

2014

An Analysis of a University Reclassification Effect on Applications Following a Move to a New Intercollegiate Athletic Association

Dylan P. Williams

Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations



Part of the [Kinesiology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Williams, Dylan P., "An Analysis of a University Reclassification Effect on Applications Following a Move to a New Intercollegiate Athletic Association" (2014). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 3018.

https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/3018

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF A UNIVERSITY RECLASSIFICATION EFFECT ON
APPLICATIONS FOLLOWING A MOVE TO A NEW INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The School of Kinesiology

by
Dylan P. Williams
B.S., Southeastern Louisiana University, 2007
M.B.A., Southeastern Louisiana University, 2008
August 2014

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Donald and Debbie Williams, my “three” brothers, Donnie, Dathan, and Mario, and my fiancé, Kineta. Without their love and encouragement, I would not have been able to complete this project and accomplish my goals.

Acknowledgements

I must begin by saying thank you to my Lord and my savior Jesus Christ for giving me the courage to earn my doctorate and the strength to endure the trials and tribulations that I have encountered during this process. Everything I worked hard to achieve could not be accomplished without God giving me guidance and knowledge to succeed. Thank you Lord for not only the great things that I have done here but for the times when I needed your guidance the most. I am truly thankful for everything, and I will continue praise and worship you.

While my four years at LSU were both fun and challenging, there have been many people that I need to thank for their efforts during this entire process. First and foremost, I am grateful to have met my fiancé Kineta when I first started my coursework. You have put up with me during some of the hardest times within this process, but I am truly grateful to have you by my side and I look forward to our future together. I am also grateful to have the love and support from my family including my parents, Donald and Deborah Williams; my brother Donnie, his wife Tammy, and their children Riley and Karli; my brother Dathan; and my close cousin, who is like my “third” brother, Mario. Anytime that I felt lost or down, you all provided me with the encouragement to keep going.

I am also grateful to have some of the best friends that I could ever hope to have in life. I first must thank my best friend Chris Pousson and his wife Kelly for their advice when I was considering working on my doctorate. I have truly enjoyed the last 10+ years of our friendship, and I know that despite long distances and what life gives us, we will continue to have that bond. I am also grateful to have gotten to know my close friend

Andrew Brister while I have been at LSU. Thank you for being there to listen to my frustration about school, life, the Saints, all LSU sports, and whatever else came along this process. Another person that I am thankful for having as a friend is my fellow Ph.D. colleague Patrick Tutka. While we did not understand one another when we first met, we got to know one another and bond as friends. I have enjoyed our daily conversations on sports, politics, relationships, and of course the differences between the North and South. I look forward to continuing with you as we both progress in our careers. Finally, I want to thank my friends Greg Hamlin, Joel Pena, Justin Mahe, Pat Hardin, Anthony Rutledge and his wife Sarah, and Tia Friel and her husband Connell, simply for being my friends, and I am looking forward to celebrate with you all in the near future.

I am also truly grateful to my dissertation committee. First, to my advisor and committee chair, Dr. Chad Seifried, thank you for your advice throughout this dissertation project and the numerous projects that we have worked on together. I may not have understood everything you suggested at the time but I thank you for being patient with me as I grew into a better scholar. I am also grateful for everything that you have exposed to me in our field, and I hope to continue to build on those aspects as I continue my career. To Dr. Brian Soebbing, although you only served as a committee member, I have enjoyed being able to ask you for feedback on this project as well as class and manuscript preparation. Thank you for taking time out of your day to answer the questions that I had about every single aspect of the dissertation, especially the statistical side. To Dr. Jimmy Smith, this dissertation would not exist without your help back in 2012 when you and Brian both allowed me to participate in a project related to your dissertation. That presentation has led to this project and many others that will soon

follow. To Dr. Kwame Agyemang, thank you for your comments and support throughout this process as well as the much needed Twitter comment or joke to break the monotony. Finally, to Dean Damon Andrew, I have enjoyed every opportunity to converse with you, even if it was for a few minutes with your busy schedule. I cannot thank you enough for agreeing to be on my committee, and I am grateful for all the advice that you have given me.

Finally I would be remiss if I did not thank certain individuals that I have had the pleasure of working with over the last four years. First, I must thank Dr. Aaron Clopton for accepting me into the Ph.D. program back in 2010. Although you left to go to the University of Kansas after my first year, I am still very appreciative of the opportunity that you provided me here at LSU. I also need to thank Dr. T. Gilmour Reeve for supporting the Sport Management Ph.D. program and allowing me to enroll in 2010. Finally, to Dr. Dee Jacobson, thank you for always believing in me and providing a welcoming environment to us Graduate Assistants. I am very thankful for all the conversations that we have had the last four years and your suggestions as how I can improve as a teacher.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	ix
Abstract	xi
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Background of the Problem	5
Legitimacy and College Movement	7
The Benefits of Sports	10
Statement of the Problem	11
Conceptual Framework	13
Research Setting	14
Research Questions	15
Summary	15
Justification and Significance	16
Limitations	18
Delimitations	18
Organization of the Study	19
Chapter 2 – Searching for Legitimacy	21
Legitimacy	22
Institution	33
Institutional Strategy	35
Social Identity Theory and Mobility	39
Conclusion	45
Chapter 3 – The Novelty of College Movement	50
College Movement	51
Flutie Effect	58
Conclusion	68
Chapter 4 – Methodology	69
Historical Research Design	69
Model One Research Design	72
Dependent Variable	74
Independent Variables	74
Control Variables	82
Model and Estimation Technique	83
Estimation Issues	86
Model Two Research Design	87
Dependent Variable	88
Independent Variables	88
Control Variables	88

Model and Estimation Technique	93
Estimation Issues	95
Chapter 5 – The History of the NAIA	97
The Inception Period (1935 – 1945)	97
The Postwar Period (1945 – 1952)	110
The Expansion Period (1952 – 1958)	129
The Establishment Period (1958 – 1962).....	145
The Conflict Period (1962-1966).....	170
The Refinement Period (1966 – 1971).....	195
The Maturity Period (1971 – 1975)	212
The A.D. (After Duer) Period (1975 – 1986)	233
The Decline Period (1986 – 1995).....	271
The Stabilization Period (1995 – 2002).....	298
Aftermath and Summary.....	311
Chapter 6 – Statistical Analysis	317
Model One	317
Summary Statistics.....	318
Results	322
Model Two – Overall Model	332
Summary Statistics.....	333
Correlation Coefficients.....	337
Results.....	342
Model Two - Geographic Regions.....	344
Summary Statistics.....	344
Results	351
Model Two - NCAA Division	362
Summary Statistics.....	362
Results	364
Chapter 7 – Discussion	368
University Movement	368
Private Colleges	368
Women’s Colleges	369
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	370
Geographic Location.....	372
Carnegie Size Classification	374
Religious Affiliation	376
Sponsored Sports	377
NAIA Leadership.....	379
Summary	382
Reclassification Effect	382
Overall Model	383
Geographic Region	385
NCAA Division	386

Summary	387
Chapter 8 – Conclusion.....	389
Limitations	397
Future Areas of Research.....	399
Historical Track	399
Empirical Track.....	403
References	407
Vita.....	452

List of Tables

Table 2-1 - Sub-Types of Legitimacy	27
Table 4-1 - IPEDS Regions.....	76
Table 4-2 - Religion Classifications	78
Table 5-1 - 1938 NAIB Board of Management	102
Table 5-2 - 1940 NAIB Executive Committee and Officers	107
Table 5-3 - 1953 NAIA Annual Membership Dues.....	130
Table 5-4 - 1958-59 NAIA Executive Committee Supervisory Responsibilities.....	150
Table 5-5 - 1959-60 NAIA Annual Membership Dues	157
Table 5-6 - NAIA Representation Request to the USOC	178
Table 5-7 - NAIA Representative Distribution for Olympic Games	193
Table 5-8 - NAIA Membership Violating Rules in 1969-70.....	206
Table 5-9 - 1993 NAIA Division I Men's Basketball Region Alignment	294
Table 5-10 - 1993 NAIA Division II Men's Basketball Region Alignment	295
Table 6-1 - Summary Statistics for Model One	318
Table 6-2 - University Tabulations for Model One	319
Table 6-3 - University Tabulations by Division Movement.....	321
Table 6-4 - Division II Movement	324
Table 6-5 - Division III Movement.....	329
Table 6-6 - Summary Statistics for Model 2A.....	334
Table 6-7 - Summary Statistics for Model 2B	335
Table 6-8 - University Tabulations for Model Two.....	337
Table 6-9 - Correlation Matrix for Reclassification Effect - Model 2A.....	338

Table 6-10 - Correlation Matrix for Reclassification Effect - Model 2B	340
Table 6-11 - Reclassification Effect - 5 Years.....	342
Table 6-12 - Reclassification Effect - 10 Years.....	343
Table 6-13 - Summary Statistics by Geographic Region for Model 2A.....	345
Table 6-14 - Summary Statistics by Geographic Region for Model 2B.....	349
Table 6-15 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2A (Five Years)	352
Table 6-16 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2A (Ten Years)	354
Table 6-17 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2B (Five Years)	357
Table 6-18 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2B (Ten Years)	359
Table 6-19 - Summary Statistics by NCAA Division.....	363
Table 6-20 - Reclassification Effect for Division II	365
Table 6-21 - Reclassification Effect for Division III	366
Table 8-1 – Model One Significant Results.....	390
Table 8-2 – Model Two (Overall Model) Significant Results.....	392

Abstract

Scholars have argued that athletics are utilized by universities to advertise their school to all individuals (Collins, 2012; Dwyer, Eddy, Havard, & Braa, 2010; Toma & Cross, 1998; Washington & Ventresca, 2004; Weaver, 2010). Expectedly, university officials are willing to contribute resources in order to develop an effective athletics program to establish an institution's legitimacy among other universities (Collins, 2012; Toma & Cross, 1998; Washington & Ventresca, 2004). One tactic employed by schools focuses on the process of athletic association reclassification into the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) from other member associations (e.g., National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics). Officials consider this move due to the NCAA's identity as the premiere intercollegiate athletic association. As such, studies on college movement recognized that universities are more likely to move to the NCAA if other universities with shared characteristics have reclassified in order to become legitimate among peers (Smith, Williams, Soebbing, & Washington, 2013; Washington, 2004; 2004-05). However, research has not been conducted to estimate the quantity and duration of a potential 'reclassification' effect. The purpose of this dissertation is to determine if a change in athletic association will increase the number of application receives after reclassification. The dissertation analyzes this phenomenon through the movement of former NAIA member schools from 1959 to 2012 to the NCAA.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

According to Washington and Patterson (2011), one of the prevalent theories in management literature as well as in sport management literature is institutional theory. Specifically, sport management scholars have concentrated on the concept of isomorphism, which is the pressure to adopt structures, services, or forms within an organizational field (Boxenbaum & Jonsson, 2008). Isomorphism studies within sport management include works reviewing the influence pressure from Sport Canada for National Sport Organizations to change (Slack & Hinings, 1994), the formalization within a Canadian amateur ice hockey organization (Stevens & Slack, 1998), the low percentage of black coaches in college sports (Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2001), and the relationship between the status of soccer clubs in the English Premier League and their website design (Lamertz, Carney, & Bastien, 2008). However, Washington and Patterson (2011) argued sport management scholars should explore other institutional theory concepts such as the diffusion of innovation studies, distinctions between early and late adopters, a focus on the organizational field, and the adoption of rationalized myths by formal organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Meyer & Scott, 1983; Tolbert & Zucker, 1983). Washington and Patterson (2011) also identified sport management researchers have conducted fewer studies on the institutionalization of sport organizations and specifically legitimacy.

Successful organizations often obtain legitimacy among rival firms through affiliation (Oliver, 1997). DiMaggio and Powell (1983) detailed organizations competing for vital resources and power need institutional legitimacy to achieve prosperity. For universities, school officials institute programs that will allow the institution to mimic

and surpass other universities in order to attract students. One specific program utilized for this purpose is intercollegiate athletics. According to several researchers (Collins, 2012; Toma & Cross, 1998; Washington & Ventresca, 2004), university officials contribute significant resources to create an effective athletics program with the goal of establishing an institution's legitimacy among peer universities and subsequent generation of significant increases in alumni donations, game attendance, and student body population (Collins, 2012; Toma & Cross, 1998; Washington & Ventresca, 2004). Through athletic contests, university decision makers create an effective marketing tool that allows the institution to alter its perception and acquire legitimacy within its organizational field (Tomasini, 2005).

Affiliation in college sports focuses on the associations universities have among other institutions within the organizational field of intercollegiate athletics. This organizational field is comprised of the largest and popular athletic association governing bodies: the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). Both organizations compete over symbolic resources and legitimization through the acceptance of field participants that are needed for survival (Washington, 2004). These elements are essential for these firms compared to material and tangible resources since both organizations institute different strategies to acquire environmental resources (Galvin, 2002). Finally, both athletic associations conduct what is known as institutional strategy, which describes "patterns of actions that are concerned with managing the institutional structure" of membership and standards of practice (Lawrence, 1999, p. 162).

Similar to the associations, each university prepares a specific institutional strategy to manage its standards of practice. Collins (2012) identified this practice as an athletics strategy and is implemented to manage a university's athletic affairs. Specifically, athletic departments will develop certain courses of action to execute their various sport program initiatives. Projects included in an athletics strategy involve the addition or removal of a program, the hiring and firing of coaching staffs, the construction of new or the renovation of existing facilities, the decision to affiliate with a particular conference, and the reclassification of a university to a different level of athletic competition (Collins, 2012). Through the contribution of resources, university administrators have a distinct appreciation for intercollegiate athletics as it serves as a form of advertising that has the ability to reach a broader base of individuals and achieve sport success (Weaver, 2010). As a return on investment, officials believe the university will receive improved media coverage that will increase awareness among other institutions and attract a higher student population (Collins, 2012; Toma & Cross, 1998; Washington & Ventresca, 2004). Many researchers recognized a prominent athletic campaign can be utilized as an advertisement for potential applicants (Dosh, 2012; Goff, 2000; Weaver, 2010). As a successful team becomes better known, incoming students may be more inclined to apply and enroll at the institution for their academic pursuits. This increase (i.e., Flutie Effect) exists temporarily but has provided substantial applications and enrollment figures to institutions (Hansen, 2011).

Typically, athletic success is synonymous with many of the universities associated with the NCAA and Division I (Getz & Siegfried, 2010; McCormick & Tinsley, 1987; Mixon & Hsing, 1994; Mixon & Ressler, 1995; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto,

2004). For teams without a great history of athletic success, the novelty of athletic achievement becomes a cost-effective marketing instrument that encourages many individuals to view the institution differently and potentially encourage students to apply and enroll (Tomasini, 2005). Several recent examples of studies following the Flutie Effect examined these outcomes after the successes of Butler University, George Mason University, and Northwestern University during their men's basketball and football seasons (Baker, 2008; Dosh, 2012; Selingo, 1997). With multiple schools attaining this phenomenon, one can argue that university officials concluded that an investment of resources towards athletics in order to achieve performance goals would be a sound strategy to capture similar gains in student body population.

Based upon the gains at these schools, many university officials could also logically assume that other changes in an athletic strategy could achieve a similar result. One area in particular is a university's affiliation with an athletic association. Past research noted that schools consider changing athletic affiliations in order to improve their institution's legitimacy (Smith, Williams, Soebbing, & Washington, 2013; Washington, 2004; 2004-05). Specifically, university officials believe by aligning with the NCAA, the institution will improve its perception among other firms and allow for an increase in new students (Keller, 2004; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). Historically, movement between associations has occurred at a steady pace since the 1950s when both the NCAA and the NAIA established themselves as the premiere intercollegiate sport associations in the United States (Washington, 2004; 2004-05). Therefore, the purpose of the dissertation is to first review the history of university movement from the NAIA to the NCAA with respect to the NAIA's legitimacy within the organizational field of

intercollegiate athletics. Second, the dissertation analyzes one potential consequence of university movement, a temporary increase in applications. Specifically, the dissertation explores if an increase in applications (i.e., Reclassification Effect) can be obtained and for how long for schools transitioning from the NAIA to the NCAA.

Background of the Problem

According to Getz and Siegfried (2010), the NCAA has traditionally been acknowledged as a prestigious college sports association due to its affiliation with prominent universities. However, in the mid-20th century, the NCAA faced strong competition from the NAIA (Smith, 1987; 2000). A group of smaller colleges in 1937 founded the NAIA due to the colleges' concerns with the NCAA (Wilson, 2005). Many decision makers from these institutions felt they would not be considered for postseason competition in the NCAA's sponsored championships in relation to their much larger peers. As such, these smaller colleges decided to form their own college athletic body, first as a basketball centered organization, later evolving into an intercollegiate athletic association that sponsored multiple sports (Hoover, 1958).

The NAIA was able to differentiate from its NCAA counterpart by developing relationships with colleges that were traditionally not viewed as a prototypical NCAA member. Schools identified as teaching colleges, liberal arts colleges, and historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) were classified as smaller colleges and did not have a proper designation within the NCAA (Washington, 2004). By supporting universities with these characteristics, the NAIA provided an alternative organization that would suit the respective needs and visions of the smaller school (Smith, 1988). With a sizeable population of smaller schools, this strategy allowed the young organization to

establish itself as a legitimate association within intercollegiate sports. The NAIA's obtainment of legitimacy matches Scott's (1995) argument where firms must meet "a condition reflecting cultural alignment, normative support, or consonance with relevant rules or laws" (p. 45). In addition, the NAIA used the power of affiliation as a means to accrue its legitimacy within the organizational field (Oliver, 1997). As such, the NAIA was able to establish a substantial niche within intercollegiate athletics while emphasizing a decentralized management approach opposed to the NCAA's centralized governing methodology (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005).

The NAIA and the NCAA continually implemented measures in order to attract members and maintain their respective legitimacy. Specifically, both organizations faced mimetic pressures in order to adapt in the ever changing world of intercollegiate athletics. In 1957, for example, NCAA officials agreed to reorganize its firm into a revolutionary two division structure that allowed the organization to provide services to schools the NCAA often ignored in the past (Falla, 1981). This structure called for the separation of many of the original members of the NCAA, which consisted of the large universities in the U.S., from the smaller colleges and universities (Falla, 1981; Wilson, 2005). Ironically, these divisions were to be called the University Division and the College Division. According to Washington (2004), the NCAA's decision to officially designate the College Division was an attempt to solicit smaller colleges in the NAIA to join the NCAA. Furthermore, the College Division also provided the NCAA a way to accept HBCUs into membership (Katz, 1990; & McLendon, 1988).

Although the two divisional structure was successful, the NAIA and the NCAA still maintained relatively similar membership counts (Wilson, 2005). By 1966,

membership in the NAIA grew to 517 members while the more established NCAA, in comparison, possessed 536 members (Washington, 2004-05). The organizations would continue to engage in a membership stalemate until 1973 when the NCAA began discussions for a new reorganizational effort. It was at this time that NCAA officials agreed to a second reorganizational effort, establishing the current three division structure (Washington, 2004-05). Unlike the prior reorganization effort, the NAIA viewed this new initiative by the NCAA as a direct threat to the values and goals maintained of the NAIA (Wilson 2005). Specifically, NAIA officials viewed Division III as a direct competitor since the NCAA adopted many of the philosophies that the NAIA maintained at the time. Furthermore, many NAIA members were enticed by the financial commitment that the NCAA made to support both Division II and Division III (“Football Rights Fees Announced”, 1976; Washington, 2004-05).

Legitimacy and College Movement

With increased financial support and the NCAA’s establishment as the premiere college sports association, many NAIA members began to change their athletic affiliation and reclassify to the NCAA (Smith, 1988; Washington, 2004). According to Wilson (2005) as well as the NAIA website (“About the NAIA”, n.d.), the NAIA lost over 250 members between 1973 and the present time either to defection to the NCAA or removal of sports programs. During this same time period, Washington (2004) calculated that the NCAA added nearly the same amount of schools the NAIA had lost.

According to Land (1977) and Washington (1999), member schools from both organizations held the NCAA in higher prestige as the organization still associated with large universities. On the other hand, the NAIA maintained its association with many

smaller schools and conceptually maintained an identity as a lower-order organization (Land, 1977; Washington 1999). As more institutions viewed both organizations in this way, the schools started to analyze their own legitimacy and determine if their affiliations were altering the perception of their university. Thus, many small schools were presented with the choice to join a prestigious organization (i.e., the NCAA) or maintain the less admired image of a smaller college (i.e., the NAIA) (Washington, 2004-05).

Both Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004; 2004-05) have argued the use of social identities has influenced the decision to reclassify from the NAIA to the NCAA. For example, officials from Northeastern Oklahoma State University (NOSU) of Tahlequah, Oklahoma, and Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SOSU) of Durant, Oklahoma, decided to transfer their athletic association membership to the NCAA (“SOSU Leaves NAIA for NCAA”, 1994). Within, both schools noted their decision to move into the NCAA was related to the high number of schools within their area and conference choosing to also move into the NCAA. This example highlights the influence social identities (e.g., conference alignment, geographical location, and competition within sport) have on the decision to align with the NCAA in an attempt to acquire legitimacy within intercollegiate athletics.

Several researchers examined the influence social identities have on athletic affiliation reclassification over the last three decades (Smith, 2011; Smith et al., 2013; Washington, 2004-05; Weaver, 2010). For instance, Washington (2004-05) noted NAIA universities reclassifying to the NCAA between 1973 and 1999 departed from the NAIA due to the organization’s declining legitimacy. Furthermore, these member schools analyzed their involvement with the fleeting association and if continued association

could cause implications to their own organizational identity. Washington (2004-05) also showed that many NAIA members moved due to certain shared characteristics with departed institutions such as past NAIA conference association or HBCU designation. Smith et al. (2013) further acknowledged other identities influence reclassification including women-only college designation and geographical locations as defined by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Along with shared characteristics, Smith (2011) noted NAIA member schools left the organization for the NCAA due to the perceived benefits the association could provide their institution. Through an analysis of the institution's archetype, or description of the meaning of an organization (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980), Smith (2011) discovered NAIA members left the organization due to its current standing within the organizational field in comparison to the NCAA. Specifically, the universities included in the study noted the NCAA created additional opportunities for recruiting students to their school as many recruits appeared to be unaware of the NAIA (Smith, 2011). Based on Smith's (2011) findings, it appears university officials assume a reclassification from the NAIA to the NCAA will raise awareness for the university, conforming to a rationalized myth of intercollegiate sports. Meyer and Rowan (1977) defined rationalized myths as "practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work and institutionalized in society" (p. 340). By adopting a rationalized myth, an organization can increase its legitimacy as well as its survival prospects within the organizational field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977).

The Benefits of Sports

While officials consider reclassification strategies through this philosophy, several researchers have not confirmed if actual results match the perceived benefits. Tomasini (2005) examined the economical differences from 27 institutions that reclassified from either Division II or Division III to the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) of Division I between 1993 and 1999 and found reclassification did not result in a significant increase in revenue or game attendance. Frieder (2007) similarly analyzed financial data of 29 schools moving from either the FCS to the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) of Division I or from Division II to the Division I-FCS. The results of the study showed while revenues increased for most schools, the financial gains were offset by increased expenditures due to the reclassification (Frieder, 2007).

Dwyer, Eddy, Havard, and Braa (2010) tracked the reclassification efforts of one Rocky Mountain Region institution in 2002 from Division II to Division I. According to Dwyer et al. (2010), the administrators of the university believed the move would increase revenue, exposure, fan support, and admissions. However, the study noted the school saw decreases in all these areas after the university's reclassification. Weaver (2010) analyzed the reclassification strategy of two North Carolina universities to determine if their respective moves were beneficial to their institutions. His study found the movement for one of the schools did not meet the expectations of the administrators while the second university received acclaim that could not be obtained previously (Weaver, 2010).

While these studies show mixed to negative results after reclassification, there are limitations that have not been addressed in prior works. First, research on

reclassifications has only focused on a small sample of institutions that have reclassified over a short period of time (Frieder, 2007; Tomasini, 2005). Second, many studies focused on interorganizational reclassification (i.e., Division I-FCS to FBS; Division III to Division II; Division II to Division I-FCS; etc.) (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010) and, thus, ignored the potential impact that can be generated from the reclassification of athletic associations.

Finally, while Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004-05) identified prominent characteristics that have influenced college reclassification, neither study analyzes the specific reclassification destination and if certain characteristics can influence the move. For example, both NOSU and SOSU noted their reasoning for joining Division II was due to the high number of institutions participating in Division II football within their geographic location in comparison to NAIA member schools (“Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should”, 1999). Thus, it would be more beneficial for schools to analyze the aims and scope of each of the NCAA divisions to determine which level would work best for an institution’s athletic affairs in order to obtain the assumed benefits branding and outreach (Dwyer et al., 2010; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

University officials will more likely consider reclassification into the NCAA based on social characteristics in order to conform to rationalized myths for the accruelement of legitimacy within the organizational field (Keller, 2004; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). This rationale is based under the belief that NCAA affiliation is considered to be a societal mandate that allows for the accruelement of legitimacy. Furthermore, an institution can improve its image within the public eye through the

NCAA's branding and outreach since sports are viewed as an effective advertising vehicle (Smith, 2011; Tomasini, 2005; Weaver, 2010)). Thus, university officials could utilize a reclassification effort to bring awareness to the university as it conforms to the generalized beliefs of the organizational field of intercollegiate athletics. Furthermore, the reclassification could also allow for a temporary increase of student applications and enrollment as well as increased financial standing and emotional support (Keller, 2004; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010).

Despite this logical progression, limited research exists to confirm that a university's reclassification from one athletic association to another will generate these desired results (i.e., reclassification effect). Past studies show institutions conducting a reclassification effort based upon the perceived benefits enjoyed mixed results and have been limited to the qualitative and case study methodologies. Further, these studies analyzed the outcomes of reclassification based on the views of stakeholders involved in the process. Although these perspectives can prove certain elements to be true or false, they do not acknowledge or monitor the activity of other similar schools that may or may not be considering a similar movement strategy. As such, this dissertation will conduct an empirical analysis on the likelihood of a university transitioning from the NAIA to either NCAA Division II or Division III based on a school's social identities. Furthermore, this dissertation will analyze the movement of universities formerly associated with the NAIA from 1959 to 2012 to become a member of the NCAA determine if athletic affiliation has a significant impact on the number of applications that a school receives.

Conceptual Framework

Traditionally, researchers identify intercollegiate athletic success as advertising vehicle for institutions. These include McCormick and Tinsley (1987) who noted that schools participating in big-time athletic conferences foresee a 3% increase in the average SAT scores for entering freshman. Mixon and Ressler (1995) estimated out-of-state applications for each round a university advances to in the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament. Finally, Pope and Pope (2009) discovered the long term success of football and basketball teams increase the quantity of applications by 2-8% for Top 20 football schools and Top 16 basketball schools. While athletic success is proven to attract students, research is limited on measuring other athletic department events and its effects on the student body population.

The purpose of this dissertation is to identify and understand the rationale for universities to consider a transitional move from the NAIA to the NCAA in an attempt to acquire legitimacy through an analysis of social identities. Institutions that have considered this move have based their decision on the rationalized myth that the NCAA is the premiere intercollegiate athletic association (Getz & Siegfried, 2010; Falla, 1981). University officials conduct an organizational change process of social mobility which Rao, Davis, and Ward (2000) noted analyzes the firm's environment for potential alterations to its identity. In terms of affiliation, universities associated with the NAIA may determine that association with the organization is a detriment to their own identity and choose to depart for the NCAA, which is established as the premiere intercollegiate athletic association within society. According to Rao et al. (2000), if organizations share social characteristics with prior defectors, there is a greater possibility of a firm's

defection to enhance the firm's identity. Theoretically, this is a possible argument for NAIA member schools to depart for the NCAA.

Furthermore, many of these institutions operated under the possible assumption that through NCAA affiliation, the school will see an increase in student applications. In order to determine if college movement can generate a potential Reclassification Effect, this dissertation will analyze the methodology behind the aforementioned Flutie Effect as well as other variations of its methodology such as the Novelty Effect of professional sports stadiums and arenas (e.g., Clapp & Hakes, 2005; Coates & Humphreys, 2005; Leadley & Zygmunt, 2006; McEvoy, Nagel, DeSchrive, & Brown, 2005; Noll, 1974). The belief new stadium construction increases attendance is similar to a university's belief that athletic association reclassification can raise university awareness to attract students and establish the university's legitimacy among its peers. Because of these similarities, this dissertation develops a parallel methodology to measure the effect of a reclassification effort from the NAIA to the NCAA.

Research Setting

To provide a more comprehensible outline of this dissertation, it is important to discuss the specific aspects of the population. The population for this dissertation will involve the membership of the NAIA from 1959 to 2012. This time period is important for this dissertation as it includes activity of NAIA schools both before and after the NCAA's reorganization effort in 1973. NAIA membership records were obtained directly from the NAIA and confirmed through the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the IPEDS database provides basic data on postsecondary education in the U.S.

in order to describe and determine trends in terms of the number of students enrolled, the number of faculty and staff employed, the number of degrees earned, and the total amount of dollars expended (“About IPEDS”, n.d.”).

Research Questions

The general research questions for this dissertation include the following:

1: Does the history of the NAIA provide a rationale for the change in membership with respect to the organization’s/association’s legitimacy?

2: Do particular social identities predict the likelihood that NAIA schools will transition from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II or from the NAIA to NCAA Division III?

3: Does a transition from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II or III lead to an increase in applications? If so, how long does this “Reclassification Effect” last?

Summary

The overall purpose of this dissertation is to examine the history of movement from the NAIA to the NCAA, with relation to the NAIA’s legitimacy, and the potential benefits a university may receive after reclassifying. To research this potential effect, this dissertation analyzes the history of movement between the NCAA and the NAIA. According to Washington (2004-05), many NAIA member schools departed the association for the NCAA due to the perceived declining legitimacy of the NAIA. Smith (2011) elaborated that university officials believed association with the NCAA would allow the school to take advantage of the organization’s brand to assist in recruiting efforts. Tomasini (2005) also noted successful athletic programs have the ability to generate increases in alumni donations, gate attendance, game revenue, and student

enrollment. As such, university officials contribute resources into their athletic programs with the belief the institution will receive notoriety among their peers. Currently, limited research proves these accusations to be true or false. As such, this dissertation will conduct an empirical analysis on the likelihood of a Reclassification Effect from the NAIA to a specific NCAA division. Furthermore, this dissertation will also analyze the application data of all institutions associated with the NAIA and NCAA to determine a school's athletic association can contribute to the number of applications that a school receives as well as overall student body enrollment.

Justification and Significance

University officials long held that an institution's identity should be developed in order to create value and achieve legitimacy among their peer institutions through NCAA affiliation (Dwyer et al., 2010). Specifically, "proponents of intercollegiate athletics assert a symbiotic relationship exists between athletics and academics, with universities benefitting economically by participation in intercollegiate athletics" (Tomasini, 2005, p. 9). As such, universities should see increases in alumni donations, attendance at sporting events, public perception and prestige, visibility, and applications and enrollment because of the increased exposure related to the reclassification efforts (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Goff, 2000; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). However, the moves by past institutions have not met those expectations (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010) as decision makers did not account for the increased costs of reclassification. Opposed to the cost of reclassification, this study will help schools considering reclassification if a temporary increase in enrollment can be achieved and for how long this will occur. This research will allow

decision makers to properly frame their university's strategy to meet its respective goals with an understanding of the intercollegiate athletic environment.

In addition, through a historical analysis of NAIA membership, this dissertation will detail the organizational field alterations that caused several institutions to depart the NAIA for the NCAA. This analysis will provide a necessary historical background to identify how the rationalized myths of the intercollegiate athletic organization field were established. Specifically, the historical analysis can determine how association with the NCAA became the societal mandate for intercollegiate athletics. Past research also analyzed reclassification to the NCAA from a general standpoint without specific divisional classification. University officials build their institutional strategy through firmly established goals and consider associations that will allow the university to reach those goals (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010). This research will remind decision makers to analyze the best possible location for their respective institution.

Finally, this study will also closely examine the NCAA's transition procedures for schools. Smith et al. (2013) noted many institutions applying to the NCAA have undertaken drastic changes to their athletic departments. While the process can be unique for each university, this research will provide the NCAA with further analysis to alleviate potential complications during the transition process such as issues with educational compliance and other transitional requirements. For the NAIA, this research can identify areas the organization will need to improve upon to enhance its overall image. With information on the probability of movement and actual results, the NAIA could alter their by-laws and rules to better accommodate their current membership and attract new schools to join the association. Furthermore, the historical analysis of the NAIA displays

several events that were detrimental to the association and how decision making can be approved for the association when faced with similar challenges.

Limitations

The limitations for this dissertation are based on the utilization of governmental data acquired from the IPEDS database. Because this information is collected by a third-party, the accuracy of the data may be called into question. Specifically, there may be errors in the numbers reported in the data as well as the potential for missing data on certain variables needed for the analysis. In addition, the historical section of this dissertation cannot be fully validated due to the failure of the NAIA organization to preserve much of its documents. According to Hoover (1958), Land (1977), and Wilson (2005), much of the early records of the NAIA were lost to a fire in 1943. Furthermore, a complete file of data was lost during the process of moving the executive offices from the campus of Pepperdine University in Los Angeles, California to Kansas City in 1957 (Hoover, 1958). In the end, information contained in the historical portion of this analysis required the use of newspaper articles and available primary data from the NAIA.

Delimitations

The considerations for delimitations for this dissertation involve the boundaries of historical research for the NCAA. Information regarding the NCAA throughout the historical portion of this dissertation is utilized only through the engagement of conflict with the NAIA. While this conflict does include information on specific watershed moments for the NCAA, a historical analysis of the organization is not included in this dissertation. Furthermore, previous research on college movement has examined the

movement from the NAIA to the NCAA from a general membership basis (e.g., Smith et al., 2013; Washington, 2004; 2004-05). This dissertation considers the movement of universities from the NAIA to the NCAA based upon their choice of NCAA divisional hierarchy through the use of mixed methodology involving both historical analysis and quantitative methods. However, past studies (e.g. Dwyer et al. 2010; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010) have utilized qualitative methodology to understand the university's decision to move into the NCAA. While this particular type of research analysis has its advantages, it was not utilized for this study due to the potential for variability among results for the Reclassification Effect.

Organization of the Study

This dissertation is organized into eight chapters. Following the introduction, the second chapter is a review of literature on the topics of legitimacy, institutional strategy, diffusion, social identity theory, and social mobility. Chapter 3 reviews the literature on college movement as well as an analysis of studies similar to the Reclassification Effect. Chapter 4 describes the data used in this research and includes a description of the conceptual models that will be estimated and the methodologies that will be employed to accomplish the research objectives. Chapter 5 contains the results of the historical analysis of the NAIA to communicate the various reasons and the context for why schools considered reclassification following the process established by Seifried (2010) regarding historical research in sport management. Chapter 6 consists of a descriptive analysis of the model's results. Chapter 7 provides a detailed analysis of the statistical findings within the theoretical framework provided in Chapters 2 and 3. Finally, this

dissertation will conclude with Chapter 8, which involves a summary of the work and offers future topics or points of emphasis to study.

Chapter 2 – Searching for Legitimacy

The purpose of this chapter is to review the conceptual basis for university movement into a new athletic association. First, the chapter will provide a brief overview of the concept of legitimacy and its relation to the institutional strategy of membership organizations. This examination will be followed by a discussion on the diffusion of practices within an organizational field as well as the institutional isomorphism that causes organizations to consider change. From this analysis, organizations appear to review their own identities to rationalize their decision to alter their affiliations. Thus, this section will also provide an analysis of the social identity theory and its potential to cause movement of organizations. Finally, this discussion will conclude with a brief discussion on the movement of universities from the NAIA to the NCAA in order to maintain legitimacy through social identity theory and diffusion.

Many schools associated within the NAIA chose to depart the organization for more lucrative opportunities provided by the NCAA (Smith, 2011). While each university maintained its own reasons for departing the NAIA, the overall movement between associations highlights the relationship that organizations have with affiliations. Affiliations provide firms with opportunities to focus on broad interlocks and networks amongst firms (Benjamin & Podolny, 1999). Furthermore, organizations are able to craft an identity through affiliation. According to Ashforth and Mael (1989), firms place themselves into groups based upon certain characteristics to create value for both the organization and affiliated grouping. These established affiliations would then provide firms with the opportunity to achieve legitimacy while causing the diffusion of practices and crafting institutional strategy throughout larger organizational fields.

Legitimacy

The concept of legitimacy within the organizational theory literature can be defined as “a generalized perception or assumption that the actions of an entity are desirable, proper, or appropriate within some socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions” (Suchman, 1995, p. 574). In other words, organizations cannot simply acquire or possess legitimacy but rather firms must meet “a condition reflecting cultural alignment, normative support, or consonance with relevant rules or laws” (Scott, 1995, p. 45). This concept differs substantially from two other closely related terms, status and reputation. Status is “a socially constructed, intersubjectively agreed-upon and accepted ordering or ranking” of social actors (Washington & Zajac, 2005, p. 284). Benjamin and Podolny (1999) noted that status rankings can be based on the esteem that an individual or organization has through their affiliation or adoption of certain practices, values and traits. In comparison, Deephouse and Suchman (2008) (cf. Ferguson, Deephouse, & Ferguson, 2000; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova, & Sever, 2005) defined reputation as “a generalized expectation about a firm’s future behavior or performance based on collective perceptions (either direct or, more often, vicarious) of past behavior or performance” (p. 59-60).

These three concepts are very similar in nature and have been used interchangeably by society at large concealing the difference of the terms (Higgins & Gulati, 2003). This confusion is not uncommon since all three can focus on cultural factors in organizational life; all suggest that an organization can garner resources by conforming to social norms; and all emphasize that objective performance criteria may not be the best judge of the social signals of the world (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008).

As such, literatures on the concepts share the social perception of conformity as being a central determinant of organization success. However, according to Deephouse and Suchman (2008), legitimacy is fundamentally dichotomous from both status and reputation since legitimation is “a question of ‘satisficing’ to an acceptable level, and the absence of negative ‘problems’ is more important than the presence of positive achievements” (p. 60). Meyer and Rowan (1977) explained that legitimacy is fundamentally non-rival, meaning positive feedback and confidence creates win-win situations of mutual affirmation among legitimate actors. Legitimacy is homogenized as it produces a herd-like conformity along an organization’s rationalized myths established as legitimacy-defining (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Finally, legitimacy is political in nature since it can be linked to authoritative figures.

Status, on the other hand, is fundamentally ordinal and categorical meaning that it varies less within one particular group and more across multiple groups (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Deephouse and Carter (2005) noted this distinction allows for the creation of empirical separations between the different tiers of an industry (i.e. upper-, middle-, and lower-status tiers). Furthermore, status supports group rivalry because groups will compete for status through solidarity displays, collective mobility projects, and out-group ostracism. Individuals will tend to move between groups primarily through sponsorship instead of competitive performance (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Thus, status can cause segregation between lower- and higher-status groups. Specifically, a lower-status organization may mimic the elements of the higher-status group in hopes of gaining their acceptance. However, the higher-status organization may decide to remove themselves from that particular element due to the invading lower-

status group, making status a self-aware process. Finally, status is fundamentally honorific because it reflects cultural capital and habitus and elicits deference and tribute (Bourdieu, 1986). According to Washington and Zajac (2005), “status generates social esteem and special, unearned (i.e. non-merit based) benefits known as privileges, which are granted to and enjoyed by high-status actors in a social system” (p. 284). Thus, the concept of status implies the potential to validate or revoke an organization’s level of status through the acceptance or rejection within a high-status social group (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008).

In relation to status and legitimacy, reputation involves “an explicit extrapolation from past to future behavior” (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008, p. 61). Reputation often expands past an organization’s product or service to include characteristics such as being a tough competitor, a good place to work, or an environmentally sensitive manufacturer among others (Benjamin & Podolny, 1999; Washington & Zajac, 2005). Furthermore, the measurement of reputation is conducted on a continuous measure. Social actors are typically placed on a continuum from best to worst and are ranked on their current standing (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Since a firm’s reputation is contingent on its relative standing, an organization can benefit substantially from the errors of its competition. Reputation also encourages firms to differentiate from their competitors in order to distinguish themselves from the competition or by advancing its claims to uniqueness. Possibly the biggest distinction between reputation, status, and legitimacy is that reputation is fundamentally economical in nature (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). “Reputation becomes an input into potential exchange partners’ expected utility functions” (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008, p. 62). In other words, any firm considering

engaging in affairs with another firm will review that organization's reputation to determine if it is a feasible venture. Several scholars noted that a favorable reputation can be considered a strategic competitive advantage that firms can utilize (Barney, 1991; Deephouse, 2000).

While status and reputation do share elements with legitimacy, most organizations see legitimacy as an effective method to accrue stability within their respective industry (Thomas & Lamm, 2012). As such, organizations desiring to achieve legitimacy often focus their efforts towards two basic perspectives. The first perspective is to create an institutional view that emphasizes how societal beliefs can become embedded within the organization. Broadly, an institutional view stems from a set of ideas, beliefs and actions used by society that are taken for granted by an organization (Jennings, Greenwood, Lounsbury, & Suddaby, 2013). The other perspective is a strategic one that emphasizes how legitimacy can be managed in order to obtain organizational goals (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Through these two perspectives, many scholars explained that several dimensions exist for organizations to achieve legitimacy in multiple ways. Stryker (1994) noted conceptual differences between the consent of rules, the approval of rules, and the cognitive orientation to rules. Specifically, legitimacy can only be established if individuals consent to certain rule making authorities, the power of the rule itself, and the validity between the two (Stryker, 1994).

Aldrich and Fiol (1994) distinguished between cognitive and sociopolitical legitimacy by stating:

Cognitive legitimation refers to the spread of knowledge about a new venture...sociopolitical legitimation refers to the process by which key stakeholders, the general public, key opinion leaders, or government officials accept a venture as appropriate or right, given existing norms and laws (p. 648).

The sociopolitical category has been expanded to provide three sub-dimensions of legitimacy: pragmatic, moral, and cognitive (Suchman, 1995). Pragmatic legitimacy “rests on the self-interested calculations of an organization's most immediate audiences” and involves the direct exchange between the organization and its interested constituents to assess their belief about whether the organization is working in their collective best interests or not (Suchman, 1995, p. 578). Moral legitimacy is defined as the organization doing what society at large viewed as the right way of doing business (Cashore, 2002). Finally, cognitive legitimacy combines society’s ability to comprehend and take elements for granted for an organization to obtain legitimacy opposed to any form of formal evaluation (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994; Cashore, 2002). Furthermore, Suchman (1995) elaborated further on these dimensions by establishing a specific typology containing 12 different legitimacy sub-types, which are defined in Table 2.1.

While these dimensions are fairly defined, there exist two persistent areas of confusion. First, the term normative legitimacy has conflicting definitions in its sociological and organizational institutionalism usage. Suchman (1995) noted in general sociological usage, normative legitimacy has congruence with normative culture, which is society’s assessment of what is good and bad. In comparison, normative legitimacy in the organization institutionalism literature is often equated with normative isomorphism, which does review if elements are right or wrong but more from a professional context opposed to a world view (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). As such, there has been movement within the institutional theory literature to avoid the term normative legitimacy when referring to professions that seek to influence many different dimensions of legitimacy (Greenwood, Suddaby, & Hinings, 2002; Suchman, 1995). Further, as

Table 2-1 - Sub-Types of Legitimacy

Dimension	Sub-Type	Definition
Pragmatic	Exchange	Support for an organizational policy based on a policy's expected value to a particular set of constituents.
	Influence	Support for an organization not necessarily because of belief of favorable exchanges but rather due to the firm's responsiveness to larger interests of constituents.
	Interest	Support for our best interests at heart and shared values such as honesty, decency, trustworthiness, and wisdom.
	Character	Support for an organization's character in the face of isolated failures, miscues, and reversals.
Moral	Consequential	Organizations should be judged by what they accomplish.
	Procedural	Organizations should implement socially accepted techniques and procedures.
	Structural	Organizations should adopt structural characteristics within a specific morally favored taxonomic category.
	Personal	Organizations should embrace the charisma of individual organizational leaders.
Cognitive	Predictability	Organizational activity will prove to be predictable, meaningful, and inviting.
	Plausibility	Organizational activity will furnish plausible explanations for the organization and its endeavors.
	Inevitability	Organizational activity will inevitably operate in a desirable, proper and appropriate manner.
	Permanence	Organizational activity will become desirable, proper, and appropriate in itself.

Deephouse and Suchman (2008) noted, professional legitimacy should refer to any efforts to enhance legitimacy through professional endorsement while normative legitimacy “should refer to legitimacy referred to any audience (including but not limited to professional) on primarily normative grounds” (p. 53).

A second area of confusion is centered on the taken-for granted rationality within cognitive legitimacy (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994). While it is not debated that this component is important to an organization's legitimacy, the real issue comes with the measurement

of the component. One common method in several studies to determine a measurement of taken-for-grantedness (i.e., an absence of questioning) is to count the number of organizations or the number of media articles with greater numbers establishing greater legitimacy (Archibald, 2004; Carroll & Hannan, 1989). Deephouse and Suchman (2008) argued this approach may be beneficial to emerging industries, organizations, or practices but does have issues with more established ones. In terms of the establishment of an industry, Deephouse and Suchman (2008) argued that a population count becomes decoupled from taken-from-grantedness because this element for existing firms can “reduce the legitimacy of entrepreneurship more than it reduces the legitimacy of consolidation” (p. 54). With regards to media articles, the complete absence of press coverage may be due to a subject’s blending within the cultural landscape or that the subject is no longer seen as a newsworthy item to cover (Itule & Anderson, 1994; Shoemaker, 1996).

Since legitimacy is based on the perceived actions of an organization (Suchman, 1995), one must identify who is subject to social acceptance by others. Johnson (2004) elaborated that a subject of legitimation can be “an act, a rule, a procedure, a routine, a distribution, a position, a group or team, a group’s status structure, teamwork, a system of positions, an authority structure, an organization, organizational symbols, an organization’s form, practices, services, programs, a regime, a system of power, and a system of inequality (to name a few)” (p. 10-11). This definition can be attributed to several things. First, legitimacy is a social construct and can emerge from a relation to other laws, rules, norms, values, and cognitive frameworks within a larger social network (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Second, legitimacy is subjective in nature and can be

sought, gained, and defended in the face of competition (Suchman, 1995). Finally, organizations can be either passive or active when attempting to become legitimate. Recent examples of this passive or active nature include European business schools who created legitimating agencies that accredit their institutions (Durand & McGuire, 2005) and the Big Five (at the time of study, currently Big Four) accounting firms who actively created a legitimate multidisciplinary practice while adapting it for common use (Greenwood et al., 2002).

In comparison, sources of legitimacy are both internal and external audiences that observe organizations and make assessments about a firm's legitimacy (Ruef & Scott, 1998). Originally, Meyer and Scott (1992) believed two basic groups had "the capacity to mobilize and confront the organization" in terms of authority over acceptable cultural theory (p. 201-202). The first of these groups were those who "have standing and license, derived from the organization's legitimating account itself" (Meyer & Scott, 1992, p. 202). Deephouse and Suchman (2008) noted the best examples of this group are state governments since these organizations tend to buffer themselves as a legitimate organization. The second groups are external forces who have collective authority over what can be acceptable theory within a specific industry (Meyer & Scott, 1992). For example, the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), which is a member association for the accounting industry, acts as a legislative body by establishing profession ethical standards and U.S. audit guidelines ("About the AICPA", n.d.).

Based on Suchman's (1995) definition, legitimacy must be established by a "socially constructed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions" (p. 574). However, similar to the discussion on subjects of legitimation, this definition does not

limit the number of potential sources of legitimacy. In order to determine who has collective authority over legitimation, one must properly focus attention to the research question in mind. As an example, Suddaby and Greenwood (2005) argued what determines a professional accounting or law organization within the United States is based on a narrowly drawn social system. On the other hand, an examination of legitimacy for the global energy industry can be reviewed through state and federal regulators, industry analysts, political activists, and popular opinion (Robertson & Krauss, 2010).

In addition to authoritative bodies, society-at-large can be a source of legitimacy for organizations. Both Tolbert and Zucker (1983) and Strang and Soule (1998) discussed the connotation between cognitive legitimacy and mimetic isomorphism and noted that as more organizations adopted a specific practice, the more widespread its acceptance and greater its legitimacy. Baum and Powell (1995) identified the media as a rich indicator of society-wide legitimacy. According to Deephouse (1996), both journalistic efforts and mass communications both reflect and influence of the general public, whether it is broadcasted in a positive or negative light. The opposite would have occurred if the media covered the same organization in a negative light. Thus, Deephouse and Suchman (2008) argued “the media should rightfully play a dual role in legitimacy research, serving both as an indicator of legitimation by society-at-large and as a source of legitimacy in their own stead” (p. 56).

Beyond the society-at-large and the media, a third source of legitimacy can derive from interorganizational relations. According to Galaskiewicz (1985), an organization can only become legitimate when it associates with other legitimate firms. Through

affiliation with more legitimate associations, organizations can establish a better social standing. Singh, Tucker, and House (1986) supported this rationale with a statistical analysis of the legitimacy of a voluntary social service organization in the City of Toronto, Ontario, Canada based on its listing in the community directory in Metropolitan Toronto; its registry with Revenue Canada as a bona fide charity; and its endowment with a large and interorganizationally embedded board of directors. Later studies would confirm that charitable donations, interlocking directorships, and strategic alliances with prestigious partners are also important sources of interorganizational legitimacy (Cohen & Dean, 2005; Deeds, Mang, & Frandsen, 2004; Washington, 2004; 2004-05).

While these sources of legitimacy have their benefits, all three sources share interrelated issues. First, many common sources of legitimacy are themselves an organization. As an example, the AICPA may make decisions on the accounting profession but also must seek acceptance from the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) for policies issued (“The Laws that Govern”, 2013). Media stories discussing the legitimacy or de-legitimacy of an organization are produced by organizations that themselves are seeking legitimacy in their own right (Hirsch, 1977). Therefore, “the granting of legitimacy is as amenable to organizational analysis as is the pursuit” (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008, p. 56). Second, Deephouse and Suchman (2008) asked if there exists a legitimate source of legitimacy. To elaborate, Jepperson (1991) noted certain crime elements such as fraud, bribery, and political corruption can be institutionalized without being legitimate. Within some social systems such as criminal cartels or government officials, forms of crime can be accepted as legitimate from a pragmatic standpoint due to their usefulness; a cognitive viewpoint because the crime

could be taken-for-granted; and even a moral narrative based on a sense of ethical permission (Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). For example, both Pfizer Pharmaceuticals and Johnson & Johnson were forced to pay a combined total of \$130 million in fines in the United States in 2012 due to participation in a bribery and kickback program in foreign countries (Clarke, 2012). While considered illegal activity in the U.S., many foreign countries consider bribery an ethical pursuit during business affairs. Finally, there are issues with the nature of legitimacy assessment that sources make as to either grant or withhold legitimacy. While Tolbert and Zucker (1983) and Galaskiewicz (1985) acknowledged the presence of an endorsement can imply support for legitimacy, this explanation does not answer what the absence of an endorsement means for a firm. As an example, an unregistered non-profit organization could possibly be viewed as illegitimate within the organizational field that requires non-profit firms to register with their respective state and registration is open to all (Baum & Oliver, 1991; 1992).

Many studies proposed different ways for firms to accrue legitimacy. Meyer and Rowan (1977) suggested the technical efficiency and conformity of institutional myths are often precursors to legitimacy. Deephouse (1996) tested this theory through the conformity and efficiency of a bank's legitimacy through the lens of regulators and their interest in the stability in the banking system. He discovered only conformity had a positive effect on an organization's legitimacy in the eyes of the media since they assumed the regulators to both a leader and a recorder of the public's norms and values (Deephouse, 1996). Glynn and Abzug (2002) also found the conformity in organizational names increased the firm's understandability to a wide range of business and non-business audiences. These studies and other similar findings reinforce Suchman's (1995)

belief that the best way for organizations to gain legitimacy is to conform to their respective environment. However, there is a possibility for a firm to earn legitimization through manipulation (Suchman, 1995). As an example, Elsbach (1994) discovered cases of firms that failed to incorporate other legitimate organizations or make reference to the institutional environment as superior to accounts that deny responsibility.

While there are substantial benefits to obtaining legitimacy, several researchers have also acknowledged potential consequences to its acquisition. Meyer and Rowan (1977) were the first to recognize that the attainment of legitimacy can enhance an organization's survival. However, Suchman (1995) argued the strategic view of an organization could be manipulated in order to achieve the firm's desired goals. Furthermore, Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) suggested that "legitimacy affects the competition for resources" (p. 201). Several researchers have tested hypotheses that predict how various types of legitimacy can affect performance measures such as the value of initial public offerings (IPOs) (Cohen & Dean, 2005; Deeds et al., 2004; Higgins & Gulati, 2006; Pollock & Rindova, 2003), stock prices (Zuckerman, 2000), stock market risk (Zuckerman, 2000), and stakeholder support (Choi & Shepherd, 2005). Because of the potential of consequences, organizations must prepare an effective strategy in order to achieve legitimacy.

Institution

Before describing an organizational strategy to attain legitimacy, the dissertation must first define an institution and explain the institution within the identified research setting. Meyer and Rowan (1977) briefly defined an institution as the adoption of taken-for-granted rationalized myths. However, this definition was more of an assumption by a

reader than an actual description by Meyer and Rowan (1977) (Greenwood, Oliver, Sahlin, & Suddaby, 2008). Thus, the term institution has provided researchers confusion to its actual definition leading to several interpretations. Greenwood et al. (2008) noted old institutional theory has referred to institutions as individual organizations such as prisons, mental hospitals, nursing homes, and orphanages. Haase and Krücken (2011) described a second institution definition used in old institutional theory as sectors. For example, all schools and other organizations related to education would comprise the education sector. Hirsch (1975) provided a third definition for institution as the major agencies of the political economy. For example, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) are state agencies that oversee the pharmaceutical and broadcast industries respectively. Because of the ambiguity of the term institution, several scholars (Greenwood et al., 2008, Haveman & David, 2008; Scott, 1995) have requested that institutional theorists develop a universal definition of institution which will remove the confusion scholars may have.

From this perspective, several researchers established new institutional theory that has expanded on the definition for the term institution. According to Greenwood et al. (2008) an institution refers to “more-or-less taken-for-granted repetitive social behavior that is underpinned by normative systems and cognitive understandings that give meaning to social exchange and thus enable self-reproducing social order” (p. 4-5). Jennings et al. (2013) defined institution as “the routinized, taken for granted sets of ideas, beliefs, and actions used in society, which includes both formal and informal institutions, and macro and micro institutional patterns” (p. 2). The importance of these definitions in comparison to those prior is that both Greenwood et al. (2008) and Jennings

et al. (2013) incorporate elements from other areas of institutional theory. Specifically, the presence of coercive, mimetic, and normative pressure as well as the desire to achieve legitimacy stretches beyond a single firm or entity (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). This perception leads organizations to adopt practices society deems as taken-for-granted and considers legitimate.

While both definitions are similar, the present dissertation adopts the Jennings et al. (2013) definition due to its identification of macro and micro institutional patterns. This term is important as the organizational field identified within this dissertation, intercollegiate athletics, encompasses the overall nature of college sports and the firms it comprises. Furthermore, scholars defining an institution within intercollegiate athletics have focused mainly on interest-based associations (Washington, 2004-05). This definition for an institution within intercollegiate athletics is similar to the Hirsch (1975) description of institutions as governing bodies. However, both Hirsch (1975) and Washington (2004-05) definition of an institution limits the taken-for-granted element impact provided by society. Thus, the present dissertation incorporates the definition developed by Jennings et al. (2013) and defines an institution within the organizational field of intercollegiate athletics as the overall governance of college sports.

Institutional Strategy

Past studies by Tolbert and Zucker (1983) and Scott (1995) showed one of the core insights of institutional theory lies with the development of practices and processes for legitimacy within an institution. Traditionally, many institutional practices were adopted by firms based upon external definitions of legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). However, many firms today compete for legitimacy in the marketplace. Lawrence (1999)

refers to this process as institutional strategy. Specifically, an organization develops “patterns of organizational action concerned with the formation and transformation of institutions, fields and the rules and standards that control those structures” (p. 167). Firms engaged in institutional strategy are not necessarily out to acquire or maintain a competitive advantage based on existing structures. Rather, an organization is more concerned with the preservation of institutional standards and rules in order to gain a favorable set of conditions. Furthermore, institutional strategy requires that firms possess the ability “to articulate, sponsor and defend particular practices and organizational forms as legitimate or desirable, rather than the ability to enact already legitimized practices or leverage existing social rules” (Lawrence, 1999, p. 163).

Similar to other forms of organizational strategy, institutional strategies can deliberately develop as an intended plan or can occur through happenstance as an emergent strategy (Mintzberg & Waters, 1985; Rerup & Feldman, 2011). According to Quack (2007), a deliberate institutional strategy allows an organization to consciously modify its own institutional rules and position in order to position its firm in a favorable strategic position. In comparison, an emergent institutional strategy involves recognition of an organizational action pattern that can affect or influence an institutional structure while maintaining an association with their goals and objectives (Lawrence, 1999). Based on these two rationales, Lawrence (1999) developed two generic institutional strategies: 1) initiatives to set membership rules and 2) procedures to establish standards of practice (Washington, 2004-05).

The need to establish membership rules stem the aforementioned normative pressures of professionalization (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). According to Lawrence

(1999), “the empirical phenomenon of professionalization is a member of a larger set of strategies that deal with issues of membership and meaning in collectives” (p. 171).

These membership strategies can include the rules of membership as well as their meaning within an institutional community. Furthermore, the definition of membership rules can delineate the exclusionary boundaries of institutional membership and the space that members can operate. As such, it would be the best interests of the association to restrict admission to a firm if legitimacy is positively related to the group’s exclusivity. Lawrence (1999) noted an organization’s membership rules could be explicit, such as the AICPA’s rules for membership (“About the AICPA”, n.d.), or implicit, similar to the requirements for joining a fraternity or sorority.

In relation to membership strategies, standardization strategies involve the institutionalization of practices, products or services based on the assessment of value beyond practical ability through social or cultural mechanisms (Selznick, 1996). These plans are focused on “the establishment of technical, legal, or informal standards that define what is ‘normal’ for a practice, product, or service, either through regulation (e.g., Montagna, 1990; Potter, 2005) or through the enactment of less formalized norms or standards (e.g., Baron, Dobbin, & Jennings, 1986; Etzion & Ferraro, 2010)” (Lawrence, 1999, p. 177-178). The pressures to standardize can often involve the development of coercive or mimetic pressures that can force organizations to comply with established industrial standards. As an example, Slack and Hinings (1994) observed that governmental agencies and other regulatory bodies can mandate rules and regulations that must be followed in order to receive state and federal funding. The need for external

resources can cause firms to immediately adopt the rules prescribed by the leading actors within the organizational field (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983).

Many organizations and associations created standardization rules and barriers to entry. Some of the most commonly researched, however, are interest associations (Washington, 2004; Washington & Ventresca, 2004). According to Galvin (2002), interest associations “compete over symbolic resources and legitimization (such as acceptance by field participants that are needed for membership or survival) more than material resources, and therefore, may compete differently for environmental resources than other organizations” (p. 677). Furthermore, interest associations are key actors in constructing the logics and meanings within an organizational field (Washington, Forman, Suddaby, & Ventresca, 2005). Thus, if a change within the organizational field does occur, it is possible that an interest association would face the pressure to adopt new practices and innovations.

As time progresses and innovations spread through an organizational field, they evolve into a ‘taken-for-granted’ form and are established as acceptable norms (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008). Furthermore, these innovations serve as baselines that firms must establish within their organization in order to appear legitimate to others. The established baseline allows for social identities to be created both within an industry and among competitors. Several researchers demonstrated the spread of practices through mobility “can shape the composition of fields and fuel path creation by promoting new kinds of forms” (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008, p. 664). However, counter-mobility can also be created, causing powerful organizations to limit the impact an innovation has on an industry. Thus, the adoption of new practices is dependent upon a competitor’s

ability to mobilize and acquire sufficient resources (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008).

Due to the power that firms and associations can hold, it is vital for organizations to develop a social identity among rivals in order to mimic and/or immobilize the spread of a practice.

Social Identity Theory and Mobility

According to social identity theory, an individual person can often relate with others based on the social characteristics that each person possesses (Tajfel & Turner, 1985). Through these characteristics, people will attempt to classify one another into various categories defined by prototypical ideals created within society (Turner, 1985). Through the classification process, an individual has the opportunity to segment the social environment into groups defined by their respective identities. More importantly, this internal division provides the ability to define one's self within the social environment by creating their own personal identity. This identity is a self-categorization that includes one's personal attributes (e.g., abilities, attributes, psychological traits, personal interests) as well as a particular group one has a desire to join (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). As such, individuals craft their personal social identity or "self-image derived by actors when they categorize themselves as members of a collectivity or occupants of a role" (Rao, Monin, & Durand, 2003, p.797). Thus, social identification can be labeled as "the perception of oneness with or belongingness to some human aggregate" (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p. 21). Through one's social identity, individuals maintain the ability to define themselves based on personal characteristics (Turner, 1982).

According to Fink, Parker, Brett, and Higgins (2009), individuals will also identify with organizations that share the attributes they assign to their own self-concepts.

Mael and Ashforth (1992) noted by recognizing organizations with similar characteristics, one can often discover a sense of belongingness to a group or association. As an example, fans of the National Football League's (NFL) Pittsburgh Steelers are typically blue-collar workers and can identify with the Steelers' history as a hard-working team with a priority on defense (Howard, 2011). In comparison, individuals who follow the NBA's Los Angeles Lakers enjoy the team's historically flashy nature as well as the many celebrity fans who sit at courtside ("Top 10 Celebrity Lakers Fans", 2007). By associating with a particular group, individuals often perceive that members of the organization can interact with fellow members while remaining distinct from members of rival firms (Turner, 1985). In other words, an association's members can easily identify with other individuals they recognize as belonging to (the in-group) while distancing themselves from groups in which they do not belong and consider rivals (the out-group). This methodology is further enhanced by the development of positive and negative stereotyping between the in-group(s) and the out-group(s) respectively (Washington, 2004-05). Following the example of the Steelers and the Lakers, the fans of these teams distance themselves from fans of the Baltimore Ravens and the Boston Celtics respectively due to their perceived differences (Aschburner, 2010; "Steelers-Ravens Cream of the Crop", 2012). Through the creation of rivalry, an organization can establish both stability and legitimacy that can be utilized to assess prospective members seeking access into the group.

Opposed to the individual level, Turner (1982) advanced social identity theory by studying how identities could function at the group level. Specifically, Turner (1982) de-stigmatized an individual's behavior in order to enhance an organization's shared

behavior. This advancement led to the creation of self-categorization theory, recognizing methods where individuals become integrated into groups and explains groups in terms of structure and functioning of the social self-concept (Turner, 1985; Turner & Oakes, 1986). Furthermore, Turner and Oakes (1986) noted:

The social identity concept is a specification of that psychological representation of the whole and the self-categorization theory offers a detailed predictive explanation of just how the feat is accomplished, how individual psychology processes can produce more than just individual behavior and how a science of the individual need not be individualistic. (p. 250).

In other words, self-categorization evaluates people within the group in relation to how the group behaves as a whole. Turner and Oakes (1986) emphasized the advancement of social identity theory toward a group dynamic “to demonstrate concretely the predictive empirical power of the concept” (p. 242).

From this concept, many scholars argued the characteristics of an organization in and of itself are a form of social identification since firms have a uniqueness that is built around certain ideals and characteristics (Albert & Whetten, 1985; Ashforth & Mael, 1989; Dutton, Dukerich, & Harquail, 1994; Elsbach & Kramer, 1996). As such, the organization potentially molds its own identity through its mission and vision statements while also obtaining the characteristics of many members found within the group (Ashforth, 2001). As an example, the overall mission for The Louisiana State University (LSU) is “to be a leading research-extensive university, challenging undergraduate and graduate students to achieve the highest levels of intellectual and personal development” describes an overall organizational identity (“LSU Mission Statement”, 2012, para. 3). Similarly, the purpose for The Ohio State University (OSU) is “to advocate the well-being of the people of Ohio and the global community through the creation and

dissemination of knowledge” (“The Ohio State University”, 2013, para. 4). Both mission statements can be further enhanced by the various faculty and staff hired as well as the students enrolled at each respective university through the advancement of research and teaching efforts. This example shows that groups can establish multiple personalities that stem from their individual members defined by task interdependencies or shared characteristics (Washington, 2004-05).

Past research has shown that organizations with multiple identities that concentrate on the management of one particular identity will establish conflict within the organization overall (Pratt & Foreman, 2000). On the other hand, organizations possessing multiple dynamic characteristics can function harmoniously when organizations belong to either a lower-order or higher-order category that is institutionalized in a formal social system and with cross-cutting demographic categories (Ashforth, 2001). Turner (1985) defined cross-cutting groups as a collection of actors who are categorized by the same social membership but may not necessarily interact with other members. As an example, Washington (2004-05) identified race as a cross-cutting demographic since it can pierce through other social categories such as class and party affiliation. In comparison, both higher-order and lower-order categories are encoded social groups that are characterized by distinct roles, interdependencies, and interactions (Washington, 2004-05). An individual from New York City would be a member of a lower-order category compared to people from the State of New York or the United States. In terms of a university, faculty members associated with a Kinesiology Department would be considered a lower-order category while the college it is associated with (i.e., College of Education or College of Human Sciences) is a higher-order listing.

Nevertheless, the relationship between in-groups and out-groups is bound to cause conflict which can result in the possible defection of members (Washington, 2004-05). As an example, an in-group member could view the departures of fellow members to a rival firm as an issue with the specific association and desire a defection of their own. According to Washington (2004-05), “the discrepancy is derived from the fact that the focal organization’s identity might be linked to the behavior of a peer (defection from an association) that is different from the focal organization’s behavior” (p. 34). When individuals and organizations become engaged in identity conflict, Rao et al. (2003) identified three specific strategies that members can implement when they feel that their social identity is threatened. They termed these strategies social creativity, social change, and social mobility. Social mobility describes an actor’s ability to exit the in-group and join an out-group (Rao, Davis, & Ward, 2000). Social creativity describes an individual’s ability to creatively alter characteristics to make the in-group seen more favorably to others. Finally, social change is defined as the strategy “where actors compete directly with the out-group to alter the relative status of both groups through collective action” (Rao et al. 2003, p. 813).

Of the three strategies, several researchers suggested social mobility strategies are preferred when a change in group membership is possible (e.g., Ellemers, Spears & Doosje, 1997; Jackson, Sullivan, Harnish, & Hodge, 1996). Social mobility is a form of organizational change that utilizes elements from the organization’s environment to influence the identity of the organization (Rao, Davis, & Ward, 2000). Organizations considering social mobility face potential threats to their identity that emanate from the in-group when fellow members defect to an out-group. These ties should insulate an

organization from the effect of identity-discrepancies but can cause an organization to consider enhancing its own identity to match the former in-group member (Rao et al., 2000). Thus, any ties between in-group and out-group members as well as defectors could exacerbate the effect on identity-discrepancies. Furthermore, if an organization has more ties with out-group members and defectors, there is a greater possibility of a group defecting from its in-group, utilizing social mobility as an identity-enhancement strategy (Rao et al., 2000).

According to Taylor and McKirnan (1984), organizations can develop a need to associate with institutions that are more prominent and stable. This movement can be conducted in two different forms. First, organizations requesting membership in a particular institution will mold their own personal characteristics to match the current members of that institution and disassociate with other organizations that possess their former characteristics (Goffman, 1963). This strategy is primarily conducted by organizations formed along linguistic, cultural, and other modifiable dimensions (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Taylor & McKirnan, 1984). Second, organizations can adopt the characteristics of the institution's members while maintaining their prior associations. Groups formed on the basis of sex, race, and other invariant characteristics often engage in this type of social mobility (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Taylor & McKirnan, 1984).

Group members can, therefore, utilize defections as an identity-discrepant cue to determine if a positive social identity can be maintained. Furthermore, Washington (2004-05) suggested "the accumulation of identity-discrepant cues makes social identity salient and activates the concern of decision makers in the focal organization" (p. 36). In other words, decision makers may have to reconsider their institutional strategy and

incorporate a defection based-approach on social mobility in order to protect the organization's legitimacy.

Conclusion

According to social identity theory, individuals and organizations characterize themselves with other groups based on certain elements that comprise their social identity (Ashforth & Mael, 1989). For colleges and universities, these identities can range from geographic location and proximity to other schools; religious affiliation; private classification; and majority composition of student body (Smith et al., 2013; Washington, 2004; 2004-05). Through the proper affiliation, an organization can achieve an unprecedented level of legitimacy in relation to their competitors. As an example, the Southeastern Conference (SEC) accepted Texas A&M University and the University of Missouri from the Big XII Conference (Big XII) into their organization in 2011 ("SEC Accepts Missouri", 2011; "Texas A&M Officially Joins", 2011). An organization's affiliation can also cause the diffusion of practices since rival firms will attempt to mimic innovations in order to achieve similar success. Many of these organizations choose to conform to their peers due to the societal pressures from within their respective organizational field (Oliver, 1997). The move by the SEC to allow Texas A&M and Missouri created a chain reaction among the NCAA conferences competing in the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) [i.e., the American Athletic Conference (AAC); the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC); the Big Ten Conference (Big Ten); the Big XII; Conference USA (C-USA); the Mid-American Conference (MAC); the Mountain West Conference (MWC); the Pacific-12 Conference (PAC-12); and the Sun Belt Conference

(Sun Belt)] to consider their own expansion efforts due to the success of the SEC and the isomorphic pressures within the organizational field (Williams & Seifried, 2013).

In essence, as Knoke (1985) noted, legitimacy gives an organization the right to exist. Further, legitimacy is based on the perceived actions of an organization from an outside perspective (Suchman, 1995) and viewed as the “social acceptance” by other organizations (Yang, Su & Fam, 2012 p. 41). The need for social acceptance through affiliation also requires organizations to adapt to the technical and societal pressures of an organizational field (Boxenbaum & Jonsson, 2008). Several schools competing in intercollegiate sports often feel this pressure to move into higher divisions (i.e., Division I Football Championship Subdivision; Division II; Division III) or larger conferences in order to obtain social acceptance. Past examples of NAIA to NCAA movement include Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Southeastern Oklahoma State University (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994), Western Washington University (“Washington Colleges Could Leave”, 1991), and the University of Wisconsin of Platteville (Leitner, 1990). Movement also occurs within the NCAA itself with the recent examples of the University of Utah’s transferring its membership from the MWC to the PAC-12 in 2010 (“Utah Excited by Pac-10”, 2010), Appalachian State University transitioning from Division I FCS to compete in the Sun Belt in 2014 (“Appalachian State to Join”, 2011), and the University of New Orleans returning to Division I by joining the Southland Conference (an FCS conference) in 2013 after an initial drop to Division II (“New Orleans to Join”, 2012).

Furthermore, competition plays a vital role as firms will attempt to acquire resources, power, and legitimacy with the hope of becoming the dominant organization

within the field (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). The NCAA and the NAIA continually viewed each other as competitors and sought numerous ways to attract universities to their organization. One of the ways that organizations attempt this is to mimic society's view of what a legitimate organization is within the specific industry (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). As firms embrace established ideals and develop an industry's rationalized myths, organizations will face coercive, mimetic and normative pressures to remain more homogeneous to other institutional structures (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). Both the NAIA and the NCAA appear to have faced isometric pressures from one another as well as other related organizations within intercollegiate athletics (i.e., the AAU; the AIAW; and the U.S.O.C.). As such, both organizations created policies to encourage schools to join their organization such as the addition of HBCUs as full-time members and the sponsoring of women's championships (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005).

Organizations faced with the issues of staying institutionalized while also attempting to become a legitimate firm may consider institutional strategies with preserve institutional standards and rules. A firm developing a new institutional strategy seeks to create a new innovation that will allow the organization to earn legitimacy within its organizational field as well as maintaining a competitive advantage over rivals through its innovation opposed to existing structures. Thus, the desire for legitimacy often leads to the diffusion of new practices that are validated within the organizational field. As an example, the NAIA's establishment of the National Invitational Basketball Tournament (NIBT) was a means for the organization to maintain its goals of facilitating championship play for smaller colleges and universities (Stooksbury, 2010). As the event proved successful, the organizational field would then be filled with competitors hosting

their own tournaments (i.e., the National Invitational Tournament (NIT) and the NCAA University/Division I Men's Basketball Tournament).

Organizations also take notice of discrepant cues that impact their respective industry. Washington (2004-05) discussed the impact of defection from an affiliation and how a firm's identity could be impacted. Defection is an important identity discrepant cue for organizations to consider if they fear that a particular affiliation is distorting their legitimacy within the organization field. When organizations are faced with this issue, a social mobility strategy may be instituted in order to follow past defectors that share similar characteristics to their new affiliation. These specific identities can be cross-cutting demographic characteristics (Ashforth, 2001; Turner, 1985) or based on higher- and lower-order grouping (Washington, 2004-05). Nevertheless, either identity grouping could encourage a firm to join a new affiliation with the hopes of maintaining their own social identity and organizational legitimacy. For the athletic associations, both the NAIA and the NCAA marketed their membership efforts toward specific characteristics the universities maintained. As time progressed, both the NCAA and the NAIA would share practices and innovations in order to maintain their standing with their competitor (e.g., the NIBT and the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament; HBCUs as full members; sponsoring women's championships). This competition led to an altering institutional strategy that impacted both membership groups for many years to come.

As facilitators of governance within intercollegiate athletics, both the NAIA and the NCAA altered their institutional strategies based upon measures that society deemed legitimate with the goal of attaining new members. Schools were also influenced by defectors that shared characteristics and left one association in the hope of achieving

legitimacy. Much of the decision-making from the associations created a tumultuous period for many schools desiring both their legitimacy among their peers but also their social identity. Thus, several schools chose to move from the NAIA to the NCAA based on prior defectors leaving the NAIA and/or the overall decline of the NAIA (Washington, 2004-05). In addition, many schools believed a move to a new association would create an increase in student applications as well as increased exposure for the university's brand (Dwyer, Eddy, Havard, & Braa, 2010; Weaver, 2010). As such, NAIA members were enticed to join the NCAA due to the perceived value derived from prior defectors and societal views. These views were derived from the NCAA's changes to its institutional strategy inviting schools traditionally identified through NAIA characteristics as well as the benefits received by current NCAA members.

Chapter 3 – The Novelty of College Movement

The purpose of this chapter is to review the methodological basis for university movement into a new athletic association. First, the chapter will analyze previous college movement studies that were based on social mobility and legitimacy and address their limitations with respect to determining the quantitative benefits of measuring freshmen applications. This discussion will be followed by a discussion of prior research on the Flutie Effect and its' impact on applications through athletic success. Many of the studies focused on this phenomenon narrowly focus on an athletic contest or championship as a basis for research. This focus limits the possibility of events outside of competition that may impact applications. Finally, this chapter will discuss the similarities between the diffusion of university movement from the NAIA to the NCAA and the diffusion of stadium construction in order to establish legitimacy and a social identity as framed in the previous chapter.

As discussed in Chapter 2, social mobility reviews possible determinants of movement from one group to another group (Smith, Williams, Soebbing, & Washington, 2013). Inter-group movement can cause damages to the status of remaining group members due to the visibility that comes with social mobility (Greve, 1995). As a result, Rao et al. (2000) stated defections by in-group members to out-groups who share similar identities create a discrepancy between an organization's need for positive social identity and the realities of the world. Furthermore, decision makers of an organization are likely to believe their affiliation with the in-group is in jeopardy as well as the organization's own social identity. When faced with this threat, an organization's leadership often relies on certain identity-discrepant cues which assist decision makers as to whether to leave an

in-group for an out-group (Washington, 2004-05). The firm's response to these cues is likely to be affected by its ties to in-group and out-group members as well as the affiliations of defectors to in-group members and the organization (Rao et al., 2000).

College Movement

Washington (2004) utilized the concepts from Rao et al. (2000) to explore the evolution of the NCAA in response to the organizational field changes caused by the NAIA. Specifically, Washington (2004) noted the NCAA adopted the "Sanity Codes" and reorganized to create the College Division in order to contend with the increasing presence of the NAIA. As such, Washington (2004) separated the NCAA based on two periods: (1) the Emergence and Dominance of the NCAA (1906-1952) and (2) the Institutional Strategy of the NCAA (1952-2004). These designations were vital to the study as Washington (2004) hypothesized the NCAA focused on specific schools for membership prior to 1952, allowing the NAIA to thrive. The specific school characteristics were designated based on identifiers such as liberal arts colleges, HBCUs, and teachers' colleges. In order to test his hypothesis, Washington (2004) conducted a longitudinal logistic regression analysis of 549 colleges, representing the population of schools founded prior to 1905. According to the results, Washington (2004) argued that, before 1952, schools classified as liberal arts schools, HBCUs, and teachers' colleges were less likely to make a transition to the NCAA because of the NCAA's decision to rank these institutions as lower-order organizations. However, after 1952, colleges with these designations transitioned into the NCAA after the creation of the College Division and a small college tournament.

Washington (2004-05) expands on this work where he hypothesized that “prior defectors belonging to lower-order categories and cross-cutting social categories simultaneously increase the probability that the focal organization will join the rival group” (p. 37). From a higher education perspective, colleges and universities often categorize themselves with other institutions (i.e., public/private, religious affiliation, size or enrolment) to compete for state and federal funding (Liefner, 2003). Ashforth and Mael (1989) identified this tactic as “fruitful applications to organizational behavior” (p. 20) as it incorporates individual ideals into organizational virtues of social identity theory progressed by Tajfel (1978, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1985) and Turner (1975, 1982, 1984, 1985) with stronger purpose towards the organization. Washington (2004-05) reviewed the status of 500 colleges and universities that were members of the NAIA from 1973 to 1999 and conducted a logistic regression to determine if social identities influence college movement. Of the 500 colleges, 255 schools chose to leave the NAIA for the NCAA (Washington, 2004-05). According to the results, Washington (2004-05) suggested that “multiple social identities can be simultaneously salient” (p. 48). Specifically, his analysis proved that schools within a particular NAIA athletic conference did transition to the NCAA following a fellow NAIA school as well as schools classified as HBCUs. In addition, the study also noted that schools that maintained large student populations and offered more sports programs were more likely to relocate to the NCAA.

Smith et al. (2013) expanded on the Washington (2004-05) study by addressing two of its limitations. First, Washington (2004-05) only reviewed the movement of NAIA member schools as of 1973 without consideration of schools that became NAIA

members after 1973. More importantly, however, was the instability and definition of conference association, an identity that Washington (2004-05) utilized for concentrated geographic areas. According to Smith et al. (2013), conference affiliation “does not account for various geographical factors that may influence the choice that universities can make to move associations” (p. 24). Thus, instead of conference affiliation, Smith et al. (2013) examined each NAIA member’s geographical region based on the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) classifications in an effort to evaluate the decision to conduct social mobility. Smith et al. (2013) also incorporated other social identities such as women’s institution designation, religious affiliation, and the Carnegie Foundation size classification (i.e., very small, small, medium, or large college). The results show schools located in the New England and Rocky Mountain regions would be more likely change affiliations when similar institutions within close proximity decide to change. These results reflect the sentiment shared by Northeastern Oklahoma State University (NOSU) and Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SOSU), who transitioned to the NCAA after other schools in their region also moved (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994). On the other hand, institutions in the Southeast and Mideast regions would be less likely to change affiliations. Finally, schools with a religious affiliation, designated as women’s institutions, or classified as a small or medium school would also be more likely to move to the NCAA.

Smith (2011) studied nine universities moving from the NAIA to the NCAA based on an organization’s archetype, or the description of the meaning of an organization (Hinings & Greenwood, 1988; Ranson, Hinings, & Greenwood, 1980). Through qualitative analysis, Smith (2011) discovered several institutions on a

reorientation organizational track chose to leave the NAIA due to its deteriorating reputation. Smith (2011) explained these schools maintained a 'schizoid' position with regard to athletic affiliation due to their fears of the NAIA label. Hingins and Greenwood (1988) described the 'schizoid' position as an organization adopting two different design structures but having no clear conclusion as to which structure to choose. In addition, several of the university officials claimed branding was a significant piece to leaving the NAIA for the NCAA. The decision makers from these universities noted the NCAA brand created additional opportunities for the recruiting of institutions considering a move to the NCAA as many potential recruits appeared to be unaware of the NAIA. Smith (2011) argued university officials believed a move to the NCAA will establish legitimacy for the school while also increasing student enrollment. This analysis echoes the remarks made by William Jewell College President David Saltee and Azusa Pacific University Athletic Director Bill Odell when both institutions chose to relocate to the NCAA in 2011 after many years as NAIA members (Palmer, 2011).

Interestingly, several studies discovered such perceived benefits may not be realized with a move to the NCAA. Tomasini (2005) examined the economic differences that may occur following a reclassification from either Division II or Division III to Division I-AA. The study analyzed 27 institutions that reclassified to Division I from 1993 to 1999 and reviewed if the university received higher donations to the university general fund; higher attendance at home football games; higher freshman applications; and higher undergraduate enrollment. According to Tomasini (2005), the reclassification effort did not result in a significant positive increase in any of these areas in the first three years following a university's reclassification. In addition, the study also suggested that

“schools that reclassified to Division I-AA remained similar to schools in Divisions II and III in the variables studied” (Tomasini, 2005, p. 14).

Frieder (2007) conducted a study on schools reclassifying from either Division I-AA (now Division I-FCS) to Division I-A (now Division I-FBS) or from Division II to Division I-AA. From 1993 to 2003, 11 institutions made the transition from the FCS to the FBS and 18 schools moved from Division II to Division I-FCS. According to Frieder (2007), many of these schools considered reclassification due to three perceived benefits: (1) an increase in overall revenue; (2) an increase in applications, academic pool, and greater diversity; and (3) an increase in reputation and prestige, “as the perceived quality of an institution’s academic program is often tied to the success on its athletics program” (p. 7). The study collected financial data from each institution that reclassified from the NCAA Archives as well as the annual Graduation Rate Report and the annual Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) data. Frieder (2007) showed revenues did increase for each institution, but the increase was offset by a substantial increase in expenses and creating a net loss after reclassification. Division II schools moving to Division I-FCS saw a greater financial net loss than school moving from the FCS to the FBS. Finally, Frieder (2007) could not suggest a considerable measurement for nonfinancial benefit from reclassification.

Dwyer et al. (2010) studied the strategic management decisions and stakeholder perceptions of a university reclassifying from Division II to Division I through a mixed-methodological case study. The Dwyer et al. (2010) study utilized a medium-sized public university with approximately 12,500 total students located in the Rocky Mountain Region of the U.S. that made the transition to Division I in 2002. Data was collected

from undergraduate students and alumni through questionnaires and semi-structured interviews. According to the interviews, the administrators of the university cited the chance to increase revenue, exposure, fan support, and admissions were the perceived benefits to be gained with reclassification. However, the athletic department saw a budget deficit from 2004 to 2006 because of the increased expenses. The university did enjoy a gain in attendance from 2002 to 2005, but this was followed by three years of decline. Dwyer et al. (2010) concluded the results of the quantitative analysis showed that both current students and alumni have an apathetic to slightly favorable opinion of the athletic department and its move to Division I athletics.

