

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATORS' MOTIVATIONS FOR
ADDING INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL

Brandon Yeargan

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
2013

Approved By:

Barbara Osborne, J.D.

Coyte Cooper, PhD

Corey Holliday, M.A.

ABSTRACT

BRANDON YEARGAN: University Administrators' Motivations for Adding Collegiate Football
(Under the direction of Barbara Osborne, J.D.)

The purpose of this study was to discover how university administrators believe adding college football will benefit their school and to investigate to what degree those anticipated benefits were realized. The research utilized branding theory to identify benefits commonly derived from football programs. University Presidents, Provosts, Athletic Directors, Senior Woman Administrators, and Faculty Athletic Representatives at NCAA Division I, II, & III member institutions who added college football in the 2001-2011 period were asked to participate in an on-line survey. The primary motivations for adding football were increasing undergraduate enrollment, increasing the amount of initial applications, and improving school spirit. Improving the proportion of male students on campus was also a university goal. Student-athlete participation opportunities, school spirit, the amount of initial applications for admission, and undergraduate enrollment all increased after adding football. This study serves as an aid to the many athletic departments currently contemplating whether to add football.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1-8
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Statement of Purpose.....	2-3
Research Questions.....	3-4
Definition of Terms.....	4-7
Assumptions.....	7
Delimitations.....	8
Limitations.....	8
Significance of the Study.....	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9-29
Brand Theory.....	9-10
Branding and Higher Education.....	10-12
University Brands and Athletics.....	12-13
Benefits of Athletics and Branding.....	14-26
An Analysis of NCAA Member Athletics Programs that Added or Discontinued Football Programs Between 1996 and 2005.....	26-29
III. METHODOLOGY.....	30-34

	Purpose.....	30
	Instrumentation.....	30-31
	Credibility, Validity, and Reliability.....	32
	Subjects.....	32-33
	Data Analysis.....	33-34
IV.	RESULTS.....	35-56
	Research Question 1.....	38-41
	Research Question 2.....	42
	Research Question 3.....	43-47
	Research Question 4.....	48-49
	Research Question 5.....	50-51
	Research Question 6.....	52-56
V.	DISCUSSION.....	57-68
	Summary.....	57
	Previous Studies.....	57-64
	Limitations.....	64-65
	Implications.....	65-66
	Future Research.....	66-68
	APPENDICES.....	69-85
	REFERENCES.....	86-91

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1.	Administrator Positions Represented in Study Results.....	37
2.	Goals Identified in Survey.....	39
3.	Goals Identified in the Survey and the Extent to Which They Were Realized.....	46
4.	Conference Affiliation Before and After Adding Football.....	50
5.	Potential Motivation Breakdown by NCAA Division.....	56
6.	ANOVA Results Investing Motivations by NCAA Division.....	56
7.	Potential Motivation Breakdown by Respondent Job Position.....	58
8.	ANOVA Results Investigation Motivations by Respondent Job Position.....	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the fall of 2010, four NCAA member institutions began playing collegiate football, some for the first time and some for the first time in over 100 years (National Football Foundation, 2012). Five more schools began playing intercollegiate football a year earlier in 2009 and another five kicked off in 2008. These years of expansion are not isolated or unprecedented. At a time when colleges and universities are facing severe pressure to cut their budgets and spending due to the recovering economy, more and more NCAA schools are making the decision to add college football teams each year. Between 2001 and 2011, forty-two NCAA schools began playing college football at the varsity intercollegiate level (National Football Foundation, 2012). Eight schools will begin play in 2012 and thirteen will begin in 2013 (National Football Foundation, 2012). Numerous other schools have announced the formation of committees dedicated to seriously exploring adding college football (National Football Foundation, 2012). Colleges and universities are adding the sport at all levels (Division I-FCS, Division-II, and Division-III) as well (Feezell, 2009). Given the impressive amount of expansion, the decision to add football is not quick or easy. Starting and supporting a college football program requires a significant fiscal investment and often accounts for a large percentage of the athletic department's budget (Dunham, 2007).

While it does require large fixed costs, intercollegiate football also carries great potential to generate a number of benefits for the school (Gardiner, 2010). Athletic department personnel believe football can produce additional revenue and generate positive

publicity and prestige for the school (Toma, 2003). Football can help attract more freshman applicants, increase enrollment, drive media attention and coverage, boost school spirit, improve prestige, and solicit more alumni donations (Coe, 2005; Dunham, 2007; Ehrman & Marber, 2008; Feezell, 2009; Murphy & Trandel, 1994). Adding football also seems to be a viable strategy for schools, particularly small schools, looking to improve their male-female undergraduate student ratio (Feezell, 2009; Gardiner, 2010; Pennington, 2006). Sponsoring a football team can quickly add over 100 participating males to the school's enrollment (Pennington, 2006). University administrators also believe football attracts male students who want to attend a college with a football team to cheer for (Suggs, n.d.). Regardless of the motivation, colleges and universities continue to begin football programs.

Statement of the Problem

Adding an intercollegiate varsity sport can be very expensive for schools, especially if that sport is NCAA football. Analyzing collegiate administrators' motivations in deciding to add college football will offer valuable insight for peer institutions considering adding the sport. Also, an investigation of the outcomes of adding football will help administrators determine whether adding football is a useful and viable strategy to reach the athletic department and university's goals.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to discover how NCAA university administrators believe adding college football will benefit their school. The secondary purpose is to investigate to what degree those anticipated benefits were realized. This study surveyed all university presidents/chancellors, university provosts, head athletic directors, senior woman administrators, and faculty athletic representatives at the 42 NCAA schools who added college football programs between 2001 and 2011.

Research Questions

Based on a review of the related literature, the following questions were developed to guide the research:

[RQ 1]: To what extent did each of the following goals motivate the university's decision to add a college football program?

- [a]: Increase athletic department revenue
- [b]: Increase the school's prestige/reputation
- [c]: Increase undergraduate enrollment
- [d]: Increase the amount of initial applications for admission
- [e]: Increase the number of new athletics donors
- [f]: Increase the amount of athletics donations
- [g]: Establish new athletics conference affiliation
- [h]: Maintain current athletics conference affiliation
- [i]: Improve school spirit
- [j]: Develop the university's brand
- [k]: Increase student-athlete participation opportunities

[RQ 2]: Are there any other factors that were considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned?

[RQ 3]: To what extent have the following occurred as a result of adding football?

- [a]: Increase athletic department revenue
- [b]: Increased the school's prestige/reputation
- [c]: Increased undergraduate enrollment
- [d]: Increased the amount of initial applications for admission

[e]: Increased the number of new athletics donors

[f]: Increased the amount of athletics donations

[g]: Improved school spirit

[h]: Developed the university's brand

[i]: Increased student-athlete participation opportunities

[RQ 4]: Were there other benefits gained by adding football?

[RQ 5]: Were there any negatives from adding football?

[RQ 6]: Were there any statistical differences in the motivations for adding football based upon NCAA division and respondent job position?

Definition of Terms

- *Student-Athlete*: a student who participates in intercollegiate varsity sport.
- *National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)*: A member association composed mostly of higher education institutions. Each member school is able to choose a level of competition that best fits its mission. The NCAA is made up of three membership classifications that are known as Divisions I, II, and III. Each division creates its own rules governing personnel, amateurism, recruiting, eligibility, benefits, financial aid, and playing and practice seasons-consistent with the overall governing principles of the Association. Every program must affiliate its core program with one of the three divisions (NCAA.org, 2012).
- *Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS)*: Formerly known as NCAA Division I-A Football, the Football Bowl Subdivision is a subdivision of NCAA Division I comprised of institutions which meet specific membership qualifications, such

as average attendance requirements, to be eligible for membership. The FBS is the most competitive subdivision for intercollegiate athletic competition. Additional requirements are found on pages 340-342 in the 2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual. FBS teams play in bowl games and are allowed 85 scholarship players (NCAA.org, 2012).

- Football Championship Subdivision (FCS): Formerly known as NCAA Division I-AA, the Football Championship Subdivision is a subdivision of NCAA Division I comprised of institutions which meet specific membership requirements. Additional requirements are found on pages 343-344 in the 2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual. FCS teams play for an NCAA championship through a 20-team playoff format and are limited to 63 scholarship players (NCAA.org, 2012).
- NCAA Division I: The highest level of intercollegiate athletics as categorized by the NCAA. In order to qualify for Division I classification, the athletic department must be in compliance with NCAA regulations and sponsor at least 16 varsity sports. Additional requirements are found in the 2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual on pages 7 & 335-340.
- NCAA Division II: Division II provides an intersection where athletically gifted students can compete at a high level, while maintaining much of a traditional college experience. The Division II emphasis is on balance, with the objective of providing student-athletes a comprehensive program of learning and development. Student-athletes are encouraged to achieve

excellence in their sport, in the classroom, and in their community
(NCAA.org, 2012).

- NCAA Division III: Division III is comprised of more than 170,000 student-athletes at 444 mostly smaller institutions. More than 80 percent of Division III student-athletes receive financial aid, but not for playing a sport. The students on the intercollegiate teams of Division III member schools come to college for an education and to play their sport for the love of the game. Liberal arts colleges that subscribe to the Division III philosophy enable students to integrate and balance their athletics experience with academic interests and other co-curricular activities (NCAA.org, 2013).
- Athletic Director (AD): The highest-ranking institutional administrator responsible for leading the intercollegiate athletics program.
- Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR): A member of an institution's faculty or administrative staff who is designated by the institution's president or chancellor or other appropriate entity to represent the institution and its faculty in the institution's relationships with the NCAA and its conference(s), if any (2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual, p. 18).
- University/College President/ Chancellor (PRES): The highest-ranking leader at an institution of higher education.
- Provost: The senior academic administrator at an institution of higher education.

- Senior Woman Administrator (SWA): The highest ranking female involved in the management of an institution's intercollegiate athletics program (2011-2012 NCAA Division I Manual, p. 18)
- Prestige: Reputation or influence arising from success, achievement, rank, or other favorable attributes. Distinction or reputation attaching to a person or thing and thus possessing a cachet for other or for the public (Dictionary.com, 2012).
- School Spirit: A mark of distinction or feeling of support towards a social institution (i.e., university) understood to be distinctive, central, and enduring by multiple constituents including students, faculty, administrators on campus, parents, alumni, taxpayers, and legislators.
- University Brand: The way alumni, students, faculty, prospective students, legislators, and the public as a whole perceive a college or university (Yavas & Shemwell, 1996; Lawlor, 1998). The image and perception of an institution, its students, and its alumni (Roy, Graeff, & Harmon, 2008).

Assumptions

- Subjects understood all questions being asked of them and answered objectively and honestly when completing the survey.
- The completion of the survey and participation in the study was voluntary for all targeted subjects.
- Testing procedures were followed such that a neutral environment was provided for subjects responding to the survey questions.

Delimitations

- Only NCAA Division I, II, and III member institutions that have added football as a varsity sport between 2001 and 2011 were invited to participate in the survey. NAIA and USCAA schools were not included.
- Five athletic/university leaders were asked to participate in the survey from each school (AD, FAR, PRES, PROVOST, SWA)
- The time period of this study was delimited to the ten-year period of 2001 to 2011.

Limitations

- Survey participants could only choose a single response on a Likert scale on two survey questions.
- The population of this study is somewhat small (limited to just 42 schools who have added college football during the 2001-2011 period).

Significance of the Study

The results of this study are beneficial for multiple athletic department and university stakeholders, specifically top collegiate athletic administration and university presidents/chancellors. It is important that administrators are aware of the findings of this study as an aid in their own decision-making process. For instance, if a high percentage of respondents confirm the addition of football has increased applications, enrollment, and prestige at their school, institutions exploring adding football may use the statistical support to help influence the process at their own schools. Also, given the lack of empirical research on this topic, this study will hopefully serve to facilitate future research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This review of literature will help establish the theoretical framework for a survey of institutions that added NCAA intercollegiate football programs between 2001 and 2011. The first section will examine brand theory and how universities differentiate themselves from competitors through developing their unique brand. The second segment will outline universities' use of athletics to market their institution. The third section will examine the literature and existing research on the benefits of college sports to universities. The final section will spotlight a 2007 study which serves as a model from which this study modifies and replicates.

Brand Theory

Brand theory is one of the elements of a wider framework or foundation of marketing theory. As the name would imply, brand theory is based upon the term brand and the practice of branding. So what exactly is a brand? It is more difficult to pinpoint or describe than it might seem because there is no singular accepted definition of a brand (Hankinson, 2001). A brand has elements that are both tangible and intangible. Many people think of a brand in terms of a physical indicator such as a logo or design, but a brand is also the essence of a company (Aaker, 1996; Chapleo, 2004; Keller, 2008). A brand distinguishes an organization and its products or services from those of others, and activates a consumer's purchasing decision (Aaker, 1991, 1996; Keller, 2008). An organization's brand is its identity and its reputation, formed by consumers' attitudes and perceptions of the organization and its products or services as well as influencing those perceptions (Marrs,

Gajos, & Pinar, 2011). Brands create an emotional tie with consumers and satisfy their functional and symbolic needs (De Chernatony & McDonald, 2000; Park, Jaworski, & Macinnis, 1986).

The process of how an organization markets or promotes its brand is known as branding or brand management. The main objective of branding is to establish a stronger position and competitive advantage in the perception of stakeholders in the market (Keller, 2003). Successful branding efforts will increase consumers' level of awareness, positive thoughts and feelings, and loyalty towards that organization and its product or service (Aaker, 1991). Organizations use branding as a mechanism to express their companies' identity and core values (Balmer, 2001).

The success of a brand or branding effort is subjective, but some brands are certainly more successful than others (Chapleo, 2005). Chapleo (2009) describes a 'successful' brand as one that is clearly defined, identifiable, consistent with the needs of customer groups, and able to demonstrate a competitive advantage. A successful brand differentiates the organization, company, or product by effectively communicating its strengths (Jevons, 2006). Successful brands create or associate a personality, image, and attribute to an organization or product that consumers aspire to be or to have (Doyle, 1990).

Branding and Higher Education

The international marketing of higher education institutions has received a substantial amount of attention in the literature both domestically and internationally. Veloutsou, Lewis, and Paton (2004) believe higher education institutions must function like modern corporations due to the increasing competition they face from peer colleges and universities. Along with forcing greater competition, the economic recession has jeopardized schools'

financial security. Given these external and internal pressures, institutions now realize the value of building a strong and sustainable university brand (Jevons, 2006).

Applying brand theory to higher education institutions includes a wide range of perspectives. The school's brand is how alumni, students, faculty, prospective students, legislators, and the public as a whole perceive a college or university (Lawlor, 1998; Yavas & Shemwell, 1996). The brand defines the essence of what a university 'is,' what it 'stands for,' and what it is going to be known for (Weaeraas & Solbakk, 2009). Schools use their brand to differentiate themselves from competitors in order to attract students and academic staff (Chapleo, 2005; Hemsley-Brown & Goonawardana, 2007; Toma, 2003). University branding efforts often influence a prospective student's willingness to apply to that institution (Ivy, 2001).

