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ABSTRACT

The budgets of Division I athletic departments across the United States are increasing at a vast pace. The purpose of this study was to evaluate a representative group of Ohio’s state funded Division I universities, and the amount of funding for their athletic budgets. The researcher obtained the statistical information from the business offices of all the Division I athletic departments in Ohio. The study encompassed the fiscal years of 2004-2007. The researcher compared the overall operating athletic budget from each individual school. The statistical information was acquired from each university’s athletic department website.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

What is the basis for large athletic budgets? How are the funds divided upon “evenly” among the individual sports? Does size of the institution factor in when determining the size of an athletic budget? When an athletic department achieves tremendous success in terms of wins and losses and their athletic department’s budget is so great, some investigation is warranted (Wieberg and Whiteside, 2007). There are numerous myths and facts that coincide with the overall makeup of an athletic department’s budget with which most persons are unaware (Goral, 2004). For example, most individuals identify high profile athletic departments and successful athletic programs as having endless resources when it comes to spending. However, most large athletic programs operate in the red and only a small amount of schools affirm to earn a profit from sports (Goral, 2004). In order to for most athletic departments to earn significant revenue, a national power must be present (Wieberg and Whiteside, 2007). In most cases, football and men’s basketball are the economic drivers for most athletic departments (King, 2002).

No matter how large or successful the athletic program may be, there are limits to their spending such as travel and recruiting, coaches salaries, and even facilities. However, there are more resources available to those who compete on the highest level and achieve elite status. Elite status can be defined by Conference and or National Champions. The size of the operating budgets for that of the Division I athletic programs in the state of Ohio vary from school to school, and size does play a large part, but it does not depend on the overall success of the program.
This study looked at the various ways that the Division I universities in Ohio spend their budget, as well as where their budgets derive from. By obtaining records from the 2004-2007 fiscal years, the researcher analyzed the various expenses of each athletic department. The researcher attempted to determine the amount of funds available to the overall athletic department based on size and success. The premise of this study was to show that athletic success does not simply solely rely on a large athletic budget. Successful athletic programs are a positive influence on the athletic department and the college community as a whole.

Statement of the Problem

The advancement of vast spending throughout college athletic departments is a universal theme in intercollegiate athletics. Many athletic programs perform at a high level despite lack of funding. There is not enough evidence to show the general population that these athletic departments are doing the university any justice with the high end expenditures. The mid-major level schools that have drastically smaller budgets are having an infinite quantity of success against elite programs.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to show the size of each athletic department’s budget in the state of Ohio in comparison to their success that is measured through wins and losses. The success of athletic programs does not illustrate the amount of spending that takes place. By obtaining records from the fiscal years 2004-2007, the researcher analyzed the athletic department’s budget and the success of the teams. The researcher also attempted to determine
the effect that large amounts of spending plays in the success determined through wins and losses.

*Research Hypothesis*

The research hypotheses expressed below will be tested using statistical procedures. The researcher envisions the result of the study will portray the principle that large spending in an athletic department does not guarantee success through wins and losses.

*Null Hypothesis*

There will be no difference between an athletic department’s spending and their success measured through wins and losses.

*Alternative Hypothesis*

There will be a difference between an athletic department’s spending and their success as measured through wins and losses.

*Limitations of the Study*

This study was purely a quantitative study that was descriptive in nature. It attempted to examine the personal opinions of the student-athletes or of the athletic directors. This study was limited to six of the eight Ohio state sponsored Division I athletic departments. This study did not include Cleveland State University or Wright State University because neither school has a football program. Youngstown State University was also excluded from the study because the football program competes at the NCAA Division I – Subdivision. The University of Cincinnati
and Kent State University were not included in this study because they did not respond after numerous times of being contacted. Three men’s and three women’s sports were studied because each school offers them. It was not a cross section of colleges or universities across the country. It focused exclusively on the NCAA Division I athletic departments. It did not compare across NCAA Division I, NCAA Division II, NCAA Division III, NAIA, or Junior Colleges.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