Weaver (2010) similarly conducted a case study to study the reclassification efforts of two institutions: (1) the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG), a large public university; and (2) Elon University, a small private college. UNCG moved from Division III to Division I in 1991, while Elon University transitioned from the NAIA to Division II to Division I in 1997 (Weaver, 2010). Both of these schools were chosen for this study due to four factors: (1) both universities were located in North Carolina; (2) many decision makers involved in the transition are still with their respective university; (3) both schools have been in Division I for more than five years; and (4) up to 20 years of historical data on reclassification could be obtained for each school.

Through a historical analysis of documents as well as semi-structured interviews, Weaver (2010) adopted a case study methodology as well as Pettigrew's (1987) contextualist model of change to analyze the impact that reclassification had on the university. Pettigrew (1987) noted that change incorporates the process, content, and

context and should be studied as a “multilevel analysis” over a long period of time (p. 51). According to Weaver (2010), both UNCG and Elon administrators believed the transition to Division I would establish legitimacy for each respective institution.

However, UNCG’s move to Division I was not as beneficial as decision makers hoped in 1991. Specifically, many critics of the move still found it to be controversial and debate the decision to this day. In comparison, Elon University officials felt the move to Division I would alter the university’s identity in relation to its peers. Fortunately, the transition to Division I helped Elon become one of the “best private schools along the Eastern seaboard” (Keller, 2004, p. 2).

These studies on college movement all highlight the rationale as to why administrators consider a reclassification effort. Many officials believe movement to a higher division or better athletic association will improve the university’s identity among its peers, as an athletic department is viewed as a medium for attracting recognition both locally and nationally (Dwyer et al., 2010). Specifically, “proponents of intercollegiate athletics assert a symbiotic relationship exists between athletics and academics, with universities benefitting economically by participation in intercollegiate athletics” (Tomasini, 2005, p. 9). As such, the university should see increases in alumni donations, attendance at sporting events, public perception and prestige, and visibility (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Goff, 2000; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). In addition to sport related benefits, university officials expect to see a significant increase in applications because of the increased exposure related to the reclassification efforts.

Flutie Effect

As noted earlier, university officials view intercollegiate athletics as a vehicle of promotion for their university (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010). They believed a successful sports program is beneficial to the university because it can increase alumni donations, game attendance, gate receipts, and student applications and enrollment (Eitzen, 1997; Tomasini, 2005). In regards to student applications and enrollment, university officials base a potential increase on the actual increase that Boston College (BC) saw in 1985. During the 1984 football season, the BC Golden Eagles would finish with a record of nine wins and two losses and compete in the Cotton Bowl against the University of Houston (“1984 Boston College Eagles”, 2010; Sami, 1985). However, BC earned acclaim on a national level as the university had nine of its games broadcasted on national television (Oslin, 2004). One specific contest presented BC as a national university when it competed against the University of Miami on November 23, 1984 (Oslin, 2004). The game was highly competitive and was decided on a last-second Hail Mary pass from Golden Eagles Quarterback Doug Flutie to Wide Receiver Gerard Phelan (“College football’s best”, 2002; Hansen, 2011; McDonald, 2003). Based on the team’s success and national exposure, Flutie was able to capture multiple individual player honors including the coveted Heisman Trophy (Battista, 2006; Sami, 1985).

After Flutie graduated from college, BC saw a significant increase (i.e., 30%) in freshman applications over the next two years (Marklein, 2001). According to Tomasini (2005), college administrators from across the country believed the increase was directly related to the success of the BC football team. Since many scholars consider the success of the athletic program as a form of advertising, the increase enjoyed by BC has been

effectively called the “Flutie Effect” (Castle & Kostelnik, 2011; Collins, 2012; Hansen, 2011; Litan, Orszag, & Orszag, 2003). While this effect is named after Flutie, the rationale behind the trend can be traced back to 1901, when admission trends were affected by athletic contest results between Harvard and Yale (Clotfelter, 2011).

More recent examples of the Flutie Effect have also been claimed. In 1995, for instance, the Northwestern University Wildcats football team would win the Big Ten Conference championship and attend the Rose Bowl for the first time in 47 years versus the University of Southern California (USC) Trojans (Friend, 1996). While the Wildcats would fall to the Trojans (41 to 32) (“High Scoring Bowls”, 1996), Northwestern experienced a 30 percent increase in applications in 1997 (Selingo, 1997). In 2005, George Mason University was chosen as for an at-large selection for the NCAA Division I Men’s Basketball Tournament as an eleventh seed prior to advancing to the Final Four (“Florida’s Outside Shooting”, 2006; “Larranaga Signs Extension Through”, 2006). According to Baker (2008), George Mason saw a 10 percent increase in freshman applications in 2006, with 17 percent from students from out-of-state, and a 40 percent boost in out-of-state applications in 2007. Finally in 2010 and 2011, Butler University advanced to the national championship game in the Division I Men’s Basketball Tournament (Dosh, 2012). According to Dosh (2012), Butler experienced a 41 percent increase in applications after the 2010 tournament. As the phenomenon between athletic success and an applications increase became apparent, Tomasini (2005) noted the need to create a successful athletic program explains why university stakeholders desire to place their school in the best possible position to receive these benefits. Arguably, this rationale could explain the efforts by many universities considering reclassification.

The seminal work on the Flutie Effect can be traced to McCormick and Tinsley (1987). The study analyzed if the presence of big-time athletics had an impact on the academic quality of incoming freshman. To properly measure academic quality, the researchers utilized Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) for students applying to college in 1971. The study analyzed 150 schools based on the status of their athletic program and conference association. Specifically, McCormick and Tinsley (1987) designated schools from the ACC, SEC, Southwestern Conference (SWC), Big Ten, Big Eight Conference, PAC-10 and schools considered as a major independent (i.e., the University of Notre Dame; the University of Pittsburgh; and The Pennsylvania State University) as big-time athletic schools ($n = 63$). The results showed high profile athletic schools saw a 3 percent increase in the average SAT scores for entering freshman in comparison to the other schools in the study. In addition, McCormick and Tinsley (1987) noted schools with a high winning percentage among their conference rivals will marginally increase the average SAT scores for incoming students.

While McCormick and Tinsley (1987) reviewed the quality of applications, they also noted increases in the quantity of out-of-state resident applications for schools were identified by division level. Utilizing human migration theories, Mixon and Hsing (1994) measured potential determinants for students to enroll in institutions outside of their state of residence. The study analyzed several characteristics of universities including the total enrollment of the university, the non-resident tuition expense, the institution entrance difficulty, and the division of NCAA athletic participation. Using a tobit regression model of 220 institutions in 1990, Mixon and Hsing (1994) noted participation in big-time athletics (i.e. Division I-FBS; Division I-FCS; Division I) attracts more non-resident

students than any other NCAA division or athletic association. Mixon and Ressler (1995) expanded this research by analyzing 156 NCAA Division I schools participating in the Men's Basketball tournament from 1978 to 1992. After controlling for similar variables as Mixon and Hsing (1994), Mixon and Ressler (1995) found that, for the schools that participated in the Division I basketball tournament would receive an increase of out-of-state applications of approximately 6 percent for each round a university advances in the tournament.

Murphy and Trandel (1994) also considered athletic success but instead of basketball, football records were analyzed. Specifically, their study analyzed schools who competed in Division I football and who were members of one of the six major conferences from 1978 to 1987: (1) the ACC; (2) the Big Eight; (3) the Big Ten; (4) the PAC-10; (5) the SEC; and (6) the SWC. These conferences contained a total of 55 schools. The ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model in this study utilized variables to measure the number of freshman applications received based on the within-conference winning percentage of a university's football team. Other variables controlled for included the number of high school graduates in an institution's state; the per capita income of an institution's state; the cost of tuition; and the average salary paid to a university's full professors (lagged for one year). The model also contained fixed effects to capture unmeasurable university characteristics that did not change during the years analyzed. According to the results, for each 25 percent increase in winning percentage among football conference opponents, the university would receive a 1.3 percent increase in freshman applications (Murphy & Trandel, 1994). In other words, universities playing

in one of the six major conferences will play approximately eight conference games each year and will see a slight increase in freshman applications for each win they secure.

Instead of regular season victories, Toma and Cross (1998) analyzed the effect winning a national championship in football or men's basketball has on the quantity of undergraduate applications received by a Division I institution. The study reviewed application data for 11 different institutions that won the Men's Basketball Championship and 13 institutions that won the Football National Title from 1979 to 1992. For each of these schools, admissions data were collected for the three years before the national championship season and three years after the championship season (Toma & Cross, 1998). Of the 16 national championships acquired in football during the sample period, 14 showed an increase in the number of applications, seven saw an increase of 10 percent or more, and two schools (i.e., University of Miami (FL) in 1987 and the Georgia Institute of Technology in 1990) had an increase of 20 percent or more. In addition, 14 of the 16 schools maintained their application increase over three years, with 13 experiencing an increase of 7 percent or more (Toma & Cross, 1998). Only the University of Alabama (1979) and Clemson University (1981) did not see a significant improvement in admissions after winning a football national title immediately or three years after. For basketball national championships, only two schools (i.e., the University of Michigan in the Fall 1990 admission cycle; Georgetown University in the Fall 1985 admission cycle) saw an application increase of over 10 percent the year after the championship season. However, three years after a championship proved to increase the number of applications for 10 of the 13 schools (Toma & Cross, 1998).

Mixon, Trevino, and Minto (2004) revisited the relationship between SAT scores and college football success by replicating Murphy and Trandel's (1994) study with an updated data series on football winning percentages from 1990 to 2000 and the median SAT score of a university's 2001 freshman class. The schools included in this sample (n = 68) were from the ACC, Big Ten, Big XII, Big East, C-USA, MWC, PAC-10, and SEC conferences as well as the University of Notre Dame. The model utilized by Mixon, Trevino, and Minto (2004) is similar to Murphy and Trandel's (1994) model, but includes variables to determine the percentage of faculty holding a Ph.D. degree and a private school designation. The results of the model supported the findings of McCormick and Tinsley (1987), Murphy and Trandel (1994), and the viewpoint of college administrators (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010). Specifically, "by succeeding on the playing field, a university is able to increase the quality of its incoming freshman class (i.e., increase median SAT scores)" (Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004, p. 423).

Instead of focusing on one specific sport, Pope and Pope (2009) showed success in multiple sports could increase applications and enrollment for a university. In addition, this study analyzed enrollment data over 20 years, nearly double the time period most other studies have analyzed. To measure the athletic success in football, Pope and Pope (2009) collected the Associated Press (AP) college football rankings for teams finishing in the top 20. For basketball, the study based success on a team's qualification to the NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament, advancement to the Sweet Sixteen and Final Four, and winning the national championship. In terms of collegiate data, the researchers obtained college-level data from the Thomson Corporation, the publishers of *Peterson's Guide to Four Year Colleges*, on 332 schools that participated in Division I basketball or

Division I-FBS football from 1983 to 2002. Other variables collected include the average nine-month full-time professor salary and total annual cost of attendance at each school. Finally, SAT scores were derived from the College Board's Test-Takers Database, an SAT score database. Pope and Pope (2009) found the long term success football and basketball teams increases the quantity of applications to a school by 2 to 8 percent for Top 20 football schools and Top 16 basketball schools. In addition, the study also noted private schools saw a two to four time increase in application rates after sports success compared (Pope & Pope, 2009). Furthermore, applications received by the institutions are comprised of both low and high SAT scoring students, providing the potential for schools to improve their admission results (Pope & Pope, 2009).

Hansen (2011) argued the increase in national media exposure and athletic success would have a significant impact on both recruiting and enrollments for colleges. To review this phenomenon, Hansen (2011) analyzed Texas Tech University in 2008 during one of its most successful football seasons as a setting for the study. The Red Raiders finished the season with an 11 win and 2 loss record and qualified for the AT&T Cotton Bowl Classic against the University of Mississippi ("2008 Texas Tech Red Raiders", 2010). Similar to BC, Texas Tech had a dramatic last-second victory over rival and the top ranked football team in the nation, the University of Texas at Austin (Hansen, 2011).

Hansen (2011) conducted a qualitative study with the utilization of questionnaires to 75 students that were first enrolled at Texas Tech University from 2009 to the fall of 2010. In addition, the study acquired enrollment application data from 2007 to the fall of 2010 to assess any trends. Participants were asked to discuss the factors that played a

role in their college choice decisions. According to the results, students attending Texas Tech were influenced by other factors (i.e., academic programs, academic reputation, and campus facilities) as opposed to the successful 2008 football season. However, approximately 33 percent of respondents noted that iconic athletic moments helped with their decision to apply to the university. Finally, 43 percent of survey respondents noted a positive influence of having a Division I athletics program and 25 percent by having a winning football team (Hansen, 2011). Hansen (2011) concluded that collegiate athletic success has an effect on the college choice decisions of students but not a significantly larger role than traditional college choice factors.

To this point, many of the studies conducted on the potential of the Flutie Effect centered on the success of Division I schools. It was not until Castle and Kostelnik (2011) and Krenz (2011) that research would be conducted on programs from other NCAA divisions. Castle and Kostelnik (2011) investigated the impact athletic success has on the quantity of freshman applications and the quality of enrolled freshmen at 14 Division II institutions. The 14 schools utilized in this study were associated with the Pennsylvania State Athletic Conference (PSAC) from 1995 to 2004. The schools were studied based on their success for the Sports Academy Directors' Cup, which is awarded to the university in each NCAA Division as well as the NAIA that exhibits the highest overall intercollegiate athletic success by the National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics (NACDA), and the Dixon Trophy, which is similar to the Sports Academy Directors Cup but only awarded to a school in the PSAC (Castle & Kostelnik, 2011). Following a similar model as Murphy and Trandel (1994), this study indicated a strong correlation between overall athletic success and the quantity of freshmen applicants.

Specifically, the rankings of the 14 universities in the Dixon Cup Standings showed that applications did increase for the higher ranked schools.

Similar to Hansen (2011), Krenz (2011) studied the impact of winning a Division II national championship in football at the University of Minnesota-Duluth (UMD) in Duluth, Minnesota. In 2008 and 2010, the UMD Bulldogs captured its first two national championships in football, defeating Northwest Missouri State University in 2008 (21 to 14) and Delta State University in 2010 (20 to 17) (Luther, 2011; “Minnesota-Duluth Wins First”, 2008). Krenz (2011) conducted a qualitative study to obtain the opinions, beliefs, and understandings of employees of UMD. The staff members were asked questions related to the 2008-09 football season in order to gather information and perceptions on how success in sport affects the university and its stakeholders. The Chancellor of the university, Head Coach of the football program, Athletic Director, Assistant Athletic Director, Head Athletic Trainer, an Admissions Officer, and an Academic Officer were the seven university staff members interviewed. According to their comments, the staff members agreed a national championship changes the perception and belief of the campus and students can be recruited and acquired easier (Krenz, 2011). Furthermore, the respondents noted the exposure on a national stage for football helped create publicity for the university as a whole.

While much research on the Flutie Effect was conducted within the last 30 years, many studies only analyzed a successful athletic program based on individual and team results. Although the basis of the phenomenon is derived from on-the-field or on-the-court success, an athletic department can achieve success in a multitude of ways. According to Collins (2012), “an institution’s decision to implement an athletics strategy

generally represents some form of organizational change: change in the structure of the athletics department (e.g., staffing and sport sponsorship), change in conference membership, or change in the level of athletics competition (p. 4). The decisions made for these specific changes can affect stakeholders of the university as well as create significant consequences on organizational culture, institutional mission, and academic reputation (Collins, 2012).

Although the Flutie Effect may be limited in this respect, many scholars have established variations of this methodology to analyze the effects of other phenomenon. One of the most common areas studied under this methodology is the increase of professional sport game attendance after the construction of a new stadium. This phenomenon is known as the Novelty Effect and is analyzed from an event study standpoint within economic literature (e.g., Clapp & Hakes, 2005; Coates & Humphreys, 2005; Leadley & Zygmunt, 2006; McEvoy, Nagel, DeSchriver, & Brown, 2005; Noll, 1974). While the seminal work on the Novelty Effect was prepared by Noll (1974), Coates and Humphreys (1999) introduced the age of the stadium in the current year as well as a dummy variable for the first ten years a team has occupied the new stadium to measure the actual length of a Novelty Effect. These dummy variables would be altered to capture each year within the first ten years (i.e., Year One variable, Year Two variable, etc.) (Coates & Humphreys, 2005). Although the use of age variables is not unique to Novelty Effect studies, the present dissertation argues the measurement of age utilized by Coates and Humphreys (2005) can capture a Reclassification Effect for athletic association affiliation through the length of NCAA membership.

Conclusion

University officials may operate under the belief that athletic association reclassification can improve the legitimacy of the university and attract high school graduates to apply and enroll at their institution. Past research demonstrated that certain social characteristics will increase the probability of a school transitioning to the NAIA to the NCAA (Smith et al., 2013; Washington, 2004-05). However, these studies only considered a general move to the NCAA and a specific Division transition. Many university officials consider the general NCAA's branding and outreach opposed to the specific divisional level as beneficial to the institution (Dwyer et al., 2010; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). Specifically, university officials proclaimed a move to the NCAA will increase their legitimacy and identity among other institutions in order to attract new students (Keller, 2004; Smith, 2011; Weaver, 2010). However, minimal work examines the quantity and duration of this possible benefit. Therefore, this dissertation examines a university's movement from the NAIA to the NCAA and its potential effects on the university. This study utilizes an econometric model mirroring specific variables utilized in past Flutie Effect and Novelty Effect studies to determine the longevity of a Reclassification Effect on applications based upon a social mobility strategy to improve a university's social identity through movement from the NAIA to the NCAA.

Chapter 4 – Methodology

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine a university's movement from the NAIA to the NCAA and its potential effects on the university. In order to study this phenomenon, this dissertation first provides a historical analysis of the NAIA since its inception in 1937 to the present day. Next, the dissertation explores the likelihood of university movement from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II or Division III based upon a university's social identities through a logistic regression model. Finally, the present work incorporates both Flutie Effect and some novelty effect methodology to create a Reclassification Effect model to determine if an increase in applications can be achieved based upon an athletic association reclassification.

Historical Research Design

This dissertation utilizes a historical analysis developed by Booth (2005) and Seifried (2010) to help understand the membership history of the NAIA from 1936 to 2012 for better comprehension regarding a potential Reclassification Effect. Step one of the historical research method required the pursuit and acquisition of those documents and artifacts connected to this time period (i.e., 1936 to 2012). Within reasonable limits, a wide range of primary sources and secondary sources were collected. Primary documents used to support the pursuit of organizational legitimacy by the NAIA included NAIA yearbooks, reports, letters or correspondence with organizational officials, and items from the *NAIA News*.

Secondary sources incorporated into this review included a variety of history books, academic articles, reviews of research, and newspaper articles from national media publications such as *The New York Times*, *Kansas City Star*, *Christian Science*

Monitor, and *St. Petersburg Times* in addition to a variety of other local newspapers.

Media publications are important because Baum and Powell (1995) highlighted the media as one agent because of their ability to comment publicly on organizations and their practices as being with or against social norms. Negative coverage or promotion possibly may signal a lack of merit regarding the organization's actions toward their strategic objections (Drori & Honig, 2013) as well as the organization not becoming socially accepted and possibly on par with industry peers (Baum & Powell, 1995; Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). Finally, Deephouse and Suchman (2008) argued the media is frequently believed to be a legitimate source of information. Important media such as major newspapers and television networks are frequently targeted and solicited by organizations as a strategy to provide them help when maintaining or establishing legitimacy (Boyle, 2001). Overall, every attempt was made to collect data from those secondary sources utilizing primary sources; further, a wide range of sources is presented because all accounts must remain suspect until corroborated by other sources.

Step two calls for an historical criticism to test the reliability of sources and compare observations. Step two certifies the authenticity of primary and secondary sources towards the preparation of accurate conclusions. The historical criticism is necessary because it serves to establish the credibility of sources both internally and externally to help avoid selection and use of some data to favor a specific hypothesis. Internally, the dissertation addressed the accuracy of the data collected and looked for gaps in the provided explanations. The internal criticism also attempted to consider the author or speaker's intended audience and his/her reputation as an expert or non-expert. The external criticism involved examining how the primary and secondary sources

collected their information and if that information appeared falsified in any way. In essence, the dissertation sought to establish reliability and validity through asking questions such as: 1) who created the source; 2) their relationship to the information presented; 3) and how the information was collected. Checks for trustworthiness also occurred through examining the authenticity of documents. As an example, the dissertation analyzed the date of work and the temporal arrangement of events presented in the sources used. Reliability also received attention from attempts to choose documents/documentation as close to the event(s) as possible. Finally, the dissertation looked to see if local or national social, economic, religious, and political conditions prejudiced the information used.

The dissertation followed step two by analyzing and interpreting the evidence collected in order to establish a relationship between the NAIA membership history and a larger theme or themes found which focused on organizational legitimacy. The dissertation sought to prevent a poor logical analysis through categorizing data and embracing the constructionist approach as their epistemology. Booth (2005) described constructionists as seeking to analyze patterns, trends, and other events through history to construct an ‘informed’ narrative regarding a phenomenon, organization, or individual. Further, as constructionists, the dissertation organized a narrative through embracing the “concepts and theories of others as tools to propose and explain relationship between events” (Booth, 2005, p. 6). To aid, a detailed outline and timeline was prepared to identify, organize, and criticize the various interconnecting themes emerging from the topic in the fourth and final step. An *ex post facto* interpretive lens was used to consider how the NAIA took the path that it did and that theoretical lens, unveiled itself to be

concentrating on organizational legitimacy through the various institutional strategies employed.

Model One Research Design

To investigate the effect a university's social identities have on the likelihood of university movement, this dissertation will examine the initial movement of schools from the NAIA to the NCAA. NAIA membership will be examined from 1973 to 2012. This time period is particularly useful since it encompasses the NCAA reorganizational effort to create Divisions II and III (Falla, 1981). If a school decides to reclassify into another NCAA division, return to the NAIA or another athletic association, or drop its athletic program altogether, the school will be removed from the sample. Smith, Soebbing, and Washington (in press) noted schools associated with the NAIA shared many similarities with schools aligned with Division II and III. In addition, Divisions II and III are considered since many schools were enticed by the NCAA financial support ("Football Telecasts and Revenue Spread Wide", 1976; Washington, 2004-05). Division I is not considered because of the lack of similarities between NAIA member schools and Division I schools. The annual membership records for the sample years were obtained directly from the NAIA.¹ University identities such as location, public/private distinction, HBCU designation, women's college designation, religious affiliation, and revenue generating sport offerings were collected from the various university websites

¹ Smith et al. (2013) collected the membership list from Chad Waller and the NAIA Membership Services Department. This dissertation utilized the same list and would like to thank Mr. Waller and his staff for their help in providing the NAIA membership for the time period.

and other university publications (e.g., yearbooks, newspapers, annals, etc.) as well as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), IPEDS “is a system of interrelated surveys that gathers information from every college, university, and technical and vocational institution that participates in the federal student aid programs” (“About IPEDS”, n.d., para. 1). This database provides basic data on U.S. postsecondary education in order to describe and determine trends in terms of the number of students enrolled, number of faculty and staff employed, number of degrees earned, and the total amount of dollars expended (“About IPEDS”, n.d.”). Schools participating in or are applicants for participation in any federal student financial aid program (e.g., Pell Grants and federal student loans) are required to complete an IPEDS survey annually according to Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Information from this database has been previously utilized by Smith et al. (2013) in terms of regional definitions as well as serving as a confirmation secondary source on identity verification. The IPEDS database has also been used in many studies such as ones analyzing college quality (Black & Smith, 2004), cost differences between for-profit and non-profit universities (Laband & Lentz, 2004), educational costs and student engagement (Pike, Smart, Kuh, & Hayek, 2006), minority college enrollment and attainment (Backes, 2012; Hinrichs, 2011), and part-time faculty effects on graduation rates (Jacoby, 2006).

The unit of observation is a university-year. This unit of observation is in accordance with the IPEDS database, which is sorted by the academic year. The IPEDS database was analyzed for NAIA member schools based upon the NAIA listing. Any institution that merged with another school, changed its name, or closed was identified to

ensure that no double counting occurred within the data set. Furthermore, the sample does not include any international universities along with any U.S. institutions not included in the IPEDS database. The collection of data for this dissertation is consistent with the methods used by Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004; 2004-05). The data set includes 22,367 university-year observations from 1973 to 2012.

Dependent Variable

Colleges and universities that were members of the NAIA during the sample time period were included in the data set one year after departing the NAIA for Division II or Division III. This inclusion allows for the simulation of movement by one institution after similar universities accomplished reclassification. After one year in the NCAA, the observed university will no longer be present in the sample. A university's movement to either Division II or Division III was observed through the use of 1/0 dichotomous variable. The value of one indicates that an observed university left the NAIA in the current year, while zero signifies that the university stayed in the NAIA. This variable serves as the dependent variable in the logistic regression model utilized for Model One.

Independent Variables

In their analysis of organizations moving from one stock exchange (e.g., the NASDAQ) to another stock exchange (e.g., the New York Stock Exchange), Rao et al. (2000) argued defections constituted an identity-discrepant cue for remaining organizations within a particular in-group to consider a move to an out-group. Both Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004; 2004-05) utilized Rao et al.'s (2000) theoretical framework when interpreting certain identity-discrepant cues that influence a university to defect from an in-group (e.g., the NAIA) and join an out-group (e.g., the

NCAA). If a university decides to change its affiliation with one particular group, this change may influence other universities to reconsider their own relationship within the association and possibly defect to the out-group as well. As a result, this dissertation incorporates the identities utilized in both Smith et al.'s (2013) and Washington's (2004; 2004-05) research with some alterations to specific categories such as religious affiliation and sport offerings. Furthermore, two different models are estimated in order to differentiate between schools making an initial movement to Division II or Division III.

The first identity is the geographic location of the university. Washington (2004-05) considered a school's conference affiliation within the NAIA as a definition of its geography. Smith et al. (2013) altered this approach by utilizing the eight IPEDS definitions for geographical regions. The regions are classified as (1) New England; (2) Mid-East; (3) Great Lakes; (4) Plains; (5) Southeast; (6) Southwest; (7) Rocky Mountain; and (8) Far West.² Table 4.1 identifies the states included in each specific region. These regions will be classified as an indicator variable for the specific region that the school is located (e.g., New England region). In addition, a count variable will be included to determine the number of universities in an observation's region that moved to either NCAA division in the given year (e.g., *# of schools from university's region to Division II*; *# of schools from university's region to Division III*). Finally, an interaction variable will also be utilized that will compare the eight geographic regions with the two count variables (e.g., *New England Region*Region School # to Div. II*; *New England Region*Region School # to Div. III*). A positive and significant parameter on the

² The IPEDS database identifies a ninth region for U.S. Service schools. For the purposes of this dissertation, schools coded with this frequency were removed from the sample.

Table 4-1 - IPEDS Regions

Region	States
New England Region	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
Mid-East Region	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania
Great Lakes Region	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin
Plains Region	Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota
Southeast Region	Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia
Southwest Region	Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas
Rocky Mountains Region	Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Utah, Wyoming
Far West Region	Alaska, California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, Washington

interaction variable will indicate that the more universities located in the observed university's region that choose to move to either Division II or Division III, the more likely it is for the observed university to move into a specific division in the given year.

The second social identity is religious affiliation. Both Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004-05) incorporated religious affiliation within their study based upon Garg, Rasheed, and Priem's (2005) belief that schools with a religious affiliation are similar to "the business-format of franchising where schools receive a basket of 'goods' such as approaches and procedures that are implemented" (p. 31). Steensland, Park, Regnerus, Robinson, Wilcox, and Woodberry (2000) cautioned researchers how to categorize and study religious groupings. Specifically, Steensland et al. (2000) argued religious denominations should be grouped according to their affiliation within six nominal categories opposed to each denomination's specific ideology. This process avoids any potential historical, terminological, and taxonomical inaccuracies that may occur while also focusing on concrete religious traditions (Steensland et al., 2000).

The misclassification of religious affiliation may have resulted in the mixed results reported by both Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004-05). Specifically, Washington (2004-05) noted schools with religious affiliation (e.g., Baptist, Methodist, and other religious affiliations) were less vulnerable to the pressure to change athletic affiliation after previous institutions defected from the NAIA to the NCAA. Smith et al. (2013) showed different results, noting religious affiliation had no significant impact on the likelihood of movement. However, Smith et al. (2013) classified religious affiliation in general terms (i.e., coding 1 for affiliation, 0 otherwise) despite attempts “to aggregate the denominations to larger and generalized categories” (p. 31). This dissertation attempts to correct the religious affiliation indicator variable by grouping schools according to Steensland et al.’s (2000) six nominal categories: (1) Mainline Protestant; (2) Evangelical Protestant; (3) Black Protestant; (4) Roman Catholic; (5) Judaism; and (6) Other (e.g., Mormon, Jehovah’s Witness, Muslim, Hindu, and Unitarian). Table 4.2 provides a full listing of denominations within each nominal category.

Based on these categories, the religious affiliation will have three variables. First, an indicator variable will be utilized to distinguish universities with religious affiliation under one of the six groupings with zero as a designation for schools with no affiliation (e.g., Mainline Protestant). The second variable will be a count variable (e.g., *# of Religious Grouping to Division II; # of Religious Grouping to Division III*) that is equal to the number of universities from the observed university’s religious grouping that moved to the NCAA in a given year. Finally, an interaction term (*Religious Grouping*# of Religious Grouping to Division II; Religious Grouping*# of Religious Grouping to Division III*) will be used to compare the indicator and count variables.

Table 4-2 - Religion Classifications

Religion Group	Denominations
Catholic	Roman Catholic
Mainline Protestant	American Baptist Churches in U.S.A., American Evangelical Lutheran Church, American Lutheran Church, Episcopal Church, Evangelical Lutheran, Lutheran Church in America, Presbyterian Church in U.S.A., United Methodist Church, United Presbyterian Church in U.S.A., American Reformed, Baptist (Northern), Christian Disciples, First Congregationalist, Disciples of Christ, Evangelical Reformed, First Christian Disciples of Christ, First Church, First Reformed, Friends, Grace Reformed, Hungarian Reformed, Latvian Reformed, Moravian, Quaker, Reformed, Reformed Church of Christ, Reformed United Church of Christ, Schwenkfelder, United Brethren in Christ, United Church of Canada, United Church of Christ, United Church of Christianity
Evangelical Protestant	American Baptist Association, Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, Southern Baptist Convention, Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod, Advent Christian, Amish, Apostolic Church, Apostolic Christian, Assembly of God, Bible Missionary, Brethren Church, Brethren-Plymouth, Brother of Christ, Calvary Bible, Chapel of Faith, Charismatic, Chinese Gospel Church, Christ Cathedral of Truth, Christ Church Unity, Christ and Missionary Alliance, Christian Cavalry Chapel, Christian Methodist Episcopal, Christian Reformed, Christ in Christian Union, Christ in God, Churches of God, Church of Christ, Church of Daniel's Band, Church of God of Prophecy, Church of Prophecy, Church of the First Born, Church of the Living God, Community Church, Community of Christ, Covenant, Dutch Reformed, Evangelical Congregational, Evangelical Covenant, Evangelical Free Church, Evangelical Methodist, Evangelical United Brethren, Faith Christian, Faith Gospel Tabernacle, First Christian, Four Square Gospel, Free Methodist, Free Will Baptist, Full Gospel, Grace Brethren, Holiness Church of God, Holy Roller, Laotian Christian, Living Word, Macedonia, Mennonite, Mennonite Brethren, Missionary Baptist, Missionary Church, Mission Covenant, Nazarene, Non-Denominational, Pentecostal, Pentecostal Assembly of God, Pentecostal Church of God, People's Church, Pilgrim Holiness, Primitive Baptist, Seventh Day Adventist, Swedish Mission, Triumph Church of God, The Way Ministry, Wesleyan, Wesleyan Methodist-Pilgrim
Black Protestant	African Methodist Episcopal Church, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, African Methodist, Disciples of God, Federated Church, Pentecostal Apostolic, Zion Union, Zion Union Apostolic, Zion Union Apostolic-Reformed
Other	Christadelphians, Christian Scientist, Church of Jesus Christ of the Restoration, Church Universal and Triumphant, Jehovah's Witness, Latter-Day Saints, Mormon, True Light Church of Christ, Worldwide Church of God, Christ Church Unity, Eden Evangelist, Mind Science, New Age Spirituality, New Birth Christian, Religious Science, Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam, Eastern Orthodox

The third identity relates to the HBCU designation. Both Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004; 2004-05) included this characteristic in their research. This characteristic is important since both the NAIA and the NCAA previously focused on the admission of HBCUs at specific points in time. Stooksbury (2010) noted the NAIA's admission of HBCUs came after the NCAA criticized the NAIA for its rule banning African-Americans from participating in the NIBT in the 1940s. By the 1950s, the NAIA abolished the rule and slowly began accepting HBCUs as full members (Wilson, 2005). As the NAIA grew, the NCAA altered their policies in order to attract HBCUs including the creation of the College Division (Falla, 1981; Washington, 2004). Furthermore, several studies (Katz, 1990; Katz & McLendon, 1988; Spreitzer & Snyder, 1990) explained sports play a predominant role in African American culture. As such, Smith et al. (2013) noted a move to the NCAA from the NAIA could allow an HBCU to potentially gain exposure and attract new students to its institution. An indicator variable (BCU) is included that takes the value of one if the university is an HBCU and zero otherwise. In addition, there is a separate count variable (e.g., *# of BCU to Division II*; *# of BCU to Division III*) signifying the number of HBCUs that moved to each respective division in a given year. Finally, there is an interaction variable (*HBCU*# HBCU to Division II*; *HBCU*HBCU to Division III*) combining the HBCU indicator variable with the HBCU count variables in a given year.

The fourth identity involves schools classified as private. Prior studies on college movement did not test if the private school designation influences the likelihood of reclassification. Instead, Smith et al. (2013) created a count variable for the number of public schools to control for the movement of public schools that were not classified as

an HBCU, women's college, or affiliated with a religion. This variable was created since most schools maintaining these characteristics are private institutions. However, some institutions can be classified as private schools without possessing any additional identity. Thus, the dissertation will control for private institutions by creating an indicator variable for schools designated as private (PRIVATE). This indicator variable takes the value of one if the university is private and zero otherwise. In addition, there is a separate count variable (e.g., *# of Private Schools to Division II*; *# of Private Schools to Division III*) signifying the number of private schools that moved to each respective division in a given year. Finally, there is an interaction variable (e.g., *PRIVATE*# Private to Division II*; *PRIVATE*Private to Division III*) combining the private school indicator variable with the private school count variables in a given year.

Size classification based upon the classifications designed by the Carnegie Foundation is the fourth social identity. According to the foundation, the Carnegie Classification "has been the leading framework for recognizing and describing institutional diversity in U.S. higher education" and "has been widely used in the study of higher education...as a way to represent and control for institutional differences" ("About Carnegie Classification", n.d., para. 1). Smith et al. (2013) noted the Carnegie Classification system has 18 different size classifications based upon the length of degree programs (i.e., two-year or four-year schools); if the university is private or public; and if a university is considered a residential or commuter university. To reduce the number of classifications, Smith et al. (2013) aggregated the Carnegie Classification system into four specific categories: (1) very small or small; (2) medium; (3) large or very large; and (4) not classified by Carnegie. This dissertation adopted Smith et al.'s (2013) groupings

to indicate the size of universities moving to either Division II or Division III because of the assumption the Carnegie Classification is relatively consistent over time. Very few universities move between classifications in a short period of time (e.g., University A moving from a “small” classification to a “medium” classification”).

Similar to the previous independent variables, there is an indicator variable for each of the aggregate Carnegie classifications (e.g., Medium). There is also a count variable (e.g., *# of Schools from Size to Division II; # of Schools from Size to Division III*) equal to the number of universities joining either division based upon the observed university’s size classification in a given year. Finally, there is an interaction variable showcasing the interaction between the indicator and count variables for all size categories (e.g., *Medium University*# of Medium Schools to Division II; Medium University*# of Medium Schools to Division III*).

The sixth social identity is a university’s sponsorship of revenue generating sports. Traditionally, scholars argued only two revenue generating sports exist within intercollegiate athletics: (1) football and (2) men’s basketball (Fulks, 2011; Kahn, 2007). However, some universities generate revenue and profits from sports traditionally viewed as non-revenue generating. For example, the University of Connecticut (UConn) consistently generates revenue from its women’s basketball program (Eaton-Robb, 2011); Louisiana State University (LSU) sponsors a profitable baseball team (Louisiana Legislative Auditor, 2012); and the University of Minnesota (UM) generates profits from its men’s hockey team (Mullen, 2010). The NCAA also continues to expand its broadcast coverage for many sport championships it sponsors (“NCAA, ESPN Agree”, 2011). Due to the success and growth of women’s basketball, baseball, and men’s

hockey, many universities have added these sport programs hoping to achieve similar success. As such, this dissertation includes indicator variables for five potential revenue generating sports: (1) football; (2) men's basketball; (3) women's basketball; (4) baseball; and (5) men's hockey. Count variables are also used to show the number of schools sponsoring one of these sports and moving to Division II or III in the given year (e.g., *# of Schools with Football to Division II*; *# of Schools with Football to Division III*). Finally, an interaction variable combines the indicator and count variables for all five respective sports (e.g., *Football*# of Schools with Football to Division II*; *Football*# of Schools with Football to Division III*).

Control Variables

In order to control for time-based effects, the dissertation establishes a control variable representing each year of the sample setting (TREND). The year 1973 will take a value of one. TREND will continue to increase until it reaches the year 2012 and takes a value of 40. Both Clapp and Hakes (2005) and McEvoy et al. (2005) used a similar trend variable to control for the overall popularity for the years included in their respective studies. For the purpose of this dissertation, TREND controls for the expected upward trend of movement during the time period analyzed (1973 – 2012).

The dissertation also monitors the effect NAIA leadership may have on the likelihood of movement within the observed year. During the time period analyzed, six individuals served as the NAIA Executive Secretary/CEO. A. O. Duer was Executive Secretary from 1949 to 1975. Duer retired in 1975 and was replaced by Harry Fritz. Fritz would stay on as leader until 1986, when he was removed from office. Jefferson Farris was named NAIA Executive Secretary/CEO in 1986 and served until 1990. After

Farris stepped down, James Chasteen took over as CEO in 1991. In 1996, Chasteen was removed from office, and Steve Baker was appointed CEO. Baker stepped down in 2006, and Jim Carr took over as NAIA CEO and continues to serve as of 2014. Each leader will have a variable that takes on a value of one for each year of his respective tenure and zero otherwise. For example, schools who were affiliated with the NAIA during Duer's tenure as Executive Secretary (DUER) takes a value of one from 1973 to 1975 and zero for all other years.

Model and Estimation Technique

Logistic regression is a regression analysis that is used for the prediction of a particular outcome. Abraham and Ledolter (2006) noted the dependent variable is dichotomous and takes two distinct values: (1) $y_i = \text{success}$, coded as 1; and (2) $y_i = \text{failure}$, coded as 0. The outcome y_i is assumed to have a Bernoulli distribution with the following success and failure probabilities:

$$P(y_i = 1) = \pi \text{ and } P(y_i = 0) = 1 - \pi, \text{ for } i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (1)$$

Logistic regression projects the success probability as a function of the severity of independent variables. Due to the nature of the dichotomous dependent variables, it is erroneous to utilize a standard linear regression model (i.e. $y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \epsilon_i$) with binary response data (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006). A linear model allows for response estimates to be outside of the range of zero to one. Furthermore, Marx (2012) noted the normal error distribution is no longer valid since only two different errors are possible with a binary response variable.

The probabilities of $\pi(x_i)$ are parameterized as:

$$\pi(x_i) = \left[\frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \epsilon_i}} \right] \text{ and} \quad (2)$$

$$1 - \pi(x_i) = \left[\frac{e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon_i}}{1 + e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon_i}} \right] \quad (3)$$

According to Abraham and Ledolter (2006), “the probabilities are nonlinear functions of the parameters β ” (p. 345). However, through a log transformation, the nonlinear function can appear as a linear model. It can be shown as:

$$\text{Ln} \left[\frac{\pi(x_i)}{1 - \pi(x_i)} \right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon_i \quad (4)$$

Geaghan (2012) positioned the log transformation of the original probabilities results in a ratio known as the log odds. This ratio compares the probability of an occurrence to the probability of its nonoccurrence and is referred to as the odds of occurrence (Marx, 2012). The odds of occurrence can take on values between zero and infinity. For example, if $\pi = 0.5$, the odds are even and an event can either occur or not occur. If $\pi = 0.8$, then an event is four times more likely to occur than its nonoccurrence. The log odds, or logit, assumes a linear function and shows that the regression coefficients represent a change in the odds (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006).

An alternate function that transforms a probability π into a quantity from zero to infinity is a probit, which is the inverse of the distribution function Φ of the standard normal distribution (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006). A linear regression can be used to model the effects of covariates on the probit as follows:

$$\text{Probit}(\pi) = \Phi^{-1}(\pi) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon_i \text{ or} \quad (5)$$

$$\pi = \Phi(\beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p X_{ip} + \varepsilon_i) \quad (6)$$

According to Maddala (1983), the difference between a logit and a probit model is that a probit regression will generally have flatter tails than a logistic regression. In other

words, there is not much difference between the two functions except when probabilities are very close to either zero or one (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006). Since there will be very little qualitative differences in the conclusions of logistic and probit models, this dissertation will utilize a logistic regression model as this model is consistent with the previous research examining university movement (Smith et al., 2013; Washington, 2004; 2004-05).

Furthermore, previous sports research has been conducted utilizing logistic regression by examining the likelihood of a university receiving an invitation to the NCAA men's basketball tournament (Washington & Zajac, 2005); a university's adoption of a sports program (Washington & Ventresca, 2004); a professional sports team winning a game (Taylor & Trogon, 2002); and a coach being dismissed from his/her job (Frick, Barros, & Prinz, 2010). The general logistic regression models are:

$$\text{Ln} \left[\frac{\pi_{D2}(x_i)}{1 - \pi_{D2}(x_i)} \right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2}(\pi_{D2}) + \varepsilon_i \quad (7)$$

$$\text{Ln} \left[\frac{\pi_{D3}(x_i)}{1 - \pi_{D3}(x_i)} \right] = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{i1} + \beta_2 X_{i2}(\pi_{D3}) + \varepsilon_i \quad (8)$$

where $\pi(x_i)$ is the probability of a school moving from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II (π_{D2}) or Division III (π_{D3}); β_0 is a constant; β_1 is the set of coefficients for explanatory variables X_{i1} that do not change over time; β_2 is the set of coefficients for explanatory variables $X_{i2}(\pi)$ that do change with time; and ε_i is an error term. The results from this logistic regression model will indicate if the independent variables are likely to cause a change in the dependent variable.

Estimation Issues

Two potential estimation issues exist that could affect the accuracy of the results. The first is multicollinearity, and it occurs when two independent variables are very highly correlated (Geaghan, 2012). Schroeder, Sjoquist, and Stephan (1986) noted no statistical test can determine if multicollinearity is a problem. In order to avoid this potential issue, a careful model specification is necessary (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006). Since multicollinearity occurs between two or more correlated variables, one simple solution would be to remove a variable that is correlated (Geaghan, 2012). This action would create a reduced model with a subset of the original variables while reducing the correlated variables (O'Brien, 2007). A second solution would be to increase the sample size in the hope that additional data will bring out the differences in variables and reduce the correlation (Grewal, Cote, & Baumgartner, 2004; Mason & Perreault, 1991). Because of the large sample size utilized in this analysis, multicollinearity is not expected to be a problem with the exception of the interaction variables. However, the inclusion of these variables is essential to examine the interaction effects (Price & Wolfers, 2011). Thus, similar to Smith et al. (2013) and Washington (2004; 2004-05), the present dissertation will contain interaction variables despite concern for multicollinearity.

The second estimation issue deals with the standard errors of the data. In a general panel regression model, one assumes that errors can occur at either the firm level or the time level (Thompson, 2011). Many studies adjust standard errors for correlation for one of these items but not across both. Thompson (2011) argued, however, that simultaneously clustering both firms and time will lead to significantly more accurate inference in panel data. Because the data set for this dissertation is comprised of many

universities over a period of time, some unobserved heterogeneity that is similar within each university's observations is present. As a result, the standard errors of the logistic regression model are clustered by university.

Model Two Research Design

From 1973 to 2012, 248 institutions made the initial move from the NAIA to Division II while 229 schools moved to Division III. The schools that proceeded with this action believed that the move would increase their overall applications. As such, this dissertation investigates if a university reclassification from the NAIA to the NCAA has a significant effect on applications. To analyze the Reclassification Effect, a panel regression model was implemented on application data collected by IPEDS for all schools that maintained an association with the NAIA since the organization's inception in 1937. Current and former NAIA member schools are chosen for this analysis in order to test if schools joining the NCAA from the NAIA does impact the benefits received through a reclassification or if the defector is still similar to their NAIA counterparts. Completed IPEDS surveys from these schools can be obtained from 1984 to 2012. While IPEDS records were not collected before 1984, the model will account for schools that moved between 1937 and 1983 through an independent variable that accounts for the age a university has been associated with the NCAA. Similar to Model One, the unit of observation for Model Two is a university-year in accordance with the IPEDS database. The sample will not include any international universities as well as any U.S. institutions that were not included in the IPEDS database.

Dependent Variable

The natural logarithm of the total number of applications (LN_APP) received by a university in the current year is the dependent variable for Model Two. Similar to Pope and Pope (2009), the dissertation uses log total applications as opposed to total applications utilized in Murphy and Trandel (1994) to avoid the significant overweight of large schools compared to small schools. The natural logarithm will also transform the model into an intrinsically linear model (Geaghan, 2012).

Independent Variables

In order to measure the Reclassification Effect, the dissertation utilizes two distinct independent variables. The first variable is the length of NCAA membership for a university as well as its affiliated division in the observed year (NCAA_AGE; D2_AGE; D3_AGE). The second variable is a dummy variable that indicates the first five years (RANGE5) and first ten years (RANGE10) of NCAA affiliation. Similar to Coates and Humphreys (1999; 2005), an additional dummy variable indicates that the observed year is one of the first ten years. In other words, if a university is in its first year of NCAA membership in the observed year, the dummy variable, YEAR1, takes on the value of one in the observed year and zero for all subsequent years.

Control Variables

Many studies on the Flutie Effect (McCormick & Tinsley, 1987; Mixon & Hsing, 1994; Mixon & Ressler, 1995; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Pope & Pope, 2009) and the novelty effect (Baade & Dye, 1990; Baade & Sanderson, 1997; Coates & Humphreys, 1999; 2005; Leadley & Zygmunt, 2006; Noll, 1974) established specific control variables related to two or more separate categories

(e.g., university and city specifics for Flutie Effect; city and franchise characteristics for novelty effect). Similar to these studies, the dissertation classified independent variables based upon two distinct categories: (1) athletic department specific and (2) university specific.

The first category of control variables relate to the athletic department of a university. Similar to Coates and Humphreys (2005) and McEvoy et al. (2005), a squared term for the age of association ($NCAA_AGE^2$, $D2_AGE^2$, and $D3_AGE^2$) is also created in order to determine if a curvilinear relationship exists. Further, all universities with an athletic program share the penultimate goal of “providing an environment where all student-athletes can pursue their athletic endeavors” (“Mission Statement: South Georgia”, 2007, para. 1). Athletic departments attempt to ensure that their teams and student-athletes are in a position to compete and potentially win championships. As noted in Chapter 2, many athletic departments make the decision to either leave the NAIA for the NCAA or stay with the NAIA and maintain their current social status (Smith, 2011; Washington, 2004; 2004-05). However, a reclassification from the NAIA to the NCAA requires schools to meet certain conditions for each respective division before committing to the move (NCAA Division II Manual, 2011a; NCAA Division III Manual, 2011b).

According to the NCAA Division II Manual (2011a), Bylaw 20.10.3 states institutions affiliated with Division II must sponsor a minimum of five men’s sports and five women’s sports, with at least two team sports for each gender, or four men’s sports and six women’s sports. In comparison, Bylaw 20.11.3 of the NCAA Division III Manual (2011b) mentions schools associated in Division III must provide athletic teams

in at least five NCAA sponsored sports for men and five for women with at least one sport occurring each season if the institution has enrollment of 1,000 students or less. For institutions with enrollment above 1,000, they are required to have at least six NCAA sponsored sports for men and six for women (NCAA, 2011b). The NCAA also places additional restrictions on each division such as the prohibition of athletically based financial aid for student-athletes in Division III schools (NCAA, 2011b) and the distribution of financial aid at Division II that is equivalent to a set number of full scholarships (NCAA, 2011a). Because of the variability between Division II and III, the model controls for the number of sports offered by a given institution in the current year.

Comparable to previous Flutie Effect (e.g., Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Toma & Cross, 1998) and novelty effect (e.g., Clapp & Hakes, 2005; Coates & Humphreys, 2005; Leadley & Zygmunt, 2006; McEvoy et al., 2005) studies, the dissertation controls for the athletic success certain sports provide universities on the field or on the court. Specifically, this dissertation creates an indicator variable to control for the observed institution's achievement of a title (e.g., division, conference, and/or national) in three sports: (1) football; (2) men's basketball; and (3) women's basketball. Many of the Flutie Effect studies examined football exclusively (Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Murphy & Trandel, 1994); men's basketball exclusively (Mixon & Ressler, 1995); or a combination of the two sports (Pope & Pope, 2009; Toma & Cross, 1998). Women's sports, specifically women's basketball, have not been considered as a source for a potential increase in applications. Thus, the championships earned by a university's women's basketball program are included in the model.

The second category of control variables relate to the university itself. The dissertation utilizes some of the social characteristics identified in Model One in this study examining determinants of applications. Recall these identities are private school designation (PRIVATE), women's only institutions (WOMENS), HBCUs (BCU), geographic regions (NE, ME, GL, PL, SE, SW, RM, FW), and religious affiliations (CATH, M_PROT, E_PROT, and OTH_REL). Past studies have only considered if an institution is private or public (Mixon & Hsing, 1995; Mixon, Trevino & Minto, 2004) without consideration of other identities attracting individuals to a university.

The dissertation also controls for the age of each university contained in the sample (AGE_UNIV). In addition, past work on the Flutie Effect has not identified the various degree programs offered by an institution each year. Because of the variability among schools, however, one may find controlling for the number of all potential degree programs offered at a university to be impractical. Instead, this variable is operationalized by an indicator variable for schools with a graduate school program (GRAD) since the dependent variable is total applications (graduate and undergraduate) for a university in the observed year.

A university's quality is also analyzed in the model. Both Buss, Parker, and Rivenburg (2004) and Sumaedi, Bakti, and Metasari (2011) based the quality of an institution on its tuition prices, noting higher tuition costs provided a higher quality education. Previous Flutie Effect studies have shown inconsistency in their utilization of tuition costs. Mixon and Hsing (1995) analyzed the non-resident tuition for public schools and tuition for all students within private colleges while Murphy and Trandel (1994) only included in-state tuition. Pope and Pope (2009) included the cost to attend

school from a general standpoint but utilized it as a log variable. Based on these examples, this dissertation utilizes the tuition costs for out-of-state residents as it mirrors the costs for private schools. The variable will indicate which quantile a university's out-of-state tuition costs in the observed year (QT_UGRAD). The dissertation will determine if a school's undergraduate out-of-state tuition expense falls within the Top 90th (QT_UGRAD=1), Top 75th (QT_UGRAD=2), Top 50th (QT_UGRAD=3), Top 25th (QT_UGRAD=4), and Top 10th Quantiles (QT_UGRAD=5). For example, a school that has out-of-state tuition costs between \$15,707.50 and \$21,344.00 in 2012 falls within the Top 25th Quantile of undergraduate tuition expense. This quantile range is also utilized to determine a school's graduate out-of-state tuition expense (QT_GRAD) if a school has a graduate school program.

Another common control variable found in Flutie Effect studies is the student-faculty ratio (SF_RATIO) (e.g., Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Tucker, 2004). According to Tucker (2004), this ratio is a university's student enrollment divided by the number of faculty working at the same school in the current year. This variable is believed to be important to potential students as a lower student-faculty ratio is perceived to equate to a higher quality of instruction and attention provided to each student which may affect total applications (Finn, Pannozzo, & Achilles, 2003; Mitchell, Bradshaw, & Leaf, 2010). Finally, the dissertation includes a variable for schools that have adopted the Common Application during the time period analyzed. The Common Application is a non-profit organization "provid[ing] a common, standardized first-year application form for use at any member institution" (History, n.d., para. 1). The Common Application was originally designed by private schools but allowed public institutions to join in 2001

(History, n.d.). Since its inception in 1975, the organization has 517 members (History, n.d.). Because of the Common Application growth, the dissertation includes an indicator variable to identify schools imploring this new technology according to a membership listing provided by the Common Application organization. This variable takes the value of one in the observed year if the university has the common application and zero in the observed year if it does not utilize the Common Application. The dissertation anticipates that, due to common applications, a positive and significant coefficient on CMAPP reflects an increase in the number of total applications.

Model and Estimation Technique

The standard linear regression assumptions specify that the errors ε_t ($t = 1, 2, \dots, n$) in the regression model $y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 X_{t1} + \beta_2 X_{t2} + \dots + \beta_p X_{tp} + \varepsilon_t$ are uncorrelated and/or independent. According to Abraham and Ledolter (2006), this assumption may be unreasonable if a regression model is estimated for panel series data. Panel data are data where multiple cases are observed over multiple time periods (“Data and Statistical Services”, 2007). Observations become available at equally spaced time periods such as months, quarters, or years. Both Abraham and Ledolter (2006) and Marx (2012) noted correlations among observations k periods apart are referred to as autocorrelations. All correlations among observations one step apart (i.e., the lag 1 autocorrelations) are the same and can be expressed as:

$$Corr(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2) = Corr(\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3) = \dots Corr(\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_t) = \dots Corr(\varepsilon_{n-1}, \varepsilon_n) = \phi \quad (9)$$

Correlations must fall between -1 and +1, and the parameter is restricted to the absolute value of ϕ less than one. The autocorrelations of observations k steps apart are:

$$Corr(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_{k+1}) = Corr(\varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_{k+2}) = \dots Corr(\varepsilon_{t-k}, \varepsilon_t) = \dots Corr(\varepsilon_{n-k}, \varepsilon_n) = \phi^k \quad (10)$$

Marx (2012) noted the autocorrelation of error terms is dependent upon two factors: (1) they are dependent upon the time lag between the observations; and (2) they decrease exponentially with the time lag. Abraham and Ledolter (2006) highlighted that the time index can be removed because of the autocorrelation dependence on time and can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1 &= \text{Corr}(\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_t) = \phi, \rho_2 = \text{Corr}(\varepsilon_{t-2}, \varepsilon_t) = \phi^2, \dots, \rho_k \\ &= \text{Corr}(\varepsilon_{t-k}, \varepsilon_t) = \phi^k\end{aligned}\quad (11)$$

The autocorrelations describe the autocorrelation function which is viewed as a function of the lag k . Abraham and Ledolter (2006) observed $\rho_0 = 1$ and $\rho_k = \rho_{-k}$ and show the autocorrelation function needs to be shown only for nonnegative k 's. This alignment of the autocorrelation function of errors shows a first-order autoregressive model with exponential decay (Marx, 2012). Specifically, if an observation is far from the next observation, the autocorrelation will be weak. If ϕ is large and close to one in absolute value, then the exponential decay will be slow even if errors are farther apart (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006).

The specific panel regression model utilized in this dissertation is:

$$\text{Ln}(\text{APP_TOTAL}_{it}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{AD}_{it} + \beta_2 \text{UNIV}_{it} + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_3 \text{NCAA}_{kit} + e_{it} \quad (12)$$

where APP_TOTAL_{it} is the total number of applications received by university i in year t ; AD_{it} represents a vector of athletic department control variables for the university and year such as number of sports programs and championships won; UNIV_{it} is a vector of university specific control variables including the age of the university in years; and NCAA_{kit} is a set of dummy variables taking on a value of one if university i in year t is in its k th year of NCAA affiliation. β_1 , β_2 , and β_3 are parameters to be estimated and e_{it} is

the disturbance term. If β_3 is statistically significantly different from zero, then a school's athletic association would have influence on the applications at a university.

Estimation Issues

Model Two has estimation issues to consider. The first is autocorrelation, which indicates that errors at adjacent time periods are correlated (Marx, 2012). According to Abraham and Ledolter (2006), “many business and economic data are positively autocorrelated” (p. 179). Essentially, models with positive errors in a prior time period will imply a similar positive error for the current time period. Thus, the errors may not be independent as assumed in standard regression but instead autocorrelated. To test for potential autocorrelation, a Durbin-Watson test must be implemented (Marx, 2012). The null hypothesis of the Durbin-Watson test is the model has no first order autocorrelation ($H_0: \phi = 0$) and is based upon the following model:

$$DW = \frac{\sum (e_t - e_{t-1})^2}{\sum e_t^2} \quad (13)$$

When the Durbin-Watson test statistic is approximately 2, the model will accept the null hypothesis. However, when the Durbin-Watson test statistic is smaller or larger than 2, then autocorrelation exists within the model (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006).

According to Marx (2012), a model with first order autocorrelation must have an estimate of ϕ , which is unknown in an OLS model. To estimate ϕ , the autoregressive approach called Iterative Yule-Walker can be implemented. This method alternates an estimation of β using generalized least squares with an estimation of ϕ using the Yule-Walker equations applied to the sample autocorrelation function (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006.). Marx (2012) noted the method starts by ignoring autocorrelation and fitting a least squares estimate of β . Next, ϕ is estimated from the sample autocorrelation function

of the OLS residuals by using the Yule-Walker equations (Abraham & Ledolter, 2006.). Then, the model $e_t = \phi e_{t-1} + a_t$ is fit using standard linear regression with no intercept (Marx, 2012). Finally, an estimate of ϕ is created to allow for Yule-Walter equations to be run.

Chapter 5 – The History of the NAIA

The Inception Period (1935 – 1945)

At the 1936 Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) basketball tournament, Dr. Joseph Reilly, athletic director of the Kansas City Athletic Club, formally voiced his frustration over the loss of the annual event in Kansas City during 1934. Specifically, Reilly noted that Kansas City lost the event when it was in the process of constructing Municipal Auditorium (i.e., a state-of-the-art facility capable of holding 9,960) through support from the Works Progress Administration (Wilson, 2005). Second, the loss of the AAU event evoked considerable lamenting from basketball enthusiasts in the Kansas City who regularly attended and followed the tournament Wilson (2005). The AAU tournament was after all front page news annually in Kansas City and a source for promotion to those outside the Kansas City region about the city (Stooksbury, 2010). Third, Reilly changed the conversation by contacting *Kansas City Star* sports editor C. E. McBride to discuss the possibility of a college-only tournament that could be developed for Kansas City (Hoover, 1958; Stooksbury, 2010). McBride referred Dr. Reilly to Emil S. Liston, the basketball coach and athletic director for Baker University, a small college located 50 miles southwest of Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). At the 1936 AAU Tournament, Liston also maintained similar frustrations about the AAU's lack of competitive balance for colleges and the loss of that event for Kansas City (Stooksbury, 2010). Professionalized business teams comprised of older and more experienced players often dubbed as "basketball tramps" by the *Kansas City Star* dominated the event in recent years (Stooksbury, 2010; Wilson, 2005).

With the support of Reilly, Liston contacted Kansas City business owner George Goldman of Goldman's Jewelry Company to determine his interest in the potential college-only basketball tournament for 1937 (Stooksbury, 2010). At the time, Goldman was a manager/investor of the Municipal Auditorium and immediately interested in the prospect of hosting the college-only tournament (Stooksbury, 2010). During a meeting with Reilly and Liston, Goldman learned that neither had financing or organizational support for the tournament. Furthermore, Liston desired for the tournament to be open to colleges of any size, including ones that were traditionally considered too small to be included in national affairs (Stooksbury, 2010). Liston's plan of starting with 16 teams as a trial tournament and then expanding to 32 in order to create a "true national clearing house of collegiate basketball" was also explained along with the fact that it would be an amateur event heavily influenced by the inventor of basketball, Dr. James Naismith (Stooksbury, 2010, p. 10).

Dr. Naismith was well established within the region after completing his medical degree in Denver and moving to the University of Kansas in 1898 ("The History of Basketball", 1971). While at Kansas, he was presented with countless endorsement opportunities. However, Dr. Naismith turned down all but one of these opportunities as he felt that the game of basketball should be used for teaching instead of profiteering (Stooksbury, 2010). Dr. Naismith became highly involved with the formation of the new college-only tournament because of his friendship with Liston. According to legend, Naismith, Liston, and Kansas City businessman Frank Cramer of Cramer Sports Medicine met at Liston's home and discussed the design of the tournament as well as how to gain fan support (Henry, 1994). At this meeting, all these men agreed that money

should be as far away from athletes as possible (Stooksbury, 2010). Specifically, Dr. Naismith publically stated that “no one should seek financial reward for their athletic accomplishments” (Stooksbury, 2010, p. 11). Upon hearing the news about Dr. Naismith’s participation and interest with this tournament, Goldman allowed Liston and Dr. Reilly to utilize the Municipal Auditorium free of charge (Wilson, 2005). However, attendees of the event would be asked to volunteer to save on labor costs. Further, participating colleges would have to cover their own travel expenses but would have their food and lodging expenses covered by tournament proceeds (Stooksbury, 2010; Wilson, 2005). Finally, Goldman agreed to underwrite the local costs of the tournament until revenue can be generated (Wilson, 2005).

With these financial guarantees, Liston began heavily promoting the event in an attempt to attract teams for March 1937. For example, Liston maintained contact with coaches of conference champions or high finishers from Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, South Dakota, Iowa, Indiana, and Oklahoma (Wilson, 2005). In order to produce the most attractive tournament, Liston only sought championship teams in the Midwest (Stooksbury, 2010). Despite this potential limitation, Liston assured Kansas City enthusiasts that the tournament would be entertaining and that solid teams would be invited to compete for the first collegiate basketball championship (“Expect 16 Teams”, 1937). Further, Liston stated:

“The colleges are ready to establish a clearing house for basketball. Now, it is up to Kansas City. The colleges are taking the chance. They are coming in here at their own expense, and now if Kansas City wants the tournament it is up to the fans. We have national championships in track, boxing, wrestling, swimming and virtually every other sport. There isn’t any reason why we shouldn’t have a real national champion in basketball” (“Expect 16 Teams”, 1937, para. 4).

Unfortunately, two issues surfaced quickly as the March 9 to 12 tournament dates approached. First, as Liston began assessing interest in the tournament, he became dissatisfied with the quality of teams (Stooksbury, 2010). In order for the tournament to be successful and prompt future commitments, Liston knew he needed high-quality teams. Second, Municipal Auditorium would not be available for the number of nights required to host a 16-team tournament because Goldman reserved March 12 for a grand tennis exhibition that featured a match between the No. 1 ranked tennis player Ellsworth Vines and former amateur champion Fred Perry (Hoover, 1958; Stooksbury, 2010). In essence, it was not feasible to have a 16-team tournament cross over the tennis event. Appropriately, Liston announced that the initial college-only tournament would be cut from 16 to eight teams just three days before the start of the event (“Champions are set”, 1937; Stooksbury, 2010). In an article in the *Kansas City Journal-Post*, Liston stated the following:

“We can cover the field with eight just as well as we could have with 16. They are all champions with the exception of St. Benedict’s, and the records show that St. Benedict’s to be about the best independent college team of the season” (“Champions are set”, 1937, p. 11A).

The 1937 eight-team tournament was comprised of schools from Missouri (Central Missouri Teachers College); Kansas (Baker University, St. Benedict’s College, and Southwestern College); Iowa (Morningside College, Luther College); South Dakota (South Dakota Wesleyan College); and Arkansas (Arkansas State Teachers College) (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005). After the third day, Central Missouri Teachers College of Warrensburg, Missouri, defeated Morningside College of Sioux City, Iowa, in the tournament finals to become the first college-only tournament champion (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005).

When the tournament was completed, Liston and the other participating coaches were enthusiastic about this event despite the disappointing \$700 in gate receipts and \$28 in profit generated (Hoover, 1958; Stooksbury, 2010). However, coaches from around the country began contacting Liston to inquire about entry into next year's basketball tournament based on the great experience the first tournament attendees received (Stooksbury, 2010). With increased curiosity, Liston began conducting meetings with various coaches and administrators to discuss plans for the 1938 tournament to be branded – the National Intercollegiate Basketball Championship Tournament (NIBT) (Hoover, 1958; Stooksbury, 2010).

Liston also headed to Denver for the 1937 AAU tournament to give more college coaches information about the burgeoning event to be held in Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). Ironically, the AAU placed college teams in a separate bracket after responding to the long-time demands by the college coaches (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005). However, Liston concluded small colleges did not have a future with the AAU tournament and wanted provide these institutions with an outlet for wider recognition (Hoover, 1958). There also was no other national basketball tournament for college and university teams since neither the National Invitational Tournament (1938) nor the National Collegiate Athletic Association Tournament (1939) were established (Wilson, 2005).

After collaborating with coaches and administrators in Denver, Liston started to create a 16-member Board of Management that was comprised of athletic directors and basketball coaches (Wilson, 2005). Hoover (1958) noted the executive officers represented a wide geographic range across the United States and Liston served as the board's chairman (see Table 5.1).

Table 5-1 - 1938 NAIB Board of Management

Board Member	Position	School
Emil S. Liston	Athletic Director	Baker University
Eugene Eberhardt	Athletic Director	Oregon State Normal University
John Bunn	Basketball Coach	Stanford University
Forrest Cox	Basketball Coach	University of Colorado
S. M. Clark	Athletic Director	New Mexico Normal University
Al Baggett	Athletic Director	West Texas State Teachers College
Henry P. Iba	Athletic Director	Oklahoma A & M
Pat Mason	Athletic Director	Rockhurst College
R. G. Rogers	Basketball Coach	Morningside College
W. B. Woodson	Athletic Director	Arkansas State Teachers College
Arthur "Dutch" Lonborg	Basketball Coach	Northwestern University
Roy E. Tillotson	Athletic Director	Franklin College
A. F. Rupp	Basketball Coach	University of Kentucky
Roy Clifford	Basketball Coach	Western Reserve University
Max E. Hannum	Basketball Coach	Carnegie Institute of Technology
Clair F. Bee	Athletic Director	Long Island University

In one of his first acts as chairman, Liston drafted a bulletin to the other board members that outlined his vision for the future of the NIBT (Stooksbury, 2010). The bulletin stated the following:

"This is an open National Intercollegiate Championship Tournament. No rules of eligibility have been set up, other than the teams which enter will represent standard institutions of college or university rank and will be governed by the rules of eligibility in their respective conferences...The tournament is sponsored by no individual and no organization; but by the colleges and universities interested; this is an attempt to establish a national clearing house for university basketball. Conferences that object to participation in a tournament under other than college or university management should be informed that this tournament is controlled by a board of management entirely of college and university men...No one will make any money out of this tournament. In the event that the receipts amount to more than the local expenses, said amount will be placed in a reserve fund under the control of the board of management. It is the desire of the chairman of the board of management that this reserve fund be built up to a sum to enable it to act independently in future years (E. S. Liston, personal communication, 1937).

Based on a personal letter from Liston to Dr. Naismith (October 12, 1939), there were 16 districts set up to represent schools potentially invited from these areas. As more teams became interested, the field expanded from the original eight-team format to a full

32-team tournament in 1938 with schools located as far away as Oregon and Virginia traveling to the 1938 tournament (Wilson, 2005). The 1938 championship also demonstrated the close relationship between Liston and Dr. Naismith as the tournament champion would receive the Maude Naismith Trophy, named after Dr. Naismith's wife (Hoover, 1958). The *Kansas City Times* also reported that the winning team's members would receive miniature diamond studded gold basketballs while the second place team would receive a trophy from the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce as well as miniature gold basketballs ("Pair Teams Today", 1938).

The success of second Kansas City event sparked tremendous excitement about the future of basketball among coaches across the nation. After the completion of the 1938 NIBT, the Metropolitan Basketball Writers Association began their efforts to provide a "world series" for basketball ("National Cage Meet Opens", 1938). This event was held in New York's Madison Square Garden and was called the National Invitational Tournament (NIT) (Stooksbury, 2010). Six teams were invited to compete with Temple University winning the first NIT ("Owl Cagers are Honored", 1938). However, the schools invited to the NIT were much larger (i.e., Bradley University; Long Island University; New York University; Oklahoma A&M University; Temple University; and the University of Colorado) compared to the NIBT competitors ("National Cage Meet Opens", 1938). Thus, the NIBT provided a niche because regardless of size postseason competition emerged for coaches and players to put their philosophies and abilities to the test (Stooksbury, 2010).

Quickly after seeing the success and attention generated by the NIBT and NIT, the NCAA sought to establish its own eight-team national tournament for colleges

associated with major conferences such as the Big Ten Conference and Pacific Coast Conference as well as certain schools the NCAA deemed as independent (“Court Title Tourney Planned”, 1938; “Big Ten Still Spurns”, 1938). The 1939 NCAA tournament (i.e. the first) was divided among three locations: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Francisco, California; and Evanston, Illinois. Teams located in the Eastern United States met in Philadelphia for the first two rounds while schools in the Western United States competed in San Francisco (Stooksbury, 2010). After winning the Western Region, the University of Oregon defeated The Ohio State University (OSU), 46 to 33 in the inaugural title game held in Evanston, Illinois (Snider, 1939). In a short time, college basketball went from having no national championship tournament to having three.

The 1939 NIBT proved to be a major success as more than 30,000 fans packed the Municipal Auditorium for the duration of the event more than 7,000 fans turning out to see San Diego State University take on Southwestern College of Kansas in the championship (Stooksbury, 2010). As the fourth NIBT approached, Liston began working on the idea of expanding the event (Wilson, 2005). During the fall of 1939, for instance, Liston published a circular entitled *Intercollegiate Basketball* which would serve as the official publication of an organization that would expand past the annual tournament (Hoover, 1958). In the publication, Liston set forth objectives of this proposed organization. Further, Liston wanted Dr. Naismith to be included in the development of the organization as much as possible. In a letter to Dr. Naismith, Liston shared his excitement regarding the success of the 1939 tournament:

Dear Dr. Naismith,

Enclosed is information relative to the organization of the National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball. This organization is going forward rapidly and as you

will note the organization convention will be held in Kansas City, March 8, 9, 10 just at the beginning of the championship tournament. The official name of the tournament is the National Intercollegiate Basketball Championship Tournament.

The 1939 tournament was a success in every way. Representative teams were selected from twenty one different states. Sportsmanship was fine, the officiating considered by coaches and spectators to be the best ever seen in that number of games. The games for the most part were closely contested, very few lop-sided scores. Such scores usually resulted in the latter part of the game after the team had cracked. ...

The tournament attracted more national attention than the 1938, more newspapers covered the tournament. The increased publicity was noticed particularly on the West Coast, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and in the south.

The teams were selected by committees in each of the district[s] and there were sixteen districts last year. It is felt that by having thirty-two districts as the organization of the National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball calls for, there will be more general interest and more widely scattered areas represented. The teams in some instances were selected by elimination tournaments. There will be more of these this year. (Liston, E. S., personal communication, October 12, 1939).

Liston hoped to have the 78-year old Dr. Naismith at the 1940 tournament. On November, 28, 1939, however, Dr. Naismith passed away nine days after suffering a massive brain hemorrhage (Stooksbury, 2010). His son, Jack Naismith, appeared at the 1940 tournament in his father's place and went on to state "The National Intercollegiate Tournament most nearly carries on with the dream Dr. Naismith had for the game of basketball" (Stooksbury, 2010, p. 47).

After the death of Dr. Naismith, the official development of the National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball (NAIB) moved quickly. However, many organizations were rather displeased with the rapid growth of the NAIB. The AAU did not appreciate the NAIB drawing teams away from its annual events while the NCAA refused to acknowledge the NAIB's existence as a rival association (Stooksbury, 2010). Arguably, the biggest conflict came from Edward J. Hickox, the Secretary-Treasurer of

the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC). Hickox believed that the NAIB's goal was to create a divisive league of coaches and warned members about encouraging or aiding a movement that would weaken the NABC (Hoover, 1958). The irony behind Hickox's letter is that Liston himself was a founding member of the NABC and did not receive a copy of this letter (Stooksbury, 2010). Some members of the NAIB presented a copy of Hickox's letter to Liston, who then wrote a carefully worded response. Liston stated:

“The National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball membership is institutional, not individual....[it] is not a “divisive” organization....[it] has not, through its membership or through representatives of its membership, sought to discourage or alienate members of the National Association of Basketball Coaches or any other organization or individual members of such organization” (Liston, E. S., personal communication, January 13, 1940).

Hoover (1958) noted the issues between Liston and Hickox were ultimately cleared and Hickox became a charter member of the coaches' association sponsored by the NAIA.

As the 1940 NIBT approached, Liston called the first general session of the Organizing Convention of the NAIB into order. The meeting was held on March 10, 1940, in the Phillips Hotel in Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). Prior to this meeting, a constitution committee was already at work drafting a document for the upstart organization (Hoover, 1958). After three sessions over 26 hours, the meeting attendees ratified the NAIB constitution (Stooksbury, 2010). In addition to the constitution, a Nominating Committee was charged with drawing up a list of four Executive Committee members and six officers (see Table 5.2.).

The collective committee members agreed that the best way to govern the tournament was to get coaches from across the nation active in the decision-making

Table 5-2 - 1940 NAIB Executive Committee and Officers

Member	Position	School
Emil S. Liston	Executive Secretary	Baker University
Morris H. Gross	President	San Diego State University
E. F. Kimbrell	First Vice President	Westminster College
Louis E. Means	Second Vice President	Beloit College
Flucie L. Stewart	Third Vice President	Appalachian State College
C. E. Miller	Fourth Vice President	Baltimore University
Al Baggett	Executive Committee	West Texas State College
Raymond W. Hanson	Executive Committee	Western Illinois State Teachers College
Charles Dee Erickson	Executive Committee	Washburn College
Charles R. Davies	Executive Committee	Duquesne University

process by continually cycling positions of authority (Wilson, 2005). Thus, the committee members decided a new president would be elected each year during the NAIB annual convention held before the NAIB Tournament and that the prior year's president would be a member of the Executive Committee for one year (Stooksbury, 2010; Wilson, 2005). However, the NAIB's Executive Secretary had the real power in the beginning (Stooksbury, 2010). For example, as Executive Secretary Liston maintained the duties of organizing the NIBT and control over the tournament's overall direction.

Within the constitution, the founders of the NAIB set forth four purposes and a rationale for the organization. The rationale and purposes were as follows:

“Fundamentally, the National Association of Intercollegiate Basketball believes in the socializing values of intersectional and national competition. In the development of such a program ... the responsibility for the management and control rests with the administrators of college basketball. NAIB believes that such a program is compatible with a well-rounded, sound, educational program. Such a program administered through the NAIB organization is without the dangers of commercialization by private promotion.

1. To foster an appreciation of intercollegiate basketball and an acceptance of the responsibility for its growth and development.

2. To establish uniformity in the game through district meetings and intersectional play culminating in a national championship tournament.
3. To encourage district organizations, to foster clinics and other similar meetings for the good of the game.
4. To serve member institutions through the office of the Executive Secretary-Treasurer, which office shall act as a clearing house for helpful information and service” (Hoover, 1958, p. 50).

Finally, the NAIB tournament expanded the number of districts from 16 to 32 in order to secure a wider representation (Hoover, 1958). Each district contained a District Committee, whose duties were to recommend representative teams from their district and serve as liaison personnel.

To coincide with the 1941 tournament, the Junior Chamber of Commerce in Kansas City sponsored the first “Tip-Off” banquet for approximately 125 members of the NAIB and other guests (Hoover, 1958). This inaugural affair gradually expanded to include all 32 teams in the tournament as well as their coaches and managers (Wilson, 2005). Along with the banquet, committee members discussed how to strengthen the current 32 district organization. According to Hoover (1958) and Wilson (2005), the district system was a key building block of the NAIA structure and proved to be of great importance and concern throughout the organization’s history.

In the early years, the NAIB annual meeting had real decision-making responsibilities. For instance, according to Wilson (2005), the delegates sent to the annual meetings were required to participate in the decision-making process. However, if a school did not send a representative, it would be bound by the decisions of those schools that did send representatives. Hoover (1958) showed evidence of this practice after the third annual meeting in 1942 when a constitutional change was passed and went into effect immediately. This constitutional amendment incorporated the amount of

annual membership dues (\$10 per school) to be paid at the beginning of the NAIB's fiscal year (Hoover, 1958). The only other noteworthy action from these early meetings discussed the election of the District Chairmen:

“The District Chairmen shall be elected by members of the association within the district unless there are less than six members therein. The election shall be annually, prior to April 15. The president of the association shall, on April 15, appoint district chairmen in districts having less than six members” (Hoover, 1958, p. 53).

Now no longer just a tournament, the NAIB was an athletic association that competed against the NCAA for members. While the NCAA focused primarily on large universities, Liston and the NAIB wanted to provide a place for smaller colleges within the collegiate sports scheme. Small schools within the NCAA had desired more recognition in the 1930s (Wilson, 2005). Evidence of these claims exists through a charter developed for the smaller schools. For instance, Forbes (1955) argued that smaller schools can have a special role within the NCAA. He stated:

“Unlike the powerful “big time” universities, they are relatively free from pressure of bowl games, highly competitive schedules, and other external forces. Freedom from these obligations should permit the small colleges to take the leadership toward improving intercollegiate sports and point out the philosophic concepts in relation to general education, if they would but acknowledge and act upon their convictions” (p. 202).

However, the NCAA had multiple definitions of a small school and could not reach a consensus on a program for these institutions. Liston appeared to recognize this situation and wanted the emerging NAIB to fill this void but by early 1943 World War II began to disrupt life profoundly for NAIB.

World War II resulted in a near cessation of activities for the NAIB as well as other intercollegiate activities because limitations on gasoline halted travel to Kansas City, many student-athletes volunteered to leave school for the war, and the availability

of potential volunteers decreased (Wilson, 2005). Expectedly, many NAIB schools discontinued their active membership while many of the remaining members expressed difficulty in paying member fees (Hoover, 1958). Specifically, no surviving records indicate that an annual meeting occurred in the spring of 1943 despite several indications the basketball tournament would proceed as scheduled (Hoover, 1958). However, a new set of officers was elected prior to the 1943 event which the Kansas City's media boasted as the classiest event in the NAIB's six year history (Stooksbury, 2010). In the end, Southeast Missouri would go on to win the NIBT in an all-Missouri contest with Northwest Missouri State, 34 to 32 but that would be the last until after the war (Smith, 1944).

The Postwar Period (1945 – 1952)

By the spring of 1945, there were indications that the United States and its allies held the upper hand and victory was only a matter of time. Thus, life began to return to normal for U.S. citizens and sporting events returned to area of prominence. Accordingly, the NAIB made plans for a return of the NIBT in March of 1945. However, there was some work ahead for the young organization. First, the organization would have to deal with delinquent membership. From 1942 to 1945, several NAIB member schools did not pay their association dues nor have active affiliation during some of the critical war years (Hoover, 1958). In order to re-enlist those colleges, the membership in attendance of the 1945 annual meeting felt the proper approach was one of education rather than assign penalties (Wilson, 2005). In essence, the attending members recognized the extraordinary conditions based on the war and refused to allow these

circumstances to effect the growth of the NAIB or the positive approach they supported for smaller collegiate institutions.

Many universities saw athletic programs as a luxury item and could not justify their existence in the ration-based economy of the war (Stooksbury, 2010). In addition, universities also faced the possibility of closing their doors forever. College-aged students had trouble affording the cost of tuition and were not attending higher education, forcing many universities to consider closing their doors (Stooksbury, 2010). However, help came in the form of the U.S. Armed Forces. In December 1942, the U.S. Armed Forces announced plans to utilize college facilities in order to train over 250,000 young men in a uniform-and-pay system (“New Army, Navy College”, 1942). Over 350 colleges and universities participated in this program and saw an influx of new students whom had their tuition paid for by the Armed Forces (“Students Urged to Stay”, 1942). The Armed Forces involvement allowed smaller colleges to maintain many of their programs and ensured that college-life was renewed to an extent. Although the students were going to become servicemen and often wore military uniforms to class, the recruited soldiers were allowed to join student organizations and participate in athletics such as basketball (Stooksbury, 2010).

As Liston and the NAIB began restoring order in 1945, intercollegiate sports, and specifically college basketball, faced a substantial issue in regards to gambling. In 1944, Kansas coach Dr. Phog Allen and Liston were involved in a public feud regarding gambling in college sports. According to Stooksbury (2010), their disagreement centered on the ability of gamblers to infiltrate college basketball. Dr. Allen voiced that gambling could threaten the integrity of college sports. Upon making these claims, Allen provided

a telegram to Ned Irish, the acting president of Madison Square Garden in New York, that included the name of at least one basketball player who allegedly ‘sold out’ to bookies during a basketball tournament in 1943 (“Allen Furnishes Data”, 1944). Dr. Allen did not publicly reveal the name of the player but provided several insightful thoughts on the state of affairs:

“I have obtained much information from coaches who told me things honestly and frankly, but who now refuse to take responsibility for their statements. My motive for releasing any information on gambling is no reflection on your efficient promotional venture of basketball. My desire is to awaken the college presidents of America to their responsibility in providing a source of power in fighting these professional gambling rodents. Nothing Irish or any coach or promoter can do will stop the gamblers. Only the college presidents can stop it by appointing an absolute czar such as baseball has in Judge [Kenesaw] Landis” (“Allen Furnishes Data”, 1944, para. 5-6).

Liston, however, felt that these charges showed a deplorable lack of faith in the American youth and meager confidence in the authority of coaches (“Allen Furnishes Data”, 1944).

Unfortunately, Dr. Allen’s fears were confirmed in 1945. According to *The Tuscaloosa News*, five basketball players from Brooklyn College in New York willingly accepted \$1,000 from bookies Harry Rosen and Harvey Stemmer to throw a basketball game against the University of Akron (“Scandal Brings Major Problem”, 1945). Dr. Allen continued to blame the athletic directors, coaches, and faculty representatives for failure to protect college athletics from gambling (“Athletic Chiefs Blamed”, 1945). He also stated:

“Intelligent people have known all along that big-time gamblers were getting to college basketball players in the East. Instead of facing the facts and acting, our national athletic bodies, to save face, have been meeting and denying that these conditions exist when every well-informed person knew better” (“Athletic Chiefs Blamed”, 1945, para. 3).

Dr. Allen continued to urge the public that a college czar is necessary in order to deter any future offenses. The NCAA responded with a released statement on January 13, 1945 condemning the presence of gambling in college basketball but placing much of the blame on the media (Stooksbury, 2010). Further, an NCAA resolution encouraged its member schools to bar gamblers from contests, to discontinue the issuance of predication charts, and to stop the publication of odds by newspapers (Stooksbury, 2010). The NAIB Executive Committee also took action by drawing up resolutions that clarified the NAIB was against all organized gambling on sporting events and that the organization had no affiliation or desire to aid organized gambling (Hoover, 1958).