Bennett and Ali-Choudhury's (2009) study sought to determine which elements were most significant in establishing a university's brand. They created a model involving three primary components of indicators of the brand, and investigated how each component was perceived by a sample of prospective students. The three elements used were brand covenant, brand quiddity, and brand representation. Brand covenant is the university's core values and mission. Brand quiddity refers to the unique characteristics or qualities that define the university. Brand representation is the university's efforts to externally communicate their brand using publications, logos, typefaces, and apparel. All three elements interact which contributes to consumers' perceived image of the university. Other research has investigated additional elements and criteria commonly used in schools' branding initiatives. Some of these elements are observable statements such as visual designs, mission/vision statements, and core values (Van Riel, 1995; Waeraas & Solbakk,

2009). However, it's important for the school's brand to actually fit with its vision and mission. The university's brand and reputation will be damaged if consumers sense a disconnect between the two. Sevier (2006) calls this brand congruency. The brand must be congruent and integrated at all levels of the university in order for it to be effective.

University Brands and Athletics

Perhaps, the most evident and frequently observed representation of a university's brand is its intercollegiate athletics department (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). Athletic departments often consider themselves the front-porch of the university, often because the athletic department is the largest and most visible department on campus (Muret, 2011). According to Clark, Apostolopoulou, Branyold, and Synowka (2009) and Toma (2003), the overall brand or identity of the school is closely intertwined with its athletic programs, especially for Division-I schools. Researchers have determined that prospective students believe a successful athletic department is crucial for the overall enhancement of the institution (Canale, Dunlap, Britt, & Donahue, 1996; Davis & Van Dusen, 1975). Intercollegiate athletics shape the image and perception of an institution, its students, and its alumni while at the same time building bonds of community and allegiance among supporters (Roy, Graeff, & Harmon, 2008). Of the entire university and all its departments, consumers typically have the most exposure to and interaction with the university's athletics department. Thus, intercollegiate athletics have become a fundamental tool in developing the university's overall brand (Gladden, Milne, & Sutton, 1998). Athletics provide value for the university that few other institutional entities can replicate (Fulks, 2009). College athletic departments, coaches, student-athletes, and fans contribute to the characterization of the school's essence and brand position (Toma, 1999).

Gladden, Milne, and Sutton (1998) identified four main components of brand equity in Division-I college sports: brand awareness, perceived quality, brand association, and brand loyalty. They also proposed certain characteristics of the athletic department that work as antecedents affecting the university's brand equity. Some of these include on-the-field success, head coach, star players, program reputation and tradition, conference affiliation, and game schedule. The effective use and development of brand equity can generate significant revenue for college athletic departments. A strong brand can stimulate national media coverage, increase ticket sales, sponsorship revenues, and donations, as well as enhance game atmosphere, student culture, and school pride.

Athletic programs can benefit a university's brand, but they also have the potential to irreparably damage it (Goff, 2001). In spite of this risk, schools rely heavily on athletics to define and market their brand. Hughes and Shank (2008) call athletics a 'free' marketing tool able to benefit the school in a number of ways. Of course, supporting competitive Division-I athletics is far from free (Marklein, 2001). According to a *USA Today* 2011 study, seven schools currently have annual expenses greater than \$100 million (Texas: \$133,686,815, Ohio State: \$122,286,869, Michigan: \$111,844,553, Florida: \$107,157,831, Alabama: \$105,068,152, Penn State: \$101,336,483, and Auburn: \$100,497,784). Regardless of the cost, universities appear determined to use intercollegiate athletics to promote their institution.

Benefits of Athletics and Branding

Given these astonishing figures on athletics expenditures, some might question what benefits schools in turn receive. Many schools use athletics as a mechanism to position or advance the institution (Feezell, 2009). A wealth of literature exists on the benefits that college athletics provides to schools and their brands.

Fielding ‘big-time’ successful college sports teams can offer multiple tangible and intangible benefits for the university (Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004). In a study commissioned by the NCAA, Litan, Orszag, and Orszag (2003) developed a typology of the benefits successful athletics programs generate. Athletics can foster direct financial effects, indirect financial effects, indirect non-financial effects that are quantifiable, and indirect non-financial effects that are not quantifiable. Similarly, Gladden, Milne, and Sutton (1998) simplified these effects into two categories: tangible and intangible benefits. Tangible benefits are those financial and physical revenues athletics directly produces (i.e., ticket sales, sponsorship revenue, television money, merchandise sales, concessions sales). Whereas, intangible benefits cannot be physically measured (i.e., school pride, fan affiliation, alumni relations, on-campus atmosphere, reputation).

The direct financial effects should be the simplest category to evaluate, yet reviews remain mixed in the current literature. To put it most simply, does spending on athletics improve the university’s revenue and net income or add to the red? Studies have not yet found a significant relationship between the two (Sheehan, 2000) nor is there evidence that athletic expenditures significantly reduces the university’s net income (Litan, Orszag, & Orszag, 2003). Schools with football programs report greater athletic department revenues than those without football, but they also incur significantly more expenses than non-football playing schools (Dunham, 2007). Athletic departments do not claim that spending on athletics is a positive contribution to the school’s net income (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). This is perhaps because very few schools are able to generate positive income from athletics (Zimbalist, 1999). Most colleges and universities do not use athletics as a way to flourish financially. However, Toma (2003) claims many schools think football specifically carries

the potential to generate significant revenue. Successful athletic teams are associated with boosting athletic department revenue (Fulks, 2009). Generating additional revenue is not motivation for every school though. Phillip Dubois, Chancellor at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, who is set to kick off their first football season in 2013, says the possibility of generating additional revenue did not motivate their decision to add football (Perlmutter, 2008).

Before further examining the other three categories of effects, it is important to mention the interaction effect of athletics success. Nearly anytime the benefits of athletics are discussed in the literature; winning is an integral component and often intertwined. The assumption is that winning athletic teams produce greater benefits in all four categories. The fruits of winning athletics programs are perhaps most visible in the indirect financial benefits schools reap (Litan, Orszag, & Orszag, 2003). Winning teams improves alumni support and involvement which can manifest in increased donations to the school. As teams win more games and championships, alumni become interested, invested, and inclined to donate to the athletic department and school (Gladden et al., 1998; Litan et al., 2003).

Current studies that investigate the relationship between winning and donations have garnered mixed results. Hughes and Shank (2008) claim athletics success increases alumni donations to the university. On the other hand, Frank (2004) found that the benefits from winning, if they exist at all, are not significant. News reports and anecdotes seem to support evidence of a positive significant relationship. The *Washington Post* reported in 2001 that winning teams put the University of Maryland in a national spotlight, which inspired more alumni to give money (*Washington Post*, 2001). Goff (2000) found that both average and major improvements in athletic success substantially increased general giving to universities.

Baade and Sundberg (1996) determined that the general giving per university alumni depends very little on the athletic department's overall winning record. In a five-year case study at Clemson University, McCormick and Tinsley (1987) found that athletic success increased both athletic booster donations and general university contributions. They claim that athletic fundraising does not crowd out gifts to academics. Brooker and Klastorin (1981) assert that athletic success increases the portion of alumni who donate to the university and increases the average gift to the university annual fund. Sigelman and Bookheimer (1983) find the opposite in regards to annual fund giving. Their study revealed that contributions to the annual fund are negatively correlated with athletic success. Frey (1985), Grace (1988), and Sigelman and Carter (1979) failed to find evidence of a significant relationship between athletic success and alumni giving.

Other studies look at the effect of success in football specifically on alumni giving. The *National Football Foundation* published a 2012 report detailing Georgia State's, who added a football program in 2010, dramatic improvement in fundraising due to the on-field success of its football team. According to this report, "annual donations to Georgia State's Panther Athletic Club Annual Fund grew steadily from \$32,000 and 230 supporters in 2009 to a projected \$600,000 and 1,200 individuals this fiscal year" (*National Football Foundation*, 2012). Tucker and Amato (1993) found that having a highly successful football team does improve alumni giving rates for major universities.

Other studies use football wins, bowl game appearances, and championships as barometers of success in the relationship. Grimes and Chressanthis (1993) found evidence of a strong positive correlation between winning a championship and alumni donations. Although, they concluded that giving doesn't significantly depend on athletics success,

Baade and Sundberg (1996) found that bowl appearances did raise general alumni giving for public universities. Coughlin and Erekson (1984) found that bowl participation and basketball winning percentages increase gifts specifically to the athletic department. Sigelman and Bookheimer (1983) generated a significant correlation between contributions to the athletic department and football success. Brooker and Klastorin (1981) revealed evidence of a positive statistical relationship between the percentage of alumni donating to the school with its winning percentage in football and number of bowl appearances. Rhoads and Gerking (2000) took it a step further claiming that alumni-educational donations respond positively to football bowl wins rather than solely bowl game appearances. Two other studies failed to find significance in the relationship between football bowl appearances and donations. Turner, Meserve, and Bowen (2001) looked specifically at football wins and losses at several 'higher-profile' and Ivy League schools but failed to find a significant relationship. Using a sample from 1975-76, Sigelman and Carter (1979) did not find an association between winning football teams, bowl appearances, and alumni contributions.

Alumni support generated from winning often translates to direct financial effects and tangible benefits to the university as well (Gladden et al., 1998; Litan et al., 2003). Improved alumni support can produce additional revenue from donations and alumni association membership as well as promote better game attendance and increased revenue from ticket, concession, and merchandise sales. In the same 2012 *National Football Foundation* report, several schools reported experiencing incredible attendance gains and record ticket sales revenue after their new football programs began to enjoy on-field success. The University of Texas at San Antonio topped 25,000 in attendance at all six home games in the 2011 season; averaging 35,521 attendees per game. Old Dominion University, who added a football team

in 2009, was one of only twelve FCS teams to draw an average of 100 percent or more of stadium capacity in the 2011 season. Colorado State University-Pueblo went 11-1 in the 2011 season and attracted 53,494 fans to seven home games which filled its stadium to 117.57 percent capacity.

The third main benefit successful athletics teams generate for the university are what Litan, Orszag, and Orszag (2003) call indirect non-financial effects. These effects are broken into two categories: quantifiable effects and non-quantifiable effects. Quantifiable indirect non-financial effects include increasing the number of freshman applications, increasing student enrollment, and improving student attendance/involvement (Bale, 1991; Ehrman & Marber, 2008; Marklein, 2001; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Noll, 1999; Rooney, 1987; Toma & Cross, 1998). Many scholars, researchers, administrators, and fans call this phenomenon the 'Flutie effect' (Burris, 2004; Fisher, 2009). The title references former Boston College star quarterback Doug Flutie and his infamous game-winning Hail Mary pass to beat the University of Miami in 1984. The play, the game, and Flutie himself, all became hits in the media and American popular culture. Boston College reaped the benefits of this national exposure. Applications to the school increased a record 30-percent in the following year (Marklein, 2001). The basic theory behind the Flutie effect is that memorable and exciting wins and NCAA championships increase awareness of the school, which motivates more high school seniors to apply (Fisher, 2009).

The Flutie effect is not a phenomenon exclusive to Doug Flutie and Boston College. Many other colleges and universities reap the benefits of success in sports as well. Ehrman and Marber (2008) found that applications for admissions unanimously increased when a school was successful in sports. Similarly, in a 2001 study, the *Washington Post* reported

that winning sports teams encourage more students to apply to a school. Many schools have experienced incredible gains after winning national championships in football and men's basketball. Clemson University felt its 'Flutie effect' after winning the national championship in football in 1981. In the following year, Clemson's applications increased by 17 percent (*Scripps Howard News Service*, 2001). Zimbalist (1999) also found that athletic success is associated with increased applications. Toma and Cross (1998) observed that winning a national championship in football or men's basketball is significantly related to an increase in applications but only in the following year. They found mixed results on whether general athletic success draws additional applications for admissions. Murphy and Trandel (1994) investigated the relationship between success in football and applications for schools only in the major athletic conferences. They found that an increase of .25 in winning percentage is equivalent to an increase of 1.370 times the previous amount of applications received.

In addition to increasing the number of freshman applications, winning sports teams and the addition of a football program can help schools increase their enrollment. Sports attract student-athletes who want to continue participating in college, thus enabling the institution to reach enrollment targets (Feezell, 2009). Most of these students pay full tuition and fees, which helps increase both the school's enrollment and the amount of revenue from tuition (Tucker, 2004). Division III Adrian College added six varsity sports in 2005 and subsequently experienced a 50 percent increase in enrollment and 3,000 additional applications (Sander, 2008). Sports, football in particular, also attract students in ancillary activities such as marching band and cheerleading and certain fields of study like athletic training, exercise science, and sports journalism (Pennington, 2006).

As the gender gap continues to widen in American universities and colleges, many schools have turned to football as a strategy to increase undergraduate male enrollment (Suggs, n.d.; 2003). Smaller schools can make significant progress towards a more equitable male-female ratio by adding roughly twenty-five or more football-playing male students each year (Feezell, 2009). University administrators also believe it is easier to recruit male students who may not play the sport but want to attend a college with a football team to watch (Suggs, n.d.). Administrators at Adrian College believe football helped attract males who might not have otherwise found the school (Feezell, 2009). Since adding football in 2010, Shenandoah University has experienced a six percent increase in undergraduate male enrollment, bringing the total to 41 percent (Pennington, 2006). The University of Mary Hardin-Baylor experienced a similar increase in male enrollment, jumping from 32 to 40 percent after football was added (Pennington, 2006). Brevard College, which added its football program in 2006, claimed it was able to attract new applicants that yearned simply for ‘the tradition of football’ (“College will be glad it has football,” 2006, p.1). Lindsey Wilson Athletic Director Willis Pooler acknowledged using football as a strategy to increase enrollment. Pooler explained, “We wanted to attract students who wouldn’t normally consider us because we didn’t have football” (Gardiner, 2010). Since adding the sport in 2010, enrollment has grown at Lindsey Wilson by almost a third.

Mixon and Hsing (1994) claim adding sports can boost enrollment because out-of-state students prefer schools with larger sports programs. On its website, the University of South Alabama says one of their justifications for adding football was that it has been shown to increase enrollment rates (Gardiner, 2010). USA Athletic Director Dr. Joel Erdmann said adding football was ‘a signature of the institution’s growth’ (National Football Foundation,

2012, p.1). Enrollment has since increased at South Alabama from 13,090 in 2006 to more than 15,000 in the fall of 2011 (National Football Foundation, 2012). Administrators at the University of New Haven also attribute record-breaking enrollment to the addition of football in 2009. The school's undergraduate enrollment grew from 2,500 in 2008 to 4,607 in 2011 (National Football Foundation, 2012). After adding football in 2010, Lamar University's enrollment grew from 9,906 students in 2006 to 14,021 students in 2011. Yet again, Lamar's leadership attributes this rise to the addition of football (National Football Foundation, 2012). While it seems to be a popular strategy for many smaller schools, not everyone adding football does so to increase enrollment. University of North Carolina at Charlotte Chancellor Phillip Dubois said growing the school's enrollment did not motivate its decision to add football (Perlmutter, 2008). Instead, Dubois cited other intangible benefits from which UNCC would benefit.