*Lucrative Business*

College sports have become big business for many institutions. According to an NCAA study that was released in the summer of 2003, athletics budgets at the average Division I schools have more than doubled from 1995-2001 (Goral, 2003). What are some of the factors in these drastic increases? Operating costs, such as increased travel expenses and marketing definitely play a role, but schools are willing to spend top dollar in the hope of a sold-out crowds of 100,000 plus fans or lucrative television contracts (Goral, 2003). For example, the CBS television network paid $6 billion for private rights to air the yearly March Madness basketball tournament for a ten year period, and ABC has a $525 million, seven-year deal to air the four college football Bowl Championship games. Teams who make these bowl games can earn nearly $13 million each (Goral, 2003). It can be worth the risk to spend “top-dollar” on increased travel expenses and marketing if their school earns a pay-off of nearly $13 million. This type of national recognition may mean an even larger pay-off in terms of dollars for these universities because it can possibly draw interest from the public causing an increase in merchandise sales.
Expectations

One of the most demanding aspects of an athletic director’s job is the pressure of selecting a winning coach since they have no substantial control over the daily operations of the team but are held responsible for the overall success. If he or she hires someone who is not successful, it can set the program back for years to come in of success through wins and losses, and cause the athletic program and department to lose money. Critics do not always understand the numerous functions of a coach, such as personnel decisions of their team. An athletic director has to deal with decisions made within the athletic department that can bring great media attention, scrutiny, pressure from big boosters, and even pressure from lofty administrators such as the president or the Board of Trustees (Coy, 2007). Those who donate large sums of money to the university athletic programs may threaten to pull out the funding if a certain coach is not selected or retained (Coy, 2007). On another note, a coach can come under intense criticism if he or she does not perform up to the standards that are set-forth by the institution. For example, former Ohio State University head football coach John Cooper, where in 13 seasons at the helm he compiled an astounding record of 111-43-4 (Kinney, 2006). To Ohio State fans, the most important game of the year is the one against archrival Michigan where Cooper went just 2-10-1 (Kinney, 2006). This caused great uproar from fans in the Buckeye community who for many years wanted his job. At schools where rivalries play such a significant role, how a coach fares against a rival can determine their job security.
Recruiting Factor

The overall success of a program also determines the type of recruits they sign. Top-rated student-athletes want to play for top-rated programs at the highest level, providing them with exposure and possibly an opportunity to play at a level beyond college. A majority of the mediocre programs will continue to have a mediocre reputation until they start to win because winning lures these highly coveted recruits to their program. Top-players want to be a part of a program with a great deal of tradition, pride, and excellence. The expectation of success is a positive pressure to have. Once mediocrity is accepted, it is going to be an uphill battle for years to come.

Current Budgets

With success also comes a larger fan and booster backing, causing an increase in the athletic budget. In 2006, The Ohio State University had an athletic budget of $101.8 million, the largest in the country, with 36 varsity sports, which is 16 more than the NCAA Division I-A average (Wieberg and Whiteside, 2007). The University of Texas ranked second and the University of Florida ranked third in athletics expenditures a year ago. Texas put $83.6 million and Florida $78.2 into 20 sports each. All three universities have something in common—winning a National Championship in football within the past five years, Ohio State’s coming in 2002, Texas in 2006, and Florida defeating the Buckeyes for the 2007 National Championship. Florida’s men’s basketball team also won National Championships in 2006 and then again in 2007 by defeating Ohio State.
Lack of Federal Funding

Since athletic programs are such a large component of higher education institutions, athletic departments face the same problems as do the institutions to which they belong (Kriemadis, 1997). Athletic administrators must now deal with phases of decline, government mandates and guidelines, and financial difficulties (Kriemadis, 1997). As Stanley O. Ikenberry, then president of the American Council on Education, pointed out in the spring 2001 issue of The Presidency, state funding for public universities grew at a shocking speed the last decade. The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that state appropriations to higher education increased on an average of 6.4 percent per year during the last half of the 1990s (Genshaft, 2002).

