

Running head: Operating Expenditures and Winning in NCAA Div. III

The Relation between Operating Expenditures and Winning in NCAA Division III

Eastern Oregon University

by Brian Sather

October, 2004

One University Blvd - Quinn 101D

La Grande, OR, 97850

Email: bsather@eou.edu

Phone: 541-962-3501

The Relation between Operating Expenditures and Winning in NCAA Division III

Abstract

Recently, financial concerns about intercollegiate athletics have received substantial attention in various media. NCAA Division I programs receive much of the attention but most college athletes participate at smaller colleges. The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of operating expenses on winning in the NCAA Division III. Eight sports (4 men's and 4 women's) were selected for collection of data based on their popularity in the NCAA Division III. Data was collected from 42 conferences and 2,433 teams. The results of the Spearman's rank order correlation test found weak correlations between operating expenditures and winning percentages. A further analysis of the data revealed substantial positive intercorrelations for operating expenditures between sports at each institution. Due to the recent calls for reform, especially of big-time intercollegiate sports, the author recommends that Division III members move toward more equitable expenditures between schools and refocus on the division mission. "Small-time" college sports programs, such as those in Division III, should relish their inexpensive nature and seek to maintain their integrity by limiting costs.

The Relation between Operating Expenditures and Winning in NCAA Division III

Recently, financial concerns about intercollegiate athletics have received substantial attention in various media. Television programs like ESPN's "Outside the Lines" have focused on a range of topics from payment of college athletes to gender equity. "The Jim Rome Show," a nationally syndicated sports-radio broadcast, regularly addresses the big-business nature of intercollegiate sports and how educational goals are often compromised because of this. Other recent publications include arguments and research that examines perceived problems in college athletics (Shulman & Bowen 2001; Sperber, 2000; Zimbalist, 1999). Although the focus is on intercollegiate athletics, the main concern is over high profile National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I schools because of their large budgets and constant media attention.

While Division I programs receive the attention, the majority of college athletic programs are largely ignored. Most college athletes participate at smaller colleges. The NCAA Division III, primarily made up of smaller colleges, includes 424 schools and 136,572 athletes that constitute 40 percent of the total NCAA athletes (National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA], 2002). The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA), also primarily smaller colleges, includes 330 schools (National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, 2003). Because of their magnitude, athletics at smaller institutions deserve more attention by the media and by researchers.

The Division III philosophy statement reads:

Colleges and universities in Division III place highest priority on the overall quality of the educational experience and on the successful completion of all students' academic programs. They seek to establish and maintain an environment in

which a student-athlete's athletics activities are conducted as an integral part of the student-athlete's educational experience. They also seek to establish and maintain an environment that values cultural diversity and gender equity among their student-athletes and athletics staff. (NCAA, 2003b, ¶ 1)

Among the list of objectives of Division III include the following:

1. Place special importance on the impact of athletics on the participants rather than on the spectators and place greater emphasis on the internal constituency (students, alumni, institutional personnel) than on the general public and its entertainment needs.
2. Award no athletically related financial aid to any student
3. Encourage participation by maximizing the number and variety of athletics opportunities for their students
4. Assure that the actions of coaches and administrators exhibit fairness, openness and honesty in their relationships with student-athletes;
5. Assure that athletics participants are not treated differently from other members of the student body
6. Assure that athletics programs support the institution's educational mission by financing, staffing and controlling the programs through the same general procedures as other departments of the institution. (¶ 2)

These objectives have contributed to the appeal of Division III, as increases in athlete participation have exceeded both Division I and Division II (NCAA, 2003a) and recent steps have been taken to limit Division III membership growth (Suggs, 2002, 2003). In light of growing concerns for big time college sports (Shulman & Bowen 2001; Sperber, 2000; Zimbalist, 1999), Division III seems to be held in higher respect and lauded by the media for their innocence (Chen, 2000; Murphy, 2000; Pluto, 2003). Cockley and Roswal (1994) offer evidence that faculty at some Division I and II institutions were disenchanted

with their athletic programs, while Division III faculty showed greater satisfaction and felt they had more input into the decision making. Research by Robst and Keil (2000) revealed that NCAA Division III athletes have higher GPAs and higher graduation rates than non-athletes. Furthermore, Schroeder (2000) determined Division III athletes were involved in other extracurricular activities, interacted with professors, and demonstrated significant absorption in academic activities.

