



Selected funding variables of athletic departments in the Big Sky Conference and their relation to attendance, winning, athletes' academic success, NCAA violations, and coaching staff turnover by Thomas Allen Raunig

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University
© Copyright by Thomas Allen Raunig (1995)

Abstract:

University athletic departments receive pressure from outside sources who attempt to influence the decisions of athletic administrators. Many variables must be considered in order to evaluate university athletics, but little scientific research has been done on the subject.

The goal of this study was to provide administrators with an understanding of the variables that affect university athletic programs, and to aid them in decision making.

Nine universities, each a member of the Big Sky Athletic Conference, provided their annual athletic department audit. The audits included football and men's basketball expenditures for the fiscal years 1987 through 1991. Data for other variables was collected directly from the Big Sky Conference Commissioner's office. Variables used to evaluate the athletic departments were academic achievement, attendance, won-lost records, coaching staff turnover, funding level, and type of funding. NCAA rule violations was removed as a variable due to lack of data. The athletic programs were placed in groups based upon data then analyzed for each variable using discriminant analysis to explain group placement.

Key findings showed that institutions with high unearned funding levels for athletics have the greatest academic achievement and that winning, attendance and high funding are closely related. In addition, the programs who won more had lower academic achievement. This study's findings supported the Knight Commission's recommendations for increased state funding as a way to increase institutional control over athletic departments.

The study concluded that scientific methods can be applied meaningfully to university athletic issues. It also concluded that money plays an integral part in the success of an athletic department, and the recommendation was made that if a balanced competitive conference is desired, the conference should limit the amount of money spent by their members or increase revenue sharing. In addition, it was recommended that when the conference is considering new members they should compare data from this study to that of prospective members to help determine if they are a compatible member for the conference.

SELECTED FUNDING VARIABLES OF ATHLETIC DEPARTMENTS IN
THE BIG SKY CONFERENCE AND THEIR RELATION TO
ATTENDANCE, WINNING, ATHLETES' ACADEMIC
SUCCESS, NCAA VIOLATIONS, AND COACHING
STAFF TURNOVER

by

Thomas Allen Raunig

Advisor

John W. Kohl

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
Bozeman, Montana

July 1995

D378
R1933

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

Thomas Allen Raunig

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

7/14/95
Date

John W. Kohl
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Department of Education

7/14/95
Date

Diane M. Bell
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

10/20/95
Date

Pat Brown
Graduate Dean

SELECTED FUNDING VARIABLES OF ATHLETIC DEPARTMENTS IN
THE BIG SKY CONFERENCE AND THEIR RELATION TO
ATTENDANCE, WINNING, ATHLETES' ACADEMIC
SUCCESS, NCAA VIOLATIONS, AND COACHING
STAFF TURNOVER

Thomas Allen Raunig

Montana State University
1995

Abstract

University athletic departments receive pressure from outside sources who attempt to influence the decisions of athletic administrators. Many variables must be considered in order to evaluate university athletics, but little scientific research has been done on the subject.

The goal of this study was to provide administrators with an understanding of the variables that affect university athletic programs, and to aid them in decision making.

Nine universities, each a member of the Big Sky Athletic Conference, provided their annual athletic department audit. The audits included football and men's basketball expenditures for the fiscal years 1987 through 1991. Data for other variables was collected directly from the Big Sky Conference Commissioners office. Variables used to evaluate the athletic

departments were academic achievement, attendance, won-lost records, coaching staff turnover, funding level, and type of funding. NCAA rule violations was removed as a variable due to lack of data. The athletic programs were placed in groups based upon data then analyzed for each variable using discriminant analysis to explain group placement.

Key findings showed that institutions with high unearned funding levels for athletics have the greatest academic achievement and that winning, attendance and high funding are closely related. In addition, the programs who won more had lower academic achievement. This studies findings supported the Knight Commissions recommendations for increased state funding as a way to increase institutional control over athletic departments.

The study concluded that scientific methods can be applied meaningfully to university athletic issues. It also concluded that money plays an integral part in the success of an athletic department, and the recommendation was made that if a balanced competitive conference is desired, the conference should limit the amount of money spent by their members or increase revenue sharing. In addition, it was recommended that when the conference is considering new members they should compare data from this study to that of prospective members to help determine if they are a compatible member for the conference.

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University-Bozeman, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under the rules of the Library. I further agree that the copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microform along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Signature Thomas A. Rummig

Date August 11, 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	9
Purpose Statement	9
Research Questions	10
Delimitations	12
Limitations	13
Definitions	14
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	15
Introduction	15
Academic Achievement	26
NCAA Rule Violations	33
Attendance	40
Winning	43
Coaching Staff Turnover	47
Funding	50
Type of Funding	56
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	61
Population	66
Reliability and Validity of the Data	67
Pilot Study	68
Statistical Overview	70
Instrument	73
Research Hypothesis	75
IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS	77
Introduction	77
Discriminant Analysis With Football Academic Achievement	77
Discriminant Analysis With Basketball Academic Achievement	81
Discriminant Analysis With Football Attendance	83
Discriminant Analysis With Basketball Attendance	86

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
IV. RESULTS AND FINDINGS— <u>Continued</u>	
Discriminant Analysis With Football Won-Lost Standings	90
Discriminant Analysis With Basketball Won-Lost Standings	94
Discriminant Analysis With Football Turnover	96
Discriminant Analysis With Basketball Turnover	99
Discriminant Analysis With Football Funding Levels	102
Discriminant Analysis With Basketball Funding Levels	106
Discriminant Analysis With Type of Funding ...	109
V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
Summary of Findings	113
Conclusions	115
Conclusions Concerning Football Programs	115
Conclusions Concerning Basketball Programs ...	116
General Conclusions	117
Recommendations	119
Recommendations Concerning Football Programs .	119
Recommendations Concerning Basketball Programs	124
Recommendations Concerning Type of Funding ...	130
General Recommendations	132
Closing Statement	135
REFERENCES	138

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Variables in structure matrix for football academic achievement	80
2. Variables in structure matrix for basketball academic achievement	83
3. Variables in structure matrix for football attendance	86
4. Variables in structure matrix for basketball attendance	90
5. Variables in structure matrix for football won-lost standings	93
6. Variables in structure matrix for basketball won-lost standings	96
7. Variables in structure matrix for football coaching staff turnover	99
8. Variables in structure matrix for basketball coaching staff turnover	102
9. Variables in structure matrix for football funding	106
10. Variables in structure matrix for basketball funding	109
11. Variables in structure matrix for type of funding .	112
12. Comparison of means for Group 1 and Group 2 basketball programs	129
13. Comparison of high and low unearned funded groups .	131

Abstract

University athletic departments receive pressure from outside sources who attempt to influence the decisions of athletic administrators. Many variables must be considered in order to evaluate university athletics, but little scientific research has been done on the subject.

The goal of this study was to provide administrators with an understanding of the variables that affect university athletic programs, and to aid them in decision making.

Nine universities, each a member of the Big Sky Athletic Conference, provided their annual athletic department audit. The audits included football and men's basketball expenditures for the fiscal years 1987 through 1991. Data for other variables was collected directly from the Big Sky Conference Commissioner's office. Variables used to evaluate the athletic departments were academic achievement, attendance, won-lost records, coaching staff turnover, funding level, and type of funding. NCAA rule violations was removed as a variable due to lack of data. The athletic programs were placed in groups based upon data then analyzed for each variable using discriminant analysis to explain group placement.