Kansas City Star sports editor C.E. McBride defended the NAIB and the NIBT noting that scandals similar to this do not occur within the new organization and smaller schools. In an editorial, McBride (1945) wrote:

“The hush-hush policy with regard to basketball gambling as exposed recently in New York never has had many seconds in this corner...But the hush-hush flag hasn’t been run up in this corner, and now, with our city teeming with college basketeers and their coaches, may be a likely time to dig into the subject again... Kansas City long has been a thriving center of basketball and not yet have we had to cope with a betting scandal. Or any other kind of a basketball scandal. We don’t want to start now. This may not be taken to mean that there is any special reason for an article such as this. As far as we know, there isn’t, but where there are bookmaking and betting there always is the chance, and because of that it is up to every player and every coach and more than that, every patron of the game, to be on his guard to protect the sport if occasion should arise. ...Mr. Emil S. Liston of Baker University is your working head. He is as splendid a college coach and as fine a representative as you could have named. He stands for all that is good and sporting in college athletics and is firm against all else. As long as all of you connected with the tournament rally around your leader and keep the good name of the game and all college sports ever in mind, there isn’t likely to be any scandal attached” (para. 1-4).

With encouragement from the Kansas City Media, Liston aimed to persevere through both national obstacles and his own health problems in order to produce a quality NIBT

in 1945 (Stooksbury, 2010). Since travel restrictions were still in place from the war as well as issues with delinquent membership, Liston and the Executive Committee agreed to limit the NIBT field to 16 teams (Hoover, 1958).

The 1945 Annual Meeting also saw discussions for holding a smaller basketball tournament in Kansas City to act as a preseason tip-off event. According to Hoover (1958), two of these programs were held in December 1945. The financial arrangement for these preseason events was similar to that of the NIBT. Team expenses at the tournament site were paid from gate receipts while the teams themselves were reimbursed for their travel expenses as much as possible after tournament expenses had been paid (Hoover, 1958). This tournament was designed to be a four-team event and would later be called “tip-off tournaments” (Wilson, 2005). The participating teams for the first “tip-off tournament” were defending NIBT champion Loyola University; NIBT runner-up George Pepperdine University; West Texas State Teachers College of Canyon, Texas; and Valparaiso University of Valparaiso, Indiana. The tournament netted each participating school \$275 in addition to its expenses (Hoover, 1958). Proving to be a successful venture, the NAIB continued to sponsor future “tip-off tournaments” in succeeding years but moved such events to a specific member’s campus instead of the Kansas City neutral court (Wilson, 2005).

As new business ventures started to become available, the NAIB began to show signs of professionalization but the NAIB’s institutionalization paled in comparison to explosive growth and the mushrooming of governmental agencies (Wilson, 2005). One of the key reasons was the NAIB was purely run by volunteers. However, at the 1945 Annual Meeting, the NAIB agreed to pay Liston \$500 in the 1945-46 fiscal year to serve

as the organization's executive secretary (Hoover, 1958). For the 1946-47 fiscal year, the NAIB agreed to raise Liston's salary to \$2,000 and expand his position to a half-time position (Wilson, 2005). Hoover (1958) noted that the proceedings from the 1946 Annual Meeting indicated the salary increase was commensurate with the amount of time that could be devoted to the Executive Secretary position. Liston also had openness to his expanded role since his health issues limited his abilities as a coach (Wilson, 2005). Yet, Liston declined a larger salary increase for two reasons: (1) he was receiving disability payments from insurance policies and thus felt financially secure; and (2) he wanted the NAIB to have some economic freedom since the organization was still in its infancy. The Executive Committee was impressed with Liston's selfless act and decided to provide him with a car allowing Liston to operate easily despite his health problems (Wilson, 2005). As time passed, Liston resigned from his position at Baker University, and the Executive Committee offered him a 10-year term working full time as the Executive Secretary at \$4,000 per year and increasing to \$4,500 in 1948 and \$6,000 in 1949 (Hoover, 1958).

Next, two issues arose as the NAIB was returning to form. The first dealt with teams participating in the NIBT who were not members of the NAIB. Since the event's inception, NAIB membership was not a requirement to participate in the NIBT (Hoover, 1958). However, if non-member schools participated in the NIBT, they were required to pay an entrance fee not required by NAIB members. Originally, this fee was \$25; however, NAIB active members wanted to see this fee to increase to \$50 (Hoover, 1958). In essence, NAIB members were becoming agitated about outside institutions playing in the NIBT because they could ultimately steal the show (Wilson, 2005). Therefore, the

members attending the 1946 Annual Meeting agreed to an increase in non-member entry fees and would consider future increases at the next annual meeting (Hoover, 1958). In 1950, the executive Committee agreed to prohibit any non-NAIB members from participating in the NIBT (Wilson, 2005).

The other main issue involved how NAIB tournament teams were selected. Some of the district committees responsible for picking the teams had several institutions worthy of entry into the NIBT; thus, some districts implemented a district playoff to determine their representative (Wilson, 2005). However, not all districts prepared playoffs for their teams, upsetting members in highly competitive districts. These members proposed at the 1945 Annual Meeting that all district representatives should have to qualify for the NIBT through a district playoff (Hoover, 1958). A committee was established to study this proposal and they found that problems varied greatly between districts so no general plan could be recommended. Instead, they suggested plans should be worked out in each specific district and publicized before the season starts in order to eliminate any misunderstanding about how the district determines their champion (Hoover, 1958).

The 1945 NIBT proved to be a successful return for the NAIB, and discussions began for the 1946 tournament about the number of teams it should include. At the time of the 1945 tournament, most members believed another 16-team tournament would be conducted in 1946 and in future years until U.S. travel restrictions were removed (Hoover, 1958). However, Liston and other NAIB leaders believed it was time to return the NIBT to a 32-team format and this was discovered through direct contact with each

district chairman (Hoover, 1958; E. S. Liston, personal communication, January 20, 1946; Stooksbury, 2010).

Expectedly, Liston promoted the 1946 NIBT would have a strong level of competition and create a star-studded affair. Two of the top offensive players were reported to play for the NIBT title. The first was the 7'1" Elmore Morgenthaler of the New Mexico School of Mines. During the 1946 season, Morgenthaler was the nation's second highest scorer with 22 points per game (Stooksbury, 2010). In addition, Eastern Kentucky University was invited to the NIBT and led by forward Fred Lewis who averaged 21.5 points per game (Stooksbury, 2010). The 1946 tournament also included many marquee teams such as Indiana State Teachers College; Arizona State University in Flagstaff; Louisiana Polytechnic Institute; and the University of Houston. As news continued to accumulate about the 'celebrity' of the tournament field, Kansas City residents showed their support for the 1946 NIBT through record advanced ticket sales (Stooksbury, 2010).

The 1947 NIBT can be summarized by its eventual champion, the Marshall University Thundering Herd. According to Stooksbury (2010), the Herd was overlooked by Kansas City sports fans as they were believed to be one of the 16 teams that would make a short visit to Missouri. These enthusiasts, however, were unaware of the Herd's high powered offense that averaged 80 points per game during the regular season (Stooksbury, 2010). In the opening round, the Herd shocked the Municipal Auditorium attendees when they defeated the Wisconsin State Teachers College 113 to 80 despite a tournament record 56 points from the losers' Nate DeLong (Wilson, 2005). Interestingly, the newly installed electronic scoreboard had issues keeping up with the score as it was

only able to display two figures (“A Bead on Basket”, 1947). After their victory, Marshall became the odds-on favorite to win the tournament. The success of the Herd in the 1947 NIBT Championships attracted many Kansas City fans and achieved a sell-out crowd for the championship game along with record profits (Stooksbury, 2010).

As the NAIB tournament returned to its state before the war, the Naismith family and Liston entered into negotiations about the Maude Naismith Championship Trophy given to the winner of the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). The Naismiths still maintained an interest in the success of the NAIB tournament after the death of Dr. Naismith and expressed a desire to change the name of the championship trophy (Hoover, 1958). At this time, there was a backlog on orders for awards. This backlog was a substantial carry over from the war as trophies were not available for purchase (Hoover, 1958). Thus, the physical Maude Naismith Trophy was not distributed to the winners of the NIBT since 1942. Through correspondence with Liston, Jack Naismith formally requested and authorized a change in the name of the trophy from the Maude Naismith Trophy to the James Naismith Trophy (Hoover, 1958). Honoring these wishes, the NAIB officially made the change and retroactively awarded past NIBT winners with the James Naismith Trophy as far back as 1943 (Wilson, 2005). Once trophies would be available for purchase, the NAIB would utilize money that was reserved for these awards (Hoover, 1958).

With a successful 1947 NIBT, the NAIB was now setting its sights on international competition and the 1948 Summer Olympics (Stooksbury, 2010). The NAIB had an interest in the possibility of gaining recognition for the winner of the NIBT as a possible representative in the Olympics (Hoover, 1958). Liston diligently worked on

convincing the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) to grant the NAIB champion a place in the USOC's amateur tournament to decide the 1948 U.S. Olympic basketball team (Stooksbury, 2010). In a letter to Pepperdine University basketball coach Al Duer, Liston wrote that his hard work paid off as the NAIB was invited to the USOC's qualifying playoff program (personal communication, August 3, 1947). The proposed tournament was scheduled in March 1948 in New York and would include eight teams in two brackets: a college bracket consisting four college and university teams (two NCAA finalists, the NIT winner, and the NIBT winner) and an independent bracket comprised of three AAU teams and the Young Men's Christian Association champion ("American Olympic Committee", 1947). Once winners emerge from each bracket, the Olympic Committee would fill the 14 man roster with seven college players and seven independent team members ("Top Amateur Cage Teams", 1948).

The University of Louisville captured the 1948 NIBT title, defeating the John Wooden coached Indiana State Teachers College 82 to 70 and thus, Louisville traveled to New York to participate in the Olympic Trials (Wilson, 2005). For Louisville to have representation on the U.S. squad, it would have to compete against the University of Kentucky, the Eastern NCAA champion; Baylor University, the Western NCAA champion; and New York University, the NIT runner-up (Grimsley, 1948). NYU was invited to the trials since Saint Louis University, the winner of the 1948 NIT crown, withdrew for academic concerns ("Billikens Pass up U.S. Olympic Trials", 1948). The independent bracket saw the National AAU Champion Phillips Oilers from Bartlesville, Oklahoma; National AAU Runner-up Denver Nuggets from Denver, Colorado; AAU representative Oakland Bittners from Oakland, California; and National YMCA

Champion Prospect Park from Brooklyn, New York (“Top Amateur Cage Teams”, 1948). Despite its impressive showing in the NIBT, Louisville would fall to its home-state rival, the University of Kentucky, 91 to 57 (“Kentucky, Baylor Win Olympic Trials”, 1948; Hoover, 1958). Kentucky would ultimately advance to the final round of the trials before falling to the Phillips Oilers 53 to 49 (“Fourteen Named as Olympic Cagers”, 1948).

Although Louisville did not win the Olympic trial tournament, it was considered a major success for an NAIB institution was allowed to participate in the trials. The NCAA felt it should be the only intercollegiate athletic association for consideration for Olympic events and did not want to compete with the NAIB or any other college organization (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). Days before the scheduled Olympic trial, the NCAA almost got its wish. On March 4, 1948, Liston had received a letter from Louis G. Wilke, Chairman of the 1948 Committee, stating that a protest had been made to prohibit the NAIB tournament winner from competing in the Olympic qualifying tournament (Hoover, 1958). The protest was started by Olympic Committee member Harry D. Henshel after he was informed of schools boycotting the NAIB tournament because of the NAIB’s rule in regards to prohibiting African-American players from competing (“Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials”, 1948).

According to Wilson (2005), the NAIB by-laws did not include any discriminatory provisions; however, tournament officials had instituted an informal rule against African-American participation when the NAIB was established. The informal rule was first acknowledged in the 1946 tournament when Morningside College of Iowa had a black forward named Rosamond Wilson on its roster (Katz & McLendon, 1988). In that tournament, Wilson was forced to stay on bench and serve as his team’s manager

(Wilson, 2005). Pepperdine University basketball coach and the 1947 President of the NAIB Al Duer had urged Liston to abolish the discrimination policy and viewed it as shameful and undemocratic (Wilson, 2005). Liston responded supportively to Duer's request but was aware of the obstacles trying to change the views of others. According to Katz and McLendon (1988), Duer discussed the change at the 1947 NAIB tournament with some of the Southern leaders of the organization. However, these efforts did little to affect the Southern regions' attitudes towards African-American participation.

The North, on the other hand, started to take moral stands against discrimination. With Jackie Robinson's historic participation with the Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947, the New York district took a moral stand against the NAIB's prohibitive rule (Stooksbury, 2010). Manhattan College of New York had earned the right to represent the New York district at the 1948 NIBT ("Manhattan Quits over No-Negro", 1948). However, the school declined the opportunity because of the rule barring African-American players despite not having any African-Americans on their team ("Manhattan Quits over No-Negro", 1948; Stooksbury, 2010). In a telegram to Liston, Manhattan College Athletic Director Brother Eusebuis voiced his concerns:

"Manhattan College administration directs me to withdraw our consent to participate in the NAIB tournament unless rule quote colored players not eligible unquote appended to rule #2 is eliminated. Unless this action is officially published as a change and given same prominent as original eligibility rules we cannot participate" (B. Eusebuis, personal communication, March 2, 1948).

As the media began picking up this story, Liston informed *The New York Times* that "our executive committee will discuss the situation here Saturday night at the regular meeting before the tournament starts" ("Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials", 1948, para. 4). Current NAIB President Joe Hutton also acknowledged:

“We do have a rule barring Negroes from competition, but it has been in existence as long as [the] NAIB. So far as I can recall, it has never been an issue in the selection of teams for Kansas City competition” (“Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials”, 1948, para. 8).

Despite Hutton’s statements, NAIB New York District Chairman and University of Buffalo basketball coach Mal Eiken emphasized that no team from his district would be sent to the NIBT unless the rule was rescinded (“Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials”, 1948). Along with Manhattan College, other schools from the area condemned the 1948 tournament including Long Island University and Siena College (“Negro Ban Hurts NAIB Tourney”, 1948). However, Siena College Athletic Director Mauris Fitzgerald was advised that 32 college members were going to be polled to determine if the rule should be repealed (“Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials”, 1948). According to Hoover (1958), Liston polled the Executive Committee by wire for a vote on this problem. By a vote of seven to two, the committee repealed the ban on African-American players (“NAIB Tourney Lifts Ban”, 1948). While this poll was conducted, Liston urged Manhattan College to reconsider its invitation decline (Wilson, 2005). Manhattan choose to attend after the rule was rescinded making it as far as the quarterfinals in the 1948 NIBT (Wilson, 2005). Further, because of the NAIB’s quick action to repeal the rule, the USOC retained the original tournament as planned (Hoover, 1958).

The first African-American to participate in the NIBT was Clarence Walker, a reserve guard for the Indiana State Teachers College (Wilson, 2005). At the time, the Indiana State Sycamores was coached by future hall of fame coach John Wooden. In his first year, Wooden led the Sycamores to a 17-8 record and earned a bid into the NAIB tournament during the 1946-47 season (Stooksbury, 2010). However, Wooden was

aware of the NAIB's rule regarding African-American players. Liston contacted Wooden personally about his invitation to the 1947 NIBT, but Wooden politely declined the invite (Stooksbury, 2010). The next season, Wooden led the Sycamores to a 23-6 record and earned another invite to the NAIB tournament. Wooden again declined Liston's invitation unless the rule regarding African-American players was rescinded (Stooksbury, 2010). After the Executive Committee lifted the ban, Liston again called Wooden to invite him to the tournament. However, this time Wooden accepted the invitation to compete in the NIBT because of the potential to advance the progress of integration.

On March 9, 1948, the Sycamores faced St. Francis College of Lorretto, Pennsylvania, in the opening round of the tournament. Indiana State had little trouble defeating St. Francis College, but the importance of this contest came at the midpoint of the first half. Walker entered the game with a 25 to 11 advantage to the delight of the Kansas City crowd (Stooksbury, 2010). According to the *Kansas City Call*, Walker played a total of 20 minutes and contributed a field goal and a free throw to help Indiana State defeat St. Francis, 72 to 40 ("Coach Praises Player", 1948). Wooden also commented:

"Walker is a good boy and a good player. He plays much better than he has in this first game. But he was somewhat tense. He'll make it all right. He didn't know that he was going along with the team until two days before we left home. He had not had any practice for two weeks because we did not know if he would be permitted to play in the tournament" ("Coach Praises Player", 1948, para. 5).

The decision to lift the African-American ban became one of the biggest highlights for the young NAIB. The following year, Liston did receive a few angry comments from critics, but several African-American players came with their teams from San Jose State, Portland University, and Lawrence Tech of Detroit (Katz & McLendon, 1988).

The post-war period proved to be very successful for the NAIB. Unfortunately, this new organization would also have to deal with tragedy when Emil S. Liston suffered a fatal heart attack at his home in Baldwin, Kansas on October 26, 1949 (Hoover, 1958). More than 1,000 people crowded the First Methodist Church in Baldwin to pay their respects to Liston and his family (Stooksbury, 2010). With respect, the *Baker University News-Bulletin* provided a tribute in the form of an editorial praising Liston's work with smaller colleges (Hoover, 1958).

After Liston's death, the Executive Committee convened for two days to discuss the future of the NAIB (Stooksbury, 2010). At this meeting, the committee decided that current association president Gus Miller would handle most of the decisions and work as the Executive Secretary until an official one could be selected (Hoover, 1958). For their search to replace Liston, Miller and four other committee members chose to limit candidates to college men who were familiar with the organization and seek the men instead of receiving applications (Wilson, 2005). This committee screened the applicants and brought their findings to the Executive Committee meeting in Kansas City on November 27, 1949 (Hoover, 1958). At the meeting, the search committee recommended that former NAIB President and Pepperdine basketball coach A. O. Duer take over as the Executive Secretary of the NAIB (Stooksbury, 2010). After extensive discussion, Duer accepted the position under the provision that no new projects would be undertaken until Duer became acclimated as Executive Secretary (Hoover, 1958). Duer had become close with Liston when he was serving as a district chairman and as NAIB President during the 1946-47 season. In addition, Duer enjoyed experience organizing basketball tournaments

like the Los Angeles National Collegiate Championships – an 8-team Christmas holiday tournament (Stooksbury, 2010).

As Duer began his new position, the NAIB started to consider broadening its scope. A member at the 1949 Annual Meeting had suggested that additional sports be regulated under the NAIB (Hoover, 1958). In the past, Liston responded favorably to the suggestion and formed a committee to study the possibility of adding additional sports (Wilson, 2005). The members at the meeting also considered creating their own All-America basketball team. Since 1940, the NAIB had been naming All-American teams but those teams were only comprised of players from tournament teams (Wilson, 2005). The committee created to study this issue developed procedures whereby players would select an all-opponent team. The only stipulation was the players selected had to represent a member institution of the NAIB (Hoover, 1958).

The NAIB also began discussion regarding organization-specific eligibility rules at this time. For instance, before 1949, the organization did not have any eligibility rules or standards other than those created by individual conferences or universities (Hoover, 1958). A committee was formed to study the possibility of having a code for participation in the national tournament (Wilson, 2005). Should any standards be adopted, they would only be applied to the national tournament and not to regular season play of the member schools (Hoover, 1958). After taking a year to study the eligibility problems, the committee proposed that transfer students had to reside in their new school for 18 weeks in order to become eligible for the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). This new rule meant that a transfer student needed to begin in the fall quarter or semester at their new school to be able to play basketball in March.

The NCAA was also wrestling with eligibility issues along with financial aid concerns. The growth in popularity of college football around the 1920s concerned NCAA officials that enforcement would be a difficult problem to solve (Lazaroff, 2007). In 1946, NCAA delegates similarly met in Chicago for a special conference (Wilson, 2005). Delegates at this meeting drafted the “Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics” (Falla, 1981). It defined amateurism, required athletes to meet the same academic standards as non-athletes, provided rules for offering financial aid to athletes, and prohibiting officials representing a member institution from soliciting attendance in exchange for financial inducement (Wilson, 2005). Originally, this document started as a questionnaire to NCAA member schools but overwhelming support from members allowed the NCAA to adopt the document as Article 3 to the NCAA Constitution in 1948 (Falla, 1981). When this document was approved, the NAIB endorsed the Sanity Codes and went on record to do everything possible to further this idea (Hoover, 1958).

The Sanity Codes allowed the NCAA to regulate its member schools by establishing a three-member Constitutional Compliance Committee and implement penalties for violations. Interestingly, the only penalty that the NCAA utilized for violations was expulsion (Falla, 1981; Wilson, 2005). By 1950, the Committee found seven institutions (i.e., the University of Virginia; the University of Maryland; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; Virginia Military Institute; The Citadel; Boston College; and Villanova University) in violation of the Sanity Code and brought motion to terminate the membership of these schools before the NCAA Convention in 1950 (“Sanity Code Vote”, 1950). However, in a seven hour uninterrupted session, the

NCAA could not acquire the necessary two-thirds of member votes to expel the schools (Fleisher, Goff, & Tollison, 1992).

After the vote in 1950, many schools within the Southern and Southwestern U.S. were determined to reduce the NCAA's enforcement and return power back to individual universities ("Fight on NCAA Said", 1951). According to Falla (1981), the Sanity Code raised "the consciousness of everyone connected with intercollegiate sports, but as a practical instrument of regulation, it is a failure" without enforcement (p. 134). At the 1951 NCAA Convention, NCAA members voted to eliminate the Sanity Code with a vote of 130 for and 60 against ("NCAA Votes to Kill", 1951).

The need for the NCAA to provide regulation was important since college sports faced another gambling scandal. Three players from the City College of New York (CCNY), winners of the 1950 NIT and 1950 NCAA Tournaments, admitted to accepting \$1,500 per game to fix three games played in Madison Square Garden ("Scandal Rocks Cage Game", 1951). In addition, reports also surfaced that three members of the 1948-49 University of Kentucky basketball team accepted \$500 bribes to shave points in a 1949 NIT game ("Scandal Reaches Kentucky", 1951). Both of these scandals were instrumental on many colleges choosing to de-emphasize sport, the main focus of the 12-Point Code ("NCAA Plans New Policy", 1951).

Although the NCAA faced much scrutiny regarding gambling, the NAIB did not have as many issues. The NAIA was not involved in many gambling issues due to its high sensitivity toward the issue (Wilson, 2005). In 1946, the NAIB passed a resolution against organized gambling. By 1950, Kansas State Teachers College basketball coach Gus Fish began offering statistical services to NAIB schools through wire services

(Wilson, 2005). While this service provided valuable information, the NAIB was concerned that organized gamblers could use this information if it was improperly handled. This fear also prompted the NAIB to exclude the University of Nevada from the 1950 NIBT (“Nevada Dropped from NAIB List”, 1950). The University of Nevada accepted \$1,000 from Las Vegas gambler L.B. Binion to help pay for travel expenses to get to Kansas City (“Nevada Dropped from NAIB List”, 1950). This association led Duer and the Executive Committee to exclude the school from the tournament (Wilson, 2005).

While organized gambling was a problem for college sports, there were positive developments allowing the NAIB to grow. For instance, in January 1950, a new monthly magazine, the *NAIB News*, had its first issue published and distributed to NAIB members throughout the school year (Wilson, 2005). According to Hoover (1958), the magazine was developed by the office of the Executive Secretary and edited by him until a Publicity Director was hired by the NAIB. It was expected to be a monthly publication but only five issues appeared in 1950 (Wilson, 2005). The NAIB also established the “NAIB-E.S. Liston Memorial Scholarship”, a \$300 cash award provided to a worthy basketball player (Hoover, 1958).

Prior to the 1951 Annual Meeting, the Executive Committee received letters from several individuals encouraging the NAIB to broaden its scope (Hoover, 1958). This enthusiasm reached its apex as the Executive Secretary was asked to poll the membership by mail for their reaction to expansion and authorized the Executive Committee to proceed with expansion when feasible (Wilson, 2005). Most of the enthusiasm seemed to exist for track and field. District 10 planned to hold a track meet in the spring of 1951 at

Kansas State Teachers College in Emporia, Kansas (Hoover, 1958). There NAIB officials saw the event as a trial run for sponsoring a national championship in track and agreed to underwrite \$400 for the meet that turned out to be a success with regard to participation, interest, and profit (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005). Because of this success, plans were conducted to hold the NAIB's first national track and field, golf, and tennis championships at Abilene, Texas on June 6 and 7, 1952 (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005).

The Expansion Period (1952 – 1958)

Many members were enthusiastic with these latest developments and continued to push for the NAIB's expansion. By 1952, the NAIB was represented all across America with over 400 members (Stooksbury, 2010). At the 1952 Annual Meeting, members brought to the floor a suggestion that the name of the organization should be changed in order to reflect this new scope (Hoover, 1958). Many ideas had surfaced but suggestions were narrowed to only two options. The first was the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA) while the other was the National Association of Intercollegiate Sports (NAIS) (Hoover, 1958). After deliberation, the convention agreed to send these two recommendations to all members for a vote. The result was a landslide victory (Wilson, 2005). On October 1, 1952, the organization once known as the National Association for Intercollegiate Basketball officially became known as the NAIA (Stooksbury, 2010).

The 1952 Annual Meeting also altered the annual membership fees. Instead of assessing a \$10 flat fee, the NAIA decided to create a sliding scale from \$10 to \$50 based on the enrollment of the member school to become effective during the 1952-1953 school year (see Table 5.3). The dues were based upon the enrollment for the 1953-1954 school

year and no member that was delinquent in its payment of dues would be permitted to vote or participate in any tournament activities.

Table 5-3 - 1953 NAIA Annual Membership Dues

College Enrollment	Annual Dues
350 to less	\$10.00
350 to 500	\$15.00
500 to 1000	\$20.00
1000 to 1500	\$25.00
1500 to 2000	\$30.00
2000 to 3000	\$35.00
3000 to 4000	\$40.00
4000 to over	\$50.00

Since the organization was considering expansion, this move was made to boost revenue and likely offset any cost increases (Wilson, 2005). The organization also agreed to alter its voting policies. In earlier meetings, each member in attendance would be able to vote on matters but the new policy required the district to vote on behalf of their members (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005).

Perhaps the most important business of the 1952 meeting involved the question of African-American colleges. After the NAIB removed the restrictions on African-American players participating in the NIBT, many African-Americans sought further representation by pushing for black colleges to participate in either the NIBT or the NCAA Tournament. According to Crowley (2006), the NCAA had no specific regulations that prohibited black colleges from becoming members while the NAIB altered its by-laws to allow African-American participation. At the 1950 NABC Annual Convention in New York City, Howard University basketball coach Eddie Jackson, Virginia State College coach Harry Jefferson, and North Carolina College coach John McLendon brought forth an official petition for black schools to enter either the NCAA Basketball Tournament or the NIBT (Katz, 1990). After arguing their case, The

Pennsylvania State University head coach and NABC President John Lawther agreed to place its concerns before the NABC Executive Committee (Katz, 1990). Once discussions were complete, Lawther told the three coaches that “Our committee has approved your petition unanimously. We feel that such a step is long overdue and your schools must be included if basketball in America is to be truly American” (McLendon, 1979, p. 7).

In 1951, an official forum known as the National Athletic Steering Committee (NASC) was created in order to create an organizational focus for all black colleges (Katz, 1990). The NASC’s purpose was to study the problems of segregation and discrimination within intercollegiate athletics (Wilson, 2005). In order to combat these problems, the primary goal for the NASC was to get a black college into either the NAIB or the NCAA national championship (Stooksbury, 2010). According to Katz (1990), the NCAA was receptive of the NASC’s program but had issues fitting black colleges into its membership. After hearing this news, McLendon (1979) declared:

“[The NCAA] had no championship apparatus which would accommodate black colleges. In fact, the organization argued that they had no way to include any ‘small’ colleges at all, as it arbitrarily regulated all black schools to small college status. Along with this, the NCAA voiced the fear fans may not accept or appreciate the kind of game you play...your coaches may not be competent enough” (p. 8).

While the NCAA dismissed these schools as small and insignificant, the NAIB was becoming open and receptive to the thought of historically black colleges participating in the NIBT.

On June 5, 1951, Central State College of Ohio applied for admission to the NAIB (Wilson, 2005). Duer initially responded positively to the school’s application for membership but was later cautious of the move after learning that “yours [Central State

College of Ohio] was a colored college” (Katz & McLendon, 1988, p. 14). At this point in time, desegregation had not occurred in the U.S., and Missouri, a former slave state, still maintained separate-but-equal racial laws (Wilson, 2005). The complexity of inviting historically black institutions into the NAIA and NIBT prompted Duer to discuss this matter thoroughly with the Executive Committee (Katz & McLendon, 1988). The Athletic Director of Central State Mack Greene challenged Duer to apply the NAIA’s Code of Ethics which includes a clause against all prejudice (Wilson, 2005). Duer would meet with Greene in Cincinnati in January 1952 at the NCAA annual meeting, which was held concurrently with the NASC’s first meeting. Duer informed Greene that Central State was accepted as a full member of the NAIA and would be eligible for the Ohio District playoffs two months later (Wilson, 2005).

When all members learned of Central State’s acceptance, roadblocks began to emerge. The Ohio District chair, Don Renninger of Findlay College, ruled Central State ineligible to participate because he claimed to have no record of Central State’s approval to participate (Wilson, 2005). When Duer confirmed Central State’s membership, Renninger threatened to resign if his ruling was not upheld (Katz & McLendon, 1988). Duer backed off on his pursuit temporarily but returned to the matter at the annual convention. On March 12, 1952, the Executive Committee approved that all colleges for African-Americans meeting the required standards to be eligible for full membership in the NAIA (“Negro Schools In”, 1952). According to the *Kansas City Star*, “Negro teams now may play in district playoffs where such participation is possible” (“Negro Schools In”, 1952, para. 2). In order to accommodate the black colleges, a new district-at-large (District 29) was established for all NASC members in the NAIB (Wilson, 2005). The

creation of District 29 essentially turned the newly created NASC basketball tournament into a district playoff for the African-American schools with the winner earning a spot in the NIBT (Katz & McLendon, 1988).

The 1952 NIBT was the last tournament without representation from black colleges. Southwest Missouri State University captured the Naismith Trophy over Murray State University 73 to 64 (“Missouri Boys Annex Crown”, 1952). The event again proved to be very successful as advance ticket sales for the 1952 event rivaled the 1950 tournament’s figure of 58,000 (“NAIB Meet Opens Today”, 1952). After the tournament, Duer successfully put pressure on Kansas City businesses to open up to black teams and told Kansas City that if they still wanted the NIBT in the Municipal Auditorium, they would have to embrace integration (Wilson, 2005).

Over the course of 1952, 36 black institutions would join the NAIA as the first members of the new District 29 (Wilson, 2005). Many of these schools participated in separate tournaments in order to qualify for District 29’s official playoff, the NASC Tournament. According to the *Washington Afro-American*, Florida A&M College; Bethune-Cookman College; Virginia State College; Philander Smith College; Tennessee A&I State University; North Carolina College at Durham; Southern University; and Lincoln University of Missouri competed in a regional tournament to qualify in February 1953 (“First Round Cage Pairings”, 1953). Tennessee A&I would go on to win this qualifying tournament as well as the NASC Tournament hosted on its campus for a bid to the 1953 NIBT (Wilson, 2005). According to Wilson (2005), when the Tennessee A&I Tiger took the floor in Kansas City, the team was greeted with a cheering crowd. Central State Athletic Director Mack Greene was in the stands for Tennessee A&I’s game and

was delighted the crowd welcomed the Tennessee team despite its “extra protective cutaneous pigmentation” (Katz & McLendon, 1988, p. 17). This response worked to the benefit of Tennessee A&I as the Tigers defeated Geneva College in the opening round in overtime 89 to 88 and St. Benedict’s College in the second round 79 to 56 (Wilson, 2005). However, Tennessee A&I’s run would end in the quarterfinals against East Texas State (72 to 67) (Wilson, 2005). In the end, Southwest Missouri successfully defend its title, defeating Hamline University 79 to 71 in what was considered the best event to date (“Springfield State Wins”, 1953).

After the 1953 NIBT, many NAIA schools began scheduling interracial games for the following season. White schools such as Peru State College of Nebraska; Eastern New Mexico College; Southwest Missouri State University; and Culver-Stockton College would play games against historically black institutions like Kentucky State University; Fisk University; and Central State College of Ohio (Wilson, 2005). In addition, Tennessee A&I was invited to participate in the St. Paul, Minnesota, Christmas Tournament. Since the integration plan was going well, NAIA President A. G. Wheeler appointed a Select Committee on Integration in order to integrate the District 29 teams toward each team’s respective regional district (Katz & McLendon, 1988).

While integration was a primary concern during 1953, the NAIA continued to focus on other issues. For example, the NAIA was concerned with the eligibility of its members when the Presidents’ Advisory Committee (PAC) proposed that new members applying for membership must maintain membership in their regional accreditation agency (Hoover, 1958). While this recommendation was meant for future members, the policy was not made retroactive so not to deter current members that are either not

accredited or in the process of accreditation (Wilson, 2005). Representatives from the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER) were also in attendance. According to the *NAIA News*, plans were initiated “to work out an affiliation of our two organizations which would be a great step toward bringing athletics and physical education back into mutual understanding and administration” (*NAIA News*, 1953, p. 6).

Professionalism was also a matter of great concern in 1953 for all amateur organizations. After its annual convention, the AAU altered its rule on professionalism to where a professional athlete could regain his/her amateur status after a five-year waiting period (“Better Athletes is Olympic Aim”, 1953). However, the athlete cannot regain his amateur status in the sport the athlete was paid money (“Better Athletes is Olympic Aim”, 1953). The USOC, in attendance at the meeting, also agreed to the AAU’s definition and altered its rules accordingly. On the other hand, the AAU’s new definition put both the NCAA and the NAIA at odds. Specifically, the NAIA decided if a player became a professional in one sport, he would still be considered an amateur in all other sports (Hoover, 1958). According to Wilson (2005), “a professional career in one sport was like an outside job and did not logically affect any other sport” (p. 39). The NCAA, however, would not follow suit until the 1970s.

Next, the NAIA established the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletic Coaches (NAIAC) in order to discuss problems peculiar to the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). The NAIAC’s membership included coaches from all sports. This association differentiated itself from other coaching organizations because many of the other coaching groups were for specialized coaches working in one specific sport/domain

(Hoover, 1958). NAIA coaches were typically employed in multiple positions similar to former Executive Secretary Emil Liston (Baker University's football, basketball, and baseball coach as well as Athletic Director) and current Executive Secretary A. O. Duer (George Pepperdine University's basketball coach and Athletic Director) (Wilson, 2005). Therefore, they encountered unique problems and experiences that were different from those coaches at larger universities.

Little substantive action took place in 1954. The only noteworthy item from the 1954 NAIA Annual Meeting was the adoption of a two-year suspension for schools failing to participate in the national basketball tournament after declaring its intention to participate (Hoover, 1958). By 1955, the NAIA implemented new measures to help with its growing membership numbers. According to Wilson (2005), membership during the 1950-51 school year was 314 schools and averaged 10 schools for each of the 32 districts. By 1955, the membership count escalated to 437 (14 schools per district) and would stabilize over the next decade (Wilson, 2005).

The fastest growing and largest district was District 29 (i.e., the district-at-large for historically black colleges). Recognizing this trend, Duer and the Executive Committee agreed to provide District 29 with two entries into the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). One of these entries would qualify through the NASC Tournament while the other would be selected as an at-large team (Hoover, 1958). This idea essentially created a new district (District 6) for all the Southern historically black schools in 1956 (Wilson, 2005). Two years later, District 6 itself was split into two separate districts (i.e., District 6A for Southeastern institutions and District 6B for all Southwestern schools) (Wilson, 2005).

Overall, this arrangement assured three black colleges an opportunity to participate in the NIBT and demonstrated the value of black colleges to the NAIA.

Also at the 1955 NAIA Annual Meeting, Duer called for a vote on two items that he began campaigning for in 1953 (Wilson, 2005). First, Duer wanted to apply the NAIA's current standards of eligibility for all levels of competition (Hoover, 1958). At the time, both the NAIA and the NCAA had standards of eligibility only for post-season play and national tournaments (Wilson, 2005). The proposal passed at the 1955 meeting and provided the NAIA with actual enforcement over 'eligibility' violators. In comparison, the NCAA held little enforcement power and a problematic eligibility certification process (Falla, 1981). For example, once an NCAA athlete had his academic progress certified, typically in the fall semester, the athlete could compete in sports for the entire year without attending a class (Falla, 1981). Duer's second issue involved problems with transfer students from junior colleges. He recommended an 18-week resident requirement be implemented for transfer students, who were defined as students "who had not been graduated by the junior college from which they came" (Hoover, 1958, p. 100). A third item at the 1955 NAIA Meeting called for district basketball playoff games to be held on the home courts of participants (Hoover, 1958). This rule adoption was a measure that presumably would try to reduce the possible costs of outside gym rental and enhance the proceeds available to send teams to the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). In the end, all three items were approved.

By the 1956 Annual Meeting, many delegates wanted to expand the NAIA's sports offerings which were limited to basketball, track and field, tennis, and golf (Hoover, 1958). The first NAIA Track and Field Championship took place in 1952 and

was met with great fanfare. Abilene Christian University proved to be an early dominant force in track and field, winning the 1952, 1954, and 1955 events and taking second in 1953 (“Abilene Christian First”, 1955; Wilson, 2005). While track and field proved to be a success with the addition of tennis and golf as supplementary events, the delegates at the 1956 NAIA Convention decided to sponsor national championships in wrestling, swimming, cross-country, and baseball (Hoover, 1958).

Also previously absent from the formal conversation and NAIA was football, despite the great interest in that activity from its membership. According to Wilson (2005), the NAIA began publishing detailed statistics for the sport before voting to sponsor an official national championship. In 1956, the NAIA became the first national collegiate athletic organization to directly sponsor a postseason football game (Hoover, 1958). The delegates dubbed the first postseason event the Aluminum Bowl, and it was to be held on December 22, 1956, in Little Rock, Arkansas (Hoover, 1958). Little Rock was chosen as the site because it was not in close proximity to any major NCAA bowl game; was home of the 35,000 seat War Memorial Stadium; and was far enough south to get fair weather in December (“Aluminum Bowl Game to be”, 1956). The practice of providing for a national championship differed significantly from the NCAA as the organization only sanctioned postseason bowl game competition opposed to a postseason playoff.

Many schools hoped to impress the NAIA selection committee for an invite to the first Aluminum Bowl (“Westminster Seeking Bid”, 1956; “Mighty Bears Push Toward”, 1956). The selection committee was composed of the current NAIA President, immediate past president, the current NAIA First Vice-President, and a representative

from the Aluminum Bowl Association (Hoover, 1958). After deliberation, the NAIA felt the two best teams in the nation were Montana State University and the St. Joseph's College of Collegeville, Indiana ("St. Joseph's Meets Montana", 1956). The NAIA expected to have a crowd between 15,000 and 25,000 for the game ("Aluminum Bowl Game to be", 1956). Interestingly, the game was also to be televised by the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS) (Hoover, 1958). However, the event was less than stellar as the Aluminum Bowl ended in a scoreless tie and was played in the rain on a muddy field ("Montana Bobcats Tie", 1956). Both Montana State and St. Joseph's shared the Aluminum Bowl trophy and title as co-champions ("Montana Bobcats Tie", 1956). The weather caused the attendance to drop to 8,000 ("NAIA Official Outlines Bowl Game", 1957).

The next year, the NAIA decided to move the football game from Little Rock to a new site ("NAIA Official Outlines Bowl Game", 1957). According to Hoover (1958), the decision to move the event was due to the unsettled conditions surrounding the racial integration of the City of Little Rock and the NAIA's support of its historically black members. After the decision to move the game, Duer laid out a basic outline for any city considering hosting the game. This outline stated that the city would need:

1. A stadium capable of seating 18,000-20,000 persons to help pay the "the game's expenses."
2. A sponsor for the television rights which run about \$25,000.
3. Satisfactory weather conditions.
4. A general interest in the NAIA's level of collegiate athletics ("NAIA Official Outlines Bowl Game", 1957, para. 9).

Many areas were considered for the second NAIA football championship. Competing cities included Memphis, Tennessee; Odessa, Texas; Sacramento, California; and St. Petersburg, Florida ("NAIA Official Outlines Bowl Game", 1957). Duer originally

entered into negotiations to have the Aluminum Bowl in Memphis, but those talks broke down the NAIA chose to move the game to St. Petersburg (Putnam, 1957; “Small College Bowl Will Not”, 1957).

St. Petersburg was excited to host the 1957 Aluminum Bowl, but decided to hold a contest to change the name of the event (“Latest Entry; Satellite Bowl”, 1957). The contest saw 1,973 entries with the winner receiving an all-expense paid vacation to Havana, Cuba (“Latest Entry; Satellite Bowl”, 1957). After reviewing the submissions, the St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce and the NAIA agreed to alter the Aluminum Bowl name to the Holiday Bowl (Hoover, 1958). The inaugural Holiday Bowl was played at Stewart Field and saw Pittsburg State College of Kansas compete against Hillsdale College of Michigan (“Pitt Teacher Club Arrives”, 1957). In front of a crowd of 7,500 and a CBS nationally televised audience, Pittsburgh State would hold-off a Hillsdale comeback and win the second annual NAIA National Championship 27 to 26 (“Pittsburgh 27-26 Victor”, 1957).

After having to move the game once, Duer wanted the Holiday Bowl at one permanent site (Putnam, 1957). With the first St. Petersburg event proving to be a financial success, it seemed to be a great location for future years (“Integration Issue May Force”, 1957). Unfortunately, racial tension again became an issue for the NAIA. According to *St. Petersburg Independent* Sports Editor Jeff Moshier, integration could have forced the NAIA to move its football championship again (“Race Issue Held Periling”, 1957). For instance, the fans in attendance at the Holiday Bowl were surprised African-Americans participated for both teams in the first Holiday Bowl and an African-

American cheerleader worked for Hillsdale College (“Integration Issue May Force”, 1957). More specifically, Moshier commented:

“While this might appear bigoted to many, the fact remains that St. Petersburg of all the large cities in Florida probably maintains the strongest front against integration, notwithstanding that as a resort city the bulk of its population no doubt is native of north of the Mason-Dixon line. Strong criticism can be expected from the segregationists and unless an agreement is reached to draw the color line a cleavage in the ranks of the city’s more prominent business and civic leaders might result if an effort is made to repeat an integrated game. And it is unlikely that the NAIA will be interested in returning now that the integration issue has been raised” (“Race Issue Held Periling”, 1957, para. 8-9).

Despite Moshier’s prediction, Richard A. Parker, chairman of the Holiday Bowl Committee believed “there is absolutely no reason why we won’t have the Holiday Bowl here next year” (“Race Issue Held Periling”, 1957, para. 3). Parker was correct on his assessment as the Holiday Bowl would stay in St. Petersburg until 1960.

Along with adding new sports, the critical 1956 Annual Meeting saw legislation that streamlined the district committees’ voting representation along with the opportunity to gain athletic insurance coverage (Hoover, 1958). In 1954, catastrophic insurance was made available to the member schools; however, starting in fall 1956, three levels were offered to the members to provide for a wider coverage of events (Wilson, 2005). The highest plan would “cover any intercollegiate sport, including football”, and would have “the insurance company pay all costs for any accident to the insured” (Hoover, 1958, p. 105).

The 1957 Annual Meeting created a new Faculty Athletic Chairmen Committee (Hoover, 1958). Under Perry Mitchell of Central Washington State College (Ellensburg, Washington), the Faculty Athletic Chairs worked on eligibility issues and academic standards (Hoover, 1958). According to Wilson (2005), the presence of this committee

“provided a deterrent to any temptation the athletic directors might have had to water down academic standards” (p. 44). Finally, a special meeting of selected college presidents, athletic representatives, coaches, and Executive Committee members was called with the aim to revise the NAIA’s Aims and Objectives (Wilson, 2005). After the meeting was completed, a 14-point set of Aims and Objectives was drawn up and sent to all member schools for feedback (Hoover, 1958). Once revisions were received, the group would reconvene at the 1957 Annual Meeting and incorporate the members’ feedback into a revised proposal (see Appendix 1).

By 1957, the NAIA was a thriving organization with the addition of the new sports and the active engagement of its membership at annual meetings. However, Wilson (2005) noted Duer and the NAIA felt they were under constant attack from the NCAA during this time. At the NCAA Convention in January 1956, the NCAA decided to set up a small college basketball tournament beginning in 1957 to rival the NAIA (Falla, 1981). For instance, many believed this new tournament would eventually “kill off the NAIA tournament” (“Fans, Officials Satisfied with Present”, 1956, para. 8). Furthermore, it was arranged so that the new small college tournament would have no relation with the much larger university championship or encourage any form of playoff between them (“NCAA Meet Disbands”, 1956; “NCAA to Split Tourney”, 1956). Interestingly, the institutions would be able to declare which tournament they want to participate in and NAIA schools were invited to declare their allegiance to the NCAA a year in advance if they planned to switch (“NCAA Meet Disbands”, 1956).

Upon hearing about this possibility, Duer attended the NCAA Convention to make a strong pitch for the NAIA and about the proposed split. Specifically, Duer stated:

“We feel that athletics throughout the nation will be hurt by this move. It’s difficult for us to understand why the NCAA, after 15 years, suddenly becomes interested in the small colleges, particularly in the basketball tournament area. We are at a critical time now maintaining our athletic programs. Many small schools are in danger of losing football because of lack of support. We can’t see why you don’t show interest in this situation, rather than setting up a duplicating activity” (“NCAA to Split Tourney”, 1956, para. 9 and 10).

According to Katz and McLendon (1988), Duer also wrote to a friend that:

“Everyone here knew for sure that the aim of this move of the NCAA was to put us out of business...My good friend, Mr. [Walter] Byers [NCAA president] has put us Number 1 on his wanted list and makes no secret he is after our scalp” (p. 26-27).

After the NCAA’s decision, the NAIA started actively campaigning to strengthen its membership, which was comprised of 465 colleges at the time (“NAIA Fighting against NCAA”, 1956). Duer and the Executive Committee began sending brochures to NAIA members that included clippings and excerpts from various sports writers and college officials criticizing the NCAA decision (“NAIA Fighting against NCAA”, 1956). The booklet included a statement from Duer that read “The reported prediction of the decrease of NAIA finds it in the healthiest [sic] position in its history” (“NAIA Fighting against NCAA”, 1956, para. 7).

According to Katz (1990), the NCAA became threatened by the NAIA’s success at integrating the historically black institutions into the NIBT and into the greater organization. Before the NAIA, the NCAA was uncertain with how to effectively deal with the black colleges because the organization viewed these schools as small and insignificant (Crowley, 2006). The NAIA’s suspicions became more pronounced when the NCAA set up a regional tournament involving four black colleges – Florida A&M University; Tuskegee University; North Carolina A&T State University; and Lincoln University (Wilson, 2005). Crowley (2006) noted the four-team tournament was

scheduled at Tuskegee University and purposefully involved the addition of Lincoln University as an outside competitor.

Unfortunately for the NAIA, many of the historically black schools disagreed about which path would be best for their future. For example, Central State Athletic Director Mack Greene urged many of the black colleges to establish and maintain dual membership if possible with the NAIA and the NCAA so they could attend the national tournament of their choice (Wilson, 2005). On the other side, former North Carolina College and current Tennessee A&I basketball coach John McLendon and Texas Southern University basketball coach Alexander Durley called for a loyalty pledge among the black schools associated with the NAIA (Katz & McLendon, 1988). Their message included the opportunities the NAIA provided these institutions such as African-Americans on committees and having an opportunity to compete on an equal basis (Wilson, 2005). Because of this strong message, many of these colleges decided to stay associated with the NAIA (Katz, 1990). One of the well-known examples of loyalty came from Hillsdale College. Hillsdale was a dual member before the 1957 season and was penalized for its participation in the NAIA National Championship game by the NCAA (“Quits NCAA for Play”, 1957). Hillsdale Athletic Director and Coach Frank Waters decided to withdraw the school’s affiliation with the NCAA instead of facing the NCAA’s penalties because of the NCAA’s alleged tolerance of a black school ban in 1954 (“Quits NCAA for Play”, 1957).

To further support or reinforce the NAIA against the NCAA the NAIA sought out partnerships with other outside organizations. As an example, in 1958, the NAIA began an association with both the National Federation of State High School Athletic

Associations (NFHS) and the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA) to better manage the NAIA's sponsored sports (Wilson, 2005). The three organizations formed a close working relationship and termed themselves the National Alliance of Athletic Associations (NAAA) (Hoover, 1958). For instance, the NAIA Football Advisory Committee and the NAIAC voted to make the NAAA rules for football the official rules for the NAIA sponsored bowl game (Wilson, 2005). Before this ruling, all schools at the college level played under the rules originally set up by the NCAA (Hoover, 1958).

Finally, after operating in the offices of George Pepperdine University in Los Angeles since 1949, the NAIA officially moved its executive offices to Kansas City in the summer of 1957 (Wilson, 2005). NAIA officials desired a move to stabilize the association and its impending conflict with the NCAA. In essence, the move was vital because it provided better service to over 400 members (Hoover, 1958). In addition to the new locale, Duer decided to staff a full-time Director of Publicity as well as additional office workers (Hoover, 1958). With the expansion into new sports, NAIA officials believed the organization was establishing itself as one of the premiere intercollegiate sports associations in the U.S.

The Establishment Period (1958 – 1962)

According to Land (1977), NAIA officials focused much of their attention in 1958 on four general areas:

“(1) clarification of policies; (2) improvement and expansion of national championship events programs; (3) the folly of expanding institutional athletic programs at the cost of complete loss of educational purpose or significant dilution of purpose; and (4) affiliation with other organizations” (p. 33).

Again, the biggest threat to the NAIA at this time was the creation of the NCAA's College Division. The success of the College Division basketball tournament in 1957, held in Evansville, Indiana, led the NCAA to sponsor a cross-country championship meet in 1958 and to provide small colleges more representation on rules committees ("NCAA Council Report Warns Tougher", 1959; "NCAA Meeting Winds Up", 1958). However, the NCAA did not view the addition of the College Division as the suggested act of war nor did it intend to fight with the NAIA over dual memberships ("NCAA Denies 'War' with NAIA", 1958). NCAA Executive Director Walter Byers further elaborated on this with the following:

"Almost 200 smaller institutions have become members of the NCAA during the past seven years which seems to be positive proof that the NCAA provides services and benefits which they can't find anywhere else. We do not conduct membership drives or solicit members and we are really proud and grateful that our membership has increased by 88 percent during this period" ("NCAA Denies 'War' with NAIA", 1958, para. 3).

While the NCAA was trying to promote the positives of the College Division, NAIA officials still feared that NCAA wanted to lure away NAIA members by providing them with a more known alternative ("NCAA Council Report Warns Tougher", 1959; Wilson, 2005).

Another one of Duer's fears focused on how the national sports scene was evolving toward a product focused on the glamour and excitement of "big time" programs (Land, 1977, p. 34). In much of his commentary, Duer wanted the NAIA to resist this trend and instead focus on the concept of an "educationally integrated athletic program" (Wilson, 2005, p. 46). Duer articulated his concerns in the first expanded edition of *The NAIA News* as he wrote about the principles he supported. Within Duer stated:

“The basic aim to which we must hold if we are to be worthy of leadership in intercollegiate athletics is that our program must be based squarely on sound educational policies and be an integral part of the total educational offering of member institutions rather than a separate commercial or promotional adjunct. The acceptance of this aim is and must continue to be the distinguishing quality of our program and its test of membership. The acceptance of this concept serves as a real base for the development of the athletic program of an institution. However, this concept is contrary both to the present trend in the development of intercollegiate athletics nationally and also is in direct conflict with the major trends of our society” (Duer, 1958, p. 3).

Duer’s message to the membership was a part of one of the significant developments from the 1958 annual meeting: the expansion of *The NAIA News* as the official source of news for NAIA members (Land, 1977). *The NAIA News* saw its publication schedule changed to quarterly issues from a periodical basis because of members’ desires for an expanded NAIA. Specifically, *The NAIA News* was to expand its content and volume (Wilson, 2005). According to Land (1977), the expanded magazine had three purposes:

- (1) to present news of interest to the members;
- (2) to serve as an organ for exchange of ideas for improvement of techniques; and
- (3) to give constant interpretation and motivation to the philosophy, aims, and objectives of the NAIA (p. 35).

The formation of the NAAA proved to be a significant step for football coaches as the rules of the game were finally established and unified (Land, 1977). Specifically, over 11,000 football teams at different levels of competition were now playing with similar rules because of the previously aforementioned alliance between the NJCAA, NFHS, and NAIA. Those rules provided benefits such as alliance representation; free substitution, which allowed a more efficient utilization of players; the use of freshman players; uniform officiating; consistent athletic performance; and knowledgeable spectators (Land, 1977).

The 1958 Holiday Bowl championship game saw an expansion in presentation as the NAIA implemented a four team playoff for its football national championship, something the NCAA would not implement until 2014 (“2 Grid Play-offs to Precede Bowl”, 1958). The playoff system was implemented in accordance with the NAIA’s tradition that champions must prove their right to titles on the playing field (“2 Grid Play-offs to Precede Bowl”, 1958). St. Petersburg was encouraged by the success of the prior bowl game and the playoff was announced as a mechanism to enhance the event. In January 1958, city leaders formed a group known as the Committee of 100 in order to study the construction and financing of a new sport facility centered on the Holiday Bowl (Bothwell, 1958). Committee Chairman Richard Parker declared:

“We believe that the future of that game (Holiday Bowl) will depend upon our ability to supply a stadium. We have a year to put it across. But the year after that we’re going to need a stadium. I think it’s going to be one of the most important projects this city will ever see” (Bothwell, 1958, para. 3).

The concern for a new stadium can also be attributed to comments from CBS. According to Walter Ramseur, St. Petersburg Chamber of Commerce President, an NAIA official had informed him that CBS was in favor of televising the Holiday Bowl, but did not like the Stewart Field background of traffic and landscape (Bothwell, 1958). CBS also noted it preferred to broadcast the game from Al Lang Field, a baseball stadium, since it had better television accommodations (“Council Okays Lang Site”, 1958). After deliberation, the council unanimously approved hosting the Holiday Bowl and agreed the baseball diamond would not be damaged by the football contest (“Council Okays Lang Site”, 1958).

By November 1958, the NAIA selection committee chose Northeastern Oklahoma State College of Tahlequah, Oklahoma; Gustavus Adolphus College of St. Peter, Minnesota; St. Benedict's College of Atchison, Kansas; and Arizona State College of Flagstaff, Arizona as the top four teams for the inaugural playoffs ("NAIA Selects Playoff Teams", 1958). On December 6, 1958, Northeastern Oklahoma was paired with St. Benedict's in Tulsa while Arizona State met Gustavus Adolphus in Tucson ("4 NAIA Clubs Clash", 1958). Both Northwestern Oklahoma and Arizona State won their semi-final contests and earned a chance for the NAIA National Championship ("Holiday Bowl Foes Get Here", 1958). Once the contestants were determined, 3,000 fans purchased tickets for the Holiday Bowl on December 20, 1958 ("3,000 Holiday Tickets Sold", 1958). While initial sales were strong, some 3,500 seats remained available for the stadium that could host 10,000 ("Suncoast Blackout Set", 1958). Due to the decline in ticket sales, Eugene Dodson, the general manager of Station WTVT of Tampa, announced the Holiday Bowl was going to be blacked out for anyone within a 150 mile radius of St. Petersburg ("Suncoast Blackout Set", 1958). Although the game was not shown to St. Petersburg residents, the 1958 Holiday Bowl emerged as a successful event as Northeastern Oklahoma State defeated Arizona State 19 to 13, becoming the third NAIA National Champion in football ("Lumberjacks Determined to Return", 1958). Both Arizona State head coach Max Spilsbury and Northwestern Oklahoma State head coach Harold Stratton suggested the increase in stature of small college football through the playoff was exciting. Further, Spilsbury also stated:

"I suppose a lot of people who have been watching the pros and major colleges play all season didn't think much of a small college game on television. But I'm sure we gave them a good show. I think we certainly brought credit to NAIA

football [sic]. The boys on both teams played their hearts out” (“Lumberjacks Determined to Return”, 1958, para. 7-8).

While the Holiday Bowl was praised by the competing coaches and the NAIA deemed the playoffs successful, the NCAA was not content with one of the invited participants. An 18-man NCAA Advisory Council placed Gustavus Adolphus, a dual member of NCAA and NAIA, on probation for one year for competing in the non-NCAA certified playoff game against Arizona State (“NCAA Puts Cincy and Holiday”, 1959).

As the NAIA was expanding, the organization became difficult to manage and caused Duer to continually contact members to make sure all affairs were in order. According to Land (1977), each member of the Executive Committee was given the responsibility of regulating selected committees in Table 5.4. This approach taken by Duer highlights what is arguably the strength of the NAIA: its “grassroots decision making” organizational structure (Land, p. 40). The NAIA governance structure represented an extensive democratic process. Leaders were provided with multiple

Table 5-4 - 1958-59 NAIA Executive Committee Supervisory Responsibilities

Committee Member	Supervisory Responsibilities
John Longfellow	Finance, International Affairs, Swimming
Ross Merrick	International Affairs, Professional Education, President’s Advisory
John Knight	Special Redistricting, Golf
Francis Hoover	Statistical, Television, Historical
A. W. Mumford	Faculty Athletic, Redistricting
Leo Nicholson	Hall of Fame, Special Awards, Track and Field, Conferences
Al Buckingham	Cross Country, Wrestling
Cliff Aultman	Tennis, NAIAC
Jess Hawthorne	Baseball, Research
Volney Ashford	Independent Colleges, Football
W. L. Zorn	Necrology
E. D. Fish	Basketball, All-American awards
Ray Hanson	Membership (chairman)

opportunities to evaluate last year's programs, to unify thinking on major problems, and to promote the unity of policies and practices in support of the stated aims and objectives of the NAIA (Land, 1977).

The attendees of the 1959 Annual Meeting discussed several significant items vital to the health of the NAIA. First, the NAIA faced pressures from the NCAA when the NAIA desired for another chance to represent the United States in the Olympics (Wilson, 2005). The NCAA was in a long-standing conflict with the AAU and the USOC over who would be the official administrative body for the various sports programs of amateur standing (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). In 1959, the AAU and the NCAA had two rival interpretations over "amateurism." As noted earlier, the AAU's interpretation was no professional athlete, regardless of sport, would be allowed in any amateur participation (Hoover, 1958; Land, 1977). The Executive Committee voted to adopt the AAU's definition and planned to phase in the rule by 1962 (Wilson, 2005). The delay in adoption occurred because Duer realized there may be some issues with current students and decided to have those individuals finish their eligibility before having to conform to the new rules (Duer. A. O., personal communication, June 29, 1959).

Another issue that concerned the NAIA was the question of conflicting events. Many NCAA events were scheduled at the same time as NAIA events (Land, 1977). Because some of the members maintained a membership in both organizations due to the NCAA's College Division, schools would often wait until the last minute to decide which postseason event would provide the most benefit (Wilson, 2005). For the NAIA, delays in playoff decisions by dual members resulted in a weakening of its playoff events and

damaging of public relations and potential income earned (Land, 1977). The Executive Committee did not take the severity of this issue lightly and adopted the following policy in order to mollify the dual membership conflict:

POLICY:

That all member institutions of NAIA shall, by reason of their membership, be assumed to be in full support of the total program of NAIA.

That an institution which is determined by their district committee to be worthy of or qualified for participation shall be expected to support the NAIA program.

If an institution determines they do not wish to participate in any post-season competition in a given sport or in all sports, they must inform the district chairman in writing well in advance of the beginning of the selection process. Otherwise, they will be assumed to wish to be considered for participation. Member institutions have full right to decide not to participate in either district or national tournaments and meets and no penalty will be given according to this paragraph.

If such an institution participates in a conflicting tournament or meet, either in date or in fact, the following penalty shall be imposed:

1. The institution shall be suspended from all district and national events.
2. They shall be ineligible for participation in statistical service of NAIA.
3. They shall lose their right to vote on district or national issues.
4. They shall be ineligible for consideration of any member of their staff to serve on district or national committees during their period of suspension (NAIA, 1959, p. 13).

A follow-up enforcement policy was also crafted concurrently to provide the Executive Committee a realistic method to deal with the dual membership problem:

ENFORCEMENT POLICY:

1. Power to enforce this policy and to mete out suspension and penalties for infraction shall be vested in the Executive Committee of NAIA, who shall take such action as they deem wise after consultation with the district committee in which the institution holds membership and an opportunity has been given the institution involved to justify its action.
2. Normal penalty for infraction of this policy shall be for a one-year period. However, lesser or greater penalties may be imposed as the situation demands (NAIA, 1959, p. 14-15).

While creating the policy was a relatively simple process, the NAIA realized the dual membership problem was more complex. According to Land (1977), the conflict was not a simple matter of an individual school looking for the best opportunity. Quite often, entire conferences had belonged to the NCAA. Under NCAA rules, conference champions were required to play in the NCAA playoffs (Wilson, 2005). With both the NAIA and the NCAA placed pressure on individual schools, dual membership did not appear to be a viable action. Instead, both associations now wanted full commitment from schools. Duer summed up his beliefs by arguing:

“The pledge has not functioned properly. Membership does obligate a school for its support. We must face this fact. We are in serious trouble all along the line if we do not.

This purposed policy will cause serious thinking on decisions this fall in membership. We must state a policy that is fair and considerate. This does not affect dual membership except in dual participation in conflict. We are coming to have more and more conflict” (NAIA, 1959, p. 16).

The new NAIA dual membership policy did not take long before it would be used.

During the Annual Meeting, District 26 committee members recommended Belmont-Abbey College be sanctioned with a one year suspension for competing in the NCAA basketball tournament instead of the NAIA District 26 playoff tournament (Land, 1977).

The Executive Committee concurred with the district chairmen and placed Belmont-Abbey on suspension for one year starting on March 15, 1959 (NAIA Executive Committee, 1959).

Along with the amateurism issue, eligibility continued to be a concern for all athletic associations. A great deal of discussion at the 1959 meeting dealt with two specific areas. The first issue concerned the “normal progress” rule. The Executive

Committee agreed an interpretative statement would need to be added to the rules and standards to better clarification. The statement reads:

“A student must maintain a cumulative grade point average required to remain in good standing as set forth by the official catalog or by the registrar if the provisions for good standing are not contained in the catalog. This interpretation does not change any provision as contained in the rule as written” (NAIA Executive Committee, 1959, p. 14).

The second concern, the transfer rule, was also a major concern for both the NAIA and the NCAA. Texas A&M University head football coach Jim Myers and Texas Christian University Athletic Director L. R. Meyer called for an NCAA investigation after several students left their respective schools in 1959 to transfer to the University of Kansas (“Coach Jim Myers Says Colleges”, 1959). Meyer commented on the transfer matter:

“We need to stop this jumping around. We must have some rules with teeth in them. Only the Southwest Conference and the Pacific Coast limit a transfer to two years of varsity competition after he has laid out a year. The other conferences – one is the Big Eight of which Kansas is a member – take a transfer, have him wait a year, then give him three years of varsity football. In other words, he loses nothing by transfer” (“Coach Jim Myers Says Colleges, 1959, para. 4).

The NAIA also had rules in place to regulate transfers by implementing an 18-week waiting period. However, the delegates at the 1959 meeting further sought to clarify the rule.

“For purposes of interpretation: the 18-week transfer rule means 18 calendar weeks. A fraction of a week is to be considered as a whole week. The 18 weeks period begins with the first day of classes. The athlete is eligible on the Monday noon following the 18 weeks. If the 18 weeks period is completed at the end of the spring term or semester, the student is eligible for any athletic competition which is an extension of the spring term or semester” (NAIA Executive Committee, 1959, p. 14).

Both of these rules were to be applied to all athletes and institutions throughout the regular season requiring a great deal of investigation and bookkeeping for the NAIA (Land, 1977). In the end, the NCAA rules were less restrictive because they only verified

eligibility at the time of post-season competition while the NAIA rigorously confirmed the eligibility of its players throughout the entire school year and to file eligibility forms before enlisting any athlete in any sport season (Land, 1977).

The NAIAC also grew during this period as coaches started taking an active role in the organization of sporting events (Wilson, 2005). By 1959, the NAIAC was segmenting for individual sports similar to other coaches' associations within the other athletic associations. However, NAIAC advertised the individual sport segmentation as allowing coaches to belong not only to the broader body of the NAIAC but to a specific sport section to help govern its officers and national championship contests (Wilson, 2005). The Executive Committee went on record supporting the NAIAC reorganization by stating:

“We urge sports advisory committee members to be members of the NAIAC scene and to be active. As sports board members and/or chairmen of sports advisory committees, end their terms of office, these two positions should become one and the same” (NAIA Executive Committee, 1959, p. 15).

Next, racial integration was still a concern for both the nation and the NAIA. By 1959, Districts 6 and 29, both at-large districts, had a combined 60 schools (Land, 1977). While the organization was the forerunner in intercollegiate integration, many African-American schools still had difficulty integrating within their geographical region (Wilson, 2005). In both the North and South, to varying degrees, resistance to integration continued. The integration issue was discussed at length at the 1959 meeting with the Executive Committee recommending the best way to start would be to have six states (i.e., Delaware, Maine, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Missouri, and the District of Columbia) absorb some of the black colleges since these states appeared to be the most ready for integration (Land, 1977). Additionally, the committee felt the national office should

instigate these moves instead of the individual institutions (NAIA Executive Committee, 1959). The NAIA's plan, as proposed by Duer, would involve three measures. First, the NAIA would set up plans moving black schools into the regular district in which they fell geographically (Land, 1977). Next, the NAIA would aid these schools by scheduling games with white schools during the regular season. Finally, the problem of a redistricting will be studied to identify a specific cause as to why some districts have resisted integration (Land, 1977). Unfortunately, formalized segregation would continue in the NAIA until 1967 when as many as 53 NAIA schools remained in the at-large district (Katz & McLendon, 1988).

An assessment of the finances occurred at the 1959 meeting, which prompted some important reaction from the membership. Specifically, it was determined that the organization depended upon three major sources of income: (1) the gate receipts from the NIBT; (2) the income from the football playoffs and bowl game; and (3) dues from member institutions (Land, 1977). For the 1958-59 fiscal year, the NAIA's projected income was \$40,000 (NAIA, 1959). Of that amount, \$18,000 was derived from dues from 465 members; \$14,000 from NIBT revenues; \$3,000 from football receipts; and \$5,000 from district playoff events (Wilson, 2005). With an established budget of \$42,000, it was calculated that member dues only comprised 44% of the budget necessary for administration (Land, 1977). More than half of the operating budget was dependent on items that could fluctuate from year to year. The Executive Committee concluded the current budget was not a sound fiscal policy and decided to increase membership dues (Land, 1977). Duer reached out to all members to inform them that the fee increase could help the NAIA have approximately 75% of its operating budget from stable income and

bring in \$28,000 annually (A. O. Duer, personal communication, March 31, 1959; see Table 5.5).

Table 5-5 - 1959-60 NAIA Annual Membership Dues

College Enrollment	Annual Dues	Proposed Dues
Up to 500	\$25.00	\$35.00
501 to 1000	\$35.00	\$50.00
1001 to 1500	\$40.00	\$60.00
1501 to 2000	\$50.00	\$70.00
2001 to 2500	\$55.00	\$80.00
2501 to 3000	\$55.00	\$90.00
3000 and over	\$60.00 & \$70.00	\$100.00

When the 1959-1960 school year began, the NAIA saw several activities come to fruition. The biggest addition was the inclusion of a soccer championship as the NAIA's tenth sponsored championship in 1959 (Wilson, 2005). The soccer committee, in November 1959, selected Pennsylvania State College at Slippery Rock as the site for the first soccer tournament (Land, 1977). After this event, the soccer committee was already hard at work aligning teams into areas, appointing area chairmen, and planning to select an All-American soccer team in 1960 (Wilson, 2005). The success of the event also encouraged Howard University of Washington, D.C. to express its interest in hosting the 1960 tournament ("Soccer", 1960).

The second year of the NAIA football playoffs proved to be more successful than the first. Opposed to neutral sites, the playoff games would be played on the home campuses of two of the competing teams (Land, 1977). Lenoir-Rhyne College hosted Southern Connecticut State College in Hickory, North Carolina, in the eastern playoff while the prior year's runner-up Hillsdale College would travel to Kingsville, Texas, to face Texas College of Arts and Industries in the western playoff ("Preliminaries Set for Holiday Bowl", 1959). According to Land (1977), both events were "characterized by

outstanding co-operation from the two schools and the Chambers of Commerce and special citizens groups (p. 56-57). Both home teams dispatched their opponents and met in the third annual Holiday Bowl held again in St. Petersburg at Al Lang Field (“Small Colleges Battle for National”, 1959). Although the athletic affair was another accomplishment, issues still lingered in regards to a new stadium in St. Petersburg. The NAIA and the Holiday Bowl Committee reached an agreement for the bowl to remain in St. Petersburg and a new stadium must be ready for the 1960 season (“Bowl Officials Query Fate”, 1959). However, many voters within the St. Petersburg committee were not willing to spend public tax dollars on a new facility despite pleas from Duer (“Bowl Officials Query Fate”, 1959). As a result, in April 1960, the NAIA suffered a major blow to its prestige and visibility when CBS announced that it was not going to broadcast the 1960 Holiday Bowl (Wilson, 2005). CBS executive William MacPhail wrote Duer to inform him that the Holiday Bowl would not be shown due to the network’s new policy to reduce the number of bowl games televised as well as the NAIA’s inability to secure ample sponsorships and better facility (W. MacPhail, personal communication, April 8, 1960).

The primary theme for the 1960 Annual Meeting focused on the integration of intercollegiate athletics within the total educational program of NAIA member institutions and not on football (Land, 1977). Duer emphasized this theme as he wrote:

“Every decision we make every policy we adopt during this week must be examined in the light of our major aim that the NAIA program be an integral of the educational program of our member institutions, rather than to become a separate commercial or promotional adjunct” (Duer, 1960, p. 3).

One particular group shared Duer’s views and began asserting themselves in the athletic domain. Specifically, a collection of university presidents began gathering for meetings

in Boston that were in conjunction with the Association of American Colleges (AAC) and the American Association of College Teacher Education (AACTE) (Land, 1977). University presidents from all across the country shared a great concern over the intrusion of money into college athletics (Wilson, 2005). Administrators openly questioned their place when financial aid for athletes was steadily climbing while gate revenue staggered (Land, 1977). Two practices that were common solutions with this problem were also discussed. First, institutions providing subsidies to one or two sports (normally football and basketball) were using those sports as publicity attractions at the expense of less popular sports (Land, 1977). The outcome of this activity decrease subsidies to those sports or saw them dropped by the college if they did not produce income (Wilson, 2005). Second, the presidents identified the growing trend for institutions to seek financial support from booster clubs and alumni for the purpose of building their program (Land, 1977). While the practice was permitted, the presidents feared that a loss of control could surface to the existence of outside money (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA Executive Committee also echoed this warning and denounced these practices (“Presidents’ Advisory Committee Reports”, 1960).

The amateurism battle once again emerged at the 1960 Annual Meeting. In 1959, Dr. Ross Merrick, NAIA Executive Committee Member, and Duer attended meetings between the AAU and the USOC to seek representation for the NAIA on Olympic committees that the NAIA sponsored (Land, 1977). Both Duer and Merrick were informed the USOC would be unlikely to grant the NAIA any representation on Olympic committees until the NAIA changed its amateur rule (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). One year earlier, Duer was also removed from the Olympic Basketball Committee after

serving for eight years (Wilson, 2005). Olympic officials told Duer that his position on the committee was an NCAA position, not an NAIA one (Land, 1977). Duer's removal left the NAIA without any representation on the Olympic committee and hurt its chances to have participation in the basketball trials in 1960. Based on these events, Duer discussed at the annual meeting changing the NAIA deadline for compliance with the amateur rule from 1962 back to an effective date of September 1, 1960 (Land, 1977).

The Olympic Basketball Committee met twice to discuss if the NAIA had the right to participate in the basketball trials (Wilson, 2005). The NCAA challenged the committee to not allow the NAIA to participate (Land, 1977). However, the NAIA's working relationship with the AAU as well as its pledge to conform to the Olympic amateur rule was enough to fight off the NCAA's petition. At first, the committee recommended the Olympic trials include two AAU teams, two NCAA teams, one armed forces team, and one NAIA team (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). However, the NCAA objected to this plan, arguing that it should have small college representation. As a compromise, the NCAA suggested one small college team comprised of six NCAA and six NAIA players could be included in the Olympic trials (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA did not prefer this arrangement and offered an alternative plan for eight teams to participate in the Olympic trials. This plan included three teams from the AAU, three from the NCAA (two from the University Division and one from the College Division), one from the armed forces, and one from the NAIA (Land, 1977).

Once this decision was made public, the USOC called an immediate meeting to discuss the NAIA participation in the basketball trials (Land, 1977). NCAA Executive Officer Walter Byers walked out of this meeting and threatened to withdraw all NCAA

teams from the trials if the NAIA were allowed to participate (Wilson, 2005). After the meeting, AAU officials advised the NAIA Executive Committee that the NAIA would have greater success gaining representation on the Olympic committee if the NAIA changed its date of compliance with the amateur rule before the meeting of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) in 1961 (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). The AAU feared that the NAIA's right to membership within the USOC would be challenged unless the NAIA was in full conformance with the amateur rule. Thus, at the 1960 Annual Meeting, the NAIA members were polled for a vote on this issue (Land, 1977). In a relative landslide, the membership voted to change its amateur rule (Wilson, 2005).

The NAIA was allowed to compete in the Olympic Trials and fielded a team of all-stars in order to have representation in the 1960 Olympics (Land, 1977). The NAIA all-star team was scheduled to face the NCAA National Champion, the OSU Buckeyes, in the opening round of the trials in Denver (Meakins, 1960). The Buckeyes' roster included All-American and National Basketball Association (NBA) bound John Havlicek, Larry Zeigfried, and Jerry Lucas (Land, 1977). Despite their talented roster, the NAIA All-Star team would rally to defeat the Buckeyes 76 to 69 (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA team would then go on to lose its second game to the AAU's Peoria Caterpillars, 89 to 68, and fall in the third place game to the Goodyear Wingfoots, 88 to 77 (Wilson, 2005). Although no NAIA players were selected to the Olympic team, upsetting Ohio State proved to be a better prize for the NAIA ("NAIA 4th in Olympic Cage Trials", 1960). For instance, Duer expressed his excitement by stating:

"I am sure you were all thrilled at the tremendous accomplishment in our All-Star team winning over Ohio State. You cannot image the shock and dismay on the faces of the NCAA leaders, nor the elation on the part of the AAU and armed services people in that we had proven our right to participate and supported their

insistence upon our being allowed this privilege” (A.O. Duer, personal communication, April 6, 1960, p. 1).

The success at the 1960 Olympic Trials also interestingly added more turmoil to the continuing conflict between the NCAA and the NAIA. The NAIA rightfully earned the privilege to participate but they also instigated and compounded the conflict. As an example, after the victory over Ohio State, an advertisement was published in *The NAIA News* that provided a subtle gesture. The advertisement was as follows:

WHAT MAKES A CHAMPION?

A champion proves his right to the title by meeting all comers and proving his worth on the field of battle. That’s why in all ten NAIA championship events those who seek championships must prove their claims on the playing field.

A champion also is a leader. He is always at the front of the pack, setting the pace.

As an organization, NAIA believes its record qualifies it for the title of champion of smaller college athletics. It has been the leader in every advance in athletics for the college of non-major status. First in national championship events, first in dealing with the problems unique to the non-major college, and, most importantly, first in urging educational responsibility in athletic programs, making them truly a part of the total college program.

A champion is always out front, leading. That’s where NAIA is. That’s where NAIA intends to stay (“What Makes a Champion?” 1959-60).

As 1961 approached, the controversy regarding the over commercialization of sport remained prevalent throughout the United States in higher education (Land, 1977). The debate centered on how higher education and athletics could coexist. Further, according to Land (1977), “the major shift within athletic competition toward building powerful teams with which to attract the communities and alumni and generate publicity was now being seriously challenged” (p. 74). Many of the leading educators of the time voiced their disapproval.

“The enthusiastic spectators at school and college contests rarely realize how corroding is the spirit generated by their zeal for winning teams. One has to visit high school after high school, as I have done in recent years, to see how much the public is to blame for some of the troubles that plague our public schools. Time and again, at the end of a visit, after discussing curriculums and teaching problems, the superintendent would say to me, “We haven’t yet talked about my chief problem, which, to be quite frank, is the record of the high school teams. Let’s face it – what this city demands is that I get coaches whose teams will win, or out I go.

I have said the disease of overemphasis started in the colleges. Many institutions of higher learning continue to be the chief offenders. As the former president of one of the country’s largest universities had said, “Without a doubt, American intercollegiate athletics have gotten out of hand. They have become infested with commercialism and professionalism, sapping a considerable degree the fine ideals they exemplify (Conant, 1961, p. 51-52).

While these viewpoints were shared by many professors, the Soviet Union dominance at the Olympic Games in Rome also caused many other American citizens to argue for more focus on athletics in schools and that colleges should embrace them to fight against communism (Land, 1977). From this rationale, the NAIA was under attack on one hand for not having sufficient rules and regulations to keep athletics from being overemphasized in the colleges. However, on the other the NAIA could have been viewed as unsupportive against communism.

With Duer’s support, the NAIA responded by endorsing a three-year study to determine solutions to the problems of intercollegiate athletics (Land, 1977). This project was estimated to cost \$50,000 and would be funded through foundation grants (NAIA Presidents’ Advisory Committee, 1961). Other suggestions urged for a university president be included on the NAIA Executive Committee (NAIA Presidents’ Advisory Committee, 1961). This suggestion led the organization to elect Dr. Morton C. Cunningham, president of Fort Hays State College in Hays, Kansas, to the Executive Committee (NAIA, 1961). Further recommendations included the support of workshops

to be held in all 32 districts within the next two years to identify and address any major problems confronting NAIA members (NAIA Presidents' Advisory Committee, 1961).

Redistricting once again became a concern in 1961 but did not provide any major resolution or permanent change. Both District 19 (Alabama and Mississippi) and District 24 (Kentucky) raised strong concerns about their current alignments (Land, 1977). At the time, District 19 maintained six NAIA members and only three were able to participate in competitions (NAIA Executive Committee, 1961). District 24's main problem involved the travel to district playoffs, which averaged 1,400 miles per round trip (Land, 1977). The district chairmen considered the playoff an undesirable choice and could not see it as successful with such travel likely.

In terms of sports, the 1960-61 fiscal year appeared to have been one of the best years for the NAIA. While the Holiday Bowl lost its television contract, the game was still considered "a tremendous spectacle of high-level sportsmanship and high-caliber play" as Lenoir-Rhyne beat Humboldt State of Arcata, California 15 to 14 ("Humboldt State Loses 15-14", 1960; Land, 1977, p. 83). However, the game was not without controversy. On the eve of the contest, Humboldt State President Cornelius Siemens protested the segregation practices implemented in St. Petersburg when five black players on the Humboldt squad were forced to stay in a different hotel than their white teammates ("Segregation Issue Pops on Eve", 1960). Siemens also noted he would recommend future Holiday Bowl games be played in integrated cities ("Segregation Issue Pops on Eve", 1960). Duer also felt pressure from Florida A&M head coach Jake Gaither with regard to inviting historically black colleges to the Holiday Bowl following a letter he wrote to Gaither ("May Drop Ban on Negroes", 1960).

“[A&M is] definitely not under consideration as a possible playoff entrant [in this year’s Holiday Bowl contest]. While we feel that there is a definite place for a Negro school in our championship picture, we do not feel that St. Petersburg is ready for a ball game that will send a white school against a colored one. It is our intention, however, perhaps in 1961 or 1962, to bring about such a contest, making our championship a completely democratic one. I look forward to the time when the NAIA football program will be as integrated and truly represented as are all of our other athletic programs” (“NAIA May Withdraw Ban”, 1960, para. 3-4, 6-7).

In the end, the 1960 Holiday Bowl was the last for St. Petersburg (“City Loses Holiday Bowl Game”, 1961). Racial tension and the inability to build a new football-only stadium terminated the contract (Beck, 1961). The Executive Committee decided to move the game from St. Petersburg to Sacramento, California, and change the name to the Camellia Bowl at the 1961 Annual Meeting (“City Loses Holiday Bowl Game”, 1961; Land, 1977). The Camellia Bowl was played at Hughes Stadium, and publicity was strong for the 1961 contest (“Camellia Bowl Football Today”, 1961). According to Land (1977), the game was televised in six different regions and broadcasted on the radio by 40 stations.

Much of the problems discussed between the Executive Committee and the District chairmen before the 1961 NIBT focused on the NAIA’s continued rivalry with the NCAA and especially the NAIA’s perceived lack of prestige (Land, 1977). During their meeting in 1961, the chairmen placed Prairie View College and MacMurray College on a one-year probation for participating in the NCAA small college tournament instead of the NAIA tournament (NAIA Executive Committee, 1961). However, these punishments appeared to be given at an irregular rate. According to Wilson (2005), four other schools committed similar rule violations as Prairie View and MacMurray but were not placed on probation. The reason for this discrepancy rests with the lack of

recommendations from district chairmen about these schools in violation (Land, 1977). This situation demonstrated both the strengths and weaknesses of the NAIA as a grass-roots organization. In order to clarify the responsibilities of the district committee members, a set of duties was adopted in 1961 that included attending meetings; marketing the NAIA; visit schools; and provide advisory for their assigned committees (Land, 1977).

One of the biggest gains of the 1961 sports year was the Pepsi-Cola Company's pledge to provide financial assistance to teams participating in the national championship in baseball and golf ("Pepsi-Cola Company to Assist NAIA", 1961). While this sponsorship was helpful, the expansion program was beginning to prove to be a serious financial burden for the NAIA (Land, 1977). In an address at the Annual Meeting, Duer stated the following:

"We have a budget which is far beyond our income on dues (about \$25,000 per year). Our experiences in our two income sports (football and basketball) have been good over the past two years, so we have been able to meet our budget of \$55,000. Travel is increasing by leaps and bounds. Our college presidents have recommended that we increase our dues by 50%. They have said, If you will build a program that is defensible, make studies to determine what that is, then have the courage to support it, we will see you get the money for the organization" (NAIA, 1961, p. 8).

After Duer's comments, the members in attendance would agree to another dues increase of 50% (NAIA, 1961).

The battle for control over amateur sports once again returned in 1962; however, the conflict was largely between the AAU and the NCAA and their fight over which organization would be the official administrative body for the various sports programs of amateur standing (Land, 1977). AAU National President N. J. Barack charged the

NCAA with “plotting to take over control of all amateur athletics” (“N.C.A.A. ‘Plotting’ Charged by A.A.U.”, 1961, para. 1). Barack would further state:

“The N.C.A.A. negotiated in bad faith with the A.A.U. for sixteen months. The N.C.A.A. was plotting to take over control of all amateur athletics at a time when its special committee resisted A.A.U. efforts to resolve the difference. Up until now the N.C.A.A. has had a full-time job policing its own members. Now it wants to control all amateur athletics, college and non-college, at a time when colleges must face up to charges of serious over-commercialization in athletics” (“N.C.A.A. ‘Plotting’ Charged by A.A.U.”, 1961, para. 3-4).