While some evidence supports the positive nature of Division III, other sources report some problems. Research by Stoll (1995) found that both Division I and Division III athletes displayed lower moral reasoning than students who were not athletes. Stoll concluded that Division III athletes fail to maintain high moral standards, in spite of the absence of money, prestige, and fame that exists in Division I programs. Other sources state that growing membership, financial disparity, enrollment differences, and a perceived straying from its mission are tearing Division III apart (Pennington, 2003; Suggs, 2003). The level of concern has reached the point that schools are making alliances in an attempt to lobby for changes in rules to limit practice time, curb alleged financial aid bias toward athletes, and rearrange national champion procedures. There is even a sentiment that the division should be subdivided or a new division added to the NCAA.

Empirical evidence is needed to guide decisions regarding the aforementioned problems in all college athletics. When dealing specifically with financial issues, big-time college sports receive attention because of their large budgets. However, Litan, Orszag, and Orszag (2003) indicated that, based on information from the Department of Education, athletic spending represented roughly 3.5 percent of higher education spending for Division I-A schools in 2001. "The share of operating athletic spending in a university's total budget is higher for smaller schools than for larger schools because of the fixed costs associated with an athletic department" (p. 2). Because expenditures on

athletics are relatively important at each university regardless of size, there should be more effort to provide research information to help guide decisions financial decisions on all collegiate levels. If a coach or athletic director is requesting more money to be competitive in their league, what evidence supports that a monetary increase result in more winning?

Shulman and Bowen (2001) provided evidence that suggested winning programs in Division I spend more relative dollars on their sports. “. . . A school with big-time aspirations and a real chance to reach national championship status in one of the High Profile sports has to be prepared to ‘spend money to make money.’ Recruiting the most talented secondary school students is notoriously competitive, and candidates choosing among leading programs of course expect excellent (and well-paid) coaches, first-rate facilities, no skimping on travel and other operating costs, and strong publicity and marketing efforts. . . . However, although spending money may be a necessary condition for sustained competitive success, it is by no means a sufficient condition” (p. 233-234).

Recently, the NCAA commissioned a study that focused on finances in Division I (Litan et al., 2003). Among the major findings were that increased spending on football and men’s basketball did not result in increased winning or increased revenues between 1993 and 2001. The study also examined results that suggest winning does not persist over time for football and men’s college basketball teams. Furthermore, there was no correlation between increased spending and academic quality of new students or increased spending and alumni giving.

The previous studies focused on winning and expenditures in Division I. Studies that focus on the NCAA Division III remain scarce. Recent research publications address distributive justice (Mahony, Hums, & Riemer, 2002), job satisfaction (Chelladurai & Ogasawara, 2003; Robinson, Peterson, Tedrick, & Carpenter, 2003), academic performance (Robst & Keil, 2000), and student involvement (Schroeder, 2000). None of

these directly address financial influences, but they do provide evidence that a limited number of publications have focused on Division III. In general, there is very little research that has examined the financial influence on winning in college sport (Litan et al., 2003).

The growing general financial concern in collegiate sports coupled with the disregard for the majority of college teams, prompts a further examination the relationship of expenditures and winning in Division III. It is important to focus on financial concerns in “small-time” athletics (Coakley, 2004). The purpose of the study was to examine the influence of operating expenses on winning in the NCAA Division III. A secondary purpose was to examine other relationships that were readily available from the data source. As NCAA conference officials, university administrators, athletic directors, and coaches make financial decisions, the results of this study will provide specific information regarding the value of financial allocations in relation to winning.