Key findings showed that institutions with high unearned funding levels for athletics have the greatest academic achievement and that winning, attendance and high funding are closely related. In addition, the programs who won more had lower academic achievement. This study's findings supported the Knight Commission's recommendations for increased state funding as a way to increase institutional control over athletic departments.

The study concluded that scientific methods can be applied meaningfully to university athletic issues. It also concluded that money plays an integral part in the success of an athletic department, and the recommendation was made that if a balanced competitive conference is desired, the conference should limit the amount of money spent by their members or increase revenue sharing. In addition, it was recommended that when the conference is considering new members they should compare data from this study to that of prospective members to help determine if they are a compatible member for the conference.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Funding intercollegiate athletics is a major problem at universities today (Thelin & Wiseman, 1990, p. 1). Many feel that the need for balancing the budget is tied to major problems in intercollegiate athletics, and there appears to be a relationship between money and improprieties in athletic departments (Bergmann, 1991, p. 28). For example, when money is used to pay for a higher than legal scholarship to get a top level athlete, the situation becomes one of ethics. Money may also be instrumental when a coach is fired for not drawing enough fans to games. Furthermore, when a university changes a transcript to allow an ineligible athlete to play, it may be related to the need to draw fans and revenue. Thelin and Wiseman (1990, p. 9) say tracing illegally used money in athletic programs is problematic. The impact of money on an athletic department is so diverse that it seems necessary to accept the fact that there are no exact answers to the problems it creates in intercollegiate athletics. However, looking for trends and relationships between selected variables has the potential of providing some information to

administrators that may help them stay out of trouble with their athletic programs.

Rosenbaum (1990) questioned the state of intercollegiate athletics: "Is there a solution for incurable intercollegiate scandals? So far, the answer seems to be no. Somebody always wants an edge. Some realists contend it is impossible to combine quality sports competition and quality learning--not enough time for both" (The NCAA News, 12/19/90, p. 4).

Rosenbaum alludes to a seemingly impossible situation, but there are many examples of programs succeeding in both the classroom and the game. In fact, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is now starting to address such problems. The NCAA has toughened academic eligibility requirements requiring an 18 ACT or a 700 SAT for freshman eligibility as well as a 2.0 GPA in core high school classes (NCAA Manual 1990, p. 108, 109; Lapchick, p. 15). It has also made funds available to finance full-time academic advisory positions at NCAA Division I schools (The NCAA News, 12/19/91, p. 1).

In some universities reforms are taking place which may give a balance to athletics and academics. Money, of course, plays a key role in leading these positive reforms. New NCAA rules are in place which help save costs on stationery, travel, recruiting visits, and scholarships (The NCAA News, 3/6/91, p. 18). Also, there is an attempt to bring about

parity among universities, allowing those with less funding to have a better chance of competing with wealthier universities.

Parity is not yet in place, and one person who realizes that is Donna Lupiano, former Women's Athletic Director at the University of Texas. Lupiano was very forward with her expectations of Texas coaches. She said, "If you're not in the Top 10, goodbye" (Wolff, 1991 p. 79). Lupiano feels her expectations were valid because of the great wealth at the University of Texas. She stated, "Your goals are reflected in your resources" (Wolff, 1991, p. 79). Although Lupiano's expectations may have been justified at the University of Texas, the question is whether other universities trying to compete with the University of Texas should have the same expectations of their coaches, or should the broader picture be looked at? Perhaps those with less resources should not expect as many wins?

At the NCAA Division III level, where athletic scholarships are not given, the view is much different than that shown by Lupiano. When Allegheny College won the Division III National Championship in football, its coach expressed a different view of winning than Lupiano. Allegheny coach Ken O'Keefe stated, "Success is not measured in terms of wins and losses. We are developing students, players, people" (Looney, 1990, p. 38). O'Keefe's viewpoint may be related to the fact that Allegheny College President Daniel Sullivan has taken a strong stance on sports at the NCAA Division I and II

levels. He said, "It is hard to teach integrity in the pursuit of knowledge, or how to live a life of purpose and service when an institution's own integrity is compromised in the unconstrained pursuit of victory on the playing fields" (Looney, 1990, p. 38). . . These very different views by administrators may reflect the overall attitude of Division I universities as compared to Division III. The only major difference in NCAA rules between the two divisions is that one can offer scholarships and the other cannot. Yet the viewpoint between the two, as expressed by Lupiano and Sullivan, is far different. This difference in viewpoints brings into focus the latent conflict between academics and athletics.

~~A~~ Currently, boosters seem to exert a lot of influence on the decisions that are made in relation to athletic programs. For example, when Mississippi State asked Head Football Coach Rocky Felker to resign after a five win/six loss season, the Mississippi State Faculty Council Head had this to say, "You have to understand that Coach Felker resigned because supporters promised that significant amounts of money would be withheld from the university if he didn't" (Reed, 1990, p. 35). After Felker resigned, Mississippi State hired Jackie Sherrill, a coach who was forced to leave Texas A&M due to NCAA rules violations. In fact, Texas A&M was found guilty of 25 NCAA violations and was put on probation for 2 years. On the other hand, Sherrill had a won-lost record of 102-37-2 at

the last two universities at which he coached. So Mississippi State chose a winner who was known to be willing to break rules to win in the past, and they did so under booster pressure (Reed, 1990, pp. 35, 36). These examples demonstrate the type of ethical dilemmas which universities are subjected to by their athletic programs.

Presidents, of course, do not always have the final say about what goes on at their universities. At Indiana University of Pennsylvania, women's gymnastics and field hockey were cut for financial reasons, but a federal district judge ordered that the sports be reinstated. At Colgate University, a court ordered them to add the sport of ice hockey for purposes of gender equity; Colgate is appealing that order (The NCAA News, 11/9/92, p. 22).

It is not only athletic boosters and courts which are involved in influencing university practices toward athletics; countless legislators play a role in the shaping of university policy. Their most important role is approving funding, and they have recently been approving less funding. In the last few years, state support of higher education has fallen one percent (The NCAA News, 11/2/92, p. 18). When the state provides less money to the university, the president often becomes the person leading the way on decisions to help balance the budget. This, of course, opens the door for conflict within the university, and often this conflict is between academics and the athletic program.

The Knight Newspaper Syndicate sponsored a commission to investigate college athletics and some of its problems. This commission was headed by former University of North Carolina President William C. Friday and former Notre Dame President Theodore M. Hesburg. The group conducted an 18-month investigation of intercollegiate athletics, and from their findings they advocated greater control by university presidents over athletics. However, some argued that this could lead to problems if the president does not take an interest in athletics. The Commission also felt that winning was over-emphasized and could be a factor in some of university athletic departments' problems (The NCAA News, 3/20/91, pp. 1, 3).

Frank Deford of Sports Illustrated indicated that university presidents have had control over athletics since the 1800s and have not had much success in controlling them (The NCAA News, 5/22/91, p. 4). His beliefs may not be those of the majority, but such statements indicate a kind of mistrust of having the academicians controlling athletics.

