.1%	3.05
Coach	54.8%	19.4%	25.9%	2.60
Totals	32.8%	27.2%	40.0%	3.11

The Tournament Location Rotated Annually Among each of the Eight Schools

This option would allow each school to host the entire tournament once every eight years. Like the previous option, there is no home court advantage for regular season finish. This tournament location option received the lowest mean score of the six options ($\bar{X}=2.63$). Dartmouth was the only team to have a mean approval rating over 3.00 ($\bar{X} = 3.39$) and the only squad to have a greater percentage of respondents answer in favor of this option than opposed. Columbia had the same number of its subjects vote in favor as opposed for this option, but the other six schools were decisively opposed to this tournament format option.

None of the five classes had a mean approval rating of over 3.00 for this location option. While the senior class has the highest mean approval rating ($\bar{X}= 2.89$), they still failed to have more than 26.4% of their respondents vote in favor. The other four classes had a lower percentage of subjects that were in favor of this option. Overall, with 48% of the subjects opposed and just 23.3% in favor, the student-athletes and coaches were opposed to the tournament location option of rotating the tournament annually among each of the eight schools. Table 19 describes the approval level of this location option by school, while Table 20 describes the approval level by class.

Table 19

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Rotated Annually among each of the EightSchools (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Dartmouth	22.2%	22.2%	55.6%	3.39
Columbia	31.3%	37.5%	31.3%	2.94
Brown	40.0%	46.7%	13.3%	2.67
Yale	53.9%	23.1%	23.1%	2.62
Penn	47.4%	31.6%	21.1%	2.53
Harvard	61.6%	23.1%	15.4%	2.46
Cornell	61.1%	33.3%	5.6%	2.33
Princeton	71.0%	7.7%	15.4%	1.88
Totals	48.0%	28.8%	23.2%	2.63

Table 20

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Rotated Annually among each of the EightSchools (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Senior	36.9%	36.8%	26.4%	2.89
Freshman	46.7%	30.0%	23.3%	2.70
Sophomore	38.4%	38.5%	23.0%	2.69
Junior	52.6%	21.1%	26.3%	2.58
Coach	48.0%	19.4%	19.3%	2.37
Totals	48.0%	28.8%	23.2%	2.63

The Tournament Location Entirely at the site of the Regular Season Champion

This tournament location option awards the entire tournament to the regular season champion. This option is not pre-determined and gives an advantage to the regular season champion, but does not differentiate between the second through eighth place finishers. This location option received a mean rating of 2.98 with 38.7% of the subjects voting opposed as compared to 34.7% that voted in favor. Penn ($\bar{X} = 3.42$) led three teams with a mean

approval rating of over 3.00 and had the largest percentage of their respondents in favor of this option (42.1%). Yale had the lowest mean approval rating at 2.77 and the lowest percentage of respondents in favor of this option at 34.7%.

The junior class had the highest mean approval rating for this option at 3.26, while the freshman class had the lowest at 2.53. Even though the mean approval rating for this tournament location option was close to neutral at 2.98, more subjects were opposed to this option than in favor. Table 21 illustrates the approval level of this tournament location option by school, while Table 22 illustrates the approval level by class.

Table 21

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at the site of the Regular Season

Champion (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Penn	21.1%	36.8%	42.1%	3.42
Harvard	38.5%	23.1%	38.5%	3.23
Princeton	33.3%	25.0%	41.6%	3.08
Brown	40.0%	26.7%	33.4%	2.93
Columbia	50.0%	12.5%	37.5%	2.88
Cornell	44.4%	27.8%	27.8%	2.78
Dartmouth	44.5%	22.2%	33.4%	2.78
Yale	38.5%	28.5%	23.1%	2.77
Totals	38.7%	26.6%	34.7%	2.98

Table 22

Approval Level of the Tournament Entirely at the site of the Regular Season Champion (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Junior	26.4%	36.8%	36.9%	3.26
Sophomore	34.6%	19.2%	46.1%	3.23
Coach	30.0%	26.7%	43.3%	3.13
Senior	47.4%	26.3%	36.3%	2.84
Freshman	53.3%	26.7%	20.0%	2.53
Totals	38.7%	26.6%	34.7%	2.98

The Tournament Quarterfinals and Semifinals Located at a Neutral Site and the Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed

This location option combines a tournament in which all teams start at one location and then play the championship game at the site of the highest seed. There is a reward for regular season play with this option as the team with the better regular season record will host the championship game. This location option received the second lowest mean approval rating with an overall score of 2.81. Overall, 41.4% of the respondents were opposed to this format compared to 22.7% that were in favor. Brown was the only school that had more of its respondents in favor of this location option than opposed. Dartmouth had the lowest mean approval rating for this option and had just 17.7% of its student-athletes and coaches vote in favor. Table 23 illustrates the mean approval level of this option by school and Table 24 illustrates the mean approval level by class.

Table 23

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Quarterfinals and Semifinals Located at a Neutral Site and the Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Brown	33.4%	20.0%	46.6%	3.20
Columbia	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	3.06
Princeton	33.3%	50.0%	16.6%	2.92
Penn	26.4%	52.6%	21.1%	2.89
Yale	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	2.85
Harvard	46.2%	38.5%	15.4%	2.69
Cornell	61.1%	22.2%	16.6%	2.50
Dartmouth	48.8%	23.5%	17.7%	2.47
Totals	41.4%	25.8%	22.7%	2.81

Table 24

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Quarterfinals and Semifinals Located at a Neutral Site and the Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Coach	26.7%	30.0%	43.4%	3.33
Senior	47.4%	36.8%	15.8%	2.74
Sophomore	40.0%	44.0%	16.0%	2.72
Junior	42.1%	26.8%	21.1%	2.68
Freshman	53.3%	33.3%	13.3%	2.50
Totals	41.4%	25.8%	22.7%	2.81

The Tournament Located Entirely at Campus Sites with Higher Seed Hosting each Game.

This location option has each tournament game played at a different location. The higher seeded team in each game will be the host. This location option gives an advantage to regular season finish. This tournament location option received the highest mean approval rating of all option by Ivy League student-athletes and coaches at 3.38. Dartmouth was the only school to have a mean approval rating under 3.00 ($\bar{X} = 2.56$) and along with Cornell were the only teams to have more respondents opposed than in favor of this location option. Princeton had the highest mean approval rating for this location option ($\bar{X} = 4.00$) and was the only team to reach that high of an approval level for any of the six location options. Princeton had 84.6% of their respondents in favor. Table 25 illustrates the mean approval rating by school of this tournament location option, while Table 26 describes the mean approval rating by class.

Table 25

Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at Campus Sites with the Higher Seed

Hosting Each Game (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Princeton	7.7%	7.7%	84.6%	4.00
Yale	7.7%	23.1%	69.3%	3.85
Brown	6.7%	26.7%	66.6%	3.73
Harvard	30.8%	15.4%	53.9%	3.62
Penn	15.8%	31.6%	52.6%	3.53
Cornell	50.0%	5.6%	44.4%	3.17
Columbia	31.3%	25.0%	43.8%	3.00
Dartmouth	44.4%	27.8%	27.8%	2.56
Totals	25.6%	20.8%	53.6%	3.38

Table 26

*Approval Level of the Tournament Location Entirely at Campus Sites with the Higher Seed**Hosting Each Game (by class)*

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Sophomore	23.1%	11.5%	65.4%	3.58
Junior	26.3%	15.8%	57.9%	3.53
Coach	19.4%	22.6%	58.1%	3.52
Senior	26.3%	15.8%	57.9%	3.47
Freshman	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	2.93
Totals	25.6%	20.8%	53.6%	3.38

*A Tournament Format where the Top Two Seeds Host 2-Four Team Tournaments and the
Winners Meet in the Championship Game at the site of the Higher Seed*

This location option was used in the 2005 and 2006 Patriot League tournaments and features an option in which the top two regular season finishers host a four-team tournament in which the two winners meet in the league championship game. This option gives an advantage for the top two regular season finishers. The overall mean approval rating for this location option was 3.04, the closest to the neutral score of 3.00 of all of the location options. Four schools had more respondents in favor than opposed, while four schools had more respondents opposed than in favor. Brown had the highest mean approval rating at 3.47 and 46.6% of its respondents in favor. Yale was the only school of the eight to have over 50% of its respondents in favor (53.8%). Harvard had the lowest mean approval rating at 2.77 with just 15.4% of their respondents in favor. Table 27 represents the approval level of this location option by class and Table 28 represents the approval level of this location option by class.

Table 27

Approval Level of a Tournament Format where the Top Two Seeds Host 2-Four TeamTournaments and the Winners Meet in the Championship Game (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Brown	13.3%	40.0%	46.6%	3.47
Penn	15.8%	47.4%	36.8%	3.32
Princeton	25.0%	33.3%	41.6%	3.17
Yale	38.5%	7.7%	53.8%	3.15
Columbia	37.6%	25.0%	37.5%	2.94
Cornell	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	2.78
Dartmouth	33.3%	38.9%	27.8%	2.78
Harvard	30.8%	53.8%	15.4%	2.77
Totals	29.9%	33.9%	36.3%	3.04

Table 28

Approval Level of a Tournament Format where the Top Two Seeds Host 2-Four TeamTournaments and the Winners Meet in the Championship Game at the site of the Higher Seed
(by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Coach	16.7%	30.0%	53.4%	3.37
Junior	21.1%	42.1%	36.8%	3.16
Sophomore	30.7%	34.6%	37.6%	3.08
Freshman	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	2.90
Senior	52.6%	31.6%	15.8%	2.58
Totals	29.9%	33.9%	36.3%	3.04

Overall Results of Tournament Location Options

Of the six tournament location options, the Ivy League student-athletes and coaches had a mean approval rating above 3.00 for half of them. These three options with over a 3.00 mean approval rating were also the three options in which more respondents voted in favor than opposed. The location option in which all games are played entirely on campus sites,

the option in which all games are played at a neutral site and the option in which the top two regular season finishers host 2-four team tournaments all received more in favor votes than opposed and are all considered acceptable by Ivy League student-athletes and coaches. The other three options received more opposed votes than in favor votes. Table 29 depicts the approval level of each of the six tournament location options.

Table 29

Approval Level of each of the Six Tournament Location Options

Option	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Entirely on Campus Sites	25.6%	20.8%	53.6%	3.38
Entirely at a Neutral Site	32.8%	27.2%	40.0%	3.11
2-Four team tournaments with winners meeting in championship	29.9%	33.9%	36.3%	3.04
Entirely at Regular Season Champion	38.7%	26.6%	34.7%	2.98
Quarterfinals and Semifinals at a neutral site with championship at higher seed	41.4%	25.8%	22.7%	2.81
Rotated Annually among all 8 schools	48.0%	28.8%	23.2%	2.63

Research Question 5

What is the preferred tournament location option for Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

The Ivy League student-athletes and coaches were asked to rank the six tournament location options from most desirable to least desirable. On the survey, the subjects were asked to place a “1” for their most favorable location option, a “2” for their next favorable, with “6” their least favorable option. They were also able to answer with a no preference. For the purposes of this research question, the results were inverted and a point system was applied to the subjects’ answers. A “1” for a location option, meaning the subject ranked that option as most favorable would be worth six points, while a “6” or least desirable location

option would be worth just one point. Scores were then added and divided by the number of subjects that ranked sites to come up with a mean score.

Fifteen subjects including six from Penn and five from Columbia voted “no preference” to a tournament location, leaving 112 subjects that provided a ranking. Overall, the location option that was voted the most desirable was having the entire tournament on a campus sites with the higher seed hosting each game. This option was ranked the most desirable by six of the eight Ivy League schools with Columbia rating it second and Dartmouth rating it third.

The tournament location option with games completely at a neutral site was ranked the second most desirable option by the Ivy League student-athletes and coaches. This option was ranked first by Columbia and Dartmouth. The third most desirable tournament location option is the top two seeds hosting 2-four team tournaments with the winners meeting in the championship game at the higher seed. This option was ranked most desirable by the Brown student-athletes and coaches and second most desirable by Penn and Princeton. The tournament option ranked fourth, quarterfinals and semifinals at a neutral site and the championship at the higher seed received the biggest mix of results from the eight teams. Yale had this option ranked second most desirable, four teams ranked it third and Dartmouth and Harvard both ranked this option the least desirable. The tournament entirely at the site of the regular season champion was ranked the second least desirable location option. Only Cornell ranked it their least desirable option. Finally, the least desirable tournament location option was the tournament rotated annually among the eight schools. Five of the eight schools voted this option their least desirable. Table 30 illustrates the ranking of each of the six tournament location options by school and Table 31 shows this

ranking by class. The tournament format ranked most desirable by Ivy League student-athletes and coaches is the tournament entirely on campus sites with the higher team hosting each game.

Table 30

Tournament Location Options Ranking (by school)

Option	Brown	Col.	Cornell	Dart.	Harv.	Penn	Prin.	Yale	Totals
Entirely on campus sites with higher team hosting each game	1	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1
Entirely at a Neutral Site	5	1	2	1	3	5	5	3	2
Top 2 seeds hosting 2-four team tournaments	1	3	5	5	4	2	2	5	3
Quarterfinals and Semifinals at a neutral site and championship game at highest seed	3	3	3	6	6	4	3	2	4
Entirely at site of the regular season champion	4	5	6	4	2	3	4	3	5
Rotated Annually among each of the eight schools	6	6	4	2	5	6	6	6	6

Table 31

Tournament Location Options Ranking (by class)

Option	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Coach	Totals
Entirely on campus sites with higher team hosting each game	2	1	1	1	1	1
Entirely at a Neutral Site	1	2	2	3	5	2
Top 2 seeds hosting 2-four team tournaments	4	5	3	5	2	3
Quarterfinals and Semifinals at a neutral site and championship game at highest seed	3	4	4	2	3	4
Entirely at site of the regular season champion	6	3	5	4	4	5
Rotated Annually among each of the eight schools	5	6	6	6	6	6

Research Question 6

What tournament format options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

The Ivy League coaches and student-athletes were asked to rate four tournament format options independently on a one to five Likert scale (1 = strongly opposed, 5 =

strongly in favor). Each of these four format options were depicted visually on the survey with a bracket and seed placement printed next to each question. Subjects were also given the opportunity to write in comments for additional tournament location and format options. For the purpose of reporting the results, the data was truncated into three categories, “In Favor” (A combination of “In Favor” and “Strongly in Favor”), “Opposed” (A combination of “Opposed” and “Strongly Opposed”) and “Neutral.