Winning sports teams and the addition of a football program can help boost enrollment, and male enrollment particularly, but how long will the effect last? Feezell (2009) analyzed six Division II and III schools that added football programs during 2002-2003. He found that football increases overall enrollment initially, but the effect decreases over time. At two of the Division II institutions, enrollment increased by three hundred or more students, but the increase stabilized and then declined over time, reaching a level below that before adding football. The Division III institutions in the study also experienced increases in enrollment after adding football, followed by a decline, but they were able to maintain enrollment at a level higher than before the addition of football. However, Feezell (2009) did find that adding football increases the percentage of men in the school's

enrollment over time. The percentage of male students enrolled increased on average by about 10 percent and was able to sustain that level at all six schools Feezell studied.

Winning athletic teams and the addition of football can also provide intangible and indirect non-financial benefits such as improving school spirit, tradition, on-campus atmosphere, community involvement, media exposure/visibility, quality of applicants, student experience, and reputation/perception (Litan, Orszag, & Orszag, 2003; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004). Gladden, Milne, and Sutton (1998) believe these intangible benefits are the best indicators of stakeholder and external perception of an institution. Many of these intangible gains are important in attracting and retaining students (Toma, 2003).

Several studies have produced evidence of the relationship between athletics success and the addition of football with increased freshman applications and enrollment, but does more applications correspond with better quality students and greater admissions selectivity? Aptitude tests (notably the SAT and ACT) are the most objective and commonly used barometers to measure the quality of incoming students and freshman applicants. The academic literature remains divided over whether sports success and football improve the quality of applicants. Whether or not schools can afford to be more highly selective after experiencing athletic success also depends on its enrollment goals. For schools already at enrollment capacity when they win a championship or add a football program, increased applications could lead to corresponding improvements in student quality and thus lower acceptance rates (Murphy & Trandel, 1994). Schools wishing to increase their enrollment might in turn have significantly higher acceptance rates as greater numbers of qualified students apply.

McCormick and Tinsley (1987) claim institutions who participate in major college athletics are generally better academically than those that do not make a similar investment. They also believe membership in a major athletic conference has a positive impact on incoming freshmen SAT scores. Bremmer and Kesselring (1993) found the exact opposite and report that neither membership in a major conference nor athletic success has a statistically significant effect on SAT scores of incoming students. Tucker and Amato (1993) did not find evidence of a significant relationship between general athletic success and incoming freshman SAT scores, but they found that having a highly ranked football team boosted SAT scores. Zimbalist (1999) failed to produce evidence that athletic success was associated with changes in SAT scores or applicant yields. Goff (2000) found that athletic success increases national exposure, which may lead to an improved applicant pool. Adrian College, which experienced a 50 percent increase in enrollment and three thousand additional applicants after adding football, also experienced 21 percent greater selectivity in admissions (Sander, 2008).

University administrators generally believe winning athletic programs and a successful football program benefit the school's image, reputation, and public perception (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Gerstner, 2011; Goff, 2000; Lovaglia & Lucas, 2005). As the metaphorical 'front porch' of the university, sports help determine the institution's brand (Bale, 1991; Rooney, 1987; Toma & Cross, 1998). Colleges and universities use sports, and football, to increase their prestige and earn notoriety (Dunham, 2007; Pennington, 2006; Suggs, n.d.). College football brings increased visibility and can entice alumni to come back to campus for games (Coe, 2005). UNC Charlotte believes football will help contribute to the reputation of its institution (Ludwig, 2008). University of Mary Hardin-Baylor President

Dr. Jerry Bawcom believes football provided the school with name recognition in important metropolitan areas where they have previously struggled to attract applicants (Pennington, 2006).

Universities also utilize sports and the media to increase visibility of the institution (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Goff, 2000). Winning athletic programs and football teams can increase the amount of media exposure the school receives (Tomasini, 2005). Intercollegiate football is highly visible given today's sophisticated media and technology (Toma, 2003). Administrators at Georgia State University point to the unprecedented positive national publicity they have received through adding football. The Panthers program appeared on the front cover of *ESPN the Magazine* and played a nationally televised game against the University of Alabama in 2011 (National Football Foundation, 2012). Elmore captures a similar sentiment from an undergraduate student at Florida Atlantic University, who said, "It's great seeing my school on *SportsCenter*, even if the FAU player is the one chasing the other guy running for a touchdown" (2006, p.5).

Winning teams and new football programs can improve school spirit and school pride for current students and alumni (Toma, 2003). Universities seek to build bonds of affiliation and loyalty between current students and their school. Athletics is one of the main ways to foster this identification. Students strengthen their connection and commitment to the school by attending games and cheering for their team (Toma, Dubrow, & Hartley, 2005). High-profile intercollegiate athletics also help improve alumni relations (Toma & Cross, 1998). Students develop an affiliation for their school and its athletics teams while they are enrolled. Many continue to stay involved as alumni by giving back to the school through fiscal donations, booster club membership, purchasing tickets and memorabilia, and cheering for

the team. Athletics can also help improve goodwill in the local community (Toma, 1999). University of New Haven Athletic Director Deborah Chin believes their entire region enjoyed a restored sense of community after the launch of its football program (National Football Foundation, 2012). UNC Charlotte administrators hope football will encourage ‘ownership’ of the university among alumni and supporters in the Charlotte area (Ludwig, 2008). Chancellor Phillip Dubois believes adding football will enliven school spirit and foster another bond of engagement between students and UNCC (Ludwig, 2008).

Many university administrators believe athletics, and specifically football, improves the student experience and quality of life on campus (Feezell, 2009; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Toma & Cross, 1998). Athletics can improve student morale (Gerstner, 2011) and provide entertainment for students (Engstrand, 1995). Sports entertain the university community, especially the students who fill the student section at football games every Saturday (Feezell, 2009). Nearly all the schools who have recently added college football, including UNC Charlotte, believe football will enrich the student experience on campus (National Football Foundation, 2012). Athletics foster a more vibrant campus community and climate (Toma & Cross, 1998; Toma, 2003) and connect students and the local community (Feezell, 2009). Campbell University Athletic Director Bob Roller claims the return of football to the school has energized the entire campus community. He says the team has received tremendous support from students, alumni, and the surrounding community. Roller believes adding football was ‘definitely the right decision’ for Campbell (National Football Foundation, 2012).

Current literature and research primarily investigate the benefits of winning athletics programs and the addition of football. Many researchers have examined the effects of

winning a national championship or adding varsity football. They want to discover whether applications and enrollment increased; whether the school garnered more media attention; whether alumni donations and involvement increased. This study will contribute to the field by identifying the primary motivations for adding football without the interaction effect of success. Sure, many schools would like to increase the number of applications they receive or improve alumni relations, but is that really why universities are deciding to add football? This study will identify the most important factors in universities' decisions to add football, and it will measure the extent to which those factors or goals were realized.

An Analysis of NCAA Member Athletics Programs That Added or Discontinued Football Programs Between 1996 and 2005

A study conducted by Aaron Dunham in 2007 examined the primary reasons why colleges and universities added or dropped football. The secondary purpose was to analyze the opinions and outcomes of those institutions' respective decisions (Dunham, 2007).

Dunham distributed an online survey to athletic administrators at the 33 NCAA institutions that added or dropped college football programs between 1996 and 2005. The survey sought to determine the different reasons or motivations why a school may have added or dropped a football program. Questions were developed with a Likert-type scale, and respondents were asked to determine the weight of various factors contributing to their decision to add or drop football as well as general satisfaction levels with those respective decisions. Factors included increasing athletic department revenue, prestige, enrollment, freshman applications, athletic donor base, student-athlete opportunities, and establishing or maintaining conference affiliation. Follow up questions which gauged their opinions and the corresponding outcomes of adding football were also asked (Dunham, 2007).

Dunham found that the most important factor behind the decision to add football was the desire to increase enrollment. Forty three and three-tenths percent of respondents said increasing enrollment was a somewhat important/major factor, 36.7% offered no response, 16.7% said it was not a factor, and 3.3% said they did not know. Over half of the 43.3% of respondents who believed increasing enrollment was a major factor, represented institutions who added football at the non-scholarship level. Several of these respondents believed football was a potential ‘cash cow’ because it provided over 100 new student-athletes who paid tuition and fees. They thought many of these student-athletes would otherwise not be attending the school without the opportunity to continue playing football.

The second most important factor was the desire to increase freshman applications. Slightly over thirty-six percent (36.7%) of respondents said increasing the number of freshman applications was a somewhat important/major factor, 16.7% said it was not a factor/minor factor, 40% offered no response, and 6.7% did not know. The third most important motivation was to enhance institutional prestige. Again, over thirty-six percent (36.7%) said increasing prestige was a somewhat important/major factor, 16.7% said it was not a factor, 40% offered no response, and 6.7% did not know. The fourth most important goal was to create more participation opportunities for student-athletes. Thirty-six percent (36.7%) of respondents said increasing opportunities was a somewhat important/major factor, 20% said it was either not a factor or a minor factor, 36.7% offered no response, and 6.7% did not know.

Dunham also gave respondents the opportunity to expand on the idea of increasing enrollment and student-athlete opportunities. Many reported the need to balance out male-female ratios on campus and to satisfy the large demand of prospective young men who want

to experience college football. Several respondents claimed the addition of football would diversify and balance the school's enrollment profile. A much smaller percentage of respondents believed the desire to increase athletic department revenue and increase the athletic donor base were important factors in the decision to add football.

In addition to identifying the motives behind the decision to add football, the second part of the survey sought to identify respondents' opinions and the respective outcomes of adding football. Participants were asked first to describe the current athletic director and athletic department senior staff's level of satisfaction with adding football. 53.3% of respondents said they agreed or strongly agreed that the current athletic director was satisfied with the decision, while 6.7% said they didn't know, and 40% offered no response. Similarly, 50% of respondents believed the athletic department senior staff was satisfied with adding football, while 3.3% disagreed or strongly disagreed, 6.7% didn't know, and 40% didn't respond.

Respondents were then asked to identify whether the same variable factors (i.e., prestige, enrollment, applications, student-athlete opportunities, athletic department revenues, and football revenues) had in fact increased since the decision to add football. Most respondents believed their institutions experienced increased enrollment, application numbers, prestige, and student-athlete opportunities after adding football.

Forty six and seven tenths percent of respondents said enrollment increased at the institution since adding football, 3.3% disagreed, 3.3% didn't know, and 46.7% didn't respond. Respondents answered similarly in terms of freshman applications. Forty three and three tenths percent agreed that freshman applications had increased, 3.3% disagreed, 13.3% didn't know, and 40% didn't respond. The majority of respondents (56.7%) recognized that

student-athlete opportunities had also increased since adding football, while 3.3% did not know, and 40% didn't respond. Forty six and seven tenths percent of respondents reported that alumni donations to athletics had increased since the institution added football, while 6.7% disagreed, 3.3% didn't know, and 43.3% didn't respond.

The results of the final two survey questions differed as more respondents disagreed than agreed with the statements. Thirty percent of respondents disagreed that athletic department revenues exceeded expenses in the first year after the institution added football, while 20% agreed, 10% didn't know, and 40% didn't respond. Thirty percent of respondents also disagreed that football revenues had exceeded expenses in at least one year since the institution added football, while 16.7% agreed, 6.7% did not know, and 46.7% did not respond.

This study builds on the current body of literature by updating some portions of the Dunham study and expanding it by focusing on branding theory in the decision making process for institutions that have added football programs.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to discover how university administrators believe adding college football will benefit their institution. The secondary purpose was to investigate to what degree those anticipated benefits were realized.

Instrumentation

This study focused on the forty-two NCAA members that added college football programs between 2001 and 2011. These colleges and universities were identified through research made available by the National Football Foundation (2012). Data was collected for this study through the use of an online survey instrument utilizing Qualtrics software. The survey contained a uniform set of questions including both open-ended and four-point Likert-type scale questions. The survey was developed by the researcher and modified by sport administration faculty and a current associate athletic director. The instrument was approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Survey respondents were asked to recall the decision-making process and rate how influential certain factors were during those stages. Data collected by the instrument measured the degree of influence each of the stated motivations had on the university's decision to begin a college football program. Respondents were asked at the conclusion of the survey to identify their respective school and current job/position at that school in order to examine the possibility of segmentation in motivations by the following two independent variables: NCAA Division (I, II, or III) and current job/position. Subjects were asked to

identify to what extent did the following goals motivate your university's decision to add a college football program. To do so, the survey used a four-point Likert scale which included 1 (Not At All), 2 (To a Small Extent), 3 (To a Moderate Extent), and 4 (To a Large Extent). Respondents also had the option to respond "Not Applicable" and/or skip any question(s). The variables respondents were asked to weigh included increasing athletic department revenue, increasing the school's prestige/reputation, increasing undergraduate enrollment, increasing the amount of initial applications for admission, increasing the number of new athletics donors, increasing the amount of athletics donations, establishing a new athletics conference affiliation, maintaining current athletics conference affiliation, improving school spirit, developing the university's brand, and increasing participation opportunities for student-athletes.

Respondents also completed either three or four open-ended questions depending on whether they were employed by the institution when football was added. The first of these questions provided respondents the opportunity to detail any potential motivations or factors they considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned in the survey. The next question, which was designed to answer Research Question 3, asked respondents to look back and evaluate whether the potential motivations for adding football were realized/achieved. Put more simply, did football produce the results for which it was intended? (i.e., did undergraduate enrollment increase; did alumni contribute more money to athletics; etc.?). Along the same lines, respondents were asked whether there were other benefits gained by adding football. Lastly, respondents were asked whether there were any negatives from adding football.

Credibility, Validity, and Reliability

The survey was developed and modified under the direction and supervision of a panel of experts in order to maximize content validity. This panel included one Sport Administration faculty member/sports lawyer, another Sport Administration faculty member, the Associate Athletic Director for Football at UNC-CH, and an expert at the Odum Institute for Advancing Social Science Teaching and Research at UNC-CH.

Subjects

Between 2001 and 2011, 42 NCAA institutions added college football programs. These institutions include all three levels of the NCAA. The entire population of interest, 210 current university administrators, were invited to participate in the study. This population included the University President/Chancellor, University Provost, Athletic Director (AD), Senior Woman Administrator (SWA), and Faculty Athletic Representative (FAR) from every NCAA institution that added college football programs between 2001 and 2011. This study seeks to survey those respondents who had key roles in the decision to add football at each institution.