Since there are many groups and individuals inside and outside of universities who try to influence athletic decisions and who may have very little knowledge of the complexity of the relationships involved, there needs to be a rational method to evaluate athletic programs. A model which uses research methods to address athletic issues could be a means to bridge this gap. Information for this evaluation

could come in the form of selected funding variables analyzed relative to specific athletic department performances, such as academic achievement, NCAA rules compliance, attendance, winning, and coaching staff turnover.

Of course, there are cases where universities are forced to spend money on athletics against their will. This can be the situation in cases involving gender equity. Administrators do not have to make any decisions in this situation, as a judge may tell them what to do. This happened in the state of Washington in 1987 when the state's supreme court found Washington State University guilty of gender discrimination and ordered total equality among the schools sports (Whiteside, 9/28/92, p. 58). The court based this decision in part on the lack of funding for women's sports. So this case points out that the distribution of funds can vary greatly between programs at the same university, and the ability of outside influences to alter university policy.

As the NCAA Rule Book gets more and more explicit, even those involved as coaches at the intercollegiate level seem not to have a grasp of what is expected of them. There are so many ways to break the rules, ranging from not fielding the required size team as Tulsa University did in track to the coach actually making car payments for athletes on Lamar University's women's basketball team (The NCAA News, 11/9/92, p. 17; The NCAA News, 11/23/92, p. 13). Both are violations, but in one case the coach was ensuring mediocrity by having a

limited size team. In the other, the coach was using illegal incentives to help win. It is no wonder that the general public looks upon intercollegiate athletics with a certain degree of suspicion; it appears they have reason. For example, when coaches complain about the rules, they are reminded that the rules are made by the membership of the NCAA. Thus, the rules are basically made by coaches and administrators so the coaches are actually complaining about the rules they took part in making. This whole picture presents a very strange view to the public.

If the Knight Commission Report recommendation is going to be observed in regard to more tolerance of coaches not winning and more public funds being made available to support athletics in order to reduce rule violations, evidence is needed to support such a recommendation. The public needs data to make it clear why such recommendations should be carried out (The NCAA News, 3/20/91, p. 3). People need to understand that the purpose of intercollegiate athletics is more than just winning. There should be a way to reward programs that play by the rules even though their won/lost record may not reflect the quality of the program. Providing decision makers with findings that look beyond just winning and losing will add reason to the process of hiring and firing. It may also give the decision makers grounds to defend unpopular decisions when questioned.

At the present time, logical answers do not always play a role in the decisions made by university administrators. For example, Alexander Wolff points out that the only time men's and women's sports are treated equally is when it comes time for budget cuts. Then they each take an equal percentage; however, since women are already at a disadvantage, they stay far behind (Wolff, 9/28/92, p. 58).

Problem Statement

University athletics is under indictment from a number of sources today, but all these accusations have brought about little change. This may be because the problems are not viewed in an appropriate way. Administrators seem to focus in on a particular problem and make a rule in regard to that problem, but that just creates a new rule to be broken. A broader view of the interrelationship among selective variables in university athletics is needed so the problems can be examined and dealt with holistically. At the present time no one looks at how these variables relate to one another, so winning is the only standard for excellence.

Purpose Statement

* The purpose of this study is to examine the interaction between selected variables which affect and shape today's intercollegiate athletic programs. These findings could give those leading the charge for reform in intercollegiate

athletics, as well as administrators trying to evaluate programs, the information needed to make informed judgments. Looking at how a decision on one aspect of an athletic program interacts with another aspect could aid in making better decisions. This study's findings describe how the selected variables relate to each other and, based on the variables, place Big Sky Conference men's football and basketball teams into groups. These groups indicate the quality of a program, but do so based on more information than just wins.

Research Questions

Question 1: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with academic success be statistically discriminated from the teams which haven't had academic success in the conference based on the variables NCAA rules violations, attendance, winning, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type of funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 2: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the most NCAA rules violations be statistically discriminated from the teams in the conference which have not violated rules, based on the variables academic achievement, attendance, winning, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type of funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 3: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the highest attendance be statistically discriminated from the teams in the conference with low attendance based on the variables academic success, NCAA rules violations, winning, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type of funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 4: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the highest finishes in the conference won-lost standings be statistically discriminated from the teams in the conference which have finished low in the won-lost standings, based on the variables academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 5: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the highest coaching staff turnover be statistically discriminated from the teams in the conference which have had low turnover rates, based on the variables academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, winning, funding, and type of funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 6: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the highest level of funding be statistically discriminated from the teams in the conference with low funding based on the variables academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, winning, coaching staff

turnover, and type of funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Question 7: Can the Big Sky Conference football and basketball teams with the highest level of unearned funding be statistically discriminated from the conference teams with a low level of unearned funding, based on the variables academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, winning, coaching staff turnover, and funding for the years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991?

Delimitations

Information on the Big Sky Conference universities athletic budgets for fiscal years July 1, 1987 to July 1, 1991 is the financial data used for this study. The Big Sky Conference had nine teams during this period (Big Sky Conference Indoor Track Media Guides, 1991, p. 2). The Big Sky Conference athletic programs used in this study were only those which appear as separate items in the audits used for this study. Those sports were men's basketball and football. All other athletic programs are combined into one category for the audit. Thus, an unbiased means to determine their expenditures was not available for those other athletic programs. So this study was delimited to Big Sky Conference Men's Football and Basketball teams, and only inter-conference games were used for the athletic success data.

The variables of academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, teams' athletic success, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type of funding are the selected variables for this study. Their use was the subject of a pilot study using Big Sky Conference Coaches and Administrators. Only after their input were the variables delimited to these seven.

Limitations

Because this is viewed as sensitive information and hard to obtain, it was necessary to focus on a small group of universities and attempt to get complete data on that group. Thus, this study was delimited to Big Sky Conference universities. Since 1985, these universities have been required to conduct an athletic department audit. This audit serves as the source of financial data for this study (NCAA Manual, 1991, p. 40). The audit was conducted by an outside agency and turned over to the university president for review (NCAA Manual, p. 40). Cooperation from the President's office at universities in this study was critical to the study's success. The accuracy of this study was also dependent upon the honesty of the Athletic Department Audits, which were done for each department by firms outside the university. It was also dependent upon the self-reporting of NCAA rule infractions to the Big Sky Conference Office, proper attendance figure reporting, accurate reporting of student

academic success, and accuracy in the Big Sky Conference reporting of staff members at Big Sky institutions.

Definitions

Athlete's academic success -- Those athletes receiving over a 3.0 GPA. Data in regard to graduation rates on athletes is not completely available for this study.

National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) rule violations -- Any reported NCAA rule infractions that occurred during the period of this study, including those cases of athletes testing positive for steroid use.

Attendance-- The recorded number of people attending an athletic event.

Teams' athletic success -- For football and basketball, the success level will be determined by the inter-conference won-lost records. Only conference games will be considered due to the variation in difficulty in non-conference schedules among Big Sky universities.

Coaching staff turnover -- Full-time coaches who leave a staff for any reason.

Amount of funding -- The total dollar amount of money available to a sport.