An Eight-team Bracket with No Byes

This format option would involve inviting all eight teams to the conference tournament and placing them in a traditional eight-team draw. This option does not give any advantage to regular season finish in terms of the number of games a team must win to take the championship. While each of the four options was examined individually, this option did receive the highest mean approval rating of 3.51. Overall, 59.0% of subjects were in favor of this option compared to just 24.6% that were opposed. The student-athletes and coaches from Yale had the highest mean approval rating of this option compared to the other seven schools ($X = 4.27$). Ten of the eleven subjects from Yale were in favor of this option (the other was neutral). This format was rated the highest for four schools (Dartmouth, Columbia, Penn and Yale). Princeton was the only school that had a mean score of less than three for this option ($X = 2.62$). Three of their 13 respondents were in favor of this option. Princeton was the only school that rated this option the lowest as compared to the other three. Table 32 illustrates the percentage of those coaches and student-athletes opposed to and in favor of this format option by team and Table 33 illustrates the percentage by class.

Table 32

Approval Level of 8-team Bracket with No Byes (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Yale	0.0%	9.1%	80.9%	4.27
Dartmouth	11.1%	5.6%	83.3%	4.11
Columbia	18.8%	18.8%	62.5%	3.81
Penn	15.0%	25.0%	60.0%	3.60
Cornell	44.5%	0.0%	55.5%	3.22
Brown	33.3%	20.0%	46.7%	3.20
Harvard	27.3%	27.3%	45.5%	3.09
Princeton	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	2.62
Totals	24.6%	16.4%	59.0%	3.51

Table 33

Approval Level of 8-team Bracket with No Byes (by class)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Freshman	10.7%	17.9%	71.4%	3.89
Senior	21.0%	15.8%	63.2%	3.63
Sophomore	30.7%	15.4%	55.8%	3.46
Coach	46.7%	16.7%	55.6%	3.33
Junior	36.8%	15.8%	47.4%	3.16
Totals	24.6%	16.4%	59.0%	3.51

A Six-team bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving a Bye into the Semi-finals

This tournament format option involves inviting only the top six conference finishers in the regular season to the post-season tournament. The top two regular season finishers receive an advantage by being placed directly into the semi-finals. This tournament format option received the second highest mean approval level from the subjects at 3.45. The Harvard student-athletes and coaches had the highest mean approval level for this option ($\bar{X} = 3.91$). Only one Harvard subject was opposed to this option. Four schools (Harvard, Brown, Cornell and Princeton) rated this option the highest among the four format options.

Dartmouth had the lowest mean score for this option ($\bar{X} = 3.11$). Table 34 illustrates the percentage of those student-athletes and coaches in favor of and opposed to this option by school and Table 35 illustrates the percentages by class.

Table 34

Approval Level of a 6-team Bracket with the top two Seeds Receiving a Bye into the Semi-finals (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Harvard	9.1%	18.2%	72.8%	3.91
Princeton	15.4%	15.4%	69.2%	3.69
Yale	18.2%	27.3%	54.6%	3.55
Columbia	25.0%	18.8%	56.3%	3.50
Brown	20.0%	26.7%	53.3%	3.47
Cornell	27.8%	16.7%	55.6%	3.44
Penn	25.0%	35.0%	40.0%	3.25
Dartmouth	27.8%	27.8%	44.5%	3.11
Totals	22.2%	23.6%	54.1%	3.45

Table 35

Approval Level of a 6-team Bracket with the top two Seeds Receiving a Bye into the Semi-finals (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Sophomore	11.5%	15.4%	73.1%	3.92
Junior	15.8%	21.1%	63.2%	3.63
Senior	15.8%	21.1%	63.2%	3.63
Freshman	28.5%	28.6%	42.8%	3.14
Coach	33.3%	30.0%	36.7%	3.10
Totals	22.2%	23.8%	54.1%	3.45

An Eight-team Bracket where the Top Two seeds Receive a Double-bye into the Semi-finals

This tournament format option involves inviting all eight schools to the conference tournament but giving a double-bye to the top two seeds. The bottom four finishers in the regular season will play in the first round with the two winners joining the third and fourth place finishers in the second round. This format gives an advantage to regular season finish by placing the top two finishers directly in the semi-finals. This format option received the lowest mean approval rating of the four options available ($\bar{X} = 2.75$). Only Princeton ($\bar{X} = 3.62$) and Columbia ($\bar{X} = 3.06$) had a mean approval rating over 3.00. Princeton was the only school to have greater than 50% of its respondents (53.9%) in favor of this option. However, five of eight schools had this option as their lowest rated among the four choices. Dartmouth and Harvard both had a mean approval rating of 2.18, the lowest of eight teams. Five of the eight schools had over 50% of their respondents opposed to this option. Table 36 illustrates the percentage of those student-athletes and coaches in favor of and opposed to this option by school and Table 37 illustrates the percentages by class.

Table 36

Approval Level of an 8-team Bracket where the top Two Seeds Receive a Double-Bye into theSemi-finals (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Princeton	30.8%	15.4%	53.9%	3.62
Columbia	31.3%	31.3%	37.5%	3.06
Cornell	50.0%	16.7%	33.4%	2.89
Brown	53.3%	6.7%	40.0%	2.80
Penn	40.0%	35.0%	25.0%	2.80
Yale	63.7%	9.1%	27.3%	2.36
Dartmouth	64.7%	11.8%	23.5%	2.18
Harvard	72.8%	9.1%	18.2%	2.18
Totals	49.5%	18.2%	32.2%	2.75

Table 37

Approval Level of an 8-team Bracket where the top Two Seeds Receive a Double-Bye into theSemi-finals (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Junior	32.1%	15.8%	42.2%	3.05
Sophomore	50.0%	15.4%	34.6%	2.77
Coach	51.7%	10.3%	37.9%	2.76
Freshman	53.6%	21.4%	25.0%	2.64
Senior	47.4%	31.6%	21.0%	2.58
Totals	49.5%	18.2%	32.2%	2.75

A Four-team Bracket with only the Top Four Regular Season Finishers

This tournament format option involves inviting only the top four regular season finishers to the conference tournament. While this format rewards the top four teams, it does not differentiate between the regular season finish of one through four in terms of the number of games needed to win the tournament. This format option received a mean approval rating of 2.83 from the subjects. It received the third highest mean approval rating of the four

options offered in the survey. Harvard ($\bar{X} = 3.27$) and Cornell ($\bar{X} = 3.22$) were the only two schools to have a mean approval rating of over 3.00. These were also the only two teams to have at least 50% of their respondents to vote in favor of this option. On the other hand, Penn and Dartmouth were the only two schools to have at least 50% of their respondents to vote opposed for this option. The other four schools had enough subjects that felt neutral about this option that they did not have a majority that felt either in favor or opposed. Dartmouth, with a mean approval rating of 2.50 had the lowest rating among the eight schools for this option. Dartmouth had 55.5% of their subjects opposed to this option. Penn had 55.0% of their subjects vote opposed to this format. Table 38 illustrates the percentage of those student-athletes and coaches in favor of and opposed to this option by school and Table 39 illustrates the percentages by class.

Table 38

Approval Level of a Four-team bracket with only the Top Four Regular Season Finishers (by school)

School	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Harvard	36.4%	9.1%	54.6%	3.27
Cornell	33.4%	16.7%	50.0%	3.22
Columbia	31.3%	31.3%	37.5%	2.94
Brown	46.7%	6.7%	46.6%	2.93
Yale	45.5%	18.2%	36.4%	2.83
Princeton	38.5%	38.5%	23.1%	2.62
Penn	55.0%	25.0%	20.0%	2.55
Dartmouth	55.5%	16.7%	27.8%	2.50
Totals	43.5%	20.5%	36.0%	2.83

Table 39

Approval Level of a Four-team bracket with only the Top Four Regular Season Finishers (by class)

Class	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Mean Rating
Junior	21.1%	36.8%	42.1%	3.37
Senior	42.2%	10.5%	47.4%	2.89
Sophomore	46.1%	15.4%	38.4%	2.77
Coach	50.0%	20.0%	30.0%	2.70
Freshman	50.0%	21.4%	28.6%	2.61
Totals	43.5%	20.5%	36.0%	2.83

Overall Ratings of Tournament Format Options

According to the survey results, the Ivy League student-athletes and coaches find two tournament format options acceptable and two unacceptable. With a mean approval rating of 3.51 and with 59% in favor of this option, the Eight-team bracket with no byes received the highest approval rating. A Six-team bracket with the top two regular season finishers receiving a bye into the semi-finals also had more subjects in favor of this than opposed. The

mean approval rating for that option was 3.45 and 54.1% of the respondents were in favor of this option. The other two options did not have a higher percentage in favor than opposed. The mean approval rating for a four team tournament was 2.83 with only 36% of the subjects voting in favor of this option. The eight-team bracket with two double-byes received the lowest mean approval rating at 2.75 with 32.2% of the subjects voting in favor of this option. Table 40 illustrates the acceptability of each tournament format option by school. Table 41 illustrates this by class.

Table 40

Acceptability of each Tournament Format Option by School

School	An 8-team bracket with no byes	A 6-team bracket with the top 2 seeds receiving a bye	An 8-team bracket with the top 2 seeds receiving a double- bye	A 4 team bracket
Brown	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Columbia	In Favor	In Favor	In Favor	In Favor
Cornell	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	In Favor
Dartmouth	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Harvard	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	In Favor
Penn	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Princeton	Opposed	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed
Yale	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Totals	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	In Favor

Table 41

Acceptability of each Tournament Format Option by Class

Class	An 8-team bracket with no byes	A 6-team bracket with the top 2 seeds receiving a bye	An 8-team bracket with the top 2 seeds receiving a double- bye	A 4 team bracket
Freshman	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Sophomore	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Junior	In Favor	In Favor	In Favor	In Favor
Senior	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	In Favor
Coach	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed
Totals	In Favor	In Favor	Opposed	Opposed

Research Question 7

According to Ivy League Coaches, what is the impact of a conference tournament on the basketball operating budget, non-conference scheduling, and recruiting?

The Ivy League coaches were asked to rate their opinion on the affect of a post-season tournament on three areas of their basketball program. These three questions were asked just of the coaches because of the student-athletes' lack of knowledge of the subject matter. The Ivy League coaches were asked to rate independently on a one to five Likert scale (1 = Extremely negative, 5 = Extremely positive) how the addition of a conference tournament would affect their school's basketball operating budget, the scheduling of non-conference opponents and recruiting. Those coaches answering "1" or "2" on the survey were considered to be "Opposed" and those answering "4" or "5" were considered to be "In Favor".

Basketball Operating Budget

Overall, the coaches did not think the addition of a conference tournament would affect their program's operating budget in either direction. The results showed that 48.4% of the coaches answered "no effect" towards this question, while 35.5% thought it would affect

the budget in a positive manner and 16.1% answered that it would have a negative effect.

The mean score for the basketball operating budget was 3.32. Cornell and Princeton did not have any of their coaches feel that the addition of a tournament would positively affect the operating budget.

Scheduling of Non-Conference Opponents

The Ivy League coaches did not believe that the scheduling of non-conference opponents would be effected by the addition of a conference tournament. The mean score for this question was 3.16 with the Dartmouth coaches had the highest mean at 3.50 while Brown, Cornell, Harvard, Princeton and Yale all answered with a mean score of 3.00. Overall, 87.1% of the coaches that responded believed there would be no effect on the scheduling of non-conference opponents while only 12.9% believed a tournament would have a positive impact.

Recruiting

The Ivy League coaches did believe the addition of a conference tournament would have a positive impact on recruiting. The mean score for this question was 4.29 and only two schools (Penn with a mean of 3.60 and Princeton with a mean of 3.50) had a mean score of lower than 4.00. None of the 31 coaches surveyed believed that the addition of a conference tournament would have a negative effect on recruiting, while 16.1% believed it would have no effect and 83.9% believed it would have a positive effect. Table 42 describes the breakdown by team and overall results of the Ivy League coaches' answers to the impact of a conference tournament on the basketball operating budget, non-conference scheduling and recruiting.

Table 42

*Impact of a Conference Tournament on the Basketball Operating Budget, Non-conference**Scheduling and Recruiting*

School	Basketball Operating Budget	Non-Conference Scheduling	Recruiting
Brown	No Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Columbia	Positive Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Cornell	No Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Dartmouth	Positive Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Harvard	Positive Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Penn	Positive Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Princeton	No Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Yale	No Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect
Totals	No Effect	No Effect	Positive Effect

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

This chapter examines the results of the data and the significance of the survey results. The results of each research question are studied and compared to previous research. Next, conclusions were made from the data and finally, suggestions for future research were given.

Subjects

The population of Ivy League student-athletes and coaches participating in men's basketball during the 2005-2006 season was 150. These basketball players and coaches were spread over eight teams and five groups (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior and coach). Population data was used for this study since there was a high rate of return (.84) from the survey of coaches and student-athletes. While only two teams had a perfect rate of return, the other six schools had at least a two-thirds response rate.. This high rate of return may have shown the importance of the subject matter for the players and coaches. Thirty-one of 34 coaches and 19 of 20 seniors returned surveys, accounting for a 93% response rate from the two groups that have the most experience in the Ivy League and can lend the most insight as to how a conference tournament would affect their teams in the future.

The results for each research question were broken down by school and class to examine for trends within each of these two groups. Every subject was a member of one school and one class. With either Penn or Princeton representing the league in the last 18 NCAA tournaments and 36 of the last 38, the results from the student-athletes and coaches from these two schools as compared to the other six may add insight into the different mentality between Penn, Princeton and the other six Ivy League teams. Table 43 represents the regular season conference finish and average finish over the five-year span of 2001-2005.

Table 43

Ivy League Regular Season Finish from 2001-2005

School	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Avg. Finish
Penn	2	1	1	2	1	1.7
Princeton	1	1	3	1	6	2.6
Brown	2	4	2	2	7	3.5
Yale	4	1	4	4	3	3.8
Harvard	4	5	5	7	3	5.4
Cornell	7	7	5	5	2	5.7
Columbia	4	6	5	5	8	6.1
Dartmouth	7	7	8	8	3	7.0

Research Question 1

Are Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in favor of a post-season conference tournament?

The Ivy League student-athletes and coaches were asked to rate their approval level of a post-season tournament. While the other six research questions dealt with different aspects of a tournament, this question determined whether or not the subjects wanted a tournament. There should be no discussion of tournament location or format options if the subjects are not in favor of a tournament itself. With a mean approval level of 4.07, the

student-athletes and coaches were in favor of a post-season tournament. Overall, 76% of the respondents were in favor of a tournament with just 13% opposed. Princeton was the only team in the study that did not have a mean approval rating over 3.00. They had 9 of their 13 respondents opposed to a tournament and only 3 in favor. The one-way ANOVA results showed that there is a statistical difference between Princeton and the other seven schools on this issue. Penn, on the other hand, had just one respondent opposed and 12 in favor. While they did have the second lowest mean approval rating, their results were more in line with the other six schools than with Princeton. Although Penn has represented the league in the NCAA tournament in 2002, 2003, 2005 and 2006, their subjects are still in favor of a post-season tournament. The other six schools were clearly in favor of a conference tournament. Taking out the results from Penn and Princeton, the other six schools had 86% of their respondents in favor of a tournament with just 6% opposed. Even with Princeton's opposed stance towards a tournament, the other seven schools' approval levels are so high that the overall results are strongly in favor of a tournament.