The relationship between operating expenses and winning percentage was studied. Another analysis examined enrollment (by gender) with operating expenses in order to determine if a relationship existed between winning and the number of students qualified to participate in the sport. This analysis was based on the premise that a larger pool of students yields greater athletic talent. A third analysis focused on comparisons of winning percentages between teams at the same institution to determine if a relationship existed that suggested athletic programs generated internal success across sports. A fourth analysis compared operating expenditures between teams at the same institution to examine if spending patterns were similarly implemented for each sport at an institution. A final analysis compared the conferences’ mean spending for each sport in order to examine the similarities and differences that existed across Division III conferences.

Since the Litan et al. (2003) study had a similar purpose, comparisons should be noted. Like the study discussed in this paper, Litan et al. relied on information published in the database required by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA). Litan et al.

examined data for multiple years and also used other sources such as the Integrated Post-Secondary Education Data System and a survey of chief financial officers of 17 Division I schools. Whereas Litan et al. studied over a hundred schools and focused on football and men's basketball, the research discussed in this paper examined 341 schools and information for eight sports.

The focus on operating expenses was a limitation in examining the relation between spending and winning because this is only one aspect of financial expenditures related to athletics. Other financial factors that possibly contribute to winning, such as alumni giving and capital expenditures (e.g. facilities), were not examined. Furthermore, grant-in-aid awarded to athletes is a factor that may influence winning. Even though Division III strictly prohibits scholarships tied to athletics, schools have long been accused of awarding general student grants specifically to athletes ("Sidelines," 2001). The researcher intends for future studies to complement this study by addressing the aforementioned financial influences in athletics. Another limitation of the study was that the data was collected from information that was self-reported by the universities.

Methods

Subjects

For this study, data was examined only for NCAA Division III schools that participated in a conference. Independent teams were excluded because the NCAA reports only their overall record. Since most Division III schools participate against opponents at differing competition levels, comparing overall wins and losses would be inappropriate. Based on this, the researcher only studied teams' conference win/loss records to ensure wins and losses only occurred against other Division III opponents.

In addition to the aforementioned reasons for the study, the NCAA Division III was chosen because no athletic scholarships are allowed. Small colleges in the NAIA and

NCAA Division II often have scholarship allowances in varying amounts. By examining Division III schools only, the scholarship influence on winning is diminished.

The researcher examined 341 schools ranging in size from 456 to 37,134 full-time students. The largest schools in the study may not fall in the category of “smaller colleges” but they are aberrations. All but two schools were under 20,000 total enrollment and the mean enrollment for schools was 3,624. Eight sports (4 men’s and 4 women’s) were selected for collection of data based on their popularity in the NCAA Division III. These included the sports with the highest participation rates according to the *1981-82 — 2001-02 NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Report* (NCAA, 2003): men’s basketball (mbask), women’s basketball (wbask), baseball (base), softball (soft), men’s soccer (msoc), women’s soccer (wsoc), football (foot), and women’s volleyball (vball). Women’s and men’s outdoor track and field included slightly more participants than volleyball and men’s basketball respectively, but were not included in the study due to the incomparable nature of win/loss records and intra-conference competition. Overall, data was collected from 42 conferences and 2,433 teams. Eighty percent of NCAA Division III schools are private schools and 20 percent are public.

Data Collection

The information was amassed from the 2001-2002 school year using the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act website (US Department of Education, 2003c), which is available to the public. The EADA is a federal report aimed to disclose financial spending information for compliance regarding Title IX issues. Reports for each academic year are due near the end of October and published by the end of the calendar year. The information that is published is self-reported by the schools. Information about the team records were obtained from the publications section of the NCAA website (<http://www.ncaa.org/library/records.html>).

Data Analysis

A Spearman's rank order correlation was administered comparing winning percentages and operating expenses for the teams in each sport. Operating expenses are defined as, "All expenses an institution incurs attributable to home, away, and neutral-site intercollegiate athletic contests (commonly known as 'game-day expenses'), for (A) Lodging, meals, transportation, uniforms, and equipment for coaches, team members, support staff (including, but not limited to team managers and trainers), and others; and (B) Officials" (Department of Education, 2003a, ¶ 5).