Type of Funding - The ratio of state funding or required student fee funds to private funding within an athletic department.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The variables of academic achievement, NCAA rules violations, attendance, winning, coaching staff turnover, funding, and type of funding all play a part in describing the athletic programs in the Big Sky Conference. Although no study appears to have ever been conducted using all these different variables to discriminate between programs and describe the relationships between these variables and how they interrelate to one another, there is a body of knowledge on each of these variables. Each variable has, or can have a tie to the other variable, but the one thing each program has to have is money to operate on. So intercollegiate athletic expenditures is where much of the research today is centered, and the person leading the field in this is Mitchell Raiborn.

Raiborn has been studying the finance of intercollegiate athletics since 1969. His studies on revenue and expense in intercollegiate athletics have been of great value to those wishing to understand athletic finances. Raiborn uses anonymous questionnaires to gather his data. The universities are separated into their respective divisions, but this is the

only way they are identified. His work has been used as a basis for many studies, and many people have attempted to obtain a clearer picture of intercollegiate finances based on his work. Exact answers as to why intercollegiate athletics is continually facing financial problems are very few, and as for the other problems in intercollegiate athletics, there are even fewer definitive answers. Raiborn does remain optimistic about intercollegiate athletics even though he understands their problems very well. He says, "The value of intercollegiate athletics to the direct participants and society at large is worth the monetary support" (Benson, pp. 1, 2).

Raiborn is not looking to completely change intercollegiate athletics. Oddly enough, though, Raiborn's data does serve as a basis for arguments against intercollegiate athletics. This can be seen where Donald Chu used Raiborn's data to demonstrate that men's athletic program expenditures rose at more than twice the rate women's programs did in universities which play the NCAA's highest level of football (Chu, p. 104). Chu is not the only person taking a hard look at Raiborn's data. More and more college presidents are trying to get a picture of what is going on in intercollegiate athletics. Some presidents have already come to conclusions about athletics. Richard Warch, President of Lawrence University, has declared, "Despite the pious half-time pronouncements we see on televised football and

basketball games, in which the future of humankind is tied to the universities with big-time athletics programs, these very programs contradict the fundamental aims of American higher education" (Sperber, p. 19). Other presidents, such as Joe DiBiaggio of Michigan State, feel that dramatic changes are needed, but there is no need to "destroy the game to save it" (DiBiaggio, p. 21). Some feel the faculty need to play a greater role in changing intercollegiate athletics. Today, however, the faculty representative to the athletic department is usually looked on as a pawn (Atwell, p. 10). So, perhaps the presidents are in the best position to bring about improvements in intercollegiate athletics, yet they, too, seem to have differing outlooks on athletics.

DiBiaggio advocates long-term contracts for coaches in order to relieve some of the pressures to win at all costs (DiBiaggio, p. 22). This is in accord with the Knight Commission's desire for mostly public financing of intercollegiate sports to relieve pressures from those outside of universities who give money (The NCAA News, p. 3). These suggestions touch on the fact that money plays a role in creating both positive change, and in causing some of the problems. So money can be used to help a coach feel secure by providing a long-term contract, but it can also be used by outside sources to gain influence in an athletic department.

This good-bad relationship with money hasn't been clearly correlated to outcomes. In fact, Bailey and Littleton

compared the tremendous increase in dollars which some teams spent that participate in the NCAA Division I Basketball Tournament to the number of rules violations in basketball and found no large increase in rules violations related to expenditures (Bailey & Littleton, p. 39). Bailey and Littleton concluded that gate and television financial returns are only part of the cause for problems with rule violations. They pointed to Division III level athletic programs showing dramatic increases in rule violations, and they have very little income from sports. However, these smaller universities need sports success in order to attract nonathlete students to the school (Bailey & Littleton, p. 40).

Just what causes the many problems in intercollegiate athletics isn't clear, yet people do throw out reform suggestions. One of the most popular is to simply pay athletes (Noll, p. 206; Lawrence, p. 144). This idea is far from anything the Knight Commission suggested, but it fits with the NCAA's idea to use money to solve problems. For example, when the NCAA gives \$25,000 to the athletic department at every NCAA Division I institution for academic enhancement the money will be appreciated, but it will quickly be spent (The NCAA News, 12/19/90, pp. 1, 3). Thelin and Wiseman, based in part on Raiborn's data, concluded that intercollegiate athletic departments are unable to support themselves. This seems to be the case despite arrangements like the one billion dollar television package received in

1989 by the NCAA (Thelin & Wiseman, p. 2). Incidentally, the academic enhancement money is coming from this television package. Should the next bidder not pay as much for the contract, these funds could be gone.

What makes athletic expenditures so hard to contain? To some degree it is the rising cost of all facets of education. Public intercollegiate athletic departments generally use more fee waivers than the state allots them, so they must pay for those. In addition, inflation has caused room and board costs to rise, and travel costs have also increased. Travel costs are felt in two parts of the budget: team travel and recruiting. In hard times, scholarships are looked at as one of the primary areas where costs can be cut, and this was done at the 1991 NCAA Convention. A 10% reduction in athletic scholarships for NCAA Division I institutions was approved that year (The NCAA News, 3/6/91, p. 18), so the scholarships fell from 95 full scholarships for football to 86.5. The National Football League has a squad limit size of 48 players. When comparisons like this are made, the argument for scholarships is made on the basis that recruiting 17 and 18 year old high school students is not an exact science, so there needs to be room to bring in extra candidates, assuming some won't be able to meet either the academic or the athletic expectations (Thelin & Wiseman, p. 7).

The Big Sky Conference competes at the NCAA Division I AA level for football, so their scholarship level is now 63 (The

NCAA News, p. 18). All other Big Sky Conference athletic teams compete at the highest level of NCAA competition. This IA status for Big Sky Conference universities is often viewed as an option for cost cutting, for lower NCAA levels require that the university provide fewer scholarships and employ fewer staff (NCAA Manual, pp. 150-153). At the present time the Big Sky Conference has the minimum number of sports allowed by the NCAA to stay at Division I status. This number went from twelve to fourteen men's and women's sports in the 1993-1994 school year (The NCAA News, 1/16/91, p. 13). There is also an option to have six men's athletic teams and eight women's athletic teams in order for Division I universities to address gender equity (The NCAA News, 1/20/93, p. 14). NCAA Division II requires only eight sports be offered (NCAA Manual, p. 8). Thus, many people look toward dropping to a lower level of NCAA competition as a means to solve financial problems.

Philosophy comes into play when the question of eliminating athletic programs is discussed. Some may ask, if athletics does have a place in education, then why should a non-revenue sport be cut? Non-revenue athletic programs serve an educational function as much as the revenue programs. Questions like these are not answered in the NCAA purpose statement, or in the Big Sky Conference Handbook. The closest the NCAA purpose statement comes is to say that it wishes to have standards whereby programs can maintain high quality

(NCAA Manual, p. 1; Big Sky Handbook, p. 1). The NCAA does show a desire for universities to provide more athletic opportunities to students by providing incentives to universities to have more than the minimum number of athletic teams. Once again, they use money to encourage universities to have more athletic teams by giving financial subsidies. The greater the number of athletic teams a university provides, the greater the subsidy (The NCAA News, 12/19/91). The Big Sky Conference has not followed this idea to any degree having dropped wrestling in 1987 as a cost saving move, but has recently added women's golf as the seventh required athletic team. Golf has a much lower number of participants than wrestling, and has a maximum scholarship limit of five, as opposed to eleven in wrestling (NCAA Manual, p. 153). So the Big Sky Conference may not be quite as interested in providing the maximum number of students an opportunity to participate, but this Conference's regional economic base is far different than that found in most metropolitan areas. It seems that the NCAA, by providing subsidies, is tempting universities to add teams, but the more wealthy universities which already have the extra athletic teams may well be the big winners.