These results were generally consistent with what Okanes (2001) found concerning opinions on a PAC-10 tournament. The teams that were generally near the top of the standings each year, such as Stanford and Arizona, were opposed to the tournament. They were the only two teams that voted against a tournament during a vote in 2000 (Okanes, 2001). Coaches from Washington State and Arizona State, two schools that have not had a successful history of regular season finishes, spoke in favor of the tournament as a way for teams that did not fare well in the regular season or who were on the bubble for the NCAA Tournament to earn their way into the tournament with a strong showing in the conference tournament (Okanes, 2001). While the Ivy League, being a one-bid league, does not have to

be concerned with teams finishing in the bottom of the standings making a push for an at-large bid with a strong showing in a potential conference tournament, the teams at the bottom of the standings were most in favor of the tournament because of their chance to win the automatic bid to the NCAA tournament.

When the Big Ten conference was having their debate on whether to institute a conference tournament in the mid-1990s, their coaches were more concerned about their teams' performance in NCAA tournament play. The Big Ten coaches wanted a tournament so their teams would be more prepared for the "one and done" format that the NCAA tournament would bring them a week later (DeCourcy, 1996). The Big Ten conference also stated that by having the tournament at a neutral site each year, there could be a potential large economic impact on the host city and another way for the league and its schools to make more money (Dienhart, 1998). The Ivy League's survey results were more in tune with the Pac-10 than the Big Ten and their reasoning behind wanting a conference tournament.

Research Question 2

What factors are most important to Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in their decision on whether they are in favor of a post-season tournament?

The subjects were asked to rate the level of importance of five factors and their agreement level of two statements to help determine the factors that are most important in determining whether or not a subject is in favor of a post-season tournament. While some of the factors are tangible such as "The opportunity to play in additional games" or "The opportunity to play on national television", other factors are more opinion-based such as the impact on academic success and the motivation to play out the regular season games once a team is eliminated from the regular season championship.

“The opportunity to play in additional games” ($\bar{X} = 4.24$) and “The opportunity to play on national television,” ($\bar{X} = 4.23$) received the highest mean ratings of the five factors. Seven of the eight schools rated one of these options as their highest. The student-athletes of the Pac-10 conference also were in favor of a post-season tournament for the opportunity to play additional games on television (Okane, 2001). While it would not be known how much television exposure the Ivy League would attain if they implemented a tournament, it is highly likely that the championship game would be broadcast on national television with earlier round games broadcast locally. Twenty-six of the thirty conference tournament championship games in 2006 were broadcast on one of ESPN’s networks (ESPN, ESPN2, ESPN U or ESPN Classic), while the other four were broadcast nationally on CBS. While some of the power conferences had their earlier rounds broadcast nationally, it is unlikely the Ivy League would draw that attention; however, some of the conferences similar to the Ivy League were able to place their semi-finals and in some cases early round games on regional television. The Patriot League had one of their semi-final games broadcast nationally on College Sports TV and the Northeast Conference had their 2006 semi-final games broadcast regionally on CN8 network and the Madison Square Garden Network (MSG). The Colonial Athletic Association had one of their 2006 semi-finals broadcast regionally on the CAA TV Network while the other was broadcast nationally on ESPNU. The Ivy League can look at these three examples of comparable conferences and believe that they will have an opportunity for television exposure at the very least in their championship game.

The “Experience of playing in a conference tournament” received a mean importance rating of 3.94 with only Princeton rating this factor below 3.00 ($\bar{X} = 2.69$). Using a one-way

ANOVA with Tukey adjusted post hoc tests, Princeton's mean importance rating was significantly different from all other schools except Penn.

The only factor that the coaches and student-athletes did not feel was important was the opportunity for additional travel. This may have to do with the feeling that too much travel may not be good for the student-athlete and that while trips in December and early in the season may have educational purposes, a trip for a conference tournament is strictly business and winning a conference championship.

The travel question results also are explainable because the majority of teams may wish to stay at home or close to home when competing in a conference tournament. The 2006 West Coast Conference Tournament was held in Spokane, WA, on the campus of Gonzaga University. Gonzaga has won the league championship seven times from 1999-2006 and went into the 2006 tournament with a 38 game home-court winning streak (Adams, 2006). Six of the eight schools in the conference are located in California and having to travel north to Spokane, WA, did not sit well with some of the coaches. Jessie Evans, coach of the University of San Francisco, the tournament's number four seed said, "Why should we have to go up there to the farthest end of the conference? It's ridiculous to me (Adams, 2006, para. 9). Evans believes that the tournament should be played on a neutral court in a large city.

While this is the least important factor, it still received a mean importance level of 3.05 with five schools having a mean over 3.00. Princeton (\bar{X} = 1.83), had a statistically significant difference of means with Columbia (p = .000), Cornell (p = .027), Dartmouth (p = .000) and Yale (p = .013) according to a one-way ANOVA with Tukey adjusted post hoc tests. The other seven teams had no significant differences between each other.

Overall, the coaches and student-athletes did not believe that the addition of a conference tournament would jeopardize academic success. Penn and Princeton had the highest and third highest agreement levels, while Harvard, Brown and Yale were the only three schools to have an agreement level below 3.00. The fact that the highest scoring school had just a 3.00 mean agreement level signifies that there is little concern that academics would be jeopardized if a conference tournament is to be added in the future. While it would be an extra weekend that the student-athletes concentrate on basketball, the amount of missed class time would correspond with the tournament location format used. A format in which games are played completely on campus sites would mean that there would be no missed class time for the home team, but a potential for five or six missed days of class for a low seeded team that plays three road games. One factor that was expressed by many subjects was the fact that the possible conference tournament would occur during the spring break of most of the schools. If the tournament is played during spring break, it would not affect missed class time since the student-athletes would not be missing class. One Ivy League coach has the following to say regarding the addition of a tournament and its effect on missed class time, “National rankings of schools academically do not stop schools outside of the Ivy League from participating in post-season tournaments. Why should our kids be looked at differently? They enjoy competing against other student-athletes like themselves. One more weekend will not hurt them academically.” The overall ratings indicate that missed class time would not be an important factor to the subjects, but this cannot be completely evaluated until the tournament location option is chosen and the dates of the tournament are known.

The Pac-10 coaches that were against the implementation of their tournament cited missed class time as an important factor. “I don’t think we’re sending out the right message

in terms of class attendance” said Lute Olson, coach of the University of Arizona (Okanes, 2001, p.3). Mike Montgomery, coach at Stanford University, and his team skipped the pre-tournament press conference so his student-athletes could remain at school another day and take classes (Gilmore, 2002). The two coaches that made these statements were also coaching teams that routinely advanced to the NCAA tournament and did not need a conference tournament to help their cause. Arizona State coach Rob Evans pointed out that if there were no tournament, half of the teams would be on the road playing regular season games anyway (Okanes, 2001). The results from the Pac-10 coaches that had the stronger basketball schools used missed class time as an argument against the tournament, while the schools that needed the conference tournament to help their NCAA tournament qualification did not believe missed class time was that important. These results echo that of the Ivy League student-athletes and coaches.

The Big Ten conference traditionally did not hold a post-season tournament because of such reasons like missed class time and academics. This factor did not stop the conference coaches from approving a tournament on a 9-2 vote (DeCourcy, 1996).

Research Question 3

Would the addition of a conference tournament lessen the importance of each regular season game and the regular season champion?

The Ivy League student-athletes and coaches were asked to rate their agreement level with the statements that the addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of each regular season game and the regular season champion. The mean agreement level was similar for both statements (2.94 and 3.02). The coaches and student-athletes took a neutral stance towards both of these statements. Overall, 46.8% of coaches and student-athletes disagreed with the statement that the addition of a conference tournament would

lessen the importance of each conference game while 41.3% agreed with the statement. The results of this question showed the gap between Princeton and the rest of the Ivy League in their agreement with this statement. Princeton had 69.3% of their student-athletes and coaches agreeing with this statement, with Penn second at 50.0%. The other six schools all have more of their respondents disagreeing with the statement than agreeing. The same trend is shown with the second statement. Princeton had 84.6% of their respondents agreeing that a conference tournament would lessen the importance of a conference title while Penn was second with 65.0% agreeing. Since these are the only two teams that have won an Ivy League title since 1988, they are the only ones who know what it is like to win a regular season title. The other six schools, besides Harvard, all have more disagreeing with the statement than agreeing. Teams such as Columbia (75.1% disagreeing) and Yale (69.3% disagreeing) have not represented the Ivy League in the NCAA tournament during the lifetime of their student-athletes and their responses are expected considering a conference tournament would most likely give them a better chance of advancing to the NCAA tournament.

Research Question 4

What tournament location options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

This is the first of two questions that ask the subjects about tournament location options. This research question examines six tournament location options independently. Three of these options were rated acceptable by the coaches and student-athletes, while three were not acceptable. While each location option was different, they each had their own degree of home court advantage and incentive for regular season finish. A tournament

played entirely at a neutral site would have no home court advantage while games played at home sites would have an advantage.

The Tournament Location Entirely at a Neutral Site

This location option has zero home court advantage and no incentive for regular season finish. This location option was deemed acceptable overall by Ivy League student-athletes and coaches with a mean approval rating of 3.04. Breaking down the results by school, Dartmouth, Columbia, Cornell and Harvard all were in favor of this option while Yale, Brown, Penn and Princeton were opposed. Penn and Princeton, with their strong regular season finishes and conference titles, would seem to be opposed to this option because it would not give them any incentive for regular season finish. The four schools that are in favor of this option would want to neutralize the dominance of Penn and Princeton by forcing them to play the tournament at a neutral site and limiting the advantage they have. Yale and Brown, the other two teams opposed to this option both have had strong league finishes from 2000-2005. Yale finished tied for the regular season championship in 2002, while Brown finished second at 12-2 in 2003.

The Tournament Location Rotated Annually Among each of the Eight Schools

This option gives a random home court advantage to the school that is hosting the event. Each school would host every eight years. There is no advantage for regular season finish since the location is pre-determined. This option received the lowest mean approval rating at 2.63 with 48.0% of the respondents opposed and only 23.2% in favor. Dartmouth and Columbia were the only two schools to not have a greater percentage of their squads opposed to this option than in favor. From 2002-2006, one of these two teams has finished last four of those five season and neither team was able to finish in the top half of the league

standings during that span. They would be in favor of this option to be able to have the home court advantage once every eight years since they have not been able to gain this advantage through their regular season finish. Brown, Yale, Penn, Harvard, and Cornell all have similar opinions to this option with mean approval ratings ranging from 2.67 to 2.33. Princeton is decidedly against this option with 71.0% of their respondents opposed to this option. The teams that finish in the upper half of the standings would most likely be against this option because they would not receive an advantage for their regular season play. There would also be the concern that not all eight schools have facilities that would be capable of hosting a conference tournament. This option was deemed unacceptable by the coaches and student-athletes and should not be considered for use in a conference tournament situation.

The Tournament Location Entirely at the site of the Regular Season Champion

This location option received a mean approval rating of 2.98. Although this rating signifies that the student-athletes and coaches were virtually neutral towards this option, there were more subjects opposed (38.7%) than in favor (34.7%). Three schools, Penn, Princeton and Harvard were in favor, while the other schools were opposed. This format gives a location advantage to the regular season champion only. Since Penn and Princeton have been the only two teams to win the regular season championship outright since 1988, they would be in favor of this option. Harvard, while having a mean approval rating of 3.23, had the same amount of their subjects in favor as opposed. The other five schools were all opposed to this location option most likely because they would not have the opportunity to host the event if Penn and Princeton continue to win the regular season title. This location option is not acceptable among the Ivy League coaches and student-athletes and should not be considered by the league.

*The Tournament Quarterfinals and Semifinals Located at a Neutral Site and the
Championship Game Located at the Site of the Highest Remaining Seed*

This location option combines having all eight teams play at one site for two rounds and at the higher seeded team for the championship round. There is an incentive for regular season finish but only after winning two games on a neutral court. This location option was not deemed acceptable by Ivy student-athletes and coaches. Brown was the only school to have more respondents in favor of this option than opposed and Columbia had the same amount of each. These were the same two schools that were most in favor of having the tournament rotated annually. Princeton and Penn had the third and fourth highest mean approval rating for this option. They would want this option to be able to host the championship game on their home court.

The Tournament Located Entirely at Campus Sites with the Higher Seed Hosting each Game

This location option received the highest overall mean score at 3.38. Dartmouth was the only school with a mean rating of under 3.00 and Cornell was the only team to have a higher percentage of respondents more opposed than in favor. This location option has the least feel of a conference tournament since individual games are played on campus sites and the tournament must be played over a longer period of time giving schools the ability to travel. This location option has the potential for the most missed class time and the most travel since a low seeded team could conceivably play three road games and three different sites. Even with all of the limitations, this option had the highest overall rating. This option could be popular because it allows multiple teams to host games during the tournament. The teams that finish in the third and fourth positions during the regular season would host first round games in addition to the first and second place teams. A team like a Yale and a Brown

that have finished in the top half of the league standings would benefit by an early round home game, even if Penn and Princeton finish ahead of them. Dartmouth had the lowest approval rating and that can be attributed to the fact that their lower half finishes would prevent them from hosting any games. This location option was acceptable by student-athletes and coaches and should be considered by the Ivy League if they feel that home court incentive is of more importance than the experience of a tournament in which all schools are playing at the same location.

A Tournament Format where the Top Two Seeds Host 2-Four Team Tournaments and the Winners Meet in the Championship game at the Higher Seed

This tournament format was used in the Patriot League during the 2005 and 2006 conference tournaments. This option divides the conference in half with four schools playing at the regular season champion and four schools playing at the second place finisher. The two teams remaining after the semi-finals will play at the home of the higher seed. This option provides an incentive for regular season finish, but only for the top two seeds. The results for this option split down the middle with four schools above 3.00 in their mean approval rating and having more respondents in favor than opposed. Brown, Penn, Princeton and Yale were the four schools who voted in favor of this option, again showing the schools (Penn and Princeton) that have won the regular season title and the schools (Brown and Yale) who have had high finishes would want this option to be able to host games on their home court. Brown and Yale would figure they do not need to win the regular season championship, but only finish second in order to host two games and make it to the championship where only one win could get them into the NCAA tournament. Columbia, Cornell, Harvard and Dartmouth all are not in favor of this option and figure that they would

need to win three tournament games on the road to win the championship if they do not finish in the top two in the regular season. This task would be more daunting than having to win three games on their home court or at a neutral site. While this option was not approved by all eight teams, it still received a higher percentage voting in favor than opposed and should be considered if a tournament was implemented.