Spearman's test was also administered to compare each of the following: winning percentage and total operating expense (football and basketball only), winning percentage and enrollment (by gender), and intercorrelations between teams for winning percentages. A Pearson product-moment correlation test was employed to examine intercorrelations between teams for operating expenses. Football was eliminated from the two intercorrelation analyses above because conference affiliations for each school are substantially different from the other sports in the study. The Spearman's test, rather than Pearson's, was employed for all comparisons that included winning percentage because these data, by nature, represent a non-normal distribution with many numbers at the far extremes of the range.

The total operating expense mentioned above is distinct from operating expense and is only reported for basketball and football. It is defined as, ". . . Expenses attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities. This includes appearance guarantees and options, athletically related student aid, contract services, equipment, fundraising activities, operating expenses, promotional activities, recruiting expenses, salaries and benefits, supplies, travel, and any other expenses attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities" (Department of Education, 2003b, ¶ 24).

A possible problem with the data is the self-reporting nature of the information provided in the EADA report. Some universities have shown reluctance to report data in the first place and schools may manipulate numbers to look more equitable in their spending between men's and women's sports (Thelin, 2000). The volume of data studied combined with the belief in equality emphasized by Division III athletic directors (Mahony et al., 2002) helps diminish this limitation. Self-reporting also potentially yields inconsistency between schools as budgetary allocation practices differ. Furthermore, entry and calculation errors may be more likely because one person is usually responsible for providing the data.

Results

Descriptive statistics for each of the sports examined in the study are listed in Table 1. The results of the statistical test showed weak positive correlations between operating expenses (oe) and winning percentages for any of the sports examined (see Table 2).

In an attempt to examine the relationship between sports within an athletic department, a further analysis of the data was administered. The statistical results revealed weak positive intercorrelations for winning percentages for all of the comparisons studied (see Table 3). A modest relationship existed between men's soccer and women's soccer (Spearman rank results $r_s = 0.407$, significant at the level of $p < 0.01$).

The only substantial positive correlations found in the study were intercorrelations for operating expenditures between sports at each institution. A Pearson product-moment correlation test revealed high positive correlations for each paired comparison of sports (see Table 4). The lowest value resulted from associations between expenditures in women's basketball and baseball ($r_s = 0.642$). The highest positive correlations were between men's and women's basketball ($r_s = 0.870$), baseball and softball ($r_s = 0.839$),

and men's and women's soccer ($r_s = 0.833$). All results were significant at the $p < 0.01$ level.

Another notable comparison was the disparity between conferences in spending (see Table 5). The statistics for football revealed the largest margin of difference between conferences' mean operating expenditures ($M = \$73,582$) with a standard deviation of \$26,190 and a range of \$40,808 to \$156,039. Even women's soccer, the sport with the lowest standard deviation ($SD = \$5,588$), between conferences' mean spending ($M = \$17,496$) revealed a range from \$9,683 to \$37,233.

This finding prompted a further examination of the possible effect of spending across conferences. Theoretically, members of some conferences may altogether spend more prolifically than those of other conferences. This occurrence would diminish the importance of the overall correlation coefficients in Table 1 because of the effect across conferences. In other words, teams with low winning percentages in high spending conferences may have spent more than teams with high winning percentages in conferences with low spending averages. To test this possibility, a one-way ANOVA was administered to compare the standard deviations for conference mean expenditures and the standard deviations in expenditures in each sport for the entire. The results showed no significant difference ($F = 3.62, p = .111$) so no further analysis of the effect across conferences was pursued.