When talking about intercollegiate athletics as a part of higher education, people tend to think of major programs where athletic teams are bringing in considerable revenue to the university, perhaps even helping to build buildings. In fact,

only one percent of the NCAA financial goal for athletics is to earn dollars for non-athletic activities (Bergmann, p. 29). Raiborn's survey of 1981-1985 athletic department finances (Raiborn, p. 50) showed financial losses at 42% of the universities surveyed. The National Association of College and University Business Officers studied NCAA Division I universities' finances for the year 1989 and found 70% of the athletic programs were losing money. Less than 100 schools were actually showing a profit (The NCAA News, 12/22/93, p. 15).

This points out the irony of intercollegiate athletics. People think that there is a great deal of money available, yet the reality is much different. One group which has been making money steadily for ten years is the NCAA. It has shown revenue surpluses ranging from as low as \$200,000 to as high as \$13,000,000. The NCAA's total assets as of August 1990 were \$4,878,322 (The NCAA News, 1/2/91). Unfortunately, the NCAA's members are not doing quite as good a job at managing their money. This is not a new phenomenon to universities, although the fiscal problems seem to be getting worse with time. The average deficit for universities at the Division I level of NCAA competition in 1981 was \$120,000 (Begly, p. 293). Today, universities that sell out every football game still are running huge deficits. Michigan is the prime example. They showed a \$3.6 million deficit in their athletic department for 1988 (Sanoff & Schrof, p. 52).

Big Sky Conference universities, to no one's surprise, are also running up deficits. Montana State University Men's Athletic Department for fiscal year 1990-1991 was \$340,000 in debt (Chaney, p. 3). The debt was covered by the rest of the university. Yet, just the fact that it occurs at all causes questions and criticism. People perhaps do not understand how unpredictable the business climate is for athletics. In Bozeman, even a winning football or basketball team's ability to draw attendance can be hurt by poor weather. The risk of injury to a star athlete can also damage attendance. If the goal is to keep a positive public image and create opportunities for student athletes, then Montana State University may be on track. Of course, those who lose funding dollars to cover athletic departments' debts may not agree.

Because many variables go into what makes an athletic program successful, success could be viewed as a relative term. If making money is the goal, then there are not many universities succeeding. If winning without breaking NCAA rules and using steroids is success, then the list may also be small. These variables and more help form the picture in intercollegiate athletics today. Winning appears to still be the only bottom line. Coaches usually must provide won-lost records to help judge their self worth as no one is quantifying the other variables. Digger Phelps was pressured out as basketball coach at Notre Dame in 1991, yet he had graduated every athlete to go through his program (Taylor,

p. 48). Obviously, graduation rates were not looked on as the biggest factor in coaching basketball at Notre Dame. Phelps' case points to the need for emphasis on other aspects besides winning.

Not always are the examples as clear cut as in Phelps' case. For example, some universities consistently ask coaches to win, but never provide the funds to compete at the level they are asked to. So coaches get frustrated and leave, or don't win and are forced to leave. It can be a vicious circle. The issue is further complicated when coaches are forced out by rule violations or by boosters who are unhappy for reasons such as boring styles of play, unusual coaching methods, or personality conflicts. Disillusion with the issues and the politics which go along with intercollegiate athletics has caused people to vent frustration about the situation. University of Delaware Athletic Director David Nelson said, "The institutions of higher education of the country have been responsible for major discoveries in every discipline but have yet to solve satisfactorily governance problems of intercollegiate athletics" (Hart-Nibbrig & Cottingham, pp. 81, 82).

To further confuse the issue of winning and finances, alumni donations have not been shown to have a relationship with successful athletic teams (Sigelman & Carter, p. 219). Yet we have been given the impression that at Mississippi State athletic success plays a big role in alumni generosity

(Reed, p. 35). Intercollegiate athletics' justification for its financing seems to carry with it some very odd relationships. Perhaps this is because people sometimes contribute money for reasons they themselves do not understand. The unsubstantiated story about Florida State football coach Bobby Bowden's annual fund raising visit provides some feel for the status of finance in intercollegiate athletics. Bowden was in a room full of boosters and an almost evangelical atmosphere was being created as he called upon one person after another to shout out how much they were going to give to Florida State University. One man jumped up and shouted \$100,000. After a few months the money never came from the man and Florida State University took him to court to get the money. The next year Bowden is back in the same room, the same man jumps up and promises to give \$100,000, plus throw in the court costs (Fullerton).

If college athletics did not deal with young people, and if public money was not at stake, perhaps all of the problems could be laughed off. But the truth of the matter is, investigation is needed to determine the relationship between athletic finance and what we consider success in athletics. It is the thesis of this research that this is the first step toward making strides for both academic and athletic excellence in an atmosphere free from corruption and cheating.

Academic Achievement

The academic achievement of the student athlete is a highly controversial issue in the literature. There has not really been a definitive study as to whether athletic participation helps or hurts academics. Studies have shown athletes to be equal to the student population in some cases and worse in others (Messner & Groisser, p. 260). There have been studies about athletes' personality traits which have shown them to have more desirable traits and greater peer status than others (Underwood, p. 14). Yet some statistics cannot be overlooked, such as a study conducted on the graduation rates of those who become professional athletes after matriculating at various universities across the United States. This study found two of the top football programs in the country graduated only 17 out of 56 athletes they sent to the NFL between 1976 and 1980. The two universities were Alabama and Oklahoma. On the other hand, Penn State graduated 37 out of 41, and Michigan graduated 17 out of 20 (Underwood, p. 32). So there seems to be a great deal of variation around the country in athlete graduation rates, even among successful programs. But to draw conclusions from this information would be premature and there is a need for further study.

The issue of academic achievement is also clouded by the fact that some universities find ways to help inadequate students get by in school, thus graduating students who have learned almost nothing. Many intercollegiate programs have

been challenged by the NCAA for academic abuses: Oregon, Arizona State, and Southern California were all caught during the 1979-1980 school year for giving credit to students for classes in which they did not do the work (Underwood, p. XI). It is no surprise that students would be willing to risk suspension from school for this, since rules are broken just to get students into school in some cases. An example of this is transcript forgery, for which Oregon, New Mexico, and UCLA have been caught (Underwood, PP. XI, 83). There have even been accusations of people taking the ACT for athletes to help get them into school. This charge was brought against Kentucky when an incoming freshman basketball player suddenly scored a 23 on his ACT. The athlete's previous two attempts on the test had produced scores of three and seven. He had also failed to meet the required score of 700 on the SAT in two attempts (Wolff and Ketyian, p. 167). All of the wrongdoing and questionable activities make it hard to believe even the good statistics on academic success.