Overall Results of Tournament Location Options

Of the six possible tournament location options, three were deemed acceptable, while three were deemed unacceptable. Examining the results more closely, there was only one option that the student-athletes and coaches heavily favored and two options that they were heavily opposed to. There were three options that the subjects were split on with all three having the percentage in favor and the percentage opposed within 8% of each other. The options that give the most incentive for regular season finish were approved by Princeton and Penn as well as Yale (regular season tri-champion in 2002) and Brown (regular season runner-up in 2003). The options that give zero or little incentive for regular season finish were favored by schools such as Columbia and Brown that have finished in the lower half of the league standings from 2001-2005. While the results by school yielded significant findings, the results by class did not.

Many of the student-athletes and coaches gave their opinions on potential locations that they felt would be best for the league. One student-athlete from Brown recommended rotating the tournament between Boston, Philadelphia and New York City to give the league the most exposure. Depending on the actual facility used, this idea could prove to be a positive choice for the league as these are the three largest cities in the geographical scope of the league. Some of the coaches of the northern based schools recommended cities such as Providence and areas in upstate New York as possible sites. Coaches from the southern

schools in the league suggested the Palestra or the Spectrum in Philadelphia as a favorable location.

The League office and university presidents have many location format options to choose from if they implement a tournament. The option that the coaches and student-athletes were most in favor of (the tournament played entirely on campus sites) would be the option that has the potential for the most missed class time and the most expensive. The option that the subjects were most opposed to (the tournament rotated annually among all eight schools) has the potential of being the most complicated since all eight schools might not be capable of hosting the tournament. While this research question focuses on each location option independently, research question five examines the location options ranked against each other. From the results of this research question, there are three acceptable location options for student-athletes and coaches.

Research Question 5

What is the preferred tournament location option among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

This question asks the coaches and student-athletes to rank the six location options in order from most preferable to least preferable. The location option that received the highest mean approval score from research question 4 also was the most preferable option overall from the subjects. Six of the eight schools ranked this option as their most preferable adding to the results that this location option received the most positive results. The only two schools that did not rank this option number one was Columbia (second) and Dartmouth (third), the two schools that showed from their results in research question four that they are opposed to tournament options that favor incentive from regular season finish. While

playing the entire tournament at a neutral site received the second highest mean approval rating and the second most preferable ranking, its results were spread across the schools. Columbia and Dartmouth rated this option as their most favorable adding to their preference of not awarding home court by regular season finish. Penn, Princeton and Yale all rated this option as their fifth most preferable. Penn, Princeton and Brown all have similar voting preferences starting with the option that awards the most home court advantage (entirely on campus sites) and potentially three home games. These three schools' second choice is the option with two-four team tournaments. This option awards the regular season champion up to three home games and the runner-up two home games. The third most preferable for Princeton and Brown and fourth for Penn is the option with the quarterfinals and semifinals at a neutral site and the championship at the higher seed, awarding incentive for regular season finish. Penn's third choice, as well as Princeton and Brown's fourth, is the option that has the tournament entirely at the site of the regular season champion. The two options that were voted fifth and sixth by these three schools are the options that do not award regular season finish incentive (entirely at a neutral site and rotated annually). Dartmouth's results are reverse of those from the previous three schools. Their top two options are the ones with no incentive for home court advantage. While student-athletes and coaches on Penn and Princeton can claim regular season championships and would want the options that favor regular season finish, Brown's players and coaches have not. The results from Brown show they believe that their program is on the level of Penn and Princeton and the second place finish in 2003 is not a one shot finish. While, overall, the coaches and players from the eight schools have made it clear that their most preferable option is the one with games entirely on campus sites and their least preferable option as the one where the location is rotated,

examining the results by school shows that preference can be attributed to regular season finish. Those schools (Penn, Princeton, Brown, Yale) that have either won a regular season championship or finished near the top of the standings are more in favor of those options that award home court for regular season finish. Those schools (Dartmouth and Columbia) that have not finished near the top of the standings are more in favor of the options that do not reward home court for regular season finish. If the regular season standings change over the next five years, and schools such as Dartmouth and Columbia finish in the top half of the league standings, the subjects on these teams would most likely vote for options that favor regular season finish. The answer to this question may lie in the two teams that have had experience finishing in both the top half and bottom half of the league standings from 2001-2005, Harvard and Cornell. Harvard finished seventh in the league in 2004 and third in 2005. Cornell finished second in 2005 and seventh in both 2001 and 2002. As expected, their results include a mix of regular season finish incentive options and those without incentive. Cornell has the option entirely at a neutral site ranked second, while Harvard has that ranked third. Harvard has the option of the regular season champion hosting the entire tournament ranked second while Cornell has it ranked sixth. The Ivy League office will need to look at factors such as attendance, expenses, and arena capacities to make the ultimate location decisions, but the current student-athletes and coaches have made their preferences clear with the teams that have finished consistently in the top half of the standings in favor of location options that reward regular season finish, while the teams that finish in the bottom half of the standings in favor of options that do not reward regular season finish.

Research Question 6

What tournament format options are acceptable among Ivy League student-athletes and coaches?

In addition to tournament location options, the subjects were asked questions about tournament format options. The four options differed by two factors, the number of teams invited (either four, six or eight) and whether or not byes are given to the top regular season finishers. Similar to the tournament location options, teams can choose format options with varying degree of incentive towards regular season finish.

An Eight-team Bracket with No Byes

This format option is a traditional eight-team bracket where all eight teams are invited and there are no byes. There is no incentive for regular season finish with this option since all eight teams are invited and there are no byes. This option was acceptable among student-athletes and coaches with a mean approval rating of 3.51 and 59.0% in favor as compared to 24.6% opposed. Dartmouth and Columbia are near the top of the list in mean approval level continuing the trend found in the location options. These two teams had an average finish of sixth from 2001-2005 and both teams finished seventh or worse at least twice during that five-year span. Princeton was the only team to have a mean approval rating of less than 3.00 and had 46.2% opposed as compared to just 23.1% in favor. This could be because they would want a format option that gives more clout to regular season finish and it could just be because the majority of the Princeton team is against a conference tournament altogether. This option did receive the highest mean approval rating with the middle teams such as Yale, Cornell and Harvard all in favor of this option probably because it is the most traditional of the tournament options. With 59.0% of the Ivy League student-athletes and coaches in favor, this tournament format option is acceptable and should be considered if the Ivy League implements a tournament.

A Six-team bracket with the Top Two Seeds Receiving a Bye into the Semi-finals

This format is opposite of the previous in both teams invited and byes for top seeded teams. In this format, only the top six regular season finishers would be invited, leaving teams seven and eight out of the tournament. The top two seeds would receive byes into the semi-finals. This option was also deemed acceptable by the subjects and was a close second in mean approval rating at 3.45. The results by school show the trend of the top regular season finishers favoring the options that give more weight towards regular season finish. Princeton had the second highest mean approval level at 3.69 while Dartmouth had the lowest mean approval level at 3.11. Even the school with the lowest mean approval rating is in favor of this option and it should be considered if the Ivy League ever implements a tournament.

An Eight-team Bracket where the Top Two Seeds Receive a Double-bye into the Semi-finals

This bracket format option involves inviting all eight teams, but giving an advantage to the top two seeds by advancing them to the semi-finals with a double-bye. This option received a mean approval rating of 2.75 with 49.5% opposed as compared to 32.2% in favor. Only two teams, Princeton and Columbia were in favor of this option. Princeton would most likely be in favor because of the double-bye format allowing the higher seed to play fewer games, creating an advantage. Columbia would most likely be in favor because all eight teams are invited. Since this option gives a regular season finish advantage to one factor (double-bye), but not to the other (number of teams invited), mixed results are to be expected. The subjects on each team would vote in favor or opposed depending on if they placed more weight on the double bye or the number of teams invited. Since this is the case and the overall rating is as low as it is with close to half of the subjects voting against this option, it should not be considered if the Ivy League were to implement a tournament.

A Four-team Bracket with only the Top Four Regular Season Finishers

This tournament format option does not reward the top regular season finishers with any byes into the next round, but does only invite the top four teams into the tournament. Results were mixed, but overall only 36.0% of the subjects were in favor as opposed to 43.5% opposed. With a mean approval rating of 2.83, this option finished third of the four format choices. Dartmouth had the lowest mean approval rating at 2.50 which is to be expected since 2005 was the only year they finished in the top five between 2001-2005 and would have been the only year they would have participated in the tournament under this option during that span. Penn and Princeton were the next two lowest mean approval ratings. While Penn would have participated in all five tournaments and Princeton four of the five from 2001-2005 under this option, they still had close to a two to one ratio of their student-athletes and coaches opposed as to in favor. Harvard and Cornell were the two teams with the highest mean approval rating. This result would go against logic since Cornell would have only participated in the 2005 tournament under this option and Harvard the 2001 and 2005 tournaments. Overall, with only two teams in favor and a mean approval rating of 2.83, this option should not be considered if the Ivy League were to institute a tournament.

Overall Ratings of Tournament Format Options

Of the four tournament format options listed, two invited less than eight teams and two gave a bye to the top seeded teams. Teams seemed to vote depending on how much weight they gave to each of these two factors. Two options were approved by the coaches and student-athletes, while two were not. The two that were approved are the options that award no incentive for regular season finish (an eight-team bracket with no byes) and the option that awards incentive in both factors (a six-team tournament with a bye). While not as

strong as the location options, the relationship between regular season finish and format options that award incentive for regular season finish is apparent. The eight-team bracket with no byes is the most traditional tournament format and would be the safest option. Seven of the eight schools voted in favor of this option. According to the subjects, they would also be in favor of a six-team bracket. If the league wants to award incentive for regular season finish, this format would be acceptable.

Research Question 7

According to Ivy League Coaches, what is the impact of a conference tournament on the basketball operating budget, non-conference scheduling, and recruiting?

This question asks the coaches their opinions on three factors impacting their basketball program. They answered how much they think the addition of a conference tournament would affect the following:

Basketball Operating Budget

A conference tournament mean additional games in the season for each team and depending on the tournament location option picked, additional expenses related to travel for some if not all of the teams. While this would seem to mean that the basketball operating budget would be affected in a negative way by adding extra expenses, the coaches did not believe that was the case. Four schools, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard and Penn all believed there would be a positive effect. However, close to half of the coaches (48.4%) believed there would be no effect on the operating budget. This could be the case depending on where the funding comes from to attend a conference tournament and cover the travel expenses. It is possible that the coaches believe the revenue generated from gate receipts, sponsorships, merchandise and television rights would more than cover the expenses of the eight schools.

Non-Conference Scheduling

The coaches did not believe there would be an effect on non-conference scheduling. In the 2005-06 season, the Ivy League teams were permitted to play 27 total games including 13 non-conference games. Since 87.1% of the coaches believed there would be no effect on this factor, the coaches would not change the way they handle non-conference scheduling if a tournament were to be implemented.

Recruiting

All eight schools believed that the addition of a conference tournament would have a positive effect on recruiting. The exposure that comes with a conference tournament would help them recruit athletes to the Ivy League. A conference tournament also gives the schools that finish at the bottom half of the standings another opportunity to win a conference title and advance to the NCAA tournament. These schools can sell the fact that they would be at most three wins away from winning a championship to their recruits. One Ivy League coach stated, "Recruits and prospective recruits get additional opportunities to team and program comparisons." With 83.9% of the coaches believing that the addition of a conference tournament would have a positive effect on recruiting and zero percent believing it would have a negative effect, the league office should look at this statement from the coaches. If they believe that the addition of a conference tournament will help them recruit better athletes, then that could lead to stronger programs overall in the league.

Conclusion

The findings presented in this investigation may interest Ivy League men's basketball student-athletes and coaches, women's basketball student-athletes and coaches, athletic administrators, administration and Ivy League conference officials. Since the Ivy League is the only Division I conference in the country that does not sponsor a post-season tournament,

members of the national media may also find these results interesting. While there are seven research questions and over twenty survey questions, this project covers a wide variety of areas related to a potential post-season tournament in the Ivy League. This project covers the approval level of the tournament, factors that are important in the decision of the subjects' approval level of a tournament, tournament location and format options as well as impact on certain basketball program factors. While the subject's class did not make much of a difference in the survey results, the school affiliation proved to be notable. Subjects from Penn and Princeton, the two schools that have the highest average regular season finish from 2001-2005 and the only two schools to have earned the Ivy League's automatic bid to the NCAA tournament during that time, had different opinions than subjects from Columbia and Dartmouth, the two schools that had the lowest average regular season finish from 2001-2005. These opinions differed in most of the research questions and showed the impact of regular season finish on the mindset of the student-athletes and coaches.

In terms of the approval level of a post-season tournament, seven schools were in favor with Princeton being the only school opposed. Overall, with 76% of the student-athletes and coaches surveyed in favor of a tournament, the league officials and university administrators should be aware of that number. The student-athletes and coaches' opinions on how a conference tournament would jeopardize academic success should be noted as well. None of the eight teams believed that academic success would be jeopardized because of the additional travel that comes with a conference tournament. Academics have long been one of the main reasons why university presidents have not implemented a tournament in the past.

The student-athletes and coaches were decisive in choosing three tournament location options and two tournament format options that were acceptable to them if a tournament is to be held. These options had varying degrees of incentive for regular season finish. Schools such as Penn, Princeton and Brown that have finished near the top of the Ivy standings during the 2001-2005 time span were in favor of options that rewarded a strong regular season record, while schools such as Columbia and Dartmouth that had the lowest average finish during those five years were in favor of location and format options that did not give incentive to schools that finished with a strong regular season record. In choosing the tournament location and format, the Ivy League should expect that schools that finish in the top two or three in the regular season would want to be rewarded for that effort and need to keep in mind that the choice of location and format can have a large impact in the team that ends up winning the tournament.

While the opinions of the student-athletes and coaches may not sway the league officials and university presidents that will ultimately decide the fate of a conference tournament, they should be given consideration since they are the ones that are most affected by a tournament or lack thereof.

Future Research

The men's student-athletes and coaches are just one group that can be examined when determining the impact of a conference tournament on the Ivy League. The opinions of the women's coaches and players would also be impacted by this decision as they would most likely implement a tournament if the men were to have one. Athletic administrators, university presidents and the league office are also on a list of those that will have a say in this decision and their opinions would be valuable. While the opinions of those involved

with a tournament are important, the feasibility of implementing this event will have just as much an impact on the decision. The costs associated with renting a facility, traveling, officials, and other expenses will weigh heavily on the ultimate decision. The timing of the tournament would also be a major concern since the regular season ends just five days before the announcement of the NCAA tournament. If a tournament were to be implemented, the regular season schedule of the Ivy League teams may need to be altered. Research could also be done in the area of fan interest as these are the people that would attend the event. The Ivy League officials would want to have an estimate of the number of people who would attend a league tournament at various locations. The more information the league has about the success of a tournament will help them to ultimately determine if they want to implement one. The research from this study shows that the student-athletes and coaches who participated during the 2005-2006 basketball season are in favor of a tournament. These results coupled with future research about the feasibility of a tournament will help the Ivy League officials and university presidents in determining whether the conference implements a post-season tournament, or remains the only Division I conference without one.