Respondents were asked to identify whether they were in their current position when the decision was made to add football. Due to the changing nature of collegiate athletics and the length of time examined (2001-2011), it was expected that some of these respondents may have changed jobs or retired since the decision was made to add football. Respondents who were not in their current position at the time of the decision skipped ahead in the survey to question 4. These respondents still offer a unique perspective into how things have or have not changed since adding football. They will provide feedback on football's impact on campus as well as provide valuable insight by completing the three open-ended questions.

Participants were invited to participate in the study via email. The email explained the purpose and significance of the study, included the physical link to participate, and thanked the respondent for their voluntary participation in the study. The email also mentioned that the researcher was available to answer any potential questions regarding individual questions as well as the overall study. One of the main concerns during the drafting stages of this research study was the potential downfall of yielding a poor response rate. The main strategy the researcher used to counter this threat was sending personalized emails to each member of the population. Each member of the population was individually emailed and asked to participate; reminder invitations were emailed as well.

Subjects were incentivized to participate in the study by having the option to receive a summary of the results upon completion of the study. Respondents were informed that the survey should take approximately five to ten minutes to complete. A reminder email was sent to members of the population who did not respond after the initial email invitation to participate in the study.

Data Analysis

After the completed surveys were returned, quantitative data was analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software in order to tabulate descriptive statistics and test for significant differences. These statistics provide a solid description of the primary motivations behind the decision to add college football. The researcher will use tables depicting frequencies and percentages to summarize the relevant data and answer the several components of RQ-1. After the means were calculated and grouped according to the respective research question, the components/factors were sorted in ascending order to reveal the most influential motivations relative to each other.

The researcher will employ one-way between-subjects ANOVA's to test for significant differences in motivations for adding football based upon two independent variables: NCAA Division and respondent job position. The relevant findings are presented in the following 'Results' chapter.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter examines the six research questions proposed within Chapter 1. The total population of interest included 210 university administrators representing 42 total schools. Three of the total 210 administrators (1.4%) held multiple titles, in all three cases the Athletic Director also served as the Senior Woman Administrator. Seventy-four of the 210 total administrators in the population responded to the survey producing a response rate of 35.2%.

The 42 total institutions in the population encapsulate the wide range of schools adding football in terms of NCAA division, scholarship allocation, enrollment, location, year in which football was added, and athletics conference affiliation. The population breakdown by NCAA division is as follows. Nine of the 42 (21.4%) schools in the population compete at the Division I level, sixteen (38.1%) at the Division II level, and 19 (45.2%) at the Division III level.

At least one administrator from 35 of the 42 schools in the population participated in the study producing an institutional response rate of 83.3%. Of these 35 schools represented in the study, 6 (17.1%) participate at the Division I level, 14 (40%) participate at the Division II level, and 15 (42.9%) participate at the Division III level. See Appendix 5 for a complete listing of institutions represented in the study.

The 74 completed surveys also represent a significant distribution of university administrators by job position/title. While none of the 35 schools represented in the results had all five possible administrators respond to the survey, two institutions (5.7%) each had

four administrators respond. Seven of the 35 institutions (20%) were represented by three university administrators, 12 schools (34.3%) had two administrators respond, and 14 (40%) had only one administrator complete the survey. Five administrators (14.2%) responded in full to the survey but declined to identify their employing institution. See Table 1 for a complete listing of positions represented in the study.

Table 1

Administrator Positions Represented in Study Results

Job Position	Frequency	Percent
Athletic Director	14	18.9
University President	19	25.7
Faculty Athletic Representative	14	18.9
University Provost	9	12.2
Senior Woman Administrator	11	14.9
Other	7	9.5
Total	74	100

72 respondents identified their current job position in the survey; two of the 72 selected multiple titles. The largest group represented was University Presidents/Chancellors: 19 total participants, 25.7%, were the highest-ranking leader of their institution. Tied for the second largest group represented in the study was Athletic Directors and Faculty Athletic Representatives (FARs) with 14 respondents (18.9%). Eleven Senior Woman Administrators (SWAs), 13.6%, completed the survey, as well as 9 University Provosts (11.1%). Seven respondents (9.5%) identified their job position as ‘Other.’ Two of the seven were Executive Vice Presidents at their university, one was the Dean of Administration, one was a Senior Associate Athletic Director, and the remaining other did not specify.

Of the 72 total respondents, 37 (51.4%) were employed by their respective athletic department at the time when the school decided to add college football, while 35 were not.

Respondents who indicated that they were employed during the decision making process were asked to complete survey questions 2 and 3, while those who were not employed at the time skipped ahead to question 4. It should be noted that those administrators who were not part of their university's decision still provided valuable feedback on the immediate and lasting effects of adding the sport.

Research Question 1

Respondents who were employed in their current position at the time the decision was made to add a college football program were asked to identify (on a four-point Likert scale) to what extent did each of the eleven goals motivate the university's decision to add college football. See Table 2 for a complete listing of the eleven goals.

Table 2

Goals Identified in Survey

Goal	Mean	Not at all	To a Small Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Large Extent	# of Responses
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	3.81	0	0	7 (19.4%)	29 (80.6%)	36
Increasing the amount of initial applications for admission	3.65	0	1 (2.7%)	11 (29.7%)	25 (67.6%)	37
Improving school spirit	3.49	0	5 (13.5%)	9 (24.3%)	23 (62.2%)	37
Developing the university's brand	3.29	2 (5.4%)	1 (2.7%)	18 (48.6%)	16 (43.2%)	37
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	3.08	4 (10.8%)	3 (8.1%)	16 (43.2%)	14 (37.8%)	37
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	3.05	2 (5.4%)	10 (27.0%)	9 (24.3%)	16 (43.2%)	37
Increasing the number of new athletics donors	2.51	6 (16.2%)	13 (35.1%)	11 (29.7%)	7 (18.9%)	37
Increasing the amount of athletics donations	2.51	4 (10.8%)	16 (43.2%)	11 (29.7%)	6 (16.2%)	37
Establishing new athletic conference affiliation	2.13	18 (48.6%)	5 (13.5%)	5 (13.5%)	9 (24.3%)	37
Increasing athletic department revenue	1.8	20 (57.1%)	7 (20.0%)	3 (8.6%)	5 (14.3%)	35
Maintaining current athletic conference affiliation	1.44	23 (71.9%)	6 (18.8%)	1 (3.1%)	2 (6.3%)	32

Respondents indicated that increasing undergraduate enrollment most strongly motivated the university's decision to add football with a mean response of 3.81 on the Likert scale. An overwhelming majority of respondents (29, 80.6%) indicated that increasing enrollment motivated the university's decision to add football to a large extent. Seven respondents (19.4%) believed increasing enrollment motivated the addition of football to a moderate extent. No respondents indicated that increasing undergraduate enrollment motivated the addition of football to a small extent or said it was not a factor.

Increasing the amount of initial applications for admission was also a strong motivation, with a mean score of 3.65. Yet again, a majority (25 respondents or 67.6%) indicated that increasing the amount of applications motivated the addition of football to a large extent. Eleven respondents (29.7%) believed increasing applications motivated the addition of football to a moderate extent, and only one respondent (2.7%) said it was a small factor. Nobody indicated that increasing the amount of applications was not a factor.

Improving school spirit was an important factor in the university's decision to add football with a mean score of 3.49, placing its influence directly between a large extent and a medium extent. Twenty-three respondents (62.2%) indicated that improving school spirit motivated the addition of football to a large extent, 9 (24.3%) to a moderate extent, 5 (13.5%) to a small extent, and nobody said it was not a factor at all.

Developing the university's brand was also a strong consideration for university respondents producing a mean Likert score of 3.29, but not as influential as improving school spirit, increasing enrollment, or increasing applications. Sixteen respondents (43.2%) claimed developing the university's brand motivated the addition of football to a large extent, 18 (48.6%) to a moderate extent, 1 (2.7%) to a small extent, and 2 (5.4%) said it was not a factor.

Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities was just slightly less influential than improving the school's prestige/reputation, yielding a mean of 3.08 as a factor in the university's decision to add football. Fourteen university respondents (37.8%) believed increasing student-athlete participation opportunities motivated adding football to a large extent, 16 (43.2%) to a moderate extent, 3 (8.1%) to a small extent, and 4 (10.8%) said it was not a factor.

Increasing the school's prestige/reputation motivated the university's decision to add football to a moderate extent, as represented by a mean score of 3.05. Sixteen (43.2%) respondents believed increasing the school's prestige/reputation motivated the university's decision to a large extent. Nine respondents (24.3%) indicated that increasing the school's prestige/reputation motivated the addition of football to a moderate extent. Ten (27.0%) said it motivated to a small extent, and only 2 (5.4%) said it was not a factor at all.

Increasing the number of new athletics donors was less important to universities and colleges than applications and enrollment as 37 respondents yielded a mean score of 2.51 on the Likert scale. Only 7 respondents (18.9%) claimed increasing the number of new athletics donors motivated the addition of football to a large extent. Eleven respondents (29.7%) believed increasing the athletic donor based motivated the addition of football to a moderate extent, 13 (35.1%) said it was a small factor, and 6 (16.2%) claimed it was not a factor.

Similarly, increasing the amount of athletics donations produced a mean of 2.51. Six respondents (16.2%) believed increasing the amount of athletics donations motivated the university's decision to add football to a large extent, 11 (29.7%) to a moderate extent, 16 (43.2%) to a small extent, and 4 (10.8%) claimed it was not a factor. Respondents responded similarly to these two questions which indicated that increasing donations, whether by increasing the number of donors or by increasing the amount of donations, was similarly valued.

Two survey factors regarding athletic conference affiliation and its impact on the university's decision to add intercollegiate football yielded similar responses. Establishing a new athletic conference affiliation generated a mean score of 2.13. Nine respondents (24.3%) indicated that establishing a new athletics conference affiliation motivated adding

football to a large extent, 5 (13.5%) believed enticing a new conference motivated to a moderate extent, 5 (13.5%) to a small extent, and nearly half of the respondents, 18 (48.6%) said it was not a factor. Maintaining current athletic conference affiliation was the least important motivation producing a mean score of only 1.44. Only 2 respondents (6.3%) reported that maintaining current athletics conference affiliation motivated the addition of football to a large extent, 1 (3.1%) to a moderate extent, 6 (18.8%) to a small extent, and the large majority, 23 (71.9%) said it was not a factor.

Finally, increasing the athletic department's revenue generated a mean Likert score of 1.80, placing the average not quite to a small extent but significantly greater than not a factor. Five respondents (14.3%) believed increasing the athletic department's revenue motivated the university's decision to add football to a large extent (4 on the Likert scale). Three respondents (8.6%) indicated that increasing athletic department revenue motivated the decision to a moderate extent, while 7 respondents (20.0%) claimed it only motivated to a small extent. The majority of respondents indicated that increasing athletic department revenue did not motivate the decision to add the sport at all. Twenty of the 35 (57.1%) chose the not at all option on the Likert scale.

Research Question 2

The second main research question provided university respondents the opportunity to expand in an open-ended format on any other potential factors that were considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned. Only respondents who were employed in their current position at the time when the decision was made to add varsity football were prompted with this question. 16 of the 37 respondents (43.2%) indicated that there was at least one additional motivation or factor.

The most popular factor considered in the decision to add football provided in the open-ended responses was the desire to improve the gender ratio on campus. Ten respondents indicated that improving the male-to-female ratio and bringing more males to the university were important factors in adding football. Also, five respondents indicated that developing and building a relationship with the local community was a university goal which football was intended to accomplish. Two university respondents reported adding football as a strategy to improve alumni relations. These colleges thought football would help bring alumni back to campus for gamedays while also improving the atmosphere on campus. Other respondents cited raising visibility of the institution, increasing the amount of resident students as compared to commuters, and satisfying demand as additional motivations for adding college football. For a complete listing of these additional benefits see Appendix 2.

Research Question 3

The third research question addresses the secondary purpose of this study: to explore to what degree the anticipated benefits from adding football were realized. All participants in the study, both those who were and were not in their current position when football was added as a varsity sport, were prompted with this question. University respondents were asked to what extent has the institution been able to achieve any of nine factors as a result of adding football. See Table 3 for a complete listing of these nine goals and the extent to which they were realized.

Table 3

Goals Identified In the Survey and the Extent to Which They Were Realized

Goal	Mean	Not at all	To a Small Extent	To a Moderate Extent	To a Large Extent	# of Responses
Increased student-athlete participation opportunities	3.39	1 (1.3%)	6 (7.9%)	31 (40.8%)	38 (50.0%)	76
Improved school spirit	3.32	1 (1.3%)	9 (12.0%)	30 (40.0%)	35 (46.7%)	75
Increased the amount of initial applications for admission	3.27	4 (5.4%)	8 (10.8%)	26 (35.1%)	36 (48.6%)	74
Increased undergraduate enrollment	3.24	3 (4.0%)	11 (14.7%)	26 (34.7%)	35 (46.7%)	75
Developed the university's brand	3.08	4 (5.3%)	12 (15.8%)	34 (44.7%)	26 (34.2%)	76
Increased the school's prestige/reputation	2.89	7 (9.1%)	20 (26.0%)	24 (31.2%)	26 (33.8%)	77
Increased the amount of athletics donations	2.8	3 (4.0%)	25 (33.3%)	31 (41.3%)	16 (21.3%)	75
Increased the number of new athletics donors	2.79	3 (4.0%)	26 (34.7%)	30 (40.0%)	16 (21.3%)	75
Increased athletic department revenue	2.36	20 (26.7%)	26 (34.7%)	11 (14.7%)	18 (24.0%)	75

Increasing participation opportunities for student-athletes was the most realized benefit gained from adding football. 76 respondents yielded a mean score of 3.39 revealing that participation opportunities increased between a moderate and large extent. Half of respondents (38) believed student-athlete participation opportunities increased to a large extent, 31 (40.8%) to a moderate extent, 6 (7.9%) to a small extent, and only one (1.3%) said participation opportunities did not increase at all.

School spirit increased to the second-largest extent after football was added as a varsity sport as indicated by a mean score of 3.32. Thirty-five respondents (46.7%) believed football improved school spirit to a large extent, 30 (40%) to a moderate extent, 9 (12.0%) to a small extent, and only one (1.3%) said it did not increase at all.

With a mean of 3.27, the amount of initial applications for admission increased to a slightly larger extent than the increase in undergraduate enrollment. Nearly half of respondents, 36 (48.6%), said the amount of initial applications for admission increased to a Large extent, 26 (35.1%) to a moderate extent, 8 (10.8%) to a small extent, and 4 (5.4%) said it did Not at All.

Undergraduate enrollment increased between a moderate and large extent after adding college football, as reported by a mean score of 3.24. Thirty-five university respondents (46.7%) reported that their school's undergraduate enrollment increased to a Large extent, 26 (34.7%) to a Moderate extent, 11 (14.7%) to a Small extent, and only 3 (4.0%) said it did Not at All.