Discussion

It appears that a weak relationship exists between operating expenditures and winning in NCAA Division III. The results were significant from zero, but the r_s values were not large enough to usefully predict (Vincent, 1999) that an increase in operating expenditures will result in an increase in winning percentage in Division III. Thus, the results showed no significant relationship between winning and operating expenditures

from a practical standpoint. The significant p -values found for the correlation coefficients suggests a high level of confidence that the results from the sample are consistent with the population (Urdan, 2001) and are not due to chance (Kault, 2003; Weiss, 2002). A p -value should *not* affect the interpretation of the magnitude of the associations (Miles & Shevlin, 2001), which were weak. The statistically significant but weak relationship was likely the result of the large sample of teams included in the study. In their study of Division I football and basketball, Litan et al. (2003) also failed to find a statistical relationship between operating expenditures and winning.

Due to the disparity in expenditures for each of the teams in Division III (standard deviations for each sport ranged from \$11,282 to 49,618 per sport), the findings suggest schools may be spending money unnecessarily. Assuming that financial allocation decisions are based on the premise that coaches and athletes need adequate resources to win in their league, the current expenditure decisions do not reflect success in this area. However, financial decisions may be based on other factors such as providing sports as a service to society, media exposure ("Athletics and Their Costs," 1993), the importance of a quality experience for the student-athlete, entertainment for the campus, or enrollment concerns. Regardless of the reasons, it appears that schools have divergent views about the amount of money necessary to support their athletic programs.

In addition to finding weak correlations between operating expenses and winning, weak correlations were also found for total operating expenses and winning in football and basketball (see Table 2). Salaries, benefits, and recruiting expenses are major factors in total operating expense that distinguish the numbers from operating expenses figures. The absence of a high correlation for total operating expenses deserves further attention by researchers that focuses on what factors contribute to this. Due to the trend of increasing coaches' salaries (Naughton, 1998), this aspect of total operating expenses merits special consideration.

The researcher examined other factors that potentially could show more of a relationship to winning than operating expenses. Some might assume that schools with higher enrollments have deeper pockets and spend more on athletics. Also, individuals might expect that schools with higher enrollment generally would have better winning percentages because they have a larger talent pool to draw from and generally have larger overall budgets. This study failed to confirm either of these assumptions. Table 2 reveals no significant correlation for enrollment by gender and winning percentages for football and weak positive correlations for all other sports. This evidence fails to support the belief postulated by Pennington (2003) that bigger schools are better in NCAA Division III.

The notion that a successful sports program yields success throughout the program also appears erroneous according to the analysis performed in this study. Other than the low but notable correlations between women's and men's soccer ($r_s = 0.407$), women's basketball and women's soccer ($r_s = 0.322$), and women's soccer and softball ($r_s = 0.304$), all other associations were very weak. Based on this information, it would be difficult to predict winning based on the success of other teams in a program's athletic department.

The positive correlations found in operating expenses between each paired comparison of the sports at each school should be expected (see Table 4). Although the correlations are high, it would seem that the highest correlated sports, of which there are similar sport for both males and females, should be even closer to a 1.0 correlation due to the Title IX requirements. These results confirm the inequities in spending between male and female sports so well documented in the literature.

An interesting result was that schools tend to spend across sports with a high level of consistency. An athletic program that spends more on one sport tends to spend

more on other varsity programs. This positive correlation indicates that schools are consistent with their spending school-wide across team sports. The generous programs tended to be equally generous with all of their sports confirming the nature of NCAA Division III found by Mahoney et al. (2002). Ironically, there appears to be little support from the current analysis that this spending results in more individual team wins or overall winning in the program.

Since the findings fail to show a substantial relationship between winning and operating expenses and there continues to be considerable differences in expenditures by schools, the researcher recommends that university administrators and conference leaders consider steps to ensure more equitable spending in Division III. In an era of financial restraints in higher education nationally (*Economist*, 2003; Hebel, 2003; *USA Today*, 2003)—especially at small colleges (O’Neill, 2001)—an approach to minimizing costs in athletics falls in line with the current needs. Unfortunately, costs are rising in athletic departments (NCAA, 1998, 2002; Shulman & Bowen, 2001), so financial decisions regarding athletics should be based on evidence the expenditures are necessary.