APPENDIX A

TOURNAMENTS FROM FIVE SIMILAR CONFERENCES

The following represents data collected on five Division-I conferences and their post-season basketball tournament format, location, results and future. Each conference was examined over the years 1996-2005. These five conferences were chosen because of their geographic and attendance similarities to the Ivy League (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). All five conferences are considered "one-bid leagues" because none sent an at-large bid to the NCAA tournament from 1996-2005. This section presents the different location formats, bracketing options and brief futures of each tournament for the Ivy League to consider if they are to implement a post-season tournament.

America East Conference

Overview

The America East Conference contains schools in the New England area. In 2004-2005, the league was composed of the following ten schools: The University at Albany, Binghamton University, Boston University (Boston U.), Hartford University, University of Maine, University of Maryland-Baltimore County (UMBC), University of New Hampshire (UNH), Northeastern University, Stony Brook University and University of Vermont. From 1996-2005, the landscape of the America East Conference changed as four schools (University of Delaware, Drexel University, Towson University and Hofstra University) left the conference at the end of the 2001 season to join the Colonial Athletic Association. The

conference remained at ten schools until the defection and immediately added Stony Brook University, the University at Albany and Binghamton University to raise their conference membership to nine. The conference contained nine schools from 2001-2003 and added the University of Maryland-Baltimore County for the 2004-2005 season.

Tournament Format

The America East conference tournament format has remained the same even though they have had a transformation in their conference membership. The league has invited all of its participants to play in the post-season tournament (this excludes the 2002 and 2003 tournaments when Binghamton did not participate because they were not eligible for NCAA post-season play due to their reclassification from Division II to Division I). The first three rounds of each of ten tournaments from 1996-2005 took place at a pre-determined site on the campus of one of the participants. From 1996-2001, the tournament was held on the campus of the University of Delaware. After Delaware left the conference in 2001, the first three rounds of the tournament shifted to Northeastern University in 2002 and Boston University in 2003 and 2004. Binghamton University hosted the first three rounds of the tournament in 2005 (America East Championship Results, 2005). The tournament's first three rounds took place over a Friday, Saturday and Sunday at one location, while the championship game was played the following Saturday morning at the home court of the higher seed.

Location Advantage

The University of Delaware advanced to the championship game four of the six times they hosted but only one of those times did they have to upset a higher seed (America East Championship Results, 2005). In 2002, #7 seed Northeastern failed to win their quarterfinal game at home against #2 Boston U. and in 2003, Boston U. won two games as the #1 seed on

their home floor to advance to the championship game. In 2004, Boston U., lost as the #1 seed on their home floor in the quarterfinals to #8 Stony Brook. Binghamton hosted the event in 2005 and they did win one game as the #5 seed, defeating #4 Albany before losing to eventual champion Vermont (America East Championship Results, 2005). Home teams finished 12-5 in the first three rounds of the tournament with only 3 of those wins over a higher seeded team. Twice, (Boston U., in 2004 and Delaware in 1996) the tournament host lost to a lower seeded team. So, while hosting the tournament did not give the host school an advantage for the first three rounds, the home court in the championship game was important as the home team won nine out of ten times.

Tournament Results

In the ten years examined, the #1 seed reached the finals eight times and won the tournament seven times. Boston University was the only #1 seed to lose in the championship game and the only team to lose the championship game on its home court when Vermont defeated them in 2004. The only times the #1 seed failed to reach the championship game were in 2002 when #5 seed Maine defeated #1 seed Vermont and in 2004 and when #8 seed Stony Brook defeated the #1 seed Boston University in the quarterfinals. Schools having to play in the first round game (seeds #7-#10) have only one quarterfinal victory in ten years (Stony Brook's upset over top seed BU in 2004). First round winners are just 1-19 in their next game and the top 2 seeds reached the semi-finals in nine of the ten years of the study. Table A1 illustrates the locations and championship results of the 1996-2005 America East conference championship tournaments.

Table A1

America East Conference Tournament Results 1996-2005

Year	First 3 rounds Location	Championship Location	Championship Result
1996	Delaware	Drexel	#1 Drexel def. #2 Boston U.
1997	Delaware	Boston U	#1 Boston U. def. #2 Drexel
1998	Delaware	Delaware	#1 Delaware def. #2 Boston U.
1999	Delaware	Delaware	#1 Delaware def. #2 Drexel
2000	Delaware	Hofstra	#1 Hofstra def. #3 Delaware
2001	Delaware	Hofstra	#1 Hofstra def. #2 Delaware
2002	Northeastern	Boston U	#2 Boston U. def. #5 Maine
2003	Boston U	Boston U	#2 Vermont def. #1 Boston U.
2004	Binghamton	Vermont	#2 Vermont def. #4 Maine
2005	Binghamton	Vermont	#1 Vermont def. #2 Northeastern

Tournament Future

The current format in the America East Conference has been used since 1996 and will continue to be implemented in at least the 2006 and 2007 seasons (Men's Basketball Championship Returns in Binghamton in 2006, Boston University to Host in 2007, 2005). In an agreement by conference athletic directors in May of 2005, the 2006 tournament was again awarded to Binghamton University and the 2007 tournament was awarded to Boston University (Men's Basketball Championship Returns in Binghamton in 2006, Boston University to Host in 2007, 2005). Joel Thirer, Director of Health, Physical Education and Athletics at Binghamton was pleased with the event in 2005 and commented, "The championship was a big financial success, which was attributable to our great fan and sponsor support. While revenue generation is not the only factor that needs to be considered, from a fiscal standpoint, the America East Conference benefits from a stronger bottom line with regard to underwriting all of the conference's services throughout the year (Men's Basketball Championship Returns in Binghamton in 2006, Boston University to Host in

2007, 2005).” The tournament drew 15,977 fans for the first three rounds in Binghamton and sold out one of the quarterfinal sessions and the semi-final session (Men’s Basketball Championship Returns in Binghamton in 2006, Boston University to Host in 2007, 2005).

Colonial Athletic Association

Overview

The Colonial Athletic Conference was the beneficiary of the defections from the America East Conference as they gained the University of Delaware, Hofstra University, Towson University and Drexel University for the 2001-2002 season. These four schools replaced The University of Richmond which left after the 2001 season for the Atlantic 10, East Carolina University (ECU) which became a member of Conference USA in 2001 and American University which became the eighth member of the Patriot League in 2001. After the conference changes in 2001, the scope of the Colonial broadened with schools as far north as Long Island, NY (Hofstra) and as far south as Wilmington, NC (UNC-Wilmington). The league contained teams in the New York (Hofstra), Philadelphia (Drexel), Baltimore (Towson), Washington DC (George Mason) and Richmond (Virginia Commonwealth University (VCU)) markets. The other schools rounding out the conference include Old Dominion University (ODU), James Madison University (JMU) and the College of William & Mary. In 2004-05, the conference finished 12th out of 31 Division I conferences in average home basketball attendance at 3,812 fans per game (2005 NCAA Division I Men’s Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005).

Tournament Format

Similar to the America East Conference, the Colonial invites all of its members to the post-season tournament, but they play their entire tournament at one site over a consecutive

four-day span. In the ten years examined, the Colonial has played their entire tournament at the Richmond Coliseum in Richmond, VA. The Coliseum was once the home of Virginia Commonwealth until the 1999 season when they moved into a new arena in the same city as University of Richmond until they left the league in 2001. No Colonial team from 1996-2005 that had to play a first round game has advanced past the semi-finals (2004-05 Men's Basketball in Review, 2005).

Location Advantage

VCU was the regular season champion in 1996 and won the conference tournament on their home floor. The following year as the #4 seed, VCU lost in their first game of the tournament to #5 seed William and Mary. In 1998, VCU finished ninth and lost in the quarterfinals after beating #8 East Carolina in the first round game. In 1999, VCU as the #6 seed upset #3 seed Richmond before falling in the semi-finals (2004-05 Men's Basketball in Review, 2005). Even though their home court gave them a few upset victories according to seeding, the only time VCU won the Colonial tournament on their home court was in 1996 as the number one seed.

The University of Richmond staged one upset victory in their home city before they left the conference. In 1998, as the #3 seed, they defeated #1 UNC-Wilmington in the championship round at Richmond Coliseum to advance to the NCAA Tournament (2004-05 Men's Basketball in Review, 2005).

From 2000-2005, VCU won the conference tournament in 2004 as the number one seed, but was twice defeated by lower seeds in the 2000 quarterfinals and the 2003 semifinals (2004-05 Men's Basketball in Review, 2005).

Tournament Results

In the ten years examined, the #1 seed won the tournament seven times and reached the championship game nine times. As the number four seed, UNC-Wilmington's upset victory over #1 seed George Mason in 2000 was the only loss by a #1 seed before the championship game. Schools winning in the first round went 2-11 in the quarterfinals. The #2 seed has not fared as well as their seeding should indicate. The only year that the #2 seed won the tournament was 2001 and they advanced to the championship game only 3 times in the ten year span (2004-05 Men's Basketball in Review, 2005). Table A2 illustrates the Colonial Athletic Association Tournament from 1996-2005.

Table A2

Colonial Athletic Association Tournament Results 1996-2005

Year	Location	#1 Seed Result	Championship Result
1996	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 VCU def. #3 UNC-Wilmington
1997	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 ODU def. #6 James Madison
1998	Richmond Coliseum	Runner-up	#3 Richmond def. #1 UNC-Wilm.
1999	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 George Mason def. #2 ODU
2000	Richmond Coliseum	Semi-finals	#4 UNC-Wilmington def. #3 Richmond
2001	Richmond Coliseum	Runner-up	#2 George Mason def. #1 UNC-Wilm
2002	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 UNC-Wilm def. #3 VCU
2003	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 UNC-Wilm def. #3 Drexel
2004	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 VCU def. #3 George Mason
2005	Richmond Coliseum	Champion	#1 ODU def. #2 VCU

Tournament Future

While the CAA tournament has been held at the Richmond Coliseum since 1990, their contract with the city expires in 2007 and cities such as Norfolk and Baltimore are excited at the opportunity to lure the tournament away from Richmond. The 16 year run at the Richmond Coliseum trails only the Big East's 23 year continuous stay at Madison Square

Garden among conference tournaments (Radford, 2005). The Colonial tournament drew a tournament record 10,650 fans for the 2005 championship game between ODU and VCU. Virginia Commonwealth's SportsCenter department estimated a \$4.9 million economic impact on the city of Richmond for the 2005 tournament (Radford, 2005). The city of Baltimore is interested in bringing the tournament to 1st Mariner Arena, while Norfolk would like to have the tournament at the Scope. ODU athletic director Dr. Jim Jarrett said, "As long as our league isn't going to play men's tournament games on the regular season floor of a conference member, Scope is as great an opportunity for our fans to see us play in person as there is... I'm really pleased Norfolk is bidding on it" (Radford, 2000). .

Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference

Overview

The Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference (MAAC) consists of teams in the New York area. Six schools (Canisius College, Iona College, Manhattan College, Marist College, Niagara University, and Siena College are located in New York State). Three schools (Fairfield University in Connecticut, Rider University and St. Peter's College in New Jersey) are located in adjoining states. Loyola College in Maryland is the tenth member of the MAAC. The league has had ten teams since 1997 when Rider and Marist joined the conference. In 2004-05, the MAAC averaged 2,513 fans per game placing them 20th of the 31 Division I conferences (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Attendance, 2005).

Tournament Format

The MAAC tournament has alternated between the Pepsi Arena in Albany and HSBC Arena in Buffalo each year during the ten-year examination except for a one-year move to the Sovereign Bank Arena in Trenton, NJ in 2003. Both Pepsi Arena and HSBC arena have

hosted the Men's NCAA Basketball tournament and both seat over 17,000 fans. Pepsi Arena in Albany is the home court of Siena College, while HSBC Arena in Buffalo is located within 25 miles of both Canisius and Niagara. In 1996 and 1997, when the conference had eight schools, the tournament had three rounds with no byes. From 1998-2002, after the expansion to ten schools, the tournament added a first round involving seeds #7-#10. In 2003, the conference decided to reward the regular season champion by giving that school a bye directly to the semi-finals (Men's Basketball Championship History, 2005). Seeds #2-#4 receive a bye into the second round leaving the #5-#10 seeds to play first round matches. This format has remained through the 2005 championship.

Location Advantage

Siena has profited from a home court tournament at the Pepsi Arena in Albany. The Saints won the tournament as the #7 seed in 2002 by winning four games (three over higher seeds). Siena is 9-4 in conference tournament games at home, but just 5-4 in Buffalo and Trenton (Men's Basketball Championship History, 2005). Niagara as the #1 seed won the 2005 MAAC tournament in nearby Buffalo. The Purple Eagles are 4-3 in Buffalo over the 1996-2005 span but that includes an upset loss as the number one seed in 1999 to five seed St. Peters. Niagara is 5-4 in Albany and Trenton. Canisius, who won the 1996 tournament in Buffalo, has returned to the finals two other times, both in Buffalo. The Golden Griffins are 5-4 in Buffalo and 6-5 in the two other sites. Rider had the opportunity to play in the 2003 conference tournament in nearby in Trenton, NJ but as the #7 seed lost in the first round to #8 seed Saint Peters.

Tournament Results

Table A3 illustrates the championship results of the MAAC tournament from 1996-2005. Prior to the tournament format switch in 2003, the #1 seed had won the championship only two times out of seven years and had reached the championship game only one other time. Since the tournament switched to the double-bye format in 2003, the number one seed has defeated the number two seed in all three conference tournament championship games. In 27 total tournament games played since the format switch there have been only three times (11%) where the lower seeded team has won the game. That is compared to the previous seven years where the lower seeded team won 23 out of 59 games (39%) (Men's Basketball Championship History, 2005).

Table A3:

MAAC Conference Tournament Results 1996-2005

Year	Location	#1 Seed Result	Championship Result
1996	Albany, NY	Semifinalist	#5 Canisius def. #2 Fairfield
1997	Buffalo, NY	Quarterfinalist	#8 Fairfield def. #2 Canisius
1998	Albany, NY	Champion	#1 Iona def. #3 Siena
1999	Buffalo, NY	Semifinalist	#2 Siena def. #5 Saint Peters
2000	Albany, NY	Runner-Up	#2 Iona def. #1 Siena
2001	Buffalo, NY	Champion	#1 Iona def. #2 Canisius
2002	Albany, NY	Quarterfinalist	#7 Siena def. #4 Niagara
2003	Trenton, NJ	Champion	#1 Manhattan def. #2 Fairfield
2004	Albany, NY	Champion	#1 Manhattan def. #2 Niagara
2005	Buffalo, NY	Champion	#1 Niagara def. #2 Rider

Tournament Future

The reasoning behind the tournament format change in 2003 from the MAAC Council of Presidents was to hold the tournament in one location over a four-day weekend, lessen missed class time and improve the conference's opportunity to play in the postseason.