The dispute between the AAU and the NCAA can be linked back to April 1960 when the NCAA ended its alliance with the AAU do to its inconsistency, poor administration, poor foreign travel arrangements, and failure to cooperate (“NCAA Council Urges Colleges”, 1961). This squabble focused on international jurisdiction on basketball representation on the Federation of International Basketball (FIBA) where the AAU controlled with two delegates (“N.C.A.A. ‘Plotting’ Charged by A.A.U.”, 1961). However, the NCAA not only proposed a United States Basketball Federation to govern the sport but also wanted to sponsor teams in track and field for the Olympics and other foreign competition (“N.C.A.A. Accused of ‘Power Grab’”, 1961). Although USOC President Avery Brundage warned that the international body would not certify a coaches’ organization or a collegiate group, the NCAA refused to back down (Duer, 1962a).

By December 1961, the NCAA was urging its member schools to boycott any AAU events unless colleges were given more say in amateur sports (“N.C.A.A. Council Urges Colleges”, 1961). In addition, the NCAA enlisted the NFHS to help with the NCAA’s drive for power and proposed to the USOC that high schools should have a higher vote count (“A.A.U. Wins Point in N.C.A.A. Battle”, 1961). The USOC denied

this request, but offered the NCAA its own vote increase to have equal footing with the AAU (“A.A.U. Wins Point in N.C.A.A. Battle”, 1961).

The NAIA observed the conflict between the AAU and NCAA over amateur athletics with great concern. Duer especially was concerned about the outcome and desired “a strong and democratic national administration of sports be developed which will assure that we [the NAIA] uphold national prestige in all national competition” (“NAIA Asks Voice in Amateur Field”, 1962, para. 2). Duer’s biggest fear was the NAIA would not get fair representation in international competition. He stated “we [the NAIA] are not concerned with having a major influence in these inter-organizational matters, but do strongly feel we have a right to direct representation on these bodies, not through another organization. Representation through another organization is unacceptable” (“NAIA Asks Voice in Amateur Field”, 1962, para. 7). The NAIA was also troubled with the NCAA’s attempt to run amateur athletics and discouraged when NCAA established new coaches’ federations in track and field, gymnastics, and basketball (“NAIA Asks Voice in Amateur Field”, 1962).

As the 1962 Annual Meeting approached, Duer and other NAIA officials pondered the question of a strong and democratic national administration of sports. Thus, the Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Executive Committee adopted the following position and presented it to Brundage:

1. NAIA continue its position in the protection and promotion of amateurism in athletics;
2. Continue to work for the best interests of American amateur athletes;
3. Support those organizations as are legally constituted with authority which is recognized by international bodies;
4. Earnestly beseech both major athletic bodies to resolve their differences in the interest of our national prestige and unity (Duer, 1962a, p. 3).

The NAIA members also adopted an official position of support for the AAU with ideas about how to plan for the future (NAIA, 1962; Wilson, 2005).

The Olympic relationship issue continued as the USOC conducted its quadrennial meeting in December 1962 in Washington, D.C. (Land, 1977). Duer was asked by the USOC to supply evidence to support the NAIA's right to Class B membership within the USOC (Wilson, 2005). Duer's testimony produced enough solid evidence illustrating why the NCAA was a realistic threat to the USOC. The NCAA continued to insist that no other collegiate association should have any representation on the Olympic committee except the NCAA (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). The NCAA also reaffirmed its commitment to the NFHS by proposing to give them "full representation" on the executive board of the Olympic association as well as representation on many of the Olympic sports committees while denying it to the NAIA (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). Based on the NCAA testimony, the NAIA and the AAU now became allies and served to protect the current Olympic practices (Wilson, 2005). Additionally, this alliance reignited the intense feud between the NCAA and the NAIA (Duer, 1962a)

One week after the meeting in Washington, D.C., FIBA representative Lou Wilky was appointed to resolve the issue of the United States Olympic basketball committee (Land, 1977). Delegates from the NCAA, AAU, NJCAA, Jewish Welfare Organization (JWO), NFHS, YMCA, armed services, and the NAIA had failed to resolve their differences before Wilky (Duer, 1962b). After a heated debate, Wilky proposed a proportional representation that would resolve the issue for the 1964 Olympics (Wilson, 2005). His plan called for seven representatives apiece from the AAU and the NCAA; three representatives each from the NAIA and the YMCA; two representatives each from

the JWO and the NFSHSAA; and one representative each from the NJCAA, the Army, the Navy, and the Marines (Duer, 1962b).

Duer also acknowledged the NIBT experienced an increase in attendance over the previous year by 4,000 (Duer, 1962a). Further, the 1962 NIBT had “the strongest competition, finest teams, greatest enthusiasm by the people and best attendance” (Land, 1977, p. 109). Westminster College of Pennsylvania entered the championship game as the top ranked team (“Westminster Eying NAIA Championship”, 1962). However, they would fall to Prairie View A&M University of Texas 62 to 53 behind All-American Zelmo Beaty’s 28 points (Prairie View Tops NAIA”, 1962). Track and field championships were held for the fifth consecutive year at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and grossed over \$16,000 over the two night event (Land, 1977). In addition, the Bowling Proprietors of America (BPA) pledged \$25,000 a year to sponsor bowling as an NAIA sport (Wilson, 2005). The first championship was held in April 1962 and was won by Gannon College of Pennsylvania (Wilson, 2005). Overall, Duer assessed for 1962 that “The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics has, without a doubt, just completed the best year of its existence, from every method of measurement and observation” despite its problems and a \$2,275.26 deficit (Duer, 1962a, p. 3).

The Conflict Period (1962-1966)

By the fall of 1962, the battle for amateur sports escalated substantially. According to Land (1977), the NCAA refused to cooperate with the U.S. State Department when the State Department sponsored a U.S. tour with the Russian basketball team playing against the top college teams. The AAU was in charge of the tour and asked the colleges to participate in the event in November 1962 (“Bickering to Hurt

America”, 1962). However, NCAA President Walter Byers stated college rules forbid teams to participate in any contest before December 1 (“Move to Organize Better US”, 1962). Byers further stated:

“I cannot [sic] accept placing the blame for the timing of the Russian trip on the State Department. It is another example of poor management of the AAU. It would take a convention to change our rules to let our teams play in November, and the AAU didn’t ask us in time for the convention” (“Move to Organize Better US”, 1962, para. 7-8).

The NCAA would not allow any of its athletes to compete on this tour and even threatened certain athletes with ineligibility in all their member schools if players accepted an invitation (NAIA, 1963). The AAU still acted as the official sanctioning body for all meets involving non-collegiate athletics while the United States Track and Field Federation (USTFF), the NCAA track and field federation, sought control of amateur track and field events (Land, 1977).

At its twenty-sixth annual meeting, the NAIA spent a great deal of time determining its position with this conflict. In a statement adopted at the Annual Meeting, the NAIA stated the following:

“The NAIA does not seek more power or control. All the NAIA wants is that athletes of our 463 member institutions who are of sufficient quality to win gold medals in international competition to have an opportunity to compete” (“NAIA Asks for Senate Inquiry”, 1963, para. 4).

As noted earlier, Duer and other NAIA officials were committed to having a strong and democratically administered amateur governing body that would be fair to all parties supporting amateur sport (Wilson, 2005). Appropriately, NAIA supported the AAU as it defended the NAIA against the constant challenge from the NCAA (“NAIA Refuses to Join NCAA”, 1963). Further, the NAIA would seek a full Senate investigation of all agencies and associations involved in the administration of amateur athletics in the

United States (“NAIA Asks for Senate Inquiry”, 1963). Land (1977) argued this request was not a “spur of the moment decision”; rather a last-resort effort derived from circumstances from as far as 1948.

President John F. Kennedy became concerned with the volatile relationship among the amateur organizations and appointed Attorney General Robert Kennedy as an arbitrator to resolve this dispute in October and November 1962 (Wilson, 2005). Originally, Attorney General Kennedy expressed confidence that progress had been made and felt the AAU and the NCAA would find a way to resolve their differences (Sheehan, 1962). However, after a three-hour meeting, Attorney General Kennedy did little to end the dispute (Sheehan, 1962). According to Falla (1981), an agreement was reached between the AAU and the NCAA but was renounced two weeks later by the AAU. A second attempt by Kennedy to mediate the conflict was achieved but, again, the AAU repudiated the agreement (Falla, 1981). Wilson (2005) argued that during these discussions, the NAIA viewed the NCAA as a bully trying to get its way.

After the Attorney General’s negotiations fell through, President Kennedy appointed General Douglas MacArthur to arbitrate the differences between the AAU and the NCAA (“Arbitrator Role Given MacArthur”, 1962). General MacArthur was familiar with Olympic conflicts as he brokered an earlier conflict in 1928 when he was the head of the American Olympic Committee (Wilson, 2005). While both sides approved General MacArthur as an arbitrator, it would take nearly 14 months to reach an agreement. According to Falla (1981), three key points emerged from the MacArthur arbitration. First, immediate amnesty would be granted to all athletes previously disqualified for Olympic consideration for competing in unsanctioned events (Falla, 1981, p. 87).

Second, the AAU and the USTFF would get equal representation (three members each) on the newly formed Olympic Eligibility Board in order to make eligibility determinations (Wilson, 2005). Finally, an “athletic congress” would be created and made up of representatives of all major amateur sports bodies to work out a permanent plan (Falla, 1981). Under the MacArthur plan, the USTFF would have jurisdiction over high school and college track athletes while the AAU had authority over non-student athletes (Wilson, 2005). The agreement was designed as a temporary solution for the 1964 Olympic Games but would need to be readdressed after the Olympics (White, 1964). After the agreement, General MacArthur warned all parties with the following:

“I am reluctant to believe that either of these groups directly or indirectly, intend to abrogate their given word to the detriment of their country and the athletes whose activities they control. Should either do so, it would indicate an irresponsibility in the exercise of authority which would well merit the condemnation of every sportsman, and indeed, every patriotic American” (“MacArthur Tells Feuding Track Bodies”, 1963, para. 10-11).

While the dispute over the control of amateur athletics was one of great concern, the NAIA and the NCAA battled in other areas. According to Land (1977), the continued conflicts over dual membership and conflicting events reached new heights. By 1963, about one-third of the 463 member schools of the NAIA in 1963 maintained membership with the NCAA (“Small School Ruling Group Says”, 1963). In addition, the NCAA College Division created championships in basketball, cross-country, golf, tennis, track and field, and wrestling (Land, 1977). Thus, the severity of the disputes would only escalate as the NCAA announced its intentions to host several of these events simultaneously with the established NAIA championship events (Wilson, 2005). In order to mollify the dual membership conflict while strengthening its hand over the NCAA, the Executive Committee passed the following action:

“If any conference with more than 50 percent [sic] membership in the NAIA pledges or sends a team to a conflicting event, all members of that conference will be immediately declared ineligible to participate in all NAIA events” (“NAIA Acts to Strengthen Hand”, 1963, para. 3).

This action was primarily aimed for participation in the NIBT. The Executive Committee also passed another action that would extend to other sports. It stated:

“If any team [in the NAIA] plays more than 25 percent [sic] of its football or basketball games against teams officially classed as in the major level of competition, that team will be ineligible for NAIA district or national competition” (“NAIA Bans NCAA Events”, 1963, para. 3).

The NAIA generally classified major schools as schools contained in the Associated Press (AP) Poll (“NAIA Acts to Strengthen Hand”, 1963). Land (1977) noted a third action was passed but was less effective due to the difficulty of interpretation and severity of the penalty. It read:

“The NAIA Executive body interprets the sponsoring of NCAA College Division events by a member of NAIA to be in direct conflict with the best interests of the NAIA program and shall be in violation of NAIA policy. Violation of this policy shall subject the institution to a 2 year suspension penalty from the NAIA program” (Land, 1977, p. 125).

All three of these moves were designed to gain complete allegiance of all intercollegiate programs to NAIA members and their rules and standards (Wilson, 2005). This strategy believed to be critical to the NAIA in order to maintain a strong organization and retain its members.

The Executive Committee also implemented rules that strengthened the interpretation and enforcement of the NAIA’s eligibility rules (Land, 1977). Many of the problems centered on misunderstandings on the part of some conferences and institutions. According to Land (1977), some members chose to interpret the rules to mean they should be followed in only the sports they wished to qualify for national events. By

September 1963, the Executive Committee rejected this argument and clarified the rules as follows:

“All NAIA institution members must abide by all eligibility rules for every sport in which they sponsor a team. Member institutions are responsible to certify that all athletes participating in all sports in which intercollegiate competition is sponsored by the institution are eligible according to all NAIA rules and standards” (Land, 1977, p. 126).

In regard to penalties for violating this policy, the Executive Committee stated that “the use of an athlete, with full knowledge, who is known to be ineligible by NAIA rules will thereby rule the institution ineligible to participate in all district and national events sponsored by NAIA” (Land, 1977, p. 126).

In spite of these issues, Duer (1963a) continued his efforts to promote unity among the NAIA members. According to Land (1977), the number of institutions maintaining membership with NAIA had remained constant. During the 1962-63 fiscal year, 229 member institutions and over 3,000 athletes participated in national events (Land, 1977). Duer and the Executive Committee viewed these numbers as an indication that the NAIA was growing in strength each year in comparison to the NCAA College Division. To continue its growth, the Executive Committee declared that non-accredited colleges would be given a two-year period to achieve regional accreditation and maintain a probationary membership with the NAIA until accreditation was complete (NAIA Executive Committee, 1963).

While there were problems throughout the 1962-63 fiscal year, Duer (1963b) proclaimed the 1963-64 fiscal year as a banner year for the NAIA. He based his assessment on the following highlights:

1. More athletes participated in the program than in any other year in the history of the organization.

2. The NAIA gained in stature with other national organizations as sports leaders both nationally and internationally.
3. The public image of NAIA became clearer during the year as a result of the national conflict.
4. The organization grew stronger in a period of the greatest confusion and conflict in the history of amateur athletics because it took a firm stand on issues and demonstrated uncompromising sincerity of purpose.
5. There was increased participation in all areas of the membership, including the national coaches' association, the committee work, and attendance at the annual meeting.
6. Public interest in and support of individual and team participation in the 11 national championship events exceeded that of any other year (Duer, 1963b, p. 3).

On the other hand, Duer was very quick to criticize the NCAA by calling the entire amateur system in the U.S. a farce ("NAIA Executive Highly Critical", 1963). Duer accused the NCAA of being immoral and of conducting under-the-table methods to achieve their goals ("Amateur Standings Given a Lambasting", 1963). Duer continued his attacks on the NCAA with:

"We're more on the side of the AAU because we think the NCAA is engaged in a sheer power grab. We feel that if colleges are permitted to continue on their present course, our whole amateur structure may scramble. It's not just the matter of athletic scholarships, which Avery Brundage (president of the International Olympic Committee) objects to so strenuously. It's the way colleges to after top athletes. In this mad scramble to be big time [sic], ethics are forgotten. Talented athletes are recruited and subsidized in every violation of our amateur codes. It's done undercover. This corrupts our young athletes and produces our sports scandals. I don't think we have even scraped more than the surface of our scandals" ("NAIA Executive Highly Critical", 1963, para. 6-9).

The conflict continued throughout 1963 and into 1964 as the NCAA continued its campaign to become the sole amateur sports organization (Land, 1977). The AAU and the NAIA remained united against the NCAA's efforts and created a tentative agreement with the NCAA to coexist for the 1964 Olympic Games in Tokyo. The Olympic basketball trials were scheduled to take place at St. John's University in Brooklyn in April 1964 ("Format for Picking Olympic", 1963). Eight teams with 12 players per team

competed in a single-elimination tournament with a consolation bracket. Of the eight teams, three would come from the NCAA; two from the AAU; two from the armed forces; and one from the NAIA (“Adopt New Plan to Pick”, 1964). After the trials were completed, the Basketball Committee and the Olympic coach selected the best players from the 96-player field to comprise the 12-player Olympic roster (“Format for Picking Olympic”, 1963). In comparison, the U.S. Track and Field Committee invited the first six place winners in each of the 17 events on the programs of the NCAA Championships and the National AAU meet (“Format for Picking Olympic”, 1963). However, the Track and Field Committee reserved the right to invite additional qualifiers from both the NCAA College Division and the NAIA ranks (“Format for Picking Olympic”, 1963).

While there were agreements to coexist, the NAIA and the AAU worked together to combat the NCAA. The AAU Executive Director Colonel Don Hull was invited to attend the NAIA’s Annual Meeting in March 1964 (Land, 1977). Hull accepted the invitation and provided the following:

“I want to say definitely the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States is fighting no one. Our job is to try to bring everyone together on a platform of eligibility, picking national teams, and national and international members, and when we send the United States teams into international competition...you must follow established procedures. The procedures will be changed as soon as the desires are changed, but no one group, no matter how well financed, can hit somebody over the head in the international group and take over” (NAIA, 1964, p. 9).

According to Land (1977), several NAIA leaders asked Hull to make a statement that would be helpful in the overall picture. He responded by offering:

“I think to continue the same strong course you have taken is the main and best thing to do. If all of us keep always in mind that we are working for the good of the youth of this country, we will have no problems...You are a strong organization and I predict you will grow stronger” (NAIA, 1964, p. 9).

After discussing recommendations with the AAU, the NAIA first petitioned the USOC for equitable representation on the various Olympic committees (see Table 5.6). Second, the NAIA requested more interpretation of amateurism and the clarifying the definition of the amateur athlete. At the 1964 Executive Committee Meeting, the Executive Committee issued the following statement:

“In order to properly control completion under the NAIA program, only the amateur athlete is eligible to participate. An amateur is a player who engages in athletic contests for educational values, personal pleasure, satisfaction, and for the love of the sport; not for monetary or material gain to himself” (p. 8).

Table 5-6 - NAIA Representation Request to the USOC

Board of Directors	Six members	
Increased Voting Strength	50 votes	5 delegates
Representation on the following Olympic sports committees		
Baseball	4	
Basketball (Men's)	1	
Basketball (Women's)	5	
Cycling	1	
Gymnastics	3	
Soccer Football	3	
Swimming (Men's)	4	
Swimming (Women's)	1	
Tennis	2	
Track and Field (Men's)	5	
Track and Field (Women's)	1	
Volleyball	1	
Wrestling	4	

The committee further identified several items that would cause an athlete to lose his amateur standing. An athlete would lose his amateur status if he:

“received money in any form beyond the actual expense of participating; signed a contract with any professional team; participated in an athletic event as a member of a professional team; coached an organized team or individual for pay beyond actual expense; exploited athletic ability through exhibition, radio, or television appearances for pay; or received remuneration for the use of his name or picture to promote a product or enterprise” (Land, 1977, p. 138).

The Executive Committee concluded this meeting by reiterating that once an amateur becomes a professional in one sport, he becomes a professional in all sports (NAIA Executive Committee, p. 8). These acts allowed the NAIA to continue its position of support for the AAU as well as gaining the recognition and privileges the NAIA has sought since its inception.

While the AAU and the NCAA were meeting with General MacArthur, the NAIA petitioned the USOC for greater representation in those sports that NAIA sponsors championships (Land, 1977). At its meeting in November 1963, the USOC announced it would broaden its representation for all-policy-making groups. Thus, the USOC would allow the NAIA three representatives on the USOC board: Duer; Cliff Aultman of Geneva College, Pennsylvania, the 1963-64 NAIA President; and Dr. Jesse Hawthorne of East Texas State College, the 1964-65 NAIA President (Wilson, 2005). In addition, the NAIA was able to increase its voting power within the USOC when it earned its request for 50 votes as well as an increase in representation from one member to five (“NAIA Authorized to Name 3”, 1964).

Although the USOC provided some good news, the Executive Committee’s actions and penalties enacted in 1963 for participation in conflicting events did little to solve the dual membership problem (Land, 1977). According to Wilson (2005), Duer had difficulty understanding why some representatives of the NAIA member institutions did not share the same dedication to do whatever it took to enhance the NAIA’s quality and prestige. At the 1964 Annual Meeting, Duer stated the following about the “vacillation” among NAIA members:

“I say to you that I am discouraged at the reasoning of some about dual membership. This is your responsibility and if you cannot see that dual

memberships are going to weaken our organization and take away from you what you have sacrificed to gain, you are not reasoning and facing the facts. You are asking organizations to “bid” for your participation and support. Yet you take little or no responsibility for making any program what you want it to be. If you are thinking this way, without loyalty to any organization or cause, I would not place much value on your membership or leadership. I tell you this very frankly” (p. 3).

Much of the dual membership concerns came from Districts 6A and 29, those districts comprised of predominately historically black schools (Wilson, 2005). Both districts originally pledged their regular season champion to the NIBT while their end-of-season tournament champion went to the NCAA College Division Championship (Land, 1977). However, District 29 only sent its tournament champion to the NCAA Tournament in 1963 while ignoring its pledge to the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Because of this action, the Executive Committee ruled that “if a team is selected for the NAIA tournament in Kansas City and does not come to the tournament, they will subject to penalty as provided by the constitution” (Land, 1977, p. 140). Still, this act proved to be difficult for the districts-at-large since many of the black schools were not placed in their geographic location districts. Again, the lack of integration and the unwillingness of some regions/states to embrace historically black schools damaged the NAIA’s commitment from those institutions.

Following a difficult year financially in 1963, the NAIA recorded a net profit of \$31,765 in 1964 (NAIA, 1964). This financial success was helped again by a sponsorship from the BPA of \$22,000 for a bowling championship and the aforementioned increase in member fees (Land, 1977). However, BPA sponsorship would end after this year (NAIA Executive Committee, 1964). Land (1977) noted that

the insurance plan with the Mutual of Omaha would be renewed to help reduce those concerns for the 25 year old association.

At the 1964 Olympic Trials, the NAIA again fielded an All-Star team to compete against three NCAA teams, two AAU squads, and two Armed Forces teams for basketball representation (“Two Rockhurst players on NAIA”, 1964). After all the rosters were announced, Duer again attacked the NCAA’s claim to represent small colleges since it only had one player from the College Division playing on an NCAA All-Star roster (Wilson, 2005). However, they were defeated in the semi-finals of the Olympic trials by the NCAA Reds squad (“Final Game Tonight for Olympic”, 1964).

After the completion of the trials, two players from the NAIA squad had impressed Oklahoma State and U.S. Basketball coach Henry Iba: Lucious Jackson of Pan American College and Willis Reed of Grambling (Wilson, 2005). After deliberating with the 20-man selection committee, Jackson was the only player chosen to represent the NAIA on the Olympic squad (Padwe, 1964). According to Wilson (2005), the NCAA petitioned to keep Reed off the squad and was successful. The U.S. Olympic team would capture the Gold Medal with Jackson’s help in the 1964 Olympics Tokyo (“Tokyo Olympics Cloaked in Red”, 1964). Reed would get some measure of revenge as he was named the NBA Rookie of the Year after the Olympics (“Willis Reed Named Rookie”, 1965). Also at the games, Florida A&M track star Robert Hayes laid claim to the title “world’s fastest human” after winning the Gold medal in the 100-meter dash with a then Olympic-record of 10-seconds flat (“Hayes Equals World Record”, 1964). Dr. Jesse J. Hawthorne of East Texas State College, the NAIA President, also attended the Olympic Games in Tokyo and represented the NAIA (Hawthorne, 1964-65).

Despite the NAIA's success at the 1964 Olympics, the NCAA College Division continued to schedule events on the same days as NAIA National Championships in basketball, football, swimming and wrestling as well as regional meets in golf and tennis (Land, 1977). To make matters worse, two of these events were scheduled at NAIA member institutions – wrestling at Colorado School of Mines and swimming at Illinois State Normal University (Wilson, 2005). Perhaps the most significant development, however, involved a new policy approved in November 1964 by the NCAA council: boycotting any track and field meet not sanctioned by the USTFF (“NCAA Will Curb Track Activities”, 1964). According to Smith (1964), this policy was actually proposed back in January 1963 with some NCAA members withholding their undergraduate athletes from AAU meets and denying the AAU use of their campus facilities. The aforementioned arbitration hearings led by General MacArthur put an end to that practice (Smith, 1964). However, with the Olympics completed, the NCAA council reinstated the boycott. NCAA President Robert F. Bay summarized the NCAA's viewpoint with the following:

“College athletes may compete in any open meet which extends them an invitation and which obtains a USTFF sanction...There is nothing in the NCAA's stand which questions or takes away the AAU's authority or right to sanction open competition or which would result in limiting anyone's competition in indoor meets this winter...

All the NCAA is saying is that the educational institutions of the United States have the right and obligation to sanction the forms of athletic competition in which their student-athletes engage...If the AAU persists in misleading claims that it is the only amateur organization which can sanction open track competition: if it pressures indoor meet promoters not to seek USTFF sanction under threat of losing AAU sanction, the resulting denial of competition to collegians will be the direct responsibility of the AAU...

It is difficult for our college and university administrators to see how anyone can construe this as an ‘NCAA boycott’” (“NCAA Will Curb Track Activities”, 1964, para. 6-10).

The AAU was outraged by this measure and harshly criticized the NCAA for implementing a boycott that was “unnecessary and unwarranted” (“College Group’s Track Ban”, 1964). AAU Executive Director Col. Hull also stated “this threatened NCAA action will harm athletes, the sport of track and field and will probably decimate the nation’s future international track teams” (“College Group’s Track Ban”, 1964, para. 5). Hull continued his allegations by suggesting:

“If this edict is abjectly followed, athletes will be denied the opportunity to take part in the traditional indoor meets. They may be forced into competition under the sanction of the unrecognized federations and thereby lose their eligibility to represent their country in international competition, including Olympic Games. The AAU...cannot bow to this or any threat by the NCAA, which is just one of many sports organizations in these United States” (“College Group’s Track Ban”, 1964, para. 9-10).

At the annual conference in December 1964, the AAU hardened its stance on the NCAA and threatened to withdraw its own approval of any meet which also requests sanctions from the USTFF (Grayson, 1964). In a released statement, the AAU stated:

“For 76 years the AAU has recognized the right of an educational institution to compete among themselves without the necessity of an AAU sanction or registration. The threatened NCAA boycott has not changed this policy. But AAU do not recognize dual sanctions” (Grayson, 1964, para. 3).

Newly elected AAU President Clifford H. Buck remained optimistic a settlement could be reached if his colleagues were willing to stay open-minded (Grayson, 1964, para. 5). AAU officials did not share Buck’s optimism. For example, at the 1965 NCAA Convention, NCAA members officially approved the boycott of AAU-sanctioned track meets after March 1, 1965, but with an added resolution to invite the AAU to co-sanction events at the domestic level (Liska, 1965). Col. Hull commented that he was “gratified and encouraged by the NCAA resolution” but was suspicious of the compromise offered

by the NCAA (Liska, 1965, para. 6). However, an agreement would not be reached from this compromise; thus, both parties continued to feud (Litsky, 1965).

Interestingly, the AAU received support from many NCAA members. Representatives from the University of Pennsylvania, Yale University, Harvard University and the United States Military Academy at West Point all spoke against the boycott. Jerry Ford, the Athletic Director from the University of Pennsylvania, went on record to say the boycott was “a device under the cloak of words to sound like a service to members” (White, 1965, para. 24). Prior to the convention, the eight Ivy League colleges led by Yale University declared their independence from the control of competition by the USTFF and the NCAA (“Ivy Loop, Led by Yale”, 1964). This move was made after the Eastern Collegiate Athletic Conference proposed a coalition to end the complex battle for control of U.S. amateur athletics (“Ivy Loop, Led by Yale”, 1964). Yale and U.S. Track and Field Coach for the 1964 Olympics Bob Giegengack also vetted his frustrations by noting:

“Yale is a sovereign body not taking any orders from any group. It hasn’t agreed to a boycott of anyone. We are loyal members of the NCAA and are not defying anyone. We just don’t want our boys on the Yale team used as weapons” (Grayson, 1964, para. 8).

Despite the complaints from the Ivy League schools, NCAA Executive Director Walter Byers felt that no school would consider leaving the NCAA. He argued, “these people are educators and men from such institutions who know how to live with regulations they may not be disposed to favor” (White, 1965, para. 29).

Many schools, however, considered the implications for competing in an AAU competition. As an example, Southern University of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, competed in an AAU event three weeks before the NCAA championships in June 1965. According

to Wiles Hallock, the NCAA Publicity Director, Southern University was “willing to take the risk of a penalty” (Litsky, 1965, para. 6). In addition to Southern, several athletes from St. John’s University, Grambling University, and Washington State University participated in the AAU National Championships in San Diego in June 1965 without fear of penalties (“Punishment Not Likely for Collegians”, 1965). However, the athletes from these schools who participated would not be penalized according to NCAA President Everett D. Barnes of Colgate University. Barnes further elaborated that he did not “see any action being taken against the colleges since we want more to have the differences settled than to have some member colleges penalized for an individual’s actions” (“NCAA Plans No Reprisal”, 1965).

The NCAA’s actions would cumbersome for the NAIA as the organization needed to make a decision for NAIA members sharing affiliation with the NCAA (Land, 1977). Of the 455 schools that were members of the NAIA, 138 colleges also maintained membership with the NCAA, according to Land (1977). While the dual member count included approximately 30% of NAIA membership, these members with dual affiliation were not concentrated in one specific region. According to Land (1977), 15 of the 32 geographical districts maintained two dual members or fewer; five districts had zero; and eight districts contained only one dual member. Nevertheless, Duer and the Executive Committee had to carefully decide the proper action. Unfortunately, 40% of the district chairmen as of 1965 were from institutions holding dual memberships (Duer, 1965a). Wilson (2005) illustrated that schools affiliated with the NCAA College Division and the NAIA now were put in a position to choose sides. To address the issue in 1965, the Executive Committee reiterated an interpretation of Article I, Section 7 of the NAIA by-

laws which stated that “Each member institution of NAIA shall, by reason of its membership, be assumed to be in full support of the total program of NAIA” (NAIA, 1965, p. 3). Furthermore, the policy stated:

“Any NAIA member institution which permits any member of its athletic administration or staff, or any member of the college administration to serve on any committee for organizing or administering any part of a program in conflict with the NAIA program of policies, activities or events shall thereby forfeit the right of any member of its faculty or athletic staff from serving on any NAIA committee, election or appointment to coaches association leadership or sports advisory committee.

Those serving the NAIA in a leadership position in conflict with this policy shall serve out their regular terms of office but shall not thereafter be eligible for reappointment or election so long as this conflict of interest exists.

This policy also implies that care shall be exercised in selection of leadership from institutions which may give support of their program to any organization or event in direct conflict with or preference to our program of policies, activities and events.

Support of an event held on the same date or making a choice between events in support of a conflicting or competing program, regardless of actual conflict in date, will be interpreted as violation of this policy’ (NAIA, 1965, p. 3).

Land (1977) noted any violations of these policies would carry a two-year suspension but exceptions were made for cases related to prejudicial travel expenses or school time loss. The member school would be responsible to inform the Executive Committee at least 30 days in advance of the event and explain their extenuating circumstances (NAIA, 1965).

The Executive Committee’s rationale for this policy was as follows:

“Now we feel, and this is our premise, that membership demands responsibility, that you have a responsibility in membership, and if you do not want to take responsibility for NAIA other than just another opportunity to participate, you can still do that, but if you cannot, it is our Executive Committee’s feeling you should not be included among the leaders of NAIA” (NAIA, 1965, p. 4).

Wilson (2005) suggested that with this viewpoint, “the NAIA walked a tightrope between allowing member colleges to thumb their noses at the championships it had

developed, and pressuring the members so much that they decided to simply opt out and join the NCAA” (p. 66). The Executive Committee attempted to enforce this policy at its 1965 meeting. The committee reviewed at least 13 violations involving dual member schools that violated the NAIA policy (Land, 1977). According to meeting minutes, several schools were placed on suspension, some were warned, and others were given an ultimatum to change (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965). While it can be argued that the Executive Committee was inconsistent with its penalties, the committee was actually dealing with each member school on an individual basis. Thus, each member school reviewed was given a chance to explain or justify its position at the Executive Committee meeting (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965).

The Executive Committee also worked on solving an internal conflict between district programs and redistricting. The NAIA had been dealing with this issue over the last 10 years as much of the controversy focused on the all-black schools transitioning into their respective geographical district (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005). By this time, 50 member schools were classified among the three at-large districts comprised of black colleges (Land, 1977). To officially address this issue, the Executive Committee declared that as of September 1, 1965, the black colleges would begin integrating in their respective geographical district (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965). According to the Executive Committee plan, seven districts would be involved. Specifically, District 6A (Southeast at-large district) would become District 6 while District 6B (Southwest at-large district) would change to District 30 (“Seven Districts Involved in NAIA”, 1964). District 30 originally contained all member schools within the State of Pennsylvania. Due to the high number of member schools, Pennsylvania would split into two districts:

District 18 (Western Pennsylvania) and District 19 (Eastern Pennsylvania). Member schools in Louisiana (former District 18), Alabama and Mississippi (former District 19) would be combined to form District 27 (“Seven Districts Involved in NAIA”, 1964). Member schools in Tennessee (former District 27) would move into District 24 and associate with members in Kentucky. Some examples of schools affected by this move include Le Moyne College, Lane College, Fisk University, Kentucky State College and Knoxville College moving into District 24 and Arkansas A&M transitioning into District 17 (Wilson, 2005). The Eastern and Western Pennsylvania all-black schools had already been integrated before this decision. Overall, this represented a tremendous gain for the black colleges as well as a vast achievement for the NAIA by maintaining their status as a forerunner in the civil rights movement (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965).

As the 1964-65 fiscal year drew to a close, Duer boasted that 1965 was the best year for basketball in the history of the organization (Land, 1977). The 1965 NIBT grossed over \$88,000 (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965). The annual financial report reflected the tournament’s success as the NAIA showed \$31,500 in gross income (NAIA, 1965). The financial success was unexpected slightly as there were major expense increases related to staff insurance and retirement programs, travel and general office expenses, and salaries (NAIA Executive Committee, 1965).

The summer of 1965 sustained the national conflict on amateur sports. Senator Daniel D. Brewster of Maryland referred to the feud between the NCAA and the AAU over track and field as “a national disgrace” (“Maryland Senator Deplores Feuding”, 1965, para. 1). In a 1965 speech, Brewster stated the following to other Senate members about the feud:

“Here we have a situation in which, because of a feud between the NCAA and the AAU, one of our fine, record-setting and patriotic young athletics is about to be punished for trying to qualify to represent this country against the Russians. And, if Washington State University does not punish him, then that great institution will be penalized itself. All this to satisfy the selfish claims of our national athletic organization...If the two organizations cannot resolve their dispute soon, then the American people will demand that Congress take appropriate action” (“Maryland Senator Deplores Feuding”, 1965, para. 3-4).

Fellow Senators Robert Kennedy of New York and Henry Jackson of Washington also voiced their frustration over the feud between the two organizations. Kennedy, who had previously tried to help resolve the conflict, spoke against the feud believing “the NCAA has no business and no right to penalize Gerry Lindgren, or any athlete, for wishing to represent his country as an athlete” (“Senators Kennedy, Jackson Take Floor”, 1965, para. 4). Jackson further elaborated with the following:

“This long time dispute between the AAU and the NCAA must be resolved. I would not want to take sides but there must be some areas of compromise that can assure the U.S. the strongest representation abroad without subjecting some of the participants to discipline on their campuses. President Kennedy called on the late Gen. MacArthur to help resolve a dispute between the same groups before the 1964 Olympics. Must the President of the United States constantly be called upon to correct the dispute on each association? This has been a distressing situation for a number of decades. These men who administer our nation’s amateur athletics must now demonstrate the same willingness to uphold America’s standards as does the young man from my state” (“Senators Kennedy, Jackson Take Floor”, 1965, para. 11-13).

Not long after these comments, the Senate Commerce Committee led by Senator Warren G. Magnuson of Washington convened a hearing to examine the dispute (Wilson, 2005). Magnuson went on record saying that the “dispute has gone on long enough” and it had now become “the duty of the Senate to speak out for those who have no voice” (“Senate to Investigate National”, 1965, para. 3). Magnuson further elaborated by noting:

“We will call the representatives of all athletic organizations concerned in this dispute and seek their testimony in public hearings. We will call on those educators whose schools have been subjected to outside pressures as a result of

this dispute. We will call on the athletes themselves. We will work until we get to the heart of the matter, and we will take whatever action is necessary to prevent a strangling of athletic freedom in our nation” (“Senate to Investigate National”, 1965, para. 5-6).

AAU President Clifford Buck welcomed “a thorough and unbiased hearing with a public airing of all the facts and principles involved” (“Senate to Investigate National”, 1965, para. 11). Buck also remarked that the proposed hearing “should be very beneficial and the proposal deserves the favorable consideration of everyone involved” (“Senate to Investigate National”, 1965, para. 12).

The hearing was held from August 16 to August 27, 1965, in Washington, D.C. (Duer, 1965b). Magnuson offered an opportunity for Duer to testify at the hearings (Wilson, 2005). According to Land (1977), Magnuson hoped the NAIA would present an objective point of view opposed to supporting one organization and arguing issues. Duer took full advantage of this chance to establish the NAIA as “a legitimate and relevant voice in matters of amateur athletics” (Wilson, 2005, p. 62). On August 26, 1965, Duer began his testimony by establishing the NAIA’s right to voice valid opinions and propose resolutions to the amateur sport controversy (Land, 1977). He also presented the NAIA’s background and position regarding the challenges of the NCAA as well as the NAIA’s support of the AAU’s position. Duer cited his experience with the controversy as he took part in more than 20 meetings over the preceding four years in attempts to solve the controversy (Wilson, 2005). Duer also noted that he attended all USOC meetings since he became a member in 1946 (Land, 1977).

Duer contended four issues, which were evident long before the opening challenges by the AAU, were the basis for the entire conflict (Wilson, 2005). Those items were:

- (1) selection of representation to the International Amateur Federation (IAF)
- (2) selection of athletes for international tours and competitions
- (3) selection of coaches for international tours and competitions
- (4) the right of the NAIA to have representation on international bodies and the right of its athletes to have equal opportunities to enter qualifying trails and meets for the Olympic and Pan American Games (Land, 1977, p. 166).

Duer discussed the strength of the NAIA track and field program since its inception in 1952 and referenced Gold Medal winners such as Ralph Boston, Lee Calhoun, Bob Hayes, Bobby Morrow, and Dick Stebbins as attempts to establish the merits for Item 4 (Wilson, 2005). Duer concluded his testimony by stating that the dual sanctioning rule was unsound and unnecessary and doubted it would solve any issues with the conflict (Land, 1977). In return, Duer offered five recommendations to help mollify the situation.

Those recommendations included:

1. The administration of amateur athletics in the United States must continue to be accomplished by a body composed of all amateur organizations that sponsor national programs.
2. The present power balance between the AAU and the NCAA and power bloc voting on issues must be ended by giving representation and more voting strength to other worthy national organizations.
3. There must be only one “sanctioning” body for national and international competition.
4. The USOC, through its board of directors, should exert more dynamic and positive leadership in the promotion of amateur athletics and the resolution of the differences between organizations contributing to the United States Olympic Program
5. The establishment of a strong arbitration board to resolve differences that apparently could not be solved voluntarily between the organizations within the Olympic program (Land, 1977, p. 167-168).

While it is difficult to assess the complete value of this testimony, NAIA officials felt its position as well as Duer’s appearance at the Commerce Committee meeting provided great positive publicity and exposure to its philosophies (Wilson, 2005). After his testimony, Duer sent out a newsletter to the Executive Committee detailing what the presentation meant for the NAIA. According to former Army coach Colonel Earl Blaik,

Duer told him that “the official NAIA position in the AAU-NCAA conflict is a sound one and I am sure will be discussed in its proper light by the Senate Committee” (1965c, p. 2). Another senator stated that he appreciated Duer’s comments and assured Duer that “the NAIA is going to be protected and supported” (Duer, 1965c, p. 1). AAU leaders also shared these sentiments and noted “the NAIA was the organization which gained the most in the hearings” (Duer, 1965c, p. 1).

After the hearings were concluded, Magnuson and the Senate Commerce Committee gave the AAU and the NCAA one week to reconcile (“Congress Issues Deadline to Feuding”, 1965). The Committee made no effort to conceal its irritation and explain that if a deal is not reached, then the Senate would move in on the problem (“Congress Issues Deadline to Feuding”, 1965). At the October 1966 USOC meeting, an agreement was reached between the feuding organizations based on Duer’s recommendations (Wilson, 2005). Further, the USOC Board of Directors voted for NAIA representation for all Olympic committees (Duer, 1965-66). The NAIA was also rewarded nominal representation on games committees in sports that were a part of the intercollegiate program in a sizable number of NAIA member institutions (Duer, 1965-66). This proposal provided the NAIA with 37 representatives to the Olympic Games committees (see Table 5.7).

Through his latest actions, Duer concluded the NAIA had finally been given equal rights for its leadership and athletes. Ross Merrick of the national AAHPER office informed Duer that the stature of the NAIA would change as the Olympic programs would bring in new recognition and commensurate responsibility (Land, 1977). Merrick suggested the NAIA member schools request that the U.S. Olympic Development

Table 5-7 - NAIA Representative Distribution for Olympic Games

Sport	Representatives
Baseball	5
Basketball (Men's)	4
Basketball (Women's)	1
Bobsled	1
Boxing	1
Gymnastics (Men's)	2
Gymnastics (Women's)	1
Judo	1
Shooting	1
Soccer Football	3
Swimming (Men's)	3
Swimming (Women's)	1
Track and Field (Men's)	4
Track and Field (Women's)	1
Water Polo	1
Weightlifting	1
Wrestling	4

Committee establish training centers on their campuses as well as supporting these Olympic movements financially (NAIA Executive Committee, 1966). Because of Merrick's suggestion, the Executive Committee launched a drive to raise \$40,000 for the Olympic fund and asked all members to come up with \$100 per year (Wilson, 2005).

As the national amateur conflict started to be resolved, the dual membership conflict appeared to be following the same lines. Due to the Executive Committee's stance on its policies, many schools were starting to pick a side (Wilson, 2005). The 1965-66 year did have some institutions still require suspensions or questioning about violations but the quantity of such schools was lower than the prior year (Land, 1977). The penalty reduction was probably due to the success the NAIA had in total membership. During 1965-66, 26 colleges would join the NAIA, bringing the membership to a new high of 470 schools ("NAIA Membership Continues to Grow", 1966). According to the Executive Committee, 3,836 athletes representing 491

institutions participated in NAIA district, area, and national championships, another new high for the organization (“NAIA Membership Continues to Grow”, 1966).

Although membership increased, the financial statements for the 1965-66 fiscal year showed the NAIA had a deficit of \$3,269 (Land, 1977). This deficit is related to several factors. First, the national office moved from the Aladdin Hotel to the Hotel Phillips in Kansas City (“NAIA Gets New Offices”, 1965-66). Because of the NAIA increase in membership to 470 in 1964-65, the NAIA needed more space (Wilson, 2005). The Hotel Phillips was only one block from the Aladdin Hotel, provided Duer and NAIA staff members with approximately 1,600 square feet. The new office space included four private offices, a reception area, a conference room, and a combination mail and supply room (Land, 1977). With the purchase of new office furniture, the move to the new office cost approximately \$3,000 (“NAIA Gets New Offices”, 1965-66).

The football championship was another concern to the NAIA. After a few years in Sacramento, the Camellia Bowl moved to Augusta, Georgia, in 1964 and was rebranded as the Championship Bowl (“Potluck Sports”, 1964). Both the 1964 and 1965 Championship Bowls were disappointing financially. According to Land (1977), heavy rain affected the attendance to the 1965 affair and the runaway victory by St. John’s of Minnesota over Linfield College of Oregon 33 to 0 (“Bluebonnet, Liberty Set”, 1965). The poor attendance produced a \$10,000 loss for 1965 Championship Bowl (Land, 1977). The Executive Committee discussed moving the game once again at its annual meeting but tabled the issue pending the receipt of proposals from various cities (NAIA Executive Committee, 1966).

The Refinement Period (1966 – 1971)

Many institutions began to take notice of the NAIA as its stature increased after Duer's testimony to the Senate Commerce Committee regarding the amateur sport conflict. The prior fiscal year (i.e., 1965-66) saw 26 colleges gain membership ("NAIA Membership Continues to Grow", 1966). However, by the end of the 1966-67 fiscal year, another 47 schools would seek entry into the NAIA, the highest increase in membership since 1952 (Duer, 1967; Wilson, 2005). This increase immediately prompted the association to raise the number of affiliated conferences (i.e., those with more than half NAIA member schools) from 36 to 41 (NAIA, 1967). Next, the NIBT would become more prosperous as a result of the increased membership through a growth of gate receipts by 10% (Land, 1977). Further, the NAIA would send a 12-man All-Star basketball team to the 1967 Pan-American basketball trials that defeated the Armed Forces team in the championship round 77 to 71 ("Monroe Leads NAIA All-Stars", 1967). The NAIA All-Star team would produce four players on the 12-man squad representing the United States for the 1967 Pan-American Games in Winnipeg, Manitoba (Ferguson, 1967). Finally, the NAIA also announced it would add hockey as its fourteenth national championship (Land, 1977).

Another milestone was reached at the 1967 Annual Meeting when Dr. Morton Cunningham of Fort Hayes State College became the twenty-ninth president of the NAIA (Land, 1977). The interesting note about Cunningham's appointment revolved around his job; Cunningham was a college president instead of an athletic director. According to Wilson (2005), Cunningham had been appointed to the Executive Committee since 1960 and was the first college or university president to serve as the NAIA's leader. The

NCAA would not elect a college or university president to lead its association until James Frank in 1981 (Wilson, 2005).

With the organization growing and receiving more attention, Land (1977) argued it was time for the NAIA to begin refining some of its programs while taking on new challenges. This desire for refinement led to the goal of becoming an international organization. By 1967, several Canadian institutions were seeking admission into the organization. After lengthy discussion at the 1967 Annual Meeting, the delegates in attendance concluded that if any Canadian institution could meet the NAIA's criteria and demonstrate program integrity, it would be eligible for membership (Wilson, 2005). However, there were some members who had reservations about this concept. Joe Axelson, the Assistant Executive Secretary for the NAIA, wrote to Wilmont Toalson, the Chairman of the National Eligibility Committee, to voice his concern centered on differences between U.S. and Canadian educational systems (Land, 1977). Quoting a letter from David F. Anderson, Director of Physical Education at United College in Winnipeg, Manitoba, Axelson wrote:

“The degree-granting institutions for the most in Canada...are three-year, degree-granting institutions plus an honors [sic] year...At the present time we do not have a semester system, therefore, our course structures are for the most part based on the full academic year. Eligibility for athletics, as in most universities in Canada, is based on one set of examinations at the end of each year. If a student is unable to pass the required number of courses, he is ineligible for the next complete year...You ask if there is an accreditation agency within the Province of Manitoba or in Canada. No such agency exists for higher education. Accrediting is done by the individual universities” (Axelson, personal communication, p. 1).

Despite these limitations, the delegates from U.S. institutions recognized that many schools in Canada possessed more similarities than differences and that the burgeoning hockey championship would enjoy the boost (Wilson, 2005). Expectedly, the

Executive Committee decided to move forward with the invitational letters and 26 were sent out to Canadian schools (Land, 1977). Lakehead University of Port Arthur, Ontario, would become the first Canadian institution admitted in the summer of 1967 (Wilson, 2005). Two years later, Simon Fraser University of Burnaby, British Columbia, would earn admission into the NAIA and become a dominant force in swimming (“Central Swimmers Win Highline Invite”, 1970). The international image of NAIA basketball was also greatly enhanced when the organization supported two all-star team tours (Land, 1977). The first, coached by Oklahoma Baptist University coach Bob Bass, traveled to the Far East, Malaysia, and Singapore (“NAIA Players Take Summer”, 1966). The second emerged from Georgetown University when it traveled to Israel to participate in the eighth Hapoel Games.

The NAIA Research Committee was also involved in multiple projects during the 1966-67 school year. One such project aimed to move forward with a sound redistricting plan. The net effect of schools entering the NAIA was generally positive but integration was still a concern. Thus, the Research Committee had an opportunity to recalibrate the district boundaries to reflect these issues in a sufficient manner. Dr. Harry Fritz of Western Illinois University, met with the Research Committee three separate times during the school year and gave careful consideration to all requests from both individual schools and the various districts (Land, 1977). The recommendations led by Fritz proposed each district should support an optimum number of schools (e.g., 15), move schools into districts that enjoy common schedule/travel agendas, and integrate the remaining all-black colleges into their respective geographical districts (Wilson, 2005).

According to Land (1977), “this was by far the largest move ever attempted in the ‘redistricting’ of the NAIA to date” and that this should be a phased in approach (p. 193).

Several districts were affected by the Research Committee’s recommendations. For instance, the Research Committee proposed that District 8 (West Texas) would be the first to integrate black colleges within its region (Salwasser, 2011). In addition, District 19 (Eastern Pennsylvania) would have new members from Delaware, Maryland, and Upstate New York. This arrangement would leave District 31 with members from the District of Columbia, New Jersey, and non-Upstate New York (Salwasser, 2011). Collectively, these moves were activated through letters provided to each athletic director for all member schools in the districts (Wilson, 2005). The letters noted the following basic policies governing the redistricting activities:

- a. Requests of individual institutions and districts.
- b. An attempt to keep districts from reaching too high or too low a membership total as compared to the current national district membership average of 15.
- c. Strengthening of districts.
- d. Integration of predominately Negro schools into previously all-white districts wherever and whenever possible (Land, 1977, p. 194).

Other rule changes involved clarifying the 18-week transfer rule for those individuals leaving or returning from the Vietnam War. Because of the draft and the war in Vietnam, many students risked having their schooling interrupted for military service (Wilson, 2005). As a result of this, the delegates passed the following: “A student whose college career has been interrupted by one year or more of continuous active military duty shall be eligible for athletic participation immediately upon registration as a regularly enrolled student at the college of his choice” (NAIA, 1967, p. 5). This exemption was applicable to only the first two terms of attendance following release from active duty (Wilson, 2005).

The activity produced by 1966-67 fiscal year emerged through a fiscal recovery too. Specifically, the NAIA rebounded from its loss the prior year to earn a \$5,380 profit (NAIA, 1967). Still, many financial questions still remained and were discussed thoroughly at the annual meeting. The biggest items centered on insurance expenditures; the Olympic and NAIA international development programs; and increased operational expenditures (Land, 1977). As an example, the Development Committee recommended the NAIA contribute \$50,000 during the next year to its Olympic Fund, \$20,000 for the Pan-American Trials, \$10,000 for the development of sports, \$5,000 for the Federation of International Sports Union (FISU) games, and \$5,000 for administration in these areas (Wilson, 2005). However, the Executive Committee considered the collection of investments to be too heavy for the NAIA to sustain but it did approve the contribution of \$50,000 to the Olympic Fund through a petitioning for member institutions to volunteer an extra \$100 (Land, 1977). Some members argued the organization should utilize some of the organization's \$45,000 surplus of cash instead, but this idea was defeated (NAIA, 1967).

Unfortunately, football continued to be plagued by financial problems related to poor weather for the championship events. The 1966 Championship Bowl moved to Tulsa, Oklahoma, after two years in Augusta, Georgia. Waynesburg College of Pennsylvania defeated Wisconsin State University at Whitewater 42 to 21 but the contest could only attract 6,067 spectators to Skelly Stadium due to the cold weather of Tulsa ("Waynesburg NAIA King", 1966). The low attendance figure produced a \$14,000 loss for the Championship Bowl (Land, 1977). After the event, the Executive Committee

commissioned a study to determine better location for the Championship Bowl (NAIA Executive Committee, 1967).

The 1967-68 school year saw the continued redistricting process continue according to geographic alignment. During this time, 53 NAIA member institutions still remained in the three at-large districts (Land, 1977). On August 25, 1967, Dr. Fritz and the Research Committee would meet with Duer, Assistant Executive Secretary Joe Axelson, NASC Chairman Dr. Edward Jackson and other representatives from the NAIA affiliated black conferences to discuss the redistricting efforts and the problems resolving from integration (Wilson, 2005). After much discussion, all parties agreed to fully integrate for the 1968-69 school year. The Research Committee and the Executive Committee would devote much of the 1968 school year contacting affected institutions and determining the final alignment (Land, 1977).

Over 100 NAIA schools would be affected by the redistricting process (Wilson, 2005). First, the at-large district schools would be fully integrated into their respective geographical regions (Salwasser, 2011). These regions would include colleges located in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. After accounting for these institutions, several other districts changed their alignments. District 26 originally held schools in North Carolina, South Carolina and Virginia. After integration, all South Carolina schools would move into the newly vacant District 6 while members in Eastern North Carolina and Virginia would claim District 29 (Salwasser, 2011). Schools located in the Western part of North Carolina would remain in District 26. Finally, colleges in Louisiana would be in their own district, leaving District 27 with Alabama and Mississippi (Salwasser, 2011).

As the fall of 1968 approached, the NAIA scheduled several meetings to hear from several athletic directors in the affected districts (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005). Based on these meetings, the athletic directors felt the transition and integration process was progressing smoothly. *The NAIA News* included the following item to promote redistricting success:

“Eight new districts have been formed in the Southern states by the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics...With this placing of all its 525 member institutions into geographic districts, NAIA reaffirms its dedication to democratic principles and practices in all areas of its growing and increasingly complex organizational structure...

These changes, effective for the 1968-69 competitive year, follow many years of careful planning and are now a reality in which we all take deep pride. As in the past, all leaders in these new districts will have equal opportunity to share in planning and administering district qualifying events and other functions of the district. Conference affiliations will not be affected” (“NAIA Announces Redistricting Plan”, 1968, p. 2).

Duer continued his support during his address at the 1969 Annual Meeting by stating:

“...the integration problem in our organization took the greatest step forward in the history of the NAIA when we redistricted the completely Negro districts into our regular geographic districts, and these district chairmen and the institutions, are very pleased about the results. This took courage and leadership...The districts have been established and are fully aware of the benefits to be derived, as well as the right and fairness of this district organization” (NAIA, 1969, p. 4-5).

In 1968, conflicting events and dual membership continued to put pressure on all member institutions and the association. For instance, during the 1967-68 year, the NAIA hit five institutions with two-year suspensions for violating the organization’s policy: Ashland College, Northern Michigan University, Norfolk State College, Bethune-Cookman College, and McNeese State University (Wilson, 2005). The dual membership problems continued in the next school year as the same number of dual members still existed (Land, 1977). However, the total number of NAIA members increased to 546,

thus decreasing the percentage of dual members (Wilson, 2005). Because of the membership decrease, the Executive Committee chose not to implement any drastic changes in policy (Land, 1977). In addition, only two schools were penalized for participating in conflicting events in the 1968-69 school year: Texas Southern University and Alcorn A&M University (NAIA Executive Committee, 1969a).

Another membership problem involved non-accredited members (Wilson, 2005). There were 46 non-accredited schools, of which 13 were accepted under the condition that they would become accredited by their regional agencies (Land, 1977). The Executive Committee recognized this potential issue and ruled that all active members would need to be accredited by 1972 or would be demoted to associate member status (NAIA Executive Committee, 1969a). Further, associate members would have to be accredited by 1975 or face expulsion from the NAIA (Wilson, 2005).

Financially, the NAIA reached its best financial condition in the 1967-68 fiscal year under its largest membership by earning \$53,519 (NAIA, 1968). This substantial profit can be attributed to the success of basketball and the collective 1967 football playoffs. Throughout the school year, basketball was successful for the NAIA because of their success in the Pan-American basketball trials (“NAIA Wins Pan-American”, 1967). The NAIA All-Star team won the 1968 Olympic basketball trials in Albuquerque, New Mexico (“NAIA All-Stars Win in Trials”, 1968), defeating the AAU team in the finals while all four NCAA teams competing (i.e., NCAA Whites, NCAA Reds, NCAA Blues, and NCAA College Division) did not perform well (Thompson, 1968). The Championship Bowl was successful as Fairmont State College of Fairmont, West Virginia, competed against Eastern Washington State College of Cheney, Washington,

for the Twelfth Annual NAIA Championship Bowl (“Fairmont Captures Champion Bowl”, 1968). The championship game was hosted in Morgantown, West Virginia, approximately 60 miles from Fairmont (Cross, 1967). The closeness of the game produced a crowd of 12,750 to see Fairmont State defeat Eastern Washington 28 to 21 (Cross, 1967).

While the events on the field were successful during the school year, some NAIA members expressed their dissatisfaction with the playoff selection process. A suggestion was made to potentially divide the membership into two divisions for football purposes only (Land, 1977). The proposal was given to the Executive Committee that one team from each division in each area be selected to participate in the football playoffs and championships for two divisions (NAIA, 1968). The Executive Committee did not make a ruling on this proposal at this time but did establish a policy for the Championship Bowl to be held at or near the location of one of the two finalists (NAIA Executive Committee, 1968).

The \$50,000 goal set in 1967 for the Olympic Fund through the NAIA development program was running behind schedule (Land, 1977). Thus, Duer urged all of membership about its full responsibility in fund raising commensurate with the opportunities for Olympic representation (NAIA, 1968). It was also forecasted that the NAIA’s internal operations would cost more the next year. The Executive Committee decided to increase the salaries for all employees in the national office by \$50 per month as well as the Executive Secretary’s salary by \$1,000 per year (NAIA Executive Committee, 1968). In addition, a new position known as “Assistant to the Executive Secretary” in the national office was created in order to coordinate various committees

and to share in the administration of national championship events (Wilson, 2005).

Wallace H. Schwartz was hired as the first to take this position.

The 1968-69 school year also produced an unusual approach in administration of the organization. Specifically, an interim Executive Committee meeting was called at the NAIA headquarters in Kansas City in November (Land, 1977). Only six of the 10 members of the committee were present at the committee. Despite this shortfall, many issues plaguing the organization was resolved (Wilson, 2005). Specifically, the NAIA Executive Committee discussed solutions to the NAIA's position on amateur athletics; an ethics charge against one specific member filed by two other member schools; a request for an exception to district basketball playoff policies; and a problem related to a breach of schedule claim against New Mexico Highlands University for cancelling four basketball games under contract (NAIA Executive Committee, 1969b). In regards to the New Mexico Highlands issue, committee members contacted the university through conference telephone calls and ruled that probation was in order for violation of NAIA rules (Land, 1977). According to the meeting minutes, many supporters of the university called and wrote to the Executive Committee asking to not penalize the football team and bar it from postseason competition (NAIA Executive Committee, 1969b).

By the start of the 1969-70 school year, Duer challenged the members and the association to differentiate from the NCAA while continuing to refine the NAIA overall towards its goals of integrating athletics into the educational programs of its member institutions (Wilson, 2005). One of the programs designed to accomplish this mission was the "Conduct of Athletes" program. This program was designed to promote sportsmanship on the part of players, coaches, and fans (Duer, 1969). According to Land

(1977), the program would be stimulated by utilizing the media at every school and producing special articles in *The NAIA News* and *The NAIA Coach* (the NAIA's publication). Duer (1969) called on all members to integrate character and sports while denouncing the win-at-any-cost approach. He argued the win-at-any-cost approach diverted attention from good sportsmanship, high ethical standards, and fair play (Wilson, 2005). Duer (1969) did not oppose a winning spirit, but believed the pursuit of victory should not detract from the character-building aspects of sports.

Another program implemented during the 1969-70 school year was a new phase of development program. Instead of focusing on international or Olympic development, the NAIA focused on national efforts (Land, 1977). Specifically, the NAIA set a goal to raise \$330,000 within two years and redistribute this money back to the members for travel, housing, and food expenses in participation in non-revenue producing sports within the NAIA (Duer, 1970a). The first actions of this new program, according to the annual meeting minutes, were to request contributions from select individuals, organizations, and large industrial firms (NAIA, 1970). These individuals willing to contribute would become the "500 Club". Duer (1970) believed this development/fund raising program, which consisted of carefully selected leaders securing money from individuals (\$500 or more), was the key to the future success of the NAIA.

Eligibility concerns re-emerged during the 1969-70 school year. Many schools were identified as violators of the amateur status rule, transcript falsification, and transfer rule (NAIA, 1970; see Table 5.8). Many of the penalties levied on the member schools by the Executive Committee Meeting revolved around probation (NAIA Executive Committee, 1970). With the higher number of violators than expected, the Executive

Table 5-8 - NAIA Membership Violating Rules in 1969-70

School	Issue
Adelphi University	Participation in conflicting event
Boise State University	Conduct of Athletic Program; Eligibility
College of Charleston	Eligibility
Clark College	Eligibility
Fayetteville State College	Eligibility
Grace College	Eligibility
Hampton Institute	Eligibility
Huston-Tillotson College	Eligibility
Knoxville College	Eligibility
Moorhouse College	Eligibility
Paine College	Eligibility
Purdue University (Calumet campus)	Conduct of Athletic Program; Eligibility
State University of Buffalo	Conduct of Athletic Program; Eligibility
Talladega College	Eligibility
Tampa University	Conduct of Athletic Program; Eligibility
Tennessee A&I State University	Conduct of Athletic Program; Eligibility
Tuskegee Institute	Eligibility
Virginia Union University	Eligibility
University of Southwestern Louisiana	Scheduling against major competition

Committee took this opportunity to urge compliance to the eligibility rules (Land, 1977).

Thus, the committee developed the following chart entitled “Seven Easy Steps to Eligibility Compliance” and published it throughout the year in *The NAIA News*:

1. Institutional sponsorship of sports is obtained from information sheets received at the National Office. Eligibility compliance is required for each sport, so if sports are added or dropped you should notify the National Office immediately.
2. Eligibility forms *MUST* be filed on *ALL* sports sponsored by your institution. This is required whether a school is active, associate or on probation.
3. Eligibility forms are to be sent to your DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY CHAIRMAN.
4. Compliance dates *MUST* be adhered to. They are as follows:
October 15 – Cross Country, Soccer, Water Polo, Football.
January 15 – Indoor Track, Wrestling, Ice Hockey, Basketball, Swimming, Gymnastics
April 15 – Bowling, Volleyball, Outdoor Track, Baseball, Golf, Tennis, Decathlon.
5. The eligibility forms must be filed on or before the due date whether your institution is participating in seasonal competition only, or is interested in District, Area, and National competition as well.

6. Failure to comply with this regulation will result in a loss of NAIA Statistical Service and NAIA Ratings to your entire sports program and make your institution ineligible for District, Area, or National competition in the sports where compliance is not met.
7. Whenever assistance is needed, or there is a doubt, contact your District Eligibility Chairman, or the NAIA National Office (“Seven Easy Steps to Eligibility”, 1969, p. 2).

Although eligibility problems existed, several new schools would join the NAIA raising the total membership count to 550 (NAIA, 1970). Furthermore, according to a survey conducted by *The NAIA News*, 1,078 institutions (counting multiple sports separately) and 7,189 athletes participated in district, area, and national events during the 1968-69 school year (“1968-69 Participation in NAIA”, 1970). Only 87 schools did not participate in at least one national event or playoff during that time (Land, 1977). These statistics led the Executive Committee to conclude that 80.3% of the membership participated in a national championship or playoff of some kind and that the NAIA reached an all-time high of 65,816 athletes participating in NAIA sports programs (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005).

In addition, the organization’s efforts on redistricting were successful as few members made requests for changes. The Research Committee recommended District 32 (Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont) should be split into two districts due to the high number of schools (33 members) (Land, 1977). The district would be split into a northern half (District 32N) which would consist of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont and include 14 schools, and a southern half (District 32S) including Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island consisting of 19 schools (Wilson, 2005). While the district was separated, it would still be administered by one district committee (NAIA Executive Committee, 1970).

Basketball enjoyed another strong year during the 1970-71 season. First, the Basketball Committee approved a rule modification that allowed dunking (NAIA, 1970). In addition, the committee pushed for the adoption of international rule by having the semi-final game for third place in the NIBT played under international basketball rules (NAIA Executive Committee, 1971). Duer proclaimed that the 1970 NIBT provided the “finest hour” in NAIA basketball history when the top eight seeded teams survived the first two rounds of play to meet each other for the first time (“Elmore Smith and Travis Grant Pace”, 1970). Duer believed this to be substantiated when several attendance records were broken during the six day tournament. The 1970 NIBT had a total attendance of 69,255 and surpassed any previous marks (Land, 1977).

A Tuesday night capacity crowd of 10,500 was the first night sell-out in tournament history, and a daytime crowd of 4,772 was the largest one-afternoon attendance (Land, 1977). Finally, the NAIA became a full member of the Naismith Basketball Hall of Fame (“NAIA Becomes Full Member”, 1969). This membership provided the NAIA with rights and privileges of organization membership including the nomination of worthy Hall of Fame nominees; a display of NAIA memorabilia in the Hall of Fame; and representation on committees setting policies on Hall of Fame selection (“NAIA Becomes Full Member”, 1969).

In 1970, the NAIA membership further agreed to create two divisions for its 285 football playing members (“NAIA Will Crown Football Champions”, 1970). Originally, all of these members would be given an opportunity to choose which division (i.e., Division I or Division II) they wanted to compete with 97% of these recommendations accepted (Land, 1977). Division I was comprised of 137 members while District II

would have 148 members (“NAIA Will Crown Football Champions”, 1970). The only main difference between the two divisions was the level of competition played by Division I members compared to Division II members (“NAIA Will Crown Two”, 1970). Upon the creation of these divisions, Duer stated:

“This addition of a second division within the NAIA football championship program follows more than a year of detailed study by the NAIA Football Coaches’ Association under the guidance of Past-President Hanley Painter, Football Coach at Lenoir Rhyne (N.C.). The football programs at our member institutions are now such that our schools are actually competing on two different levels of competition and this second championship will give all of our schools sponsoring intercollegiate football a chance to participate in a national football championship on a level in line with the philosophy of their own athletic program. The NAIA is the only collegiate organization to sponsor a post season program to determine a national collegiate football champion and we are proud to be able to expand this program to two levels of competition” (“NAIA Will Crown Two”, 1970, para. 2-3).

The playoff format for both divisions would be similar to past years but the Division II Championship would be played one week earlier (“NAIA Will Crown Two”, 1970). The Championship Bowl name would remain with Division I (“NAIA to Add a Second”, 1970).

As 1970 progressed, the conflict between NAIA and the NCAA regarding amateurism reached a stage of acceptance rather than resolution. Land (1977) noted this approach essentially set the stage for the “concentration of efforts toward improved efficiency of operation and bigger and better national championships within the organization” (p. 249). In fact, the NAIA sent representatives to meet with the NCAA to discuss common problems shared by both organizations (Land, 1977). Arnold Kilpatrick, Eddie Robinson, and Ted Runner of the NAIA Executive Committee met with Richard Koenig, Samuel Barnes, and Marcus Plant of the NCAA in Washington, D.C. in May 1971 (NAIA Executive Committee, 1971). While no major decisions were made at the

meeting, the desire and ability to meet together appeared to be a sign of a working relationship between the two conflicted organizations (Wilson, 2005).

Interestingly, one of the most significant policy changes for the NAIA concerned a burgeoning conflict with the NASC. The NASC held that one of its objectives was to get active involvement for its member schools on NCAA planning and administrative committees (Land, 1977). Once this desire was brought to the attention of NAIA officials, Duer wrote to NASC Chairman Vanette Johnson to express his disappointment of the NASC's disloyalty to the NAIA after it had taken a strong approach in pioneering integration (Wilson, 2005). Duer also noted that Article VII, Section II of the NAIA By-Laws explicitly stated that any member institution serving on part of an NCAA committee will be disqualified from participation on any NAIA committee (Land, 1977).

Johnson responded that the NASC had no intention to undermine the NAIA and suggested a meeting to discuss how the differences might be settled (Wilson, 2005). At the 1971 Annual Meeting, representatives from both the NASC and the NAIA met to discuss the issue at length (Land, 1977). After these discussions, the Executive Committee decided to change its policy and allowed dual members to participate on NCAA committees (NAIA, 1971). However, Wilson (2005) offered "the NASC's self-interested policy of trying to play both sides of the street had effectively weakened the NAIA's equally self-interested attempt to force its own members to declare their allegiance either to it or the NCAA" (p. 81).

At the 1971 Executive Committee meeting, the Executive Committee allowed the ice hockey and baseball championships to be played on a Sunday (NAIA Executive Committee, 1971). Previously, sporting events avoided scheduling on Sunday to adhere

to the religious beliefs of many church-based institutions. Wilson (2005) argued these institutions saw this ruling as a potential detriment to these specific schools losing their distinctiveness. At this time, almost no college, high school, or kids' athletic programs included a Sunday component as "the sacredness of the Sabbath was one of the traditional values challenged by the cultural revolution of the 1960s" (Wilson, 2005, p. 81). This precedent would open the door for future requests for exemption from the Sunday playing rule (Land, 1977).

Finally, three member schools were placed on probation in 1970. Austin University received probation for the 1970 football season for violating the 18-week transfer rule ("Three Placed on Probation", 1970). Fisk University earned probation for all sports for having an ineligible athlete participate on its 1969 track team ("Three Placed on Probation", 1970). Virginia Commonwealth University received a one-year probation in all sports for scheduling more than 25% of its basketball games for the 1970-71 season against schools designated as major universities ("Three Placed on Probation", 1970). In addition to those three universities, another eight schools were reprimanded for their actions including the University of Tampa (NAIA Executive Committee, 1971). The sanction assigned to the University of Tampa was the penultimate item to cause its move from the NAIA to the NCAA College Division. However, Tampa President B. D. Owens listed economic considerations as the main reason for moving into the College Division ("Tampa Picks College Division", 1971). Similar financial considerations would eventually concern all NAIA member institutions in the near future.

The Maturity Period (1971 – 1975)

At the end of the 1970-71 school year, the NAIA had 548 members although some schools chose to affiliate with the NCAA (Wilson, 2005). In order to compete against the NCAA for membership, Duer and the Executive Committee decided to hire Haskell Cohen, a New York publicist, for \$12,000 to increase the NAIA's publicity and exposure (Land, 1977). Cohen was to release news from the NAIA through his office under the assumption that news from New York was more noteworthy (Wilson, 2005). His approach seemed to focus on what the NAIA should do and was met with predictably negative results (Land, 1977). The members were disappointed with Cohen's efforts and discussed if his services should be retained. After a heated debate over the issue, the Executive Committee ruled to retain Cohen's services with the hope that publicity would increase in due time (NAIA Executive Committee, 1972).

Publicity was also a main concern for the Special Events Committee as they continually worked on publicizing, reviewing, and approving athletic events that were socially and educationally significant and sound (Land, 1977). The Special Events Committee had certain requirements that needed to be met in order for an event to be featured. First, at least 50% of the participating teams had to be members in good standing with the NAIA ("NAIA Special Event Requirements", 1971). Other requirements involved protection of the amateur status of all participating athletes, supervision of all financial transactions of events, and restriction of advertisement in programs concerning alcoholic beverages, tobacco, or drugs ("NAIA Special Event Requirements", 1971). Based on these requirements, the Black All-Star Classic in Houston, Texas; the Boothill Bowl in Dodge City, Kansas; the Mineral Water Bowl in

Excelsior Springs, Missouri; the Baker Invitational Tournament; and the Top of Texas Basketball Tournament all earned recognition from the Special Events Committee (Land, 1977).

On the other hand, some athletic events were mirrored with poor conduct that “was reflective of the ills of society as well as of the spectators of sporting events” (Land, 1977, p. 274). Standards of conduct declined, and NAIA schools found themselves trying to control players and fans who no longer felt constrained by traditional standards (NAIA Executive Committee, 1972). As an example, a fight broke out among fans during a 1972 baseball game between Jacksonville State University and Birmingham Southern University (“Baseball Teams on Probation”, 1972). Several other incidents also occurred at the 1972 NIBT including “people sleeping in the halls of hotels, immoral acts in and around the hotels, too many people in hotel rooms, and beer can littering” (Land, 1977, p. 275). The Executive Committee directed member institutions to clarify their responsibility for the prevention of such incidents and to reward individual programs for their good behavior (NAIA Executive Committee, 1972).

The conflicting event issues also remained a problem for the NAIA as seven schools would participate in conflicting events throughout the 1971 school year. Southern Colorado State College of Pueblo, Colorado, received a two-year probation in all sports for participating in multiple conflicting events (“11 Schools Penalized”, 1972). The penalty would make Southern Colorado ineligible for district and national championship events until the 1974-75 school year (“11 Schools Penalized”, 1972). Five other schools (Alabama State University of Montgomery, Alabama; Bentley College of Waltham, Massachusetts; Delta State College of Cleveland, Mississippi; Gannon College

of Erie, Pennsylvania; and Mercer University of Macon, Georgia) received a one-year probation in basketball, disqualifying them for the 1973 NIBT should they qualify (“NAIA Puts 8 Schools”, 1972). Another 11 schools were placed on probation for violating eligibility rules (“11 Schools Reprimanded by NAIA”, 1972). As an example, Montana Tech University of Butte, Montana, was placed on probation in football for the 1972 season because it utilized an ineligible player that transferred from another school and participated in a Division II semifinal game (“11 Schools Reprimanded by NAIA”, 1972). Finally, four other schools drew suspensions as a result of investigations by district eligibility committees (Rockhurst College, New Mexico Highlands University, New York State University at New Paltz, and Blackburn College) (“Four Institutions Draw Probation”, 1971).

Also at this time, intercollegiate athletics would soon be impacted by legislation expanding sport offerings to both men and women. As the 1960s approached, a new women’s movement started to emerge which demanded legal equality with men. This push led to the passage of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 and specifically Title IX. Title IX explicitly states that “no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal Financial assistance” (20 U.S.C. § 1681, 1972). While Title IX was not designed specifically for college athletics, it impacted all intercollegiate sports where all schools receiving any federal government funding must provide equal opportunities for both men and women.

The act was to take effect in 1978, but Title IX provoked tremendous efforts by NAIA and NCAA institutions to bring their schools into compliance with the law

(Seifried, 2007; Wilson, 2005). As an example, Newberry College, a small private institution from Massachusetts affiliated with the NAIA, planned to add \$15,000 to \$20,000 to their athletic budget in 1975 for a full time women's physical education instructor and a new intercollegiate women's program (Waters, 1974). The University of South Carolina Athletic Director Harold Hagen elaborated that "Title Nine looms as a crisis on the horizon...if we had to have equal expenses for women, we would have a severe problem. We would have to curtail our men's program" ("No Drastic Cutbacks Yet", 1974, para. 5). Clemson University Athletic Director shared these sentiments as he announced a reduction of junior varsity football games to three (Waters, 1974). The NCAA took another approach in 1974 when it made a plea to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) and stated that men's sports would suffer if equal funding were to take place (Rothenberg, 1974; Seifried, 2007). HEW Public Affairs Director Lou Mathis responded to these allegations by saying:

"We didn't initiate this law. That was done by women's pressure groups to Congress. But now the NCAA and all the athletic directors are saying we're trying to destroy college athletics. Well, we're not. All we're doing is enforcing the law. That's our job as spelled out by the Constitution. Why don't they attack the Constitution?" (Rothenberg, 1974, para. 3-4).

The major concern to the NCAA and the athletic directors was funding for women's athletics. The NCAA felt that Title IX regulations were illegally far-reaching and claimed that no athletic organization received any federal funding ("NCAA Worried over Federal Rules", 1974). Brigham Young University Athletic Director Stan Watts further argued the HEW requirements would force many schools to cut back on athletics ("NCAA Worried over Federal Rules", 1974). Further, these new requirements would put all universities in a financial bind if they were forced to provide equal opportunities

to women. In response to similar concerns, HEW lawyer Gwen Gregory, who was chiefly responsible for the Title IX regulations, argued:

“It’s true that there are no athletic programs, at least to my knowledge, that are federally financed. However, the athletic program is part of the schools’ overall [sic] program. Any discrimination in the athletic program would infect the entire undergraduate student program. You can’t separate them. I think it is clear that if there is discrimination against a student in athletics...it effects anything else that the student is involved in” (Rothenberg, 1974, para. 14-15).

As the resistance to women’s athletics from the NCAA was apparent, it is not surprising a new organization would be born from conflicting viewpoints. Just as the NAIA was created to represent small college men’s basketball teams in 1937, the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was created in 1971 to sponsor seven national championships and issue guidelines to its member schools (Lieberman, 1973). By early 1972, Duer met with AIAW representatives in order to gain an understanding of the AIAW’s prerogatives (Wilson, 2005). After discussing the meeting with his fellow Executive Committee members, the NAIA voiced its full support for the AIAW to be a governing body for women’s athletics (NAIA Executive Committee, 1972). Duer further complimented the AIAW for its work and suggested the NAIA desired for open communications with the AIAW (Land, 1977).

By the 1972 Annual Meeting, AIAW President Lucille Magnuson was invited to meet with the NAIA Executive Committee to discuss the AIAW program with three specific purposes in mind (Wilson, 2005). First, the Executive Committee wanted to learn first-hand the aims, purposes, and future plans of the AIAW. Second, the committee would determine how the NAIA could coordinate its plans with the AIAW’s. Finally, both parties wanted to establish the best procedure for advising NAIA member schools with their developing women’s programs utilizing the services of the AIAW

(Land, 1977). According to *The NAIA News*, the meeting was deemed a success, and the NAIA went on record fully supporting the AIAW in every possible way (“AIAW Meets with Executive Committee”, 1972).

The 1972-73 school year was the thirty-fifth anniversary year for the NAIA (Land, 1977). Thus, the 1972 Annual Meeting was highly attended as approximately 300 member institutions were represented by delegates (“Convention Keeps Growing”, 1972). At this time, the NAIA sponsored 16 national championship events and was flourishing based on their game attendance (Land, 1977). However, the organization, as well as the United States overall, would have to deal with some of the ill wills of society. While not unique to intercollegiate athletics, the increasing social and political upheaval within American society transferred into college athletes who continually grew frustrated with the traditional hierarchy of a head coach having absolute control (Wilson, 2005). In addition, concerns over the increase of violence at sporting events and the difficulty financing programs became an issue (Duer, 1972). Facing these issues, Duer had continually focused on the basic aim of the NAIA as a way to address these issues – to assist in developing sound educational program in intercollegiate athletics (Land, 1977). At the 1973 Annual Meeting, Duer stressed that “athletics should be a privilege not a right of the athlete” and issued a “challenge to [the] membership to justify [the] claim that athletics is part of [the] educational program of the institution” (NAIA, 1973, p. 1).

The NAIA would further emphasize these values by looking to the Conduct of Athletic Committee managed by Executive Committee member Paul Pierce (Wilson, 2005). This committee had been organized for the last few years but was continually running into problems related to due process for any disciplinary action they

recommended. With the help of its legal team, Pierce and members of the Conduct of Athletic Committee designed five guidelines to regulate the conduct of athletics. The guidelines created were the following:

- An athlete has a personal and property right in so far as competing for an institution is concerned, and he cannot be deprived of this right without due process.
- The personal and property right is guaranteed by the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the USA.
- If it is felt that the athlete is guilty of misconduct, he must be given written notice of the hearing date, time and place.
- The hearing must be in the area of the school or near where the athlete lives.
- The district executive committee could be the group conducting the original hearing (Land, 1977, p. 286-287).

One of the first challenges to these guidelines involved the penalties levied against Birmingham Southern and Jacksonville State. NASC President C. D. Henry visited with the Executive Committee during its annual meeting in March 1973 to determine if the all-black schools would receive due process during the penalty process (Wilson, 2004). Henry reviewed the procedures and determined that the NAIA procedures would provide fair treatment for all schools and individuals involved as well as suppressing future violations of the participation policy and conduct of athletics code (Land, 1977).

Redistricting was also addressed at the 1973 Annual Meeting. The previously approved plan to combine District 1 (Washington and Alaska) and District 5 (Montana and Wyoming) and to divide District 32 did not go into effect as scheduled because the members of Districts 1 and 5 resisted the concept (Land, 1977). In response, the Executive Committee compromised to create Districts 32N (Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont) and 32S (Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Massachusetts) to eliminate the large original District 32. Despite this split, both districts would have to compete in a bi-district playoff for the right of one team to go to the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). Interestingly,

after a discussion with six district chairmen at the 1973 Annual Meeting, the Executive Committee decided that Districts 1 and 5 should be the two affected districts for the 1974 NIBT instead of Districts 32N and 32S since Districts 1 and 5 had less members than the original District 32 (NAIA, 1973). One year later, District 5 (Montana and Wyoming) members would be moved into District 12 which included both North and South Dakota (Wilson, 2005). District 32N would become the new District 5, and District 32S would become the lone District 32.

As the 1973-74 school year approached, Duer met with the Executive Committee at the 1973 interim meeting to discuss the NAIA's upcoming challenges. Duer felt there were "so many opportunities and challenges to increase the stature of our program" (Land, 1977, p. 301). Duer recognized the opportunities with the following:

"We have two proposals for sites for the Champion Bowl – we have the beginning of an NAIA-TV Network – we have real indication of Kansas City support for the Hall of Fame and NAIA film of the Kansas City Story...- we have increasing opportunities for national competition....Now we have increasing opportunities through national recognition in the Olympics, [and] World Student games. We have a Vice Presidency on the Olympic Committee. We have had three requests to appear before the Senate Hearings for bills designed to bring governmental control over amateur athletics. We were asked to Washington for a hearing on the drug study within athletics in the NAIA. We are developing with the Kansas City Sports' Commission a program for the NAIAC selecting an athlete of the year in 1974" (NAIA Executive Committee, 1973, p. 1).

He concluded it was now time "for [the] NAIA to capitalize on our good fortune and our stature and render greater service to our youth in our 565 member institutions" (NAIA Executive Committee, 1973, p. 2).

The amateur conflict emerged again in 1973 when the NCAA implemented a ban on its member school athletes forbidding them to compete on American all-star teams against a visiting Russian squad in basketball and track and field ("Athletes to Defy

NCAA Ban”, 1973). According to *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, NCAA Executive Director Walter Byers had written to Marquette University basketball coach Al McGuire and Athletic Director Dr. James Scott denying them permission to coach a U.S. team against the Russians. The letter stated that “no student of any NCAA institution may participate in the games...No coach of a member NCAA institution may be attached in any way to the games” (“NCAA Says College Hoopsters”, 1973, para. 7). The reasoning behind the ban focused on the AAU sponsoring the Russian tour without consulting the International Basketball Board as well as countermanding the long-existing NCAA by-laws (“NCAA Says College Hoopsters”, 1973). AAU Public Relations Director Richard McArthur was disappointed with the NCAA ruling and noted the following:

“We had hoped to field the best possible team against the Russians and redeem our defeat at Munich. We cannot be held responsible now for the international image we present. We had hoped for some sort of waiver on the part of the NCAA but we have found that in dealing with Walter Byers logic and fair play rarely enters into his thinking process” (“NCAA Says College Hoopsters”, 1973, para. 14-15).

In response, NCAA Public Relations Director Jerry Miles countered McArthur comments and acknowledged that “for undergraduates to participate in outside competition has been a violation of NCAA rules for years” (“NCAA Says College Hoopster, 1973”, para. 17). Miles further noted that this issue was another attempt by the AAU to breach well-established NCAA regulations.