For the first time in about a decade, many public universities are losing state support. A good way for universities to counter the destitution on academics is by tightening general administrative expenses, scrutinizing administrative budgets, controlling hiring and travel, and eliminating subsidies for such operations as athletics, arenas, and university clubs (Genshaft, 2002). Most big athletics programs operate in the red. Only a fraction of schools claim to make a profit from sports. A 2004 report by USA Today, puts this number at just 40 schools. In order to keep programs active, the money often comes from increased student fees. About 60 percent of Division I schools rely on this money for their programs in addition to donor dollars (Goral, 2004).

Planning

Strategic planning may assist athletic departments in effectively responding to their new situations and developing strategies enabling them to accomplish their mission and objectives they have set-forth, such as what was done at Brigham Young University. In the self-composed
study, BYU wished to find ways of balancing the $27 million athletic budget while creating distinctive sports programs based on the values of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The university ultimately came up with this mission statement:

As BYU athletics achieves its strategic vision of inspiring and developing scholar athletes into leaders, living faith-based values of morality, charity and honor, and winning on a conference and national level with world-class sportsmanship, it will stand as a role model in this new era of intercollegiate athletics (Walch, 2005).

Every athletic department is different, but every athletic department can lay the groundwork for what they want to accomplish and how they want to be viewed.

Trimming the Budget

In 2003, then an athletic director at one of the largest and wealthiest athletic departments in the country had to tell each of his 35 coaches to trim their budget by five percent over a two year span, which came out to be a cut of $2 million because of vast projects that were taking place on campus. With a small decrease of only five percent in an already hefty budget, it will not adversely affect the operation of any sport. In most cases, when a university needs to make budget cuts, the athletic department is usually the first place these cuts are made. The following are offered as suggestions as to what both Athletic Directors and coaches should keep in mind when preparing their budgets (Manos, 2003)

1. Have a thorough understanding of the department’s fiscal policies and the specific policies for both raising and spending funds.

2. Understand their accountability, as if the public were directly watching their every expenditure.
3. Equity must be present in the accounting so that one program is not favored over another.

4. All parties, coaches, athletes, and parents need to recognize that increased spending does not always translate into winning.

_Scandal_

There are many pressures on schools when it comes to the recruitment of potential student-athletes. Stakes have risen to the point where some programs are willing to gain a “competitive edge” in signing a top-rated recruit to increase their leverage to win and fill seats at games. When scandals occur, the university, coach, and the student-athlete involved receive negative publicity. NCAA sanctions can also be imposed. The athletic department can be placed on probation, have scholarships taken away, and not be allowed to participate in postseason tournaments or bowl games, causing the program to lose a significant amount of money. Former Ohio State men’s basketball coach Jim O’Brien was fired for giving $6,000 to a foreign-born basketball recruit who never played for the Buckeyes. O’Brien filed a wrongful-termination suit and won a $2.2 million settlement that the school was appealing as of January, 2007 (Wieberg and Whiteside, 2007).

The Ohio State scandal is minor compared to the one that surfaced a few years ago at the University of Colorado, with nine women alleging sexual assault by football players, and stories or recruiting parties fueled by alcohol, drugs, and the promise of sex with attractive co-eds. This made CU the poster child for missteps and misstatements in dealing with a crisis, ultimately costing then coach Gary Barnett his job (Goral, 2004). At high-profile programs, temptations are
going to be there for these student-athletes. A 1989 Harris poll showed that 77 percent of the respondents agreed that sport scandals and the pursuit of money through sports undermine the role of the university as a model of ethics and integrity (Frey, 1994). The NCAA and universities need to continue to work together on preventing situations like these and controlling them if they do occur.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Study Design

The evaluation of the athletic department’s budgets in terms of dollars was measured through the success measured by wins and losses. This was accomplished by obtaining the individual Athletic Department’s total budgets from the 2004-2007 fiscal years and as well as attaining the records of individual sports from the universities athletic websites, also from the 2004-2007 seasons. The Director of Business Operations from each university’s athletic department was contacted in attempting to obtain the total athletic budgets. The statistics included the budgets from individual sports and the number of wins and losses achieved in individual seasons.