They wanted a better championship experience for their student-athletes and fans. They took away a tournament banquet on Thursday night allowing its teams to attend class that day and instead held a small function between game sessions on Friday afternoon. By placing the number one seed directly into the semifinals they thought that was a huge reward for a regular season championship (MAAC Announces New Format, 2005).

The 2006 MAAC tournament will be in Pepsi Arena in 2006, but will move to Bridgeport, CT in 2007 for the first time. Bridgeport's Arena at Harbor Yard is the home of Fairfield University's basketball team and seats 9,000 (Fairfield University named to host 2007 MAAC Basketball Tournament, 2005). MAAC commissioner Rich Ensor commented, "It is great to bring the championship to Connecticut and have our local fans presented with the opportunity to attend the event at the Arena at Harbor Yard. Rotating the championship between cities allows all our fans the opportunity to experience top-level NCAA basketball on a regular basis. The basketball championship has been a well-received event in Albany, Buffalo and Trenton and we anticipate that it can be equally successful in Bridgeport" (Fairfield University named to host 2007 MAAC Basketball Tournament, 2005, para. six).

Northeast Conference

Overview

The Northeast Conference (NEC) contains schools located in the northeastern part of the United States, primarily in the New York/New Jersey area and north to Connecticut, west to Pittsburgh and south to Baltimore. In 2005, 11 schools competed in the NEC including charter members Fairleigh Dickinson University (FDU), Long Island University (LIU), Robert Morris University, St. Francis College (NY), St. Francis University (PA), and Wagner College. These schools were among the original schools in 1981 that formed the NEC

(About the Northeast Conference, 2005). Additionally, Monmouth University (1985), Mount St. Mary's College (1989), Central Connecticut State University (CCSU) (1997), Quinnipiac University (1998) and Sacred Heart University (1999) have joined the conference in the last 20 years.

Tournament Format

In 2005, The NEC played their entire tournament on campus sites for the first time since 1997. The conference promoted that their tournament went "Back to Campus" (About the Northeast Conference, 2005, para. nine.). Only the top eight teams were invited to the tournament and each game was played on the home court of the higher seed. Games were played over the span of six days on a Thursday, Saturday and Wednesday. Prior to the current format, the NEC played their quarterfinal and semifinal games at a predetermined location (Wagner College 2002-2004, Central Connecticut St. 1998) and had the higher seed host the championship match, and held their entire tournament at one location (Sovereign Bank Arena in Trenton, NJ 2000-2001 and Wagner College in 1999). The current format of each game being hosted by the higher seed was implemented in 1996 and 1997. In 1997, all 10 teams were invited to the post season tournament while in the years after only the top eight teams participated. In 2001, the top seven schools were invited (Rattner, 2005, p. 60-68).

Location Advantage

Wagner College and Central Connecticut State were the only two schools that had the opportunity to host games on their home court before the championship round when games were held at one site. Including championship games, Wagner went 3-4 on their home floor during the tournament from 1996-2005 (Rattner, 2005, p. 60-68). Central Connecticut State

did not participate in the tournament in 1998 because they finished in 10th place in the conference even though they hosted the event. In the three years (1996-97 and 2005) that the tournament was played entirely on campus sites, the home team went 21-4 (84%) (Rattner, 2005, p. 66-67). In all but 1999-2001 the higher seeded team has hosted the championship game with a record of 6-1.

Tournament Results

The number one seed in the NEC tournament has won the championship five of the ten times played between 1996-2005 and has reached the championship match seven times. The number two seed reached the tournament finals three times from 1996-2005. Six different schools won championships in this ten-year span (Rattner, 2005, p.60-68). Table A4 illustrates the NEC Championship results from 1996-2005

Table A4:

Northeast Conference Championship Results 1996-2005

Year	First 2 rounds Location	Championship Location	Championship Result
1996	Higher Seed Hosts	Monmouth	#3 Monmouth def. #4 Rider
1997	Higher Seed Hosts	Long Island U	#1 Long Island U. def. #3 Monmouth
1998	CCSU	Long Island U	#2 FDU def. #1 Long Island U
1999	Wagner	Wagner	#6 Mt. St. Marys def. #5 CCSU
2000	Trenton, NJ	Trenton, NJ	#1 CCSU def. #3 Robert Morris
2001	Trenton, NJ	Trenton, NJ	#2 Monmouth def. #1 St. Francis (NY)
2002	Wagner	CCSU	#1 CCSU def. #7 Quinnipiac
2003	Wagner	Wagner	#1 Wagner def. #6 St. Francis (NY)
2004	Wagner	Monmouth	#1 Monmouth def. #7 CCSU
2005	Higher Seed Hosts	FDU	#2 FDU def. #6 Wagner

Tournament Future

The Northeast Conference finished last of all 31 Division I conferences in attendance in the 2004-2005 season with an average of only 1,155 fans per game. Attendance did

increase for NEC tournament games to 1,730 fans. (2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance, 2005). After returning to a conference tournament format of games being played entirely on campus sites in 2005 for the first time in eight years, the NEC has decided to use this format again for the 2006 season.

The Patriot League

Overview

The Patriot League has eight schools participating in basketball, American University, Bucknell University, Colgate University, The College of the Holy Cross, Lafayette College, Lehigh University, United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy. The Patriot League has only sponsored a basketball championship tournament since 1991.

Tournament Format

Since 1993, the Patriot League has allowed the higher seed in the championship game to host the finals allowing for an incentive to win the regular season. The first two rounds of the tournament have been moved around both campus gyms and arenas not affiliated with member institutions. The first two rounds of the Patriot League tournament have been held on the campuses of Holy Cross, Lehigh, Navy, Army, and Lafayette. From 2002-2004, the league played the tournament at the Showplace Arena in Upper Marlboro, MD. In 2005, The Patriot League decided to hold two separate four team tournaments with the winners meeting for the championship. The eight-team bracket was divided in half with the number two, three, six and seven seeds playing on the campus of the number two seed and the number one, four, five and eight seeds playing on the campus of the number one seed. Holy Cross and Bucknell, the top two seeds each hosted Friday doubleheaders and a single game on

Sunday with the two host teams winning both games to advance to the championship game the following Friday afternoon at Holy Cross, the regular season league champion. Bucknell drew over 3,000 fans to each of its two sessions and Holy Cross drew about 1,800 fans to each of their sessions. The championship game in Worcester had attendance of approximately 4,000 in the Hart Center.

Location Advantage

Five of the eight schools have had the opportunity to host the quarterfinals and semifinals of the tournament. Including championship games (where the home team is 8-2), home teams are 20-4 (83%) in tournament play from 1996-2005 and the two losses before the finals by home teams came from hosts that lost games to a higher seed. This means that a home team did not lose to a lower seeded team before the championship game from 1996-2005 (2004-2005 Patriot League Men's Basketball Media Guide, 2005).

Tournament Results

In the fifteen Patriot League conference tournaments (1991-2005), the number one seed has won the championship 12 times with the number two seed winning the remaining three. There have been three times that the number one and number two seeds have not met in the championship game (the three times this occurred, it was the number one seed meeting the number three seed) (Patriot League All-Sports Record Book, 2004). Table A5 illustrates the Patriot League Tournament history:

Table A5:

Patriot League Men's Basketball Conference Tournament Results

YEAR	FORMAT	Champion (seed)	Runner-up (seed)
1991	Entire tournament hosted by Holy Cross	Fordham (1)	Holy Cross (3)
1992	Entire tournament hosted by Lehigh	Fordham (1)	Bucknell (2)
1993	Q and S at campus sites, F at Bucknell	Holy Cross (2)	Bucknell (1)
1994	Entire tournament hosted by Navy	Navy (1)*	Colgate (1)*
1995	Q and S at Army, F at Colgate	Colgate (1)	Navy (3)
1996	Q and S at Holy Cross, F at Colgate	Colgate (1)	Holy Cross (3)
1997	Q and S at Lehigh, F at Navy	Navy (1)	Bucknell (2)
1998	Q and S at Navy, F at Navy	Navy (1)	Lafayette (2)
1999	Q and S at Army, F at Lafayette	Lafayette (1)	Bucknell (2)
2000	Q and S at Lafayette, F at Lafayette	Lafayette (1)*	Navy (1)*
2001	Q and S at Navy, F at Holy Cross	Holy Cross (1)	Navy (2)
2002	Q and S at U. Marlboro, MD, F at American.	Holy Cross (2)	American (1)
2003	Q and S at U. Marlboro, MD, F Holy Cross	Holy Cross (1)	American (2)
2004	Q and S at U. Marlboro, MD, F at Lehigh	Lehigh (1)	American (2)
2005	Q and S at Bucknell and Holy Cross, F at Holy Cross	Bucknell (2)	Holy Cross (1)

Note: Q = Quarterfinal Round, S = Semifinal Round, F = Final Round

* = Tied for first place in the regular season

Tournament Future

The Patriot League changed their tournament format more over the 1996-2005 time period than any of the other four conferences researched in that same time span. The one thing that has remained constant is the championship game being played on the home court of the higher seed. After having the first two rounds of the tournament at Show Place Arena in Upper Marlboro, MD for three years, the Patriot League decided to give more of an advantage to the top two seeds by letting them host their first two games. This format will again be in place for the 2005-2006 season (2004-2005 Patriot League Men's Basketball Media Guide, 2004).

APPENDIX B

2005 DIVISION I CONFERENCE TOURNAMENTS

Table B1 illustrates the conferences, teams involved, potential class days missed, location and tournament format for the 30 conference tournaments that took place in 2005. The order of conferences is by average attendance throughout the 2004-2005 season.

Teams Invited

Of the 31 Division I conferences that held a post-season tournament in 2005, 19 included its entire membership in the tournament. A total of 290 of 314 schools in a conference with a post-season tournament participated in their conference's tournament in 2005. Of the top 15 conferences by average attendance in 2005, the Pac-10 and Conference USA did not include all of their members in their post-season tournament. Of the 26 conferences that contained over eight schools, 16 included all of their schools in their post-season tournament while ten decided to invite the top eight schools from the regular season standings. For tournaments larger than eight, the lower seeded schools would have to win four games to win the tournament. In 2005, the Mid-American Conference invited all 13 teams to its post-season tournament. Seeds 4-13 would have to win four games to win the tournament while seeds 1-3 would only have to win three games. For tournaments being played entirely at one site, having more than eight schools participate adds an extra round and an extra day to the tournament, but does not increase the amount of travel. Of the 30 conference tournaments in 2005, 21 were held entirely at one site. Of those 21, only 6 did not invite all of its members to participate. Kyle Kallander, commissioner of the Big South

Conference, a traditional one-bid league, commented that they wanted to limit their conference tournament to eight teams because of the impact on missed class time and budget limitations (Ask the Commissioner, n.d.).

Missed Class Time

Missed class time is a variable in the determination of conference tournament format and location. Potential class days missed in Table B1 was determined by adding each day that tournament games were played on a class day as well as adding an additional day before the tournament for practice. For instance, the Big 10 tournament had the potential for only three missed class days in 2005 since the tournament is held from Thursday through Sunday. Wednesday, Thursday and Friday are the potential class days missed. Four tournaments had the potential for five or more class days missed. The MEAC has the potential for four class days missed because the first two rounds are played over the span of four days, giving the winners of these rounds a day off in between games. The Southland and Big South conferences played entirely on campus sites, meaning a lower seeded team could possibly play three road games.

Tournament Location

The top 12 conferences by attendance all played their conference tournament at one site and nine of those 12 were held on a neutral court. The Big East played their 2005 tournament at Madison Square Garden in New York City, the home court of St. John's University. Conference USA played their 2005 tournament at the FedEx Forum, home court of Memphis University. The WAC played their tournament in Reno, NV on the campus of the University of Nevada-Reno. Nine of the bottom 18 conferences by average attendance had some kind of location change involved in their tournament.

- First round games are played on campus sites with the higher seed hosting each game and then the remainder of the tournament is played at one location (Mid-American, Ohio Valley and Big Sky).
- All rounds up to the championship are played at one location and the championship round is then held on the home court of the higher seed (American East and Patriot).
- The entire tournament is played on campus sites with each game being hosted by the higher seed (Southland, Big South, Northeast)

The Horizon League had a combination of the first two options playing first round games on campus sites, quarterfinal and semi-final games at the home of the regular season champion and the championship game at the highest remaining seed. This location format has the potential for six class days missed if a low seeded team advances to the championship game. The Horizon League Executive Council passed a proposal for this new tournament format in 2002. They wanted to spread the conference tournament around to multiple venues and award teams for regular season play by allowing the number one seed to host the second round and semifinals as well as the highest remaining seed to host the championship. In 2002 and 2003, the championship games were played in front of sellout crowds (2004-2005 Horizon League Men's Basketball Media Guide. 2004).

Tournament Format

The Horizon League is a conference that has recently gone to an untraditional form of bracketing for their tournament. Conferences are beginning to award top regular season finishers with more than games on their home court. The following formats were used in 2005 conference tournaments with the order from least emphasis put on regular season finish to most emphasis:

- 8 Teams – all teams playing 3 games. This format gives no advantage to regular season finish in terms of how many games they have to win. All eight teams would have to win three games to win the championship. Seed match-ups are 1-8, 4-5, 3-6, 2-7. 10 of the 12 conferences with eight teams in their tournament use this format with no byes.
- More than 8 teams – higher seeded teams receive one bye. This is the preferred tournament format for 15 of the 17 conferences that have more than eight participants. An example of this format is the SEC where there are 12 teams participating. The top four teams receive a bye into the quarterfinals and seeds 5-12 will play first round games. This gives an advantage to finishing in the top four as these teams would only have to win three games to win the title as opposed to four games.
- Less than 8 teams – higher seeded teams receive one bye. This format is used in the Big Sky Conference where only six of their eight teams are invited to the post-season tournament. This format is similar to the one above, just with fewer teams. The top two seeds receive a bye into the semifinals while seeds 3-6 play in the quarterfinals.
- Double Byes – Four conferences have instituted a format in which their top seeded teams receive double byes. This format emphasizes the regular season finish by giving top seeded teams either a one or two game advantage over the other schools in the league. Here are the four leagues implementing a double-bye format
 - West Coast Conference and Big West Conference implement the same format with eight schools involved. This format uses four rounds in which the top two seeds receive byes into the semi-finals while seeds three and four receive one bye into the 2nd round. Seeds 5-8 play in the first round.

- As mentioned above, the Horizon League uses a double bye format for their tournament. They have nine teams participating with the top two seeds receiving a double bye into the semifinals. The third seed receives a bye into the 2nd round and seeds 4-9 play first round games.
- The Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference uses a double bye format in their 10 team tournament. The top seed receives a bye into the semi-finals while seeds 2-4 receive a bye into the second round. Seeds 5-10 play first round games.