Developing the university's brand was also identified as a strong motivation for adding football. Respondents said the university's brand developed to a moderate extent with a mean score of 3.08. Twenty-six respondents (34.2%) believed football helped develop the university's brand to a large extent, 34 (44.7%) to a moderate extent, 12 (15.8%) to a small extent, and 4 (5.3%) said it did not develop the brand at all.

The school's prestige/reputation increased after adding college football, as represented by a mean score of 2.89. University respondents valued football's potential positive impact on the school's prestige and reputation, but on average respondents claimed the prestige/reputation increased to a Moderate extent. Slight more than a third of university

respondents, 26 or 33.8%, claimed that the school's prestige and reputation increased to a Large extent, 24 (31.2%) to a Moderate extent, 20 (26.0%) to a Small extent, and only 7 (9.1%) said it did Not at All.

The number of new athletics donors and the amount of athletics donations both increased to a moderate or small extent after adding football. The number of new athletics donors generated a mean of 2.79 and the amount of new athletics donors yielded a mean of 2.80. Sixteen respondents (21.3%) claimed that the amount of new athletics donors increased to a large extent, 30 (40%) to a moderate extent, 26 (34.7%) to a small extent, and 3 (4.0%) said it did not at all. Sixteen respondents (21.3%) also said the amount of athletics donations increased to a large extent, 31 (41.3%) to a moderate extent, 25 (33.3%) to a small extent, and 3 (4.0%) said it did not at all.

The athletic department's revenue increased given a mean Likert score of 2.36. Although it wasn't identified as one of the primary motivations driving the decision to add football, 18 university respondents (24.0%) claimed that athletic department revenue increased to a Large extent after adding football. This was an unintended or unanticipated benefit but also a greatly welcomed benefit for respondents at these schools. Eleven respondents (14.7%) reported that athletic department revenue increased to a Moderate extent. The majority of respondents claimed either revenue increased only to a Small extent, 26 (34.7%), or did Not at All, 20 (26.7%).

As part of Research Question 1, university respondents, who were employed in their current position when varsity football was added, were asked to weigh the extent to which attracting and maintaining athletics conference affiliation impacted their university's decision. The survey results indicated that neither attracting a new athletics conference nor

maintaining their current athletics conference were important motivations driving the addition of football. Both potential factors earned the lowest mean scores recorded in the study; 2.13 and 1.44 respectively. Unlike the other potential motivations, respondents were not asked in the survey whether or not their university or college joined a new athletics conference after adding football. This information was publicly available through online research and is thus not a matter of opinion or belief. Either the university changed athletics conferences or did not change in the years following the addition of varsity football.

Of the 42 schools that added football between 2001 and 2011, 27 (64.3%) changed conferences within six years while only 15 remained in their original athletics conference. Those who switched athletic conferences are listed in Table 4 along with the new conferences they joined and the year in which they jumped. Seven of the 27 schools (25.9%) joined new conferences in Division I, 8 (29.6%) joined new conferences in Division II, and 12 (44.4%) joined new conferences in Division III. After the addition of football, a few of these schools left the NAIA and became NCAA member institutions joining new athletic conferences. Also, five of the 27 schools (18.5%) joined new football-only conferences (Anna Maria College, Castleton State College, Campbell University, SUNY Maritime College, and Becker College.) These five schools maintained their current conference membership for the rest of their sports while the football team joined a new conference only sponsoring football. While the statistics demonstrate that the majority of colleges and universities joined new athletics conferences after sponsoring football, earning an invitation to a new athletic conference should not be considered a byproduct of adding football.

Table 4

Conference Affiliation Before and After Adding Football
 (* indicates a football-only conference)

School	Former Athletic Conference	New Athletic Conference	Year	Division
Florida International University	Division I-FCS Independent	Sun Belt Conference	2005	I-FBS
Florida Atlantic University	Division I-FCS Independent	Sun Belt Conference	2006	I-FBS
University of Texas at San Antonio	Division I-FCS Independent	Conference USA	2013	I-FBS
Georgia State University	Division I-FCS Independent	Sun Belt Conference	2013	I-FBS
Old Dominion University	Colonial Athletic Association	Conference USA	2013	I-FBS
University of South Alabama	Division I-FCS Independent	Sun Belt Conference	2013	I-FBS
Campbell University		Pioneer Football League*	2008	I-FCS
University of the Incarnate Word	Lone Star Conference	Southland Conference	2013	I-FCS
University of Minnesota at Crookston	NAIA	Northern Sun Intercollegiate Conference	2000	II
Central State University	NAIA	Great Lakes Valley Conference	2005	II
Lincoln University	Eastern College Athletic Conference	Central Intercollegiate Athletic Association	2008	II
University of New Haven	East Coast Conference	Northeast-10 Conference	2008	II
Brevard College	NAIA Appalachian Athletic Conference	South Atlantic Conference	2008	II
Lake Erie College	Allegheny Mountain College Conference	Great Lakes Intercollegiate Athletic Conference	2010	II
Seton Hill University	NAIA American Midwest Conference	Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference	2012	II
Louisiana College	NAIA Gulf Coast Athletic Conference	American Southwest Conference	2000	III
Rockford College		Northern Athletics Conference	2006	III
Saint Vincent College	NAIA	Presidents' Athletic Conference	2006	III
Becker College	North Atlantic Conference	Eastern Collegiate Football Conference*	2009	III
SUNY Maritime College		Eastern Collegiate Football Conference*	2009	III
Anna Maria College	Commonwealth Coast Conference	Eastern Collegiate Football Conference*	2009	III
Castleton State College	North Atlantic Conference	Eastern Collegiate Football Conference*	2009	III
Morrisville State College		North Eastern Athletic Conference	2009	III
Gallaudet University	Capital Athletics Conference	North Eastern Athletic Conference	2010	III
Stevenson University	Capital Athletics Conference	Middle Atlantic Conferences	2012	III
Birmingham Southern College	Southern Collegiate Athletic Conference	Southern Athletic Association	2012	III
LaGrange College	Great South Athletic Conference	USA South Athletic Conference	2012	III

Research Question 4

The fourth main research question provided university respondents the opportunity to expand in an open-ended format on whether there were any other benefits gained from adding football. Just slightly over half of the respondents (39) believed there were other benefits gained from the addition of varsity football.

The two most often mentioned benefits were improved alumni relations and community relations. Eight respondents believed the addition of football helped strengthen relationships with the school's alumni. Football home games provide a great opportunity to invite alumni, who may have gotten disconnected, from the university back to campus for games, events, and homecoming. The other most often mentioned benefit was community relations. 8 university respondents believed support from the community increased after starting a football program. Football provided the university another venue to engage the local community, which helped strengthen the relationship between them. Community members take pride in the university's football team.

The next most popularly mentioned benefit gained from football that respondents mentioned was an improved male to female ratio. Respondents identified improving the gender balance as a strong motivator in the decision to start a football program. Six respondents said the addition of football helped increase the proportion of male students on campus. Football also provides universities with another attractive student entertainment offering. Six university respondents said football was valuable because it helped keep students on campus on weekends. Five respondents mentioned the construction of new and upgraded athletic facilities as another benefit from football. New field turf stadiums, lights, additional office space, and improved training rooms were all byproducts of the addition of a

football program. Not only did these new facilities benefit the football team, but respondents indicated that they also benefited field hockey, men's and women's soccer, and men's and women's lacrosse as well. Four university respondents indicated that football improved the overall awareness of the institution. Football programs brought visibility to the school and to its strengths. Other respondents cited ancillary benefits stemming from the football program's birth including new educational opportunities such as programs in sport management, athletic training, coaching, and the addition of a marching band and cheerleading team. For a complete listing of the other benefits gained from adding football, see Appendix 4.

Research Question 5

While the results clearly indicate that adding an intercollegiate football program generates many benefits for the university, university respondents were also asked in similar open-ended format if there were any negatives from adding football. Forty of 74 respondents (54%) indicated that there were negatives stemming from the start of football.

The most frequently mentioned drawback of adding football was the significant costs that it takes to start and support a varsity program. Twenty-two respondents cited rising athletic department expenses and net costs combined with a lack of financial support as negatives from football. Several of these respondents claimed that football's substantial costs forced the athletic department to decrease its budget for other sports. Some of the largest costs specifically identified by respondents were funding scholarships, constructing or improving facilities, and starting a marching band. Institutional respondents also believed supporting football strained the athletic department's resources in terms of manpower and time. In several cases, starting and sustaining football required more compliance personnel and more athletic department employee time devoted to new issues arising from football.

The second most-often mentioned negatives from adding intercollegiate football were categorized as academic issues. Sixteen respondents collectively identified several academic-related issues that arose with bringing varsity football to campus. The majority of these concerns were with the academic quality and readiness of incoming football student-athletes. Many respondents believed university academic standards were being compromised in order to admit football student-athletes who were great on the field but not qualified or prepared for the academic rigor. Respondents expressed that these effects were noticeable in terms of admission, graduation, and retention rates.

Along similar lines, seven respondents cited poor faculty support and a rise in anti-athletics sentiment as negatives from the addition of football. The root of these issues is the belief that the university is compromising its admissions standards for the sake of bringing in better football student-athletes. Some respondents felt as though university faculty were not prepared for the new type of student-athlete being admitted. Also, respondents reported that faculty expressed concern with the significant resources being put into football such as funding scholarships, stadium and facility construction, and escalating coaches' salaries.

The last group of negatives provided by respondents was categorized as gender equity/Title IX issues. The root of these issues again lies in football's significant costs. Several respondents indicated their athletic department had to drop several men's sports in the years following the addition of football. With much of the athletic department's financial resources designated to start a football program, the university faced the dilemma of how to support its current men's sports offerings while also remaining in compliance with Title IX, federal legislation requiring gender equity in any government supported educational program. In response, some athletic departments chose to cut sports while others decreased their budgets and funding for other sports. For a complete listing of the negatives from adding football, see Appendix 5.

Research Question 6

At the conclusion of the survey, respondents were asked to identify which institution they were currently employed by and which job position/title they currently held. The researcher collected this demographic information to investigate whether there were statistically significant differences in motivations for adding football based on the school's NCAA division or the respondents' job position. The researcher used several one-way between subjects analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests to determine whether there were significant differences and if so, where the differences were.

First, were there significant differences in the motivations for adding college football by NCAA division? An ANOVA was calculated for each potential motivation. The dependent variable was the extent to which a goal motivated the university's decision to add football, and the independent variable was the NCAA division of the respondent's respective employer. The researcher found no evidence of significant differences in the extent to which the several goals motivated the university's decision to add a collegiate football. All of the ANOVAs produced p-values much greater than the alpha level of .05 and thus failed to produce significant findings. There were not significant differences in the motivations for adding college football by NCAA division. This lack of significance might be contributed to the low numbers in each category of the population. Table 5 and 6 show the mean breakdown by NCAA division and the ANOVA calculations.

Table 5

Potential Motivation Breakdown by NCAA Division

Potential Motivation	Mean				N			
	D-I	D-II	D-III	Total	D-I	D-II	D-III	Total
Increasing athletic department revenue	1.20	1.77	2.00	1.77	5	13	12	30
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	2.67	3.23	2.92	3.00	6	13	12	31
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	3.83	3.84	3.72	3.80	6	13	11	30
Increasing amount of initial applications	3.33	3.69	3.75	3.65	6	13	12	31
Increasing number of new athletics donors	2.50	2.46	2.33	2.42	6	13	12	31
Increasing amount of athletics donations	2.67	2.38	2.33	2.42	6	13	12	31
Establishing new athletics conference affiliation	2.00	2.00	2.33	2.12	7	13	12	32
Maintaining current athletics conference affiliation	1.40	1.42	1.56	1.46	5	12	9	26
Improving school spirit	3.17	3.54	3.67	3.51	6	13	12	31
Developing the university's brand	3.14	3.46	3.27	3.32	7	13	11	31
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	2.67	3.31	3.08	3.09	6	13	12	31

Table 6

ANOVA Results Investigating Motivations by NCAA Division

Potential Motivation	Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
Increasing athletic department revenue	2.259	0.98	0.388
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	1.442	0.76	0.477
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	0.093	0.265	0.769
Increasing amount of initial applications	0.744	1.247	0.303
Increasing number of new athletics donors	0.151	0.072	0.931
Increasing amount of athletics donations	0.471	0.286	0.753
Establishing new athletics conference affiliation	0.833	0.259	0.774
Maintaining current athletics conference affiliation	0.123	0.077	0.926
Improving school spirit	1.011	0.961	0.395
Developing the university's brand	0.504	0.387	0.683
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	1.69	1.028	0.371

Respondents were grouped into six categories (University Presidents, University Provosts, Athletic Directors, Senior Woman Administrators, Faculty Athletic Representatives, and 'other') to test whether there were significant differences in perceptions based on the respondent's job title/position. A one-way between subjects ANOVA was calculated for each potential motivation. The dependent variable was the extent to which a possible factor motivated the university's decision to add football, and the independent variable was the respective job position/title of the respondent. The tests revealed no significant differences in the extent to which the several goals motivated the university's decision to add football by job title. All of the ANOVAs produced p-values much greater than the .05 alpha level and thus did not yield any significant findings. There were not significant differences in the motivations for adding college football by the respondents' job position. This lack of significance is again perhaps due to the low numbers in each category of the population. Table 7 and 8 show the mean breakdown by respondent job position and the ANOVA calculations.