The advantage of this approach was easy resurgence of the information. There were few disadvantages to this approach. The researcher only studied the six Ohio state funded NCAA Division I athletic programs that have football as a sport. Another disadvantage was the argument from qualitative researchers who suggest too much emphasis of success is placed on numbers through that of wins and losses and the dollars spent on the university’s athletic budgets.

Procedures

The male athletic teams that are included in the study are football, basketball, and baseball. The female athletic teams that are included in the study are volleyball, basketball, and
softball. These teams were studied because they are more “popular” in terms of interest, but are also offered by every university included in this study.

*Instruments*

The study was conducted by using a print out of each athletic department’s budget that was sent through e-mail or postal. The records of the teams were retrieved by the researcher through accessing the individual universities athletic websites.

*Reliability*

To guarantee internal reliability, the following strategies were employed:

1. The researcher obtained the individual university athletic budgets from the Business Office in the athletic department and the university website to ensure accuracy in reporting the success of each team through wins and losses.

2. A panel of experts was used to verify the reliability and the validity of the report.

*Validity*

To guarantee internal reliability, the following strategies were employed:

1. Content validity was analyzed by asking each Director of the Business Office to send either through e-mail or postal a copy of their entire athletic budget.

*Data Analysis Procedures*

The data analysis procedures were organized categorically, and chronologically reviewed and coded. The quantitative data was entered into a database and analyzed using SPSS 13.0.
Preliminary Results

The researcher will prove that the alternative hypothesis is correct. The alternative hypothesis states: There will be a difference between an athletic department’s spending and their success as measured through wins and losses. The data will show that there will be an increase in an athletic department’s spending on certain teams when they are successful in terms of wins and losses. It will also show that more revenue is generated into the athletic department through outside support when teams are successful.

Potential Ethical Issues

The researcher obtained the information from the Marietta College Human Subjects Review Board and the Director of the Business Office of each individual university’s athletic department. The individual team’s records and budgets were identified, along with the university they belong to. The information to be obtained from every individual university athletic department was destroyed once it was been used for this study. The data was stored at the researcher’s residence.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS

Interpretation of Findings

The Director of each Business Office obtained the athletic budget from the 2004-2007 fiscal years from their university. They were gathered from each Director of the Business Office through both e-mail and postal. The individual team’s records were obtained from each universities athletic website. The statistics were tabulated using the SPSS 13.0 statistical software program. Of the six teams that were studied, three of them were male and three of them were female. There were six universities included in this study. The different tables and figures show that over the three year period that was studied, the researcher’s hypothesis was incorrect. The researcher envisioned the results of the study would portray the concept that large spending by an athletic department does not always guarantee success in terms of wins and losses.

The records of teams from individual seasons were not integrated. The researcher calculated the number of wins and losses achieved by each individual university’s team over the three year period that was studied. There were six athletic teams studied. The teams included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>Softball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1., Figure 2., and Figure 3 breaks down each individual athletic department’s budget from 2004-2007.
* In the left on Figure 1., the dollar amount is measured in 20 million increments.

$2.00E7 = $20 Million  $4.00E7 = $40 Million  $6.00E7 = $60 Million

$8.00E7 = $80 Million  $1.00E8 = $100 Million

Number 1 = University of Akron = $13,096,256

Number 2 = Bowling Green State University = $12,655,335

Number 3 = Miami University = $14,200,000

Number 4 = Ohio University = $11,854,000

Number 5 = The Ohio State University = $85,975,200

Number 6 = University of Toledo = $12,728,923
* In the left on Figure 1., the dollar amount is measured in 20 million increments.

$2.00E7 = $20 Million
$4.00E7 = $40 Million
$6.00E7 = $60 Million
$8.00E7 = $80 Million
$1.00E8 = $100 Million

Number 1 = University of Akron = $14,465,119
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University = $12,994,788
Number 3 = Miami University = $13,500,000
Number 4 = Ohio University = $12,670,000
Number 5 = The Ohio State University = $91,803,000
Number 6 = University of Toledo = $13,645,960
Figure 3. 2006-2007 Athletic Budgets

* In the left on Figure 1., the dollar amount is measured in 20 million increments.