The difficulty controlling expenditures conference-wide is that the schools themselves commission the conferences. Quarterman (1999) defines a conference as a, “Regional governing agency for an alliance of intercollegiate athletics programs of six or more member colleges and universities with similarities in educational and athletics goals and on the same competitive levels (§ 1). Since a conference is an alliance, no school is obligated to continue membership. The stronger schools, both financially and in winning, often have the greatest influence on a conference and may be more reluctant to cap their spending. What may result (or has already resulted) is a reaction by other schools to increase their expenditures to keep up. If conferences seek to ensure evenly matched

competition according to Quarterman's definition, it would be wise for its members to collectively ensure that spending is fair and equitable. Since this study demonstrates a disparity between conferences, there would also need to be a consensus division wide to equalize expenditures.

Although these steps would be drastic and difficult to implement, they would not be unprecedented. Both the NCAA and NAIA currently set restrictions on scholarships, recruiting, payment of athletes, practice times, and many other areas. In some professional sports, which are also a type of association of teams, steps have been taken to cap spending in order to foster more equitable competition.

NCAA Division III has the unique opportunity to capitalize on their concern for academics and avoidance of other abuses noted in larger athletic programs. A concentration on increasing financial expenditures may result in Division III going the way of big-time college sports and succumbing to what others are trying to escape. Various reform organizations have developed over the years. More recently, the Knight Foundation (2001) focused on financial abuses and the National Alliance for Collegiate Athletic Reform (Lords, 2000) focused on academic abuses. The current practices of Division III fall more in line with reformers' recommendations. But with the recent questioning of practices in NCAA Division III, its institutions must exercise caution to stay in line with the division mission. Furthermore, financial decisions should be based on the degree to which athletics supports the institutional mission (Shulman & Bowen, 2001). Small-time college sports programs, such as those in Division III, should relish their inexpensive nature and seek to maintain their integrity by limiting costs.

Conclusions

This study revealed little evidence that operating expenditures in NCAA Division III influence winning. The perception that a school can buy wins appears to have very little

empirical support from this study or the NCAA commissioned study by Litan et al. (2003). Whether or not these results can be generalized to Division II or the NAIA will need to be determined by future studies.

Further research should attempt to examine other possible factors. Suggestions for factors to analyze include coaches, administration characteristics, previous success of programs, and quality of athletic facilities. Additionally, operating expenditures and winning should be examined over time. More research should focus on small-time college sports because they represent the majority of athletic participation in United States higher education.

References

- Athletics and their costs: Excerpts from a revealing new report. (1993). *Academe*, 79(6), 26-32.
- Chelladurai, P. & Ogasawara, E. (2003). Satisfaction and Commitment of American and Japanese Collegiate Coaches, *Journal of Sport Management*, 17(1), 62-74.
- Chen, A. (2000). A little goes a long way. *Sports Illustrated*, 93(22), 34-37.
- Coakley, J. J. (2004). *Sports in society: issues and controversies* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cockley, T. & Roswal, G. M. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members' perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 17(4), 217-227.
- Economist*. (2003). Remedial finance: public universities are another victim of states' budget problems. 367(8326), 32.
- Hebel, S. (2003). To ease budget crunch, public universities seek freedom from state controls. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(41), A19.
- Kault, D. (2003). *Statistics with Common Sense*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Knapp, T. J., Rasmussen, C., & Barnhart, R. K. (2001). What college students say about intercollegiate athletics: a survey of attitudes and beliefs. *College Student Journal*, 35(1), 96-100.
- Knight Foundation Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics. (June 2001). *A call to action: reconnecting college sports and higher education*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from http://www.knightfdn.org/downloads/pdf/KCfinal_06-2001.pdf
- Litan, R. E., Orszag, J. M, & Orszag, P. R. (2003, August). The empirical effects of collegiate athletics: an interim report. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://www.ncaa.org/databases/baselineStudy/baseline.pdf>