After this latest fight, Congress was ready to take action again to settle the feud between the AAU and the NCAA. A special committee in the House of Representatives began investigations into the NCAA ban (Land, 1977). Duer was again called to testify before the committee to address his concerns (“A.O. Duer Appears before House”, 1973). He reiterated the NAIA position of siding with the AAU but was not engaged in the

dispute. In addition, Duer and the NAIA encouraged its athletes to compete in international competition; furthermore, they embraced international teams into their association (“Athletes to Defy NCAA”, 1973). Expectedly, Duer also requested the House committee provide support for the NAIA so that some of the best athletes or coaches would be allowed to participate in international competition U.S (Land, 1977). Thus, the involvement of the NAIA in problems larger than those of the internal organization lent it considerable stature (“A.O. Duer Appears before House”, 1973).

In response to the special meeting, Congress introduced a bill that would authorize fines up to \$10,000 if a college athlete was banned from intercollegiate contests because of participation in international amateur competition (“Congress Aims at NCAA Ban”, 1973). The bill was sponsored by Representatives James G. O’Hara of Michigan and John Dellenback of Oregon and would provide safeguards to college coaches who work with U.S. amateurs in international competition (“Congress to Lower Boom”, 1973). By the end of Summer 1973, U.S. Senators John Tunney of California and Warren Magnuson of Washington would sponsor Senate Bill 2365 which would create a federal board to exert controls on all international and domestic amateur athletics (“NCAA Group Frets about Senate”, 1973).

According to Land (1977), the conflict between the NAIA and the NCAA was starting to take its toll on the various aspects of each organization’s member schools. Thus, the Executive Committee sought to ease the tensions with the NCAA by engaging in another set of meetings to discuss the divisive issues such as championship choices by winning teams; conflicting events; women’s athletics; philosophy discussion of NAIA and NCAA; and international competition (NAIA Executive Committee, 1974a).

Division discussions surfaced as another important topic during these meetings because of the recent decision to reorganize the NCAA.

In January 1973, delegates of the NCAA met in Chicago for the 1973 NCAA Convention to discuss the possibility of a large-scale reorganization (Katz & Seifried, in press). The original plan for reorganization involved dividing NCAA members into two divisions, conforming to the university/college distinction, but would provide each division with the right to determine its own operating rules (“NCAA Special Convention to Consider”, 1973). Reorganization of the NCAA was important to many schools, especially those schools associated with the Southeastern Conference (SEC). SEC Commissioner Dr. Boyd McWhorter noted:

“The purpose of the meeting is to draw up a reorganization plan to present at a special NCAA meeting later this year. I think the SEC view is almost unanimous that restructuring is critical for the NCAA. If it’s the only thing to be considered at the new meeting, I think we can sit there and hone it out” (Shearer, 1973, para. 4-5).

Legendary Alabama football head coach Paul “Bear” Bryant also shared these sentiments noting that the NCAA’s recently approved limitation of 30 football grants-in-aid per year and no more than 105 players on scholarship was not enough (Shearer, 1973).

On the other hand, NCAA College Committee Member Stanley J. Marshall feared the possible results stemming from the proposed NCAA reorganization. According to *The Herald-Journal*, Marshall commented:

“The nation’s top 50 or so schools, involved in football bowl and other lucrative competition seem to feel that restrictive NCAA rules have been forced upon them by college division members. They cite the 1.6 academic entrance rule, the freshman eligibility rules, and other overall legislation as being influenced upon them by the small colleges” (“NCAA Starts 67th Annual Meetings”, 1973, para. 6-7).

Marshall further elaborated if the two divisions had the ability to design their own operating rules, small college recruiting would suffer to some extent (“NCAA Starts 67th Annual Meetings”, 1973). Marshall continued by offering:

“Supposing the big school division then voted against the pending proposal to issue tenders on the basis of need and the small school division approved such scholarships. Then it would be difficult for small college coaches to recruit. The vote on the reorganization will be a real donnybrook and there may be a flock of amendments to modify it” (“NCAA Starts 67th Annual Meetings, 1973, para. 9, 12).

During the proceedings, Eastern College Athletic Conference (ECAC) President and Massachusetts Institute of Technology Athletic Administrator Ross Smith acknowledged that his block of 120 institutions determined a fate of a proposal that would address this possible reorganization (National Collegiate Athletic Association [NCAA], 1973; “NCAA Division Not Likely”, 1973). Smith believed that the NCAA needed to be reorganized but “this plan does not in our opinion provide an acceptable process whereby the entire membership of the NCAA can achieve its respective goals” (NCAA, 1973, p. 100). After Smith’s speech, the proposal to split the NCAA into two divisions could not muster the required two-thirds vote of 295 for approval as the bill was defeated 224 to 218 in a record convention total vote of 442 (“NCAA Reorganization is Rejected”, 1973). Following the defeat of this reorganization plan, the NCAA commissioned a special convention in the summer of 1973 to determine potential reorganization plans (Falla, 1981; “NCAA Special Convention to Consider”, 1973).

The NCAA Council specifically appointed an 11-man committee to draft a new proposal. According to *The NCAA News*, the committee addressed five major points with their reorganization proposal:

1. The institutions at present classified “Major” in the sport of football will remain intact, and may vote as a group on restrictive Bylaw legislation pertaining only to them in the sport of football.
2. The membership will be divided into three categories: Division I, Division II and Division III. The NCAA Council will determine which legislation shall be subject to divided voting in the Bylaws.
3. Each institution will be given the prerogative of determining in which division it wishes to vote and participate, exclusive to football.
4. Not later than 1975-76 academic year, approximately 39 National Championships will be sponsored with a minimum of 10 National Championships to be conducted in each of the three divisions.
5. The NCAA Council and the NCAA Executive Committee will be restructured with each division being guaranteed representation on each group (“NCAA Reorganization Proposal Formulated”, 1973, para. 7-11).

According to Falla (1981), Special Committee Chairman Edgar Sherman suggested the labeling of divisions:

“Started out by suggesting maybe we could call (the divisions) by colors or names to try to avoid the one, two, three implication; but as we progressed, the discussion always got back to designating them one, two and three. People who wrote in with suggestions and comments also termed them to be one, two and three. I guess rather than fight, we gave in to it, and those are the names given...” (p. 232).

An initial draft of this proposal was distributed to NCAA members in March 1973 for preliminary reactions and refine for the NCAA Council in April 1973 (“Preliminary Reorganization Proposal Issued”, 1973). After this meeting, the Special Committee revised some provisions such as the ability for each division to establish its own by-laws without approval from any other division as well as each division creating its own criteria for membership in its own division (“Reorganization Plan Revised by Committee”, 1973). After making slight adjustments to the reorganization plan in May 1973, the NCAA Council approved the Special Committee’s proposal and subjected it to a member vote at the NCAA Special Convention in August 1973 (“Final Reorganization Proposal Approved”, 1973).

At the Hyatt Regency-O'Hare Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, the NCAA first Special Convention convened on August 6, 1973 ("First Special Convention to Decide", 1973).

Many of the members in attendance saw no issues with the proposed plan. Atlantic Coast Conference Commissioner Bob James described the conflict with the following:

"It got to a point where we felt that we had to have a change so we could solve the problems that were common just to us. It seemed that many of the things we wanted were being frustrated by those colleges that had no interest whatsoever in the point being debated. They'd just say, 'I don't like that,' and vote against it. It would cripple us and never affect them" (Attner, 1973, para. 7-8).

Even ECAC Commissioner Scotty Whitelaw had no objections to the plan as the conference's prior reservations had been met (Attner, 1973). Whitelaw further elaborated:

"We didn't like the idea of being placed in a division without having the ability to decide if we wanted to be in that division or not. This new way allows every school to examine its own athletic program and decide in just what division it would feel most comfortable. Before, it seemed the proposal was weighed all too heavily toward the major schools. Everything was spelled out for them and little was said about the second division for the smaller schools" (Attner, 1973, para. 17-19).

After discussion of the proposal, a vote was called by the NCAA members. By a vote of 366 to 13, the NCAA approved the reorganization plan (Liska, 1973). This reorganization allowed 245 schools to be classified as Division I; 200 colleges in Division II; and 225 institutions in Division III (Liska, 1973). At the time of the reorganization, the NAIA maintained 558 member schools while the NCAA had a total membership count of 670 (Wilson, 2005). By the next school year, the NAIA would lose 45 members. However, the NAIA membership total would stay relatively stable over the next ten years as member schools ranged between 509 and 527 until 1984 (Wilson, 2005).

Affecting these counts partially were those schools that maintained membership with both the NCAA and the NAIA. Legislation created and approved in the past to remedy this issue all but appeared to deal with dual membership on a temporary basis for the NAIA. As such, the Executive Committee appointed its own special committee chaired by NAIA President Dr. Robert Livingston to study the dual participation policy as it appeared in the *NAIA Handbook* and make recommendations concerning this rule (Land, 1977; NAIA Executive Committee, 1974a). This committee would make two proposals to the Executive Committee that would attempt to remedy the NAIA's problem with dual membership. First, the Special Committee recommended that Article VI, Section III, Item 2 of the NAIA By-Laws be replaced with the following:

“NAIA member institutions may participate in one (1) conflicting amateur non-NAIA district qualifying, area, or national championship event in one sport of the choice EXCEPT in the sports of FOOTBALL or BASKETBALL without penalty of probation by NAIA” (Land, 1977, p. 308).

This motion to allow participation in one conflicting event was passed by the members at the 1974 Annual Meeting (NAIA, 1974). A second suggestion involved the special events program. The Special Events Committee proposed the fee for a special event should decrease from \$100 to \$25 and the requirement for financial accounting should be eliminated (Wilson, 2005). This was also approved at the 1974 Annual Meeting.

As the 1973-1974 fiscal year came to a close, the NAIA was faced with several decisions that would alter many past traditions the organization relied upon. First, the NAIA had to decide if the annual NIBT would move into a new home in Kansas City. The Crosby Kemper Memorial Arena was constructed in Kansas City in 1974 for \$22 million (“Looking Back: The History”, 2011). The new facility would have a seating capacity of 16,284 compared to the 9,960 in the Municipal Auditorium (Land, 1977).

While more people could attend games, Duer had several reservations about making the move to the Kemper Arena. According to Land (1977), Duer feared the location of the Kemper Arena would deter businessmen in downtown from attending the afternoon games compared to the Municipal Auditorium's location in Downtown Kansas City. In addition, many of the hotels for the teams, fans and other participants were approximately four miles away from the Kemper Arena (Wilson, 2005). Nevertheless, at the 1974 Interim Meeting, the Executive Committee decided to move the tournament to the new location (NAIA Executive Committee, 1974b). The contract negotiated between Kansas City and the Executive Committee included the following conditions: 1) the maximum rent charged would be \$20,000; 2) there would be no other, similar event scheduled at the same time in the Municipal Auditorium; and 3) the city would work with the NAIA on a 5-year contract with a one year clause renewable annually (Land, 1977; NAIA Executive Committee, 1974b). In addition, the city agreed to provide shuttle bus service to and from the Kemper Arena every 10 minutes (Sharp, 1975).

Despite the serious reservations, Duer and the Executive Committee believed the NIBT would grow in Kemper Arena (Sharp, 1975). However, according to Wilson (2005), observers of the negotiations viewed the decision to move as one of blackmail. In essence, the NAIA was forced to move the NIBT to the Kemper Arena in order for Kansas City to justify its existence. If the NAIA decided not to move the NIBT to the Kemper Arena, Kansas City officials implied that conflicting events would be scheduled during the NIBT at the Municipal Auditorium in order to undermine attendance (Wilson, 2005). This position can be justified as some marquee events received poor attendance. As an example, Boxing Heavyweight Champion Muhammad Ali visited Kansas City to

fight in four two-round exhibition fights (“Poor K.C. Turnout for Muhammad Ali”, 1974). The attendance for the fights featuring Ali only attracted 3,000 spectators (“Poor Crowd at Ali Exhibition”, 1974). Ali was disturbed by the low turnout and was quoted with the following:

“This is a shame. I’m not a month away from winning the world heavyweight championship before a crowd of a hundred million people around the world...that’s 10 hundred million...and we couldn’t fill this little chicken coop up. You’re blessed to have a champion like me in this one-horse town” (“Poor K.C. Turnout for Muhammad Ali”, 1974, para. 3).

The thirty-eighth annual NIBT was held in the Kemper Arena from March 10 to March 15, 1975 as scheduled (Land, 1977). Although a heavy snowstorm disrupted the planned transportation by the city, the overall attendance for the 1975 NIBT was 69,555 with a crowd of 8,930 viewing the championship game (“Grand Canyon Wins Crown”, 1975).

Another major event for the NAIA during the 1974-75 school year involved the retirement of Executive Secretary A. O. Duer. According to Land (1977), the Executive Committee had set the date for Duer’s retirement at the end of the fiscal year in which he reached 70 years of age. This placed Duer’s retirement date on July 31, 1975 (Wilson, 2005). Before the 1974-75 academic year began, Duer was forced to undergo major surgery and was incapacitated for most of the summer of 1974. The surgery caused him to miss the Executive Committee Interim Meeting in August 1974 (Land, 1977). After his recovery, Duer returned to his position and was able to resume his full-time responsibilities until his retirement (NAIA, 1975). During Duer’s tenure as Executive Secretary beginning in 1949, the NAIA began as the NAIB and hosted one national championship in basketball for its 309 members and had a goal of establishing some committees (Wilson, 2005). By 1975, the NAIA had established 32 district committees,

16 sports committees, 20 general committees, and numerous special committees to help regulate the 16 national championship offerings for the 513 members of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). On March 13, 1975, NAIA President Dr. Arnold Kilpatrick made the official announcement of Duer's retirement at the NAIA Annual Meeting (NAIA, 1975). Much praise was given to Duer during the 1975 Annual Meeting from the over 1,200 in attendance at the meeting. In addition, Rich Sambol, sports writer for the *Kansas City Times*, praised Duer for his service and proceeded to call him the NAIA's "Guiding Light" during his 23 years as Executive Secretary (Sambol, 1975).

The final major event during the 1974-75 school year involved finding Duer's successor as Executive Secretary. At the Executive Committee Interim Meeting in August 1974, Dr. Kilpatrick appointed a search committee to review candidates for the Executive Secretary (NAIA Executive Committee, 1974b). According to Land (1977), Dr. Kilpatrick wrote a letter to all past presidents of the NAIA as well as the Executive Committee to make as many recommendations as possible to the search committee according to the following criteria: "(1) age, not over 56 or 57; (2) national and international stature; (3) personality; (4) preparation, by degree, coaching experience, executive experience, etc.; (5) speaking ability; (6) credibility, character and integrity; (7) enthusiasm; and (8) good health" (p. 320). The search committee reviewed all recommendations submitted by September 1975 and, according to Wilson (2005), discussed an agreement with their chosen candidate who insisted that "his name be kept quiet because of the sensitivity of his current position" (p. 96). That individual was Joe Axelson, the former Assistant Executive Secretary of the NAIA and current General Manager of the NBA's Kansas City Kings.

Several amendments passed during the 1974 Annual Meeting were scheduled to go into effect in March 1975 after approval from the NAIA member schools through a mail ballot. These items involved the allowing of: (1) an institution to participate in one conflicting event annually; (2) a student participant to carry less than a full load in his last term of attendance preceding graduation if his schooling had been done in the four year minimal time (3) a freshman who participated in a freshman program and went on to participate in a varsity program to have that year count as one of his four years of eligibility in that sport; and (4) a student athlete to sign a professional contract but not receiving money to appeal for the restoration of his amateur standing (NAIA, 1975).

While there were three key events that were the focal point of the 1974-75 academic year, the NAIA was not without its problems. For instance, Dr. Livingston identified three important issues the NAIA would have to contend with in the immediate future: (1) the challenge of the NCAA Division III; (2) the matter of dual membership; and (3) the pro-amateur rule (NAIA, 1975). First, NAIA officials viewed the NCAA's Division III as a direct competitor and believed the NCAA was now able to target smaller schools to join their association (Wilson, 2005). After the slight dip in membership count following the NCAA's reorganization in 1973, the Executive Committee appointed Committee Member Paul Pierce to research the specific reasons why schools left the NAIA for the NCAA and asked Dr. Kilpatrick to look into the perennial problem of conflict of events and dual membership (NAIA Executive Committee, 1975a). Dr. Kilpatrick's research was requested after the Executive Committee took no action following three distinct violations related to football games involving Alcorn A&M College, Grambling College, and Slippery Rock College (NAIA Executive Committee,

1975a; 1975b). While there may not have been an official penalty, the NAIA did provide Slippery Rock College with sanctions for their actions. According to *The Gettysburg Times*, “the NAIA removed all mention of Slippery Rock from its rankings and statistics” (“Slippery Rock is Pa. Champ”, 1974, para. 11). The NAIA also ruled that no player or coach from Slippery Rock would be allowed to compete in any postseason contests (“Slippery Rock is Pa. Champ”, 1974).

In regards to the pro-amateur rule, the NCAA announced during its 1974 Convention that it was changing its amateurism rule. After discussion at the convention, the NCAA members narrowly approved a constitutional change that would allow a student athlete to become a professional in one sport but remain an amateur in other sports (“Changes in Amateurism Approved”, 1974). Needing 254 members to approve the change to achieve a two-thirds majority, the final vote tally was 258 for the change and 123 against (Prewitt, 1974). This was the NAIA’s original rule before the AAU influenced the Executive Committee to change the rule to better match the Olympic standards (Hoover, 1958; Land, 1977). By 1974, the NCAA began to waiver. University of Southern California head football coach John McKay noted he was partial with the rule change by explaining the following example:

“We had a boy at Southern Cal several years ago who was a great football player but quit to try professional baseball. He hurt his arm, and he’s a Los Angeles cop now. He could have returned to school and played football under this policy” (Prewitt, 1974, para. 3).

University of California Athletic Director Dave Maggard also favored the rule change and believed that the AAU would alter their rules as well. Maggard’s rationale was based on Jim Thorpe’s posthumously re-awarding of several gold medals he won during the

1912 Olympic Games which were returned following the discovery that Thorpe played baseball on the semi-pro level (Prewitt, 1974).

The NAIA Executive Committee remained continually frustrated with its lack of publicity and the work of Haskell Cohen. Yet, at the 1974 Executive Committee Interim Meeting, the Executive Committee was presented with a tentative agreement with the Hughes Television Network to carry sports programs (NAIA Executive Committee, 1974b). According to Land (1977), the deal called for televising events in capsule form from each of the 17 sports programs as selected by the network during the course of the 1974-75 collegiate season. The Hughes Television Network would pay the NAIA a fee of \$40,000 for the sports content and provided the NAIA with \$2,000 for an exclusive, irrevocable 60-day option as a measure of good intentions (Land, 1977). Cohen negotiated the deal with the Hughes Network contract and demanded that he should have an increase in his salary of \$1,500 per month should the television deal fully materialize (Wilson, 2005). After months of anticipation, the deal did not materialize during the 1974-75 school year and thus, the Executive Committee decided to terminate Cohen's contract at its 1975 meeting (NAIA Executive Committee, 1975a).

Upon Duer's retirement, the NAIA maintained 513 members; down slightly from its peak of 561 at the end of the 1971-72 fiscal year (Wilson, 2005). Wilson (2005) explained that "anxiety underlay surface optimism as the possibility of more and more defections to the NCAA's new Division III loomed on the horizon" (p. 102). Still, one of the major strengths of the NAIA centered on its democratic form of administration as the 32 districts, grouped into eight areas enjoyed considerable autonomy in conducting its operations (Wilson, 2005). Many NAIA members and knowledgeable observers believed

that the district organization was a key to the NAIA's future success (Land, 1977). Thus, the organization was decentralized further by providing each member institution the responsibility to regulate itself. As an example, eligibility regulations passed by NAIA officials were created in order to move the student athlete steadily toward graduation (Land, 1977). Though designed to be minimal, this management structure created a uniform floor upon which any institution may operate and the ability of the institution to manage itself (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005). Collectively, the NAIA felt it was in a stable position to maintain its current status as a small school association.

The A.D. (After Duer) Period (1975 – 1986)

At the NAIA Executive Committee Interim Meeting in August 1975, Dr. Livingston had the unfortunate duty to inform committee members that Joe Axelson, the aforementioned anonymous Executive Secretary-elect, could not be released from his contract with the Kings and therefore not able to become the NAIA's third Executive Secretary (NAIA Executive Committee, 1975b). According to Wilson (2005), once those in attendance learned that Axelson was the anonymous individual, several committee members and observers speculated that Axelson commanded a higher salary than Duer. Others blamed Dr. Livingston for issuing a press release that clearly hinted Axelson would be appointed Executive Secretary, forcing Axelson to withdraw his name in order to mollify the Kansas City Kings owners (Wilson, 2005). Despite the circumstances, Dr. Livingston announced through a newsletter that the search committee would be re-commissioned and a new search for Duer's successor would be conducted (Land, 1977).

Because he was serving the dual role as NAIA President and Interim Executive Secretary until April 1976, Dr. Livingston was able to take a half sabbatical leave from

his institution, the Oregon College of Education in Monmouth, Oregon (Land, 1977). During his interim tenure, Dr. Livingston foresaw two significant items of legislation that would cause the conflicting event issue to permanently subside. According to Land (1977), the Executive Committee temporarily suspended Article VI, Section III, Item 2 of the NAIA By-Laws (allowance of member institutions to compete in one conflicting event that is not football or basketball). In addition, the following regulation was submitted to NAIA voting delegates at the 1976 Annual Meeting and was adopted for the 1975-76 school year:

Each member institution shall be required to submit to the NAIA National Office and their [sic] District Chairman its declaration of whether it intends to participate in NAIA District, Area or National Events in all sports recognized by NAIA. Institutions declaring their intent to participate in the NAIA Championship Event program, in each sport, must honor this commitment. Should an institution declare its intent to participate, and then not participate, if qualified, it shall be liable for any or all of the following penalties:

- (1) The institution shall be suspended for all District, Area, and National events to a maximum of two years.
- (2) It shall be ineligible for participation in statistical services, to a maximum of two years.
- (3) It shall lose its right to vote on District or National issues during the penalty period.
- (4) No member of its staff shall be eligible to serve on District or National committees during the period.

Institutions that fail to file their "Declaration of Intent to Participate" form with the NAIA National Office and their respective District Chairman shall:

- (1) Be declared ineligible to participate in any NAIA Championship event for those sports in which they are delinquent.
- (2) Cause the institution to be declared ineligible to participate in all other NAIA Championship events until the delinquent form is filed.
- (3) Cause statistical service of NAIA to be withheld until the delinquent form is filed.
- (4) Cause the institution to be investigated by the NAIA Executive Committee for possible institutional censure and/or suspension of the institution.
- (5) Cause their athletes and coaches within the delinquent sport(s) to be ineligible for NAIA District, Area, or National Awards (Executive Committee Makes New Changes", 1975, p. 16).

Land (1977) further acknowledged that member schools would not have to make a declaration of intent for events in cross-country, gymnastics, indoor track, wrestling, swimming, golf, outdoor track, and tennis. Instead, a member institution was only required to meet district and/or national entry deadlines and qualifying standards where applicable (Land, 1977). After deliberation, the NAIA voting delegates approved these measures by a vote of 87 to 2 (“By-Laws Proposals Receive Approval”, 1976). In addition to this policy, the Executive Committee chose to suspend Article VI, Section C, Item 4, which permitted member schools to schedule no more than 25% of its football or basketball games against NCAA Division I institutions (“Executive Committee Makes New Changes”, 1975). According to Land (1977), “these two acts of legislation essentially wiped out the long struggle between the NAIA and the NCAA in the area of institutional participation” (p. 340). In the past, many institutions were forced to decide between two organizations that could offer the greatest benefits. With these measures, now institutions could easily be members of both organizations and receive the best benefits from each (Land, 1977). Thus, instead of the organization forcing the issue, the responsibility now rested with each institution to make its intent known at an early enough date to avoid embarrassment to the national organization (Wilson, 2005).

One other important item conducted during Dr. Livingston tenure as Interim Executive Secretary was the official announcement of A. O. Duer’s successor as Executive Secretary. The search committee, which was chaired by Dr. Livingston, requested applications and nominations for candidates for the position be submitted to the committee by October 1, 1975 (Land, 1977). By October 27, the search committee met to narrow the list of candidates to five recommendations for the Executive Committee’s

recommendation (NAIA Search Committee, 1975). These suggestions were provided to all Executive Committee Members on November 16 and 17 in an interim meeting held in Dallas, Texas (Land, 1977). On December 15, 1975, the Executive Committee had made its decision, and Dr. Livingston scheduled a press conference at the Raddison-Muehlebach Hotel in Kansas City to announce Dr. Harry G. Fritz would become the NAIA's third Executive Secretary ("Dr. Harry Fritz Tabbed", 1975).

At the time of the announcement, Fritz was serving as the Athletic Director and Dean of the School of Health Education at the State University of New York at Buffalo (Wilson, 2005). He possessed a broad athletic background allowing him to relate to student athletes, coaches, athletic directors, officials, and leaders in other organizations. In addition, Fritz also served as the President of the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NAPSE) and enjoyed two terms on the Board of Governors of the AAPHER, representing AAPHER on the United States Collegiate Sports Council (Wilson, 2005). Finally, he was one of the founding members of the National Association of Collegiate Directors (NACDA- established in 1965) and a member of the NAIA Executive Committee from 1968 to 1972 (Wilson, 2005). According to Land (1977), Fritz demonstrated great leadership skills at each phase of his lengthy career and appeared to be an outstanding choice as the new leader of the NAIA.

Fritz assumed his full-time duties as Executive Secretary on April 12, 1976 ("Dr. Harry Fritz Tabbed", 1976). While Fritz would inherit the position, there was still an aura of fear in regards to potential defections. As an example, eight schools of the Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference (Buena Vista College of Storm Lake, Iowa; Central College of Pella, Iowa; Luther College of Decorah, Iowa; Simpson College of Indianola,

Iowa; Upper Iowa University of Fayette, Iowa; The University of Dubuque of Dubuque, Iowa; Wartburg College of Waverly, Iowa; and William Penn College of Oksaloosa, Iowa) announced that they would “conduct their athletic events under NCAA rules and regulations beginning in the fall of 1976” and “had voted to reapply for admission to the NCAA as an allied conference” (Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference, 1976). Upon receiving news about the Iowa Conference, Fritz sent letters to the presidents of each school involved as well as contacting each athletic director through telephone calls (Land, 1977). He was able to fight off a wholesale defection but foresaw the potential of future defections (Wilson, 2005).

Part of the reason Fritz feared future departures was due to a recent NCAA decision. In 1975, the NCAA negotiated with its television partner, the American Broadcasting Corporation (ABC), to televise the national championship contests in football for Division II and Division III as well as some regular season matchups through “exception telecasts” (“Football Telecasts and Revenue Spread Wide”, 1976). According to the NCAA, an exception telecast is a game broadcast that is either:

“Permitted because of special circumstances surrounding a particular game (e.g. a sell-out) or those permitted because of the special circumstances surrounding the participating institutions (e.g. they are members of Division II or III or they are Division I institutions which have never appeared on the ABC-TV series)” (“Football Telecasts and Revenue Spread Wide”, 1976, para. 16).

Because these games were televised on ABC, the NCAA was able to receive a rights fee of \$500,000 for all Division II and Division III football championship telecasts (“Football Rights Fees Announced”, 1976). In addition, the NCAA received \$150,000 for the rights for five other Division II and Division III national championship events and \$190,000 for four regular season games for the members of Division II and Division III (“Football

Rights Fees Announced”, 1976). The total contract between ABC and the NCAA was worth \$18 million (“Football Rights Fees Announced”, 1976). Thus, the NCAA was able to provide both Division II and Division III with approximately \$840,000 to broadcast regular season games on either regional or national television and fully sponsor national championship contests.

According to Land (1977), the amount of money that the NCAA was willing to provide to the newly created Division II and Division III showed all schools the long-term plans the NCAA had for each division for the potential temptation to help NAIA members make the transition. In response to this possibility, Dr. Livingston voiced a new mantra the NAIA would embrace for the next quarter century; “perhaps the association was better off without lukewarm members” (Wilson, 2005, p. 105). Nevertheless, Fritz would meet with the NCAA in December 1976 through a new NAIA-NCAA Joint Committee (“NAIA, NCAA Get Together”, 1976). Both the NCAA and the NAIA were represented by their head officials (Fritz for the NAIA; Byers for the NCAA) and two other officials associated with each respective organization. The mission for this initial meeting was focused primarily on the common mission of promoting intercollegiate athletics (Wilson, 2005). Specifically, the meeting covered seven main areas: (1) common dates for schools declare whether they will compete in NAIA or NCAA championships; (2) coordinating dates for postseason football playoffs and bowl games; (3) amateurism and limits on financial aid to athletes; (4) international competition; (5) government problems; (6) common playing rules; and (7) television coverage (“NCAA, NAIA May Be Settling”, 1976). The meeting proved to be well received and prompted

the announcement that future meetings were scheduled for early part of 1977 (“NAIA, NCAA Get Together”, 1976).

Fritz was highly optimistic about the new working relationship with the NCAA and reported that relations were good in his 1978 and 1979 address at the Annual Meetings (Wilson, 2005). His internal optimism and diplomatic skills were also readily apparent when the AAU and the NCAA had rekindled their historical feud over Olympic and amateur athletics. In 1975, the NCAA ruled that any collegiate athlete participating in an AAU-sponsored trip to China would face suspension and potential loss of scholarship (Seppy, 1975). The reasoning for this new ban, according to NCAA Executive Director Walter Byers, was the NCAA constitution states that if a college athlete competes for an outside team, with exception to a national team, he/she would be declared ineligible for this sport automatically (Seppy, 1975). These new developments in the conflict led President Gerald Ford to appoint a new commission to review the state of Olympic and amateur athletics (Seppy, 1975). President Ford was an adamant sports follower and despised the Olympic and amateur sport conflict (“Ford Names Panel to Study”, 1975). President Ford further elaborated:

“In the past, rivalries among amateur sports organizations have sometimes fragmented our international sports efforts, hindered opportunity for our athletes to develop their skills fully and restrained voluntary financial support for our Olympic as well as other amateur sports teams engaged in international competition. The federal government has never attempted to direct amateur athletics in this country nor should it....It is through this commission that I am establishing today that we hope to find direction in this quagmire” (“Ford Names Panel to Study”, 1975, para. 3, 7).

The committee formed under President Ford was tasked to study the state of amateur athletics with four basic objectives in mind:

1. To provide a “better environment” for amateur athletes, including improved athletic facilities for international events, more cooperation between organizations and more financial assistance.
2. To pave the way toward ending the jurisdictional disputes which have beset amateur sports in the United States.
3. To maximize, through a variety of mechanisms, the athletic developmental opportunities for young Americans.
4. To help ensure that the athletes of the highest abilities represent the United States in international competition (Seppy, 1975, para. 11).

Almost immediately after the Commission on Olympic Sports first gathering, the commission was ready to recommend sweeping changes in U.S. policy toward international sports competition (“Amateur Policy Criticized”, 1975). According to Commission Chairman Gerald B. Zornow, the commission “barely scratched the surface of a surface that needs a considerable amount of scratching” (“Amateur Policy Criticized”, 1975, para. 4). As more meetings were scheduled between officials from the NCAA and the AAU, the Commission on Olympic Sports issued a report in February 1976 stating the U.S. had no effective system for amateur athletics but rather numerous organizations that function independently (“Commission Says Amateur Sports”, 1976). The report further suggested:

“Individually, many, if not all, of these organizations are capable of meeting their own organizational goals and to some degree meeting the needs of athletes who participate in their programs. However, the overall system for amateur sports in this country is characterized by its voids as much as by its positive programs. As a consequence, the resources which are devoted to amateur sports are not used as effectively or as efficiently as they might be and the benefits derived from amateur sports are not as great as they should be” (“Commission Says Amateur Sports”, 1976, para. 3-4).

Zornow further argued in the cover letter of the report to President Ford that “improvements in the areas of organization, management and finance are required before the system as a whole can operate effectively, efficiently and in the best interests of the

public” (“Commission Says Amateur Sports”, 1976, para. 9). Zornow believed the needed reform for amateur athletics cannot come from the existing structure and posited:

“Rather, there seems to be a need for a single, comprehensive organization to provide the leadership, direction, coordination and support necessary to effect change within the current system. We see this organization as concerned with amateur sports that are played competitively at the international level rather than just those sports currently on the Olympic roster since the problems of Olympic sports cannot be dealt with effectively in isolation from other amateur sports” (“Commission Says Amateur Sports”, 1976, para. 11-12).

Based on these recommendations, the U.S. Senate began hearings in 1977 and 1978 with the officials from the amateur sports organizations with the task to develop legislation addressing the commission’s concerns (Seppy, 1978). The NAIA, again, played a vital role during these hearings as Fritz was invited to testify before both the Commission on Olympic Sports and U.S. Senate (Wilson, 2005). The commission wanted Fritz to provide information regarding the history and background of the NAIA; the concept of the NAIA district organization; suggestions for improving international competition; and the NAIA’s relationship with and views of the USOC (Land, 1977). According to Land (1977), Fritz believed his testimonies were both well received and honored the ideas that he and Duer previously expressed. After the hearings were conducted, Congress was ready to write a bill that would drastically reorganize the regulation of amateur sports (Seppy, 1978). Known as the Amateur Sports Act of 1978, the bill designated the USOC as the cording body for amateur sports, restructured the USOC and many of its constituent organizations, and provided the USOC with a mandate to resolve any disputes through arbitration (“Carter Signs into Law Amateur”, 1978). The Amateur Sports Act also recognized certain rights for amateur athletes while providing a resolution of disputes involving all amateur sports organizations (“Carter

Signs into Law Amateur”, 1978). According to Eskey (1978), the Amateur Sports Act would appropriate \$16 million to the USOC for its reorganization efforts as well as subsidizing sports training centers and distributing information on how to prevent and treat injuries.

Seppy (1978) noted the amateur sport associations were supportive of the Amateur Sports Act when it was discussed in the summer of 1978. However, by October 1978, both the NCAA and the AAU chose to withhold any comments about the bill until they could read the exact language of the bill (Greene, 1978). Ultimately, NCAA Public Relations Director stated that the bill is “one that’s been supported on a broad base by the NCAA and we would...be pleased to have it passed” (Greene, 1978, para. 9).

Conversely, AAU Spokesman Marty Wise stated:

“Our stand would be (that) some of the amendments would hamper the administration of amateur in the United States and restrict the ability of national sports governing bodies to fulfill their obligations with respect to the regulations which govern international competition” (Greene, 1978, para. 10).

The NAIA, supportive of the AAU in the past, actively supported the new bill (Wilson, 2005). In addition, Fritz noted in his 1979 Annual Meeting address that the NAIA was credited as the major reason for the successful passage of the Amateur Sports Act (NAIA, 1979). Moreover, Fritz was named to the reorganized USOC Executive Board and believed the NAIA was uniquely positioned to play a major role in reconciling the issues between the different amateur organizations (Wilson, 2005).

Many cosmetic changes also occurred in 1976 and 1977. For example, in the fall of 1976, the entire second floor of the Midland Building in Kansas City, which provided 4,200 square feet of office space, was obtained for NAIA officials as the new spacious headquarters (Wilson, 2005). Other items that changed included altering the Executive

Secretary title to Executive Director and the Annual Meeting to the National Meeting. Wilson (2005) noted 1976 also saw the welcome addition of an internship program through Western Illinois University. In order to pay for these items, members in attendance of the 1977 National Meeting endorsed an increase in member institution fees (NAIA, 1977). By the 1970s, the costs to run many of the events that the NAIA sponsored were impacted by the substantial rise of inflation on the U.S. currency (“No Easing of Inflation Seen”, 1979). NAIA officials hoped that the Hughes Television deal would supplement income, but when that fell through, they were forced to raise membership dues (Wilson, 2005). The new scale ranged from \$300 to \$550 per year and would be based on the population of the member school (NAIA, 1977).

Along with budgetary concerns, all colleges and universities began their preparations for their adherence to Title IX by 1978. For NAIA officials, attempting to find the place for women’s sports may have occupied the time and thoughts of leaders more than any other issue (Wilson, 2005). During its interim meeting in 1975, the Executive Committee conducted a survey to ascertain what NAIA member institutions were doing about implementing women’s athletic programs (NAIA Executive Committee, 1975b). This survey was approved by the NAIA Committee for Women’s Athletics (Land, 1977). Wilson (2005) noted that NAIA officials would meet with AIAW representatives at least twice a year and would work through the AIAW as the route to promoting national championships for women. However, NAIA members voiced frustration when working with the AIAW as the women’s organization was not well managed as its leaders tried to handle complex issues in a short period of time (Wilson, 2005).

At the 1976 Annual Meeting, the Executive Committee met with six school presidents to design a way for all schools to comply with Title IX (NAIA, 1976). After members returned the surveys, the Executive Committee continued to urge members to work with the AIAW toward national competition (Wilson, 2005). President Dr. Livingston offered his personnel opinion that both the NAIA and the NCAA would eventually establish their own women's athletic programs that would be similar to the ones offered by the AIAW (NAIA, 1976). However, these programs would not occur for a few more years and, in the meantime, the NAIA would maintain a working relationship with the AIAW until the end of the decade.

By 1978, however, the NAIA Executive Committee established the Task Force on Women's Athletics and to study how the NAIA could develop women's programs within the organization and sponsor its own women's championships (Wilson, 2005). The task force was chaired by Point Loma College Athletic Director Carroll Land and charged with the assessment of current NAIA schools with women's programs and gathering feedback to present at the 1979 National Meeting. After reviewing the comment, the task force developed the following five-point statement of goals for an NAIA women's program:

- To develop commonality of rules and guidelines for sports competition for men and women.
- To achieve equitable and proportionate representation by men and women at all levels of governance in the NAIA.
- To make available institutional membership in the NAIA in the Men's Division, Women's Division, or both.
- To expand the NAIA program to include competitive opportunities and championship events for women and to provide for selected district/national sports championships beginning in 1979-80.
- To explore the sponsorship of co-educations intercollegiate sports and establish co-educational programs that will reflect member preferences (NAIA, 1979).

Much discussion during the 1979 National Meeting centered on the task force's proposal for a NAIA sponsored women's championship program. While Fritz claimed that "consideration of questions concerning women's competition by the NAIA...should not be interpreted as any lessening of...support [for the AIAW]", many members in attendance saw the conversation as a complete opposite (NAIA, 1979, p. 13). Members in attendance ultimately put the issue to a vote and temporarily approved a women's division; however, when the vote was passed to all members through correspondence, the measure faced a narrow defeat (Wilson, 2005).

While the NAIA was considering adding a separate women's division, the NCAA was committed to overturning Title IX in court. In the past, the NCAA argued that the Title IX regulations were illegal should not be implemented on any athletic organization ("NCAA Worried over Federal Rules", 1974). By 1975, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) developed regulations that athletic departments would have to follow (Eskenazi, 1975; Seifried, 2007). The demands called for the 16,000 public school systems and 2,700 colleges and graduate schools to grant equal opportunities to women or suffer a loss in federal funds; however, the colleges were not required to provide equal expenditures for men and women (Eskenazi, 1975). The HEW did not attempt to force colleges to follow these rules but rather have colleges acknowledge that they would comply with the law. As such, some NCAA and NAIA members would already implement women's teams. As an example, St. John's University of Queens, New York, was sponsoring women's teams as well as providing financial aid to female athletes (Eskenazi, 1975). St. John's Athletic Director Jack Kaiser further elaborated:

“We’ve changed the status of women’s teams from ‘clubs’ to ‘varsity’. We now have women at our varsity dinner and other functions. I think the Government is going to be logical about compliance. It won’t ram things down our throat” (Eskenazi, 1975, para. 21).

Hall (1975) also acknowledged the University of Southern California was embracing the Title IX regulations with a training room that is co-educational twice a day. However, the NCAA’s main argument was that Title IX regulations would disrupt the financial basis that most universities operate their intercollegiate athletic programs (“H.E.W. Head Says Title IX”, 1975). HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger disagreed with the NCAA’s stance and noted the following:

“The N.C.A.A. position on this is wrong. Those are things that will be considered. The list is just illustrative...It is to help the people who will be administering the program. It is just a guideline to see if they are enforcing the law. I again repeat that the new regulation does not mean equal funding. But the opportunities need to be made available” (“H.E.W. Head Says Title IX”, 1975, para. 5-6).

Although the NCAA fought the implementation of Title IX, in 1975, NCAA President John Fuzak of Michigan State University sent a report from the NCAA Council to its members noting that the NCAA had a moral obligation to provide services to female student-athletes for its member institutions (Falla, 1981). Specifically, Fuzak noted “the NCAA cannot legally or practically limit its services and programs so as to exclude such qualified females” (Falla, 1981, p. 164). Initially, however, the NCAA did not want to interrupt the services already provided by the AIAW, adhering to an earlier pledge when the AIAW was created in 1971 (Wilson, 2005). Yet, the NCAA was criticized by the AIAW, for needing to change its ways in order for sports programs to achieve true parity (“NCAA Must Change Ways”, 1977). Grand View College Women’s Athletic Director Charles Jacobson further elaborated on this viewpoint with the following:

“There’s no way in the world most colleges can afford an equal program for men and women if men stay where they are. There’s no way they can spend the same amount of money on women’s athletics, so something is going to have to happen” (“NCAA Must Change Ways”, 1977, para. 3-4).

Jacobson further commented that discrimination against women was widely apparent on most NCAA member school campuses and predicted that some of the financial realities of meeting federal requirements would cause some major changes to male competition (“NCAA Must Change Ways”, 1977).

By 1978, the NCAA’s court case was dismissed by the U.S. District Court of Kansas (White, 1978). The NCAA believed the regulations of Title IX to require colleges to provide equal accommodations to female athletes to avoid discrimination would be too costly (*NCAA v. Califano*, 1978). However, the courts ruled the NCAA’s claim was premature since no college had yet to face any challenges to provide equal facilities (White, 1978). Furthermore, the court ruled the NCAA lacked any legal standing to sue since they could not show how it would be injured by the regulations (*NCAA v. Califano*, 1978). Regardless of the court case results, another proposal was presented at the 1978 NCAA Convention to sponsor three championships for women in Division II: basketball, gymnastics, and swimming (“161 Proposals in Legislative Package”, 1978; White, 1978). Many arguments were presented from delegates of member schools that showed tremendous support for the proposal including Springfield College delegate Edward Steitz. Steitz belief behind the proposal was as follows:

“As we all realize, no institution is compelled, nor is it mandatory, to participate in an NCAA championship. We have NCAA members, especially in Divisions II and III, that are not members of AIAW or any other predominately female-dominated organization. The NCAA has both a moral and legal responsibility to provide women’s championship competition for our colleagues who are in those positions. The NCAA legal counsel has told us so without any equivocation. We strongly believe the NCAA, or any other national organization to which we

belong, has the responsibility to present as many opportunities and services to the membership as it can possibly provide, regardless of whether another organization to which we belong offers somewhat similar service” (Falla, 1981, p. 166).

While support for the proposal was available, some members still had fears that the current organization of the NCAA structures (i.e., Division I, II, and III) would not be appropriate for women at this time (Falla, 1981). This proposal would be defeated by Division II voters 31 to 44 (Falla, 1981).

The NCAA would appeal the court ruling and bring the case to the U.S. Court of Appeals in 1980 where it was again dismissed by the courts. However, the NCAA was beginning to recognize its legal vulnerability under Title IX (Wilson, 2005). Thus, a third proposal was brought to the 1980 Convention floor to sponsor women’s championships in basketball, field hockey, swimming, tennis, and volleyball for Division II and Division III (“More Than 1,000 Expected”, 1980). According to White (1980), Division I had no immediate plans to implement championships for women. However, the move to have championships in Division II and III was based on the number of members in both divisions that were not members of the AIAW. Assistant Executive Director Tom Hansen noted the following:

“Only 74 percent of our Division III institutions [283 schools total] are also members of the AIAW and only 83 percent of Division II members [179 schools total] belong to the AIAW. This leaves a lot of schools with no national tournaments for women’s athletics” (White, 1980a, para. 6).

After lengthy discussion, both Division II and III approved the sponsorship of five national championships each for women and would go into effect in the 1981-82 academic year (“A Calm Convention”, 1980).

The NCAA’s approval for national championships for women suggested both the NAIA and the AIAW to analyze their current offerings of women’s sports. Upon hearing

the news, AIAW President Carole Mushier criticized both the NAIA and the NCAA for their past attempts to created women's championships ("AIAW Criticizes NCAA, NAIA", 1980). While the NAIA was more than willing to meet with the AIAW about its goals, Mushier's frustrations were mainly directed at the NCAA for its refusal to discuss the problem with the AIAW. At its annual conference in 1980, the AIAW Executive Board had "strenuously opposed" any proposal under consideration at the NCAA Convention that would establish women's championships in Division II and III ("AIAW Criticizes NCAA, NAIA", 1980, para. 5). Mushier would further comment on the situation by arguing:

"The NCAA proposals represent another attempt to deprive women of athletic opportunities and undermine the growing strength of AIAW, the organization created to govern and stimulate women's athletic programs. This latest effort is a continuation of the NCAA's unceasing desire to dominate college athletics. They have traditionally opposed increased opportunities for women athletes. The NCAA traditionally had defined 'athletics' as 'men's athletics'. They have demonstrated no genuine interest in expanding opportunities for women that AIAW now offers, and undoubtedly at more than twice the price" ("AIAW Criticizes NCAA, NAIA", 1980, para. 6-7, 9).

After a history as a forerunner to items that were once taboo, the NAIA was now trailing the NCAA in terms of female participation. In addition, it was condemned by the AIAW for the NCAA's actions at its conference. Thus, at the 1980 National Meeting, Carroll Land was prepared to submit a new women's sports proposal addressing some of the limitations from his prior report (Wilson, 2005). During his deliberation, Land referenced both the Title IX imperatives and the NCAA's vote in order to encourage the members in attendance that the establishment of a women's program for the NAIA was now a necessity instead of an option (NAIA, 1980). Land's recommendation was also vital to the organization as the AIAW began to emerge as a stronger competitor.

During its convention, the AIAW called for a five-year moratorium on both the NCAA and NAIA women's championships in order to avoid any of the corruption that had marred men's programs ("Women's Organization Promises", 1980). The AIAW also agreed to allow all transferring student athletes to compete immediately and receive financial aid after one year in their new institution (Gross, 1980). These decisions made any type of cooperation impossible. Should NAIA member schools wish to compete in the AIAW, they would be in violation of NAIA rules just by following the AIAW's rules (Wilson, 2005). Finally, the AIAW announced it had reached an agreement with the Entertainment and Sports Programming Network (ESPN) to televise some of their championship contests for their Division II and III (Gross, 1980). The AIAW already maintained an agreement with the National Broadcasting Company (NBC) to broadcast AIAW Division I contests for \$1 million over three years (Gross, 1980).

The proposal offered by Carroll Land was to provide women national championships in nine different sports: basketball, volleyball, track and field, cross country, tennis, golf, gymnastics, softball, and swimming and diving ("NAIA Approves Program for Women's", 1980). While more than the NCAA's offerings, the number of women's sports offered lagged behind the AIAW's sponsorship of 17 different championships (White, 1980b). However, Park College Indoor Track Coach Bob Moorman contended that the NAIA should move ahead with the proposal since the AIAW lacked in areas that both the NAIA and the NCAA had already accomplished (i.e., integration and infrastructure) (Wilson, 2005). The AIAW implemented grouping similar to the NAIA's old District 29 member-at-large grouping for black colleges (Wilson, 2005). If the NAIA would sponsor women's athletics, then those female participants

from the all-black schools could participate in an integrated structure. Moorman also noted that the NAIA's focus on smaller schools would provide a more balanced alternative for members instead of the AIAW's mixing of larger and smaller schools (Wilson, 2005).

Wanting to hear from all angles, NAIA officials invited the newly elected AIAW President Christine Grant to argue her case against the policy (Wilson, 2005). She reiterated the argument that the AIAW offers more championship opportunities for women ("Championship Play Approved", 1980). Grant also noted the future plans of the AIAW and its 971 members would be to sponsor 39 national championships in 17 sports on three division levels while providing each school the opportunity to choose its division level by sport (Fields, 1980). She mentioned the AIAW's recent deal with NBC and ESPN and described how the money would be distributed to all three divisions (White, 1980b; Wilson, 2005). Finally, she concluded her arguments mentioning the five-year moratorium voted on by the AIAW delegates as they opposed both the NAIA and the NCAA staging women's tournaments ("Women's Organization Promises", 1980). Despite her pleas, the members in attendance voted decisively (113 to 12) in favor of commencing women's championships ("NAIA Approves Program", 1980). The measure was then sent out to all members through the mail to get final approval. With 79% of the eligible colleges voting, the women's proposal was approved 267 to 119 (Fields, 1980). The plan was set to go into effect in the fall of 1980, an entire year earlier than the NCAA had planned ("NAIA Approves Program", 1980). The first women's champion crowned was the University of Wisconsin-Parkside of Kenosha, Wisconsin, in cross-country (Wilson, 2005). Later in the fall, Azusa Pacific College of Azusa, California, would

capture the first women's national title in volleyball, a sport that was dropped for the men in 1979 (Wilson, 2005).

With the NCAA now trailing in female sport offerings, the 1981 Convention saw many NCAA constituents tackle this issue with new authority. Specifically, a proposal (Proposal No. 51) was brought to the convention floor that would increase the NCAA Council from 18 individuals to 22 while providing a minimum of four positions for women ("Delegates Focus on Four Key", 1981). In a second proposal (Proposal No. 53), the NCAA Executive Committee would also increase from 10 members to 12 and would allocate at least two positions on the committee for women ("Delegates Focus on Four Key", 1981). Proposal No. 51 would gain the necessary two-thirds for passage and triumph with 68.6% of the total vote (369 to 169) despite a requested recount (the recount tally showed 383 for the policy and 168 against) ("Governance Approval Highlights Convention", 1981). Proposal No. 53 passed easily since it only needed a simple majority in comparison to Proposal No. 51, which was a constitutional amendment ("Governance Approval Highlights Convention", 1981).

While there were opponents to Proposal No. 51 and No. 53, there was more heated debate at the NCAA Convention over Proposal No. 72 ("NCAA Yields to Women", 1981). This proposal called for the addition of women's championships to Division I athletics ("Governance Approval Highlights Convention", 1981). According to Falla (1981), the proposal was an amendment to an NCAA bylaw and would only require a simple majority from Division I schools to approve the measure. University of Arkansas Athletic Director Frank Broyles spoke out against the policy, stating the following in regards to the AIAW's rules that prohibit off-campus recruiting:

“Let me make one thing clear once and for all, we will have no choice in the national championships. Any coach knows he’s going to have to meet the competition. If I choose to stay in AIAW, I can’t recruit off-campus and I won’t have the best players. There is no option for any athletic director in this room, believe me, there is no option. You’re asking women to join a method of recruiting that has driven men out of coaching. And maybe double the enforcement staff” (Tucker, 1981, para. 9-10).

A vote occurred after the discussion and would end in a tie (“Governance Approval Highlights Convention”, 1981). Immediately after the count, a second vote was called and the proposal would be defeated by the slimmest of margins (Tucker, 1981).

According to *The NCAA News*, 128 were against the proposal while 127 were for it (“Governance Approval Highlights Convention”, 1981). After the second count, Broyles cheered loudly and would be joined by many others (Tucker, 1981).

This vote would then be followed by another motion to rescind the prior year’s vote at the 1980 Convention and abolish the women’s championships in Division II and III (Falla, 1981). This motion would be overwhelmingly defeated (“NCAA Yields to Women”, 1981). Instead, the entire body would approve the addition of women’s championships in fencing, golf, and lacrosse for Division II and III schools (Tucker, 1981). This adoption put the NCAA members in an odd position. First, any Division I school with women’s teams would have to send them to either Division II or III to compete for a national championship (“NCAA Yields to Women”, 1981). Second, the approval of Division II and III championships created major inconsistencies since the championships in the lower divisions were widely accepted but fought against unmercifully by Division I (Falla, 1981). Because of this argument, a motion to reconsider the stance on Division I was brought to the convention floor and would easily pass with a vote tally of 141 to 105 (“Governance Approval Highlights Convention”,

1981). In the final vote of the day, the Division I delegates finally approved women's championships in Division I with by a tally of 137 to 111 ("Governance Approval Highlights Convention", 1981).

As the NAIA and the NCAA were now beginning to offer national championship opportunities for women, the AIAW was starting to see its decline. AIAW President H. B. Grant was outside the NCAA Convention doors hoping that her message would translate to the NCAA membership (Tucker, 1981). She would continually reiterate the values of the AIAW in the press.

"Since 1970, we have fought to create a strong, viable, alternative approach to athletics and each year the battle to survive has taken a greater toll. I emphasize the fact that AIAW has taken the leadership role in attempting to bring the officers of the three organizations (AIAW, NCAA and NAIA) together. Since the NCAA in November 1978 had declined our invitation to discuss the topic, the executive committee contacted the American Council on Education to urge that their newly created Presidents' Committee on Collegiate Athletics convene a meeting so that the elected leadership of NCAA, NAIA, and AIAW could discuss possible solutions to the many problems facing intercollegiate athletics" ("A Key Time for Women", 1981, para. 8, 10-11).

Despite these comments from Grant, other AIAW officials argued their greatest fear was the organization's loss of control over women's athletics ("Women Fear Power Loss", 1981). After the NCAA Convention, former AIAW President Christine Grant felt that the NCAA would "come to regret" its decision to add women's championships ("NCAA May Regret Latest Move", 1981).

"What I see is women losing control of their own athletics. I can only hope you will be as kind to us as you have been over the years to major college football. You have spoken during this convention of providing us options. But in motion after motion, you have assured women will have no options. You bought your way into women's athletics with promises of money, but I believe you will come to regret your action" ("NCAA May Regret Latest Move", 1981, para. 2-3).

Once women's sports were added to Division I, all schools within Division I would have until May 1981 to decide between the NCAA and the AIAW for national championship play (Henkel, 1981). In order to entice schools, the NCAA promised to provide \$2 million to help fund women's championships as well as funding traveling expenses, something the AIAW did not provide (Henkel, 1981). Thus, many AIAW members left the organization to affiliate with the NCAA. The departures included many schools were already affiliated with the NCAA on the men's side such as the University of Kansas, the University of Missouri, Kansas State University, and the University of Nebraska ("Some Big Eight Women", 1981). However, some colleges decided to stay with both organizations. As an example, Ohio University allowed its basketball, cross-country, swimming and diving, indoor and outdoor track and field, and volleyball teams to compete for NCAA championships while their field hockey, lacrosse, softball, and tennis teams fought for AIAW titles ("OU Makes One-Year", 1981).

The biggest threat to the AIAW centered on the 1981-82 women's basketball championships. In March 1982, the NCAA officially announced its 32-team women's basketball tournament, labeling the tournament as "an historic occasion" for the NCAA ("NCAA Releases First Women's", 1982, para. 1). The bigger story, unfortunately for the AIAW, was centered on the level of competition in the NCAA tournament. Of the Top 20 women's basketball teams, only three had chosen to compete in the AIAW: the University of Texas; Rutgers University; and Villanova University ("History of the Women's", 2001; "Women Cage Powers Vie", 1982). Next, the AIAW would also lose its NBC contract once the NCAA hosted its first women's championships in the 1981-82 academic year ("His Wish Granted", 1982). The AIAW tried to sue the NCAA under the

Sherman Anti-Trust Law in 1982 (“N.C.A.A. Upheld in Trust Case”, 1983). However, this effort would prove to be futile and would lead to the AIAW delegates to vote on suspending all operations in the summer of 1982 (Fields, 1982). The courts also held that legal competition rather than illegal monopolistic practices caused the demise of the AIAW (“N.C.A.A. Upheld in Trust Case”, 1983). Specifically, the AIAW failed to prove to the court any “specific intent necessary to sustain its claim of attempted monopoly” by the NCAA under the Sherman Act (“N.C.A.A. Upheld in Trust Case”, 1983, para. 3).

The NAIA attempted to continue a working relationship with some of the AIAW representatives through March 1981 in order to develop an Athletes’ Bill of Rights (Wilson, 2005). Fritz further explored the possibility of having both the NAIA and the AIAW jointly sponsor women’s championships (Middleton, 1981). While these items did not come to fruition, the NAIA and the AIAW agreed to use the same set of playing rules for their women’s championships which were published by the National Association for Girl and Women in Sport (Fields, 1981). Although the NAIA agreed to this policy, Fritz reiterated that it was in the NAIA’s best interest to allow its members to compete in NAIA championships by the fall of 1982 as long as they abide by NAIA, AIAW, or their own institutional rules, which were typically stricter than the organizational rules (Fields, 1981). Fritz concluded his argument by suggesting:

“We were interested in meeting with A.I.A.W. to find ways to permit dual membership in our organization and the women’s group, without penalizing our schools...But A.I.A.W. insists that their rules must be used...They maintain that only their rules protect students’ rights” (Fields, 1981, para. 8).

According to Crawl (1983), Fritz acknowledged in his annual report that the NAIA women’s division drastically increased from 285 members in 1981-82 academic year to 460 institutions in 1982-83 and forecasted that the women’s membership would

likely surpass the men's membership by 1985. One of the reasons the NAIA saw a tremendous growth in women membership was due to the decline of the AIAW. Many schools within Division I did not have the experience to operate women's athletics and looked to begin their smaller and more low-key programs with the NAIA (Crowl, 1983). Some of the women's teams that initially joined the NAIA were Gonzaga University, Hardin-Simmons University, Marquette University, Pan American University, and the College of William and Mary (Crowl, 1983). Before these schools could officially join, the NAIA had to change its rule that barred Division I schools from participating in NAIA competition (Wilson, 2005). Appropriately, NAIA delegates decided to set up mechanisms that allowed for exemptions to the rule, thus approving the Division I schools to have women's programs within the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). At the 1984 National Meeting, delegates furthered the movement for women by guaranteeing them half of all future vacancies on the Executive Committee, or National Executive Committee (NEC) as it was now being called (Crowl, 1984). Furthermore, NAIA President David Olson established a new Women's Sports Development Committee in the summer of 1985 that would assure a formalized process to focus attention on women's issues (Wilson, 2005).

By 1983, the NAIA provided intercollegiate sport services for approximately 530 schools ("Small-College Group Eyes", 1983). As such, a proposal was made at the 1983 National Meeting to establish two divisions of competition for four sports: (1) men's baseball; (2) men's basketball; (3) women's basketball; and (4) women's volleyball ("Small-College Group Eyes", 1983). While the NAIA had divisions for football, many delegates were against this proposal. Many of the critics noted that the two separate

divisions would result in unnecessary expenses as well as destroying many regional and intrastate rivalries (Crawl, 1983). They also expressed that two divisions would also threaten the popularity the 32-team NIBT (Crawl, 1983). In comparison, those who were in support of the proposal noted the wide disparities in levels of play among institutions such as schools that offered athletic scholarships versus those that did not (Crawl, 1983). After lengthy discussion, the proposal for the two divisions was rejected by the NAIA delegates in attendance at the 1983 National Meeting (Wilson, 2005). Other issues with the Districts also emerged in 1983 when the newly established District 29 in Maryland and Virginia was dissolved immediately after issues with dual membership and small membership (Wilson, 2005). This left the organization with 31 districts until 1985 when District 29 was established as the district for Hawaii schools.

While the NAIA achieved tremendous growth, some governance issues began to surface. In 1980, NAIA President LeRoy Walker first noted that the structure of the NAIA needed “to be consistent with the times and the NAIA constitution and by-laws” (Wilson, 2005, p. 123). By 1983, both Walker and Fritz were also growing more frustrated with the outdated governing structure. The 1984 Annual Meeting prompted many delegates to argue that the 10-member Executive Committee was also not adequate in handling the wide variety of interests of the NAIA (Crawl, 1984). Fritz called for the creation of a task force that would review four possible changes to the NAIA governance structure (Wilson, 2005). First, the National Meeting could become more of a convention that maintained final decision-making authority, similar to the NCAA’s Convention. Second, Fritz suggested a more broad-based executive board that would be modeled comparatively to the NCAA and could bring legislation to the convention and function as

the key-decision maker for the association. Third, Fritz suggested that the Executive Committee would reduce in size and stature, taking more of a committee oversight role over the daily operations and implement decisions of the board and convention. Finally, Fritz recommended that the NAIA overhaul its district alignment as he labeled it as both a strength and weakness (Wilson, 2005).

After the 1984 National Meeting, *The NAIA News* began circulating Fritz's ideas while challenging its readers who believed in the NAIA's mission to maintain the goal of integrating intercollegiate athletics with an institution's educational purpose (Wilson, 2005). The organization continued to reaffirm its commitment to high academic standards at the 1984 National Meeting. However, this affirmation, according to Fritz, was a major reason that many schools were leaving the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Specifically, Fritz argued the members should support the academic standards openly and encourage those dissatisfied with the rules to maintain their membership and not defect to the less restrictive NCAA (Wilson, 2005).

The Presidential Advisory Committee (PAC) was also in favor of these high academic standards. In 1983, the PAC organized its own separate sub-committee called the Presidents' Committee on Academic Qualifications and Admission Standards (Wilson, 2005). At the 1984 National Meeting, the sub-committee, headed by Southwestern Oklahoma State University President Leonard G. Campbell, would make its first proposed legislation by proposing five separate items involving the governance of the organization (Crawl, 1984). The most notable of the proposals involved each member institution's president to appoint a faculty athletic representative that was a member of the school's faculty but not affiliated with the athletic department (Wilson,

2005). All of the sub-committee's proposals were supported by the delegates, with some receiving unanimous approval (Crowl, 1984). The PAC also suggested ways to provide more power to university presidents within the NAIA (Crowl, 1984). According to Wilson (2005), "this desire suggested a different direction for governmental reforms than Fritz had envisions and precipitated two years of contentious debate on the NAIA's future" (p. 145).

In the fall of 1984, Fritz's task force would meet to draw up a proposed new governing structure for the NAIA. Associate Executive Director Wally Schwartz was quoted by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* saying that "the governance model we currently operate under is 40 years old, and it is healthy at times to re-evaluate" ("Sports Study Set by Association", 1984, para. 2). Schwartz continued to note that the NAIA was looking for ways to "bring more people into leadership roles and to have more involvement from college presidents and faculty representatives" ("Sports Study Set by Association", 1984, para. 4). The proposal created by this task force published in *The NAIA News* covered six pages in length. Within the proposal, three new governing bodies would be established: a 50-member council in charge of the regulation of championships and the oversight of all NAIA programs and policies; an eight-member executive board that would oversee the day-to-day operation of the NAIA; and a Council of Presidents (COP) that would provide formal authority to the PAC ("Limits on Playing Season", 1985). In addition, each institution would be allotted one vote for any proposed changes to the NAIA Constitution and the By-Laws (Monaghan, 1985). Interestingly, the Executive Director was not included in this organizational plan (Wilson, 2005).

Eligibility Committee member Arleigh Dotson expressed his desire to remain with the current arrangement since the power would remain with the Executive Committee, and he felt comfortable approaching that body with ideas (Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, Dotson argued if the presidents, district chairs, faculty athletic representatives, athletic directors and other groups feeling left out would recognize how readily they could share in the power, they would be content as well (Wilson, 2005). Another concern from delegates was the proposed structure would increase costs since its implementation would involve more people (Monaghan, 1985). According to Saginaw Valley State College Jack Ryder, “some elements in the proposal could be deleterious to incorporating the numbers of women that should, in the eyes of the executive committee, be involved in the governance process” (Monaghan, 1985, para. 7). In addition, the proposal also provided confusion as there was no coherent line of authority (Wilson, 2005). As such, the delegates in attendance at the 1985 National Meeting voted to withdraw the proposal from consideration for the moment (Monaghan, 1985). However, the NAIA delegates agreed to allow each institution to have one vote instead of the representation design of the past (Monaghan, 1985).

A bigger issue discovered in the meeting minutes of the 1984 Executive Committee meeting highlights the National Executive Committee’s (NEC) negative view of the university presidents (Wilson, 2005). According to the minutes, the NEC believed the presidents developed inefficient proposals that were more focused on the philosophy of ideals instead of their practical implications (NAIA National Executive Committee [NEC], 1984). In addition, the NEC felt that university presidents did not use advisors effectively nor did they appreciate the ability and hard work of the athletic directors

(NAIA NEC, 1984). Point Loma College Athletic Director Carroll Land argued that an increased presidential role would be a detriment to the NAIA since it would undermine the efforts of the athletic directors (Wilson, 2005). Land would concede, however, that some of the issues faced by the NEC in 1985 stemmed from ineffective operating policies established years earlier than he established during his tenure on the Executive Committee (Wilson, 2005).

The NEC also expressed its frustrations with Fritz as the Executive Director of the NAIA. At the 1985 National Meeting, the NEC voted 9 to 0 to review the status of his contract before the end of the summer meeting (Wilson, 2005). The NEC's reasoning for the vote related to Fritz's inability to provide the NEC a coherent and audited budget for the next fiscal year (Wilson, 2005). However, the NEC's view of Fritz was already in decline because of his decline in performance as Executive Director. Fritz also expressed his own frustrations regarding the NEC and seized the opportunity to blister them for their own shortcomings. Fritz felt that each member of the NEC had a narrow focus on their local and/or denominational interests, which worked against the NAIA as a whole (Wilson, 2005). Specifically, the multiple functions that the NEC handled created a gridlock for future NAIA actions. Fritz supported a change in governance in order to eliminate this bottleneck effect. According to Wilson (2005), Fritz's critique was a reflection of "a common frustration of administrators trying to manage departments that had little knowledge of or interest in the organization's overall operation (p. 148).

Interestingly, PAC member, Jeff Farris, expressed his own frustration in regards to the presidents' lack of involvement. By 1985, the PAC was simply an advisory board that did not receive much consideration (Wilson, 2005). As such, Farris and the PAC

members came up with an idea that was indirectly suggested by the NEC. Since the delegates at the 1985 National Meeting approved the one vote per institution rule (Monaghan, 1985), the presidents could theoretically have that vote since they appointed delegates. Thus, the presidents could choose to appoint themselves instead of the customary practice of appointing the athletic directors (Wilson, 2005). The presidents could also forward nominations for the NEC itself and could nominate only presidents to the committee (Wilson, 2005). Farris, however, did not speak for all member institution presidents but rather a small consortium of 25 to 30 that shared similar frustrations (Wilson, 2005).

According to the minutes of the newly established NAIA Summer Meeting, the presidents also wanted the NAIA to enhance its role in order to improve the association (NAIA, 1985). Furthermore, the presidents noted that if the NEC did come forth with a restructuring proposal to include university presidents, then it would be able to solve this problem without any conflict. Farris argued that the presidents must not try to re-design the NAIA (NAIA, 1985). The NEC recognized Farris's viewpoints and believed it was necessary to develop a committee to help craft a new proposal with a target date of action at the 1987 National Meeting (Wilson, 2005). However, the NEC underestimated the urgency of their task. NAIA President David Olson hoped to have a preliminary proposal drafted to give to all the NAIA members by December 15, 1985, but the possibility of taking 18 months to analyze and refine the plan would turn out to be an illusion (Wilson, 2005).

Recognizing Fritz's claim of bottlenecking, the NEC decided to schedule a third annual meeting in the late fall (Wilson, 2005). The first fall meeting, however, was met

in executive session to discuss Fritz's contract as Executive Director. At the meeting, Olson explained that all legal ramifications to the removal of Fritz were still under study and if action was taken now, the NAIA and the NEC may be on shaky ground (NAIA NEC, 1985). Officially, the NEC approved a motion to conduct a thorough annual evaluation of Fritz to be completed by March 1, 1986 in advance of the 1986 National Meeting (NAIA NEC, 1985). However, the NEC also agreed to extend Fritz's contract as Executive Director until July 31, 1987, as an effort to ease tension between the two (Wilson, 2005).

Members of the PAC were also invited to the fall NEC meeting. Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College President Roger Webb brought some issues that the presidents previously identified as concerns for the NAIA: (1) criteria for NAIA membership; (2) season length; (3) number of contests; (4) district inconsistencies toward infractions; (5) failure to communicate with the presidents; and (6) the need for change in the NAIA's structure (NAIA NEC, 1985). After sharing these concerns, the NEC quickly responded by changing the PAC into the Council of Presidents (COP) (Wilson, 2005). The COP was charged with the following functions: proposing changes to the NAIA constitution and by-laws; advising the NEC; reviewing NAIA academic and admission standards; and reviewing NAIA sports programs (NAIA NEC, 1985). It was the NEC's hope that tensions created between the two bodies would ease by providing the presidents with this measure.

These efforts would be in vain, however, as the COP had its own vision for the NAIA. During a joint meeting with other presidents, Mount Mercy College President Tom Feld designed a proposal for a COP takeover of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). After

minor revisions to the plan, the COP scheduled a meeting in Kansas City on November 12, 1985, with NEC representatives David Olson and Roger Jenkinson in attendance. At the COP meeting, former PAC member Jeff Farris was elected as chairman of the COP, and the COP moved quickly to approve Feld's plan to affect a peaceful revolution in the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Feld's plan saw the National Meeting become the legislative branch of the organization; the NEC would serve in an administration role; and the COP would become the governing body of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). This plan would also reduce the NEC's current power. According to Wilson (2005), Olson wondered if the COP's actions would "demoralize athletic directors, district chairs and others in the trenches and if the COP had the time or the knowledge to run the organization (p. 149). While the COP efforts were concerning, Olson and the NEC were also engaged in conflict with Fritz, trying to exercise more effective control over the Executive Director (Wilson, 2005). The committee members were required to have their evaluations of the Executive Director by December 1, 1985, while Fritz was charged with crafting a coherent budget by November 18. As 1986 approached, the COP's proposal was published in various news outlets. University of Central Arkansas (UCA) President Jeff Farris led the charge by spreading the COP's message of attempting to band together to regain control of their athletic programs ("NAIA Regains Control of Athletics", 1986). Farris would further state the following:

"Everybody around the country is concerned about some of the things that are happening in college athletics. Presidents naturally get more concerned when they hear some of these things. I think presidents everywhere have banded together and have begun talking about their role. We have a chance to do some things that can make the NAIA unique and get more attention and respect" ("NAIA Regains Control of Athletics", 1986, para. 2).

Farris further elaborated that he was tired of the NAIA member schools being considered havens for athletes who do not have the grades to get into larger colleges (“NAIA Presidents Joining Forces”, 1986). To elaborate on this remark, Farris stated:

“It really disturbs me to read all the time about this blue-chip athlete who is not eligible to play for any NCAA school, so he’ll probably have to go to an NAIA institution. That’s embarrassing. It’s also terribly embarrassing for an athlete to play four years and still be three and a half years short of any degree” (“NAIA Presidents Joining Forces”, 1986, para. 5).

Farris also commented that the NAIA member schools do not have an effective way to enforce association rules (“NAIA Regains Control of Athletics”, 1986). Farris called the current system “an honor system” and “if you’re accused, you are asked if you are guilty and if you say no, that’s it” (“NAIA Regains Control of Athletics”, 1986, para. 8). He finally mentioned that the NAIA has “an organization entirely run by athletic people...you don’t expect them to legislate things that will make their jobs tougher” (“NAIA Regains Control of Athletics”, 1986, para. 9).

The COP’s proposal was also disclosed to the media. According to *The Daily Leader*, the new structure would give the COP three responsibilities held by the NEC: the continuing review and evaluation of academic standards; the budget and all fiscal matters of the NAIA; and the employment and supervision of the Executive Director (“NAIA Council Proposes New”, 1986). The COP members would be comprised of either school presidents or chief executive officers (CEO) that are elected from each of the 32 districts (“NAIA Shifts More Responsibility”, 1986). The NEC would retain administrative duties but would report to the COP under this proposal (“NAIA Shifts More Responsibility”, 1986). According to Farris, the primary goal of this plan is “to get the president more meaningfully and actively involved in the affairs of the NAIA”

(“NAIA Shifts More Responsibility”, 1986, para. 5). Furthermore, Farris noted that “the presidents can work productively with the athletic people...not that we don’t have good academics, but we have to continue to improve and define what they are” (“NAIA Shifts More Responsibility”, 1986, para. 6).

Mount Mercy College President Tom Feld informed some reporters that restructuring the NAIA was in discussion for many years but recent turmoil in college athletics prompted the presidents to act (Wilson, 2005). Feld clarified this statement with the following:

“Intercollegiate athletics in this country has been a disgrace, and the public is fed up with it. We don’t have the same problems that the big National Collegiate Athletic Association institutions have, but we don’t want to wait until there are problems. We want to address the issues now” (Farrell, 1986, para. 7).

Misericordia College President Joseph Fink noted the presidential authority over the NAIA affairs would distinguish the NAIA member schools from the NCAA institutions (Farrell, 1986). While the NAIA members felt pressures to win, Fink believed constant presidential review of athletics policies will keep sports in the proper student-athlete perspective (Farrell, 1986). In contrast, NAIA President David Olson questioned whether each university president would have the time to control the NAIA’s affairs. Olson described his feelings with the following:

“I don’t consider the proposal a personal affront, but I have some questions whether presidents have the time and commitment to do some of the things they say they want to do. I spend considerable time, significant periods of time at a stretch, with NAIA business. Whether the presidents can do likewise remains to be seen. I think we have made significant headway in redesigning the NAIA. Any time you can involve chief executive offices in the athletics program of an institution, it has been my experience that it is a very positive thing” (Farrell, 1986, para. 17-18).

However, the new policy would still need to acquire two-thirds of the membership vote to change the power structure of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). In order to acquire the necessary votes, the COP began encouraging its fellow university presidents to contact the athletic department and assuring them that the change would not be a hostile takeover. Instead, the COP's change was a way for the presidents to work cooperatively with the athletic staffs (Wilson, 2005). In addition to talking with the athletic staffs, many presidents decided to appoint themselves as their institutional delegate for the National Meeting (Wilson, 2005). Others had gathered proxies from presidents who would be unable to attend the 1986 meeting (Farrell, 1986). As such, Wilson (2005) described this power play by the COP as the "great proxy battle of 1986" (p. 151). NEC member Carroll Land further denounced this ploy by the COP as undermining the democratic nature of the NAIA. In response to the proxy vote, Tom Feld said:

"The apprehension will fade as long as the presidents, in essence, don't do that anymore. The proxy was needed this year for us to have a meaningful role. The presidents don't intend to collect proxy votes in the future, but the proxy vote is important to those institutions that can't make the convention. I think the district chairmen should get those votes" (Farrell, 1986, para. 11).

The COP's tactic would prove to be successful as the plan to restructure the NAIA was overwhelmingly approved 319 to 55 (Farrell, 1986). Effective August 1, 1986, the COP would enjoy rule over the decision-making process of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Several members were encouraged by the change but still had reservations about the COP's position. North Carolina Central University President Leroy Walker noted:

"It's the right move, with certain concerns addressed. The bottom line, in the NCAA and the NAIA, is that presidents are responsible. And if they're responsible, they have to get directly involved. If they're not going to attend meetings and don't get involved in athletics, it is not going to work. Until they

become more involved with the concerns with athletics, then the things that happened at Tulane and Georgia are going to continue to happen” (Farrell, 1986, para. 16-17)

Walker acknowledged a point-shaving scandal at Tulane University in 1985 as well as a lawsuit filed against the University of Georgia where a former instructor spoke about the favoritism to athletes at Georgia (Farrell, 1986). Dakota Wesleyan University President James Beddow also acknowledged:

“You’d be surprised by the level of interest by the presidents. The NAIA is mostly small institutions know a lot more about what goes on their campuses than presidents of large institutions. These presidents know athletic programs and they know them well. All the presidents understand that it is ‘put up or shut up’ time. There is a commitment there to see it through the long haul. I can guarantee presidential involvement from here on in. I don’t think this is Halley’s Comet” (Farrell, 1986, para. 22-23).

As the COP vote was occurring, the NEC also considered what to do in regards to its Executive Director. According to Wilson (2005), Fritz felt he was punished for shoddy work conducted by the NEC, causing the COP to conduct their hostile takeover. While Fritz was a well-liked individual, he appeared to be incapable of change and would not adapt to the new regime of the NAIA. Thus, the NEC made the decision to remove Fritz as the NAIA’s Executive Director and delegated him to be a consultant to the COP effective April 1, 1986 (Lederman, 1986). His removal, however, was complicated as Fritz refused to vacate his office and had to be forcibly ousted by security (Wilson, 2005). Once Fritz was removed as Executive Director, the NEC named Wally Schwartz, the Assistant Executive Director, to the position on an interim basis while also serving as Chief Operating Officer (COO) (Wilson, 2005).

As Schwartz became acclimated to the new NAIA regime, he was also able to analyze the organization’s budget (Wilson, 2005). The fiscal budget was an item that

generated much conflict between Fritz and the NAIA. Since he was named to the position, there were rumors that the NAIA was in financial trouble. In 1979, an article in *The Kansas City Times* quoted anonymous sources that identified the NAIA's money issues ("NAIA is Ailing Financially", 1979). Some of the items mentioned from these disgruntled employees include the following:

Financially, we're as low as we've ever been. When Al Duer (former executive director) left, there was a big reserve, but now there is none, we have nothing to fall back on. And we're in trouble ("NAIA Suffering Financial Woes", 1979, para. 2).

Everybody's near panic. There's a real worry about expenditures, needless expenditures. There is concern, and it is quite justified.

There is an overall mood of depression. We're carrying on a façade. Things are shaky.

We shouldn't be trying to go big time – putting our football games in the Kingdome or trying to develop international competition. We started out as an austere organization and that's the way it should stay ("NAIA is Ailing Financially", 1979, para. 6, 9, 11).

In reference to the final quote, the NAIA held its 1977 Division I championship game in the Kingdome in Seattle, known as the Apple Bowl, and the International Cup basketball tournament in Kansas City ("NAIA is Ailing Financially", 1979). Both of these contests were believed to be overall failures (Wilson, 2005). In response to these accusations, Fritz denied that the NAIA had financial difficulties.

"I don't know where you got your information but there is no crisis problem. There is a continual financial problem, but most organizations have concern about meeting expenses. We have to watch our P's and Q's... We don't need money to exist, just to exist as an organization. But we do in order to exist and do all the things we'd like to do. We've been very jealously guarding our reserves at the approximate level" ("NAIA is Ailing Financially", 1979, para. 4, 8).

This issue continually kept the NEC and Fritz in constant conflict as the NEC called for better accounting practices. When Fritz was removed as Executive Director, Schwartz discovered why.

On May 6, 1986, Schwartz analyzed the NAIA budget and noted that the organization had approximately \$160,000 in its checking account and \$315,000 in accounts payable (Wilson, 2005). Fritz had also compiled bills in his desk drawer, paying them only as money became available. In addition, any budget statements provided by the NAIA were only snapshots at a given moment because Fritz continually moved funds from the NAIA and the NAIAC in order to establish solvency (Wilson, 2005). The financial issues were a major concern to the presidents and the requests for better accounting standards can be labeled as a cause for the COP takeover. Regardless, the financial health and stability of the NAIA was in serious doubt and would have significant ramifications that would be felt the organization for many years.

The Decline Period (1986 – 1995)

The COP was scheduled to be in charge of the NAIA's budget, academic standards, and hiring practices on August 1, 1986 (Farris, 1986b). While Schwartz was running the office on an interim basis, it was UCA President and COP Chairman Jeff Farris who became the de facto head of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). According to Wilson (2005), Farris issued a press release noting the NAIA's immediate tasks were to develop an operating budget reflecting the sports programs offered by the organization and to select the successor for the Executive Director. While these were the main concerns, Schwartz did oversee some new policies.

One of the most discussed items for all organizations during the 1980s involved the abuse of illegal drugs. While illegal drug use had always been a concern, it was not until the 1985 that a formal effort was made on the collegiate level to provide drug testing. At the 1985 NCAA Convention, the Special NCAA Committee on Drug Testing presented Proposal No. 75 as an effort to have drug testing in the NCAA (“Questions and Answers Concerning”, 1986). An official NCAA program would be reviewed and formally discussed in 1986 as many member schools were already conducting their own drug testing programs. As an example, according to a December 1984 survey, approximately 90 of 518 member schools sampled conducted some form of testing (“Questions and Answers Concerning”, 1986). Many prominent NCAA coaches also spoke in favor of drug testing. As an example, North Carolina State University Athletic Director and Basketball Coach Jim Valvano was a major proponent for drug testing and prevention in intercollegiate athletics (Droschak, 1986).

“I don’t have the answer to drugs, but I am mad as hell about it. Without question, our goal is to have a drug-free athletic program. It is an important issue that must be discussed this year. We have the opportunity as athletes to make a strong statement and hopefully help solve problems as opposed to saying it’s everywhere and we just reflect that. My own personal opinion – and this is Jim Valvano talking and not the university – is a very strong and hard line on drug testing. If a youngster is shown positive, I want him off the squad” (Droschak, 1986, para. 2, 4, 7).

While having the support of many high-ranking NCAA members it took tragedies to prompt action on the drug issue. Perhaps the most widely known happened in June 1986 when University of Maryland All-American Len Bias was found collapsed in his dormitory room and pronounced dead after two hours of unsuccessful attempts to revive him from an apparent heart attack (“Bias May Have Used Cocaine”, 1986). Bias was selected as the second overall pick in the NBA Draft by the Boston Celtics and medical

reports relayed that Bias had cocaine in his system when he died (“Bias May Have Used Cocaine”, 1986; Keteyian & Selcraig, 1986). Although what happened to Bias was unfortunate, the incident provided rationale for intercollegiate athletic associations to institute drug testing policies. In the end, the NCAA nearly unanimously approved the testing for “street drugs” as well as performance-enhancing drugs (“NCAA Schools Vote to Test”, 1986).

The NAIA also recognized the severity of this problem and implemented its own policy in July 1986 (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA required its 480 members to stress education over punishment by adopting a drug education and screening program by the end of 1986 (“NAIA Members Adopt Drug”, 1986). The Policy on Substance Abuse stated:

“Drug abuse is a major social problem which demands the attention of all segments of society, in particular the education community. The magnitude of the problem compels this association to accept the responsibility to provide leadership in educating student-athletes who may be using or may be under pressure to use drugs” (“NAIA Members Adopt Drug”, 1986, para. 3).

The COP and the NEC required all member schools to submit a policy statement by January 1, 1987, which would outline their position on drug abuse and describe their method of educating student athletes on the problem and screening for their use (“NAIA Members Must Adopt”, 1986). Furthermore, by January 1, 1988, all institutions must have screened their student athletes (Wilson, 2005). Before this official NAIA policy came into effect, many member schools instituted their own individual drug education and drug screening plans. As an example, the University of South Carolina at Spartanburg (USCS) USCS Athletic Director Gene DeFilippo commented:

“We have an education program and drug testing program, so yes, I guess you can say we’re ahead. We have a drug education program where we bring in Dr.

Harold Moody to talk to the kids about health hazards and talk about damage drugs cause to the heart, liver, brain, etc. We also will do some things differently this year like brining in former addicts of alcohol and drugs to talk about the problems they went through” (“NAIA Members Must Adopt”, 1986, para. 8-9, 11).

Schwartz was proud of the stance that the NAIA was taking since it favored education over punishment. He further elaborated on this point by suggesting:

“It creates a statement that these abuse substances are more than just a passing thing when you make a big fanfare saying you are going to check at national events. We felt that this was enough of a concern that it needed to be addressed by each and every institution, not just once a year but throughout the whole year” (“NAIA Members Must Adopt”, 1986, para. 16).