Table B1

2005 Division I Conference Tournaments

Conference	Teams	Class Days	Location	Format
Big 10	11/11	3	Indianapolis, IN	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
ACC	11/11	4	Washington, DC	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
SEC	12/12	3	Atlanta, GA	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
Big East	12/12	4	New York, NY	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined site- home of one of the participating teams
Big 12	12/12	3	Kansas City, MO	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
Mtn West	8/8	3	Denver, CO	All 3 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
Pac 10	8/10	3	Los Angeles, CA	All 3 rounds at pre-determined neutral site in the same city as 2 of the participating institutions
Conference USA	12/14	4	Memphis, TN	All 4 rounds at pre-determined site – home of one of the participating teams
Missouri Valley	10/10	3	St. Louis, MO	All 4 rounds at pre-determined neutral site
Western Athletic	10/10	3	Reno, NV	All 4 rounds at pre-determined site – home of one of the participating teams
Atlantic 10	12/12	4	Cincinnati, OH	All 4 rounds at pre-determined neutral site in the same city as one of the participating institutions

Colonial	10/10	3	Richmond, VA	All 4 rounds at pre-determined neutral site in the same city as one of the participating institutions
Mid American	13/13	4	1R: Campus Sites Q-F: Cleveland, OH	5 first round games involving seeds 4-13 at higher seed Quarterfinals thru finals at pre-determined neutral site
Horizon	9/9	6	1R :Campus Sites QF-SF: Milwaukee, WI F: Milwaukee, WI	Seeds 4-9 play first round games at higher seeds Winners join 3 seed in the quarterfinals Top 2 seeds get byes into semifinals Regular season champion hosts quarterfinals and semifinals Championships game is played at highest seed remaining
Sun Belt	11/11	4	Denton, TX	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined site – home of one of the participating teams
Ohio Valley	8/11	4	QF: Campus Sites SF-F: Nashville, TN	Quarterfinal games at site of higher seed Semis and Finals at pre-determined neutral site
West Coast	8/8	3	Santa Clara, CA	Double-bye Format Seeds 5-8 play in first round Winners play seeds 3-4 in Quarterfinals Winners play seeds 1-2 in Semifinals All 4 rounds played at pre-determined site- home of one of the participating teams
Big West	8/10	4	Anaheim, CA	Double bye Format similar to West Coast Conference All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site

Mid Continent	8/9	3	Tulsa, OK	All 3 rounds played at pre-determined site in the city of one of the participating teams. Seeds 1 and 2 play their quarterfinals on Saturday while other two are on Sunday
Metro Atlantic Athletic	10/10	3	Buffalo, NY	Seeds 5-10 play in the first round Winners play seeds 2-4 in the second round Winners join the #1 seed in the semi-finals All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site in the same city as one of the participating teams
Southern	12/12	4	Chattanooga, TN	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined site- home of one of the participating teams
Big Sky	6/8	4	1R: higher seeds S-F: Portland, OR	Only top 6 schools qualify Seed 3 hosts Seed 6 and Seed 4 hosts Seed 5 Winners join Seeds 1 and 2 in the Semi-finals Semis and Finals hosted by #1 Seed
America East	10/10	4	1R, QF, SF: Vestal, NY F: Burlington, VT	First three rounds played at pre-determined site- home of one of the participating teams Championship game played at highest remaining seed
MEAC	11/11	5	Richmond, VA	All 4 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site First two rounds are played over 4 days
Southland	8/11	5	Entirely at Campus Sites	Tournament is played entirely at campus sites Each game is played at site of higher seed

Patriot	8/8	4	QF-SF: Lewisburg, PA Worcester, MA F: Worcester, MA	2 – four team tournaments with #1 and #2 seeds hosting Winners of each play at site of highest seed
Big South	8/9	5	Entirely at Campus Sites	Tournament is played entirely at campus sites Each game is played at site of higher seed
SWAC	8/10	3	Birmingham, AL	All 3 rounds played at pre-determined neutral site
Atlantic Sun	8/11	3	Nashville, TN	All 3 rounds played at pre-determined site – home of one of the participating teams
Northeast	8/11	4	Entirely at Campus Sites	Tournament is played entirely at campus sites Each game is played at site of higher seed Teams are re-seeded after the first round

Note: Conferences in order by 2004-2005 average attendance

Teams: Number of teams participating in the tournament / Total number of teams in the tournament

Class Days: Potential for class days missed- starts one day before tournament begins

APPENDIX C

CURRENT IVY LEAGUE CHAMPIONSHIP EVENTS

While the Ivy League does not currently sponsor a men's basketball post-season championship tournament, they do sponsor championship events in eight sports. These sports: cross country, men's and women's swimming and diving, indoor and outdoor track and field, men's and women's golf and baseball are primarily individual sports. Baseball, the lone sport on the list that is not individual competition, is played as a best two-out-of-three series. Here are the current sports with championship events, their locations and formats:

Cross Country

The 2005 Ivy League Cross Country championships will be held on Friday, October 28 in the Bronx, NY hosted by Columbia. The event has been hosted by Columbia's Van Cortland Park every year except two since the tournament's inception in 1939 (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information).

Swimming

The 2005-06 Eastern Intercollegiate Swimming League Championships (EISL) will be held at Harvard University for the women and Nassau County Aquatics Center for the men. The EISL is comprised of the eight Ivy schools as well as Army and Navy. The men's competition was contested at Harvard in 2005 and the women's event was held at Princeton in 2004. The current format of deciding the Ivy League champion at the EISL meet was established in 1997 and since that time, the women's event has alternated between Harvard and Princeton. The men's event has rotated between Princeton, Army, Harvard and the

current Nassau County Aquatics Center site. Both men's and women's events will be held on a Thursday through Saturday in 2006 meaning at least two days of missed class for all eight schools (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information, 2005).

Track and Field

The eight Ivy League track teams compete in the Ivy League Heptagonal Track and Field Championships for both the indoor and outdoor meets. The indoor "Heps" will take place on Saturday and Sunday February 25-26 at Dartmouth. In 2007, Columbia will host the event. The outdoor "Heps" will be held on May 6 and 7, 2006 at Franklin Field in Philadelphia. Penn will host the event in 2006 while Princeton will host in 2007. The dates of competition are on a Saturday and a Sunday on the weekend after classes have ended for all schools. The outdoor Track and Field Championships have been rotated between Columbia, Brown, Yale, Princeton and Penn from 1984-2005. Dartmouth last hosted the event in 1982 and Cornell last hosted the event in 1983. (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information, 2005).

Golf

The men's golf championship tournament began in 1975, while the women's golf championship tournament began in 1997. All eight schools are invited with the two tournaments held at different sites each year. From 1987 to 1999, the men's event was held at Bethpage Golf Club in New York. From 2000-2005, the event has been held in both Jackson, NJ and Hamburg, NJ. The women's event has been hosted at Bethpage, Trenton, NJ, Ridgewood, NJ and in 2005 at East Hampton, NY. In 2006, the golf championships will be held on a Friday and Sunday in April (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information, 2005).

Baseball

The only team sport that the Ivy League sponsors that competes in a post-season championship each year is baseball. For the sport of baseball, the Ivy League divides the conference into two divisions of four. Each team plays the three other teams in their division four times each and the four teams in the other division three times each. The division winners then meet for a best-of-three championship series at the home of the school with the better record. This series is played over a Saturday and Sunday in May after classes have ended (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information, 2005). By only inviting the division winners, the conference is able to have a championship event that limits travel and missed class time.

Non-Tournament and ECAC Sports

Like basketball, the following sports do not have a championship tournament at the end of the season; they send their regular season winner to the NCAA Championship tournament: field hockey, lacrosse, volleyball, soccer, tennis and softball. There are four additional sports that compete in the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference and compete in the ECAC championship events. Fencing competes in the Intercollegiate Fencing Association with other ECAC schools. Their 2006 championship will be held at Penn on Saturday, February 26. Wrestling competes in the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association. Their 2006 tournament will be held at Lehigh University from Friday, March 3 through Sunday, March 5. Rowing competes in the Eastern Athletic Rowing Conference. The 2006 women's championship will be held on Cooper River in Camden, NJ on Sunday, May 14. The 2006 men's championships will be held on Lake Quinsigamond in Worcester, MA on Sunday, May 21 (2005-2006 Ivy Championship Information, 2005).

Ice Hockey

Six of the eight Ivy League schools sponsor both men's and women's ice hockey. These teams play in the ECAC Hockey League and participate in the ECACHL championship tournament at the end of each season. The ECACHL tournament uses a format that takes place over the span of three consecutive weekends. All 12 schools are invited and the first round of the tournament involves the 5-12 seeds playing a best-of-three game series at the rink of the higher seed. The four series winners and the top four seeds then meet in a best-of-three quarterfinal series at the rink of the higher seeds the following weekend. These games are played on a Friday, Saturday and Sunday each weekend. The four teams left after the first two rounds then converge on a neutral site (Pepsi Arena in Albany for 2005) and compete in a single-game playoff with semi-finals on a Friday afternoon and the championship and third place games being played the following day (2005 ECACHL Tournament, 2005). Even though this tournament format is not feasible for basketball since a tournament could not be played over three weekends, this is the only multi-team tournament that Ivy League teams participate.

APPENDIX D

SURVEY

IVY LEAGUE POST-SEASON CONFERENCE TOURNAMENT SURVEY

Dear Ivy League Men's Basketball Coach:

My name is Andy Pogach and I am currently a second-year graduate student in the Sport Administration Program at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Every student in the program has to complete a thesis project on a college-athletics-related topic of interest. While some of my classmates are writing their thesis on topics such as the BCS, fundraising and Title IX, I decided to focus my study on something that I was involved with for seven years of my life; Ivy League basketball. I was a four-year student manager for Coach Dunphy and graduated from the University of Pennsylvania in 2001. After graduating, I was the Director of Men's and Women's Basketball Operations at Penn from 2001-2004.

In 2005, The Ivy League is currently the only NCAA Division I conference that does not sponsor a post-season basketball championship. The following survey will ask for your opinions and personal preference on aspects involving a potential post-season conference tournament. All basketball student-athletes and coaches will be asked to participate in the study with the findings to be generalized and compared to findings at the other seven Ivy League institutions. While the results of this survey will be reported to the Ivy League, the survey itself has not been commissioned by the Ivy League and does not mean that they are discussing any possible changes to the current format.

Please answer all questions honestly and to the best of your ability. There is no right or wrong answer. Do not hesitate to write in any comments or additional suggestions that you think may help express your opinion towards a particular question.

Your name will not be used in the study. The only reason I am asking each subject to write his name on the survey is for possible statistical comparisons between “starters” vs. “non-starters”, and groups based on minutes per game and points per game.

The Behavioral Institutional Review Board (Behavioral IRB) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has approved this study. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, please contact the Behavioral IRB at 919-962-7761 or at aa-irb@unc.edu. By completing this survey, you are giving consent to participate in the study. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact the researchers at the email or phone number provided. Thank you once again for your time and effort.

Andy Pogach
pogach@uncaa.unc.edu
(919) 843-4738

Dr. Nathan Tomasini (Advisor)
tomasini@email.unc.edu
(919) 843-0336

NAME _____

YEAR: **Freshman** **Sophomore** **Junior** **Senior**

POSITION: **HC** **AC** **Volunteer** **Operations**

NUMBER OF YEARS COACHING IN IVY LEAGUE _____

1. Please rate your approval level of a post-season conference basketball tournament

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

2. Please rate the level of importance for each statement below concerning an Ivy League post-season tournament.

a.) The experience of competing in a conference tournament.

1	2	3	4	5
Not important at all	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important

b.) The opportunity to play on national television if your team qualified for the conference tournament championship game.

1	2	3	4	5
Not important at all	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important

c.) The opportunity to compete in additional game(s) beyond the regular season.

1	2	3	4	5
Not important at all	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important

d.) The motivation to compete in the remaining regular season games after elimination from winning the regular season championship.

1	2	3	4	5
Not important at all	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important

e.) The opportunity for additional travel during the Ivy League Conference Tournament

1	2	3	4	5
Not important at all	Not important	Neutral	Important	Very Important

3. Please rate your agreement level of the following statements:

a.) The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of **each conference game** during the regular season.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

b.) The addition of a conference tournament would lessen the importance of winning the regular season **conference title**.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

c.) The amount of travel needed for a conference tournament would cause additional missed class time jeopardizing academic success of student-athletes.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

d.) The uniqueness of the Ivy League in that they are the only conference without a post-season tournament is very important to me.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree

4. Tournament Location Questions

Even if you are opposed to a post-season tournament, please answer the following questions:

If a tournament were to be conducted in the future, please rate the following tournament location formats on a 1-5 scale (1 = strongly opposed, 5 = strongly in favor).

a.) The tournament location, entirely at a neutral site

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

b.) The tournament location rotated annually among each of the eight schools

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

c.) The tournament location entirely at the site of the regular season champion

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

d.) The tournament quarterfinals and semifinals located at a neutral site and the championship game located at the site of the highest remaining seed.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

e.) The tournament located entirely on campus sites with the higher seed hosting each game

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

f.) A tournament format where the top 2 seeds host 2- four team tournaments and the winners meet in the championship game at the site of the higher seed

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

Please rank the previous tournament location choices from most desirable to least desirable. If you have no preference, please check that box, or if you have additional suggestions, please write that in the space below:

_____ No preference of tournament sites

Please rank the items below (1= most favorable, 6 = least favorable)

_____ The tournament located entirely at a neutral site

_____ The tournament location rotated annually among each of the eight schools

_____ The tournament located entirely at the site of the regular season champion

_____ The tournament quarterfinals and semifinals located at a neutral site and the championship game located at the site of the highest remaining seed.

_____ The tournament located entirely on campus sites with the higher seed hosting each game

_____ A tournament format where the top 2 seeds host a 2- four team tournaments and the winners meet in the championship game at the site of the higher seed

Additional Location Suggestions:

5. Tournament Format Questions:

If a tournament were to be conducted in the future, please rate your opinion of the following tournament formats. Please refer to the tournament brackets listed next to each option.

A.) An 8-team bracket with no byes.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

B.) A 6 team bracket with the top 2 seeds receiving a bye into the semi-finals:

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

C.) An 8 team bracket where the top 2 seeds receive a double-bye into the semi-finals.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

D.) A 4 team bracket with only the top 4 regular season finishers involved

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Opposed	Opposed	Neutral	In Favor	Strongly In Favor

Additional Format Suggestions:

Coaches Only Questions

Please rate the following statements in terms of how a post season tournament may affect your basketball program:

a.) Basketball Operating Budget

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Negative	Negative	No Effect	Positive	Extremely Positive

b.) Scheduling of Non-conference opponents

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Negative	Negative	No Effect	Positive	Extremely Positive

c.) Recruiting

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Negative	Negative	No Effect	Positive	Extremely Positive

Please state any comments either positive or negative regarding a post-season tournament.