Table 7

Potential Motivation Breakdown by Respondent Job Position

Potential Motivation	Mean						
	AD	PRES	FAR	PROV	SWA	OTHER	TOTAL
Increasing athletic department revenue	2.00	1.25	2.14	1.25	2.40	2.00	1.82
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	3.40	3.11	2.71	3.00	3.17	2.80	3.03
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	3.80	3.75	3.87	3.75	4.00	3.75	3.83
Increasing amount of initial applications	3.60	3.37	3.75	3.50	4.00	3.80	3.67
Increasing number of new athletics donors	3.20	2.12	2.37	2.25	2.67	2.60	2.50
Increasing amount of athletics donations	3.00	2.00	2.50	2.00	2.83	2.80	2.50
Establishing new athletics conference affiliation	1.80	2.75	1.87	2.00	1.67	2.20	2.08
Maintaining current athletics conference affiliation	1.25	1.33	1.67	1.00	1.50	1.80	1.45
Improving school spirit	3.40	3.87	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.80	3.50
Developing the university's brand	3.20	3.55	2.71	3.50	3.67	3.20	3.30
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	3.20	3.25	2.62	3.00	3.50	3.40	3.14

Potential Motivation	N						
	AD	PRES	FAR	PROV	SWA	OTHER	TOTAL
Increasing athletic department revenue	5	8	7	4	5	5	34
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	5	9	7	4	6	5	36
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	5	8	8	4	6	4	35
Increasing amount of initial applications	5	8	8	4	6	5	36
Increasing number of new athletics donors	5	8	8	4	6	5	36
Increasing amount of athletics donations	5	8	8	4	6	5	36
Establishing new athletics conference affiliation	5	8	8	4	6	5	36
Maintaining current athletics conference affiliation	4	6	6	5	6	5	31
Improving school spirit	5	8	8	4	6	5	36
Developing the university's brand	5	9	7	4	6	5	36
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	5	8	8	4	6	5	36

Table 8

ANOVA Results Investigating Motivations by Respondent Job Position

Potential Motivation	Sum of Squares	F	Sig.
Increasing athletic department revenue	6.634	1.083	0.391
Increasing the school's prestige/reputation	1.821	0.351	0.878
Increasing undergraduate enrollment	0.296	0.368	0.866
Increasing amount of initial applications	1.625	1.164	0.350
Increasing number of new athletics donors	4.167	0.811	0.551
Increasing amount of athletics donations	5.367	1.362	0.266
Establishing new athletics conference affiliation	5.442	0.662	0.655
Maintaining current athletics conference affiliation	1.961	0.497	0.775
Improving school spirit	3.625	1.415	0.247
Developing the university's brand	4.055	1.384	0.258
Increasing student-athlete participation opportunities	3.431	0.827	0.540

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to discover how NCAA university administrators believe adding college football will benefit their institution. The method chosen was to conduct an online survey of all NCAA member institutions that added football as a varsity sport between the years 2001 and 2011. University presidents, university provosts, athletic directors, senior woman administrators, and faculty athletic representatives at each school who added football during that period were invited to participate. A survey response rate of 35.2% produced data from a representative sample of NCAA schools that added college football programs between 2001 and 2011. Results from the survey indicated that university administrators' primary motivations for adding college football were increasing undergraduate enrollment and increasing the number of initial applications for admission. Several respondents also believed football would improve the gender ratio on campus. Respondents also indicated that improving school spirit (3.5 mean score), developing the university's brand (3.29 mean score), and increasing the school's prestige (3.20 mean score) were important goals motivating the university's decision to add football.

Previous Studies

The findings from this study are consistent with much of the current literature on the topic and reveal that administrators generally understand the value that athletics, and specifically, football, provide to the university (Gladden, Milne, & Sutton, 1998). Increasing athletic department revenue, however, was not one of these anticipated benefits. The

majority of respondents, 57.1%, said increasing athletic department revenue did not motivate the university's decision to add football at all, while 20% said it was a small factor, 8.6% moderate, and 14.3% large. Current literature remains mixed on the direct fiscal benefits of football (Sheehan, 2000; Toma, 2003). The results from this study demonstrate that universities will be disappointed if they added football to improve their fiscal bottom line. Respondents indicated athletic department revenue increased to a small extent (2.36 mean) after adding football. While football can certainly generate money for the university through avenues such as ticket sales, concession sales, and corporate sponsorships, the costs to start and support a football program are high. Several respondents identified these significant costs as a negative in the survey.

The results demonstrate that administrators value the indirect tangible and intangible benefits football can provide the university. Respondents identified many of these benefits as strong goals driving the institution's decision to add the sport. One of these was the desire to improve the school's prestige/reputation. The consensus in the literature is that winning athletic teams and a successful football program benefit the institution's reputation and public perception (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Gerstner, 2011; Goff, 2000; Litan et al., 2003; Lovaglia & Lucas, 2005; Mixon et al., 2004). Dunham's 2007 study found enhancing institutional prestige was the third most important motivation to respondents. Improving the school's image was a somewhat important/major factor for over one-third (36.7%) of the respondents. This study also found that increasing prestige was important to universities as it generated a mean score of 3.05. Respondents identified increasing prestige as the 5th most important motivation. Respondents indicated that prestige/reputation increased to a moderate extent (2.89 mean) after adding football. Football programs do add value in the minds of

administrators. As the team enjoys success and wins games, administrators believe the university's reputation will improve. Increasing the university's prestige and improving its reputation lead to better awareness and visibility which can also increase the amount of applications and enrollment.

Current literature consistently demonstrates that winning athletics programs can increase student enrollment (Bale, 1991; Ehrman & Marber, 2008; Marklein, 2001; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Noll, 1999; Rooney, 1987; Toma & Cross, 1998). Some institutions utilize varsity athletics as a mechanism or strategy to reach enrollment targets (Feezell, 2009). Sports such as football, hockey, and lacrosse attract large rosters of student-athletes who want to continue playing the sport in college (Feezell, 2009). Dunham (2007) found that increasing enrollment was the most important factor behind the decision to add football. This study's findings support that conclusion as well. Respondents said increasing undergraduate enrollment was the strongest goal behind the university's decision to add football (3.81 mean). However, actual enrollment increases may not have met expectations, as respondents indicated that increases after starting football were realized to a moderate extent with a mean of 3.24. It appears that varsity football will increase undergraduate enrollment, but the more difficult decision for universities is whether that increase is worth the cost of starting a program. Administrators need to collect data on the actual costs that it will take to support football in order to make an informed decision.

In addition to increasing enrollment, football is also used to increase male enrollment on campus. As the gender gap continues to widen in American higher education, many small schools have turned to football as a strategy to increase the number of male students (Suggs, n.d.; 2003). With each incoming recruiting class of roughly 25-30 football student-athletes

each year, smaller schools, in particular, can make significant progress towards a more equitable male-female ratio (Feezell, 2009). Many of these student-athletes may not have considered attending that institution if not for the opportunity to continue playing football (Feezell, 2009; Suggs, 2003). In addition to the 100 males on the roster, football also attracts male students who want to attend a college with a football team or want to participate in ancillary activities such as marching band or athletic training (Pennington, 2006; Suggs, n.d.). Dunham's (2007) findings reflect administrators' acknowledgment of the need to balance out male-female ratios. The findings of this study concur, as several respondents provided feedback in the open-ended survey questions that improving the gender ratio was a strong consideration in the decision-making process. This is, once again, a situation where universities must decide whether balancing the gender ratio is important enough to undertake the start-up costs of varsity football.

Another benefit mentioned frequently in the literature is football's capacity to increase applications. Current literature demonstrates that successful sports teams can increase the number of freshman applications (Bale, 1991; Ehrman & Marber, 2008; Fisher, 2009; Marklein, 2001; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Noll, 1999; Rooney, 1987; Toma & Cross, 1998; Zimbalist, 1999). Awareness of the university improves when its teams win, and one of the main fruits of better visibility is additional applications. Some researchers call this trend the 'Flutie effect' (Burriss, 2004; Fisher, 2009). In the years following championships and significant wins in football and men's basketball, several schools received record-breaking application rates (Ehrman & Marber, 2008; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Toma & Cross, 1998). Dunham (2007) found that increasing freshman applications was the second most important factor behind adding football. This study supports that finding as increasing

the number of initial applications for admission was the second strongest goal with a mean score of 3.65. More than two-thirds (67.6%) of respondents said increasing initial applications motivated the university's decision to a large extent and 29.7% said to a moderate extent. This study also achieved similar results to Dunham when evaluating whether applications actually increased after football's founding. In Dunham's study, 43.3% of respondents agreed that freshman applications had increased, while 48.6% of respondents in this study said that initial applications increased to a large extent and 35.1% to a moderate extent.

While most researchers agree that successful football teams can increase enrollment and application rates, no research was found that evaluated whether the addition of football has an impact on alumni giving. Other studies have examined whether successful football teams improve alumni giving, and have produced mixed results (National Football Foundation, 2012; Tucker, 2004). At least one previous study found that football helps develop alumni relations generally (Toma & Cross, 1998), which can lead to higher fiscal donations and booster club membership. Increasing alumni donations was not one of the strong factors identified by administrators in Dunham's (2007) study. 27% said increasing the donor base was somewhat important, while 27% also said it was a minor factor/not discussed at all. Likewise, respondents in this study did not recognize increasing donations as significant criterion in deciding to start football. Increasing the number of new athletics donors and increasing the amount of athletics donations both produced mean scores of 2.51. When asked to what extent both donors and donations increased respondents generated means of 2.7 and 2.8 respectively. While the results demonstrate that football helped improve alumni giving, each institution should conduct a cost-benefit analysis to determine

whether adding football is the most efficient short-term solution to increase giving, or whether increased giving supports the cost of starting and sustaining a football team. Regardless of cost, football does provide an opportunity to reconnect with alumni that is harder to measure. Universities can utilize home football games as an opportunity to invite alumni to campus with the intention of reinvigorating their school spirit. Ideally, as alumni become more involved and invested, the university will solicit fiscal commitments (Gladden et al., 1998; Litan et al., 2003). Also, fielding a varsity football team will create another alumni group that can stay involved with the university down the road.

Football can also improve school spirit around campus and in the local community (Litan et al., 2003; Mixon et al., 2004; Toma, 1999). Winning sports teams and new football programs breed school pride for both current students and alumni (Toma & Cross, 1998; Toma, 2003). College football rallies the two groups together to cheer for their beloved university (Coe, 2005). Dunham's (2007) study did not specifically identify developing school spirit as a possible reason for adding football. However, this study found that improving school spirit was the third strongest goal in adding football. With a mean score of 3.49, respondents said increasing school spirit motivated the university's decision between a moderate and large extent. The majority of respondents indicated that football accomplished this goal producing a mean of 3.32. Nearly half of respondents asserted that school spirit increased to a large extent. Respondents said football helped develop a better relationship with the local community, improved the atmosphere on campus, and brought disconnected alumni back for home games.

Colleges and universities today realize the value of building a strong and sustainable university brand (Jevons, 2006). Schools use their brand to differentiate from competitors

and to attract students to apply to the institution (Chapleo, 2004; Hemsley-Brown & Goonawardana, 2007; Ivy, 2001; Toma, 2003). The overall brand or identity of the university is often closely intertwined with its athletic programs (Clark, Apostolopoulou, Branyold, & Synowka, 2009; Putler & Wolfe, 1999; Toma, 2003). Some researchers have found perspective students believe a successful athletic department is crucial for the overall enhancement of the institution (Canale, Dunlap, Britt, & Donahue, 1996; Davis & Van Dusen, 1975). This study's results support these findings. With a mean of 3.29, developing the university's brand was the fourth-most important goal in adding football. Looking back after football's arrival on campus, respondents believed the institution's brand developed to a moderate extent with a mean of 3.08. Having a strong brand separates the university from competitors and distinguishes it in a crowded market. A powerful brand attracts students and student-athletes alike which will be evident in higher application rates, increased enrollment (and male enrollment), and improved reputation.

Finally, by adding football as a varsity sport, many athletic departments offer more participation opportunities for student-athletes. Dunham's (2007) study found that creating more opportunities for student-athletes was the fourth-most important factor to respondents with 36.7% of respondents indicating that increasing opportunities was a somewhat important/major factor. This study found that creating more opportunities was important to universities but not to the same extent, as respondents recorded a mean of 3.08. The majority of respondents (56.7%) in Dunham's (2007) study indicated that student-athlete opportunities did increase after adding football. Similarly, of all the possible benefits identified in this survey, respondents said student-athlete participation opportunities increased the most with a 3.39 mean score. Almost half (49%) of respondents said opportunities increased to a large

extent and 40.8% to a moderate extent. While the amount of participation opportunities increased overall, some respondents raised concerns about having to cut several men's sports in the process. These respondents blamed the athletic department's budgetary strain on football's significant start-up costs. Although football created roughly 100 more opportunities for student-athletes to play the sport, the athletic department chose not to support other sports with the same overall budget. Thus, while there was a net gain in overall participation opportunities, many men's sports suffered in order to support football.

Limitations

There are a few potential limitations when interpreting the results of this study. Only the five selected administrators at NCAA institutions who added college football programs between 2001 and 2011 were invited to participate. This research therefore, cannot be extended to the many schools who added the sport before 2001 or to those who added it after 2011. Also, this research cannot be extended to the 15 NAIA schools that started playing varsity football within the same 2001 to 2011 period. Universities who are considering adding the sport should interpret these findings with caution due to the constantly changing landscape of college athletics.

The second limitation of this study is the 35.2% response rate. Although the collection of returned surveys included university administrators of all three job positions and at schools competing in all three NCAA divisions, there is a possibility of non-response bias. The nature of sensitive information this study sought to gather could have threatened the response rate. Some administrators may have been hesitant or fearful about disclosing university information and thus chose not to complete the survey. Additional responses may have had the potential to change the results.

Another potential limitation is that the survey's results and impending findings are all based upon self-reporting. Respondents were asked in the survey to identify in their opinion to what extent certain factors motivated the university's decision to add football. This study took consideration of these opinions as factual data. Respondents also self-reported data estimating the extent to which those same goals were realized. There is potential that the respondents who reported that data were incorrect, overly optimistic or pessimistic because of personal bias, or just untruthful in their analysis. These decision-makers and stakeholders may have a bias because they supported the addition of football. Perhaps, they are less likely to be critical of the decision or they may have inflated the positive benefits actually accrued.

Implications

The findings from this study will be useful for university and athletics administrators at institutions that are considering adding football as a varsity sport. These institutions can utilize this research to make an informed decision on whether adding college football is the most effective strategy to accomplish their institution's goals. It is critical for university administrators to be aware of these findings in order for them to form realistic expectations of the outcomes of starting football on their campus. Obviously, the circumstances differ at every school. Each institution encounters unique challenges and has diverse goals. However, if increasing enrollment is one of those goals, the results from this study indicate that football is an effective strategy to do so.

Being aware of the negatives that respondents identified in the survey will also be of great help to universities considering adding football. The main negatives respondents reported were football's significant start-up costs, academic challenges with incoming student-athletes, and poor faculty support. If universities are aware of these challenges they can be prepared to tackle them ahead of time. First, universities should develop a fundraising

initiative that's able to fund much or all of football's start-up costs. Consideration should also be given to funding for increasing women's opportunities for Title IX compliance purposes instead of reducing the number of other men's sport participation opportunities because of the costs of football. This is obviously easier said than done, but raising the money to support football will ultimately help lead to its immediate and long-term success.

It is also important for the university and athletic department to include faculty in the decision-making process. The university's administration needs to gain faculty approval and support in order to counter or minimize any anti-athletics sentiment that may occur. The university should also formulate a realistic protocol or procedure in admitting football student-athletes. Several respondents indicated faculty concerns about the quality of incoming football players and their lack of readiness for higher education. Universities can do two things to alleviate some of these concerns. First, they should set and adhere to minimum academic floor requirements. If a student-athlete cannot meet this standard, they will not be admitted regardless. And second, the university should invest in academic support for student-athletes. Providing proper support for student-athletes will benefit both the athletes themselves and the faculty they will work with.