Schwartz’s comments outlined the major difference between the NAIA and the NCAA drug-testing policies. When the new program went into effect on January 1, 1988, all NAIA schools were required to screen their student athletes for drugs at any time during the year – before, during, or after an athlete’s season (“NAIA Considering Tougher Drug”, 1986). The NCAA’s plan only required drug screening at championship events and bowl games (“NCAA Schools Vote to Test”, 1986). Many of the NAIA officials encouraged the stance the NAIA took to combat drug abuse. College of Charleston Athletic Director John Krese felt that the NAIA has “the better system” and can “possibly curtail possible use of drugs more than the NCAA” (“NAIA Considering Tougher Drug”, 1986, para. 4). Presbyterian College President Kenneth Orr also noted:

“My sense of it (the plan) was that the NAIA developed a policy that needed to be more of a pervasive and not one that focuses only on those teams or individuals participating in championship events. By pervasive, I mean the institutions need to look at the problem as a whole and respond to it” (“NAIA Considering Tougher Drug”, 1986, para. 6).

Although the NAIA still competed with the NCAA on many aspects of intercollegiate sport, the NAIA did not enjoy the same financial standing. Thus, when

the COP had its first official meeting as the administrative board in July 1986, budgetary issues were the first item discussed (Wilson, 2005). COP and Administrative Committee members Leonard Campbell and Tom Feld presented a preliminary budget proposal based on analysis of the association's finances as of the 1985-1986 fiscal year (NAIA Council of Presidents [COP], 1986). Campbell and Feld proposed that the organization work on a budget of \$125,000 for the next fiscal year starting on August 1, 1986 (NAIA COP, 1986). According to Wilson (2005), the COP discussed ways to increase its revenue including charging its members a registration for the NAIA's National Meeting which would bring in an additional \$30,000 in revenue. In terms of costs, the COP agreed to eliminate the practice of paying for meals at NAIA events and meetings (NAIA COP, 1986). In addition, the COP agreed that the budget 1987-1988 fiscal year needed to be balanced (Wilson, 2005). In order to achieve a balanced budget, the COP agreed that many of the sporting events should be self-supporting and specifically focused on the women's NIBT. The women's postseason basketball tournament was a big money loser for the NAIA, and the COP decided to subsidize the women's NIBT up to of \$30,000 (NAIA COP, 1986).

The COP was also considering the official successor to Harry Fritz as Executive Director. While originally a task that was conducted by the NEC, the hiring of the Executive Director was now under the sole jurisdiction of the COP (Farris, 1986b). As such, most of the search committee for the new position appears to have come from the COP Administrative Committee: Chairman Leonard Campbell of Southwest Oklahoma State University; Tom Feld of Mount Mercy College; Joe Struckle of Northwest Oklahoma State University; Fred Young of Elon University; and John Tomlinson of

Mesa State University (Wilson, 2005). While there was an extensive search, the group focused on one major candidate: COP Chair and UCA President Jeff Farris. However, Farris was not interested in the position initially. In an interview with *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Farris noted that he was happy at UCA since he was at the school for 26 years (Lederman, 1986). Yet, through the search committee's persistence, Farris became excited about the prospect of running the NAIA (Lederman, 1986). Feld had specifically noted that "one of Jeff's strengths, which was important to the search committee, is that he has played many roles in the NAIA...he will bring all those perspectives to his job as executive director" (Lederman, 1986, para. 14). Farris became the choice for the Executive Director, and he agreed to assume the role officially on December 1, 1986 (Wilson, 2005). Farris established many goals upon his arrival to the position. His main focus was on the student half of the student-athlete, specifically examining examine and clarifying the academic standards of the association (Lederman, 1986). In addition, Farris identified that he wanted to precisely define the role and mission of the NAIA; develop external sources of funds through corporate and business support; and increase the association's membership (Lederman, 1986)

Before Farris formally took office, the COP was already working on ways to expand publicity of the NAIA. In March 1986, the COP negotiated with ESPN to televise the 50th NIBT semi-finals and championship rounds to a national audience in 1987 (Atkin, 1986). According to Wilson (2005), in order for ESPN to televise the event, the NAIA would have to solicit \$250,000 in advertising. The COP and the NAIA worked hand in hand with the Kansas City Area Chamber of Commerce in order to raise the funds since everyone involved saw the broadcast deal as an opportunity to boost the

organization's visibility (Wilson, 2005). Their efforts would prove to be fruitful and ESPN televised the 1987 NIBT (Jablonski, 1986; Wilson, 2005). The American public was treated to two semi-final match-ups between Central Washington University of Ellensburg, Washington, and Washburn University of Topeka, Kansas, as well as West Virginia State University of Institute, West Virginia, and Georgetown College of Georgetown, Kentucky ("Jackets Nip Tigers", 1987). Washburn would narrowly edge Central Washington 65 to 63 and meet West Virginia State, who dominated Georgetown 74 to 67 ("Jackets Nip Tigers", 1987). In the 50th NIBT Finals, Washburn defeated West Virginia State 79 to 77 to capture its first national championship ("Washburn Ichabods Edge West", 1987).

The golden anniversary of the NIBT was successful and ESPN was impressed with the event. An estimated 1.5 million homes nationwide tuned in to see the ESPN telecast of the NIBT ("NAIA Men's Basketball Tournament", 2012). As such, an agreement was reached to televise the men's NIBT finals for the next five years (Wilson, 2005). According to the agreement, ESPN would carry live broadcasts of the semi-finals and championship games in the first year, but only the championship game in subsequent years ("NAIA-ESPN Sign Contract", 1987). ESPN President and CEO J. William Grimes noted that "the dream of all NAIA players is to go to Kansas City and play in the tournament...ESPN will enable [sic] millions of basketball fans to be able to share in the players' unforgettable experiences ("NAIA-ESPN Sign Contract", 1987, para. 3). Farris also shared his excitement for the ESPN contract by stating:

"ESPN is giving us an opportunity to showcase the championship game of the tournament on which our association was built. At the same time, we can show the viewers that the NAIA is more than a basketball tournament. We are an

athletics association to the education of our student-athletes” (“NAIA-ESPN Sign Contract”, 1987).

With one of Farris goals achieved, the COP would also focus time on getting the organization financial affairs in order. In November 1986, Schwartz announced the various associations within the overall NAIA body (i.e., coach association; athletic director association; sports information association; etc.) would have separate accounts for funds generated by their own dues structure in an effort to end the accounting system that Fritz employed during his tenure as Executive Director (Wilson, 2005). Each association was now in charge of the development of formal budgets in order to distribute money properly and take responsibility for all spending decisions (Wilson, 2005). Fortunately, this reform policy would be short lived as the COP would develop a new dues schedule that would include the membership fees for these particular associations. Since the NAIA’s budget was primarily derived from membership dues, Farris and the COP were forced to analyze their financial health while encouraging members to escape the customary barebones budget (Wilson, 2005). As such, the COP would propose a drastic increase in membership dues in January 1987 and would not be officially approved until April 1989 (NAIA COP, 1989). The proposed plan was a phased in fee increase over three years to a range of \$2,250 and \$3,300 per year based on the population of the school (NAIA COP, 1989). According to Wilson (2005), “the new assessments provided a much more solid base for NAIA operations than had ever been the case before” (p. 165).

The most important element that Farris wanted to focus his efforts on was to upgrade the academic standards for NAIA student athletes (Lederman, 1986). Farris wanted the NAIA to be placed head and shoulders above the NCAA when it came to

academic standards (Wilson, 2005). Therefore, the NAIA began implementing policies that differed significantly from the NCAA standards. As an example, NAIA members voted to disallow remedial courses in determining an athlete's academic load in 1987 (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA agreed that classes that contributed to an athlete's graduation would be the considered in the student's academic load. As such, the COP established a task force on academic standards that met before the September 1987 COP meeting. The task force included athletic directors, coaches, members from the Eligibility Committee, and district chairs, and they agreed on a consensus plan of attack on higher education standards (Wilson, 2005).

The members of the task force recognized that the NCAA also looked to increase its academic standards. The NCAA's campaign focused primarily on a proposition on freshmen eligibility, Proposal No. 48 (Wilson, 2005). At the 1983 Convention, NCAA delegates voted to require freshmen student athletes entering college in the fall of 1986 to have achieved at least a 2.00 grade point average (GPA) in a core curriculum of 11 academic subjects as well as achieving a minimum score of 700 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) or a 16 on the American College Testing (ACT) test to be eligible for practice and participation in Division I athletics in their freshman year (White, 1986). After discussion at the Convention, however, the proposal would be not be phased in until the start of the 1986-1987 school year and that incoming freshman athletes would be required to secure a 2.20 GPA and a 660 on the SAT or a 13 on the ACT to qualify for full eligibility ("Changes in 'Proposal 48' Will", 1986). If the student had a GPA of 1.80, the student could still qualify for eligibility with an SAT of 740 or an ACT of 17 ("Changes in 'Proposal 48' Will", 1986). These figures would continue to be adjusted

until the proposal would be fully implemented in the 1988-1989 school year with the only exception that a 15 on the ACT was the floor instead of the proposed 18 (“Changes in ‘Proposal 48’ Will”, 1986).

When Proposal No. 48 was passed by the NCAA, there was a mixed reaction to the policy. Randy Beard of *The Herald-Journal* praised the NCAA for its approach “to strike fear into the hearts” of major college athletic directors as well as football and basketball coaches everywhere (Beard, 1987, para. 1). However, the proposal had major repercussions to intercollegiate athletics. According to a survey of major-college football and basketball recruits in 1986, almost 500 incoming freshman would be ruled ineligible for practice or regular season participation during their first year in college (Bock, 1986). Many of these students were found to attend predominantly black schools (Bock, 1986). While the number of athletes ruled ineligible is high, few in intercollegiate athletics were surprised by the account. According to Gavie Hopkins, Assistant Athletic Director at the University of Arizona, “young people recruited to be impact players in revenue sports generally come from poor educational backgrounds” (Bock, 1986, para. 16).

Furthermore, Hopkins added, regarding Proposal 48:

“I oppose using test scores to adversely affect a class of people from going to college and getting a degree. The tests are biased. When has any inner-city disadvantaged community ever tested well. I am an example of that. Don’t test from a background of knowledge. Test what these kids have lived, smelled, and tasted for two to three generations” (Bock, 1986, para. 18).

In contrast to Hopkins, Arliss Roaden, executive director of the Higher Education

Commission in Tennessee argued:

“I like the legislation, but I think in the future the NCAA ought to look at increasing the standards. They are awfully low right now....I am disappointed, though. After it was passed, with the time frame for implementation, nobody really believed it would happen.

There seemed to be an undercurrent of feeling that they'd back off. When they didn't, athletes were caught unprepared when they shouldn't have been. They were warned" (Bock, 1986, para. 22, 24).

While the NCAA Council saw the struggles with the implementation of Proposal No. 48, the NAIA was figuring how to implement a similar plan and extend it further.

According to Wilson (2005), the COP wanted student athletes to demonstrate their academic seriousness and progress toward their degree. First, the NAIA required its student athletes to maintain a 2.0 GPA for the duration of their careers ("NAIA Clarifies Academic Rule", 1987). In addition, the COP mandated that student athletes must complete 12 credit hours to participate in sports in their first semester of play; 24 credit hours to play in their second season; 48 credit hours for their third season; and 72 hours for their fourth season starting in the fall semester of 1989 ("NAIA Approves Legislation", 1988). Furthermore, the NAIA's plan required member schools to be accredited by one of six accrediting bodies. Those schools that do not have accreditation would have four years to meet this standard ("NAIA Approves Legislation", 1988). Farris and the COP were proud of this policy as it separated them from the NCAA in terms of academic eligibility. Farris also shared:

"This represents a giant stride and one that will allow us to say to all of our constituencies that we are placing athletes in a proper perspective as an important part of our institutions. This clearly places the NAIA as the athletic association which demonstrates...that only bona fide college students will represent our institutions in our athletic programs" ("NAIA Approves Legislation", 1988, para. 3-4).

Dr. Richard Rosser, president of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities also praised the NAIA for their policy.

"This is really a pioneering effort by the NAIA to put emphasis on academic progress. Anything which improves the emphasis of academic enterprise is sorely needed. We must restore the idea that 'athletes' is the secondary consideration or

emphasis among the student-athlete” (“NAIA Approves Legislation”, 1988, para. 5-6).

Despite the success of the proposal’s passing, the COP was continually frustrated by the NAIA’s lack of visibility in comparison to the NCAA. According to *The Herald-Journal*, some NAIA member schools felt that the organization had fallen behind the NCAA in terms of academic standards (“NAIA Approves Legislation”, 1988). Farris acknowledged this belief was “the strangest thing I’ve found in the year I have been in this job with NAIA is the perception that the academic standards of the NAIA somehow are lower than the academic standards of the NCAA” (“NAIA Approves Legislation”, 1988, para. 15). This claim was substantiated by the COP’s Marketing and Membership Committee public opinion survey on college athletics (Wilson, 2005). The results of the survey data showed that the American public had a negative view on college athletics, believing it to be overemphasized in schools or plagued by various problems (e.g. gambling; drug use; etc.) (Wilson, 2005). The most surprising result from this study, however, was that the NAIA did not even register with the American people. Furthermore, a survey of ten major media sources showed that none of the organizations could name Farris as Executive Director and only two (*Sports Illustrated* and *The Los Angeles Times*) knew of the NAIA’s greater commitment to academics (Wilson, 2005). In order to increase the NAIA’s appeal, the Marketing and Membership Committee created a public relations department as well as a department of membership services to handle publications, ratings, statistics, and awards (Wilson, 2005).

The NAIA delegates also had many considerations for altering the on-field product. First, the NAIA agreed to limit member schools to schedule up to 65 baseball

games, 11 football games, and 32 basketball games per year (Rhoden, 1989). According to Farris, the NAIA never had this restriction before.

“That’s been an issue, sort of, on why we didn’t and nobody ever knew except with a small association we kind of know what each other is doing...We put a great deal of emphasis on academics. And also if we’re going to compete for national championships, let’s all compete on as level of a table as we can” (“NAIA Sets Limits on Sporting”, 1989).

There were also arguments for the expansion of championship offerings as well as division splits for some of the NAIA sponsored national championships. In 1986, the NAIAC had recommended that the football, softball, and women’s basketball postseason should be expanded for the 1987 season and divisions for men’s and women’s basketball (“NAIA against Expansion Format”, 1986). During his interim tenure as chief administrator, Schwartz noted that the NEC had “concern for athletes missing more class time, whether the number of participating schools justified expanded playoffs, and the financial impact of the institutions and the association” (“NAIA against Expansion Format”, 1986, para. 3). One year later, the football playoffs would expand to 16 teams in Division I and 16 in Division II (“Blue Hose ‘Meet’ Lions”, 1987; Wilson, 2005). Unfortunately, this increase would only last for two years as the number of schools competing in Division I reduced to the point where the playoffs were reduced to eight teams (Moore, 1989). The football division splits were also going through problems in the late 1980s and early 1990s. By 1989, 52 schools from seven conferences were playing Division I football while 105 schools in 12 conferences competed at the Division II level (Wilson, 2005). Ultimately, the NAIA would return to undivided competition in football by 1997.

NAIA President Roger Jenkinson reengaged the NEC on the division split issue in February 1987 by appointing a task force to research the possibility of splitting men's and women's basketball into two divisions (Wilson, 2005). After discussing several task force recommendations, the delegates in attendance of the 1988 National Meeting approved the division split by a two to one margin and instructed the NEC to develop a formal plan for the 1989 National Meeting (Wilson, 2005). The NEC proposed creating two divisions in men's and women's basketball as well as baseball and volleyball ("NAIA to Split in 4 Sports", 1989). After hearing the proposal, the delegates in attendance at the 1989 meeting overwhelmingly supported the NEC's proposal with a 257 to 143 vote ("NAIA Split Decision Affects", 1990). Farris explained:

"The split will mean schools which commit roughly the same resources to athletics will play each other, avoiding situations where smaller schools must try to compete against larger ones. Our championship opportunities have been dominated more and more by our members who place greater emphasis on the financing of their programs. This has caused discussion in recent years about the desirability of a second division in our competition, a division for the lower emphasis programs" ("NAIA to Split in 4 Sports", 1989, para. 2-3).

Although the proposal was accepted, the NEC postponed its implementation until 1991 ("Changes Mark NAIA Convention", 1990). Specifically, the NAIA chose to have separate divisions of competition for men's and women's basketball beginning in the 1991-1992 academic year while volleyball would be implemented in 1993-1994; baseball was postponed indefinitely ("Changes Mark NAIA Convention", 1990). By the spring of 1990, Farris notified the NEC Divisions of Competition Committee that a consensus on the issue seemed elusive (Wilson, 2005). While there was an acceptance of the proposal, some schools were opposed of the separation plan developed by the NEC. According to Wilson (2005), "some schools flatly said they would bolt from the NAIA if divisions

were not adopted to give them a better chance to compete” (p. 169). Kansas Wesleyan coach Dennis Wahlgren shared this resentment and noted that “year in, year out, we can’t compete with Division I NAIA schools because of their budgets and what they can give in athletic scholarships” (“State Schools Applaud NAIA”, 1990, para. 6).

The basic guidelines for the division split required at least half the member institutions participating in a sport for them to be eligible for divisions with the expectation that at least 100 institutions would fit into each division (Wilson, 2005). In addition, the divisions had to promote competitiveness and be financially stable. By 1991, the division split would only occur in men’s and women’s basketball (MacKay, 1991). Despite plans for a division split, the 1993-1994 volleyball split never occurred (Wilson, 2005). The initial distribution of schools saw 235 schools go to Division I men’s basketball and 184 in Division II. Women’s basketball schools were divided 199 and 194 respectively (Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, the championship tournaments in Division I would have 32 teams competing for a national championship while Division II only included 20. Finally, the COP agreed to have the Division I NIBT would be held in the Kemper Arena while the Division II NIBT would be held on the campus of Tarleton State University in Stephenville, Texas (MacKay, 1991).

The 1989 National Meeting in Memphis would have its fair share of surprises. Feeling that he had achieved many of the goals that he set for himself when he was named Executive Director, Farris made the startling announcement that he was retiring from his position (NAIA COP, 1989). Farris’s health started to decline, and he was concerned that he would not be able to effectively perform his duties and that his choices were “either not to work the way I wanted to work or get out” (Lederman, 1989, para. 3).

However, Farris believed the NAIA was a healthy organization and now was the right time to step down (Corbitt, 1990a). In addition, unlike the past Executive Directors, the NAIA already had Farris's successor on staff: Athens State College and Calhoun Community College President James Chasteen (Corbitt, 1990a; 1990b; Lederman, 1990a). Chasteen's appointment as Executive Director would start on January 1, 1991, but Farris would retire at the end of July 1990 (Corbitt, 1990b; Lederman 1989). When Farris had retired in July 1990, the NAIA's membership count was 465 (Wilson, 2005).

On his way out, Farris realized that the new governance structure was plagued with defects that hindered the effectiveness and efficiency of the association (Wilson, 2005). By 1986, the COP was intended to function like a college board of trustees but tended to stray into the day-to-day functioning of the association. This action interfered with the NEC's assigned role which focused on the administration of the organization (Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, the national office staff found working with the COP to be a more difficult connection than with the athletic directors of the NEC. According to Wilson (2005), "many athletic directors grew disenchanted with the NAIA, but once they had taken power, the presidents were not about to give it up" (p. 171). Further, other NAIA members questioned why the NEC had not been eliminated when the COP's plan had implemented their takeover in 1986. The original plan by recognized that divided leadership would threaten the day-to-day operations and chose to eliminate the NEC (Wilson, 2005). On the other hand, Farris sought to make the transition as smooth as possible and decided to retain the NEC. This decision proved to be problematic as the power division grew stronger as each year passed (Wilson, 2005).

By the fall of 1988, the COP revisited the governance structure through establishing a research committee with Tom Feld in charge (Wilson, 2005). This frustrated members of the NEC, including newly elected NAIA President Phyllis Holmes, the first female president of the organization (“NAIA Has First Female”, 1988). Holmes expressed her frustration with what she perceived as the COP’s attempt to pursue a flow-through method policy similar to what the NCAA has and stray from the original grassroots governance that the NAIA had historically used (Wilson, 2005). At the 1989 COP Meeting, the COP developed and approved a new governance plan that featured the COP, athletic directors, and faculty athletic representatives as equals with a coordinating council drawing from the three to blend their perspectives (NAIA COP, 1989). Specifically, the COP would focus on the finance and development of the association; the athletic directors would handle competition; and faculty athletic representatives would oversee eligibility and academic standards (Wilson, 2005). The NEC asked to review this plan and won a delay in voting until the 1990 meeting (NAIA COP, 1989).

However, the COP began to have reservations about sharing power on an equal basis and decided to create a new proposal for NAIA governance (Wilson, 2005). Farris created a new proposal that had membership at the top, the COP next, and followed by the Executive Director, with a National Coordinating Committee to advise him. Beneath the Executive Director were three equal bodies: the athletic directors, the faculty athletic representatives, and the district chairs. The delay in voting allowed the COP to change its vision from sharing power to ruling without the NEC’s constraints. The NEC countered this proposal with one of their own. It was similar to the COP but included a renamed NEC (the National Administrative Council) that would keep its college-board

oversight mission. Feld noted that the NEC's proposal undermined the Executive Director's administrative role in favor of creating an Administrative Committee, whose only purpose would be to extend the NEC's power. As the 1990 National Meeting approached, COP member Joe Struckle notified the NEC that the original proposal would win handily. Realizing potential defeat, the NEC withdrew its proposal and accepted a compromise proposal with the COP to give them ultimate control ("NAIA Officials Compromise", 1990).

Thus, delegates in attendance of the 1990 National Meeting showed unanimous approval for the COP plan (Lederman, 1990b). The COP would now have full governance of the NAIA while the NEC would be disbanded by the end of 1990 ("NAIA Votes to Go", 1990). The COP would be comprised of college presidents from each of the 32 geographic regions while the Executive Director would report directly to them ("NAIA Split Division Affects", 1990). The Executive Director title, however, would now change to the NAIA's Chief Executive Officer ("NAIA Split Division Affects", 1990). Additionally, a nine-member National Coordinating Committee (NCC) was established and would oversee the athletic directors, faculty athletic representatives, and district chairs ("Changes Mark NAIA Convention", 1990). The NCC would report directly to the CEO. Since the NEC was to disband, this meant that the office of the NAIA President would be abolished, leaving the CEO as the de facto figure head of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005).

Chasteen faced challenges when he was instituted as the CEO. First, he had to overcome his own limitations. For example, Farris participated at nearly every level of NAIA athletics and was very familiar with the organization. Yet, Chasteen had no

athletic experience and focused primarily on the educational side when reaching the position of President at two Alabama colleges. Further, Chasteen was a charter member of the COP and served as chairman of the National Committee on Academic Standards (Wilson, 2005). He provided many in the national office with positive reinforcement and created a pleasant working environment, but he did not connect well with the membership because of his lack of sports experience (Wilson, 2005).

Chasteen was committed to his job and decried that his focus would be on membership and resource development in the immediate future (Wilson, 2005). However, results on this front never seemed to materialize as membership within the NAIA continued its decline. From 465 members in the fall of 1990, membership dropped to 436 in the fall of 1991, 409 in 1992, and 389 by the fall of 1993 (Wilson, 2005). This drop was the biggest departure in membership since the 1973 NCAA Reorganization. There were several theories as to why membership decreased such as the tightened academic standards. Other reasons focused on financial aid limitations. The COP declared limits in scholarships in all sports including football (33 full scholarships in Division I and 12 in Division II) and basketball (12 scholarships in Division I and 3 in Division II) (Luder, 1992a). Some schools were also deterred by a new NAIA policy that mandated that any booster club funds were controlled by the institution instead of the athletic department (Wilson, 2005). Through oversight from the university, the NAIA attempted to avoid the abuses that many NCAA programs experienced with out-of-control boosters (Lowitt, 1986). Many, of course, were enticed by the NCAA's ability to offer more financial incentives compared to the NAIA. In 1989, the NCAA reached an agreement with CBS to televise the NCAA Division Men's Final Four for \$1 billion for

the next seven years starting in 1991 (Gerard, 1989). The funds received from CBS would go toward the sponsorship of both men's and women's sports, specifically Division II and III, as well as broadcasting the national championships for 16 different contests ("Schultz Seeks Members' Ideas", 1989). According to Wilson (2005), the highly publicized deal "surely caught the attention of financially-strapped NAIA athletic directors and presidents" (p. 187).

Two other items have been argued to be reasons for the declining membership. The first reason stems from discussion that began in 1986 when an editorial in *The Kansas City Star* mentioned the possibility of the NAIA offices searching for a new home (Wilson, 2005). Many cities began enticing the organization to move by offering buildings, tax breaks, and several other perks. The COP "frequently decried [its] low place on the Kansas City sports pecking order, with the NCAA, the Royals, the Chiefs, the Kings, and the Big Eight basketball tournament all seeming to attract more local attention" (Wilson, 2005, p. 169). By 1990, the City of Canton, Ohio made a formal offer for the association to move from its original Kansas City home (NAIA COP, 1990). The COP considered the offer but formally rejected it by an 18 to 9 vote (Kerr, 1990; NAIA COP, 1990). The COP felt that the smaller size and difficult air access offset the advantages that Canton offered over Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). The COP then voted to stay in Kansas City as long as the city kept its promises (NAIA COP, 1990). However, the NAIA's lease with the Midland Building was still set to expire in the summer of 1991 (Wilson, 2005).

The relationship between the NAIA and Kansas City was further altered when the NAIA was required to reschedule the 1990 NIBT due to a Big Eight basketball game

(“NAIA Tournament Gets Snub”, 1990). Thus, on September 30, 1992, the NAIA announced that it would move its headquarters as well as the NIBT to Tulsa, Oklahoma, by the summer of 1993 (“Basketball; N.A.I.A. Approves”, 1992). Kansas City officials and even NAIA staff members were surprised by this announcement as well as the COP’s unanimous decision to move (Luder & Fitzpatrick, 1992). Chasteen commented that Tulsa Mayor Rodger Randle made the initial contact with the NAIA and offered an outstanding deal (Luder, 1992d). According to Wilson, (2005), Randle initiated the negotiations and offered discounted floor space and parking; country club memberships; and a supportive community as incentives for the NAIA to consider relocation. Chasteen further elaborated:

“There’s a lot of financial support and a commitment to amateur sports (in Tulsa). Here (in Kansas City), I think the commitment is to professional sports, and I understand that. If you list all the sports priorities in Kansas City, the NAIA would not be at the top. Tulsa will take us as their top priority” (Luder, 1992d, para. 2-3).

The COP was able to conduct these negotiations in absolute secrecy and kept the move a surprise to everyone in attendance of the 1992 National Meeting. Members of the NAIA national office staff were not told until minutes before it was announced to everyone in attendance, including senior NAIA staff member Wally Schwartz (Luder, 1992d).

According to Wilson (2005), Schwartz discussed the rumors of a possible move with Chasteen, and Chasteen brushed off the rumors. A few hours later, the move was announced and Schwartz felt betrayed. John Laney, Vice President of the Greater Kansas City Sports Commission shared Schwartz sentiments, stating “we are disappointed, to put it mildly, and perplexed. I would certainly hope that we have the opportunity to discuss with them what the problems were that led to this” (Luder & Fitzpatrick, 1992). Many of

the athletic directors in attendance of the 1992 National Meeting were also caught off-guard. William Jewell College Athletic Director noted the move hit him on a personal level (Luder, 1992e).

“I think all of us are in an emotional state of shock. Whenever you’re in a situation like this, you need some healing time to step back and see how to react. Right now, it affects my emotions from a standpoint of close personal relationships. In my case, the NAIA means a basketball tournament in Kansas City since I was in high school in 1957. The NAIA means making a local call to Wally Schwartz about eligibility. The NAIA means that, if I needed something from the national office, Steve Veal (Vice President of Championships) lives close enough to come by and drop it off” (Luder, 1992e, para. 2-3).

Frank Diskin, Athletic Director at Rockhurst College, felt bothered “that the leadership of this association doesn’t trust the membership enough to let them in on what’s going on until after it happens” (Luder, 1992e, para. 6).

A second reason as to why schools may have considered leaving the NAIA centered on another one of its cornerstones: the district system. The NAIA always prided itself on the district organization and the grass-roots approach to governance (Wilson, 2005). When Farris was Executive Director, he received a recommendation from the NEC to institute a guideline for all districts to have at least 10 member institutions. The NEC appointed an alignment committee to rearrange some of the southeastern districts and made a recommendation to Farris and the NEC (Wilson, 2005). To Farris and national office’s surprise, there was no feedback from member institutions in Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana. According to Wilson (2005), Farris was “embarrassed because he had written to them on the assumption that they were aware of the plans” (p. 182). This plan was scheduled to go into effect in August 1991, but Farris postponed the order out of respect to the affect areas. Hawaii also faced issues due to revenue sharing. The NAIA by-laws noted that districts were to send a portion of their playoff revenues to

the national office to help fund championships (Wilson, 2005). Since Hawaii schools always had to come to the mainland for district playoffs and championships, Hawaiian schools had trouble funding their travel costs. As such, the COP agreed to let members in Hawaii keep their district playoff revenues to cover their travel costs (Wilson, 2005).

By the 1991 National Meeting, several affiliated conference commissioners requested the COP to assess the role that affiliated conferences would play in the NAIA future (“NAIA Votes to Ditch”, 1993; Wilson, 2005). In February 1992, the Futures Committee advocated integrating the conferences into the governing and championship structures in some way. The COP called for an ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for a governance structure through conference affiliation at the 1992 National Meeting (Wilson, 2005). Chasteen also shared his thoughts on the affiliated conference proposal noting that “the NAIA has always been built around the district structure, but we’ve really notice the growing importance and significance of affiliated conferences” (Luder, 1992b, para. 3). During the first day of meetings, many delegates appeared to be in favor of the proposal. NAIA Futures Committee member Joel Thomson shared:

“I think it’s in the best interests of the association. It does a couple of important things for the association. It allows colleges to form associations with a common ground. And it allows teams to compete for conference championships, win that conference and not have to compete again to qualify for national competition” (Luder, 1992c, para. 7).

Thomson noted that 67% of the NAIA member institutions at this time were members of an affiliated conference (Luder, 1992c). Under the proposal, a winner of an affiliated conference would advance automatically to region or area competition and to national competition (Luder, 1992c). Schools that are not affiliated with conferences could still qualify for regional and national competition through district play (Luder, 1993).

In October 1992, the COP would assemble another committee that was dedicated to the role of affiliated conferences and would be chaired by Hastings College President Bob Boerigter (Wilson, 2005). The goal of this committee was to flesh out the conference recommendations and develop a plan to make conferences a central part of NAIA operations. When the COP gathered in April 1993, the committee presented a detailed map to achieve its goals, including the placement of conferences and independents in regions based on the specific sport (Wilson, 2005). The proposal noted that basketball would be the first sport that would see the implementation of regions in the 1993-1994 academic year with other sports adopting it the next year (“NAIA Votes to

Table 5-9 - 1993 NAIA Division I Men's Basketball Region Alignment

Conference	Membership
Arkansas Intercollegiate	9
Carolinas Intercollegiate	8
Chicagoland	7
Eastern Intercollegiate	6
Georgia Atlantic	9
Golden State Athletic	7
Gulf Coast Athletic	9
Heart of Texas	6
Kentucky Intercollegiate	7
Oklahoma Intercollegiate	6
Sooner Athletic	6
Show-Me Collegiate	6
Southern States	8
Tennessee Collegiate	9
West Virginia Intercollegiate	14
Wolverine-Hoosier	7
Pacific Northwest (Independent)	7
Pacific Northwest- Montana (Independent)	5
Great Lakes (Independent)	12
Far West (Independent)	6
Far West- Hawaii (Independent)	3
Southeast (Independent)	7
Southwest (Independent)	11
Midwest (Independent)	10
Northeast (Independent)	8

Ditch”, 1993- see Tables 5.9 and 5.10). In order to qualify for the 32-team Division I men’s basketball tournament, a team would have to win one of the 16 affiliated conferences; one of the nine regional berths for independents; or one of the seven at-large slots (Wilson, 2005). The Division II men’s tournament had a 24-team field made up of 14 conference champions, seven regional independents, and three at-large teams (Wilson, 2005).

Table 5-10 - 1993 NAIA Division II Men's Basketball Region Alignment

Conference	Membership
Central Atlantic	9
Florida Sun	8
Heart of America	9
Kansas Collegiate	9
Lake Michigan	7
Mayflower	7
Mid-Central	6
Midwest Classic	7
Nebraska-Iowa	7
North Dakota Athletic	6
Northwest	7
South Dakota Intercollegiate	6
Tennessee-Virginia	11
Texas Intercollegiate	6
Pacific Northwest (Independent)	9
Southwest (Independent)	8
Midwest (Independent)	10
Great Lakes (Independent)	10
Great Lakes (Independent)	7
Northeast (Independent)	8
Northeast (Independent)	10

The COP approved these recommendations and put it on the agenda for the 1993 National Meeting. The COP also explained how conferences would qualify as an affiliated conference: must have at least six member institutions; a charter or constitution with appropriate officials, eligibility rules, and standards that matched NAIA rules; and sponsor at least one men’s and women’s sport in fall, winter, and spring (Wilson, 2005).

The committee still wanted to retain districts; however, no sufficient role could be sustained for them. Thus, the district system was eliminated. After the proposal was refined, the Council of Affiliated Conferences and Independents (CACI) was created to replace the district chairs on the NCC. Members in attendance of the 1993 National Meeting overwhelmingly approved the policy by a vote of 262 to 58 (“Reorganization for the N.A.I.A.”, 1993).

The difference in votes can be explained by those member schools in a conference and those that are classified as an independent (Luder, 1993). William Jewell women’s coach Debbie Baker was in favor of the change and believed “it makes our conference more competitive knowing the stakes are higher” (Luder, 1993, para. 3). In contrast, Rockhurst College Athletic Director and men’s basketball coach Frank Diskin voiced:

“I thought the district concept was a grass-roots concept. With the district system, you developed some great in-state rivalries. I can’t see us developing a great rivalry with Minnesota-Duluth...It makes it difficult for us, especially in increased travel. It makes you look real hard at getting into a conference. We continue to look” (Luder, 1993, para. 4, 9).

Avila University men’s basketball coach Fred Turner shared Diskin’s concerns and believed that the NAIA was hurting themselves (Luder, 1993). He further stated that “the districts were working smoothly, and the rich tradition is with the district system” (Luder, 1993, para. 12).

After making the move to Tulsa and abolishing the district system, Chasteen was proud to announce that the NAIA had a budget surplus of \$437,000 in 1993 (Wilson, 2005). This surplus was a substantial increase from the 1992 surplus of \$122,000 and the 1991 deficit of \$47,000. The financial success of the organization led the COP to begin sponsoring women’s golf tournaments in the 1993-1994 fiscal year and then as a

championship sport in 1994-1995 (Luder, 1992f; Wilson, 2005). In addition, the Division II men's basketball tournament would expand from a 20-team tournament to a 24-team and then a 32-team tournament by 1995 ("College Basketball", 1994). The organization also envisioned a plan for a championship festival, similar to an Olympic festival, in the spring involving at least eight sports starting in 1998 ("Sports Digest", 1994). However, this expansion phase would not last long nor would the profits.

At the 1995 COP Meeting, the presidents discussed reducing the number of basketball teams for the postseason to 16 each as well as hosting both division tournaments in the same city (NAIA COP, 1995). In addition, the COP agreed to end the two-division structure in football after the 1995 playoffs (Wilson, 2005). These moves were a result of a shrinking budget that supported an \$182,000 deficit and more uncertainty (NAIA COP, 1995). According to Blum (1995), membership shrunk from 474 institutions in 1988 to 392 in 1995. Furthermore, from 1990 to 1993, 92 schools left the NAIA while only 15 joined during the same timespan (Blum, 1995). Nearly 50 members also held memberships with the NCAA and could easily leave around this time (Blum, 1995). Membership would continue to fall to a membership count less than 300 institutions today ("About the NAIA", 2013). Westminster College Athletic Director Joseph Fusco summarized the defection by noting:

"We've been a loyal member of the NAIA, and they have been good to us. But we see erosion of membership nationally. We needed to take care of ourselves, to be in a good position in case the worst happens" (Blum, 1995, para. 4).

Many feared that the mass exodus of members would cause the NAIA to fall including Bard College Athletic Director Joel Thomson. Specifically, Thomson stated:

“I’d hate to be the one to put the nail in the coffin. My gut feeling is that unless a significant number of NCAA members look in a different decision and join, I don’t think the NAIA will hold up for the next three years” (Blum, 1995, para. 6).

Chasteen, however, denied these suggestions and felt the changes that were made in the past two years would “position itself solidly for the future” (Blum, 1995, para. 7).

Chasteen believed the drop in membership was related to the change in governance as well as its toughened standards on academic eligibility, financial aid, and its move from Kansas City to Tulsa. Chasteen further explained his expectations believing that membership would range between 375 and 400 once the membership fluctuation settles (Blum, 1995).

The Stabilization Period (1995 – 2002)

Chasteen had good reason to be upbeat and expect the institution movement to subside. The NAIA now had an unlikely ally in its favor: the NCAA. Many schools were leaving the NAIA to join the NCAA, specifically Division III. This movement caused the membership count in Division III to increase exponentially. According to Wilson (2005), if each division was counted separately, Division III would be the largest athletic association, followed by the NAIA, Division II, and finally Division I. Because of their rapid growth, the NCAA Council implemented a two-year freeze on membership growth on Division II and III until changes in the governance structure were in place (“Restructuring Prompts Moratorium”, 1995). NCAA President Eugene Corrigan explained the moratorium with the following:

“The NCAA is not refusing new members, but time is needed to work through the long-range impact of restructuring and membership growth. There is no desire to exclude institutions with athletics programs comparable to those of current members...During this period, the Association will study and evaluate appropriate procedures and criteria for NCAA membership in light of the potential for a large

increase in the number of schools that might want to join” (“Restructuring Prompts Moratorium”, 1995, para. 6, 8).

This alliance was more apparent when Huggins (1996) wrote an article entitled “Stronger NAIA Eases Threat of Excessive Growth in Division III”. In the article, University Athletic Association Executive Director and Division III Task Force member Richard Rasmussen noted that “a strong NAIA is a very healthy thing for the NCAA...it relieves the pressure on Division III of having to deal with excessive growth” (Huggins, 1996, para. 6). Similarly, NAIA President Bill Patterson remained upbeat about the NAIA’s future. He explained:

“The problems we are facing are the rumors, not the reality. We feel that the one problem we have is rumor control. Both the NAIA members and the NCAA members, as we express our concerns, are making a problem out of a non-problem. The (NCAA) moratorium gives us some time to allay some fears” (Huggins, 1996, para. 10).

The NCAA moratorium would be extended to four years on August 1, 1997 and is still continued to this day as an orientation program for schools joining the NCAA (“Membership Total Hits 1,261”, 2000).

However, teams moving from the NAIA to the NCAA never seemed to stop. The reason many schools were considering Division III over the NAIA was due to its non-scholarship nature. Many schools in the NAIA were more comfortable with the Division III philosophy of no athlete financial opposed to the limited financial aid provided by the NAIA (Huggins, 1996). However, other schools maintained other reasons. The University of Wisconsin of Platteville (UW-P) made the move to the NCAA because of the high membership dues (Leitner, 1990). UW-P Sports Information Director Terry Owens further accounted:

“The dues for the NAIA memberships were up and the ones for NCAA Division III aren’t as expensive. In the postseason, the NCAA will help defray some of the costs, whereas the NAIA doesn’t. It was an economic decision...The NAIA has lost a ton of teams. It is in a lot of trouble. It was an obvious decision to go to the NAIA” (Leitner, 1990, para. 3, 6).

Western Washington University basketball coach Brad Jackson noted that when his school was considering transferring to the NCAA, membership in the NCAA was more prestigious (“Washington Colleges Could Leave”, 1991). Jackson noted that “the NAIA is looked upon as a little brother or sister, or almost a nonentity by some people” (“Washington Colleges Could Leave”, 1991, para. 11). Northeastern Oklahoma State University (NOSU) Athletic Director Gill Cloud also considered several factors but “the primary one has been scheduling differences, particularly in football...The number of NAIA Division I schools had dwindled so drastically we can hardly fill our schedules” (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994, para. 3). Southeastern Oklahoma State University Athletic Director Don Parham made efforts to stay with the NAIA due to their charter member status but saw other Oklahoma schools depart for the NCAA (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994). Furthermore, Parham offered:

“NCAA membership dues are \$900 compared to approximately \$3,500 to \$4,000 NAIA dues. The NCAA also pays our catastrophic insurance (\$6,000 to \$7,000), provides strong financial support for playoff teams and allows members at all levels to share in the NCAA’s lucrative football and basketball TV income” (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994, para. 5).

In order to combat these losses, the COP approved a program to permit dual members eligibility exemptions for one sport (NAIA COP, 1996). The COP also discussed potential ways to attract those members who regretted leaving the NAIA for the NCAA (Wilson, 2005). The COP developed a time table for recruiting new members while laying out its expectations for members of the COP including being strong

advocates for the organization (NAIA COP, 1996). The NAIA also attempted to correct its financial issues by providing a stable national body. Sister Grace Mary Flickinger, chairwoman of the Council of Faculty Athletic Representatives reported that the NAIA's budget was balanced (Monaghan, 1995). While explaining the budget, Flickinger further noted:

“Some schools have left because they thought it was to their financial benefit to join the more wealthy organization. Some left when we established more-stringent academic policies. I think that if we can establish more-stringent reporting policies on financial aid, more will leave” (Monaghan, 1995, para. 6).

Despite the losses, however, both Flickinger and Chasteen remained positive about the current membership. Flickinger argued that those schools that remain are here “because they are committed to the NAIA's philosophies” (Monaghan, 1995, para. 8). Chasteen continued to feel that the organization had turned the corner and felt that membership would range around 350 over the next five years (Monaghan, 1995).

However, these promises appeared to be nothing more than just hopes and prayers. Westminster College Athletic Director Joseph Fusco provided the following when discussing his institution's move to Division II:

“We had to ask ourselves the question, as a national organization with a declining membership, ‘What is the appeal for industry and business and others who support athletics to continue to support the NAIA?’. I have seen no real strong effort on the part of the present administration to stem that tide. I see a continual decline. I don't see a viable organization with 300 or fewer schools” (Morgan, 1995, para. 1-2).

Fusco's comments reflect the lack of management from the COP due to the group's high turnover rate. According to a study of the 225 institutions between 1986 and 1994, the turnover of presidents was an often cited reason for their departure from the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). From 1992 to 1995, the president turnover from the COP was 90 percent

(Wilson, 2005). Many of the members that voted for the move to Tulsa or elected Chasteen as the CEO were now gone from the organization. An average of 50 new presidents per year had taken over NAIA institutions and many of them had experience with the NCAA instead of the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). In addition, the presidents had many other issues to consider at their university level. With the low morale in the mid-1990s, the COP was led to make tough decisions.

In June 1996, the COP decided to buy out the remaining time on Chasteen's contract and remove him as CEO ("NAIA's Chasteen Hanging", 1996). Many members faulted him for the NAIA issues, noting that "he failed to understand or be responsive to the needs of the membership" (Wilson, 2005, p. 206). The COP felt that Chasteen needed to have a better grasp as to which schools were at risk for moving but instead chose to watch them leave (Wilson, 2005). The COP allowed Chasteen to resign from his position and named NAIA President Bill Patterson as the interim CEO until a replacement could be found (Ferguson, 1996). When Patterson was appointed, he gave an impassioned speech to the members at the 1996 National Meeting that set the goals for the organization (Wilson, 2005).

"The NAIA is not dying. Our survival isn't threatened. Today more than ever athletics is governed far too much by money and greed than education. It is driven by won-loss records rather than academics. We must not let this organization deviate from its goal... We have 362 NAIA schools in 45 states and British Columbia, and over the last 10 years we've had a net loss of 109 institutions, 14 of those schools didn't meet NAIA accreditations and 37 more are either merged or gone" (Ferguson, 1996, para. 5, 7).

While Patterson was in charge on an interim basis, Western Montana College Chancellor Shelia Stearns and Georgetown College President William Crouch were in charge of finding Chasteen's permanent replacement ("NAIA' Chasteen Hanging", 1996). Both of

them agreed that the next CEO of the NAIA should not be a college president. Instead, they felt that the new CEO should be able to bridge the gap between presidents and athletic directors as well as market the NAIA effectively. After considering several individuals, Stearns and Crouch settled on Steve Baker as the new CEO of the NAIA (Ferguson, 1997).

Baker was a former Major League Baseball (MLB) pitcher for four seasons (Wilson, 2005). While his playing career was rather mediocre, Baker joined the MLB Commissioner's office in New York working for MLB International (Ferguson, 1997). Baker served as the Vice President in the marketing department, overseeing operations in Europe. Over a period of seven months, both Stearns and Crouch got to know Baker as he researched the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Vice President of NAIA Championships Lynn Adams was excited about the hiring of Baker (Ferguson, 1997). She explained that "Steve came to the front of the candidates very early...In fact, he had on-the-job training by visiting NAIA schools and educators to be sure this was going to be a right fit for him" (Ferguson, 1997, para. 6). When Baker was hired, he appeared at the April 1997 COP meeting in Tulsa showcasing his commitment and familiarity with the NAIA. Although there would need to be some time to develop a comfort level between the COP and Baker, the membership received a boost of morale due to Baker's outside nature.

After speaking with many NAIA presidents, Baker set forth a plan of action centered on his perceptions of the NAIA's problems. Some of the items that Baker identified include the continued lack of visibility for the NAIA and its championship events and poor communication between the national office and both member institutions and the public (Wilson, 2005). Part of the reason for the poor communication dealt

primarily with the structure of the NAIA governance. After discussing issues with many member institutions, Baker got the message a restructuring of regions was needed again in order to create the needed interaction between member schools and the national office. As such, Baker made suggestions to enhance the regional plan that would be centered on cutting expenses and creating media and corporate excitement at the regional level (Ferguson, 1998a). Based on Baker's suggestions, the Regional Enhancement Task Force proposed three options at the 1998 National Convention:

“The status quo; the national basketball tournament with an eight-team field beginning at the regional level (seven geographic areas; or the reduction of the national field to 24 teams with eight geographic regions and a decrease in qualifiers in the individual sports” (Ferguson, 1998a, para. 4).

Those in attendance were in favor of the regional enhancement policy. COP Chairman Bill Crouch felt that a decision could be reached by the end of the meeting (Ferguson, 1998b). He also argued:

“It would be my desire to approve most of the regional enhancement program, and leave further studies of the Far West and Northeast regions to the task force. Except for those areas, most of the NAIA membership is in the Heartland of our country” (Ferguson, 1998b, para. 2).

However, Baker was not satisfied with the proposed regional enhancements. As such, the CEO proposed an expansion of regions to 14 to the COP where each region would be comprised of at least two conferences and no more than three (Bunch, 1999). After an extended discussion, the COP approved the proposal due to its attendant marketing plan. By the year 2000, the regional emphasis meant COP members represented both their college and region while much of the NAIA governance was handled by Regional Management Committees, similar to the past district chairs (Wilson, 2005).

In addition to the region expansion, Baker proposed at the Spring 1999 COP meeting to transition the NAIA from its dues assessment based on enrollment to a flat fee for all members (Wilson, 2005). Baker argued that by basing dues on full time equivalent (FTE) enrollment was an imperfect science since enrollment would always fluctuate. More importantly, the historical dues assessment was based on an assumption that smaller enrollments meant fewer sports could be sponsored. After another lengthy discussion, the COP implemented a three-year adjustment period, beginning in the 2000-01 academic year, where dues would move to a flat \$4,400 (Wilson, 2005). Although this amount was substantially higher than the \$900 in fees for Division III, Baker hoped that the NAIA assessment would decrease as alternative revenues would become available.

As Baker became acclimated to his position, the membership numbers for the NAIA remained fairly constant between 1997 and 2002. According to Wilson (2005), “from 344 members in 1997-98, of which 70 were dual members and thus mostly expected to move to the NCAA when their probation time was up, membership declined only to 332 by 2001-02” (p. 220). This stabilization in membership started to give the NAIA its confidence back. As such, the COP implemented a policy that halted any school waiting for NCAA admission to be unable to compete in NAIA title competitions. This new policy helped the NAIA distance itself from the perception that “if you can’t be in the NCAA, you can always play NAIA ball” (Wilson, 2005, p. 220). The COP would also establish a \$1,500 application fee for schools seeking to join the NAIA as well as instituting more rigorous screening of applicants to determine their viability.

As the end of the 20th century approached, the organization began to question the main office and the NIBT were in the best location. According to a study conducted by Creative Resources in 1996 showed the move from Kansas City to Tulsa severely damaged the organization (Wilson, 2005). The membership never felt included in the decision-making process to consider the move to Tulsa, nor did the leadership clearly communicate the true purpose of the move (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA's lease with Tulsa would expire in 1998, and Baker did work with Tulsa and Mayor Susan Savage on a renewal (Klein, 2000). Baker was committed to staying in Tulsa and attempted to come up with a future plan for the NAIA (Klein, 2000). However, the organization had its issues within Oklahoma. First, attendance in the Mabee Center paled in comparison to the crowds in Municipal Auditorium or Kemper Arena in the 1960s and 1970s (Wilson, 2005). The 1999 Division I NIBT would only draw about 31,000 attendees, approximately 4,000 less than the NIBT's draw in its final year in Kansas City (Klein, 2000). Nevertheless, the NIBT was a successful event for the Tulsa community. In 1994, the NIBT was estimated to bring more than \$11 million into the city's economy while the NAIA Convention, Men's and Women's Tennis Championships, and the Men's Golf Championship would generate an additional \$9 million (Hartnett, 1994). The NAIA was also viewed as a boost to the Tulsa economy for approximately \$65 million by 1999 ("Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should", 1999). Baker acknowledged the economic success by suggesting:

"This organization can thrive here in Oklahoma, and we think we're doing a pretty good job of making it here. It would just help us a lot if we had more participation by as many schools as possible in Oklahoma" ("Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should", 1999).

Baker was fully aware that the organization lacked the historic connection that it originally had in Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). Many schools within the Oklahoma region moved to the NCAA, robbing the NAIA and the NIBT of potential local appeal (“SOSU Leaves NAIA For”, 1994). Moreover, it appeared that none of them were willing to move back. Oklahoma City University Sports Information Director Tony Sellars felt his school was happy with its decision to move to Division II (“Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should”, 1999). NOSU Athletic Director Gil Cloud also noted that after investing four years becoming active in Division II, his school had no plans to return.

“We were completely surrounded by states that had made the decision to go to NCAA. Finding comparable opponents in all sports, not just football, became a problem. We felt for the longevity of our program that’s where we wanted to be” (“Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should”, 1999, para. 16).

By 1999, the NAIA and the City of Tulsa were negotiating to move the organization into the downtown area (Bunch, 1999). The deal negotiated would have the NAIA move the NIBT to the Maxwell Convention Center for 2000 and 2001 while also carrying a three-year renewal option (Bunch, 1999). Baker showcased his enthusiasm stating that the NAIA was “excited to establish this partnership with the Tulsa Convention Center and we appreciate the efforts of the Tulsa Sports Commission to help make this move a reality (Bunch, 1999, para. 4). However, this support was more of a façade as Baker had issues scheduling meetings with Mayor Savage to discuss the NAIA’s importance to the downtown developments (Wilson, 2005). Baker’s continued frustrations led to his recommendation to the COP to seek requests for proposal from cities that had expressed interest in the NAIA in April 2000 (Bunch, 2000a). As news of this broke, Oklahoma City requested an exploratory meeting with Baker in an attempt to lure both the NIBT and national office (Bunch, 2000b). As time progressed, the COP

would receive bids from 18 cities interested in housing the organization: Branson, Missouri; Chula Vista, California; Cleveland, Ohio; Denton, Texas; Fort Wayne, Indiana; Grand Rapids, Michigan; Hardin County (Jackson), Tennessee; Kingsport, Tennessee; Lexington, Kentucky; Lincoln, Nebraska; Louisville, Kentucky; Memphis, Tennessee; Mobile, Alabama; Muncie, Indiana; Olathe, Kansas; St. Charles, Missouri; and Tulsa, Oklahoma (Bunch, 2000a).

The NAIA had several requirements for their new home but they wanted to engage in a specific strategy to pick the right home. First, the chosen city should be within 45 miles of an international airport (Bunch, 2000c). In addition, the city should have five NAIA schools within a 100-mile radius as well as access to a basketball facility with seating of 7,000 (Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, the city should provide adequate ground transportation and hotel rooms to house national tournament participants (Bunch, 2000c). By September 2000, the Relocation Committee reviewed the proposals and narrowed the group down to five: Cleveland; Fort Wayne; Lexington; Olathe; and St. Charles because the NAIA decided to leave Tulsa for good (Bunch, 2000c, 2000d). The front runner of these cities was believed to be Olathe, Kansas, a suburb 20 miles southwest from Kansas City (Wilson, 2005). Its proposal included 27 acres to construct a convention center, hotel, and 8,000 to 10,000 seat arena (Bunch, 2000c). In comparison, Fort Wayne established a committee to raise \$1.5 million in private money to lure the NAIA and designated three sites in to house the headquarters (Bunch, 2000c).

By the end to 2000, both Lexington and Cleveland had withdrawn their bids leaving only three finalists. After leaving Kansas City, Missouri, rather abruptly in 1994, the COP decided on Olathe over Fort Wayne and St. Charles (Fields, 2001). Olathe

maintained the built-in advantage over the other two cities of representing a return to the association's roots (Wilson, 2005). The NAIA would join in a partnership with the Olathe School District and the City of Olathe in the construction of the new headquarters. The school district was committed to provide \$100,000 per year for ten years starting in 2001 and be used for capital costs of a convention center (Bunch, 2001). The Olathe Chamber of Commerce anticipated that the NAIA would generate an economic impact of \$20.7 million in industrial output, 300 jobs, and \$6.4 million in increased total earnings by Kansas City households (Bunch, 2001). However, the calling card for the COP was Olathe's efforts to promote character similar to the NAIA's plans to offer character-based sportsmanship programs (Fields, 2001).

During the negotiation process, Baker announced a program focused on character building and sportsmanship ("NAIA Unveils Program on Sportsmanship", 2000). Known as the Champions of Character, the program encouraged the 328 member schools to set character standards and accountability in NAIA sports ("NAIA Unveils Program on Sportsmanship", 2000). The program called for the emphasis of five core values that would govern both officials and student athletes in the classroom, on the athletic field, and in the community: Respect, Integrity, Responsibility, Community Leadership, and Sportsmanship (Covitz, 2002). According to Baker, this program was established for the NAIA to devise its own brand while setting it apart from the NCAA (Covitz, 2002).

Baker further noted:

"Before you figure out what your brand is, you ask the question, 'What do we do well?'. The answer from our membership was we utilize participation in sport to create solid citizens. It's the academic experience, a good education, that character-building as you play sports. We were turning out citizens who participate in the community. They're teachers, lawyers, doctors, civil servants, moms and dads" (Covitz, 2002, para. 47).

The NAIA sought to change the culture of sports by ending trash talking and unsportsmanlike behavior while seeing the importance of being a team player and following the instructions of coaches (Boyce, 2001). The program also attempted to end the use of profanity by both athletes and coaches (Boyce, 2001). Olathe recognized the Champions of Character program as a positive and chose to promote its bid by emphasizing the focus on character. Once the NAIA returned, Olathe became the first community to take part in the program (Boyce, 2001).

The combination of the Champions of Character program and the NCAA moratorium helped the NAIA maintain its membership, even charting an increase in members in 2001 (Boyce, 2001). However, several schools were awaiting the end of their application period. As such, the membership count in 2002 decreased to 307, a loss of 28 schools (Wilson, 2005). While most of these schools left to join the NCAA, some went to other organizations or even worse ended their athletic programs (Wilson, 2005). However, the decline stabilized rather quickly in 2003 despite falling under 300 members. In response, Baker chose to pursue some potential prospects to join the association. In March 2003, Baker listed six different categories of schools to target including the newly labeled historically black universities and colleges (HBCUs); Division II schools facing budget cuts; Division III schools that recognized possibilities for generating enrollment increases through athletic scholarships; and schools in Canada and Mexico (Wilson, 2005). The Canadian pursuit proved to be a fruitful attempt as the University of British Columbia, the University of Alberta, and the University of Victoria joined the Simon Fraser University in the NAIA between 1999 and 2001 (Wilson, 2005).

The NAIA received another boost when it reached an agreement with College Sports Television (CSTV) to broadcast national championship games (“NAIA and Cable Station Reach”, 2003). The agreement was a five-year deal that gave CSTV the exclusive rights to broadcast five NAIA national championship games, including football and four basketball tournaments (“NAIA and Cable Station Reach”, 2003). Upon the announcement of the agreement, Baker noted:

“Partnering with CSTV is a tremendous opportunity for the NAIA as we seek to expand the awareness of our association, member institutions, and student athletes...Broadcasts of NAIA championships will further expose to the sports public our brand of sports where student-athletes play simply for the love of the game” (“NAIA and Cable Station Reach”, 2003, para. 3).

The agreement also called for the organization to share production costs with CSTV, but as viewership would increase and advertisers pay for sponsorships, CSTV would become a major resource (Wilson, 2005). The network was originally available on the DirecTV satellite service as part of a premium sports package. However, CSTV would begin to be picked up by several cable services, eventually leading to CBS acquiring CSTV in 2006 for \$325 million (Whitford, 2010). CSTV would eventually become the CBS College Sports Network and continues to broadcast NAIA events as of 2013 (“CSTV to Become CBS”, 2008).

Aftermath and Summary

Throughout its over 75 year history, the NAIA has been a legitimate organization that was dedicated to the promotion of intercollegiate athletics as an extension of institution. Originally designed as a basketball-centric organization, the association created the first national collegiate basketball and football championships which prompted other collegiate organizations to follow its lead. The NAIA continued to

innovate throughout its history as it was the first organization to integrate African-American athletes and HBCUs as well as one of the first to sponsor national championships for women. At the height of its popularity, the NAIA's success caused the NCAA to implement procedures to attract members to join their organization such as the Sanity Code and the Division Reorganization. While the organization fell upon bad times during the late 1980s and 1990s, the NAIA survived the departure of many schools and crafted a new identity that is focused on sportsmanship and character building. With the creation of the Champions of Character program, the NAIA has re-emphasized policies and procedures that Emil Liston and Al Duer publicly promoted during their lifetimes.

While the NAIA has done better in recent years, it still has its setbacks. NAIA CEO Steve Baker resigned from his position in 2006. After nine years at the helm of the organization, Baker wanted to pursue new interests (Boyce, 2006a). Baker noted it was an honor to associate with the NAIA and was proud of the organization's success (Boyce, 2006a). Taking over for Baker was NAIA COO and General Counsel Jim Carr (Boyce, 2006b). Carr spent much time learning from Baker and desired to continue the work that Baker started. For example, upon his hiring, Carr noted that the NAIA "will never challenge the NCAA in the marketplace, but there is room for growth" (Boyce, 2006b, para. 11). Carr elaborated that the key is to determine what the NAIA stands for and what their niche is, a strategy the organization always seemed to pursue (Boyce, 2006b). The NAIA also announced in 2007 that it was abolishing the region system and would primarily have direct qualification for postseason competition through affiliated conferences ("NAIA: Presidents Approve", 2007). In addition, the direct qualification

policy reduces postseason redundancy and provides a sound financial structure for postseason competition (“NAIA: Presidents Approve”, 2007).

One major niche that the NAIA will always maintain is their focus on basketball. When the NAIA moved its national office to Olathe, the organization decided to have the NIBT where the first tournament was held: the Kansas City Municipal Auditorium (Boyce, 2002). After eight years in Tulsa, the NIBT was welcomed back with open arms as the 2002 NIBT drew more than 40,000 fans over the six day tournament (Boyce, 2002). The tournament has been held at the Municipal Auditorium since 2002 and has recently celebrated its 75th anniversary in 2012 (Covitz, 2012a). Since its return to the Municipal Auditorium, the NIBT has averaged 40,000 fans each year while generating more than \$2.5 million for the Kansas City economy (Covitz, 2009). Although the average attendance is only 4,000 per game, Carr did not consider moving from the Municipal Auditorium since it has easy access to the hotels and restaurants in Downtown Kansas City, items that Al Duer considered when the NAIA moved the NIBT to the Kemper Arena (Covitz, 2009). Due to its high visibility, Carr and the NAIA agreed to an extension to keep the NIBT in the Municipal Auditorium until 2013 (Covitz, 2009). After 2012, however, the tournament attendance dropped to 34,080, a decrease from 38,207 in 2011 and 41,131 in 2010 (Covitz, 2012b). In response to the decline, Carr offered the following:

“My goal is always above 40,000. We have to keep at it, add some new twists next year, and get back over 40,000. I still think there’s huge potential (to tap) with young people, whether it be through schools, or youth basketball teams, churches. Places where young people gather” (Covitz, 2012b, para. 8).

Carr and the NAIA have the ability to access the youth in the Kansas City area more than ever. After six years in Olathe, the NAIA moved back into Downtown Kansas

City in 2007 after it struggled to find fundraising opportunities and the organization lacked strong community relations (Cooper & Horsley, 2006). Olathe Mayor Mike Copland was disappointed that the NAIA was leaving the area but felt good that the organization was staying within the area (Cooper & Horsley, 2006). After announcing the move, Carr shared:

“We’re extremely excited to be downtown and part of the revitalization of downtown. First of all, with the history of the organization being downtown...and you look out to the south and see the Sprint Center almost finished...we have a great relationship and we’re going to partner with some things at the College Basketball Experience” (Covitz, 2007, para. 4).

Today, the NAIA’s headquarters stands on the corner of Twelfth and Grand and is within close proximity to the Sprint Center and the College Basketball Experience. The building was refurbished for \$600,000 and includes exhibits from the organization’s history dating to 1937 on display (Covitz, 2007). Carr believed that the downtown building would give the NAIA a higher profile and better image within the community (Covitz, 2007).

Image and visibility are vital to the success of the organization and always seemed to be the missing element for prolonged success. Although the move back to Kansas City brought a sense of nostalgia to the organization, several schools still decided to move away from the NAIA. Some recent examples of institutions include William Jewell College in 2011, which has competed in the NAIA since its inception (Palmer, 2011). According to William Jewell President David Sallee, it was a difficult decision to make because of the strong ties that the school has with the association. However, Sallee explained:

“This was about institutional positioning. It’s about taking advantage of the NCAA brand power. In the minds of the general public, there is obviously a strong athletic brand attachment, but there is also a general perception that NCAA schools are really good schools” (Palmer, 2011, para. 5).

Azusa Pacific University also moved from the NAIA to the NCAA in 2011 reiterating William Jewell's concerns. Athletic Director Bill Odell offered that it was much easier to recruit when a school is associated with the NCAA and explained that "when we go into a house in Southern California and say we're an NAIA school, a lot of kids don't know what that is...they know the NCAA, so there's something there that you don't have to explain" (Palmer, 2011, para. 7-8).

From another perspective, the departure of NAIA continued due the quality of competition. For instance, upon announcing his schools move to Division II in 2010, Walsh University Athletic Director Dale Howard felt that after winning national championships in NAIA that they "were poised to move our athletic program to the next level" ("Stark Schools Are Approved", 2010, para. 6). The South Dakota School of Mines and Technology and Black Hills State University both moved to Division II in 2010 feeling that the move was "the beginning of a new era that will open up all sorts of positive possibilities for our student athletes and alumni", according to South Dakota Tech Athletic Director Dick Kaiser ("SD Mines, BHSU to Move", 2010, para. 3). Finally, Dominican University of California Athletic Director Ian Tonks felt that his schools move to Division II in 2008 "would bring greater exposure to Dominican athletes outside of the San Francisco Bay Area" because of the higher level of competition present in the NCAA ("Dominican U. (CA) Moving", 2008, para. 3).

Despite these defections, some schools decided to return to the NAIA. Menlo College of California left the NCAA Division III to join the NAIA level after a successful football season in 2009 (Cosgriff, 2009). Head football coach Fred Guidici noted that despite their high ranking in Division III football, the school wanted to have all its

athletic programs in the same association (Cosgriff, 2009). Finally, after twelve years as a NCAA Division II member, West Virginia University Tech decided to return to the NAIA (Keenan, 2006). WVU Tech Athletic Director Gary Prince felt that the NAIA was “a good fit for Tech...the history of Tech shows that it was always a very strong school financially and athletically as a part of the NAIA” (Keenan, 2006, para. 7). Prince also acknowledged that he did not feel the move back to the NAIA was a move downwards, noting that the competitive level is very similar to Division II (Keenan, 2006).

Finally, as of 2011, the NAIA maintained a membership count of 290 members (Palmer, 2011). While its membership significantly decreased from its peak of 558 schools in 1973 (Wilson, 2005), the NAIA still has a healthy roster of schools that compete for 23 national championships in 13 different sports (“About the NAIA”, n.d.). Again, despite suffering for image and visibility, the organization crafted a niche centered on character-building and sportsmanship that has re-ignited the organization as a viable contender in intercollegiate sports. Still, the NAIA has work ahead of it as the NCAA is still viewed as the premiere college sports organization. However, through its deal with CBS College Sports and emphasis on the student athlete experience over the entertainment spectacle, the NAIA can operate as a successful and legitimate business today.

Chapter 6 – Statistical Analysis

This chapter provides the statistical findings from the quantitative models discussed in Chapter 4. The chapter first shows the summary results and significant findings from Model One, which predicts the likelihood of college movement from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II or Division III based on social identities. Next, the chapter analyzes the results provided by Model Two, which estimates if a reclassification of athletic associations creates an increase in total university applications.

Model One

To investigate the effect that a university's social identities have on the likelihood of university movement, this dissertation examines the initial movement of schools from the NAIA to either Division II or III between 1973 and 2012. Recall, the unit of observation was a university-year. The sample did not include any international universities nor any U.S. institutions not included in the IPEDS database. Colleges and universities that were members of the NAIA during the sample time period were included in the data set one year after departing the NAIA for Division II or Division III. After one year in the NCAA, the observed university was removed from the sample. A university's movement to either Division II or Division III was observed through the use of a 1/0 dichotomous variable. The value of one indicated an observed university left the NAIA in the current year, while zero signifies that the university stayed in the NAIA. This variable served as the dependent variable. The final data set included 22,367 university-year observations from 1973 to 2012.

Summary Statistics

During the time period analyzed, 264 universities transitioned from the NAIA to Division II and 233 schools moved to Division III. Table 6.1 displays the summary statistics for the various university identities utilized in the analysis. In the sample, 1.9% of university-year observations occur when the university joins Division II, while 1.0% joined Division III. In terms of school designation, 76.2% of the university-year observations were identified as private, 2.9% were women's colleges, and 6.5% were classified as historically black universities. Approximately 23% of the observations were affiliated with a mainline protestant religion, 17.4% affiliated with an evangelist protestant religion, and 13.8% were associated with Catholicism. Finally, 10.9% of the university-year observations occurred during Duer's tenure (1949 – 1975) as Executive Secretary of the NAIA, 32.2% during Fritz's tenure (1975 – 1986), 14% while under

Table 6-1 - Summary Statistics for Model One

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Median
Joined Division II	0.019	0.108	0	1	0
Joined Division III	0.010	0.102	0	1	0
Private	0.762	0.426	0	1	1
Women's	0.029	0.168	0	1	0
BCU	0.065	0.246	0	1	0
Catholic	0.138	0.345	0	1	0
Mainline Protestant	0.229	0.420	0	1	0
Evangelist Protestant	0.174	0.380	0	1	0
Black Protestant	0.008	0.088	0	1	0
Other Christian	0.002	0.040	0	1	0
Other Religious Affiliations	0.004	0.064	0	1	0
Duer as Leader	0.109	0.312	0	1	0
Fritz as Leader	0.322	0.468	0	1	0
Farris as Leader	0.140	0.347	0	1	0
Chasteen as Leader	0.146	0.352	0	1	0
Baker as Leader	0.172	0.377	0	1	0
Carr as Leader	0.110	0.313	0	1	0
n = 22,367					

Farris (1986 – 1990), 14.6% under Chasteen (1991 – 1996), 17.2% during Baker’s tenure (1997 – 2006), and 11% of the observations under Carr’s leadership (2007 – Present).

Table 6.2 provides the number of observations located in the geographic regions identified by IPEDS. Of the eight regions identified, the Rocky Mountain region has the lowest amount of observations (3.09% of the total sample). The New England region is the second smallest region (4.51% of observations) followed by the Mid-East region (8.49% of sample). The largest number of observations were located within the Southeast region (29.03%) followed by the Great Lakes region (17.11%), the Plains region (16.41%), the Far West region (10.81%), and the Southwest region (10.56%). In

Table 6-2 - University Tabulations for Model One

Identity	Variable Names	Total Number	% of Sample
IPEDS Geographic Regions	New England (NE)	1,008	4.51
	Mid-East (ME)	1,898	8.49
	Great Lakes (GL)	3,826	17.11
	Plains (PL)	3,670	16.41
	Southeast (SE)	6,493	29.03
	Southwest (SW)	2,363	10.56
	Rocky Mountain (RM)	691	3.09
	Far West (FW)	2,418	10.81
Religious Affiliations	Catholic (CATH)	3,095	13.84
	Mainline Protestant (M_PROT)	5,116	22.87
	Evangelist Protestant (E_PROT)	3,902	17.45
	Black Protestant (BL_PROT)	175	0.78
	Other Christian (OTH_CHR)	36	0.16
	Other Religious Affiliations (OTH_REL)	92	0.41
Size	Not Classified by Carnegie (SIZEC1)	1,772	7.92
	Small or Very Small (SIZEC2)	15,451	69.08
	Medium (SIZEC3)	4,450	19.90
	Large or Very Large (SIZEC4)	694	3.10
Sponsored Sports	Football (FB)	6,119	27.36
	Men’s Basketball (MBB)	15,795	70.62
	Women’s Basketball (WBB)	14,328	64.06
	Baseball (BSB)	12,117	54.17
	Men’s Hockey (MHKY)	582	2.60

terms of religious affiliation based on the categories developed by Steensland et al. (2000), 55.5% of the sample was affiliated with any religion and 41.1% associated with a Protestant affiliation. Specifically, 22.87% of the observations aligned with a Mainline Protestant religion while 17.45% chose an Evangelist Protestant denomination and 13.84% were affiliated with the Roman Catholic faith. Many of the schools found in the sample defined themselves as small or very small (SIZEC2) (69.08%) according to the Carnegie Foundation. Approximately 20% of the university-year observations were described as medium (SIZEC3), 3.10% were identified as a large or very large university (SIZEC4), and 7.92% were not classified as a size by the Carnegie Foundation (SIZEC1). Finally, 70.62% university-year observations sponsored men's basketball, 64.06% sponsored women's basketball, and 54.17% sponsored baseball. Only 25% of the observations sponsored a football team and even fewer (2.6%) sponsored a men's hockey team.

Table 6.3 further displays university tabulations based upon a school's movement to either Division II or III. Many of the schools that chose to transition into the NCAA were located within the Southeast region (0.49% of total sample to Division II and 0.16% to Division III) while very few colleges found in the Rocky Mountain region changed their athletic affiliation (0.05% of total sample). Schools located in the New England, Mid-East, and Great Lakes regions moved to Division III more frequently than Division II. In comparison, universities found in the Southeast, Southwest, and Rocky Mountain regions preferred Division II over Division III while colleges located within the Plains and Far West regions moved at a nearly similar rate. Schools affiliated with a Mainline Protestant denomination tend to transfer to Division III opposed to Division II. Medium

and large or very large schools moved more to Division II (0.50% medium; 0.12% large) compared to Division III (27% medium; 4% large) while small or very small schools prefer Division III (0.72%) over Division II (0.55%). Finally, schools sponsoring teams in football (0.63% versus 0.46%), men's basketball (1.15% versus 0.97%), women's basketball (0.98% versus 0.73%), and baseball (0.92% versus 0.82%) aligned more frequently with Division II while men's hockey sponsored schools (0.13% versus 0.04%) migrated toward Division III.

Table 6-3 - University Tabulations by Division Movement

Identity	Variable Names	Number to Division II	% of Sample	Number to Division III	% of Sample
IPEDS Geographic Regions	NE	5	0.02	27	0.12
	ME	32	0.14	54	0.24
	GL	26	0.12	54	0.24
	PL	31	0.14	26	0.12
	SE	110	0.49	36	0.16
	SW	29	0.13	14	0.06
	RM	12	0.05	0	0
	FW	19	0.08	22	0.10
Religious Affiliations	CATH	25	0.11	35	0.16
	M_PROT	37	0.17	76	0.34
	E_PROT	24	0.11	20	0.09
	BL_PROT	1	<0.01	0	0
	OTH_CHR	1	<0.01	0	0
	OTH_REL	0	0	1	<0.01
Size	SIZEC1	4	0.02	4	0.02
	SIZEC2	123	0.55	160	0.72
	SIZEC3	111	0.50	60	0.27
	SIZEC4	26	0.12	9	0.04
Sponsored Sports	FB	141	0.63	103	0.46
	MBB	258	1.15	217	0.97
	WBB	220	0.98	163	0.73
	BSB	205	0.92	184	0.82
	MHXY	8	0.04	29	0.13

Results

Tables 6.4 and 6.5 present the results from the logistic regression model, Model One, predicting the likelihood the focal university will move from the NAIA to Division II and Division III respectively. Five variations of Model One were estimated. The first model, Model 1A, predicted the likelihood of a school moving to Division II in the current year (Y1) based upon the social identities of other schools moving in the current year. Model 1B estimated a school's potential for movement in Y1 based upon the transition of schools from the prior year (Y2), while Model 1C analyzed school movement in relation to colleges relocating two years (Y3) prior to the current year. Model 1D projected the likelihood of movement in Y1 by combining past efforts in Y2 and Y3. Finally, Model 1E estimated the potential for schools to transition to Division II based upon the movement of other schools in Y1, Y2, and Y3. One variable from each social identity grouping was removed due to collinearity issues with its respective grouping. These variables include the New England region (NE), schools not classified by the Carnegie Foundation (SIZEC1), and schools affiliated with a religion outside of Christianity (OTH_REL). These variables are the reference category for each identity. Several variables were also removed from each model due to their respective observation frequency. For example, the sample does not include any schools that moved from the NAIA to Division III that are from the Rocky Mountain region (RM). The sample also does not include any schools that have a denomination that is classified as a Black Protestant (BL_PROT) or Other Christian (OTH_CHR) denomination for either division.

According to the results on Table 6.4, many of the indicator variables only showed significance in certain models. For example, schools classified as private are

significant at the 99% confidence level and negatively related in Model 1B. Women's only colleges are positively related in Model 1D while HBCUs are negatively related in Models 1A and 1E. The Mid-East (Model 1C, positive) and Plains regions (Model 1A and Model 1E, negative) are the only geographic regions to show significance. Colleges classified as large (SIZEC4) are significant and positively related at the 99% confidence interval in Model 1B and Model 1C and positively significant at the 95% confidence level in Model 1D. Schools affiliated with Catholicism (CATH), a Mainline Protestant denomination (M_PROT), and an Evangelist Protestant denomination (E_PROT) show significance at the 99% confidence level and negative relations in Model 1A. However, in Model 1E, both Catholicism and Mainline Protestant denominations are negatively related at the 95% confidence level while Evangelist Protestant denominations are negatively related at the 99% significance level. Both men's basketball (MBB) and women's basketball (WBB) are significant at the 99% level throughout all models although MBB is positively related and WBB is negative. Football (FB) is significant and positively related in Models 1B, 1C, and 1D while men's hockey (MHKY) shows significance and a negative relationship in Model 1A. Schools affiliated with the NAIA during Duer's tenure as leader (DUER) show a negative and significant relationship in Model 1E. However, in Model 1C, a positive and significant relationship for DUER at the 95% confidence level is estimated. Only Chasteen (CHASTEEN) (Model 1B) and Baker (BAKER) (Model 1B and Model 1C) display a positive and significant relationship.

Table 6.4 also displays the interactions of the indicator variables with the number of schools moving to Division II possessing the respective identity. Private schools do not

Table 6-4 - Division II Movement

Variable Type	Variable Name	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
N/A	INTERCEPT	-3.31	2.62	-5.97**	2.09	-10.71***	2.15	-4.84	2.94	-3.92	2.81
N/A	TREND	-0.07	0.07	-0.04	0.06	0.14**	0.05	-0.05	0.08	-0.06	0.08
Indicator	PRIVATE	-0.30	0.27	-0.75**	0.27	-0.46	0.27	-0.53	0.31	-0.11	0.31
	WOMENS	---	---	1.35	0.91			1.62*	0.84	0.63	0.88
	BCU	-1.12**	0.39	-0.23	0.30	0.19	0.32	-0.19	0.31	-1.24**	0.39
	ME	0.18	0.55	0.91	0.54	1.36**	0.54	0.88	0.58	0.05	0.63
	GL	-1.06	0.56	-0.30	0.54	-0.17	0.55	-0.21	0.56	-0.70	0.56
	PL	-1.48**	0.61	-0.42	0.54	-0.39	0.55	-0.44	0.57	-1.47*	0.64
	SE	0.13	0.52	0.53	0.52	0.38	0.53	0.06	0.55	-0.08	0.55
	SW	-0.56	0.57	-0.27	0.54	0.18	0.54	-0.13	0.55	-0.76	0.60
	RM	-0.43	0.63	0.21	0.59	0.26	0.58	0.01	0.61	-0.41	0.66
	FW	-1.07	0.62	0.14	0.57	0.09	0.57	0.44	0.58	-1.18	0.71
	SIZEC2	-0.52	0.48	-0.14	0.45	-0.07	0.49	-0.28	0.47	-0.62	0.48
	SIZEC3	-0.28	0.54	0.91	0.48	0.73	0.51	0.68	0.51	0.00	0.54
	SIZEC4	0.62	0.60	1.40**	0.55	1.51**	0.61	1.33*	0.61	0.75	0.62
	CATH	-1.22**	0.43	0.16	0.30	0.21	0.30	0.20	0.32	-1.13*	0.48
	M_PROT	-0.75**	0.29	-0.19	0.27	-0.32	0.28	-0.09	0.31	-0.71*	0.34
	E_PROT	-1.44***	0.35	-0.66*	0.30	-0.37	0.30	-0.55	0.35	-1.93***	0.45
	FB	0.12	0.28	1.29***	0.23	0.88***	0.23	1.27***	0.31	0.52	0.37
	MBB	3.26***	0.73	3.61***	0.72	2.36***	0.71	3.32***	0.71	3.91***	0.91
	WBB	-0.98**	0.33	-1.16***	0.33	-1.20***	0.36	-1.76***	0.42	-1.70***	0.40
	BSB	0.07	0.32	0.33	0.27	0.36	0.26	0.24	0.34	0.04	0.37
	MHKY	-1.72**	0.58	---	---	-0.04	0.48	0.45	0.50	-0.06	0.41
	DUER	-3.47	2.35	-1.95	1.95	4.12*	2.11	-3.97	3.17	-5.73*	2.84
	FRITZ	-2.48	2.07	-2.68	1.68	2.42	1.64	-2.72	2.25	-3.67	2.25
	FARRIS	-1.62	1.36	-1.43	1.13	2.14	1.25	-1.55	1.54	-2.11	1.64
	CHASTEEN	-0.77	1.08	1.82*	0.85	0.88	0.93	-0.13	1.35	-1.73	1.70
	BAKER	-0.30	0.64	0.23	0.45	1.94**	0.72	1.88*	0.89	0.06	0.91

(Table 6.4 continued)

Variable Type	Variable Name	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
Count	Sum Y1	0.52	0.82	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Sum Y2	---	---	-0.64	0.93	---	---	---	---	-0.08**	0.03
	Sum Y3	---	---	---	---	-5.19***	1.06	---	---	-0.13***	0.04
	SumY2Y3	---	---	---	---	---	---	-2.32*	1.13	---	---
	SumD2_PRIV	-0.12	0.21	0.07	0.17	0.70***	0.16	0.72***	0.16	-0.01	0.19
	SumD2_WOMEN	---	---	-0.53	0.99	---	---	-1.72	1.11	-0.70	1.16
	SumD2_BCU	0.19	0.19	-0.10	0.18	-0.32*	0.15	0.05	0.18	-0.02	0.16
	SumD2_ME	-0.24	0.45	-0.24	0.40	1.86***	0.45	0.27	0.38	-0.07	0.40
	SumD2_GL	-0.22	0.53	0.17	0.39	2.18***	0.49	0.40	0.51	-0.22	0.32
	SumD2_PL	-0.24	0.46	-0.57	0.39	1.81***	0.39	0.01	0.37	-0.25	0.43
	SumD2_SE	-0.20	0.43	-0.60	0.40	1.82***	0.39	-0.10	0.41	-0.27	0.37
	SumD2_SW	-0.36	0.44	-0.26	0.38	1.67***	0.39	-0.03	0.45	-0.26	0.34
	SumD2_RM	-0.14	0.43	-1.05*	0.51	2.49***	0.50	0.10	0.49	-0.18	0.34
	SumD2_FW	-0.15	0.37	0.20	0.35	2.00***	0.41	0.58	0.33	0.10	0.45
	SumD2_SIZE2	-0.68	0.65	1.97***	0.56	1.53**	0.52	2.25***	0.60	0.61	0.65
	SumD2_SIZE3	-0.79	0.69	2.01***	0.57	2.06***	0.57	2.36***	0.58	0.58	0.64
	SumD2_SIZE4	-0.77	0.71	1.54**	0.55	1.89***	0.56	2.25***	0.65	0.60	0.65
	SumD2_CATH	0.02	0.22	-0.28	0.16	-0.67***	0.18	-1.07**	0.33	-0.15	0.19
	SumD2_MPROT	-0.18	0.27	0.09	0.28	0.49*	0.24	-0.28	0.21	0.14	0.23
	SumD2_EPROT	0.10	0.17	-0.28	0.19	-0.07	0.22	-0.66*	0.27	-0.21	0.21
	SumD2_FB	-0.17	0.09	0.21**	0.08	0.21*	0.10	0.15	0.09	0.08	0.08
	SumD2_MBB	0.09	0.41	-0.87	0.68	1.20*	0.52	-0.58	0.78	-0.40	0.69
	SumD2_WBB	0.18	0.17	-0.02	0.14	-0.15	0.13	-0.04	0.18	-0.09	0.12
	SumD2_BSB	0.19	0.24	-0.17	0.18	-0.14	0.18	0.34	0.23	0.12	0.15
	SumD2_MHXY	-0.67	0.35	---	---	-0.72*	0.31	0.68	0.44	0.03	0.06
Interaction	PRIVATE* SumD2_PRIV	-0.02	0.05	0.06	0.05	-0.04	0.05	-0.00	0.03	-0.02	0.02

(Table 6.4 continued)

Identity	Variables	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
Interaction	WOMENS* SumD2_WOMEN	---	---	2.12	1.52	---	---	1.29	0.85	1.82***	0.33
	BCU*SumD2_BCU	0.62***	0.12	0.40***	0.11	0.03	0.24	0.23**	0.08	0.35***	0.06
	ME*SumD2_ME	0.74***	0.14	0.54**	0.17	0.05	0.17	0.26*	0.13	0.36***	0.09
	GL*SumD2_GL	0.99***	0.24	0.00**	0.15	-0.16	0.34	-0.07	0.12	0.19**	0.08
	PL*SumD2_PL	0.83***	0.19	0.03	0.11	0.10	0.18	0.02	0.09	0.32***	0.07
	SE*SumD2_SE	0.20***	0.04	0.13**	0.05	0.16***	0.05	0.13***	0.03	0.10***	0.02
	SW*SumD2_SW	0.76***	0.15	0.58***	0.17	0.02	0.22	0.24*	0.12	0.38***	0.09
	RM*SumD2_RM	0.98***	0.15	0.53***	0.15	0.68***	0.16	0.46***	0.11	0.47***	0.09
	FW*SumD2_FW	0.82***	0.15	-0.75*	0.35	-1.50	0.88	-1.08**	0.34	0.59***	0.17
	SIZEC2* SumD2_SIZEC2	0.09**	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.04**	0.02
	SIZEC3* SumD2_SIZEC3	0.37***	0.08	-0.00	0.06	0.11	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.09**	0.04
	SIZEC4* SumD2_SIZEC4	0.84***	0.18	0.28	0.20	0.31	0.22	0.21	0.14	0.28**	0.09
	CATH* SumD2_CATH	0.80***	0.18	-0.07	0.21	-0.20	0.36	-0.11	0.18	0.43**	0.14
	M_PROT* SumD2_MPROT	0.13	0.07	-0.29*	0.14	-0.10	0.12	-0.21*	0.10	0.04	0.05
	E_PROT* SumD2_EPROT	0.38***	0.10	0.18	0.24	-0.44	0.31	-0.06	0.21	0.41***	0.09
	FB*SumD2_FB	0.13**	0.04	-0.10*	0.04	0.01	0.04	-0.05	0.03	0.02	0.02
	MBB*SumD2_MBB	-0.10	0.06	-0.14	0.08	0.02	0.10	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.04
	WBB*SumD2_WBB	0.11*	0.05	0.15**	0.06	0.16*	0.07	0.14**	0.04	0.08***	0.02
	BSB*SumD2_BSB	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02
	MHKY* SumD2_MHKY	2.41***	0.60	---	---	0.08	1.17	-1.11	1.18	0.06	0.04
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$											

have significance in any model when related to other private schools moving to Division II (PRIVATE*SumD2_PRIV). Women's colleges (WOMENS*SumD2_WOMEN), however, have a significant and a positive relationship at the 99% confidence level in Model 1E. However, WOMENS*SumD2_WOMEN is not significant in the other models. HBCUs (BCU*SumD2_BCU) are also significant and positively related in Models 1A, 1B, 1D, and 1E. All interactions involving the geographic regions were significant and positively related in Models 1A and 1E. However, the Southeast region (SE*SumD2_SE) is the only interaction to maintain a significant and positive relationship throughout all models. Similarly, all Carnegie size interactions (SIZEC2*SumD2_SIZEC2, SIZEC3*SumD2_SIZEC3, SIZEC4*SumD2_SIZEC4) as well as interactions involving Catholicism (CATH*SumD2_CATH) and Evangelist Protestant denominations (E_PROT*SumD2_EPROT) are significant and positively related in Models 1A and 1E. Finally, the football (FB*SumD2_FB) and men's hockey (MHKY*SumD2_MHKY) interactions show a significant positive relationship in Model 1A while women's basketball (WBB*SumD2_WBB) is significant and positively related for all models.