- Lords, E. (2000). Professors' group seeks to reform college sports. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(31), A58.
- Mahony, D. F, Hums, M. A., & Riemer, H. A. (2002). Distributive justice in intercollegiate athletics: perceptions of athletic directors and athletic board chairs. *Journal of Sport Management*, 16(4), 331-356.
- Miles, J., & Shevlin, M. (2001). *Applying regression & correlation: A guide for students and researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, A. (2000). The nicest team in football. *Sports Illustrated*, 93(6), 104-107.
- The NCAA News. (1998, October 12). *Survey shows increase in deficits*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://www.ncaa.org/news/1998/19981012/active/3534n01.html>
- The NCAA News. (2002, September 16). *The funding dilemma*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://www.ncaa.org/news/2002/20020916/active/3919n13.html>
- National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. (2003) *2003-2004 NAIA SID Manual*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://www.naia.org/sida/manual/sidmanual03.pdf>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2002a, September 1). *Division III Fact Sheet*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_III/fact_sheet_d3_2
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2003a, April). *1981-82 – 2001-02 NCAA sports sponsorship and participation report*. Retrieved November 18, 2003, from http://www.ncaa.org/library/research/participation_rates/1982-2002/participation.pdf
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2003b). *Division III philosophy statement*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from http://www1.ncaa.org/membership/governance/division_III/d3_philosophy_stmt

- Naughton, J. (1998). Salaries of head coaches are rising, survey shows. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44(34), A55-A56.
- O'Neill, J. M. (2001, January 29). Small, private colleges feel financial strain of increased competition. *The Philadelphia Inquirer*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=2W60271069119&db=nfh>
- Pennington, B. (2003, May 25). Playing for victory, or simply to play? Colleges are split. *New York Times*, 152(52494), A1.
- Pluto, T. (2003, March 19). College of Wooster exhibits true meaning of student-athletes. *Acron Beacon Journal*. Retrieved August 26, 2003, from <http://search.epnet.com/direct.asp?an=2W71317919624&db=nfh>
- Quarterman, J. (1999). A profile of intercollegiate athletics conference commissions and conferences. *The Physical Educator*, 56(2), 67-82.
- Robinson, M. J., Peterson, M., Tedrick, T., & Carpenter, J. R. (2003). Job satisfaction on NCAA Division III athletic directors: impact of job design and time on task. *International Sports Journal*, 7(2), 46-58.
- Robst, J. & Keil, J. (2000). The relationship between athletic participation and academic performance: evidence from NCAA Division III. *Applied Economics*, 32(5), 547-558.
- Schroeder, P. J. (2000). An assessment of student involvement among selected NCAA Division III basketball players. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(6), 616-626.
- Shulman, J. L., & Bowen, W. G. (2001). *The game of life: college sports and educational values*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sidelines. (2001). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(8), A39.
- Sperber, M. (2000). *Beer and circus: how big-time college sports is crippling undergraduate education*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

- Stoll, S. (1995). *Moral reasoning of Division III and Division I athletes: Is there a difference?* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, Portland, OR.
- Suggs, W. (2002). NCAA to consider tougher standards, both for colleges and athletes. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 48(18), A47-A48.
- Suggs, W. (2003). Division III stays the course, for now. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 49(35), A37-A38.
- Thelin, J. R. (2000). Good sports? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 391-410.
- Vincent, W. J. (1999). *Statistics in kinesiology* (2nd ed.) Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- US Department of Education. (2003a). *Definitions*. Retrieved August 24, 2003, from <http://surveys.ope.ed.gov/athletics/definitions.asp>
- US Department of Education. (2003b). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved August 24, 2003, from <http://surveys.ope.ed.gov/athletics/faq.asp#25>
- US Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. (2003c). Retrieved August 24, 2003, from <http://ope.ed.gov/athletics/>
- USA Today*. (2003, August 25). Tuition up in 49 states as schools, students struggle in tough times. Retrieved August 25, 2003, from http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2003-08-25-us-tuition_x.htm
- Urdan, T. C. (2001) *Statistics in Plain English*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Weiss, N. A. (2002). *Elementary Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Addison Wesley.
- Zimbalist, A. (1999). *Unpaid professionals: commercialism and conflict in big-time college sports*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All NCAA Division III Teams Studied