$2.00E7 = $20 Million  $4.00E7 = $40 Million  $6.00E7 = $60 Million

$8.00E7 = $80 Million  $1.00E8 = $100 Million

Number 1 = University of Akron = $17,476,590

Number 2 = Bowling Green State University = $14,344,545

Number 3 = Miami University = $14,800,000

Number 4 = Ohio University = $13,796,000

Number 5 = The Ohio State University = $98,056,597

Number 6 = University of Toledo = $13,577,160
Table 1. Cumulative Budgets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget 2004-05</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$11,854,000.00</td>
<td>$85,975,200.00</td>
<td>$25,084,952.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget 2005-06</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$12,670,000.00</td>
<td>$91,803,925.00</td>
<td>$26,513,298.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget 2006-07</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$13,577,160.00</td>
<td>$98,056,597.00</td>
<td>$28,675,148.6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of schools included
Minimum = Minimum budget for an athletic department included in the study
Maximum = Maximum budget for an athletic department included in the study
Mean = Average budget of the six universities

Table 1. shows the minimum, maximum, and the mean budget in terms of dollars available for spending. The mean from each fiscal year shows minimal significance. The statistics show that with each year, the overall athletic budget increased. The Ohio State University had the greatest increase in their overall budget from 2004-2007, with an increase of almost $18 million. The institution with the second greatest increase over the 2004-2007 years was the University of Akron with an increase of over $3 million. The only institution whose budget did not increase on a yearly basis was Miami University. From 2004-2006, their budget actually decreased by $700,000, but the next year it increased by over $1 million.
Number 1 = University of Akron - 18 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 19 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 17 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 18 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 30 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 23 wins

Figure 4. shows the number of wins that each university’s football team achieved over the three year period. The Ohio State University achieved more wins in the 2004-2006 seasons than any of the other five universities. Miami University achieved the least amount of wins than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget plays a role in a team’s success in terms of wins and losses.
Number 1 = University of Akron – 18 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 16 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 19 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 19 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 7 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 14 losses

Figure 5. shows the number of losses that each university’s football team achieved over the three year period. The Ohio State University achieved fewer losses over the 2004-2006 seasons than any of the other five universities. Miami University and Ohio University had the most number of losses than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget, team’s success in terms of wins and losses was greater.

Table 2. Interpretation of Football Statistics
Table 2. shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2004-2006 seasons. Table 2. also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2004-2006 seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>20.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>15.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of universities included

Figure 6. Men’s Basketball Wins
Number 1 = University of Akron – 69 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 40 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 58 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 59 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 72 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 57 wins

Figure 6. shows the number of wins each university’s Men’s Basketball team achieved over the 2004-2007 seasons. The Ohio State University achieved the greatest number of wins in the three year period than any of the other five universities. Bowling Green State University had the most losses out of any of the five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget plays a role in a team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Figure 7. Men’s Basketball Losses
Number 1 = University of Akron – 27 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 50 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 37 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 35 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 21 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 37 losses

Figure 7 shows the number of losses each university’s Men’s Basketball team achieved over the three year period. The Ohio State University fewer losses over the three seasons, 2004-2007 than any of the other five universities. Bowling Green State University had more losses than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget, the team’s success in terms of wins and losses was greater.

Table 3. Interpretation of Men’s Basketball Statistics
Table 3. shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2004-2007 seasons. Table 3. also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2004-2007 seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball Wins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>59.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men's Basketball Losses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>34.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of universities included
Number 1 = University of Akron – 66 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University - 87 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 114 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 72 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 113 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 60 wins

Figure 8. shows the number of wins each university’s Baseball team achieved over the three year period. Miami University amassed more wins in the 2005-2007 seasons than any of the other five universities. The University of Toledo accumulated the least amount of wins during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget does not determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Figure 9. Baseball Losses
Number 1 = University of Akron – 92 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 64 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 64 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 79 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 66 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 101 losses