For schools moving to Division III, Table 6.5 shows the private school designation does not have a significant effect on movement. Women's only colleges are significant and positively related in Model 1D. HBCUs, however, show a negative and significant relationship in Model 1A. Four of the six regions (PL, SE, SW, and FW) consistently display a significant negative relationship in all models. The Mid-East region is the only region to have a positive significant relationship in Model 1B, Model 1C, and Model 1D. SIZEC4 is significant and positively related in Models 1B, 1C, and

1D. In addition, SIZEC2 shows significance and a positive relationship. Catholicism is significant and negatively related in Models 1A and 1E while Evangelist Protestant denominations maintain a significant negative relationship in all models except Model 1D. Similar to the Division II model, MBB and WBB are significant in all models with the same positive and negative relationships respectively. In comparison, FB is significant and positively related in all models except Model 1A while BSB and MHKY are significant and positively related in Models 1B, 1C, and 1D. Finally, all NAIA leaders have no significant relationship.

In terms of interactions, private schools (PRIVATE*SumD3_PRIV) again show no significant relationship. Women's colleges (WOMEN*SumD3_WOMEN) have a significant and a positive relationship at the 99% confidence level in Model 1E. HBCUs (BCU*SumD3_BCU) also have a significant and positive relationship in Models 1A (at the 99% level) and 1E (at the 95% level). All regional interactions are significant at the 99% level and positively related in both Model 1A and 1E. Specifically, the Southeast region (SE*SumD3_SE) is the only interaction to maintain significance and a positive correlation throughout all models while the Plains region (PL*SumD3_PL) shows significance and a positive relationship at the 99% confidence level in Model 1B. Interactions involving medium sized schools (SIZEC3*SumD3_SIZE3) as well as all religious interactions (CATH*SumD3_CATH, M_PROT*SumD3_MPROT, E_PROT*SumD3_EPROT) are significant and positively related in Models 1A and 1E. Finally, men's hockey (MHKY*SumD3_MHKY) is the only sports based interaction to have a significant positive relationship in Models 1A and 1E.

Table 6-5 - Division III Movement

Variable Type	Variable Name	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
N/A	INTERCEPT	-6.59*	3.26	-8.22***	2.21	-5.87**	2.20	-4.95	3.55	-8.09	5.43
N/A	TREND	0.05	0.09	0.03	0.06	-0.03	0.06	-0.07	0.10	0.06	0.14
Indicator	PRIVATE	0.02	0.35	0.49	0.33	0.78	0.39	0.67	0.43	0.61	0.47
	WOMENS	---	---	---	---	---	---	1.61***	0.44	0.51	0.61
	BCU	-1.47**	0.58	-0.18	0.43	0.15	0.41	0.13	0.45	-0.94	0.56
	ME	-0.20	0.33	0.88**	0.30	1.14***	0.29	1.36***	0.35	0.67	0.43
	GL	-1.25***	0.35	-0.66	0.34	-0.60	0.33	-0.72*	0.36	-1.08**	0.39
	PL	-2.66***	0.41	-1.91***	0.33	-1.62***	0.30	-1.85***	0.33	-2.72***	0.40
	SE	-1.98***	0.33	-1.55***	0.31	-1.46***	0.30	-1.71***	0.33	-2.07***	0.36
	SW	-2.57***	0.47	-1.97***	0.44	-1.85***	0.40	-2.19***	0.48	-2.96***	0.62
	FW	-1.83***	0.39	-0.73*	0.32	-0.83**	0.30	-0.91**	0.31	-2.48***	0.46
	SIZEC2	-0.12	0.44	1.23*	0.58	0.58	0.57	0.80	0.62	0.60	0.67
	SIZEC3	-0.64	0.38	0.97	0.56	0.78	0.54	0.71	0.56	0.16	0.58
	SIZEC4	---	---	1.68**	0.66	1.71**	0.63	1.74**	0.67	0.86	0.74
	CATH	-1.26***	0.38	0.25	0.28	0.04	0.26	0.29	0.35	-1.22*	0.51
	M_PROT	-0.20	0.30	0.15	0.29	0.64	0.27	0.34	0.30	-0.39	0.39
	E_PROT	-2.13***	0.39	-0.67*	0.31	-0.53*	0.32	-0.56	0.32	-1.71***	0.45
	FB	0.25	0.26	0.58*	0.25	1.12***	0.27	0.96***	0.29	0.66*	0.32
	MBB	2.13***	0.60	1.47**	0.50	1.59**	0.56	1.78**	0.60	2.23***	0.66
	WBB	-1.46***	0.36	-1.39***	0.37	-1.24***	0.36	-1.56***	0.44	-1.89***	0.46
	BSB	0.52	0.33	1.13***	0.32	0.45	0.34	0.92*	0.42	0.74	0.44
	MHKY	0.36	0.38	1.29***	0.26	1.34***	0.28	1.30***	0.29	0.46	0.39
	DUER	0.53	3.45	1.30	1.92	-0.05	1.71	0.18	1.93	2.60	3.31
	FRITZ	0.89	2.49	0.62	1.41	-0.29	1.35	-1.14	1.97	1.09	2.97
	FARRIS	0.65	1.84	0.20	1.24	-0.07	1.17	-1.48	1.73	0.82	2.38
	CHASTEEN	0.49	1.36	0.73	0.82	0.35	0.88	0.27	1.55	0.60	1.70
	BAKER	0.63	0.66	0.71	0.60	1.21	0.72	-0.05	1.03	1.38	1.09

(Table 6.5 continued)

Variable Type	Variable Name	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
Count	Sum Y1	0.11	0.36	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
	Sum Y2	---	---	1.28*	0.56	---	---	---	---	-0.14**	0.05
	Sum Y3	---	---	---	---	-0.68	0.72	---	---	-0.11*	0.05
	SumY2Y3	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.15	0.81	0.09	0.22
	SumD3_Private	-0.15	0.19	0.06	0.26	-0.18	0.31	-0.12	0.27	0.20	0.35
	SumD3_Women	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.85	0.48	-0.56	0.51
	SumD3_BCU	0.21	0.42	0.12	0.34	0.93**	0.36	0.08	0.30	0.22	0.23
	SumD3_ME	-0.22	0.21	-0.09	0.20	-0.01	0.23	-0.02	0.22	0.09	0.21
	SumD3_GL	-0.02	0.25	0.01	0.34	0.14	0.32	-0.09	0.30	0.13	0.21
	SumD3_PL	-0.06	0.24	-0.03	0.35	-0.03	0.34	-0.16	0.34	0.36	0.34
	SumD3_SE	-0.01	0.26	-0.14	0.35	0.38	0.39	0.21	0.38	-0.14	0.21
	SumD3_SW	-0.26	0.21	0.07	0.32	-0.23	0.34	-0.39	0.29	0.15	0.30
	SumD3_FW	-0.19	0.28	-0.08	0.31	-0.33	0.37	0.05	0.32	-0.11	0.32
	SumD3_SizeC2	0.29	0.38	-1.19**	0.47	0.39	0.59	-0.07	0.55	-0.11	0.32
	SumD3_SizeC3	0.01	0.31	-1.25*	0.51	0.06	0.67	-0.28	0.59	-0.05	0.37
	SumD3_SizeC4	---	---	-1.58**	0.63	0.50	0.71	-0.25	0.64	-0.51	0.50
	SumD3_Cath	-0.26	0.19	0.32	0.20	-0.10	0.22	0.37	0.20	0.02	0.21
	SumD3_MPROT	-0.21	0.23	-0.34	0.21	0.16	0.25	0.05	0.23	-0.15	0.22
	SumD3_EPROT	-0.32	0.30	-0.21	0.23	-0.34	0.20	-0.10	0.19	-0.21	0.29
	SumD3_FB	-0.10	0.11	0.23*	0.10	0.22	0.14	0.03	0.11	0.05	0.13
	SumD3_MBB	-0.15	0.35	0.26	0.26	0.07	0.36	0.70*	0.32	0.29	0.27
	SumD3_WBB	0.08	0.13	-0.06	0.15	0.24	0.15	0.25	0.22	-0.05	0.22
	SumD3_BSB	0.03	0.24	-0.31	0.21	-0.09	0.27	-0.66*	0.29	-0.29	0.20
	SumD3_MHXY	-0.02	0.27	-0.07	0.10	0.27	0.20	0.11	0.11	-0.14	0.16
Interaction	Private* SumD3_Priv	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.06	0.06	-0.02	0.03	0.00	0.03
	Womens* SumD3_Women	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.62	0.55	1.31**	0.41

(Table 6.5 continued)

Variable Type	Variable Name	Model 1A		Model 1B		Model 1C		Model 1D		Model 1E	
		β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
Interaction	BCU*SumD3_BCU	0.76***	0.21	0.21	0.27	-0.24	0.31	-0.06	0.18	0.27*	0.12
	ME*SumD3_ME	0.52***	0.11	-0.08	0.10	-0.21*	0.10	-0.18*	0.08	0.01	0.06
	GL*SumD3_GL	0.46***	0.10	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.11**	0.04
	PL*SumD3_PL	0.68***	0.12	0.32**	0.13	-0.06	0.22	0.14	0.09	0.38***	0.07
	SE*SumD3_SE	0.45***	0.08	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.10	0.11	0.06	0.14***	0.04
	SW*SumD3_SW	1.39***	0.19	0.98***	0.22	1.03***	0.22	0.69***	0.13	0.71***	0.13
	FW*SumD3_FW	0.93***	0.15	0.08	0.25	0.37*	0.18	0.23	0.12	0.72***	0.12
	SizeC2* SumD3_SizeC2	0.03	0.06	-0.09	0.06	0.07	0.07	-0.01	0.04	0.01	0.03
	SizeC3* SumD3_SizeC3	0.23***	0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.07**	0.03
	SizeC4* SumD3_SizeC4	---	---	-0.74	0.77	-0.74	0.84	-0.55	0.56	0.40	0.30
	CATH* SumD3_CATH	0.96***	0.19	-0.25	0.17	-0.06	0.19	-0.18	0.16	0.35**	0.14
	M_PROT* SumD3_MPROT	0.19**	0.07	0.09	0.07	-0.14	0.09	0.00	0.05	0.10*	0.04
	E_PROT* SumD3_EPROT	1.58***	0.25	0.03	0.34	-0.22	0.31	-0.08	0.18	0.50**	0.16
	FB*SumD3_FB	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.12*	0.06	-0.04	0.03	0.00	0.03
	MBB*SumD3_MBB	-0.05	0.07	0.01	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.03
	WBB*SumD3_WBB	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.04	0.07*	0.03
	BSB*SumD3_BSB	0.06	0.04	-0.04	0.04	0.08	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02
	MHKY* SumD3_MHKY	0.72***	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.13	0.17	0.05	0.06	0.26***	0.07
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$											

Model Two – Overall Model

This dissertation also investigates if a reclassification from the NAIA to the NCAA had a significant effect on a university's applications. From 1973 to 2012, 264 universities transitioned from the NAIA to Division II and 233 schools moved to Division III, believing the action would increase the school's applications. To analyze this potential Reclassification Effect, a panel regression model was implemented on the total number of applications a university received in the current year. This information was collected from all schools that were members of the NAIA since the organization's inception in 1937 through the IPEDS database. Completed IPEDS surveys containing application data from these schools can be obtained from 2003 to 2012.

While IPEDS records were not collected before 1984, the model accounts for schools that moved between 1937 and 2002 through an independent variable that monitors for the age a university has been associated with the NCAA (NCAA_AGE). A squared term for NCAA age (NCAA_AGE²) is included in the model to determine if there is a quadratic relationship between the dependent variable (LN_APP) and NCAA_AGE. The final data set included 8,495 university-year observations from 2003 to 2012. Two variations of Model Two were estimated. The first model, Model 2A, predicts the effect that an association with the NCAA has on applications for schools that were previous members of the NAIA since its inception in 1937. Model 2B, on the other hand, estimates the same effect on previous members of the NAIA moving to the NCAA after 1973 when Division II and III were created.

Summary Statistics

Table 6.6 displays the summary statistics for universities utilized in Model 2A. In the sample, the average age of the universities (AGE_UNIV) analyzed is 107 years. The sample includes a large quantity of private schools (66.2%) while only 7.4% of the sample is classified as HBCUs and 2.3% as women's only colleges. The Catholic religion is associated with 12.5% of the sample while 22.8% is associated with a Mainline Protestant denomination, 13.1% are affiliated with an Evangelist Protestant, and 0.3% with a religious affiliation classified as other.

In terms of schools associated with the Common Application membership association (CMAPP), 13.1% of observations utilize the Common Application. The average student to faculty ratio (SF_RATIO) is 27.27, and average undergraduate tuition (QT_UGRAD) ranges between the Top 50th and Top 75th Quantiles. A large majority of the schools (78.7%) possess a graduate school program (GRAD) and have graduate tuition (QT_GRAD) averaging above the Top 75th Quantile. The average number of sports offered (SPT_OFFR) by each university in the sample is 14 while NCAA_AGE, on average, is 19 years. In terms of titles won by the revenue-generating sports, 7.5% of schools have a title in football (FB_TITLE), 12.5% have a championship in men's basketball (MBB_TITLE), and 12.0% have titles in women's basketball (WBB_TITLE). Finally, 0.8% of the observations are in first year of NCAA membership (YEAR1), 0.8% in their second year (YEAR2), 0.9% in their third year (YEAR3), 0.7% in their fourth year (YEAR4), 0.8% in their fifth year (YEAR5), 1.0% in their sixth year (YEAR6), 1.2% in their seventh year (YEAR7), 1.1% in their eighth year (YEAR8), 1.3% in their ninth year (YEAR9), and 1.5% in their tenth year of NCAA membership (YEAR10).

Table 6-6 - Summary Statistics for Model 2A

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Median
Age of University	107	41	1	320	112
Private	0.66	0.47	0	1	1
HBCU	0.07	0.26	0	1	0
Women's	0.02	0.15	0	1	0
Catholic	0.13	0.33	0	1	0
Mainline Protestant	0.23	0.42	0	1	0
Evangelist Protestant	0.13	0.34	0	1	0
Other Religious Affiliation	0.00	0.06	0	1	0
Common Application	0.14	0.35	0	1	0
Student/Faculty Ratio	27.27	14.94	4.15	235.70	24.67
Undergraduate Tuition	2.50	1.43	0	5	3
Graduate Program	0.79	0.41	0	1	1
Graduate Tuition	2.38	1.58	0	5	2
Sports Offered	14	5	0	27	15
Football Titles	0.08	0.26	0	1	0
Men's Basketball Titles	0.12	0.33	0	1	0
Women's Basketball Titles	0.12	0.32	0	1	0
Age of NCAA Association	19	20	0	76	14
NCAA – Year One	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Two	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Three	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Four	0.01	0.08	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Five	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Six	0.01	0.10	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Seven	0.01	0.11	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Eight	0.01	0.11	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Nine	0.01	0.12	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Ten	0.02	0.12	0	1	0
Observations	n = 8,495				

Table 6.7 displays the summary statistics for universities utilized in Model 2B. In the sample, AGE_UNIV is approximately 102 years. Similar to Model 2A, Model 2B includes a large quantity of private schools (73.4%) and small quantities of HBCUs (3.4%) and women's only colleges (3.2%) as women's only colleges. The Catholic religion is associated with 14.6% of the observations while 23.7% of the sample is associated with a Mainline Protestant denomination and 15.9% is affiliated with an Evangelist Protestant, and 0.4% with a religious affiliation classified as other.

Table 6-7 - Summary Statistics for Model 2B

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Median
Age of University	102	41	1	233	104
Private	0.73	0.44	0	1	1
HBCU	0.03	0.18	0	1	0
Women's	0.03	0.18	0	1	0
Catholic	0.15	0.35	0	1	0
Mainline Protestant	0.24	0.43	0	1	0
Evangelist Protestant	0.16	0.37	0	1	0
Other Religious Affiliation	0.00	0.06	0	1	0
Common Application	0.11	0.32	0	1	0
Student/Faculty Ratio	28.18	16.47	4.15	235.69	25.17
Undergraduate Tuition	2.50	1.35	0	5	3
Graduate Program	0.76	0.43	0	1	1
Graduate Tuition	2.23	1.57	0	5	2
Sports Offered	13	6	0	26	14
Football Titles	0.06	0.23	0	1	0
Men's Basketball Titles	0.12	0.32	0	1	0
Women's Basketball Titles	0.11	0.31	0	1	0
Age of NCAA Association	10	12	0	40	5
NCAA – Year One	0.01	0.10	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Two	0.01	0.10	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Three	0.01	0.11	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Four	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Five	0.01	0.10	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Six	0.01	0.11	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Seven	0.01	0.12	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Eight	0.01	0.12	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Nine	0.02	0.13	0	1	0
NCAA – Year Ten	0.02	0.13	0	1	0
Observations	n = 6,225				

Approximately 11% of observations utilize the Common Application. The average student to faculty ratio is 29.48, and undergraduate tuition ranges between the Top 50th and Top 75th Quantiles. Similar to the Model 2A sample, a large majority of the schools (75.9%) sampled possess a graduate school program with tuition averaging above the Top 75th Quantile. The average number of sports offered by each university in the sample is 13, and the average length of NCAA association is 10 years. Approximately 6% of schools have won titles in football, 12% have championships in men's basketball,

and 11% have titles in women's basketball. Finally, 1.1% of the sample is in their first year of NCAA membership, 1.1% in their second year, 1.1% in their third year, 0.9% in their fourth year, 1.0% in their fifth year, 1.2% in their sixth year, 1.4% in their seventh year, 1.4% in their eighth year, 1.6% in their ninth year, and 1.8% in their tenth year of NCAA membership.

Table 6.8 provides the number of observations located in the IPEDS geographic regions in both Model 2A and 2B. The Rocky Mountain region has the lowest amount of observations in both models (2.69% in Model 2A sample; 2.66% of Model 2B sample). The New England region is the second smallest region for both models (5.48% in Model 2A; 5.24% of Model 2B) followed by the Southwest region (8.08% for Model 2A; 9.10% for Model 2B). The largest number of observations are located within the Southeast region for both models (31.05% in Model 2A; 30.01% in Model 2B) followed by the Great Lakes region (16.52% in Model 2A; 16.44% in Model 2B), the Plains region (13.47% of Model 2A; 14.68% of Model 2B), the Mid- East region (13.01% in Model 2A; 12.45% in Model 2B), and the Far West region (9.69% in Model 2A; 9.53% in Model 2B). In terms of the religious affiliation, 49.28% of Model 2A's observations and 55.26% of Model 2B's observations possess a religious affiliation while 36.36% of Model 2A and 39.56% of Model 2B are associated with a Protestant affiliation. Specifically, the Mainline Protestant denominations are the highest affiliated religion (22.80% in Model 2A; 23.66% in Model 2B) followed by the Evangelist Protestant denominations (13.09% in Model 2A; 15.90% in Model 2B) and Catholicism (12.50% in Model 2A; 14.64% in Model 2B). Most of the schools found in both samples are considered small according to the Carnegie Foundation (59.12% in Model 2A; 66.98% in

Table 6-8 - University Tabulations for Model Two

		Model 2A		Model 2B	
Identity	Variable Names	Total Number	% of Sample	Total Number	% of Sample
IPEDS Geographic Regions	NE	468	5.51	328	5.24
	ME	1,110	13.07	780	12.45
	GL	1,390	16.36	1,030	16.44
	PL	1,140	13.42	920	14.68
	SE	2,650	31.19	1,880	30.01
	SW	690	8.00	570	9.10
	RM	230	2.71	160	2.66
	FW	827	9.74	597	9.53
Religious Affiliations	CATH	1,065	12.54	917	14.64
	M_PROT	1,946	22.91	1,482	23.66
	E_PROT	1,116	13.14	996	15.90
	BL_PROT	40	0.47	30	0.48
	OTH_CHR	10	0.12	10	0.16
	OTH_REL	26	0.31	26	0.42
Size	SIZEC1	249	2.93	219	3.50
	SIZEC2	5,036	59.28	4,196	66.98
	SIZEC3	2,560	30.14	1,530	24.42
	SIZEC4	670	7.65	320	5.11

Model 2B). Medium sized schools occupy 30.11% of Model 2A's sample and 24.42% of Model 2B's sample. Very few schools identify themselves as a large or very large university (7.85% in Model 2A; 5.11% in Model 2B) or as not classified by the Carnegie Foundation (2.92% in Model 2A; 3.50% in Model 2B).

Correlation Coefficients

Tables 6.9 and 6.10 provide the correlation coefficients for all variables utilized in Models 2A and 2A. A correlation above 0.8 or below -0.8 may indicate an issue of multicollinearity (Straub, 1989). According to the tables, most correlations fall within this range with the exception of two: the correlation between the lagged application total (LN_APP_{t-1}) and the dependent variable (LN_APP_t); and the years of NCAA association for a university ($NCAA_AGE$) and its squared term ($NCAA_AGE^2$). These correlations were expected to be above the threshold due to the nature of log transformation

Table 6-9 - Correlation Matrix for Reclassification Effect - Model 2A

Variable		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
#	Name																
2	LN_APP _{t-1}	-0.89															
3	AGE_UNIV	-0.25	0.03														
4	PRIVATE	-0.30	0.26	-0.04													
5	BCU	0.12	-0.22	-0.09	-0.20												
6	WOMENS	-0.04	0.02	-0.16	0.00	0.04											
7	CATH	-0.07	0.09	0.04	-0.37	0.01	-0.05										
8	M_PROT	-0.03	0.07	-0.13	-0.46	-0.01	-0.02	0.48									
9	E_PROT	-0.10	0.09	0.02	-0.43	0.02	0.05	0.45	0.50								
10	OTH_REL	-0.03	0.03	0.01	-0.07	-0.01	0.00	0.10	0.12	0.11							
11	CMAPP	0.15	-0.08	-0.14	-0.12	0.05	-0.03	0.09	0.15	0.15	0.04						
12	SF_RATIO	-0.05	-0.05	0.05	-0.15	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.12	0.12	0.03	0.04					
13	QT_UGRAD	0.09	-0.18	0.04	-0.51	0.30	-0.09	-0.06	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.26	0.13				
14	GRAD	-0.08	-0.01	-0.03	-0.03	0.07	-0.07	-0.13	0.00	-0.13	-0.01	0.05	-0.10	0.21			
15	QT_GRAD	0.05	-0.08	0.07	0.11	-0.04	0.04	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.03	-0.01	0.04	-0.33	-0.77		
16	SPT_OFFR	0.10	-0.28	-0.17	-0.04	0.21	0.26	-0.08	-0.17	-0.09	-0.08	0.02	-0.03	-0.09	-0.10	0.10	
17	FB_TITLE	0.02	-0.02	-0.04	0.03	0.00	0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02	-0.04	0.03	-0.05
18	MBB_TITLE	0.03	-0.04	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.02	-0.07
19	WBB_TITLE	0.05	-0.06	0.02	-0.03	0.03	0.02	-0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.03	-0.03	0.01	-0.07
20	NCAA_AGE	0.10	-0.17	0.04	0.10	-0.04	-0.06	0.04	0.01	0.09	0.04	-0.07	0.05	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	-0.25
21	NCAA_AGE ²	0.00	0.08	-0.11	-0.02	-0.06	0.06	-0.03	-0.01	-0.08	-0.03	0.03	-0.03	-0.04	0.01	0.02	0.16
22	RANGE5	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.02	-0.06
23	RANGE10	0.00	-0.02	-0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.03	0.00	0.02	0.03	-0.03	0.02	-0.01	-0.03	0.01	-0.06
24	YEAR1	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.05
25	YEAR2	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.03	-0.04
26	YEAR3	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.02
27	YEAR4	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.03
28	YEAR5	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.02
29	YEAR6	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02
30	YEAR7	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.02
31	YEAR8	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
32	YEAR9	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.00	-0.01
33	YEAR10	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.01	-0.01

(Table 6.9 continued)

Variable		17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
#	Name																
18	MBB_TITLE	-0.04															
19	WBB_TITLE	-0.03	-0.10														
20	NCAA_AGE	-0.02	0.03	0.04													
21	NCAA_AGE ²	0.00	-0.01	-0.04	-0.92												
22	RANGE5	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.13	-0.08											
23	RANGE10	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.09	0.00	N/A										
24	YEAR1	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.09	-0.06	N/A	N/A									
25	YEAR2	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.09	-0.05	N/A	N/A	0.12								
26	YEAR3	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.06	-0.03	N/A	N/A	0.03	0.12							
27	YEAR4	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.05	-0.02	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.03	0.13						
28	YEAR5	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.04	-0.01	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.13					
29	YEAR6	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.00	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.13				
30	YEAR7	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.14			
31	YEAR8	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.03	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.14		
32	YEAR9	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.14	
33	YEAR10	0.01	-0.02	0.00	-0.02	0.05	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.14
Note ¹ : INTERCEPT = 1.																	
Note ² : RANGE5, RANGE10 and YEAR variables were included in separate models and thus do not have a correlation.																	

Table 6-10 - Correlation Matrix for Reclassification Effect - Model 2B

Variable		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
#	Name																
2	LN_APP _{t-1}	-0.90															
3	AGE_UNIV	-0.28	0.07														
4	PRIVATE	-0.32	0.29	-0.06													
5	BCU	0.17	-0.26	-0.16	-0.20												
6	WOMENS	-0.02	0.01	-0.19	-0.01	0.06											
7	CATH	-0.06	0.08	0.04	-0.36	-0.03	-0.05										
8	M_PROT	-0.01	0.05	-0.14	-0.42	-0.04	-0.02	0.49									
9	E_PROT	-0.09	0.09	0.02	-0.41	0.00	0.05	0.47	0.51								
10	OTH_REL	-0.03	0.04	0.01	-0.07	-0.01	-0.01	0.11	0.13	0.12							
11	CMAPP	0.13	-0.06	-0.16	-0.05	-0.02	-0.04	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.03						
12	SF_RATIO	-0.02	-0.07	0.04	-0.17	0.07	0.01	0.11	0.13	0.14	0.04	0.03					
13	QT_UGRAD	0.12	-0.22	0.03	-0.50	0.31	-0.11	-0.06	-0.01	0.02	-0.03	-0.27	0.14				
14	GRAD	-0.05	-0.01	-0.07	-0.05	0.13	-0.06	-0.14	-0.02	-0.15	-0.01	0.07	-0.10	0.19			
15	QT_GRAD	0.02	-0.07	0.12	0.10	-0.06	0.04	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.03	-0.06	0.04	-0.29	-0.80		
16	SPT_OFFR	0.13	-0.29	-0.18	-0.06	0.19	0.29	-0.10	-0.16	-0.11	-0.09	0.03	-0.03	-0.08	-0.10	0.12	
17	FB_TITLE	0.05	-0.04	-0.07	0.02	0.04	0.01	-0.01	-0.03	0.00	-0.05	0.02	0.02	0.03	-0.03	0.02	-0.06
18	MBB_TITLE	0.02	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.07
19	WBB_TITLE	0.08	-0.09	0.00	-0.03	0.02	0.02	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	0.03	0.00	-0.01	0.04	-0.02	-0.01	-0.08
20	NCAA_AGE	0.02	-0.07	0.01	0.11	0.01	-0.08	-0.03	-0.06	0.03	0.02	-0.08	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.17
21	NCAA_AGE ²	0.05	-0.01	-0.03	-0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.06	0.08	0.01	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.07
22	RANGE5	0.01	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.02	-0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.02	-0.07
23	RANGE10	0.02	-0.04	-0.03	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.02	0.01	-0.04	0.02	-0.05
24	YEAR1	0.02	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.01	-0.05
25	YEAR2	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.04	0.03	-0.05
26	YEAR3	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.02
27	YEAR4	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.03
28	YEAR5	-0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02
29	YEAR6	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.01
30	YEAR7	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	0.00	0.02	0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.00	0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01
31	YEAR8	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.02	0.00	0.00
32	YEAR9	0.02	-0.03	-0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.00	0.00
33	YEAR10	0.00	0.00	-0.02	-0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.00

(Table 6.10 continued)

Variable		17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
#	Name																
18	MBB_TITLE	-0.05															
19	WBB_TITLE	-0.04	-0.11														
20	NCAA_AGE	0.02	0.01	0.01													
21	NCAA_AGE ²	-0.04	0.00	0.03	-0.93												
22	RANGE5	0.02	0.04	0.06	0.04	0.03											
23	RANGE10	0.02	0.03	0.06	-0.15	0.23	N/A										
24	YEAR1	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.07	-0.03	N/A	N/A									
25	YEAR2	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	-0.01	N/A	N/A	0.15								
26	YEAR3	0.00	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.02	N/A	N/A	0.04	0.14							
27	YEAR4	0.00	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.04	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.04	0.16						
28	YEAR5	0.00	0.00	0.02	-0.03	0.05	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.15					
29	YEAR6	0.00	0.02	0.02	-0.07	0.10	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.17				
30	YEAR7	0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.10	0.13	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.18			
31	YEAR8	0.00	0.03	0.01	-0.12	0.14	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.18		
32	YEAR9	0.01	0.00	0.01	-0.14	0.17	N/A	N/A	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.18	
33	YEAR10	0.01	-0.01	0.00	-0.15	0.17	N/A	N/A	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.06	0.18
Note ¹ : INTERCEPT = 1.																	
Note ² : RANGE5, RANGE10 and YEAR variables were included in separate models and thus do not have a correlation.																	

(LN_APP_{t-1} and LN_APP_t) and squared manipulation of an independent variable (NCAA_AGE and NCAA_AGE²).

Results

Table 6.11 presents the results from the panel regression models for Models 2A and 2B for the first five years of NCAA association while Table 6.12 shows the results

Table 6-11 - Reclassification Effect - 5 Years

Variable	Model 2A				Model 2B			
	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	B	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.79***	0.04	0.79***	0.04	0.98***	0.05	0.98***	0.05
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.87***	0.01	0.87***	0.01	0.84***	0.01	0.84***	0.01
AGE_UNIV	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.14***	0.02	-0.14***	0.02	-0.19***	0.02	-0.19***	0.02
BCU	0.14***	0.02	0.14***	0.02	0.27***	0.03	0.27***	0.03
WOMENS	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03
CATH	0.03*	0.02	0.03*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
M_PROT	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
E_PROT	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
OTH_REL	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.07
CMAPP	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
SF_RATIO	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01
GRAD	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
QT_GRAD	0.01**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.01*	0.01	0.01*	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
FB_TITLE	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02
MBB_TITLE	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
WBB_TITLE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
NCAA_AGE	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00***	0.00	-0.00***	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE5	0.04*	0.02	---	---	0.04	0.02	---	---
YEAR1	---	---	0.08*	0.04	---	---	0.07	0.04
YEAR2	---	---	0.02	0.04	---	---	0.02	0.04
YEAR3	---	---	0.06	0.04	---	---	0.05	0.04
YEAR4	---	---	0.01	0.04	---	---	0.01	0.05
YEAR5	---	---	0.03	0.04	---	---	0.02	0.05

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

for both models for the first ten years of membership. According to both tables, several university specific variables show significance. Applications received in the prior year show high significance and a positive relation in both models. Private school designation is significant and negatively related while HBCUs are significant and positively related.

Table 6-12 - Reclassification Effect - 10 Years

Variable	Model 1A				Model 1B			
	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	B	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.79***	0.04	0.79***	0.04	0.98***	0.05	0.98***	0.05
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.87***	0.01	0.87***	0.01	0.84***	0.01	0.84***	0.01
AGE_UNIV	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.14***	0.02	-0.14***	0.02	-0.19***	0.02	-0.19***	0.02
BCU	0.14***	0.02	0.14***	0.02	0.27***	0.03	0.27***	0.03
WOMENS	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03
CATH	0.03*	0.02	0.03*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
M_PROT	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
E_PROT	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
OTH_REL	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.07	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.08
CMAPP	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
SF_RATIO	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01
GRAD	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
QT_GRAD	0.01**	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01*	0.01	0.01*	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
FB_TITLE	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.00	0.02	-0.00	0.02
MBB_TITLE	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
WBB_TITLE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
NCAA_AGE	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00***	0.00	-0.00***	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE10	0.03*	0.01	---	---	0.04*	0.02	---	---
YEAR1	---	---	0.08*	0.04	---	---	0.08	0.04
YEAR2	---	---	0.02	0.04	---	---	0.02	0.04
YEAR3	---	---	0.06	0.04	---	---	0.05	0.04
YEAR4	---	---	0.01	0.04	---	---	0.01	0.05
YEAR5	---	---	0.03	0.04	---	---	0.03	0.05
YEAR6	---	---	0.03	0.04	---	---	0.04	0.04
YEAR7	---	---	0.02	0.03	---	---	0.02	0.04
YEAR8	---	---	0.03	0.03	---	---	0.05	0.04
YEAR9	---	---	0.04	0.03	---	---	0.04	0.04
YEAR10	---	---	0.01	0.03	---	---	0.01	0.04
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$								

Catholicism is the only religious denomination to show significance and a positive relationship in Model 2A. Compared to Model 2B, however, both Catholicism and Mainline Protestant denominations are significant and positive. A positive and significant relationship is shown with schools utilizing the Common Application and possessing a high student/faculty ratio. Both QT_UGRAD and QT_GRAD are significant and positively related.

In terms of athletic department characteristics, Table 6.12 notes a positive and significant relationship for the number of sports offered (SPT_OFFR) and length of NCAA membership (NCAA_AGE) in Model 2A. Model 2B shows a similar relationship for SPT_OFF but only displays a positive relationship for NCAA_AGE within the 95% confidence level. Furthermore, according to Table 6.12, a significant relationship could not be found for NCAA_AGE in Model 2B. Finally, Model 2A reports a positive and significant relationship within the 95% level for the first five (RANGE5) and first ten years (RANGE10) of NCAA membership, particularly in a school's first year of membership (YEAR1). Model 2B, on the other hand, shows RANGE5 has no significance while RANGE10 has a significant and positive relationship. When each individual year is parceled out, however, no year variables in Model 2B are significant.

Model Two - Geographic Regions

In addition to the overall model, the dissertation estimates if a Reclassification Effect is region specific using the same model variations.

Summary Statistics

Table 6.13 displays the summary statistics for all schools contained in the data set and utilized in Model 2A based upon geographic region. On average, the Far West

Table 6-13 - Summary Statistics by Geographic Region for Model 2A

	New England		Mid-East		Great Lakes		Plains		Southeast		Southwest		Rocky Mountain		Far West	
Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev	Mean	Std. Dev
AGE_UNIV	115	38	107	43	109	40	117	33	110	45	95	35	98	33	91	39
PRIVATE	0.51	0.50	0.61	0.49	0.74	0.44	0.75	0.43	0.65	0.48	0.59	0.49	0.39	0.49	0.74	0.44
BCU	0	0	0.05	0.23	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.09	0.19	0.39	0.06	0.24	0	0	0	0
WOMENS	0	0	0.04	0.19	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.17	0	0	0	0	0.02	0.15
CATH	0.04	0.20	0.19	0.39	0.22	0.42	0.17	0.37	0.05	0.22	0.10	0.30	0.09	0.28	0.14	0.35
M_PROT	0.04	0.20	0.10	0.30	0.22	0.42	0.34	0.47	0.32	0.47	0.24	0.43	0.04	0.20	0.12	0.32
E_PROT	0.04	0.19	0.06	0.23	0.15	0.36	0.14	0.35	0.13	0.33	0.17	0.37	0.09	0.28	0.23	0.42
OTH_REL	0	0	0.01	0.07	0	0	0.02	0.13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CMAPP	0.39	0.49	0.22	0.41	0.09	0.28	0.08	0.26	0.09	0.28	0.05	0.22	0.21	0.41	0.28	0.45
SF_RATIO	29.92	15.67	27.96	10.18	29.20	14.69	28.99	24.75	24.58	12.05	29.10	12.08	30.85	15.91	25.28	10.25
QT_UGRAD	2.67	1.60	2.76	1.32	2.97	1.14	2.36	1.40	2.03	1.34	1.80	1.30	2.47	1.47	3.53	1.43
GRAD	0.79	0.41	0.91	0.28	0.84	0.37	0.66	0.47	0.73	0.45	0.83	0.38	0.77	0.42	0.88	0.33
QT_GRAD	2.49	1.80	3.08	1.25	2.56	1.54	1.59	1.37	2.12	1.61	2.17	1.27	2.66	1.74	3.15	1.56
SPT_OFFR	14	6	15	5	15	6	16	4	14	5	12	5	15	4	13	6
FB_TITLE	0.06	0.23	0.05	0.23	0.08	0.26	0.11	0.31	0.08	0.27	0.07	0.26	0.15	0.36	0.04	0.20
MBB_TITLE	0.15	0.35	0.12	0.32	0.12	0.32	0.13	0.33	0.13	0.33	0.14	0.34	0.13	0.34	0.11	0.31
WBB_TITLE	0.11	0.31	0.11	0.32	0.13	0.34	0.12	0.33	0.11	0.32	0.13	0.33	0.13	0.33	0.10	0.30
NCAA_AGE	23	18	25	18	21	22	13	18	20	20	13	16	23	23	15	18
YEAR1	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.11	0	0	0.01	0.10
YEAR2	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0	0	0.00	0.07
YEAR3	0.01	0.11	0.02	0.14	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.09	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR4	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.11	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR5	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.05	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.13	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR6	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.15	0	0	0.01	0.12
YEAR7	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.15	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.15	0	0	0.01	0.11
YEAR8	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.16	0	0	0.02	0.13
YEAR9	0.01	0.12	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.17	0	0	0.03	0.16
YEAR10	0.03	0.16	0.02	0.13	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.18	0	0	0.02	0.13
Observations	n = 468		n = 1,110		n = 1,390		n = 1,140		n = 2,650		n = 680		n = 230		n = 827	

region has the youngest universities (91 years old) followed by the Southwest (95 years old) and Rocky Mountain (98 years old) regions. The oldest universities are found in the Plains region (117 years old) followed by the New England region (115 years old) and the Southeast region (110 years old). The Great Lakes and Far West regions have the highest concentration of private schools (74% respectively) while the Rocky Mountain region has the least amount (39%). A majority of HBCUs are found in the Southeast region (19%) followed by the Southwest (6%) and Mid-East regions. The New England, Rocky Mountain, and Far West regions do not have any HBCUs during the sample period. Similarly, the New England, Southwest, and Rocky Mountain regions do not possess any women's only institutions in the sample. The remaining regions have approximately 3% of observations that are women's only institutions. Catholic affiliated schools are primarily found in the Great Lakes (22%), Mid-East (19%), and Plains regions (17%). Schools affiliated with a Mainline Protestant denomination occupy 34% of the schools in the Plains region, 32% in the Southeast region, and 24% in the Southwest region. The Far West region has the highest population of schools affiliated with an Evangelist Protestant religion (23%). Only the Plains region (2%) and Mid-East region (1%) have schools in the sample that are affiliated with a religion designated as other.

Approximately 39% of New England schools in the sample implement the Common Application. The lowest region utilizing the Common Application is the Plains region (8% of sample). The highest student/faculty ratio, on average, is found among the Rocky Mountain region schools (30.85) while the lowest ratio is among the Southeast region schools (24.58). The highest undergraduate tuition quantile is found in the Far

West region schools and ranges between the Top 50th and Top 25th Quantiles. In comparison, Southwest region schools' undergraduate tuition range between the Top 90th and Top 75th Quantiles. Mid-East schools have the highest population of graduate schools (91%) and charge around the Top 50th Quantile for graduate tuition. The Plains region has the lowest amount of graduate schools (66%) and cost ranges between the Top 90th and Top 75th Quantiles. Most of the regions have schools that sponsor approximately 14 sports except for schools in the Plains region, which sponsors about 16 sports, and the Far West schools, which sponsor 13. In terms of championships, Rocky Mountain schools have won the most football championships (15%) while the Far West has won the least (4%). Men's basketball championships are primarily won by schools in the New England region (15%), while women's basketball championships are won by schools located in the Great Lakes and Rocky Mountain regions (13%). Finally, schools in the Mid-East region have the longest association with the NCAA on average (25 years) while Plains and Southeast schools have shorter tenures (13 years respectively).

All regions except the Rocky Mountain region have 1% of schools in their first year of NCAA membership. The second year also shows all regions except the Rocky Mountain and Far West regions with 1% of observations in their second year of NCAA membership. The Mid-East region has the highest amount of schools in their third year (3%) of NCAA affiliation. All regions except the Great Lakes and Rocky Mountain have 1% of observations as fourth year NCAA members. The Southwest region possesses the highest amount of schools in their fifth year of NCAA membership (2%) and shares the highest amount of sixth year members with the New England region (2% respectively). The Mid-East and Southwest regions have the highest amount of observations (2%

respectively) in their seventh year of NCAA affiliation. The largest amounts of schools in their eighth year of membership are located in the Mid-East, Southwest, and Far West regions (2% respectively). Schools in their ninth year of membership are primarily found in the Southwest and Far West regions (3% respectively). The New England region has the highest amount of observations within the tenth year of NCAA membership (4%). The Rocky Mountain region is the only region to not have any observations within the first ten years of NCAA membership.

Table 6.14 displays the summary statistics for all schools contained in the data set and utilized in Model 2B based upon geographic region. Similar to the results found in Table 6.13, the Far West region has the youngest universities (79 years old) followed by the Southwest and Rocky Mountain regions (95 years old respectively). The oldest universities are found in the Plains region (114 years old) followed by the New England region (109 years old) and the Southeast region (105 years old). Approximately 83% of Great Lakes schools are considered private, the most found in any region. The smallest amount of private schools is located in the Rocky Mountain region (50%). About 9% of the Southeast schools are HBCUs while 5% of Mid-East schools are women's only institutions. Catholic affiliated schools are primarily found in the Great Lakes (27%), Mid-East (24%), and Plains regions (18%). Schools affiliated with a Mainline Protestant denomination occupy 36% of the schools in the Southeast region, 29% in the Plains region, and 27% in the Southwest region. The Far West region has the highest population of schools affiliated with an Evangelist Protestant religion (30%). Similar to Table 6.13, the Plains region (2%) and Mid-East region (1%) are the only regions with schools affiliated with a religion designated as other.

Table 6-14 - Summary Statistics by Geographic Region for Model 2B

	New England		Mid-East		Great Lakes		Plains		Southeast		Southwest		Rocky Mountain		Far West	
Variable	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev	Mea n	Std. Dev
AGE_UNIV	109	33	98	42	103	42	114	34	105	43	95	36	95	35	79	36
PRIVATE	0.60	0.49	0.73	0.44	0.83	0.37	0.76	0.43	0.74	0.44	0.65	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.70	0.46
BCU	0	0	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.10	0.09	0.28	0.04	0.19	0	0	0	0
WOMENS	0	0	0.05	0.22	0.04	0.20	0.02	0.15	0.04	0.20	0	0	0	0	0.03	0.18
CATH	0.06	0.24	0.24	0.43	0.28	0.45	0.18	0.38	0.05	0.22	0.13	0.33	0.13	0.33	0.13	0.34
M_PROT	0.06	0.24	0.12	0.32	0.20	0.40	0.30	0.46	0.36	0.48	0.28	0.45	0.06	0.24	0.09	0.28
E_PROT	0.05	0.23	0.08	0.28	0.18	0.38	0.17	0.37	0.16	0.37	0.15	0.36	0.13	0.33	0.30	0.46
OTH_REL	0	0	0.01	0.09	0	0	0.02	0.15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CMAPP	0.38	0.49	0.19	0.39	0.07	0.25	0.05	0.21	0.09	0.28	0.06	0.24	0.19	0.40	0.15	0.36
SF_RATIO	30.12	17.6 6	28.39	11.1 2	31.25	16.2 9	29.34	76.5 9	25.20	13.4 4	29.63	12.9 3	30.43	15.4 4	27.31	10.0 1
QT_UGRAD	2.93	1.44	2.95	1.21	2.94	1.03	2.17	1.28	2.15	1.30	1.82	1.36	2.62	1.34	3.18	1.37
GRAD	0.70	0.46	0.89	0.31	0.83	0.37	0.65	0.47	0.68	0.47	0.79	0.41	0.73	0.45	0.88	0.33
QT_GRAD	2.23	1.79	2.88	1.29	2.37	1.42	1.55	1.35	2.00	1.65	2.08	1.34	2.54	1.75	3.03	1.52
SPT_OFFR	13	7	14	5	14	6	15	4	13	5	12	5	14	4	11	6
FB_TITLE	0.06	0.23	0.03	0.16	0.06	0.25	0.10	0.29	0.05	0.21	0.07	0.25	0.10	0.30	0.02	0.13
MBB_TITLE	0.10	0.30	0.12	0.33	0.13	0.33	0.12	0.32	0.11	0.32	0.12	0.33	0.14	0.35	0.10	0.30
WBB_TITL E	0.07	0.26	0.11	0.31	0.10	0.29	0.12	0.32	0.11	0.32	0.11	0.31	0.11	0.31	0.09	0.29
NCAA_AGE	17	14	17	12	9	12	6	10	10	11	7	9	10	10	7	11
YEAR1	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.11	0	0	0.01	0.12
YEAR2	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.14	0.01	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.08	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR3	0.02	0.12	0.03	0.16	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.08	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR4	0.02	0.12	0.02	0.13	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR5	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.13	0.00	0.06	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.13	0	0	0.01	0.08
YEAR6	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.14	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.03	0.16	0	0	0.01	0.10
YEAR7	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.18	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.11	0.03	0.16	0	0	0.01	0.09
YEAR8	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.11	0.03	0.17	0	0	0.01	0.11
YEAR9	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.12	0.04	0.19	0	0	0.03	0.16
YEAR10	0.02	0.13	0.02	0.15	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.09	0.02	0.15	0.04	0.19	0	0	0.01	0.11
Observations	n = 328		n = 780		n = 1,010		n = 910		n = 1,880		n = 560		n = 160		n = 597	

Most schools that implement the Common Application are found within the New England region (38%) while the lowest amount of Common Application users are located in the Plains region (5%). The highest student/faculty ratio, on average, can be found among the Plains region schools (34.66), and the lowest ratio is located in the Southeast region schools (25.20). The Far West region schools charge undergraduate tuition around the Top 50th Quantile which, have the lowest undergraduate tuitions, averaging around the Top 75th Quantile. The Mid-East region has the highest population of graduate school programs (89%) and graduate tuition averages around the Top 50th Quantile. The Plains region has the lowest amount of graduate school programs (66%) and cost ranges between the Top 90th and Top 75th Quantiles. Unlike the results found in Table 6.13, each region possesses more variability in terms of number of sports sponsored. Schools in the Plains region, on average, sponsor more sports (15) while Far West schools sponsor the least (11). Schools in the Plains region win more championships in football (10%) and women's basketball (12%) while teams in the Rocky Mountain region win championships in both football (10%) and men's basketball (14%). Unlike Table 6.13, New England schools had longer associations with the NCAA (17 year) compared to the Mid-East regional schools (16 year). The Plains region (6 year) has the youngest members on average.

All regions except the Rocky Mountain region have 1% of schools that are in their first year of NCAA membership. The Mid-East region has the highest amount of schools in their second year (2%) and third year (3%) of NCAA affiliation and shares the highest amount in the fourth year with the New England region (2% respectively). These two regions, along with the Southwest region, possess the highest amount of schools in their

fifth and sixth years of NCAA membership (2% respectively each year). Schools in their seventh of NCAA affiliation are mostly found in the Mid-East and Southwest regions (3% respectively). Schools in their eighth, ninth, and tenth years of NCAA membership are primarily found in the Southwest region (3% in year eight; 4% in years nine and ten). Similar to Table 6.13, the Rocky Mountain region is the only region to not have any observations within the first ten years of NCAA membership.

Results

Tables 6.15 and 6.16 present the results from Model 2A for each region for the first five years and first ten years of NCAA association respectively. Because the Rocky Mountain region has no schools associated with the NCAA during their first 10 years, a model was not estimated for this region. According to both tables, all regions show a positive and significant relationship for applications received in the prior year. The Great Lakes region is the only region to show a significant and negative relationship for the age of the university (AGE_UNIV). The private school designation is significant and negatively related in all regions except for the New England and Plains regions. The Mid-East and Southwest regions are the only regions with HBCUs that did not show a positive and significant relationship for BCU. Women's only schools are significant at the 95% level and positively related only in the Far West region. Schools affiliated with Catholicism and found in the Great Lakes and Far West regions show a significant and positive relationship while Mainline Protestant affiliated institutions in the Great Lakes region have a positive significant relationship. Evangelist Protestant affiliated schools have a significant negative relationship in the New England and Mid- East regions and a positive and significant relationship in the Great Lakes and Far West regions.

Table 6-15 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2A (Five Years)

	New England				Mid-East				Great Lakes				Plains	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.86***	0.14	0.87***	0.14	0.87***	0.10	0.86***	0.10	0.16	0.09	0.16	0.09	0.71***	0.10
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.84***	0.02	0.84***	0.02	0.86***	0.01	0.86***	0.01	0.96***	0.01	0.96***	0.01	0.86***	0.02
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.00	0.05	-0.00	0.05	-0.10***	0.03	-0.10***	0.03	-0.08*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04	-0.09	0.04
BCU	---	---	---	---	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.17*	0.07	0.17*	0.07	0.77***	0.09
WOMENS	---	---	---	---	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.07
CATH	-0.11	0.07	-0.11	0.08	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.09***	0.03	0.09***	0.03	-0.01	0.04
M_PROT	-0.06	0.07	-0.06	0.07	-0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.08***	0.03	0.08***	0.03	-0.01	0.04
E_PROT	-0.49***	0.08	-0.49***	0.08	-0.07*	0.04	-0.08*	0.04	0.06*	0.03	0.06*	0.03	-0.04	0.04
OTH_REL	---	---	---	---	0.01	0.10	0.02	0.10	---	---	---	---	-0.04	0.07
CMAPP	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.09**	0.03	0.09**	0.03	0.01	0.04
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.02*	0.01
GRAD	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.06	-0.11*	0.05	-0.11*	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.03
QT_GRAD	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
FB_TITLE	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.06*	0.03
MBB_TITLE	-0.03	0.03	-0.03	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.02
WBB_TITLE	-0.01	0.03	-0.00	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.05*	0.03
NCAA_AGE	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE5	0.04	0.05	---	---	0.02	0.03	---	---	0.04	0.05	---	---	0.03	0.04
YEAR1	---	---	0.09	0.12	---	---	0.11	0.08	---	---	-0.02	0.09	---	---
YEAR2	---	---	0.01	0.11	---	---	-0.06	0.06	---	---	0.04	0.08	---	---
YEAR3	---	---	0.08	0.09	---	---	0.08	0.06	---	---	0.14	0.12	---	---
YEAR4	---	---	-0.01	0.09	---	---	-0.07	0.07	---	---	0.09	0.13	---	---
YEAR5	---	---	0.03	0.08	---	---	0.03	0.07	---	---	-0.04	0.15	---	---
Observations	n = 468				n = 1,110				n = 1,390				n = 1,140	
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$														

(Table 6.15 continued)

	Plains		Southeast				Southwest				Far West						
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.			
INTERCEPT	0.71***	0.10	0.90***	0.07	0.90***	0.07	1.26***	0.15	1.25***	0.15	2.41***	0.23	2.54***	0.24			
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.86***	0.02	0.86***	0.01	0.86***	0.01	0.77***	0.02	0.77***	0.02	0.56***	0.03	0.58***	0.03			
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00			
PRIVATE	-0.09	0.05	-0.10***	0.03	-0.10***	0.03	-0.15	0.09	-0.15	0.09	-0.90***	0.11	-0.91***	0.11			
BCU	0.76***	0.10	0.11***	0.02	0.11***	0.02	0.09	0.08	0.09	0.08	---	---	---	---			
WOMENS	0.01	0.07	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	---	---	---	---	0.51*	0.22	0.51*	0.22			
CATH	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.25**	0.09	0.24**	0.09			
M_PROT	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10			
E_PROT	-0.04	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.39***	0.10	0.38***	0.10			
OTH_REL	-0.04	0.07	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---			
CMAPP	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	-0.13	0.08	-0.13	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.07			
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
QT_UGRAD	0.02*	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.14***	0.02	0.14***	0.03			
GRAD	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.02	0.08	-0.01	0.08	-0.15	0.12	-0.15	0.12			
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03			
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01			
FB_TITLE	-0.06*	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	0.09			
MBB_TITLE	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.05			
WBB_TITLE	0.05*	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.04	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05			
NCAA_AGE	0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01			
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.08	0.00	-0.00	0.00			
RANGE5	---	---	0.05	0.04	---	---	0.14*	0.07	---	---	0.03	0.10	---	---			
YEAR1	0.04	0.08	---	---	0.07	0.07	---	---	0.30*	0.13	---	---	0.15	0.14			
YEAR2	0.06	0.08	---	---		0.04	0.08	---		---	0.27	0.16		---	---	0.06	0.20
YEAR3	0.13	0.11	---	---		0.04	0.07	---		---	0.04	0.16		---	---	-0.14	0.20
YEAR4	-0.05	0.10	---	---		0.02	0.08	---		---	0.16	0.15		---	---	-0.20	0.20
YEAR5	-0.03	0.09	---	---		0.06	0.07	---		---	-0.01	0.11		---	---	-0.07	0.17
Observations	n = 1,140		n = 2,650				n = 680				n = 827						
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$																	

Table 6-16 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2A (Ten Years)

	New England				Mid-East				Great Lakes				Plains	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.86***	0.14	0.87***	0.14	0.89***	0.10	0.88***	0.10	0.16	0.09	0.16	0.09	0.70***	0.10
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.84***	0.02	0.84***	0.02	0.86***	0.01	0.86***	0.01	0.96***	0.01	0.96***	0.01	0.86***	0.02
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.01	0.05	0.00	0.05	-0.11***	0.03	-0.10***	0.03	-0.09*	0.04	-0.09*	0.04	-0.08	0.05
BCU	---	---	---	---	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.16*	0.07	0.16*	0.07	0.77***	0.09
WOMENS	---	---	---	---	-0.04	0.05	-0.04	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.07
CATH	-0.10	0.07	-0.12	0.08	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.10**	0.03	0.10**	0.03	-0.00	0.04
M_PROT	-0.06	0.07	-0.07	0.07	-0.03	0.03	-0.02*	0.03	0.09**	0.03	0.09**	0.03	-0.01	0.04
E_PROT	-0.49***	0.08	-0.49***	0.08	-0.07	0.04	-0.08	0.04	0.07**	0.03	0.07**	0.03	-0.04	0.04
OTH_REL	---	---	---	---	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.10	---	---	---	---	-0.04	0.07
CMAPP	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.09**	0.03	0.09**	0.03	0.01	0.04
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.02*	0.01
GRAD	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.07	-0.11*	0.05	-0.11*	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.03
QT_GRAD	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.04***	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
FB_TITLE	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.06*	0.03
MBB_TITLE	-0.03	0.03	-0.02	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.05	0.02
WBB_TITLE	-0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05*	0.03
NCAA_AGE	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE10	-0.00	0.04	---	---	-0.02	0.02	---	---	0.06	0.04	---	---	0.07*	0.03
YEAR1	---	---	0.08	0.12	---	---	0.10	0.08	---	---	-0.01	0.09	---	---
YEAR2	---	---	0.00	0.11	---	---	-0.07	0.06	---	---	0.05	0.08	---	---
YEAR3	---	---	0.07	0.09	---	---	0.07	0.06	---	---	0.14	0.12	---	---
YEAR4	---	---	-0.02	0.09	---	---	-0.09	0.07	---	---	0.10	0.13	---	---
YEAR5	---	---	-0.00	0.08	---	---	0.02	0.07	---	---	-0.03	0.15	---	---
YEAR6	---	---	-0.08	0.08	---	---	0.05	0.06	---	---	0.00	0.12	---	---
YEAR7	---	---	0.12	0.09	---	---	-0.07	0.05	---	---	0.18	0.11	---	---
YEAR8	---	---	-0.00	0.09	---	---	-0.06	0.06	---	---	-0.01	0.10	---	---
YEAR9	---	---	0.04	0.08	---	---	-0.08	0.06	---	---	0.12	0.09	---	---
YEAR10	---	---	-0.06	0.07	---	---	-0.00	0.06	---	---	0.04	0.09	---	---
Observations	n = 468				n = 1,110				n = 1,390				n = 1,140	

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

(Table 6.16 Continued)

	Plains		Southeast				Southwest				Far West			
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.70***	0.10	0.90***	0.07	0.91***	0.07	1.25***	0.13	1.25***	0.13	2.41***	0.23	2.63***	0.24
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.86***	0.01	0.86***	0.01	0.86***	0.01	0.78***	0.02	0.78***	0.02	0.60***	0.03	0.57***	0.03
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.08	0.04	-0.10***	0.03	-0.10***	0.03	-0.16	0.08	-0.16	0.08	-0.90***	0.11	-0.93***	0.11
BCU	0.77***	0.09	0.11***	0.02	0.11***	0.02	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.07	---	---	---	---
WOMENS	0.02	0.07	-0.00	0.04	-0.00	0.04	---	---	---	---	0.51*	0.22	0.53*	0.23
CATH	-0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.25**	0.09	0.25**	0.10
M_PROT	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.10	0.09	0.09	0.10
E_PROT	-0.04	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.07	0.01	0.07	0.39***	0.10	0.37***	0.10
OTH_REL	-0.04	0.07	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CMAPP	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	-0.14	0.07	-0.14	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.10	0.08
SF_RATIO	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.02	0.01	0.02*	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.14***	0.02	0.14***	0.03
GRAD	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.07	-0.15	0.12	-0.16	0.12
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.03
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.01**	0.00	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01
FB_TITLE	-0.06*	0.03	-0.01	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.09	-0.01	0.09
MBB_TITLE	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.04	-0.06	0.05	-0.06	0.05
WBB_TITLE	0.05*	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	-0.04	0.04	-0.04	0.04	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05
NCAA_AGE	0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01
NCAA_AGE ²	0.00	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE10	---	---	0.02	0.02	---	---	-0.02	0.04	---	---	0.02	0.07	---	---
YEAR1	0.04	0.08	---	---	0.07	0.08	---	---	0.29*	0.13	---	---	0.15	0.14
YEAR2	0.06	0.08	---	---	0.04	0.08	---	---	0.26	0.16	---	---	0.05	0.20
YEAR3	0.14	0.11	---	---	0.04	0.07	---	---	0.02	0.16	---	---	-0.17	0.20
YEAR4	-0.04	0.10	---	---	0.02	0.08	---	---	0.15	0.15	---	---	-0.25	0.20
YEAR5	-0.01	0.09	---	---	0.06	0.07	---	---	-0.01	0.11	---	---	-0.15	0.19
YEAR6	0.03	0.09	---	---	0.05	0.07	---	---	-0.04	0.10	---	---	-0.14	0.13
YEAR7	0.04	0.09	---	---	-0.01	0.06	---	---	-0.07	0.09	---	---	0.03	0.14
YEAR8	0.24**	0.09	---	---	0.03	0.06	---	---	-0.06	0.09	---	---	-0.03	0.13
YEAR9	0.08	0.10	---	---	0.03	0.06	---	---	-0.07	0.08	---	---	0.05	0.12
YEAR10	0.10	0.09	---	---	-0.04	0.05	---	---	-0.07	0.08	---	---	0.07	0.10
Observations	n = 1,140		n = 2,650				n = 680				n = 827			
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$														

Schools located in the Great Lakes region that utilize the Common Application show a positive and significant relationship within the 95% confidence level. The New England, Southeast, and Far West regions are the only regions to not possess a positive and significant relationship for a student/faculty ratio. The Far West region shows a significant and a positive relationship at the 99% confidence level for QT_UGRAD while the Southeast region only has a significant positive relationship at the 95% confidence level. The Mid-East region shows a negative and significant relationship for schools with a graduate school program. However, QT_GRAD has a significant positive relationship in the Mid-East. All regions report a positive and significant relationship for SPT_OFFR except for the New England region. The Plains region displays a negative significant relationship for FB_TITLE and a positive significant relationship for WBB_TITLE. NCAA_AGE is positively significant in all regions except for the Mid-East, Great Lakes, and Plains regions. Finally, only the Southwest region showed a positive significant relationship for RANGE5, specifically YEAR1. The same positive relationship is found in Table 6.16. In addition, the Plains region also shows a positive and significant relationship for YEAR8. All other regions showed no significant relationships for the association variables.

Tables 6.17 and 6.18 present the results from Model 2B and also do not include the Rocky Mountain region. According to both tables, all regions show a positive and significant relationship for applications received in the prior year. The Great Lakes region reports a significant and negative relationship for the age of the university, while the Southwest region shows a significant positive relationship for university age. All regions except for schools found in the New England, Plains, and Southwest regions have

Table 6-17 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2B (Five Years)

	New England				Mid-East				Great Lakes				Plains	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	1.10***	0.19	1.11***	0.19	1.32***	0.13	1.32***	0.13	0.28*	0.13	0.28*	0.13	0.73***	0.12
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.78***	0.03	0.78***	0.03	0.79***	0.02	0.79***	0.02	0.96***	0.02	0.96***	0.02	0.85***	0.02
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	-0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.07	-0.13***	0.04	-0.13***	0.04	-0.10*	0.05	-0.10*	0.05	-0.10	0.05
BCU	---	---	---	---	0.18	0.10	0.18	0.10	0.23*	0.11	0.23*	0.11	0.79***	0.10
WOMENS	---	---	---	---	-0.02	0.06	-0.01	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.01	0.08
CATH	-0.14	0.09	-0.13	0.09	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.09*	0.04	0.09*	0.04	0.01	0.05
M_PROT	-0.14	0.09	-0.15	0.09	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.08	0.04	-0.00	0.04
E_PROT	-0.49***	0.09	-0.48***	0.09	-0.07	0.05	-0.08	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	-0.02	0.05
OTH_REL	---	---	---	---	0.04	0.13	0.04	0.13	---	---	---	---	-0.03	0.08
CMAPP	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.10*	0.05	0.10*	0.05	-0.01	0.05
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.04*	0.02	-0.04*	0.02	0.04**	0.01
GRAD	-0.01	0.08	-0.01	0.08	-0.17**	0.06	-0.17**	0.06	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	-0.01	0.04
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
FB_TITLE	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	-0.07*	0.03
MBB_TITLE	-0.00	0.04	-0.00	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	0.04	0.03
WBB_TITLE	-0.01	0.05	-0.01	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.08**	0.03
NCAA_AGE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01*	0.00	-0.01*	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE5	0.03	0.07	---	---	-0.03	0.04	---	---	0.02	0.06	---	---	0.04	0.05
YEAR1	---	---	-0.01	0.16	---	---	0.09	0.09	---	---	-0.03	0.10	---	---
YEAR2	---	---	0.01	0.13	---	---	-0.09	0.07	---	---	0.03	0.09	---	---
YEAR3	---	---	0.09	0.11	---	---	0.01	0.07	---	---	0.10	0.13	---	---
YEAR4	---	---	0.01	0.11	---	---	-0.10	0.08	---	---	0.05	0.15	---	---
YEAR5	---	---	0.03	0.09	---	---	-0.02	0.08	---	---	-0.08	0.16	---	---
Observations	n = 328				n = 780				n = 1,010				n = 910	
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$														

(Table 6.17 Continued)

	Plains		Southeast				Southwest				Far West					
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.		
INTERCEPT	0.73***	0.12	1.12***	0.10	1.12***	0.10	1.43***	0.17	1.43***	0.17	2.60***	0.28	2.73***	0.29		
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.85***	0.02	0.83***	0.01	0.83***	0.01	0.74***	0.02	0.74***	0.02	0.56***	0.03	0.55***	0.03		
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00		
PRIVATE	-0.10	0.05	-0.13***	0.03	-0.13***	0.03	-0.17	0.09	-0.17	0.09	-1.04***	0.14	-1.06***	0.14		
BCU	0.79***	0.10	0.22***	0.04	0.22***	0.04	0.05	0.11	0.05	0.11	---	---	---	---		
WOMENS	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.05	---	---	---	---	0.54*	0.25	0.53*	0.26		
CATH	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	0.27	0.14	0.24	0.14		
M_PROT	-0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.24	0.15	0.22	0.16		
E_PROT	-0.02	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	-0.05	0.08	-0.05	0.08	0.55***	0.13	0.54***	0.14		
OTH_REL	-0.03	0.08	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---		
CMAPP	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	-0.12	0.08	-0.12	0.08	0.10	0.11	0.12	0.11		
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		
QT_UGRAD	0.04**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.18***	0.03	0.18***	0.03		
GRAD	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	-0.19	0.15	-0.18	0.15		
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03		
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01*	0.00	0.01*	0.00	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01		
FB_TITLE	-0.07*	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.07	-0.18	0.18	-0.18	0.18		
MBB_TITLE	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.11*	0.05	0.11*	0.05	-0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.07		
WBB_TITLE	0.08**	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.01	0.07		
NCAA_AGE	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.03*	0.01	0.03*	0.01		
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00		
RANGE5	---	---	0.05	0.04	---	---	0.07	0.07	---	---	0.08	0.12	---	---		
YEAR1	0.05	0.08	---	---			0.07	0.08	---	---	0.26	0.14	---	---	0.21	0.16
YEAR2	0.07	0.09	---	---			0.03	0.09	---	---	0.13	0.18	---	---	0.14	0.24
YEAR3	0.12	0.12	---	---			0.03	0.07	---	---	-0.09	0.18	---	---	-0.14	0.26
YEAR4	-0.04	0.12	---	---			0.03	0.09	---	---	0.10	0.16	---	---	-0.21	0.25
YEAR5	-0.03	0.10	---	---			0.08	0.08	---	---	-0.06	0.12	---	---	-0.08	0.22
Observations	n = 910		n = 1,880				n = 560				n = 597					
* <i>p</i> < 0.05, ** <i>p</i> < 0.01, *** <i>p</i> < 0.001																

Table 6-18 - Reclassification Effect by Region - Model 2B (Ten Years)

	New England				Mid-East				Great Lakes				Plains	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	1.13***	0.19	1.12***	0.19	1.36***	0.13	1.36***	0.14	0.28*	0.13	0.28*	0.13	0.73***	0.12
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.78***	0.03	0.78***	0.03	0.78***	0.02	0.78***	0.02	0.96***	0.02	0.96***	0.02	0.85***	0.02
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	-0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	0.02	0.07	0.02	0.07	-0.14***	0.04	-0.14***	0.04	-0.11*	0.05	-0.11*	0.05	-0.09	0.05
BCU	---	---	---	---	0.18	0.10	0.18	0.10	0.23*	0.12	0.23*	0.12	0.79***	0.10
WOMENS	---	---	---	---	-0.02	0.06	-0.02	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.01	0.08
CATH	-0.15	0.09	-0.14	0.09	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.09*	0.04	0.09*	0.04	-0.01	0.05
M_PROT	-0.14	0.09	-0.14	0.09	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.08*	0.04	0.08*	0.04	-0.00	0.04
E_PROT	-0.47***	0.09	-0.47***	0.10	-0.07	0.05	-0.08	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	-0.02	0.05
OTH_REL	---	---	---	---	0.04	0.13	0.04	0.13	---	---	---	---	-0.03	0.08
CMAPP	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.10*	0.05	0.10*	0.05	-0.01	0.05
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00***	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.03*	0.02	-0.03*	0.02	0.03**	0.01
GRAD	-0.02	0.08	-0.03	0.08	-0.16**	0.06	-0.16**	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.05	-0.01	0.04
QT_GRAD	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.04**	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00
FB_TITLE	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	-0.07*	0.03
MBB_TITLE	-0.00	0.04	-0.00	0.04	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	-0.00	0.03	0.04	0.03
WBB_TITLE	-0.01	0.05	-0.00	0.05	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.04	0.08**	0.03
NCAA_AGE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	-0.01*	0.00	-0.01*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NCAA_AGE ²	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE10	0.05	0.06	---	---	-0.06	0.03	---	---	0.04	0.04	---	---	0.07	0.04
YEAR1	---	---	0.00	0.16	---	---	0.07	0.09	---	---	-0.02	0.10	---	---
YEAR2	---	---	0.03	0.14	---	---	-0.11	0.07	---	---	0.03	0.09	---	---
YEAR3	---	---	0.11	0.11	---	---	-0.01	0.07	---	---	0.11	0.13	---	---
YEAR4	---	---	0.03	0.11	---	---	-0.12	0.08	---	---	0.06	0.15	---	---
YEAR5	---	---	0.06	0.10	---	---	-0.04	0.08	---	---	-0.07	0.17	---	---
YEAR6	---	---	0.06	0.10	---	---	0.01	0.07	---	---	-0.01	0.13	---	---
YEAR7	---	---	0.16	0.10	---	---	-0.10	0.06	---	---	0.11	0.14	---	---
YEAR8	---	---	0.05	0.11	---	---	-0.08	0.07	---	---	0.00	0.13	---	---
YEAR9	---	---	0.06	0.10	---	---	-0.10	0.07	---	---	0.11	0.11	---	---
YEAR10	---	---	-0.02	0.10	---	---	-0.03	0.07	---	---	0.05	0.11	---	---
Observations	n = 328				n = 780				n = 1,010				n = 910	
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$														

(Table 6.18 Continued)

	Plains		Southeast				Southwest				Far West			
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.73***	0.12	1.12***	0.10	1.13***	0.10	1.43***	0.17	1.43***	0.17	2.63***	0.29	2.82***	0.29
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.85***	0.02	0.83***	0.01	0.83***	0.01	0.75***	0.02	0.75***	0.02	0.56***	0.03	0.53***	0.04
AGE_UNIV	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.09	0.05	-0.13***	0.03	-0.13***	0.03	-0.19*	0.10	-0.19*	0.10	-1.04***	0.14	-1.06***	0.14
BCU	0.79***	0.10	0.22***	0.04	0.22***	0.04	0.05	0.11	0.05	0.11	---	---	---	---
WOMENS	0.01	0.08	0.02	0.05	0.02	0.05	---	---	---	---	0.54*	0.26	0.55*	0.27
CATH	-0.01	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.26	0.14	0.24	0.14
M_PROT	-0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.23	0.15	0.22	0.16
E_PROT	-0.02	0.05	0.02	0.03	0.01	0.03	-0.04	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.55***	0.13	0.54***	0.14
OTH_REL	-0.03	0.08	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
CMAPP	-0.01	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03	-0.13	0.08	-0.13	0.08	0.11	0.11	0.13	0.11
SF_RATIO	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00*	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.03**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.02**	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.18***	0.03	0.18***	0.03
GRAD	-0.01	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.05	0.08	-0.18	0.15	-0.18	0.15
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.03
SPT_OFFR	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01***	0.00	0.01*	0.00	0.01*	0.00	0.05***	0.01	0.05***	0.01
FB_TITLE	-0.07*	0.03	-0.02	0.04	-0.02	0.04	-0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.07	-0.18	0.18	-0.18	0.18
MBB_TITLE	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.11*	0.05	0.11*	0.05	-0.06	0.07	-0.05	0.07
WBB_TITLE	0.08**	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.01	0.03	-0.03	0.05	-0.03	0.05	0.00	0.07	0.02	0.07
NCAA_AGE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03*	0.01	0.03*	0.01
NCAA_AGE ²	-0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE10	---	---	0.03	0.03	---	---	-0.03	0.04	---	---	0.07	0.10	---	---
YEAR1	0.06	0.08	---	---	0.07	0.08	---	---	0.25	0.14	---	---	0.21	0.16
YEAR2	0.07	0.09	---	---	0.03	0.09	---	---	0.12	0.18	---	---	0.14	0.24
YEAR3	0.13	0.12	---	---	0.03	0.07	---	---	-0.11	0.18	---	---	-0.16	0.26
YEAR4	-0.03	0.12	---	---	0.03	0.09	---	---	0.08	0.16	---	---	-0.25	0.26
YEAR5	-0.01	0.10	---	---	0.09	0.08	---	---	-0.08	0.12	---	---	-0.17	0.25
YEAR6	0.04	0.10	---	---	0.09	0.08	---	---	-0.07	0.10	---	---	-0.15	0.21
YEAR7	0.02	0.10	---	---	-0.00	0.07	---	---	-0.07	0.10	---	---	0.16	0.24
YEAR8	0.23*	0.11	---	---	0.08	0.07	---	---	-0.04	0.09	---	---	0.06	0.20
YEAR9	0.07	0.11	---	---	0.04	0.07	---	---	-0.07	0.08	---	---	0.13	0.18
YEAR10	0.10	0.11	---	---	-0.04	0.06	---	---	-0.06	0.08	---	---	0.09	0.17
Observations	n = 910		n = 1,880				n = 560				n = 597			
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$														

a significant and negative relationship with the private school designation. Similar to Tables 6.15 and 6.16, the Mid-East and Southwest regions did not show a positive and significant relationship with BCU. Women's only colleges have a significant and positive relationship at the 95% level in the Far West region only. Unlike Model 2A, Tables 6.17 and 6.18 showed that only the Great Lakes region show a significant positive relationship for schools affiliated with Catholicism and Mainline Protestant denominations. Evangelist Protestant denominations, on the other hand, have a negative and significant relationship in the New England region and a positive significant relationship in the Far West region.

Like Tables 6.15 and 6.16, schools in the Great Lakes region using the Common Application show significance at the 95% level and a positive relation. The New England, Southeast, and Far West regions do not have a positive and significant relationship with the student/faculty ratio. The Southeast region continues to have a positive significant relationship at the 95% confidence level for QT_UGRAD while the Far West region possesses the same 99% significant positive relationship. The Mid-East region shows a negative and significant relationship for schools with graduate school programs but a positive and significant relationship for QT_GRAD. All regions except the New England region show a positive and significant relationship for SPT_OFFR. The Far West region is the only region to show significance for sports championships (FB_TITLE is negative; WBB_TITLE is positive). The Mid-East region displays a significant and negative relationship for NCAA_AGE while the Plains region reports a positive relationship. Finally, the only region to show significance within the first 10 years of NCAA membership is the Plains region, specifically YEAR8.

Model Two - NCAA Division

Finally, the dissertation analyzes if NCAA divisional alignment can create a Reclassification Effect for universities joining either Division II or III. Opposed to the prior model variations, the dissertation only reviews schools moving from the NAIA to either Division II or III since the creation of both divisions in 1973.

Summary Statistics

Table 6.19 displays the summary statistics for universities analyzed by division. According to the results, the average age for schools associated with Division II is 104 years while Division III is 108 years. The Division III sample has a larger sample of private schools (74%) and women's colleges (3%) while the Division II sample has more HBCUs (9%). On average, Division III has more Catholic affiliated (14%) and Mainline Protestant affiliated schools (26%) than Division II (Catholic, 14%; Mainline Protestant, 26%). However, both divisions have the same amount of Evangelist Protestant affiliated schools (15%) and religious affiliations classified as other (0.4%). More Division III schools utilize the Common Application (16%) than Division II schools (9%), while Division II schools have larger student/faculty ratios (28.12) compared to Division III members (26.79). Division III schools have undergraduate tuitions ranging between the Top 50th and Top 75th Quantiles while Division II schools are closer to the Top 75th Quantile. Division II schools have more graduate school programs (79%) and charge tuitions around the Top 50th Quantile. Division III schools have a higher average number of sports programs (14) as well as a longer association with their chosen division [8 years (D3_AGE) versus 6 years (D2_AGE)]. However, both divisions have won approximately the same number of championships in football (7%), men's basketball

Table 6-19 - Summary Statistics by NCAA Division

Variable	Division II					Division III				
	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Median	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max	Median
Age of University	104	41	1	320	109	108	42	1	320	112
Private	0.62	0.48	0	1	1	0.73	0.44	0	1	1
HBCU	0.09	0.28	0	1	0	0.06	0.24	0	1	0
Women's	0.02	0.14	0	1	0	0.03	0.17	0	1	0
Catholic	0.12	0.32	0	1	0	0.14	0.34	0	1	0
Mainline Protestant	0.19	0.39	0	1	0	0.26	0.44	0	1	0
Evangelist Protestant	0.15	0.36	0	1	0	0.15	0.36	0	1	0
Other Religious Affiliation	0.00	0.06	0	1	0	0.00	0.06	0	1	0
Common Application	0.09	0.28	0	1	0	0.16	0.37	0	1	0
Student/Faculty Ratio	28.12	15.64	4.15	235.70	25.22	26.79	15.70	4.15	235.70	24.03
Undergraduate Tuition	2.26	1.37	0	5	2	2.68	1.43	0	5	3
Graduate Program	0.79	0.41	0	1	1	0.76	0.42	0	1	1
Graduate Tuition	2.35	1.55	0	5	2	2.32	1.63	0	5	2
Sports Offered	13	5	0	27	14	14	6	0	27	15
Football Titles	0.07	0.26	0	1	0	0.07	0.25	0	1	0
Men's Basketball Titles	0.12	0.33	0	1	0	0.12	0.33	0	1	0
Women's Basketball Titles	0.12	0.32	0	1	0	0.11	0.31	0	1	0
Age of Division Association	6	11	0	40	0	8	12	0	40	0
Division – Year One	0.01	0.09	0	1	0	0.00	0.06	0	1	0
Division – Year Two	0.01	0.09	0	1	0	0.00	0.07	0	1	0
Division – Year Three	0.01	0.08	0	1	0	0.00	0.07	0	1	0
Division – Year Four	0.01	0.08	0	1	0	0.00	0.07	0	1	0
Division – Year Five	0.01	0.09	0	1	0	0.01	0.08	0	1	0
Division – Year Six	0.01	0.09	0	1	0	0.01	0.08	0	1	0
Division – Year Seven	0.01	0.10	0	1	0	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
Division – Year Eight	0.01	0.09	0	1	0	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
Division – Year Nine	0.01	0.11	0	1	0	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
Division – Year Ten	0.01	0.11	0	1	0	0.01	0.09	0	1	0
Observations	n = 6,282					n = 6,271				

(12%) and women's basketball (12% for Division II and 11% for Division III). Finally, both samples contain approximately 1% of schools within each of the first ten years of membership within their respective division.

Results

Table 6.20 presents the results for the Division II sample while Table 6.21 analyzes the Division III sample. Both tables include results for the first five and first ten years of division membership. According to Table 6.20, schools within Division II showed a significant and positive relationship for applications received in the prior year. Private schools have a negative significant relationship while HBCUs shows a positive significant relationship. Catholic affiliated Division II schools maintain positive significance at the 99% confidence level while Mainline Protestant Division II colleges have a positive relationship at the 95% confidence level. Division II schools using the Common Application maintained a positive and significant relationship. In addition, Division II schools have a significant and positive relationship at the 99% level with SF_RATIO and beyond the 99% level with QT_UGRAD. Unlike prior models, graduate school programs did not show significance. For athletic department variables, the number of sports offered show a positive and significant relationship. However, there is no significance for Division II schools winning football, men's basketball, or women's basketball championships won or length of Division II affiliation (D2_AGE). Finally, schools within the first five years (RANGE5_D2) or first ten years (RANGE10_D2) of Division II membership show no significance.