Questions about the mix of athletics and academics are not new. In 1929 the Carnegie Commission reported that inferior students were given preferential treatment if they were athletes (Guttman, p. 72). This did not get much attention because there was a bigger problem going on. At that time subsidizing athletes to attend a university was illegal under NCAA rules, but 81 of the 112 institutions reviewed in the study were subsidizing athletes (Lawrence,

p. 26). The problem of how much aid, if any, a student athlete should receive and what sort of recruiting practices should be allowed were the predominant issues dealt with by the NCAA up until 1957. That year the NCAA Council voted the full ride scholarship into place, and clearer recruiting rules were instituted (Lawrence, p. 60).

The Big Sky Conference has attempted to keep a slightly higher academic focus than that of the NCAA as a whole, such as setting grade point requirements for athletes which are higher than those the NCAA requires (Big Sky Handbook, p. 17). This can be somewhat deceiving to the outside observer, as universities vary in grading standards. Is a 2.0 GPA at Weber State the same as a 2.0 GPA at Stanford?

Measuring academic achievement in the form of graduation rates for basketball players at Big Sky Conference universities as well as at others was the subject of a USA Today study in 1991. Some interesting information came out of the study, as Big Sky women's perennial champion Montana had only graduated three of 18 players from 1980-1985 (Brown, USA Today, 6/21/91 p. 2C). The data was discredited in a press release two days after the USA Today article. The release pointed out that some of the girls had received their degrees from other universities, and that 14 of the 18 had now received their degrees (Chaney, The Bozeman Daily Chronicle, 6/23/91 p. 13). Of course, the fact still remains that all of

the universities in the survey faced the same problems, and University of Montana came out near the bottom.

Women athletes have enjoyed greater academic success than their male counterparts. In a survey of 257 Division I female basketball teams, a graduation rate of 60% was found. This compares with 48% graduation rates for the entire student body, and 46% graduation rates for male basketball players (Becker, USA Today, 6/20/91 p. 1C). Unfortunately, female athlete graduation rates are on the decline. Women's teams seem to be moving toward the men's graduation rates. The question is whether this is occurring because women's basketball is becoming more popular. The increased attention to women's basketball may bring with it more pressure to win and less emphasis on academics. Graduation rates for women's basketball players in the Big Eight, the Big Ten and the Southeast Conferences all have shown a decline between 1986 and 1990. The decline averages 14% across these conferences. Nine teams from these conferences were in the top 25 womens' programs in the United States for 1991. So it would seem that winning and academic success do not go hand in hand, as these top conference statistics seem to bear out (Coomes, USA Today, 6/20/91 p. 8C).

The USA Today findings on basketball seem to state the obvious: that winning in athletics and academics do not mix well. For years statements have been made by athletes which hint at this. Yet, if one were to say that athletes were

wasting university dollars and not helping themselves, there would be room for argument. One leading argument would be the fact that many of these athletes would not get any education if it were not for college athletics. Clifford Adelman of the U.S. Department of Education found, in surveying high school varsity athletes who went to college, that they had the highest rate of home ownership and the lowest rate of unemployment for any group in the study (Adelman, p. 17). However, if one looks at athletes in general, serious academic shortcomings can be found in athletes. Texas Ranger pitching coach Tom House feels that on the Rangers' 25-man roster only 10 athletes can balance their checking accounts. House, who has a doctorate in psychology, believes athletes learn sport specific skills, which help them very little off the playing field (Washington Post, 6/20/91 p. C3).

Another argument against the idea that university dollars are wasted on student athletes is that athletes are being used by universities to publicize their programs and gain low cost publicity. So the cost of education is very minor compared to what some athletes bring to a school. As the athlete is drawing in people to games, bringing in television money and licensing fees for the University, he/she is only getting a scholarship. From this perspective an athletic scholarship is viewed as a way to keep labor costs down and not as a means to get educated (Wolff and Ketyian, p. 152). Thus the scholarship dollars are not being wasted in the views of some.

In addition, the USA Today statistic indicating that male basketball players are very close to the student population in graduation rates and female basketball players are ahead of the student population serves to further demonstrate that the scholarships are not being wasted on athletes that have no intention of completing a degree.

Adelman also found athletes, to a greater degree than other students, to be taking classes some would consider easy (Adelman, p. vi). He had six categories for classifying students: varsity athletes in football and basketball, varsity athletes in other sports, students in performing arts, students in intramurals, nonathletes, and everybody else. What he found was that athletes in football and basketball took physical education activity classes and normal physical education classes at a rate of 6.4%. This compared with 4.4% for athletes on other athletic teams, 0% for non-athletes, and 2.5% for everyone else. Athletes also were able to receive credit for varsity athletics, which accounted for another 1.4% of football and basketball players' credits and 1% of the other athletes' (Adelman, p. 32). What do these figures mean? They would seem to add data to the argument that athletes should be making it academically; they take easier classes and get more help to pass those classes.

Adelman was able to come up with meaningful information in order to help paint a clearer picture of what is going on with athletes. Yet he really was more interested in what

happens with those athletes after they leave school. Because it is difficult to compare universities and classes, Adelman was most interested in whether they fulfilled the promises about higher education made when the athletes were recruited. Adelman felt that federal legislation was needed to force universities into letting student athletes know what sort of opportunity they had at succeeding academically at a university given the demands of being an athlete. Adelman felt this could be done by forcing universities to disclose records so that students -- particularly student athletes -- would know what their chances of graduation were (Adelman, p. 21). The bill is called the Student Right to Know Act, and it was passed into law in 1990. This law has forced the NCAA to get started on forcing programs to keep track of graduation rates (USA Today, 6/17/91 p. 2A).

Data on graduation rates will help student athletes in their college decision-making by helping them understand their chances of graduating at a particular university. This information could cause a dilemma for athletes if they have to choose between academics and athletics. Of course much depends on whether the student really cares about graduating. If parents and students do start to care, all the attention being focused on athletics and academics may force every university to reevaluate its activities and pay more attention to graduation rates, particularly if the universities with successful basketball teams start drawing attention to their

positive records in both wins and graduation rates. In the end there should be an overall improvement in graduation rates among athletes.

The Big Sky Conference has tried to emphasize academics with the Conference All-Academic Team for each sport, plus a Big Sky Scholar Athlete named for each school's top male and female scholar athlete. Some universities have had much more success in the area of producing members of the Conference All-Academic Team. For example, in football Montana State University has had 23% of the Football All-Academic members from 1978-1989, compared to the next best team Eastern Washington's 13% (Fenk, MSU 1990 Football Media Guide, p. 75). It is interesting to note that Montana State University's record of winning during this period has been 30% (Fenk, MSU 1990 Football Media Guide, p. 68). Montana State University's all-time won-lost percentage is .493% (Fenk, p. 70). So these figures seem to help substantiate the old belief that academics and athletics do not go well together.