Sport	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Low	High
Men's Basketball (<i>N</i> = 340)					
Operating Exp.	332	\$27,676	19,645	851	167,260
Total Operating Exp.	324	\$69,327	41,681	7,227	293,226
Enrollment (by gender)	339	1,572	1,655	168	15,339
Football (<i>N</i> = 200)					
Operating Exp.	193	71,213	49,618	20,117	334,053
Total Operating Exp.	189	193,850	89,160	34,952	493,001
Enrollment (by gender)	199	1,491	1,433	219	8,981
Men's Soccer (<i>N</i> = 315)					
Operating Exp.	306	19,083	14,697	2,881	168,611
Enrollment (by gender)	314	1,577	1,723	98	15,339
Baseball (<i>N</i> = 300)					
Operating Exp.	290	29,319	19,864	2,101	197,537
Enrollment (by gender)	300	1,506	1,470	168	9,716
Women's Basketball (<i>N</i> = 341)					
Operating Exp.	326	24,347	61,920	823	98,100
Total Operating Exp.	330	61,920	35,590	6,570	278,465
Enrollment (by gender)	340	2,130	2,219	83	21,795
Softball (<i>N</i> = 300)					
Operating Exp.	288	20,416	13,751	676	148,220
Enrollment (by gender)	299	2,097	1,932	111	14,654

Women's Soccer (*N* = 317)

Operating Exp.	300	17,501	11,282	464	91,753
Enrollment (by gender)	315	2,070	2,753	288	35,428

Women's Volleyball (*N* = 320)

Operating Exp.	307	16,554	11,685	895	89,170
Enrollment (by gender)	318	2,143	2,236	83	21,795

Table 2

Spearman's Rho Coefficients for Winning Percentages Compared to Operating Expense,
Total Operating Expense, and Enrollment by Gender.

Sport	% x Op. Exp.	% x Tot. Op. Exp.	% x Enrollment
Men's Basketball	.141*	.167**	.118*
Football	.080	.217**	.090
Men's Soccer	.288**		.138*
Baseball	.195**		.144*
Women's Basketball	.148**	.135*	.136*
Softball	.197**		.180**
Women's Soccer	.240**		.214**
Volleyball	.217**		.192**

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note: Winning percentages are based on wins and losses within conference only.

Table 3

Intercorrelations (Spearman's Rho) Between Teams for Winning Percentages

	MBASK	BASE	MSOC	WBASK	WSOC	SOFT	VBALL
MBASK	--	.291**	.133*	.254*	.240**	.180**	.168**
BASE		--	.141*	.245**	.156**	.209**	.113
MSOC			--	.182**	.407**	.122*	.187**
WBASK				--	.322**	.274**	.209**
WSOC					--	.304**	.229**
SOFT						--	.256**
VBALL							--

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Note: Winning percentages are based on wins and losses within conference only.

Table 4

Intercorrelations (Pearson Product-Moment) Between Teams for Operating Expenses

	MBASK	BASE	MSOC	WBASK	WSOC	SOFT	VBALL
MBASK	--	.686*	.762*	.870*	.769*	.703*	.730*
BASE		--	.725*	.642*	.684*	.839*	.695*
MSOC			--	.768*	.833*	.773*	.706*
WBASK				--	.799*	.702*	.738*
WSOC					--	.700*	.706*
SOFT						--	.754*
VBALL							--

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5

NCAA Division III Conference Operating Expenses for Each Sport

Sport	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Low	High
Men's Basketball	38	\$27,372	\$10,559	\$21,358	\$40,791
Football	26	73,582	26,190	40,808	156,039
Men's Soccer	37	18,981	7,245	8,117	47,057
Baseball	36	28,779	10,063	14,021	56,429
Women's Basketball	37	24,058	9,051	11,251	54,519
Softball	36	20,162	7,566	10,815	41,848
Women's Soccer	35	17,496	5,588	9,683	37,233
Volleyball	37	16,124	6,893	6,890	36,642