Figure 9. shows the number of losses each university’s Baseball team achieved over the three year period. Bowling Green University and Miami University amassed fewer losses over the three seasons, 2005-2007 than any of the other four universities. The University of Toledo totaled more losses than the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a large budget, it does not play a role in a team’s success in terms of wins and losses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Wins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>114.00</td>
<td>85.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball Losses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>101.00</td>
<td>77.6667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of universities included

Table 4. shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2005-2007 seasons. Table 4. also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2005-2007 seasons.
Number 1 = University of Akron – 30 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 61 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 40 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 90 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 77 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 44 wins

Figure 10. shows the number of wins each university’s Volleyball team achieved over the three year period. Ohio University amassed more wins in the 2004-2006 seasons than any of the other five universities. The University of Akron accumulated the least amount of wins during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget does not determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Figure 11. Volleyball Losses
Number 1 = University of Akron – 60 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 34 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 50 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 11 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 21 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 44 losses

Figure 11. shows the number of losses each university’s Volleyball team achieved over the three year period. The University of Akron amassed more losses wins in the 2004-2006 seasons than any of the other five universities. Ohio University accumulated the least amount of losses during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget, it does not determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Table 5. Interpretation of Volleyball Statistics
Table 5. shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2004-2006 seasons. Table 5. also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2004-2006 seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Wins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball Losses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>36.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number 1 = University of Akron – 18 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 82 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 35 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 40 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 87 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 36 wins

Figure 12. shows the number of wins each university’s Women’s Basketball team achieved over the three year period. The Ohio State University amassed more wins over the 2004-2007 seasons than any of the other five universities. The University of Akron accumulated the least amount of wins during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that having a larger budget does determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Figure 13. Women’s Basketball Losses
Number 1 = University of Akron – 67 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 15 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 52 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 48 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 12 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 52 losses

Figure 13. shows the number of losses each university’s Women’s Basketball team achieved over the three year period. The University of Akron amassed more losses in the 2004-2007 seasons than any of the other five universities. The Ohio State University accumulated the least amount of losses during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget, it does determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Table 6. Interpretation of Women’s Basketball Statistics
Table 6. shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2004-2007 seasons. Table 6. also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2004-2007 seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball Wins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>87.00</td>
<td>49.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Basketball Losses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>67.00</td>
<td>41.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = Number of universities included
Number 1 = University of Akron – 79 wins
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 100 wins
Number 3 = Miami University – 80 wins
Number 4 = Ohio University – 55 wins
Number 5 = The Ohio University – 106 wins
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 48 wins

Figure 14. shows the number of wins each university’s Softball team achieved over the three year period. The Ohio State University amassed more wins over the 2005-2007 seasons than any of the other five universities. The University of Toledo accumulated the least amount of wins during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that having a larger budget does determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Figure 15. Softball Losses
Number 1 = University of Akron – 77 losses
Number 2 = Bowling Green State University – 83 losses
Number 3 = Miami University – 86 losses
Number 4 = Ohio University – 109 losses
Number 5 = The Ohio State University – 65 losses
Number 6 = University of Toledo – 92 losses

Figure 15. shows the number of losses each university’s Softball team achieved over the three year period. Ohio University amassed more losses in the 2005-2007 seasons than any of the other five universities. The Ohio State University accumulated the least amount of losses during those same three seasons than any of the other five universities. This demonstrates that by having a larger budget, it does determine the team’s success in terms of wins and losses.

Table 7. Interpretation of Softball Statistics
Table 7 shows the minimum number of wins a university achieved, the maximum number of wins a university achieved, and the mean number of wins each university achieved over the 2005-2007 seasons. Table 7 also shows the minimum number of losses a university achieved, the maximum number of losses a university achieved, and the mean number of losses each university achieved over the 2005-2007 seasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Softball Wins</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>106.00</td>
<td>78.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Softball Losses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>109.00</td>
<td>85.333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Summary

The purpose of this study was to provide more research to show that athletic universities that do not have large athletic budgets can still be competitive and successful with schools that have larger funds. By obtaining the athletic budgets from the 2004-2007 fiscal years, along with the athletic records of the individual sports, the researcher analyzed the success of each individual sport through the number of wins and losses amassed to the size of the athletic budget. The researcher attempted to determine the effect an athletic budget has on a university’s athletic success.