NCAA Rule Violations

Many feel the NCAA has too many rules, and it in fact makes it impossible not to break some, just by accident. When a rule is broken the university itself is required to report it. Since the NCAA is a self-governing body, which means that the universities themselves are the NCAA, and they are expected to police themselves. Once in awhile accusations come forth from other NCAA universities or through the media

which cause the NCAA to investigate rather than to wait for a school to self report. These investigations do not have to follow the normal legal process in most states. The NCAA's justification for this is the fact that it is an organization of which the school being investigated chooses to be a part. The school is choosing to follow the rules by being in the organization (NCAA Manual, pp. 3, 4). States which have laws requiring the NCAA to follow due process when investigating are Nebraska, Florida and Nevada (Demak, p. 9).

One of the reasons the NCAA has been the focus of federal and state legislation is the fact that many people feel it is unable to control its members. In fact, a Harris Poll survey in 1989 revealed that eight out of ten people feel college sports are out of control (Brown, USA Today, 6/21/91 p. 2C). There are many unsubstantiated examples of how out of control, but Wolff and Ketyian believe most major investigations into wrongdoing produce only small changes. For example, Nevada-Las Vegas had major accusations against its basketball program but, after the investigation, the only evidence of wrongdoing was the coach's wife buying team members' graduation caps and gowns (Wolff & Ketyian, p. 289). This obviously is not what the NCAA was looking for, but it was all they could find.

One measure taken by the NCAA to help get a better picture of what is going on among members is Operation Intercept. This program interviews 50-100 top high school athletes about how they were recruited. Although the athletes

might not mention the wrongdoing of the universities they had decided to attend, they might mention the wrongdoing of other universities (Underwood, p. 79). This program, along with another called the Big Brothers Program, provides a view for the NCAA of what is really taking place in recruitment. With the Big Brothers Program, 10-15 top recruits are identified and given briefings on recruiting rules. Then they are encouraged to stay in touch with the NCAA and report any questionable recruiting activities (Underwood, p. 79).

Prevention measures have not solved the rules violations yet, but the NCAA seems to be taking action to cause programs to lose revenue when rules are broken. Usually the right to appear in postseason tournaments or games is taken away, which causes universities to suffer financially. At other times the right to appear on television is revoked, or scholarships allowed to a university are reduced (Underwood, pp. 82, 83). Then there is the option for the NCAA to terminate the employment of coaches who violate rules (Lawrence, p. 137). The NCAA seldom follows through because the university dismisses the coach before the NCAA can follow through. One case in point is Texas-El Paso's firing of two assistant basketball coaches for possible rule violations. The NCAA levied 13 charges of wrongdoing against Texas-El Paso (USA Today, 7/2/91 p. 11C). By letting the coaches go, El Paso may have hoped the NCAA would decide the school's actions were enough and that there was no need for further penalties.

Sometimes people choose to fight termination of their jobs. Jerry Tarkanian (basketball coach of Nevada-Las Vegas) successfully fought his two-year suspension from coaching. In 1977 he was able to get a restraining order preventing his suspension. The case was to be finally settled in 1984, when the Nevada Supreme Court made the injunction stand until March 26, 1990. But Tarkanian was still in coaching, so the NCAA again moved against him (The NCAA News, 2/3/90 pp. 10, 11). He agreed to step down after the 1991-1992 season, so the NCAA was able to succeed after 15 years (Wulf, p. 21).

The Big Sky Conference has been free of major rules violation cases for many years. The most widely known case of accusations of wrongdoing in the Big Sky came in 1973, and it was known as the University of Montana work study scandal. This case involved accusations of work study money being paid to athletes for work never done. No penalties ever resulted from this case, as the parties were brought to trial by the federal government but were never convicted (Charles Johnson, p. 4). Another violation caused Montana to forfeit part of a basketball season's wins in 1977. This was the result of an ineligible player being used (Jeff Herman, p. 15).

Nationally and at the Big Sky Conference level the use of steroids is one very widely talked about rule violation. Testing for steroid use has been conducted by the NCAA for six years. The testing period had only been in the Fall, but in 1990 the program was expanded to be conducted throughout the

school year (The NCAA News, 5/22/91, p. 3). When comparing only Fall figures, the percentage of people caught using steroids has declined. In 1987 1.3% of the students tested were caught; in 1988 it was .8%; in 1989 it was .7%; and in 1990 the total students caught amounted to .4% (The NCAA News, 5/22/91, p. 3). This decline in numbers is a sign that when the NCAA decides to work on solving a problem it can be effective. However the number of students caught is a far lower percent than what studies indicate the rate of athlete steroid use to be. A 1989 study by the NCAA asked male and female college athletes about their steroid use within the past year. This study showed males have a 14.7% rate of use and females a 5.9% rate. These numbers are considered to be on the low end according to other researchers (The NCAA News, 12/19/90, p. 10).

Steroids tend to be a forgotten part of the unfair activities that go on in collegiate athletics. The same desire to be a winner, which is involved in other violations, is part of steroid use; however, unlike other forms of cheating there is a greater price to pay for steroid use. Athletes can lose their health through steroid use (The NCAA News, 12/19/90 p. 4). When an athlete or coach falsifies a transcript, accepts or pays money illegally, cheats on a standardized test, shaves points for money, accepts use of cars or plane tickets illegally, gets credit for classes never attended, or any other rule violation, the most they stand to

lose is not being able to participate. With steroid use the price can be much greater due to possible long-term health problems.

The relationship between NCAA rule violations and winning is not clearly defined. This is the case because universities are not always caught when rules are broken. In most cases rule violations are uncovered several years after they occur (The NCAA News, 12/3/90 p. 10). Nevada-Las Vegas is one program which was punished while they were still near the top. UNLV won the 1990 NCAA basketball championship but was banned from live television for the 1991-1992 school year, and was not allowed in the NCAA 1991-1992 basketball tournament (The NCAA News, 12/3/90, p. 11). In 1989, Kentucky's basketball program went through similar problems with the NCAA but received no sanctions. This was the case because two of the players involved in the violations left Kentucky and the coaching staff left (Wolff & Ketyian, pp. 178, 179). Thus, the team was dismantled enough that it would take time for the program to reach its former status. Although winning and rule violations do not have a clear relationship, the NCAA definitely tries to make it more difficult for those caught breaking the rules to win. So the NCAA sends universities such as UNLV and Kentucky back to the drawing board; yet so often those who actually committed the wrongdoing are not hurt. In Kentucky's case, one of the players involved in the wrongdoing went on to become an All-American player at

Arizona, and the Kentucky head coach went on to Oklahoma State to be head coach (Wolff & Ketyian, p. 302).

Quite often winning programs do end up with rule violations after they have a very successful season. Just as UNLV received sanctions after winning the 1990 NCAA Division I Basketball Title, so did Kansas after its 1987 title (NCAA Enforcement Summary, p. 30). In football, Clemson's program was put on probation after its 1981 National College Football Title (NCAA Enforcement Summary, p. 20). Miami received sanctions against its football program after winning the 1980 Football Title, and Georgia received sanctions after its 1984 Title (NCAA Enforcement Summary, pp. 20, 22). These championship programs receive more scrutiny after a title but, of course, not every program that wins a title gets caught for violating the rules. Some do not break the rules and are still successful; it is perhaps these programs which need to be looked at. Perhaps all NCAA athletic departments could learn from them how to run a successful program without cheating.