APPENDIX E
LETTER TO COACHES

November 10, 2005

Dear Coach _____ ,

Thank you for agreeing to take part in my thesis project. Enclosed are ____ surveys that your student-athletes and coaches will be completing. While the surveys are mostly identical, the coaches' surveys will have three additional questions. **The coaches' surveys are on yellow paper, while the players' surveys are on white paper.** I have listed your staff and team as it appears on your athletic department website. If there are any additional team members, or players listed that are no longer on the team, please make that note on the cover sheet.

I would appreciate it if you could have your entire team complete the survey at the same time and with everyone present. When your team is finished completing the survey, please place the completed surveys and any extra surveys into the return envelope and send it back to me. I understand there may be a situation where you have a team member(s) absent, and if that is the case, they can complete the survey at the next convenient time and you can send it back to me separately. **If there is anyone on your team who is under 18, please do not have them take the survey. Please note on the cover sheet if there will be anyone turning in their survey late or is under 18 and will not be taking the survey.**

Please be aware and make your team aware that under no circumstances will anyone's name be used in the study or associated with any of their answers. The only reason I am asking each subject to write their name on the survey is for possible statistical comparisons between "starters" vs. "non-starters", and groups based on minutes per game. **Please do not influence your student-athletes in anyway regarding the subject matter. We want their own un-biased opinions.**

I encourage you and your team members to write any comments or additional suggestions on the survey. **All comments are confidential and any comments used in the final paper will not have a name attached.** If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me, or my advisor, Dr. Nathan Tomasini. I appreciate your help in not only allowing me to complete my graduate thesis, but creating a document that will accurately express the opinions of Ivy League players and coaches on a post-season tournament. I will send you a copy of the results when the project is completed.

Thank you,

Andy Pogach

pogach@unca.unc.edu
office: 919-843-4738
cell: 919-923-5469

Dr. Nathan Tomasini

tomasini@email.unc.edu
office: 919-843-0336

REFERENCES

- 2004-05 Men's Basketball In Review (2005). Retrieved on September 19, 2005 from the Colonial Athletic Association Website: <http://www.caasports.com/info/Recordbook/pdf2005/recordbook05mbask.pdf>
- 2004-2005 Patriot League All Sports Record Book (2004). Retrieved on April 19, 2005, from the Patriot League Conference Website: <http://patriotleague.collegesports.com/genrel/082902aab.html>
- 2004-2005 Patriot League Men's Basketball Media Guide (2004). Retrieved on April 19 2005, from the Patriot League Conference Website: <http://patriotleague.collegesports.com/sports/m-baskbl/spec-rel/101504aae.html>
- 2004-05 Year in Review (2005). Retrieved on September 16, 2005 from the Princeton University Athletics Website: <http://goprincetontigers.collegesports.com/school-bio/prin-athleticsuccess.html>
- 2004-2005 Horizon League Men's Basketball Media Guide (2004). Retrieved on September 22, 2005 from the Horizon League Website: http://www.collegesports.com/auto_pdf/p_hotos/s_chools/hori/sports/m-baskbl/auto_pdf/MensMediaGuideIntro
- 2005-06 Ivy Championship Information. (2005). Retrieved on September 27, 2005 from the Ivy League Conference Website: <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/champs.asp>
- 2005 ECACHL Tournament. (2005). Retrieved on September 28, 2005 from the Inside College Hockey Website: http://www.insidecollegehockey.com/6history/ecac_05.htm
- 2005 NCAA Division I Men's Basketball Conference Attendance. (2005). Retrieved on September 7, 2005 from the NCAA Website: http://www.ncaa.org/stats/m_basketball/attendance/2005_basketball_attend.pdf
- About The Northeast Conference. (n.d.). Retrieved on September 21, 2005 from the Northeast Conference Website: http://www.northeastconference.org/sports/general/2004/gen_aboutnec.asp?nl=1
- Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Rules, and Best Practices. (n.d.). Retrieved on September 24, 2005 from the Academic Integrity and College Sports webpage: <http://www.math.umd.edu/~jmc/COIA/AI.html>

- Adams, Bruce. (March 2, 2006). Gonzaga has the Team and the Site. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved on March 24, 2006 from the SF Gate.com webpage: <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/chronicle/archive/2006/03/02/SPGPGHGTf31.DTL>
- Admissions Statement. (n.d.). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from the Ivy League Website: <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/admission-statement.asp>
- America East Championship Results. (2005). Retrieved on August 22, 2005 from the America East Conference website: <http://www.americaeast.com/mbasketball/2005/championship.htm>
- America's Best Colleges 2006. (2005). *US News and World Report*. Retrieved on October 12, 2005 from the US News.com website: http://www.usnews.com/usnews/edu/College/rankings/brief/natudoc/tier1/t1natudoc_brief.php
- Ask the Commissioner. (n.d.). Retrieved on April 20, 2005 from the Big South Conference Website: <http://www.bigsouthsports.com/aq.front.asp?qaid=368>
- Big Sky Q & A. (n.d.). Retrieved on October 13, 2005 from the Big Sky Conference Website: http://www.bigskyconf.com/qa_front.asp?qaid=165.
- Bochner, Owen (2005, April 8). Ivy League Sports Need Revamping. *The Cornell Daily Sun*. Retrieved on April 20, 2005 from: <http://www.cornellsun.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2005/04/08/425607829ef04>
- Bradley, Michael (2005, March 6). BCS-esque. *Sports Illustrated.com*. Retrieved from The Sports Illustrated.com website on September 28, 2005 http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/2005/writers/michael_bradley/03/03/el.hombre/1.html
- Burrick, David (2004, February 18). Ivy Officials Begin Search for Potential Hoops Playoff Site. *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from http://www.dailypennsylvanian.com/vnews/display.v/ART/40331afa9647b?in_archive=1
- College Basketball History. (n.d.). Retrieved on August 18, 2005 from the College Hoops Net Website: <http://www.collegehoopsnet.com/history/collegebasketball.htm>
- Council of Ivy Group Presidents. (2002, June 20). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from the Ivy League Conference Website: <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/documents/june20.asp>
- Davis, Seth (2004, March 15). Not to be Missed: One of the hottest tickets in sports is for the ACC Tournament, an event dominated by North Carolina schools for 50 years. *Sports Illustrated*. V.100 ill p.28.

- DeCourcy, Mike (1996, November 11). Big Ten is Looking to Get Tournament Tough. *The Sporting News*. 220n46 p.54.
- DeCourcy, Mike (1999, March 1). The Buzz and the Banter Over Conference Tournaments. *The Sporting News*. Retrieved on September 29, 2005 from the Find Articles Website: http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1208/is_9_223/ai_54031642/print.
- Dienhart, Tom (1998, March 9). Winds of Change. *The Sporting News*. 222n10 26-29.
- Division I. (n.d.) Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the NCAA Website: http://www2.ncaa.org/legislation_and_governance/committees/division1.html.
- Division I. (n.d.) Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the Answers.com website: <http://www.answers.com/topic/division-i>
- Executive Committee (n.d.). Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the NCAA Website: http://web1.ncaa.org/committees/committees_roster.jsp?CommitteeName=EXEC
- Fairfield University named to host 2007 MAAC Basketball Tournament. (n.d.). Retrieved on September 20, 2005 from the Fairfield University Press Room Page: <http://www.fairfield.edu/x3573.xml>
- Falk, Aaron. (2004, February 4). More Attendance = More Attention for Ags. *The Utah Statesman*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from: <http://www.utahstatesman.com/media/paper243/news/2004/02/04/Sports/More-Attendance.More.Attention.For.Ags-597057.shtml>
- Fiss, Stirling. (2004, November 11). Contention over Ivy Football Rules. *The Daily Princetonian*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from <http://www.dailyprincetonian.com/archives/2004/11/11/sports/11405.shtml>.
- Frankel, Rich. (October 4, 1995). League to Consider Postseason Tourney. *Yale Daily News*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from: <http://www.yaledailynews.com/article.asp?AID=5438>
- Fulks, Daniel. (2005, February). *2002-03 NCAA Revenues and Expenses of Divisions I and II Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report*. Commissioned by the NCAA.
- Gilmore, Eric (2002, March 6). Terrific Time for Return of Conference Tournament. *Contra Costa Times*, p. b01.
- Harvard Athletic "Firsts". (n.d.). Retrieved on September 16, 2005 from the Harvard University Athletics Webpage: <http://gocrimson.collegesports.com/genrel/101602aad.html>

Historical Outline of Multidivision Classification. (n.d.). Retrieved on October 18, 2005
From the NCAA website: [http://www1.ncaa.org/eprise/main/administrator/
Historical_Outline.pdf](http://www1.ncaa.org/eprise/main/administrator/Historical_Outline.pdf)

History of the NCAA. (n.d.). Retrieved on August 24, 2005 from the NCAA Website:
<http://www.ncaa.org/about/history.html>

Ivy League Historical Timeline. (n.d.). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from the Ivy League
Conference Website: <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/whatisivy/history.asp>

Ivy League Men's Basketball "Conference Only" Statistics (2005). Retrieved on April
19, 2005, from the Ivy League Conference Website:
<http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/sports/stats/basketball/men/cononly.htm>

Ivy Men's Basketball Playoff games (n.d.). Retrieved on October 20, 2005 from the Ivy
League Website: [http:// www.ivyleaguesports.com/documents/ mbbivyplayoff.asp#h](http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/documents/mbbivyplayoff.asp#h)

Jacobson, Jennifer (2002, December 6). How Much Sports is Too Much? *The Chronicle
Of Higher Education*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from [http://chronicle.com/
weekly/ v49/i15/15a03801.htm](http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i15/15a03801.htm).

Krishnamurthy, Anand (2005, March 31). Ivy Council Holds League Back. *The
Columbia Spectator*. Retrieved on April 20, 2005 from:
<http://www.columbiaspectator.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2005/03/31/424b95550f80f>

Litan, Robert E., Orzag, Jonathan M and Orzag, Peter R. (2003, August). *The Empirical
Effects of Collegiate Athletics: An Interim Report*. Commissioned by the NCAA.

MAAC Announces New Format for Men's and Women's Basketball Championship.
(n.d.). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from the Sovereign Bank Arena Website:
<http://sovereignbank-arena.com/press/maacformat.html>

Men's Basketball Championship History. (n.d.). Retrieved on August 22, 2005 from the
MetroAtlantic Athletic Conference Website: [http://maacsports.com/index.php?
s=1121785997-289691619&change_well_id=2&url_article_id=2438](http://maacsports.com/index.php?s=1121785997-289691619&change_well_id=2&url_article_id=2438)

Men's Basketball Championship Returns to Binghamton in 2006, Boston University to
Host in 2007. (n.d.). Retrieved on September 19, 2005 from the America East
Conference Website: <http://www.americaeast.com/mbasketball/2005/052405.htm>

Men's Ivy League Basketball Champions. (2005). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from the
Ivy League Conference Website: [http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/sports/ivy-
champs.asp?intSID=6](http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/sports/ivy-champs.asp?intSID=6)

- Naughton, Jim. (1997, December 5) U. of North Carolina Is Proud of Its Balance of Big-Time Athletics and Quality Academics. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on September 22, 2005 from <http://chronicle.com/che-data/articles.dir/art-44.dir/issue-15.dir/15a05601.html>
- NCAA, CBS Reach 11-year, \$6 billion agreement. (1999, December 6). *The NCAA News*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from <http://www.ncaa.org/news/1999/19991206/active/3625n01.html>
- NCAA Division I, II, and III Membership Criteria. (n.d.). Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the NCAA website: http://www.ncaa.org/about/div_criteria.html.
- NCAA Revenue Distribution – Total Distribution to Members (n.d.). Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the NCAA Website: http://www1.ncaa.org/finance/7-yr_Conf_summaries/total_distribution
- NCAA Revenue Distribution Plan. (n.d.). Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the NCAA Website: http://www1.ncaa.org/finance/revenue_distribution_plan
- Okanes, Jonathan (December 19, 2001). Turbulent Tournament for Pac-10, Montgomery. *Contra Costa Times*, p. b01.
- Pollick, Josh (2005, April 15). It Can't Hurt to Discuss Ivy League Policies. *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. Retrieved on April 20, 2005 from: <http://www.dailypennsylvanian.com/vnews/display.v/ART/2005/04/15/425f44864c32>
- Radford, Rich (2005, August 16). Norfolk Wants to Host CAA Men's Basketball Tournament. *The Virginian-Pilot*. Retrieved on September 19, 2005 from: <http://home.hamptonroads.com/stories/story.cfm?story=90734&ran=196222>
- Rattner, Ron. Northeast Conference 2004-05 Men's Basketball Media Guide. (2004). Retrieved on September 21, 2005 from the Northeast Conference Website: <http://www.northeastconference.org/sports/pdf0405/records.pdf>
- Rovell, Darren. (2003, March 25). Riches Slow to Come to Cinderella Team. Retrieved On October 18, 2005 from the ESPN.com Website: <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncb/ncaatourney03/story?id=1529201>
- Shaner, Jon. (2000, October 19). A Winning Formula. *Ball State Daily News*. Retrieved On October 19, 2005 from the CNNfyi website: <http://cnnstudentnews.cnn.com/2000/fyi/student.bureau/10/18/sports.effects>
- Suggs, Welch (2004, October 29). Big Money in College Sports Flows to the Few. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Volume 51, Issue 10, Page A46

- Suggs, Welch (2003, May 2,). Sports as the University's "Front Porch". The Public is Skeptical. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved on September 26, 2005 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/V49/i34/34a01701.htm>
- Tran, Kevin. (2000, September 8). Recruiting Violations to keep Brown from Title. *Yale Herald*. Retrieved on September 16, 2005 from: <http://www.yaleherald.com/archive/xxx/2000.09.08/sports/p24.html>.
- Validity and Reliability. (n.d). Retrieved on October 26, 2005 from the Georgetown University Department of Psychology website: <http://www.georgetown.edu/departments/psychology/researchmethods/researchanddesign/validityandreliability.htm>
- Wahl, Grant (2002, March 14). For the Love of Ivy. *Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from: http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/inside_game/magazine/basketball/college/news/2002/02/26/cb/
- Walker, Don. (2003, April 2). Conference USA will take MU's Success to the Bank. *Milwaukee Journal Sentinel*. Retrieved on October 18, 2005 from the JS Online Website: <http://www.jsonline.com/sports/marq/apr03/130617.asp>
- What is the Ivy League? (n.d.). Retrieved on April 19, 2005 from The Ivy League Conference Website: <http://www.ivyleaguesports.com/whatisivy/index.asp>
- Yost, Heather (2000, December 14). Championship Sunday or Selection Sunday. Retrieved on September 24, 2005 from the NCAA News Website: http://www.ncaasports.com/story/arc_story/9803