The researcher obtained each university’s athletic budget from each Director of the Business Office. The individual records were obtained from each athletic department’s website by the researcher. The athletic budgets were from the 2004-2007 fiscal years. Six sports over and three seasons for each sport were compared, three male and three female. These sports included: football, men’s basketball, baseball, volleyball, women’s basketball, and softball. The athletic budgets for three years 2004-2007, along with the records for the three years 2004-2007, were entered into the SPSS 13.0 statistical software for calculation. Once the data was analyzed, the researcher found that out of the six sports compared, the athletic department with the largest athletic budget, that being The Ohio State University accumulated the most wins in four out of the six sports. Baseball and Volleyball were the only two sports the Buckeyes did not accrue the most wins in over the three seasons that were compared. However, they were second in wins for
those two sports. Through this comparison, it was easy to identify that by having a larger athletic budget available; it will enable you to be more successful on the playing field.

The mean scores in Table 1. showed the athletic budgets increased each year but not significantly. There was a large difference between each university’s athletic budget compared to The Ohio State University’s budget.

Figure 4. showed the mean Football wins. The universities with the two best performances included:

- The Ohio State University: 30 wins
- University of Toledo: 23 wins

Figure 6. showed the mean Men’s Basketball wins. The universities with the two best performances included:

- The Ohio State University: 72 wins
- University of Akron: 69 wins

Figure 8. showed the mean Baseball wins. The universities with the two best performances included:

- Miami University: 114 wins
- The Ohio State University: 113 wins

Figure 10. showed the mean Volleyball wins. The universities with the two best performances included:

- Ohio University: 90 wins
- The Ohio State University: 77 wins

Figure 12. showed the mean Women’s Basketball wins. The universities with the two best performances included:
• The Ohio State University: 87 wins
• Bowling Green State University: 82 wins

Figure 14. showed the mean Softball wins. The universities with the two best performances included:

• The Ohio State University: 106 wins
• Bowling Green State University: 100 wins

Discussion

With college athletics being such a profitable business and so much emphasis placed on wins and losses, it is easy to see why there has been such a drastic increase in athletic budgets over the past five years. A coach is judged on different characteristics off the field as well, but wins and losses remain the number one aspect of their job. The institutions included in this study compete at the NCAA Division I level, an elite level against elite competition. All of these universities that no matter how great or small their athletic budget, they still must prepare year round and produce on game day.

The people that need to put the success of the individual program first are the coaches and the athletic director. If this is not done, these individual’s jobs and overall success of their program is being put at risk. With a lack of success on the playing field can deter their careers for years to come. This study did not focus on the programs past successes or the coaches coaching philosophies. The athletic facilities and the off-season workout program set in place for each individual sports student athlete, along with the number of players a team lost the year before due to graduation or leaving early to turn professional was not taken into account. There are many other factors that need to be taken into account when studying a program’s success other than just their budget. This study was solely based on each sport’s success over a three
year span, compared to the size of their athletic budget as a whole, no matter how large or small. This would allow future research to analyze the human factors involved in this research.

*Future Research*

Do athletes choose a university based on how successful the program is? Are they more worried about playing right away, enabling them to gain experience and national recognition right away? Do off-season workout programs and facilities play a role in a team’s success? These are the qualitative questions that could be included in future research. This study only included the quantitative realm of athletic success in terms of wins and losses compared to the size of the athletic budget available to each individual university in terms of dollars.

In the future, studies need to focus on ways of leveling the playing field among athletic programs from a financial standpoint, or if that is even possible. As well as what truly goes into the overall framework of funding for these big-time athletic programs. By doing these things, it would provide great insight into determining what the true factors are in a program’s success.

The other question that needs to be asked is, “When, if ever does the large number of spending on athletics concede”? The NCAA needs to step in and take charge and put academics at the college level first, not the other way around.

The future research should focus on college athlete’s success in the classroom, not just on the playing field.
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