Future Research

There are several directions in which future research could expand from this study. First, researchers could widen the period of time in order to include more schools in the population who have added football. Including more schools will facilitate better analysis and potentially heighten the chances of finding significant differences as there will be more schools and administrators represented in each category. If the researcher wants to keep the period of time studied consistent, another potential extension of this research is to include NAIA schools in the population. Fifteen schools added college football at the NAIA level

during the period of 2001-2011. Comparing NCAA Division I, II, and III schools to NAIA schools could potentially provide some interesting results. With additional schools in the population, future research could compare schools of different undergraduate enrollment sizes, geographic regions, and academic ranking in addition to NCAA division and administrator job position.

Another future study to build off this research would be longitudinal in nature. The researcher could invite all NCAA schools who are adding the sport in a certain future year to participate. The researcher would follow each of these schools over a defined period of time. A longitudinal study would help mitigate one of the main limitations identified in this research; the fact that the data are based upon self-reporting. Instead of asking respondents to identify in their opinion to what extent certain factors have increased after adding football, the researcher could physically gather much of this data from each school. The researcher could determine exactly how each factor changed year after year after adding football. Thus, the data would measure how much undergraduate enrollment, the amount of initial applications for admission, athletic department revenue, the number of new athletics donors, the amount of athletics donations, and the amount of student-athlete participation opportunities increased. The researcher would still have to rely on self-reporting to measure how intangible factors such as school spirit, university brand, and prestige/reputation changed following football's first season.

Another idea to build on the topic of universities adding college football programs would be to include feasibility studies. Many institutions utilize feasibility studies and committees as part of their decision-making process. At state institutions these reports are public and can be accessed by researchers. These feasibility studies specifically identify

what goals the university intends to accomplish through starting football. Researchers could use and measure these stated goals instead of relying on administrators to identify them. A very interesting study would be one that measures whether to what extent the goals identified in the feasibility study were accomplished in the years following the football program's start, both in quantifiable and qualitative measures.

Appendix 1

Survey Instrument

1. Were you employed in your current position at the time when the decision was made to add a college football program?
 - Yes
 - No

(SKIP LOGIC: if respondent answers 'No' → skip to Question #4)

2. In your opinion, to what extent did each of the following goals motivate your university's decision to add a collegiate football program?

[a]: Increase athletic department revenue

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[b]: Increase the school's prestige/reputation

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[c]: Increase undergraduate enrollment

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[d]: Increase initial applications for admission to the university

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[e]: Increase the number of new athletics donors

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[f]: Increase the amount of athletics donations

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[g]: Establish new athletic conference affiliation

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[h]: Maintain current athletic conference affiliation

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[i]: Improve school spirit

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[j]: Develop the university's brand

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[k]: Increase student-athlete participation opportunities

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

3. Are there any other factors that were considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned?
- No
 - Yes: (if yes, open ended box: Please list all OTHER factors that were considered in the decision to add football)
4. In your opinion, to what extent have the following occurred at your university as a result of adding football?

[a]: Increased athletic department revenue

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[b]: Increased the school's prestige/reputation

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[c]: Increased undergraduate enrollment

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[d]: Increased initial applications for admission to the university

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[e]: Increased the number of new athletics donors

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[f]: Increased the amount of athletics donations

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[g]: Improved school spirit

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[h]: Developed the university's brand

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

[i]: Increased student-athlete participation opportunities

- 1: Not At All
- 2: To A Small Extent
- 3: To a Moderate Extent
- 4: To a Large Extent
- 5: Not Applicable

5. Were there other benefits gained by adding football?
 - Yes (if yes, open ended box appears with prompt: 'Please list all other benefits you perceive from adding a football program')
 - No
6. Were there any negatives from adding football?
 - Yes (if yes, open ended box appears with prompt: 'Please list all negatives you perceive from adding a football program')
 - No

7. Please select the school you are currently employed by:

- Anna Maria College
- Averett University
- Becker College
- Birmingham-Southern College
- Brevard College
- Campbell University
- Castleton State College
- Central State University
- Christopher Newport University
- Coastal Carolina University
- Colorado State University-Pueblo
- Endicott College
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida International University
- Galludet University
- Georgia State University
- LaGrange College
- Lamar University
- Lake Erie College
- Lincoln University (PA)
- Louisiana College
- Morrisville State College
- North Carolina Wesleyan College
- North Greenville University
- Old Dominion University
- Pacific University
- Rockford College
- Saint Augustine's College
- Saint Vincent College
- Seton Hill University
- Shaw University
- Southeastern Louisiana University
- Stillman College
- SUNY Maritime College
- The College of St. Scholastica
- University of Charleston (WV)
- University of Minnesota-Crookston
- University of the Incarnate Word
- University of New Haven
- University of North Carolina-Pembroke
- University of South Alabama
- Utica College
- OTHER

8. Please select your current job position(s): (select all that apply)

- University President/Chancellor
- University Provost
- Athletic Director (or highest ranking athletics respondent)
- Senior Woman Administrator
- Faculty Athletic Representative
- Other

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Thank you for your participation in the survey. Please answer all questions truthfully and to the best of your knowledge.



Were you employed in your current position at the time when the decision was made to add a college football program?

- Yes
- No



In your opinion, to what extent did each of the following goals motivate your university's decision to add a collegiate football program?

	1: Not At All	2: To a Small Extent	3: To a Moderate Extent	4: To a Large Extent	Not Applicable
Increase athletic department revenue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the school's prestige/reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase undergraduate enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase initial applications for admission to the university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1: Not At All	2: To a Small Extent	3: To a Moderate Extent	4: To a Large Extent	Not Applicable
Increase the number of new athletics donors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the amount of athletics donations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Establish new athletic conference affiliation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Maintain current athletic conference affiliation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1: Not At All	2: To a Small Extent	3: To a Moderate Extent	4: To a Large Extent	Not Applicable
Improve school spirit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Develop the university's brand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase student-athlete participation opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are there any other factors that were considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned?

- No
- Yes

>>

Please list all other factors that were considered in the decision to add football

>>

In your opinion, to what extent have the following occurred at your university as a result of adding football?

	1: Not At All	2: To a Small Extent	3: To a Moderate Extent	4: To a Large Extent	Not Applicable
Increased athletic department revenue	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased the school's prestige/reputation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased undergraduate enrollment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased initial applications for admission to the university	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased the number of new athletics donors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	1: Not At All	2: To a Small Extent	3: To a Moderate Extent	4: To a Large Extent	Not Applicable
Increase the amount of athletics donations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improved school spirit	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developed the university's brand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increased student-athlete participation opportunities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

>>

Were there other benefits gained by adding football?

- Yes
- No



Please list all other benefits you perceive from adding a football program:



Were there any negatives from adding football?

- Yes
- No



Please list all negatives you perceive from adding a football program:



Please select the school you are currently employed by:



Please select your current job position: (select all that apply)

- University President/Chancellor
- University Provost
- Athletic Director (or highest ranking athletics administrator)
- Senior Woman Administrator
- Faculty Athletics Representative
- Other



Appendix 2

Survey Question 3: Are there any other factors that were considered in the decision to add football that were not already mentioned?

1. Shifting gender balance among undergraduate students
2. Gender balance, town relations
3. Increase male enrollment, opportunity to develop marching band, become home-town team for the city, raise visibility of institution
4. Increase resident students on campus and out of state applicants
5. Increase male enrollment
6. Student demand
7. Student athletes have better academic achievement and provide more selfless community service than the general student population
8. We wanted to be a ***** NCAA Division III college option
9. To achieve better gender balance in entering first-time student classes
10. Improve male to female ratio, i.e. recruit more male students
11. Saturday home games did much to bring energy to campus, and to allow the institution to partner alumni and students events
12. Increase tie between the University and the Community. To increase Alumni and University ties and to increase alumni giving. To increase univ enrollment
13. Increase the proportion of male students in the male/female ratio, and increase diversity at the college
14. As a former women's college we were eager to reach a gender enrollment balance common in higher education. Starting football allowed us to do this. In addition, we wanted to strengthen our overall athletic program, given our equity philosophy across sports teams beginning football would likely motivated us to have appropriate coaching levels for all our teams, etc.
15. Increase percentage of male students in student body
16. The major factor was changing the gender balance from 70% women and 30% men to as close to 50-50 as possible

Appendix 3

Survey Question 5: Were there other benefits gained by adding football?

1. The gender balance moved to 54% women and 46% men from 70% women and 30% men
2. Increased male percentage of student body by about 10%- from 31% to 41%
3. Allowed us to address a lingering issue with a vocal group of alumni who advocated for the return of football
4. Athletic facilities grades. Opportunity to participate in postseason play. Opportunities for certain majors- Sport Management- Secondary Ed to grow
5. Alumni and student event planning
6. In keeping with the sports recognized by the **** Conference, there is a stigma associated with schools that have football vs. those who don't. We are currently going through the same thing with lacrosse and many schools are adding it. I feel like the schools that don't have football are looked down upon, and expected to be very good at other sports
7. Community support
8. Name recognition in the region and nationally
9. The previous female: male ratio was approximately 70:30. It is now much closer to 50:50
10. Significant increase of diversity on campus; not only players but students who wanted to attend a school where there was football
11. Football achieved #1 in the country to gain national recognition for the University. Football has been on national television
12. Public Relations
13. One of our players is being scouted by NFL teams
14. Increased our diversity, provided another venue to engage with the local community, provided another Saturday entertainment opportunity for students
15. Alumni participation in college in other areas
16. As expected it brought energy to campus during Saturday home games and allowed for the institution to facilitate student and alumni interaction events
17. Applications, enrollment, school spirit, alumni support
18. Turf field, field lights, new locker room, eventually bigger athletic training room and more coaches offices
19. Public Awareness
20. Community Support
21. Underscored transition of this institution from a commuter to a residential campus
22. Increased our ability to give benefits of a good education to additional prospective students
23. Construction of a new stadium that benefits field hockey, men's & women's lacrosse and men's & women's soccer- the first 3 of which were added at the same time as football
24. Increased student pride, ability to join more prestigious conference
25. We built a turf stadium that is now home turf for field hockey, mens and womens soccer, mens and womens lacrosse and also used with lights at night for intramurals. Use also for summer camps/programs
26. The relationship between the College and the Community has been strengthened

27. Improved university's reach into communities otherwise not considered as a recruiting location for the University
28. Community support for the university and local pride in the university
29. Gender Balance
30. Added enrollment, increase in male student population, dual sport student athletes, Saturday afternoon campus events
31. School spirit, additional facilities, bigger budget
32. Created awareness about marching band
33. Increased enrollment and return of alumni who had disconnected from the university
34. It provided another opportunity to share Jesus Christ
35. Alumni participating in Homecoming
36. Visibility in the community, successful homecoming events built around football weekends, growing marching band, introduction of pipe band, cheerleaders
37. The major benefit was the large support from the town. Football also increased students staying on campus during football weekends
38. Gender Balance was 75/25 female. Now 65/35 female

Appendix 4

Survey Question 6: Were there any negatives from adding football?

1. The feasibility study did not take into account the need for a comparable marching band. The cost of the band has been significant
2. Funding is 100% from the university with not types of endowed scholarships or other donations to assist with funding the sport. No initiation from prior administration to increase these efforts
3. Newly recruited students not necessarily prepared; negative affects on retention and graduation rate; some recruited students had difficulty meeting financial obligations
4. Makes it difficult to achieve gender equity in athletics. Men's crew, cross country, and track were deleted from sponsored sports
5. Added significant net costs to our athletics program. Added a significant additional administrative burden that distracts from other issues
6. Academic quality was compromised in some ways due to admission of some lower quality student athletes. Calendar and scheduling were modified to accommodate football activities at times
7. Academic class scheduling became more difficult, needed to close several men's sports for equity issues, increased scholarships and need for competitive scholarship to get sufficient athletes
8. There were some negatives but they are not inherent to adding football in general but the way our coaches behavior and philosophy. We have a large number of football players who have had significant academic difficulties- both in grades and attitude which has caused a simmering of anti-athletics sentiment to occur
9. The community that my institution is in, very racist and derogatory comments arose from locals. There was little community support the first few years, but donors that liked football gave a considerable amount more to their giving. Our enrollment actually went down every year after adding football because the music and arts felt threatened to come to a school with over 60% student-athletes. I think a lot of this had to do with poor leadership. Now, under the direction of a new President and Athletic Director- we are making strides in the right direction
10. Not being prepared or having a plan to have a stadium or football field on campus
11. Title IX issues, student academic quality
12. Some disruption to weekend classes, although we were able to resolve these
13. Average academic standard of admitted student has gone down
14. Much workload added in the compliance area
15. cost, academic and behavior challenges, PR issues, culture shift as we were known for the arts, unfulfilled promises to the student-athletes led to disappointment, retention issues, very mixed faculty support
16. Financial drain on the University
17. Expenses, perceptions by faculty that students are doing less studying, grades impacted negatively
18. athletic staff time was stretched for administrative issues dealing with football
19. The plan was not thought out so as a result the institution was not prepared for the different type of student-athlete coming onto campus. There was not a full understanding of what starting football meant in the facilities department. To this day,

- we do not provide enough additional services for our increase in athletes. The facilities are still severely lacking
20. Decreased budget for other sports, no conference to compete in
 21. Student athletic fee increased
 22. Loses money, danger in loss of prestige & support if lose consistently, good football players- because of the nature of the sport- can be aggressive and violent, increasing the probability of getting in trouble on/off campus
 23. Very expensive; high expectations for increasing financial support of AD and coaches; student injuries
 24. Retention rate went down
 25. Primarily the need to add athletic facilities that had not been needed before
 26. Initially- buy in from the faculty and other constituents that were not used to having football on our campus, but that has subsided
 27. Gender equity issues
 28. Athletic budget was not increased to fund football so that program and others have suffered
 29. Faculty not on board with the decision
 30. I think the most important negative- and perhaps the only negative- is the fact that by adding football, we were obliged to contribute to the unrelenting over-valuing of sports in this country. We have added another coach that receives a salary of 4 or 5 times greater than any faculty at this university. The message is clear: excellence in sport is much more important than excellence of mind. This perspective has infected our entire country and much of the world we live in. It's a kind of insanity
 31. Academic challenges, space
 32. Decrease in income
 33. Pressure to remain compliant with Title IX
 34. The cost to restore a program and add a marching band
 35. Some students resent the large influx of student-athletes. Imbalance of student-athletes to non-student athletes
 36. Student athletes who were more interested in football than in academics
 37. Costs, but they have been overcome by benefits
 38. Some faculty felt that the new athletes were 'dumb'
 39. It is difficult to compete as a small college in a large and prestigious conference
 40. Some other sports suffered financially because we have a relatively small budget and not enough funds to support all 16 sports the way they should be resourced