Georgetown is one successful basketball program which does not appear in the NCAA Enforcement Summary. The university is still recruiting top level athletes and apparently is doing so legally. On the other hand, powerhouse college programs fill up the NCAA Enforcement Summary. The most cases against any one school is seven; there are two universities with seven: Southern Methodist and Wichita

State. Arizona State has six cases, and 11 universities have five cases. Included in this group are Arizona, Florida State, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, North Carolina State, Oklahoma, and Texas A&M (NCAA Enforcement Summary, p. 39). When coaches look at the large number of universities which have broken the rules and realize they have to compete with these teams, a feeling of hopelessness could ensue. Thus, the temptation to also break the rules is fostered. One begins to feel that breaking the rules is the only way to be competitive (Wolff & Ketyian, pp. 150, 151, 297). Greater awareness of the universities that do not break the rules is an underlying reason that loss of television appearances is frequently part of the sanctions against universities. But the universities that win are the ones which get on television, and a coach may break the rules for years in order to win and gain exposure. Then, if the coach is caught their team might be banned from television for a couple of years. Apparently some believe the risk is worthwhile, as the NCAA Enforcement Summary has many cases of television restrictions placed on universities for violations (NCAA Enforcement Summary, pp. 4-38).

Attendance

High attendance figures for athletic events is an important factor to athletic departments. It serves as a revenue source, but it also shows potential athletes how the program is supported by the campus and surrounding community. Most universities look to basketball and football as the

primary revenue generating programs because of their viability as an entertainment industry. These athletic programs exist in a highly unpredictable atmosphere. In fact, the unpredictability of athletics is one factor which makes it entertaining (Snyder & Spreltzer, p. 16). Yet this unpredictability makes athletics a hard business to guarantee attendance and revenues. One factor which does tie into attendance is winning. Football attendance has been shown to have a .40 relationship to winning games (Koch, p. 120). This tie between attendance, winning, and revenue cannot be overlooked, because college athletics is a business to one degree or another (Sperber, p. 345).

For purposes of budgeting, many athletic departments use unusually high estimates for the coming year's attendance. This allows them to receive access to funds which otherwise would be kept from them (Sperber, p. 31). So optimistic attendance figures are projected, and funds are spent according to these projected incomes. Sperber likens college athletics finance to a lottery, and college athletic directors to addicted gamblers (Sperber, p. 15). Those comparisons may not be that unreasonable when looking at the issue of college athletic attendance. Counting on a 18-22 year old to stay academically eligible and healthy so that they can play is somewhat risky (Koch, p. 119). And weather can greatly affect attendance at events. For example, Montana State had a dramatic drop in attendance when a storm moved in for its 1989

home football game with Weber State. Attendance was 3,107, whereas the home average up to that point had been 9,707 (Fenk, p. 42).

Nationally, college football attendance has stopped increasing in recent years. It even declined in 1989, dropping 900,000 people in one year (Sperber, p. 30). Basketball has had a slow growth in attendance but has at least been on the increase (Sperber, p. 37). According to Sperber, television has played a role in the football attendance decline. As intercollegiate athletics are overexposed to the public (Sperber, p. 37), the result of all the football on television has been a decrease in the contract values for televising football.

In the Big Sky Conference, event attendance is closely related to winning. Nevada and Boise State, two of the most consistent winners in the conference, also lead the league in football attendance. Not surprisingly, they are also larger than average metropolitan areas by Big Sky Conference standards. Boise State has the highest winning percentage against Big Sky universities, with a .682% win rate. Reno was second with a .663% rate (Fink, p. 70). They have the two largest stadiums: Boise state with 22,600 seats; and Reno with 20,000 seats (Fink, pp. 51-56). Boise State averaged 20,000 people per game for attendance in 1990; Reno averaged 16,566. The Conference average was 10,357 (Big Sky Conference Football Media Guide, pp. 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24, 27, 30). There are

many factors in attendance besides community size, weather and winning. Attendance can be affected by whether any area athletes are on the team, the athletic department's relationship with and perception in the campus and community, the style of play by a team, promotional ability of the athletic department, whether a team has a star to promote, and competition in the entertainment market (Bale, pp. 25, 26).

Winning

To separate winning from other variables is difficult since competition is at the center of college athletics. Finding ways to win within the rules should be at the heart of intercollegiate athletics. But does the pressure to win override ethics? The general premise is that winning draws in money from attendance, television revenue, tournament bonuses, and concessions. Then the money helps keep the team winning and boosts community spirit (Bale, pp. 25, 26). This premise seems to drive most university athletic programs. The opposite situation appears to reinforce the need to win at all costs. In this case revenue is down because attendance is down, along with the other factors. This is demonstrated in the Southwest Conference where, in football, Texas draws 65,000 fans a game, Texas A&M, Baylor and Texas Tech around 35,000, while Houston, Rice, SMU and TCU are more than 10,000 people per game behind the others (Curtis, p. 5). Houston is the only school of the last four teams which is able to win consistently. The others seem to be stuck in a losing cycle.

At the end of the regular season in 1990, the four poor attendance teams' combined record was 20 wins and 23 losses, while the other four teams had 27 wins, 15 losses and two ties (Missoulian, 11/26/90 p. D-5).

Winning in the Big Sky Conference carries with it similar benefits to those enjoyed by universities nationally. Comparisons of athletic programs in the Big Sky is easier than national comparison, due to the fact that the Conference has only six men's sports and six women's sports in which championships are contested (Big Sky Conference Handbook, p. 14). The NCAA conducts 31 championships at the Division I level when men's and women's championships are combined (NCAA Manual, p. 178), so most universities do not participate in all the sports offered. Thus it is difficult to compare athletic departments on a national basis. The Big Sky Conference gives an All-Sports trophy for the top men's and women's programs, as well as a combined award. For the 1990-1991 school year Nevada won the men's award, and Weber State won the women's, as well as the combined award (Big Sky Conference Release, p. 3). While this type of measure of success helps provide an overall picture for an entire department's athletic success; obviously it is not the only measure looked at.

The emphasis on winning can be more clearly demonstrated when common aims about intercollegiate athletic program purposes begin to be forgotten. One of these assumptions is

"to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, athletics excellence and athletics participation as a recreational pursuit" (NCAA Manual, p. 1). The idea of developing well rounded athletes seems to be what this statement is all about, yet many programs abandon this idea in pursuit of more mature, fully developed athletes who may become professionals. Adding additional stature to the University. The most obvious example of this is in track and field, where foreign athletes have been brought in to help teams win. Often these foreign athletes are older, entering college on the average at an age of 19.85, as opposed to 18.25 for American track and field athletes (Bale, p. 118), so they require less work on skill development because they have been in the sport longer and have had more time to post good records, which enhances their status as prospects. For example, Filbert Bayi of Tanzania came to the University of Oklahoma in 1982 at the age of 29. This was eight years after he had set the world record in the mile (Bale, p. 118; Track & Field News, p. 23). The NCAA passed a rule in 1986 which placed limitations on the age an athlete can be to participate in intercollegiate athletics (Bale, p. 195; NCAA Manual, p. 106), but the rule has exemptions for time spent on church missions or military time, so many older foreign athletes still find their way into college programs. This is particularly true in NAIA and junior college programs, because they have no age limit rules (Bale, p. 193). However, at the