Appendix 5

Schools Represented in Study Results

School	City, State	NCAA Division	Year Added
Florida Atlantic University	Boca Raton, FL	D-I FBS	2001
Coastal Carolina University	Conway, SC	D-I FCS	2003
Georgia State University	Atlanta, GA	D-I FCS	2010
Lamar University	Beaumont, TX	D-I FCS	2010
Old Dominion University	Norfolk, VA	D-I FCS	2009
Southeastern Louisiana University	Hammond, LA	D-I FCS	2003
Brevard College	Brevard, NC	D-II	2006
Central State University	Wilberforce, OH	D-II	2005
Colorado State Univ.-Pueblo	Pueblo, CO	D-II	2008
Lake Erie College	Painesville, OH	D-II	2008
Lincoln University (PA)	Oxford, PA	D-II	2008
North Greenville University	Tigerville, SC	D-II	2003
Seton Hill University	Greensburg, PA	D-II	2005
Shaw University	Raleigh, NC	D-II	2003
Stillman College	Tuscaloosa, AL	D-II	2001
Univ. of North Carolina at Pembroke	Pembroke, NC	D-II	2007
Univ. of the Incarnate Word	San Antonio, TX	D-II	2009
University of Charleston	Charleston, WV	D-II	2003
University of Minnesota at Crookston	Crookston, MN	D-II	2001
University of New Haven	West Haven, CT	D-II	2009
Anna Maria College	Paxton, MA	D-III	2009
Averett University	Danville, VA	D-III	2001
Becker College	Leicester, MA	D-III	2005
Birmingham-Southern College	Birmingham, AL	D-III	2007
Castleton State College	Castleton, VT	D-III	2009
Christopher Newport University	Newport News, VA	D-III	2001
Gallaudet University	Washington, DC	D-III	2007
Louisiana College	Pineville, LA	D-III	2001
North Carolina Wesleyan College	Rocky Mount, NC	D-III	2005
Pacific University	Forest Grove, OR	D-III	2010
Rockford College	Rockford, IL	D-III	2001
Saint Vincent College	Latrobe, PA	D-III	2006
SUNY Maritime College	New York, NY	D-III	2006
The College of St. Scholastica	Duluth, MN	D-III	2008
Utica College	Utica, NY	D-III	2001
Other			

Appendix 6

Email Invitation to Participate

Subject: Please participate in a study of schools that have added college football

Dear _____,

I am writing to ask you to participate in a study on the potential motivations for adding intercollegiate football. This study is being conducted by Brandon Yeargan, a second year graduate student in Sport Administration at the University of North Carolina- Chapel Hill.

The purpose of the study is to discover how university and athletic respondents at NCAA member institutions believe adding college football will benefit their school.

The survey will only take approximately 5-8 minutes to complete. Your school is one of only 42 institutions in the population for this study, therefore it is important that we hear from you.

https://unc.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5muncyFKI1kgwrr

Your participation is completely voluntary, and the information you provide will be kept confidential. Results will be reported only in aggregate form; your name will never be disclosed, nor will it be associated with your institution or any reported data.

If you have any questions about the research project or the survey itself, please contact Brandon Yeargan at BYeargan@live.unc.edu

As an additional incentive to complete the survey, I will be happy to send you the results and findings.

By clicking the survey link above, you agree to be a participant in this research study. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,
-Brandon Yeargan
BYeargan@live.unc.edu

Reminder Email Invitation to Participate

Subject: Feedback needed on motivations for adding college football programs

Dear _____,

About a week ago you were invited to complete a survey on university respondents' motivations for adding college football programs. There are only 42 schools in the population for this study, so your input is desperately needed! Please take a few minutes now to click on the link below and complete the survey. By clicking on the link below, you agree to be a participant in the research study.

https://unc.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_5muncyFK11kgwrr

The survey will only take approximately 3-8 minutes to complete. Your participation is completely voluntary, and the information you provide will be kept confidential. Results will be reported only in aggregate form; your name will never be disclosed, nor will it be associated with your institution or any reported data.

If you have any questions about the research project or the survey itself, please contact Brandon Yeargan at BYeargan@live.unc.edu.

As an additional incentive to complete the survey, I will be happy to send you the results and findings.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

-Brandon Yeargan

BYeargan@live.unc.edu

REFERENCES

- Aaker, D. A. (1991). *Managing brand equity: Capitalizing on the value of a brand name*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Aaker, D. A. (1996). *Building strong brands*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bale, J. (1991). *The brain drain: Student-athletes in American universities*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Balmer, J. M. T. (2001). Corporate identity, corporate branding, and corporate marketing: Seeing through the fog. *European Journal of Marketing*, 35, 248-291.
- Bennett, R., & Ali-Choudhury, R. (2009). Prospective students' perceptions of university brands: An empirical study. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 19, 85-107.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 105-132.
- Bremmer, D., & Kesselring, R. (1993). The advertising effects of university athletic success: A reappraisal of the evidence. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 33(4), 409-421.
- Brooker, G. W., & Klastorin, T. D. (1981). To the victors belong the spoils? College athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 62(4), 744-750.
- Burris, J. (2004, September 8). Athletics not worth the price. *The Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <http://www.boston.com>
- Canale, J. R., Dunlap, L., Britt, M., & Donahue, T. (1996). The relative importance of various college characteristics to students in influencing their choice of a college. *College Student Journal*, 30, 214-216.
- Chapleo, C. (2004). Interpretation and implementation of reputation/brand management by UK university leaders. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 5(1), 7-23.
- Chapleo, C. (2005). Do universities have "successful" brands? *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 6, 54-64.
- Chapleo, C. (2009). External perceptions of successful university brands. *International Journal of Educational Advancement*, 8, 126-135.
- Clark, J., Apostolopoulou, A., Branvold, S., & Synowka, D. (2009). Who knows Bobby Mo? Using intercollegiate athletics to build a university brand. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 18, 57-63.

- Coe, R. M. (2005, November 8). UNC-P hopes football will unite community. *The Daily Tar Heel*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailytarheel.com>.
- College will be glad it has football (2006, August 9). *Hendersonville Times-News*. Retrieved on September 20, 2006, from <http://www.hendersonvillenews.com>
- Coughlin, C., & Erekson, H. (1984). An examination of contributions to support intercollegiate athletics. *Southern Economic Journal*, 51, 180-195.
- Davis, J. S., & Van Dusen, W. D., (1975). *A survey of student values and choices: A pilot study of the relationships of student values, perceptions, and choices of institutions*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- De Chernatony, L., & McDonald, M. H. B. (2000). *Creating powerful brands* (2nd ed.). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Doyle, P. (1990). Building successful brands: The strategic options. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 7(2), 5-20.
- Dunham, A. (2007). An analysis of NCAA member athletic programs that added or discontinued football programs from 1996 to 2005. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Ehrman, C. A., & Marber, A. (2008). The relationship between a college's success in sports to applications, enrollment, and SAT scores. *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 12(2), 26-31.
- Elmore, C. (2006, November 7). FAU stadium: If they will build it, who will come? *Palm Beach Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.palmbeachpost.com>
- Feezell, T. (2009). Adding football and the 'uses' of athletics at NCAA division II and division III institutions. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 148, 65-72.
- Fisher, B. (2009). Athletics success and institutional rankings. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 148, 45-53.
- Frank, R. H. (2004). Challenging the myth: A review of the links among college athletic success, student quality, and donations. *Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics*. Retrieved on September 3, 2012 from http://finance.baylor.edu/weblogs/riskmgmt/docs/frank_knight.pdf.
- Frey, J. (1985). The winning-team myth. *Currents*, 5(1), 33-35.

- Fulks, D. L. (2009). 2004-2008: NCAA revenues and expenses of division I intercollegiate athletics programs report. Retrieved on October 3, 2012 from www.ncaapublications.com/Uploads/PDF/Revenues_Expenses_10_208acb1ac8-caf1-42ad-9e1e-dc6c399c227b.pdf.
- Gardiner, A. (2010, August 11). Schools find football spurs buzz, growth. *USA Today*, Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/2010-08-11-football-spurs-buzz-growth_N.htm.
- Gerstner, G. (2011). Athletes, students, and taxpayers: The cost of going big-time at the state universities of New York. Proceedings from February 2011 *Eastern Economic Association*.
- Gladden, J. M., Milne, G. R., & Sutton, W. A. (1998). A conceptual framework for assessing brand equity in division I college athletics. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 1-19.
- Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 85-104.
- Grace, J. (1988). Good sports? Three studies examine athletic fund-raising programs. *Currents*, 14(7).
- Grant, R. R., Leadley, J., & Zygmunt, Z. (2008). *The economics of intercollegiate sports*. Hackensack, NJ: World Scientific.
- Grimes, P. W., & Chressanthis, G. A. (1993). Intercollegiate and first year student enrollment demand. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10(3), 286-300.
- Hankinson, G. (2001). Location branding: A study of the branding practices of twelve English cities. *Journal of Brand Management*, 9(2), 127-142.
- Hemsley-Brown, J., & Goonawardana, S. (2007). Brand harmonization on the international higher education market. *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 942-948.
- Hughes, S. F., & Shank, M. D. (2008). Assessing the impact of NCAA scandals: An exploratory analysis. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing*, 3, 78-92.
- Ivy, J. (2001). Higher education institution image: A correspondence analysis approach. *International Journal of Education Management*, 15(6/7), 267-282.
- Jevons, C. (2006). Universities: A prime example of branding gone wrong. *Journal of Product & Brand Management*, 15(7), 466-467.
- Keller, K. L. (2003). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Keller, K. L. (2008). *Strategic brand management* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lawlor, J. (1998). Brand identity. *Case Currents*, 24(9), 16-23.
- Litan, R. E., Orszag, J. M., & Orszag, P. R. (2003). The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: An interim report. Report commissioned by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from <http://www.sc.edu/faculty/PDF/baseline.pdf>.
- Ludwig, M. (2008, December 17). Will football be worth the cost to UTSA students? *San Antonio Express-News*. Retrieved from <http://www.mysanantonio.com/>.
- Marklein, M. B. (2001, March 20). Colleges' sport success is not a major draw. *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/2001-03-20-college-sports.htm>.
- Marrs, M. K., Gajos, R., & Pinar, M. (2011). Utilizing brand audit to develop university brand: A case study. *ASBBS Annual Conference: Las Vegas*, 18(1): 964-975.
- McCormick, R., & Tinsley, M. (1987). Athletics versus academics? Evidence from SAT Scores. *Journal of Political Economy*, 95, 1103-1116.
- Mixon, F. G., & Hsing, Y. (1994). The determinants of out-of-state enrollments in higher education: A tobit analysis. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 329-335.
- Mixon, Jr., F. G., Trevino, L. J., & Minto, T. C. (2004). "Touchdowns and test scores: Exploring the relationship between athletics and academics." *Applied Economics Letters*, 11, 421-424.
- Murphy, R. G., & Trandel, G. A. (1994). The relation between a university's football record and the size of its applicant pool. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 265-270.
- National Football Foundation, (2012, July 10). Colleges continue to add football teams. Retrieved from: <http://www.footballfoundation.org/nff/story/6671/colleges-continue-add-football-teams>.
- NCAA Division I Manual. (2011). National Collegiate Athletic Association. Indianapolis, IN.
- Noll, R. G. (1999). The business of college sports and the high cost of winning. *Milliken Institute Review*, 24-37.
- Park, C. W., Jaworski, B. J., & Macinnis, D. J. (1986). Strategic brand concept-image management. *Journal of Marketing*, 50(4), 135-145.
- Pennington, B. (2006, July 10). Small colleges, short of men, embrace football. *New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com>.

- Perlmutter, D. (2008, September 19). Yes to 49ers football- But with a \$5M catch. *Charlotte Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2008/09/19/199771/yes-to-49ers-football-with-a-5m.html>.
- Putler, D. S., & Wolfe, R. A. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletics programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16, 301-325.
- Rooney, Jr. J. (1987). *The recruiting game: Toward a new system of intercollegiate athletics* (2nd ed.). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Roy, D. P., Graeff, T. R., & Harmon, S. K. (2008). Repositioning a university through NCAA Division I-A football membership. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 11-29.
- Sander, L. (2008). Athletics raises a college from the ground up. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(4), A1.
- Scripps News Service*. (2001, November 2). 20 years ago, life changed forever at Clemson with national title. Retrieved from <http://www.shns.com>.
- Sevier, R. A. (2006). What will it take? A guide to laying the groundwork for an effective marketing strategy. *University Business*, 23-24.
- Sheehan, R. (2000). Academics, athletics, and finances. In William Kern, *The economics of sports* (75-92). Kalamazoo, MI: Upjohn Institute.
- Shulman, J., & Bowen, W. (2001). *The game of life: College sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sigelman, L., & Bookheimer, S. (1983). Is it whether you win or lose? Monetary contributions to big-time college athletic programs. *Social Science Quarterly*, 64(2), 347-359.
- Sigelman, L., & Carter, R. (1979). Win one for the giver- Alumni giving and big-time college sports. *Social Science Quarterly*, 60(2), 284-294.
- Suggs, W. (2003). More small universities are getting rid of football. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(24), A33.
- Suggs, W. (n.d.) Making the varsity: College sports and institutional choices. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 59-62. Retrieved from <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ffp0514s.pdf>
- Toma, J. D. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 81-90.

- Toma, J. D. (2003). *Football U: Spectator sports in the life of the American university*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Toma, J. D., & Cross, M. E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Understanding the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(6), 633-661.
- Toma, J. D., Dubrow, G., & Hartley, M. (2005). The uses of institutional culture: Strengthening identification and building brand equity in higher education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 29(2), 240-241.
- Tomasini, N. T. (2005). An assessment of the economic differences associated with reclassification to the NCAA Division I-AA. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14(1), 7-16.
- Tucker, I., & Amato, L. (1993). Does big-time success in football or basketball affect SAT Scores. *Economics of Education Review*, 12, 177-181.
- Turner, S. E., Meserve, L. A., and Bowen, W. G. (2001). Winning and giving: Football results and alumni giving at select private colleges and universities. *Social Science Quarterly*, 82, 812-826.
- USA today sports' college athletics finances: details of revenues and expenses at NCAA D-I public schools. (2012, May 14). *USA Today*. Retrieved from: <http://www.usatoday.com/sports/college/story/2012-05-14/ncaa-college-athletics-finances-database/54955804/1>.
- Van Riel, C. B. M. (1995). *Principles of corporate communication*. London, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Veloutsou, C., Lewis, J. W., & Paton, R. A. (2004). University selection: Information requirements and importance. *The International Journal of Education Management*, 18(3), 160-171.
- Waeraas, A., & Solbakk, M. (2009). Defining the essence of a university: Lessons from higher education branding. *Higher Education Journal*, 57, 449-462.
- Yavas, U., & Shemwell, D. J. (1996). Graphical representation of university image: A correspondence analysis. *Journal of Marketing Higher Education*, 7, 75-84.
- Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: Commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.