Similar to Table 6.20, Table 6.21 shows a significant and positive relationship for Division III schools with LN_APP_{t-1}. Division III private schools have a negative

Table 6-20 - Reclassification Effect for Division II

	5 Year Range		5 Year Ind.		10 Year Range		10 Year Ind.	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.78***	0.05	0.78***	0.05	0.78***	0.05	0.78***	0.05
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.87***	0.01	0.87***	0.01	0.87***	0.01	0.87***	0.01
AGE_UNIV	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.18***	0.02	-0.18***	0.02	-0.18***	0.02	-0.18***	0.02
BCU	0.17***	0.02	0.17***	0.02	0.17***	0.02	0.17***	0.02
WOMENS	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
CATH	0.06**	0.02	0.06**	0.02	0.06**	0.02	0.06**	0.02
M_PROT	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
E_PROT	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
OTH_REL	-0.06	0.09	-0.06	0.09	-0.06	0.09	-0.06	0.09
CMAPP	0.09***	0.02	0.09***	0.02	0.09***	0.02	0.09***	0.02
SF_RATIO	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01
GRAD	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
QT_GRAD	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
FB_TITLE	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02
MBB_TITLE	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01
WBB_TITLE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
D2_AGE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
D2_AGE_SQ	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
RANGE5_D2	0.01	0.03	---	---	---	---	---	---
RANGE10_D2	---	---	---	---	-0.01	0.02	---	---
YEAR1_D2	---	---	0.02	0.05	---	---	0.02	0.05
YEAR2_D2	---	---	-0.00	0.05	---	---	-0.00	0.05
YEAR3_D2	---	---	0.10	0.06	---	---	0.10	0.06
YEAR4_D2	---	---	0.00	0.06	---	---	-0.00	0.06
YEAR5_D2	---	---	-0.05	0.05	---	---	-0.05	0.05
YEAR6_D2	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.01	0.05
YEAR7_D2	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.01	0.05
YEAR8_D2	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.01	0.05
YEAR9_D2	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.05	0.04
YEAR10_D2	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.04	0.04
Observations	n = 6,282							
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$								

significant relationship while Division III HBCUs possess a positive significant relationship. Unlike Table 6.20, Table 6.21 notes only Catholic affiliated schools have a significant positive relationship at the 95% confidence level. However, Division III

Table 6-21 - Reclassification Effect for Division III

	5 Year Range		5 Year Ind.		10 Year Range		10 Year Ind.	
Variable	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.	β	Std. Err.
INTERCEPT	0.87***	0.05	0.87***	0.05	0.87***	0.05	0.87***	0.05
LN_APP _{t-1}	0.85***	0.01	0.85***	0.01	0.85***	0.01	0.85***	0.01
AGE_UNIV	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
PRIVATE	-0.20***	0.02	-0.20***	0.02	-0.20***	0.02	-0.20***	0.02
BCU	0.21***	0.02	0.21***	0.02	0.21***	0.02	0.21***	0.02
WOMENS	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.03
CATH	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02	0.04*	0.02
M_PROT	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
E_PROT	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
OTH_REL	-0.05	0.08	-0.05	0.08	-0.05	0.08	-0.05	0.08
CMAPP	0.07***	0.02	0.07***	0.02	0.07***	0.02	0.07***	0.02
SF_RATIO	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00	0.00**	0.00
QT_UGRAD	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01	0.03***	0.01
GRAD	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02	-0.02	0.02
QT_GRAD	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01	0.02***	0.01
SPT_OFFR	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00	0.02***	0.00
FB_TITLE	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02
MBB_TITLE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
WBB_TITLE	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
D3_AGE	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00	-0.00	0.00
D3_AGE_SQ	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
RANGE5_D3	-0.03	0.03	---	---	---	---	---	---
RANGE10_D3	---	---	---	---	0.00	0.02	---	---
YEAR1_D3	---	---	-0.02	0.07	---	---	-0.02	0.07
YEAR2_D3	---	---	-0.07	0.07	---	---	-0.07	0.07
YEAR3_D3	---	---	-0.01	0.06	---	---	-0.01	0.06
YEAR4_D3	---	---	-0.02	0.06	---	---	-0.02	0.06
YEAR5_D3	---	---	-0.03	0.06	---	---	-0.02	0.06
YEAR6_D3	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.02	0.05
YEAR7_D3	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.01	0.05
YEAR8_D3	---	---	---	---	---	---	-0.00	0.05
YEAR9_D3	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.04	0.05
YEAR10_D3	---	---	---	---	---	---	0.04	0.05
Observations	n = 6,271							
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$								

schools using the Common Application show a positive significant relationship. In addition, Division III schools have a positive and significant relationship at the 99% level for SF_RATIO and beyond the 99% level for QT_UGRAD. Graduate school programs

do not show significance while QT_GRAD is significant and positively related. The number of sports offered by Division III schools shows a positive and significant relationship. However, no other athletic department variable has any significance, including length of Division III affiliation (D3_AGE). Finally, schools within the first five years (RANGE5_D3) and first ten years (RANGE10_D3) of Division III membership show no significance.

Chapter 7 – Discussion

This chapter discusses the significant implications from the statistical results provided in Chapter 6. First, the dissertation discusses Model One's results through Model 1E as it estimates all independent variables identified in the analysis. The significant results from Tables 6.4 and 6.5 will be analyzed within the basis of the theoretical framework and historical findings provided. From this analysis, the dissertation interprets the findings from Model Two, which analyzes if a university's decision to change athletic associations has an effect on the number of applications a university receives in a given year. Model Two's results are discussed through the theoretical framework provided as well as its congruencies with Model One's findings.

University Movement

Since the creation of Divisions II and III in 1973, the NCAA has foreseen a substantial growth in membership, while depleting counts can be observed for the NAIA (Wilson, 2005). Both Washington (2004-05) and Smith et al. (2013) explained certain social identities can be utilized to predict the likelihood of colleges moving from the NAIA to the NCAA. While successful in identifying certain characteristics, both studies do not analyze the strategy universities may employ when considering change of athletic affiliation. The following sections discuss the significant findings for each social identity utilized as an independent variable in Model One.

Private Colleges

According to Table 6.1, 76.2% of the observations are identified as private institutions. While the designation is the most prominent in the sample, Model One shows the private school characteristic has no significant effect on the likelihood of

movement to either Division II or III. The lack of significance for the private school identity may relate to the high frequency of private schools contained in the sample. Rao et al. (2000) suggested if a social characteristic is prevalent among group members, the probability of defection from an in-group to an out-group would significantly decrease. Thus, if a private school chooses to depart the NAIA (i.e., the in-group) for Division II or III (i.e., the out-groups), then other private schools will not be affected by the departure since many private schools are still associated with the NAIA. However, many of the colleges contained in the sample carry additional identities that may be more significant than their private school designation.

Women's Colleges

Similar to its process with African American athletes and HBCUs, the NAIA wanted to create a welcoming environment for women's sports and especially for women's only colleges. In comparison, the NCAA spent most of the 1970s in court to halt Title IX's implementation in intercollegiate athletics (Falla, 1981). However, the NCAA would quickly transform from "fighter" to "provider" in 1980 when the organization approved the sponsorship of women's championships for Division II and III in the 1981-82 fiscal year ("A Calm Convention", 1980). The NAIA, now in the unfamiliar role of follower, quickly responded to the NCAA's policy by offering championships in nine different women's sports beginning in 1980 (Wilson, 2005). While not the first organization to officially provide women's sports, the NAIA was the first to see the benefit of providing athletic opportunities to women in intercollegiate athletics. Its efforts in this area correlate with Suchman's (1995) definition of influential pragmatic legitimacy since the NAIA provided college athletic governance to an

underrepresented body of constituents despite any potential favorable exchange.

Unfortunately, the NCAA's decision to provide four new committee positions for women on the NCAA Council ("Delegates Focus on Four Key", 1981; "NCAA Yields to Women", 1981) may have coerced women's schools to leave the NAIA. Model One notes that women's colleges were more likely to leave for the NCAA regardless of division in response to other women's colleges departing. Similar to HBCUs, the women's colleges likely saw themselves as a collective group and sought to maintain this identity while joining the NCAA (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Taylor & McKirman, 1984).

Historically Black Colleges and Universities

One of the greatest contributions the NAIA provided intercollegiate sports in the United States was the integration of African Americans athletes and HBCUs. Schools from the New England region considered withdrawing from the 1948 NIBT tournament due to an unofficial rule that prevented African American players from participating in games (Stooksbury, 2010). As news spread about the controversy, the NAIA was met with another potential boycott calling for the removal of the 1948 NIBT Champion from the 1948 Olympic basketball trials ("Olympic Committeeman Suggests U.S. Trials", 1948). Although the U.S. was unsettled about race (Katz, 1990; Katz & McLendon, 1988; Land, 1977), much of the North began to take a moral stand against discrimination (Stooksbury, 2010). The NCAA also criticized the NAIA regarding the ban on African-American players, although, the NCAA may have had an ulterior motive to become the predominant facilitator of college sport governance (Washington & Ventresca, 2008). Facing these outside pressures, the NAIA redressed this unwritten rule and allowed African American players to participate. The acceptance of African American players led

HBCUs to seek membership within an athletic association. Duer and the Executive Committee worked diligently to craft a solution that would suit all parties involved (Wilson, 2005). Helping matters, indirectly, was the NCAA's lack of movement as the association did not have a plan to help integrate HBCUs into its membership (Katz & McLendon, 1988).

While these moves may have been controversial at the time, the NAIA, as a governing body of intercollegiate athletics, provided services that society determined as proper although these needs were not facilitated by most in the organizational field. Thus, the NAIA established its moral legitimacy defined as the organization doing what society at large views as the correct way to conduct business (Cashore, 2002). Furthermore, according to Suchman's (1995) sub-types of legitimacy, the NAIA established consequential and procedural moral legitimacy through these actions. Consequential moral legitimacy notes that organizations should be judged by their accomplishments while procedural moral legitimacy reviews an organization's procedures through what is accepted by society (Suchman, 1995).

As time progressed, however, the relationship between the NAIA and HBCUs began to weaken. According to Land (1977), the NASC's desire to have HBCUs and their officials on NCAA committees compelled Duer and the Executive Committee to alter policies to appease HBCUs to remain within the NAIA. While the NASC did not want to undermine the NAIA, the organization altered substantial policies that may have impacted the NAIA's membership counts during the last 30 to 40 years. As such, Model One suggests schools classified as HBCUs are more likely to leave the NAIA for the NCAA after other HBCUs depart for the NCAA. Although both Table 6.4 and 6.5 note

significance for HBCUs movement, HBCUs are more likely to join Division II as opposed to Division III. Nevertheless, the strategic decision of which NCAA division to join may be based upon the school's decision makers and the benefits that can be obtained in each specific division. In addition, these schools continue to maintain the HBCU identity while adopting the characteristics of the division with which the decision makers choose to associate. Essentially, while the HBCUs are individual, the schools operate collectively through the shared race identity while assimilating within their new group setting (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Taylor & McKirman, 1984).

Geographic Location

Glückler (2007) argued the location or place of an organization will make a resounding difference in regards to social identity. Washington (2004-05) analyzed a geographic component through a university's conference affiliation, which may or may not be based on physical location. Smith et al. (2013) altered Washington's (2004-05) definition of geography to study if the physical location of schools had a significant effect on the likelihood of movement. Despite these differences in definition, both studies noted geography can be a determinant of the likelihood of movement. Specifically, Smith et al. (2013) noted schools found in the Southeast and Mid-East regions were less likely to move while colleges located in the New England and Rocky Mountain regions were more likely to move. They suggested the population of schools in a given region was a catalyst in the likelihood of movement. In other words, colleges in the Southeast region were less likely to move from the NAIA to the NCAA because of the larger population of schools in the region. In comparison, schools located in the New England and Rocky Mountain regions would move more frequently (Smith et al., 2013).

While Smith et al. (2013) found drastic differences among the eight regions, Model One shows movement from the NAIA to the NCAA regardless of division is more likely to occur in all regions. This difference in findings may relate to actual number of schools moving in a given year. Although an area's total population of a region may be important, Table 6.2 highlights the number of schools moving is a fraction of a region's total population. For example, the Southeast region has the highest amount of observations in the sample ($n = 6,493$) and the highest total amount of schools moving from the NAIA to Division II ($n = 110$) or Division III ($n = 36$). In other words, the general population of a region may not be a significant factor to deter schools from defecting. Instead, schools appear to be influenced more by prior defectors and their strategic choice of divisional alignment. Therefore, when a specific movement strategy is implemented, a geographic region will not deter schools from staying in their current in-group.

While geography does not discourage college movement, some regions have a higher likelihood of movement than others. As an example, schools found in the Southeast region will move with less frequency to the NCAA in comparison to the other regions. Furthermore, schools in the Great Lakes and Rocky Mountain regions are more likely to move to Division II with similarly located schools while Southwestern schools show tendencies to move to Division III. These findings support the claims made by several officials from schools proclaiming the lack of opponents in close proximity as a decision for their departure from the NAIA to the NCAA ("SOSU Leaves NAIA for NCAA", 1994). The specific division these schools decide to align with may also be a contributing factor as universities may move in groups in order to maintain relationships

and rivalries based on geography as well as previous conference affiliation (“Solon: Oklahoma Schools Should”, 1999; Washington, 2004-05).

Carnegie Size Classification

During the initial stages of the NIBT, Emil Liston believed certain schools would not be recognized by the NCAA for their efforts in postseason play as well as committee recognition when compared to their larger counterparts (Hoover, 1958). By providing a service to the smaller schools that went unnoticed by the NCAA, the NAIA established its legitimacy within the organizational field of college sports. After collaborating with several university coaches and athletic directors, Liston and the Executive Committee designed the proper foundation to support college athletic governance to smaller institutions, deviating from the existing social norms of the time (Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005). By providing governance to a group of schools that were neglected by the NCAA, the NAIA established its cognitive legitimacy within the organizational field of intercollegiate athletics. Aldrich and Fiol (1994) defined cognitive legitimacy as “the spread of knowledge about a new venture” (p. 648). Specifically, the various individuals involved with the development of the NIBT and the NAIB showed tremendous excitement toward a venture that would provide governmental services to colleges lacking strong ties to the NCAA. Both Cashore (2002) and Suchman (1995) noted cognitive legitimacy is a combination of society’s ability to comprehend and take elements for granted for an organization in order to obtain legitimacy opposed to any form of formal evaluation. In terms of the institution of intercollegiate athletics, Liston and several members of the Executive Committee understood the organizational field and

sought to extend the institution in a desirable, proper, and appropriate manner. Thus, the NAIA was able to achieve cognitive legitimacy within intercollegiate athletics.

As the NAIA achieved success in the 1940s and 1950s and began establishing its identity, the NCAA began altering its policies in order to attract small colleges as full members. Although a direct competitor, the NCAA validated the NAIA when the NCAA adopted procedures to facilitate college sport governance to smaller colleges as well as provide financial support and create postseason contests that mimicked the NIBT (Falla, 1981; Wilson, 2005). The NCAA's newly found interest in non-traditional members caught the interest of many schools associated with the NAIA during this time, including those classified as large or very large by the Carnegie Foundation. According to Tables 6.4 and 6.5, large or very large schools were more likely to transition from the NAIA to Division II when similar size schools moved but did not transition to Division III. Intuitively, the results in Tables 6.4 and 6.5 are not surprising as the NCAA was developed and traditionally known to accommodate larger schools (Falla, 1981; Forbes, 1955; Hoover, 1958; Wilson, 2005). Thus, larger schools would more likely want to be associated with the higher division and potentially join Division I in the future to associate with other larger schools affiliated with the NCAA. Furthermore, Division III was viewed as a direct competitor to the NAIA as the division supported smaller schools and would deter larger schools from joining (Washington, 2004-05). However, Model One also shows that small or very small schools are also more likely to transfer to Division II while Division III has no significant effect on schools. Finally, medium size schools were more likely to move to the NCAA with other medium schools regardless of division.

While the results show that movement to Division II is more likely than Division III, a school's divisional alignment decision may depend upon each school's budgetary concerns. Huggins (1996) noted NAIA member schools were more comfortable with Division III's rule barring athletic financial aid opposed to the limits on aid that the NAIA imposed on members. Division II, on the other hand, offered more opportunities to provide financial aid to student-athletes. Thus, decision makers may choose to enter a division that best aligns with their school's philosophies on financial aid. Furthermore, Leitner (1990) argued schools moved to the NCAA because of the higher dues paid by NAIA members. At the time, Southeastern Oklahoma State University Athletic Director noted that membership dues for Division II were \$900 compared to the \$3,500 to \$4,000 required by the NAIA ("SOSU Leaves NAIA For", 1994). Division III membership fees were also similarly priced. Finally, one could also argue the choice of division for small and medium size schools can be related to how decision makers of these schools view their institution and how their organization can receive the most benefit within the NCAA.

Religious Affiliation

In the college movement literature, religious affiliation produced mixed results. Washington (2004-05) found schools with a religious affiliation are more likely to transfer from the NAIA to the NCAA while Smith et al. (2013) noted there was no substantial effect. While these results are varied, Smith et al. (2013) argued the "conflicting results may be due to the difference in aggregating the religious denominations to several broad religious categories" (p. 35). Thus, the present dissertation provided a narrower definition of denominations to determine if religious

affiliation affects college movement. Model One notes that schools affiliated with Catholicism or an Evangelist Protestant denomination are more likely to move to the NCAA when similar schools make the move regardless of division. Mainline Protestant schools, on the other hand, are more likely to transfer to Division III instead of Division II. The Mainline Protestant schools may have sought to break away from the other religious groupings in order to join Division III. According to Taylor and McKirnan (1984), this process involved adopting characteristics based upon linguistic, cultural or other modifiable dimensions. Arguably, the Mainline Protestant schools could have modeled their culture to Division III schools in order to enhance their identity. From a historical standpoint, the NAIA's decision to provide competition on Sundays in 1971 (Wilson, 2005) may have influenced religious affiliated universities to consider transitions. While the NCAA also provided Sunday competition, the waiver to allow Sunday competition caused these institutions to potentially no longer see the distinctiveness of the NAIA within intercollegiate athletics.

Sponsored Sports

The NAIB was the first organization to create a basketball tournament for colleges only. The success of the NIBT led the organization to begin exploring the potential expansion of sport offerings to better serve the demands of their growing membership. Thus, in the early 1950s, the NAIB changed its name to the NAIA to reflect this change. Much of this demand was centered on the desire to incorporate football in the NAIA. This demand allowed the NAIA to become the first college sports organization to directly sponsor a championship game (Wilson, 2005). By supplying its members with their demands, the NAIA achieved pragmatic legitimacy from an exchange

perspective. The firm also displayed consequential moral legitimacy through the creation of the postseason football playoff for NAIA members. Through these achievements, the NAIA continued to find ways to differentiate themselves from the NCAA.

Thus, one can rationally argue schools sponsoring certain sports may or may not be influenced by other schools with these sports. However, some sports were proven to not have a substantial effect on movement. Specifically, football, men's and women's basketball, and baseball were found to not have a substantial effect on the likelihood of movement to Division III. Men's hockey, on the other hand, was found to influence schools to transition from the NAIA to Division III when other schools sponsoring men's hockey moved. This result is understandable as there are fewer schools that sponsor men's hockey when compared to the other four sports. Therefore, one can reasonably assume these schools would be influenced by one another to move in order to maintain their hockey program and potential rivalries. Men's hockey is also a strong predictor of movement to Division II and possibly causes more teams to join Division II rather than Division III. Furthermore, football and women's basketball were found to have a significant and positive effect on movement to Division II but at a much smaller rate when compared to men's hockey.

Previous literature has not explored individual sports as an identity. Instead, Washington (2004-05) identified the number of sports that a school competes in as a social identity based upon what Friedland and Alford (1991) described as a sports logic. A sports logic is a type of institutional logic for universities and their athletic departments which provides a set of material practices and develops appropriate and acceptable courses of action (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Washington & Ventresca, 2004). Schools

possessing a stronger sports logic were more likely to join an association that provides a more visible sports presence (Washington, 2004-05). Washington's (2004-05) finding corresponds with the NCAA Bylaws requiring member schools to sponsor a minimum number of sports based upon their affiliated division (NCAA Division II Manual, 2011a; NCAA Division III Manual, 2011b). However, university decision makers often consider movement based upon the success of the revenue-generating sports (e.g., football, men's basketball; Fulks, 2011; Kahn, 2007) and potential revenue-generating sports (e.g., women's basketball, baseball, men's hockey) opposed to the total number of sports offered (Dwyer et al., 2010). Thus, university decision makers should consider the ramifications of their overall athletic department when basing their decision to move to the NCAA and specific division on the individual revenue-generating sports.

NAIA Leadership

As discussed in Chapter 2, the term institution has been defined by several scholars and taken on several dimensions (Greenwood et al., 2008; Hasse & Krücken, 2011; Hirsch, 1975; Jennings et al., 2013; Jepperson, 1991; Washington, 2004-05). The present dissertation adopted the definition designed by Jennings et al. (2013), who defined an institution is "the routinized, taken for granted sets of ideas, beliefs, and actions used in society, which includes both formal and informal institutions, and macro and micro institutional patterns" (p. 2). This definition differs from earlier work in institutional theory as past scholars have defined an institution as an entity (Greenwood et al., 2008), industry sectors (Hasse & Krücken, 2011), or state agencies (Hirsch, 1975; Washington, 2004-05). However, work in institutional theory shows that the presence of coercive, mimetic, and normative pressure as well as the desire to achieve legitimacy

stretches beyond a single firm or entity (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Thus, the present dissertation considers the governance of intercollegiate athletics to be the institution of influence for all entities affiliated with the organizational field of college athletics.

Throughout the history of the NAIA, there was continuous conflict with the NCAA in regards to membership. Both organizations and their leaders were engaged in constant defense of their practices in order to establish and maintain their legitimacy within the institution. Thus, both the NAIA and the NCAA implemented institutional strategies through efforts to establish membership rules and procedures to establish standards of practice (Lawrence, 1999; Washington, 2004-05). As an example, the NAIA originally competed with the NCAA for membership by providing an outlet for schools the NCAA identified as lower-status schools (Washington, 2004). When the NAIA gained success and established legitimacy as a governing body, the NCAA altered its membership rules to attract lower-status schools by creating the College Division in 1958 and later Division II and III in 1973 (Falla, 1981; Washington, 2004). The NAIA responded to the NCAA's practices by inviting Canadian schools to become members (Land, 1977; Wilson, 2005) and embracing women's sports and supporting the AIAW after the passing of Title IX in 1972 (NAIA Executive Committee, 1972).

The NAIA was able to combat the NCAA during much of its early history due to the efforts of Emil Liston and A. O. Duer, the organization's first two Executive Secretaries (Wilson, 2005). Both men possessed a vision and framework that provided the NAIA with a significant competitive advantage over the NCAA. In addition, the NAIA also gained much from the character and charisma of both Liston and Duer

including personal moral legitimacy (Suchman, 1995). Both Liston and Duer received tremendous praise from many within the organizational field. Duer explicitly was labeled as the “Guiding Light” of the organization during his 23 years as Executive Secretary (Sambol, 1975). By embracing the leadership style of both Liston and Duer, the NAIA was able to establish specific standards of practice when faced with troubling issues including gambling, integration, Olympic representation, and overall governance of the organization.

As time progressed, however, leadership of the NAIA changed drastically. After Duer’s retirement in 1975, many significant changes were made regarding the NAIA’s standards of practice. Arguably, the prominent example can be found with James Chasteen’s appointment as CEO in the 1990s. Without warning, Chasteen upset several members when he announced the organization was moving its offices as well as the NIBT from Kansas City to Tulsa (Blum, 1995). In addition, Chasteen was at the forefront to replace the traditional district system in favor of an affiliated conference system (“Reorganization for the N.A.I.A.”, 1993). These dramatic changes upset many NAIA members and played a tremendous factor toward their departure to the NCAA. As such, Table 6.4 and 6.5 noted schools considering a move to Division II were less likely to move when Duer was leader of the NAIA while Division III movement was not affected by the leadership of the NAIA. In comparison, schools were likely to move to Division II after Chasteen was named CEO of the NAIA. The results also showed that schools were likely to move to Division II during Steve Baker’s tenure as CEO. Baker had much work to do to correct the mistakes of previous leaders and create a new

standard of practice that would retain the traditional values of the NAIA. Thus, some of the movement during his tenure as leader may not be as a result of his actions.

Summary

The results from Model One show social identities can predict or prohibit the likelihood of movement from the NAIA to the NCAA Division II or III. Due to the prevalence of the private designation, private institutions are not affected by the movement of other private schools. In comparison, women's only institutions and HBCUs move collectively as a group when one defector with either social characteristic moves into the NCAA. However, HBCUs are more likely to join Division II over Division III while women's only schools have no preference. Schools located in the seven geographic regions considered are likely to move with peer schools reclassifying from the NAIA to the NCAA regardless of division. Larger institutions are more likely to join Division II due to their potential desire to reclassify again to Division I. Mainline Protestant denomination affiliated schools are likely to move to Division III as a group in order to maintain their distinct identity. Schools sponsoring men's hockey move to Division II more often in order to keep their competitive rivalries. Finally, NAIA member schools were less likely to reclassify to the NCAA when Duer was Executive Secretary and more likely to leave the NAIA when Chasteen was CEO.

Reclassification Effect

Several researchers argued universities and their athletic departments share a symbiotic relationship where schools receive substantial benefits based upon the success of the athletic programs (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Goff, 2000; Tomasini, 2005; Weaver, 2010). These benefits can come in the form of increased quantity and better quality of

student applications and enrollment (Castle & Kostelnik, 2011; McCormick & Tinsley, 1987; Mixon & Ressler, 1995; Mixon & Hsing, 1994; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Pope & Pope, 2009; Toma & Cross, 1998), alumni donations (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007; Stinson & Howard, 2007; Tucker, 2004), gate receipts and attendance (Beyer & Hannah, 2000; Goff, 2000), and school spirit (Hansen, 2011; Krenz, 2012; Tomasini, 2005). However, most of these studies only analyze university benefits in correlation to athletic success without consideration for other athletic department decisions. Thus, this dissertation analyzes if a change in athletic association has an effect on a university's application total in a given year.

Overall Model

Through a qualitative analysis of nine universities that moved from the NAIA to the NCAA, Smith (2011) noted these schools chose to leave the NAIA due to its deteriorating reputation and join the NCAA for branding opportunities to help with recruiting. Several university athletic administrators have shared similar concerns. Both William Jewell College President David Sallee and Azusa Pacific University Athletic Director Bill Odell noted the move to relocate to the NCAA from the NAIA was highly beneficial to their school's programs and encouraged individuals unaware of their campuses to research their school, apply, and enroll (Palmer, 2011). According to the results from Tables 6.11 and 6.12, these claims appear to be correct. Model 2A estimated schools beginning their association with the NCAA receive a slight increase in applications during their first year of membership with the organization.

After the first year, a Reclassification Effect could not be found in schools that had an association with the NAIA since its inception in 1937. These results are

consistent with other studies that suggest schools receive a small increase in applications after a successful athletic campaign (Mixon & Ressler, 1995; Murphy & Trandel, 1994; Pope & Pope, 2009). However, when schools that moved from the NAIA to the NCAA since 1973 are considered, the first ten years of membership within the NCAA is insignificant. The results from Model 2B are consistent with the findings of Friedler (2007) and Tomasini (2005), who noted that an internal move in the NCAA showed no significant gains for reclassifying schools. Instead, schools that decided to reclassify to a higher NCAA division received similar numbers in terms of applications and financial support when compared to their prior affiliation

While initial reclassification was shown to briefly increase applications (Model 2A) or show no effect (Model 2B), both Table 6.11 and 6.12 show the longevity of NCAA membership can positively affect the number of total applications a school receives. While the increase in applications may be small (1% or less), the results show overall membership within the NCAA does create an increase in applications. This small benefit may be based on Smith's (2011) argument the NCAA brand itself encourages universities to consider a reclassification within the membership association. Although these results are favorable toward reclassification, university decision makers should be cautious as any potential increases in applications may not offset the actual costs of reclassification. Furthermore, the short duration of the Reclassification Effect also suggests membership within the NCAA alone may not establish or improve a school's legitimacy within the organizational field. A school reclassifying may retain its original identity regardless of the move, leading society to not recognize a move as an innovation (Tomasini, 2005).

Geographic Region

The overall model was subdivided by geographic regions to determine if a Reclassification Effect varies by region. The final data set of 8,495 university-year observations was separated by their individual region. All regions except for the Rocky Mountain region contained member institutions within the first ten years of their NCAA membership. Thus, the Rocky Mountain subdivision model was not estimated. Tables 6.15 and 6.16 display the results for Model 2A based upon the first five years and ten years of NCAA membership respectively. According to the findings, the Southwest region was the only region to show results similar to the overall model. These findings also correlate with the results from Model One as schools from the Southwest region show higher tendencies to transfer from the NAIA to the NCAA. However, a small increase in applications only occurs within the first year of membership of the NCAA, comparable to the overall model. The only other region to show a positive relationship was the Plains region, according to Table 6.16. Schools from the Plains region within their eighth year of NCAA membership will receive an increase in applications but not before or after. Similar to the Southwest region, the Plains region significance is consistent with the findings from Model One schools.

While these are positive results, these findings drastically differ from Smith et al. (2013), who suggested that schools in the New England and Rocky Mountain regions were more likely to move to the NCAA. Again, the Rocky Mountain region has been removed from this analysis, and Tables 6.15 and 6.16 show no significant gains in applications for New England schools moving from the NAIA to the NCAA within their first few years. Instead, both tables show schools in the New England region, as well as

the Southeast, Southwest, and Far West regions, do tend to get increases in applications due to their association with the NCAA. While there is no gain in the first ten years, these regions are receiving additional applications based upon their longevity with the NCAA, supporting Smith et al.'s (2013) findings.

When schools moving from the NAIA to the NCAA before 1973 are removed from each sample, Model 2B shows different results. According to Tables 6.17 and 6.18, no region showed any significant application gains within the first five years of NCAA membership. However, the Plains region continued to show an increase in applications for schools in their eighth year of NCAA association. Both tables also show differing results in relation to Tables 6.15 and 6.16 for NCAA association, specifically the Mid-East region. In relation to Model One, schools considering reclassification due to their regional peers should be cautious regarding this move as schools tend to receive fewer applications after reclassification. These findings support the work of Friedler (2007) and Tomasini (2005) who again argued that a reclassification may not provide the expected results of university decision makers. In addition, Tables 6.17 and 6.18 noted the Far West region schools tended to receive more applications due to their NCAA membership. These findings are consistent with Model One as schools found in the Far West region tend to reclassify when other regional schools move from the NAIA to the NCAA.

NCAA Division

In terms of specific divisional movement, the dissertation analyzed schools that maintained a membership between 1973 and 2012 with the NAIA and moved to the NCAA. According to Tables 6.20 and 6.21, which display the results for Division II and

III respectively, there are no significant results determined for schools within the first five or first ten years of membership in either division. Furthermore, both tables also show longevity in either division has no effect on applications. In other words, an athletic department considering a move to either Division II or III may or may not see an effect on university applications. These findings are parallel to a claim made by Tomasini (2005), who suggested that schools reclassifying from Division II or III to Division I-FCS are still similar to their Division II or III contemporaries. One can infer that for schools transitioning from the NAIA to Division II or III may retain an identity that mirrors their prior association. These results also show while a general move to the NCAA can help universities receive additional applications due to the organization's image and branding (Smith, 2011), the specific division movement may nullify any potential application benefits.

Summary

Model 2A shows schools receive an increase in applications within the first year of joining the NCAA. However, the Reclassification Effect disappears after this first year. When pre-1973 movers are removed from the sample, however, Model 2B shows that a Reclassification Effect does not occur. Instead, both Model 2A and 2B note the longevity of membership provides a small increase in applications. From a geographical region standpoint, institutions found in the Southwest receive a nominal increase in applications in the first year of NCAA membership. Similar to the overall model, Model 2B shows no immediate Reclassification Effect could be determined for any region within the first year of NCAA membership. Furthermore, NCAA affiliation length provides application increases for schools located in all regions except the Plains region.

Finally, the NCAA divisional membership models show a Reclassification Effect could not be determined for schools within their first year of membership or longevity of affiliation with either division.

Chapter 8 – Conclusion

Universities considering movement from the NAIA to the NCAA believe that the move would provide substantial benefits and establish the school's legitimacy as a viable institution (Knoke, 1985; Yang, Su, & Fam, 2012). As noted by Smith et al. (2013), "many of the schools transitioning from the NAIA to the NCAA maintain a characteristic set that is based on the ideals and characteristics stemming from university beliefs" (p. 35). These beliefs stemmed from the rationalized myth of intercollegiate athletics, where the NCAA is viewed as the predominant college sports athletic association (Getz & Siegfried, 2010; Falla, 1981). Through the adoption of a rationalized myth, an organization can potentially increase its legitimacy as well as its survival prospects within the organizational field (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). Thus, many NAIA members engaged in a social mobility strategy as elements from the institution of intercollegiate athletic governance influenced the organization's identity (Rao et al., 2000). Specifically, these universities and their decision makers identified certain discrepancy cues within the NAIA to influence their decision to reclassify. Furthermore, university officials believed their organization's current identity was not congruent with the identity of the NAIA and a change was needed (Foreman & Whetten, 2002).

Within the college movement literature, Washington (2004; 2004-05) argued schools are more likely to move the NCAA based upon the number of strong ties that a school may have with other members in the organization. Originally, the NCAA did not facilitate intercollegiate athletic governance to some smaller schools, leading to the NAIA's establishment. Through an analysis of the history of the NAIA, we can see the NCAA altered its membership strategies and operating standards (i.e., institutional

strategies) after the NAIA found success with these smaller schools. The NAIA's results led to the creation of the College Division in 1958 as well as Divisions II and III in 1973, which provided a governance institution within the NCAA for previously identified lower-status schools (Washington, 2004).

Table 8.1 shows the significant results from Model One, indicating certain identities act as identity discrepant cues and potentially lead schools to move to Division II and III. Specifically, groups with shared characteristics, such as the HBCUs, women's

Table 8-1 – Model One Significant Results

Significance	Division II		Division III	
	Variable	Relationship	Variable	Relationship
At 95%	DUER	Negative	Sum Y3	Negative
	---	---	BCU*SumD3_BCU	Positive
	---	---	M_PROT* SumD3_MPROT	Positive
	---	---	WBB*SumD3_WBB	Positive
At 99%	Sum Y2	Negative	Sum Y2	Negative
	GL*SumD2_GL	Positive	WOMENS* SumD3_WOMEN	Positive
	SIZEC2* SumD2_SIZEC2	Positive	GL*SumD3_GL	Positive
	SIZEC3* SumD2_SIZEC3	Positive	SIZEC3* SumD3_SIZEC3	Positive
	SIZEC4* SumD2_SIZEC4	Positive	CATH* SumD3_CATH	Positive
	CATH* SumD2_CATH	Positive	E_PROT* SumD3_EPROT	Positive
Beyond 99%	Sum Y3	Negative	PL*SumD3_PL	Positive
	WOMENS* SumD2_WOMEN	Positive	SE*SumD3_SE	Positive
	BCU*SumD2_BCU	Positive	SW*SumD3_SW	Positive
	ME*SumD2_ME	Positive	RM*SumD3_RM	Positive
	PL*SumD2_PL	Positive	FW*SumD3_FW	Positive
	SE*SumD2_SE	Positive	MHKY* SumD3_MHKY	Positive
	SW*SumD2_SW	Positive	---	---
	RM*SumD2_RM	Positive	---	---
	FW*SumD2_FW	Positive	---	---
	E_PROT* SumD2_EPROT	Positive	---	---
	WBB*SumD2_WBB	Positive	---	---

colleges and religious schools, may be inclined to move as a group in order to maintain their collective identities while also adopting the characteristics of their new affiliation (Hogg & Terry, 2000; Taylor & McKirman, 1984). Finally, schools sponsoring men's hockey are more likely to join either division due to the low number of NAIA schools sponsoring hockey. These individual schools appear to possess a strong sport logic in relation to men's hockey and will position their program with the best interests in mind (Friedland & Alford, 1991). Thus, specific sports programs can influence a university's social mobility strategy as a repositioning to an association that holds certain sports to higher accord.

While university decision makers may consider movement based upon identity discrepant cues, these characteristics may be aligned with the ideals of a specific division. For example, schools choosing to depart the NAIA for Division III may have migrated to that division due to its ban on athletic financial aid or Division II for increased opportunities to provide aid to athletes. However, schools may consider movement with no distinction for division. As an example, schools in the Southeast region are likely to make a move to either Division II or III, but not at the same frequency as schools in the Rocky Mountain region moving to Division II or the Southwest region moving to Division III. Schools classified as large or very large are more likely to join Division II and less likely to join Division III due to Division III's reputation as a haven for smaller schools. Religious affiliated institutions are more likely to join Division III while HBCUs and women's colleges prefer to join Division II in order to maintain their respective group settings.

Although certain identities can influence a university to change their athletic affiliation, university decision makers should not consider the move under a false contest. According to Table 8.2, schools will receive an increase in applications upon joining the NCAA in the first year of membership. After the first year, however, an application increase may not be realized in future years. Thus, university officials should be cautious when considering reclassification as the perceived benefits through NCAA association may not be fully realized. Furthermore, despite a university's attempt to alter its social identity in relation to the NAIA, the school could still retain its identity as an NAIA member despite its new affiliation. Finally, the potential benefits that a university may receive could be offset by the actual costs of joining the NCAA.

Table 8-2 – Model Two (Overall Model) Significant Results

	Model 2A		Model 2B	
Significance	Variable	Relationship	Variable	Relationship
At 95%	RANGE5	Positive	RANGE10	Positive
	RANGE10	Positive	AGE_UNIV	Negative
	YEAR1	Positive	CATH	Positive
	CATH	Positive	M_PROT	Positive
	---	---	QT_GRAD	Positive
	---	---	NCAA_AGE	Positive
At 99%	QT_GRAD	Positive	---	---
Beyond 99%	LN_APP _{t-1}	Positive	LN_APP _{t-1}	Positive
	PRIVATE	Negative	PRIVATE	Negative
	BCU	Positive	BCU	Positive
	CMAPP	Positive	CMAPP	Positive
	SF_RATIO	Positive	SF_RATIO	Positive
	QT_UGRAD	Positive	QT_UGRAD	Positive
	SPT_OFFR	Positive	SPT_OFFR	Positive
	NCAA_AGE	Positive	---	---

The present dissertation highlights the active use of various institutional strategies centered on social mobility to connect with social identity. Institutional strategies are strategies implemented by firms with the goal of defending actions deemed legitimate by both external and internal parties. Throughout the history of the NAIA, several strategies

were designed to acquire membership that focused on both adapting to the norms of society and the norms of the organizational field. As an example, the NAIA approved HBCUs for full membership after society began to focus on eliminating discrimination and embracing integration. Through the change in institutional strategy, the NAIA deemed and defended HBCUs as legitimate members of their organization and establishing the firm's identity as an innovator in the field of college athletics. This change caused many universities within the organizational field to change their affiliation and enhance their social identity.

The present dissertation also acknowledges several practical measures organizations can utilize for their pursuit of legitimacy. From an internal legitimacy perspective, the NAIA authority and governance provided evidence of pragmatic organizational legitimacy. Specifically, the NAIA's annual meetings, the redistricting of the association following the addition of historically black institutions, and regular expansion of the championship schedule (e.g., golf, football, hockey, tennis, cross country, track & field, and wrestling) provide assessment by the organization to develop legitimacy. Thus, firms should utilize a form of decentralized management to provide stakeholders with a means to become engaged with daily operative activities as well as creating opportunities for members to participate in the structural design of the firm.

Organizations can gain legitimacy, from an external perspective, by challenging the status quo of society opposed to accepting the norm. As an example, the NAIA achieved cognitive legitimacy through the promotion of their handling of the gambling and HBCU membership as well as their Olympic representation defense. Such opportunities were made possible because smaller schools were previously dismissed by

the NCAA. Next, the rebranding of an association (i.e., NAIB to NAIA) or brand name itself can help firms acquire legitimacy within their organizational field. Washington (2004) proposed “membership changes, while not the catalyst for the institutional change, are often good markers of the change; when the membership has changed, then the institution must have changed” (p. 409). Notable markers identified by Washington (2004) include changes to organizational mission statement, organizational leadership, and headquarter location. The rebranded NAIA established an important niche within intercollegiate athletics and accommodated specific interest association-based innovations that helped remove the previous basketball affiliated title (i.e., NIBT and NAIB) and to build a name more inclusive of a larger more diverse membership.

This dissertation also demonstrates ‘first-mover’ innovations can help in the development of legitimacy, highlighting the importance of differentiating oneself from competing firms while being similar enough to confer judgment upon the organization. For example, unique postseason events (e.g., expanded basketball tournament and football playoff/championship game), embracing HBCUs and Canadian schools as association members, and producing media publications (i.e., *NAIA News*) that report on the activities of the association and its members all serve as useful tools. Specifically, several scholars emphasized the media exists as a critical external agent because of their status as an entity responsible for reporting on activities either against or with social norms (Baum & Powell, 1995; Boyle, 2001; Deephouse & Suchman, 2008). The coverage provided on the aforementioned innovations provides adequate examples of the NAIA’s ability to recognize social pressures and opportunities to help the public and industry peers view them as legitimate. Further, the dissertation acknowledges the

importance of organizational or association-based media products (e.g., *NAIA News*) and the creation of offices/personnel (e.g., NAIA media staff and full-time Director of Publicity) to help maintain or improve the accrual of organizational legitimacy during the acquisition phase of membership. Wilson (2005) showed that the NAIA appeared to decline in legitimacy after 1973 as several major media outlets did not provide adequate coverage of the association's numerous events and the association did less to promote itself due to continued financial difficulties

The dissertation also supports Ashforth and Gibbs's (1990) research, who previously cautioned groups could be very aggressive in attempting to create organizational legitimacy. This dissertation's contribution emerges out of the conflict and struggle for members that occurred between the NAIA and NCAA when they engaged in a special type of institutional strategy (i.e., competitive membership strategy) to establish organizational legitimacy at the expense of the other. Within this point, the dissertation argues that competitive membership strategy should be recognized as a distinct and important component of the institutional strategy for other interest based associations. For example, the hiring and firing of leaders; the construction of new or the renovation of existing facilities; and the decision to remain affiliated with a particular interest based association or reclassify to a competing interest based association as certain courses of action to elevate and execute various competitive membership initiatives.

As noted earlier, higher education administrators regularly demonstrate a distinct appreciation for intercollegiate athletics through institutional and financial support and allow the athletic department great autonomy to develop their own strategy when entrenched with the goals of the university (Dwyer et al., 2010; Weaver, 2010). With

other interest-based associations, individual organizations have the power to disassociate themselves with their current interest based association should they feel that another association aligns better with their goals and objectives. Such membership rules and norms can be used to delineate the exclusionary boundaries of institutional membership and the space that members can operate or utilize. The dissertation argues interest-based associations should restrict admission of firms if legitimacy is positively related to the group's exclusivity but to embrace a larger set of variable members if cultural mechanisms establish standards that are not coercive or likely to impose mimetic pressures to comply with other industry standards. In addition, the need for external resources causes firms to quickly adopt the rules prescribed by the leading actors within the organizational field.

Furthermore, this dissertation extends the social identity literature by noting that legitimacy can influence firms to engage in social mobility. While Rao et al. (2000) argued movement can be influenced by the focal organization's affiliations to group members and defectors, social mobility alone may not help a firm obtain legitimacy. Instead, institutions will continuously implement strategies in order to establish and maintain their legitimacy within their respective institution. These institutional strategies are conducted to influence the mobility of firms to their association using an organization's social identity as a means to attract new members. This dissertation concludes that the social mobility that firm engages in may have to do more with the social identity of the affiliation opposed to the individual firms within the association.

Finally, the present dissertation contributes to the college movement literature to note that specific division movement is dependent on the individual characteristics of

each university. Wilson (2005) noted the NAIA closely mirrored Division III based on similar policies and the number of schools leaving the NAIA for Division III. However, this dissertation shows potential movement from the NAIA to the NCAA varied based on the social identities of each university. Thus, university decision makers must analyze what is in the best interests of their organization before engaging in a social mobility strategy for social enhancement. The dissertation also provides the college movement literature a quantitative model to estimate the benefits predicted by university officials. The results of the dissertation reduce the mixed findings that have been discovered by prior college movement studies and can be adopted into future studies.

Limitations

As discussed in Chapter 1, the accuracy of the IPEDS database may be called into question. While most of the data collected was analyzed for validity and reliability, the database may contain certain errors from the initial collection process by the third-party. Furthermore, Chapter 5 also has small issues of validity due to the lack of preservation of NAIA primary documents. While newspapers and other periodicals were used to provide historical accuracies, certain information that may provide further insight to the decision making process may be lost.

A potential limitation of Model Two involves endogenous variables. According to Bound, Jaeger, and Baker (1995), an endogenous variable is a variable that can be influenced by of the forces that influence the outcome under review. In other words, an explanatory variable is correlated with the equation error term. When variables are considered endogenous, an OLS regression may provide biased and inconsistent estimates of the causal effect of the explanatory variable. Bound, Jaeger, and Baker

(1995) noted a common strategy for dealing with endogenous variables is to utilize an exogenous instrument. Exogenous instruments separate the variance of the endogenous independent variable into exogenous and endogenous components. Once partitioned, the exogenous component of the endogenous independent variable is used within the estimation (Bound et al., 1995). In other words, an exogenous instrument predicts values for the potential endogenous variable. These predicted values are then used as a regressor in the full model.

Coates and Humphreys (2005) and Feddersen, Manning, and Borcharding (2006) corrected a potential issue of endogenous variables when these studies identified the age of the stadium may be endogenous. To adjust for this potential issue, both Coates and Humphreys (2005) and Feddersen, Manning, and Borcharding (2006) enabled a separate dummy variable for every year following the opening of a new stadium. Within the Flutie Effect literature, Pope and Pope (2009) noted endogenous variables may impact the results of their study since they showed that enrollments increased after sport success, especially for football schools. However, Pope and Pope (2009) did not offer a suggestion as to correcting for an endogenous variable. This dissertation identified that application fee was an endogenous variable. When application fee was included in Model Two, the variable was shown to be significant and positively related. The relationship explains if a school charges a high application fee a school charges, then the school will receive increases in applications. This result violates the economic principle of price elasticity where a higher price on goods creates a large change in quantity (Friedman, 1973). Based on this result, the dissertation notes application fee may be an

endogenous variable. However, an exogenous instrumental variable for application fees could not be determined, and application fees were removed from Model Two.

Another potential concern for Model Two is that fixed effects were not controlled for and do not capture changes in the quality of schools over time. The reason for not controlling for these effects in the original specification was that problems of multicollinearity surfaced, causing the removal of several key identification variables including private school designation. Many studies on higher education include some form of control for private schools (Mixon, 1995; Mixon & Hsing, 1994; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Pope & Pope, 2009). Thus, the dissertation did not control for university fixed effects.

Future Areas of Research

Throughout the preparation of this dissertation, several future avenues of research were identified that would further the history of the NAIA and advance institutional theory within the realm of sport management. These future studies are divided according to the different methodologies utilized in this dissertation: historical and empirical.

Historical Track

In Chapter 5, this dissertation studied the history of the NAIA to determine if certain events in its history explain the reclassification of schools to the NCAA. During the analysis, however, several events highlighted how the NAIA was able to establish its legitimacy as an institution of intercollegiate athletic governance and alter its institutional strategy to attract new members. Furthermore, the analysis also showed how the NCAA viewed the NAIA and what specific strategies the NCAA implemented to validate the NAIA's innovations. Future studies could further explore the membership history as

certain events occurred such as the acceptance of Canadian schools or the sponsorship of women's sports. In addition, various national and world events including wars, economic conditions, and governmental issues may also contribute to the membership history of the NAIA.

The dissertation analyzed the NAIA through the theoretical lens of legitimacy. However, the organization can also be reviewed through the related concepts of status and reputation. As discussed in Chapter 2, status is an agreed-upon ordering of social actors (Washington & Zajac, 2005), and reputation is the predicted expectations of a firm based upon past performances (Ferguson, Deephouse, & Ferguson, 2000; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova, & Sever, 2005). While an organization cannot lose its legitimacy, its status and reputation can be impacted through the actions of the firm. Thus, future research could explore which events caused society to view the NAIA with a diminished status. In addition, reputation studies can provide explicit details on the economic and political environment that contributed to the loss of membership in the later years of the NAIA.

The NAIA's greatest strength during its early years was its leadership. Both Emil Liston and A. O. Duer were successful during their respective tenures as Executive Secretary. Liston help found the NIBT and the NAIB based on the recommendations from his college coach and athletic director peers (Wilson, 2005). Through his guidance, the NIBT grew from a small 8-team tournament to a 32-team national event during World War II (Stooksbury, 2010). Liston also supported the expansion of the NAIB to include additional sports. When Liston tragically passed away, Duer was appointed as Executive Secretary and continued to expand on Liston's vision of providing intercollegiate sport

governance to smaller schools. In addition, Duer secured the firm's position with Olympic committee representation when invited to Washington to discuss the AAU/NCAA amateur conflict and potential solutions (Land, 1977). Liston and Duer were great leaders for the NAIA based on their success with the organization. Future studies could review the biographical history of both men from their coaching tenures at Baker University and Pepperdine University, respectively, as well as their specific leadership styles in relation to their respective tenures as NAIA Executive Secretary.

Another potential avenue for future research is the traditional district system the NAIA implemented from its inception to the 1990s. Unlike the current affiliated conference system, the NAIA aligned its member schools according to their geographic area in the country (Hoover, 1958). Some districts contained multiple states while others were comprised of a single or even half of a single state. The district system provided the NAIA members a form of decentralized management that provided schools the ability to self-govern and associate with the overall organization as its decision makers saw fit. Chapter 5 touched on some of the issues such as redistricting during integration of HBCUs, but future studies can explore the functionality of the district system and how a decentralized management system can be useful for intercollegiate athletics.

Speaking of integration, one of the greatest innovations the NAIA provided college sports was the facilitation of intercollegiate athletic governance to African American players and HBCUs. The genesis of African-American integration in college sports was the controversy of the unwritten rule banning African-American players from participating in the NIBT (Wilson, 2005). Through the removal of this rule, the NAIA established its legitimacy in college athletics and led to strong race relations between the

NAIA and the NASC. While the NAIA integration process was discussed in Chapter 5, major points of interest could be further researched, including the NCAA's initial response to HBCU requests for membership and the NASC's push for committee representation. Furthermore, additional analysis could provide details to the districting process the NAIA developed when HBCUs were first accepted as members.

Along with integration, many delegates pushed for the addition of football because that was positioned as necessary to maintain the membership versus their alternative option of moving fully to the NCAA (Hoover, 1958). Specifically, NAIA delegates agreed to sponsor a postseason football playoff to decide its national champion to differentiate itself from the NCAA's usage of postseason bowl games (Wilson, 2005). Its development, however, was not met without controversy. The NAIA Championship game faced troubling issues including poor game attendance and inferior playing conditions ("3,000 Holiday Tickets Sold", 1958; "Suncoast Blackout Set", 1958). Furthermore, several racial issues occurred during the early years of the football championship which may have halted the growth of the event (Beck, 1961; "May Drop Ban on Negroes", 1960; "Segregation Issue Pops on Eve", 1960). Future research could explore the early years of the NAIA playoff and determine what factors helped or hindered the first football playoffs in college football.

Future research could explore the NAIA's role within the AAU/NCAA amateur conflict. While Chapter 5 discussed Duer's proposal for Olympic representation, the amateur conflict itself has several parties involved and led to the creation of the Amateur Sports Act of 1978. The conflict lasted approximately two decades with several individuals and organizations, including the President of the United States, attempting to

appease both the AAU and the NCAA (Land, 1977). Although Chapter 5 briefly notes the NAIA sided with the AAU, further analysis of the conflict can show what contributions the NAIA received from the AAU for their support and how the Amateur Sports Act impacted all intercollegiate athletic and amateur governing bodies.

Empirical Track

During its early years as an organization, the NAIA was an innovator of college athletics. From creating the first college only basketball championship tournament to providing intercollegiate sport governance to smaller schools, the NAIA created several innovative concepts that other organizations adopted. As these innovations spread throughout the social system, firms face pressure to incorporate the practice (Boxenbaum & Jonsson, 2008). Thus, the organizational field engages in the practice known as diffusion (Strang & Soule, 1998). Diffusion shares a close relationship with both legitimacy and institutionalization as the pressure to adopt practices may cause a firm to alter its identity in order to match similar, successful, and prestigious organizations (Greve, 1996; 1998; Haverman, 1993). However, the ability to adopt new innovations requires an organization to have the motivation to pursue the change as well as the skill to realize it (Weber, Davis, & Lounsbury, 2009). As time progresses and innovations spread through an organizational field, the process evolves into a ‘taken-for-granted’ form and establishes legitimacy for firms incorporating the process (Schneiberg & Lounsbury, 2008).

The concept of diffusion can be applied to the NAIA history in order to explore types of diffusion the NAIA and intercollegiate athletics implemented throughout the NAIA’s history. One specific type of diffusion that should be researched is innovation

diffusion, as the concept allows scholars to explore all trends that occur throughout the development of the process (Bale, 2001). Future research could explore the growth of college basketball tournaments after the NAIA began the NIBT or the expansion of international college sports governance after the admission of Canadian schools.

Another area of research involves the change of authoritative power in the NAIA during the late 1980s and early 1990s. At this time, university presidents took an active role in the affairs of the NAIA by establishing the COP to act similar to a college board of trustees (Wilson, 2005). However, as the COP got more engaged, they began to take more interest in the overall day-to-day operations, interfering with the NEC's assigned role. By the early 1990s, the COP took control of all operations from the NEC.

Although the COP had good intentions, NAIA officials feared a university president would not have the time to oversee the athletic organization. Furthermore, Wilson (2005) noted most schools departing the NAIA between 1986 and 1994 were a direct result of university president turnover, with newer university presidents having more familiarity with the NCAA than the NAIA. While this may be speculation by Wilson (2005), further research on university movement during the 1986 power shift may explain why universities left the organization for the NCAA. Furthermore, a regression analysis can be performed to determine the likelihood of movement based on the experience of a new university president.

In terms of college movement, Model One can analyze if the diffusion of movement is influenced by a narrower definition of geography. Although the IPEDS regions encompass much of the country, a place-specific profile conveys regional differences and contingencies for economic development (Bathelt & Glückler, 2005;

Sayer, 2000). Several researchers have identified how organizations are influenced by local communities and their environmental conditions (Ackermann, 2002; Marquis & Battilana, 2009), governance (Davis & Greve, 1997), historical traditions (Marquis, 2003), and purchasing preferences (Lounsbury, 2007; Molotch, Freudenberg, & Paulsen, 2000). To explore the differences in geography, future research could incorporate the alignment of divisions during the course of the District System's use in the NAIA to determine if particular districts possessed a likelihood of movement.

Model One could also be applied to the NCAA to determine if identity discrepant cues exist for schools to consider movement between divisions. The model could also be adjusted to incorporate an additional control variable to monitor the movement of former NAIA members moving within the NCAA. Furthermore, Model One can also be expanded to analyze identity discrepant cues with Division I and specifically Division I-FBS in terms of conference movement. Finally, the model can be modified to predict the likelihood of reverse movement, or a return to a smaller division (i.e., Division I-FCS to Division II; Division II to Division III) or a reclassification from the NCAA to the NAIA.

The dissertation utilized Model Two to determine a Reclassification Effect on the total applications a university receives after reclassifying from the NAIA to the NCAA. Future research could explore this same effect but through a measurement of enrollment instead of applications. Specifically, Model Two can be modified to measure the Reclassification Effect on the total amount enrollment, undergraduate enrollment, and graduate enrollment. Similar to some Flutie Effect studies measuring quality of enrollment (Castle & Kostelnik, 2011; McCormick & Tinsley, 1987; Mixon & Hsing, 1994; Mixon & Ressler, 1995; Mixon, Trevino, & Minto, 2004; Pope & Pope, 2009;

Toma & Cross, 1998), Model Two could estimate the potential effect on the quality of student enrollment after a reclassification from the NAIA to the NCAA. In addition, the Reclassification Effect model could determine if movement between NCAA divisions or NCAA conferences provides an increase in the quantity and quality of both applications and enrollment. Finally, the model could also analyze if an athletic association reclassification provides an impact on athlete recruiting in revenue-generating sports, the hiring of faculty and staff (i.e., professors), and the hiring of coaches among schools affiliated with Division I-FBS.

References

- 11 schools penalized. (1972, August 24). *The Palm Beach Post*, Section E, pp. E7.
- 11 schools reprimanded by NAIA. (1972, August 24). *The Victoria Advocate*, Section C, pp. 5C.
- 161 proposals in legislative package. (1978). *The NCAA News*, 15(2), pp. 1, 4.
- 1968-69 participation in NAIA. (1970). *The NAIA News*, 19(2), pp. 4.
- 1973 NCAA convention proceedings. (1973). *1973 NCAA Annual Convention*. Meeting minutes.
- 1984 Boston College Eagles. (2010). *TotalFootballStats.com*. Retrieved from http://www.totalfootballstats.com/Team_College.asp?id=61&Season=1984.
- 2 grid play-offs to precede bowl. (1958, April). *The NAIA News*, 7(4), pp. 6.
- 2008 Texas Tech Red Raiders. (2010). *TotalFootballStats.com*. Retrieved from http://www.totalfootballstats.com/Team_College.asp?id=142&Season=2008.
- 3,000 holiday tickets sold. (1958, December 4). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.
- 4 NAIA clubs clash for Holiday Bowl berth. (1958, December 6). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.
- A.A.U. wins point in NCAA battle. (1961, December 5). *The New York Times*, pp. 56.
- A.O. Duer appears before house special committee. (1973). *The NAIA News*, 22(2), pp. 3, 12.
- A bead on basket. (1947, March 11). *The Kansas City Star*, pp. 16.
- A calm convention. (1980, January 31). *The NCAA News*, 17(1), pp. 1, 5.
- A key time for women in athletics. (1981, January 7). *Eugene Register-Guard*, Section C, pp. 2C.
- About Carnegie Classification (n.d.). *The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching*. Retrieved from <http://classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/>.
- About IPEDS. (n.d.). *Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/about/>.

- About the AICPA. (n.d.). *American Institute of CPAs*. Retrieved from <http://www.aicpa.org/About/Pages/About.aspx>.
- About the NAIA. (n.d.). *NAIA.org*. Retrieved from http://www.naia.org/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=27900&ATCLID=205323019.
- Abraham, B., & Ledolter, J. (2006). *Introduction to regression modeling*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Adopt new plan to pick, train U.S. hoop squad. (1964, January 10). *The Morning Record*, pp. 5.
- AIAW criticizes NCAA, NAIA for interference. (1980, January 6). *The Victoria Advocate*, Section B, pp. 4B.
- AIAW meets with the executive committee. (1972). *The NAIA News*, 21(2), pp. 2.
- Albert, S., & Whetten, D. A. (1985). Organizational identity. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7, 263-295.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *Academy of Management Review*, 19, 645-670.
- Allen furnishes data on gambling. (1944, October 22). *The New York Times*, Section 3, pp. 2.
- Aluminum Bowl game to be televised today. (1956, December 22). *Daytona Beach Morning Journal*, pp. 10.
- Amateur policy criticized. (1975, September 11). *The Deseret News*, Section C, pp. 2C.
- Amateur standings given a lambasting. (1963, March 20). *The Milwaukee Journal*, Part 2, pp. 18.
- American Olympic committee will carry food to Europe. (1947, July 30). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.
- Appalachian State to join Sun Belt Conference in 2014. (2013, March 27). *Sun Belt Conference*. Retrieved from <http://www.sunbeltsports.org/General/Article/tabid/1069/Article/19992/Appalachian-State-to-Join-Sun-Belt-Conference-in-2014.aspx>.
- Arbitrator role given MacArthur. (1962, December 24). *The Pittsburgh Press*, pp. 38.
- Archibald, M. E. (2004). Between isomorphism and market partitioning: How organizational competencies and resources foster cultural and sociopolitical

- legitimacy, and promote organizational survival. In C. Johnson (Ed.), *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 22 (pp. 171-211). Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI.
- Aschburner, S. (2010, June 1). Lakers-Celtics: History shows, it doesn't get any better. *NBA.com*. Retrieved from http://www.nba.com/2010/news/features/steve_aschburner/06/01/lal.bos.finals/index.html.
- Ashforth, B. E. (2001). *Role transitions in organizational life: An identity-based perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Gibbs, B. W. (1990). The double-edge of organizational legitimation. *Organization Science*, 1, 177-194.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 20-39.
- Athletes to defy NCAA ban. (1973, March 15). *The Milwaukee Journal*, Part 2, pp. 14.
- Atkin, R. (1986, March 11). Nation's oldest hoop tourney searching for new vitality. *Christian Science Monitor*, Sports Section, pp. 20.
- Attner, P. (1973, July 31). Easy approval of NCAA split forecast. *The Tuscaloosa News*, pp. 12.
- Baade, R. A., & Dye, R. F. (1990). The impact of stadiums and professional sports on metropolitan area development. *Growth and Change*, 21, 1-14.
- Baade, R. A., & Sanderson, A. R. (1997). The employment effect of teams and sports facilities. In R.G. Noll & A. Zimbalist (Eds), *Sports, jobs, and taxes: The economic impact of sports teams and stadiums* (pp. 92-118). Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institute.
- Backes, B. (2012). Do affirmative action bans lower minority college enrollment and attainment? Evidence from statewide bans. *Journal of Human Resources*, 47, 435-455.
- Baker, R. (2008, March 24). A funny thing happened on George Mason's way to Final Four. *Street and Smith's Sport Business Daily*. Retrieved from <http://m.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2008/03/20080324/Opinion/Afunny-Thing-Happened-On-George-Masons-Way-To-Final-Four.aspx>.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17, 99-120.

- Baron, J. P., Dobbin, F., & Jennings, P. D. (1986). War and peace: The evolution of modern personnel administration in the U.S. industry. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 350-383.
- Baseball teams on probation. (1972, October 12). *Observer-Reporter*, Section C, pp. C-8.
- Basketball; N.A.I.A. approves a move to Tulsa. (1992, September 30). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1992/09/30/sports/basketball-naia-approves-a-move-to-tulsa.html>.
- Bathelt, H., & Glückler, J. (2005) Resources in economic geography: From substantive concepts towards a relational perspective. *Environment and Planning A*, 37, 1545–1563.
- Baum, J. A. C., & Oliver, C. (1991). Institutional linkages and organizational morality. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36, 187-218.
- Baum, J. A. C., & Oliver, C. (1992). Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 540-559.
- Baum, J. A. C., & Powell, W. W. (1995). Cultivating an institutional ecology of organizations: Comment on Hannan, Carroll, Dundon, and Torres. *American Sociological Review*, 60, 529-538.
- Beard, R. (1987, January 11). Proposition 48 was a hint of more good things to come. *The Herald-Journal*, Section D, pp. D1.
- Beck, B. (1961, March 17). Duer cites stadium lack, segregation. *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.
- Benjamin, B. A., & Podolny, J. M. (1999). Status, quality, and social order in the California wine industry. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44, 563-589.
- Better athletes is Olympic aim. (1953, December 2). *Spokane Daily Chronicle*, pp. 21.
- Beyer, J. M., & Hannah, D. R. (2000). The cultural significance of athletics in U.S. higher education. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 105-132.
- Bias may have used cocaine. (1986, June 20). *Lawrence Journal-World*, pp. 15.
- Bickering to hurt America in Olympics. (1962, May 15). *Gettysburg Times*, pp. 5.
- Big Ten still spurns Rose Bowl bid. (1938, December 6). *Lodi News-Sentinel*, pp. 7.
- Billikens Pass up U.S. Olympic Trials. (1948, March 22). *The Deseret News*, pp. 15.

- Black, D. A., & Smith, J. A. (2004). How robust is the evidence on the effects of college quality? Evidence from matching. *Journal of Econometrics*, 121, 99-124.
- Blue hose 'meet' lions. (1987, November 28). *The Herald Journal*, Section C, pp. C3.
- Bluebonnet, Liberty set. (1965, December 13). *Ocala Star-Banner*, pp. 9.
- Blum, D. E. (1995, February 17). Beyond the big time: Association representing sports at small colleges faces questions about its survival. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 41(23), pp. A39-A40.
- Bock, H. (1986, August 31). Proposition 48 makes an impact. *The Herald-Journal*, Section C, pp. C11.
- Booth, D. (2005). *The field: Truth and fiction in sport history*. New York: Routledge.
- Bothwell, D. (1958, January 22). Committee of 100 to study financing of stadium here. *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.
- Bound, J., Jaeger, D. A., & Baker, R. M. (1995). Problems with instrumental variables estimation when the correlation between the instruments and the endogenous explanatory variable is weak. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90, 443-450.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. (pp. 241-258). New York, NY: Greenwood.
- Bowl officials query fate of new stadium. (1959, December 16). *The Evening Independent*, Section B, pp. 3-B.
- Boxenbaum, E., & Jonsson, S. (2008). Isomorphism, diffusion, and decoupling. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 78-98). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Boyce, D. (2001, July 24). NAIA staff happy to be back in area; Olathe office officially opens. *The Kansas City Star*, Section C, pp. C3.
- Boyce, D. (2002, December 13). NAIA extends deal for tournament at Municipal. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D4.
- Boyce, D. (2006a, February 21). NAIA president stepping down. *The Kansas City Star*, Section C, pp. C10.

- Boyce, D. (2006b, October 5). Carr keeps NAIA moving; College organization's new president and CEO says goal is to increase national visibility. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D3.
- Boyle, T. P. (2001). Intermedia agenda setting in the 1996 presidential election. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 78, 26-44.
- Bunch, W. (1999, April 20). Downtown move thrills NAIA. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 1.
- Bunch, W. (2000a, August 29). NAIA fields 18 relocation bids, will make cuts soon. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 1.
- Bunch, W. (2000b, March 2). OC leaders, NAIA to meet today. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 4.
- Bunch, W. (2000c, September 7). NAIA cuts host city list to final five. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 7.
- Bunch, W. (2000d, September 8). NAIA plans to take headquarters, tournament out of Tulsa. *Tulsa World*, News Section, pp. 1.
- Bunch, W. (2001, March 7). NAIA to move 20 miles from former home. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 3.
- Buss, C., Parker, J., & Rivenburg, J. (2004). Cost, quality and enrollment demand at liberal arts colleges. *Economics of Education Review*, 23, 57-65.
- By-laws proposals receive approval. (1976). *The NAIA News*, 24(4), pp. 2.
- Camellia Bowl football today in Sacramento. (1961, December 9). *Lodi News-Sentinel*, pp. 9.
- Carroll, G. R., & Hannan, M. T. (1989). Density dependence in the evolution of populations of newspaper organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 54, 524-541.
- Carter signs into law amateur athletics bill. (1978, November 9). *The Times-News*, pp. 16.
- Cashore, B. (2002). Legitimacy and the privatization of environmental governance: How non-state market-driven (NSMD) governance gain rule-making authority. *Governance*, 15, 503-529.
- Castle, J., & Kostelnik, R. (2011). The effects of an institution's athletic success on the future freshmen application pool at NCAA Division II universities. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 411-427.

- Central swimmers win Highline invite. (1970, March 9). *Ellensburg Daily Record*, pp. 5.
- Champions are set for match in auditorium (1937, March 7). *Kansas City Journal-Post*, Section A, pp. 11A.
- Championship play approved. (1980, May 7). *The Spokesman-Review*, Section B, pp. B6.
- Changes in amateurism approved by membership. (1974, February 1). *The NCAA News*, 11(2), pp. 1.
- Changes in 'Proposal 48' will help, study suggests. (1986, January 29). *The NCAA News*, 23(5), pp. 1, 10.
- Changes mark NAIA convention. (1990, October 5). *The Robesonian*, Section B, pp. 4B.
- Choi, Y. R., & Shepherd, D. A. (2005). Stakeholder perceptions of age and other dimensions of newness. *Journal of Management*, 31, 573-596.
- City loses Holiday Bowl game to Sacramento, Cal. (1961, March 17). *The Evening Independent*, Section A, pp. 7-A.
- Clapp, C. M., & Hakes, J. K. (2005). How long a honeymoon? The effect of new stadiums on attendance in Major League Baseball. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 6, 237-263.
- Clarke, T. (2012, August 7). Pfizer settles foreign bribery case with U.S. government. *Reuters*. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/08/07/us-pfizer-settlement-idUSBRE8760WM20120807>.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (2011). *Big-time sports in American universities*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Coach praises player; Indiana State fields first colored player after bars are nixed. (1948, March 19). *The Kansas City Call*, pp. 4.
- Coates, D. & Humphreys, B. R. (1999). The growth effects of sport franchises, stadia, and arenas. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18, 601-624.
- Coates, D., & Humphreys, B. R. (2005). Novelty of new facilities on attendance at professional sporting events. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 23, 436-455.
- Cohen, B. D., & Dean, T. J. (2005). Information asymmetry and investor valuation of IPOs: Top management team legitimacy as a capital market signal. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 683-690.

- College basketball. (1994, August 10). *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from http://infoweb.newsbank.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/iw-search/we/InfoWeb?p_product=AWNB&p_theme=aggregated5&p_action=doc&p_docid=0EAF40BB8AF02D20&p_docnum=8&p_queryname=18.
- College football's best of the last 20 years. (2002, November 19). *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/2002-11-19-memorable-moments_x.htm.
- College group's track ban said 'unwarranted boycott'. (1964, November 18). *The Spokesman-Review*, pp. 15.
- Collins, W. T. (2012). *Key actor perceptions of athletics strategy* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC.
- Commission says amateur sports need restructuring. (1976, February 9). *The Herald-Journal*, Section B, pp. B2.
- Conant, J. B. (1961). Athletics: The poison ivy in our schools. *Look*, 25, 49-53.
- Congress aims at NCAA ban. (1973, March 15). *The Pittsburgh Press*, pp. 39.
- Congress issues deadline to feuding amateur groups. (1965, September 2). *Sarasota Herald-Tribune*, pp. 38.
- Congress to lower boom on NCAA? (1973, March 15). *Beaver County Times*, Section C, pp. C-1.
- Convention keeps growing. (1972). *The NAIA News*, 21(3), pp. 12.
- Cooper, B., & Horsley, L. (2006, December 15). NAIA to leave Olathe; The association will return to downtown, its home for 35 years before it moved to Tulsa, Okla. in 1993. *The Kansas City Times*, Section B, pp. B1.
- Corbitt, R. (1990a, October 2). Celtics say goodbye to Dennis Johnson. *The Wichita Eagle*, Section B, pp. 3B.
- Corbitt, R. (1990b, December 26). Buffs' McCartney ignores his report. *The Wichita Eagle*, Section B, pp. 3B.
- Cosgriff, J. (2010, August 31). Menlo College changes affiliation, but not goals. *Palo Alto Online*. Retrieved from http://www.paloaltoonline.com/news/show_story.php?id=18092.
- Council okays Lang site. (1958, January 22). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.

- Court title tourney planned by NCAA. (1938, December 15). *The New York Times*, pp. 38.
- Covitz, R. (2002, March 12). Pitching the NAIA – Steve Baker left baseball behind to help turn the small-college organization into a big-league outfit. *The Kansas City Star*, Section C, pp. C1.
- Covitz, R. (2007, July 19). NAIA headquarters return to downtown Kansas City. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D1.
- Covitz, R. (2009, November 23). NAIA extends contract to keep tournament at Municipal through 2013. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from http://infoweb.newsbank.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/iwsearch/we/InfoWeb?p_product=AWNB&p_theme=aggregated5&p_action=doc&p_docid=12C2EF3420C44670&p_docnum=17&p_queryname=34.
- Covitz, R. (2012a, March 8). Top 75 NAIA tournament moments. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from http://infoweb.newsbank.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/iwsearch/we/InfoWeb?p_product=AWNB&p_theme=aggregated5&p_action=doc&p_docid=13D678BCCFD4BFE8&p_docnum=1&p_queryname=1
- Covitz, R. (2012b, March 20). Dressler of Columbia and Pioneers' Dowd picked as NAIA All-Americans. *The Kansas City Star*. Retrieved from http://infoweb.newsbank.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/iwsearch/we/InfoWeb?p_product=AWNB&p_theme=aggregated5&p_action=doc&p_docid=13DA69AFC6F84570&p_docnum=1&p_queryname=34.
- Cross, A. B. (1967, December 10). Eastern falls 28-21; Diedrick 'best back'. *The Spokesman-Review*, Section Sports, pp. 1, 3.
- Crowl, J. A. (1983, March 23). NAIA delegates reject creation of divisions in 4 sports. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26(4), pp. 18.
- Crowl, J. A. (1984, March 28). NAIA to reserve leadership positions for women; 'Eligibility fee' rejected. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 28(5), pp. 27, 29.
- Crowley, J. N. (2006). *In the arena: The NCAA's first century*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- CSTV to become CBS College Sports Network. (2008, February 12). *CBSSports.com*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cbssports.com/cbssports/story/10636901>.
- Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F. B. (2001). Occupational commitment and intent to leave the coaching profession. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 36, 131-148.

- Data and statistical services. (2007). *Princeton University*. Retrieved from http://dss.princeton.edu/online_help/stats_packages/stata/panel.htm.
- Davis, G.F., & Greve, H.R. (1997). Corporate elite networks and governance changes in the 1980s. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 103, 1–37.
- Deeds, D. L., Mang, P. Y., & Frandsen, M. L. (2004). The influence of firms' and industries' legitimacy on the flow of capital into high-technology ventures. *Strategic Organization*, 2, 9-34.
- Deephouse, D. L. (1996). Does isomorphism legitimate? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 1024-1039.
- Deephouse, D. L. (2000). Media reputation as a strategic resource: An integration of mass communication and resource-based theories. *Journal of Management*, 26, 1091-1112.
- Deephouse, D. L., & Carter, S. M. (2005). An examination of differences between organizational legitimacy and organizational reputation. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42, 329-360.
- Deephouse, D. L., & Suchman, M. (2008). Legitimacy in organizational institution. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 49-77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Delegates focus on four key legislative areas. (1981). *The NCAA News*, 18(1), pp. 6.
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147-160.
- Dominican U. (CA) moving from NAIA to NCAA Div. II. (2008, June 12). *LAXPower*. Retrieved from <http://www.laxpower.com/laxnews/news.php?story=11301>.
- Dosh, K. (2012, March 12). Tournament pays handsomely for schools. *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://espn.go.com/blog/collegebasketballnation/post?id=53175>.
- Dr. Harry Fritz tabbed as executive secretary. (1975). *The NAIA News*, 24(3), pp. 3.
- Drori, I., & Honig, B. (2013). A process model of internal and external legitimacy. *Organization Studies*, 34, 345-376.
- Droschak, D. (1986, August 7). Valvano supports drug testing. *The Times-News*, pp. 16.
- Duer, A. O. (1958, April). From the executive secretary. *The NAIA News*, 7(4), pp. 6.

- Duer, A. O. (1960). Must hold to firm line on standards. *The NAIA News*, 10(1), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1962a). NAIA 25th annual meeting. *The NAIA News*, 11(3), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1962b). U.S. Olympic meeting, *The NAIA News*, 11(2), pp. 18.
- Duer, A. O. (1963a). Al Duer encouraged by 1963 annual convention; urges unity. *The NAIA News*, 12(3), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1963b). NAIA has banner year. *The NAIA News*, 12(4), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1965a, January 29). *Newsletter to executive committee*. National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, Newsletter.
- Duer, A. O. (1965b). Duer appears before Senate committee. *The NAIA News*, 14(4), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1965c, September 3). *Newsletter to executive committee*. National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics, Newsletter.
- Duer, A. O. (1965-66). NAIA voted representation. *The NAIA News*, 15(1), pp. 3, 11.
- Duer, A. O. (1967). NAIA position on 'track and field dispute'. *The NAIA News*, 16(3), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1969). 'Conduct' program outlines three-point plan. *The NAIA News*, 18(3), pp. 3-4.
- Duer, A. O. (1970a). Development programs opens new era. *The NAIA News*, 19(1), pp. 3.
- Duer, A. O. (1970b). 'Eligibility compliance' is not a platitude. *The NAIA News*, 19(3), pp. 3.
- Duer, A.O. (1972). A brief report to NAIA membership. *The NAIA News*, 21(2), pp. 3.
- Durand, R., & McGuire, J. (2005). Legitimizing agencies in the face of selection: The case of AACSB. *Organization Studies*, 26, 165-196.
- Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 239-263.
- Dwyer, B., Eddy, T., Havard, C., & Braa, L. (2010). Stakeholder perceptions of an athletic program's reclassification from NCAA Division II to NCAA Division I (FCS) membership: A case study. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 76-97.

- Eaton-Robb, P. (2011, December 15). UConn data shows football, two basketball programs made profit. *CTpost.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.ctpost.com/uconn/article/UConn-data-shows-football-two-basketball-2405962.php>.
- Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72, 617-626.
- Elmore Smith and Travis Grant pace Kentucky State to NAIA basketball title. (1970). *The NAIA News*, 19(2), pp. 6.
- Elsbach, K. D. (1994). Managing organizational legitimacy in the California cattle industry: The construction and effectiveness of verbal accounts. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 39, 57-88.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Kramer, R. M. (1996). Member's Responses to organizational identity threats: Encountering and countering the Business Week Rankings. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 442-476.
- Eskenazi, G. (1975, June 4). Title IX rules issued for equality in sports. *The New York Times*, pp. 29.
- Eskey, K. (1978, October 18). Sports bill scores with Congress. *The Pittsburgh Press*, Section B, pp. B-3.
- Etzion, D., & Ferraro, F. (2010). The role of analogy in the institutionalization of sustainability reporting. *Organization Science*, 21, 1092-1107.
- Executive committee makes new changes for 1975-76. (1975). *The NAIA News*, 24(2), pp. 16.
- Expect 16 teams for cage tourney; National collegiate event taking shape. (1937, February 28). *Kansas City Journal-Post*, Section A, pp. 13A.
- Fairmont captures Champion Bowl, 28-21. (1968). *The NAIA News*, 17(1), pp. 5.
- Falla, J. (1981). *NCAA: The voice of college sports*. Mission, KS: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Fans, officials satisfied with present grid rules. (1956, January 12). *Oxnard Press-Courier*, pp. 15.
- Farrell, C. S. (1986, February 12). Small-college sports-governing body to vote on plan for presidents to control organization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 31(22), pp. 31-32.

- Feddersen, A., Maennig, W., & Borcherting, M. (2006). The novelty effect of new football stadia: The case of Germany. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 1, 174-188.
- Ferguson, J. A. (1996, October 16). 'Our survival isn't threatened,' says Patterson. *Tulsa World*, Section B, pp. B6.
- Ferguson, J. A. (1997, April 23). Baker takes NAIA reins. *Tulsa World*, Section B, pp. B1.
- Ferguson, J. A. (1998a, October 9) NAIA Convention to look at regional structure. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 6.
- Ferguson, J. A. (1998b, October 13) NAIA moves closer to regional plan. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 2.
- Ferguson, L. (1967, April 10). Hayes, Monroe miss list for Pan American Games. *The Tuscaloosa News*, pp. 7.
- Ferguson, T. D., Deephouse, D. L., & Ferguson, W. L. (2000). Do strategic groups differ in reputation? *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 1195-1214.
- Fields, C. M. (1980, May 12). NAIA to become 3rd college sports group to offer championship events for women. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 20(11), pp. 1, 10.
- Fields, C. M. (1981, April 6). 2 college sports associations agree to use same rules for women's championships. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 22(7), pp. 4.
- Fields, C. M. (1982, June 16). Women's sports organization suspends all activities. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 24(16), pp. 10.
- Fields, D. (2001, March 9). There's no place like home: NAIA returns to Kansas. *Daily Union*, pp. 11.
- Fight on NCAA said coming up. (1951, January 5). *The Kentucky New Era*, pp. 7.
- Final game tonight for Olympic squads. (1964, April 4). *The Evening Independent*, Section A, pp. 21-A.
- Final reorganization proposal approved. (1973, May 15). *The NCAA News*, 10(6), pp. 1-2.
- Fink, J. S., Parker, H. M., Brett, M., & Higgins, J. (2009). Off-field behavior of athletes and team identification: Using social identity theory and balance theory to explain fan reactions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 23, 142-155.

- Finn, J. D., Pannoizzo, G. M., & Achilles, C. M. (2003). The 'why's' of class size: Student behavior in small classes. *Review of Educational Research*, 73, 321-368.
- First round cage pairings. (1953, February 24). *The Washington Afro-American*, pp. 16.
- First special convention to decide reorganization. (1973, July 15). *The NCAA News*, 10(9), pp. 1.
- Fleisher, A. A., Goff, B. L., & Tollison, R. D. (1992). *The National Collegiate Athletic Association: A study in cartel behavior*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Florida's outside shooting vaults Gators into national title game. (2006, April 1). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://scores.espn.go.com/ncb/recap?gameId=264000062>.
- Football rights fees announced for 1976. (1976, April 15). *The NCAA News*, 13(5), pp. 3.
- Football telecasts and revenue spread wide. (1976, March 15). *The NCAA News*, 13(4), pp. 5-6.
- Ford names panel to study Olympics. (1975, June 20). *The Palm Beach Post*, Section D, pp. D1.
- Format for picking Olympic track, cage teams settled. (1963, December 3). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, pp. 8.
- Four institutions draw probation. (1971). *The NAIA News*, 20(4), pp. 23.
- Fourteen named as Olympic cagers. (1948, April 1). *Sarasota Herald-Tribune*, pp. 9.
- Frick, B., Barros, C. P., & Priz, J. (2010). Analysing head coach dismissals in the German "Bundesliga" with a mixed logit approach. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 200, 151-159.
- Frieder, L. L. (2007). *NCAA reclassification: The impact of reclassification from Division II to DI-AA and from Division I-AA to I-AA on NCAA member institutions from 1993 to 2003*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. W. Powell & P. J DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232-262). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Friedman, M. (1976). *Price theory*. Chicago, IL: Aldine.

- Friend, T. (1996, January 1). College football: Rose Bowl; Northwestern not content merely to smell roses. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1996/01/01/sports/college-football-rose-bowl-northwestern-not-content-merely-to-smell-roses.html>.
- Fulks, D. (2011). *2004-2010 NCAA Division I Intercollegiate Athletics Programs Report*. Indianapolis, In: National Collegiate Athletic Association. Retrieved from <http://ncaapublications.com/p-4237-2004-2010-revenues-and-expenses.aspx>.
- Galaskiewicz, J. (1985). Interorganizational relations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 11, 281-304.
- Galvin, T. (2002). Examining institutional change: Evidence from the founding dynamics of U.S. health care interest associations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 673-696.
- Garg, V. K., Rasheed, A. A., & Priem, R. L. (2005). Explaining franchisors' choices of organization forms within franchise systems. *Strategic Organization*, 3, 185-271.
- Geaghan, J. P. (2012). *Statistical Techniques II: EXST 7015 course notes*. Personal collection of J. P. Geaghan, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Gerard, J. (1989, November 22). In \$1 billion deal, CBS locks up N.C.A.A. basketball tournament. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/11/22/sports/in-1-billion-deal-cbs-locks-up-ncaa-basketball-tournament.html>.
- Getz, M., & Siegfried, J. (2010). What does intercollegiate athletics do to or for colleges and universities? (Working Paper No. 10-W05). Retrieved from <http://vanderbilt.edu/econ/wparchive/workpaper/vu10-w05.pdf>.
- Glückler, J. (2007). Economic geography and the evolution of networks. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 7, 619-634.
- Glynn, M. A., & Abzug, R. (2002). Institutionalizing identity: Symbolic isomorphism and organizational names. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 267-280.
- Goff, B. (2000). Effects of university athletics on the university: A review and extension of empirical assessment. *Journal of Sport Management*, 14, 85-104.
- Grand Canyon wins crown. (1975). *The NAIA News*, 24(1), pp. 8.
- Grayson, A. (1964, December 4). AAU-NCAA rift widens. *Christian Science Monitor*, Section B, pp. 11B

- Greene, B. (1978, October 17). Safeguards guaranteed for U.S. amateur athletes. *The Free-Lance Star*, pp. 8.
- Greenwood, R., Oliver, C., Sahlin, K., & Suddaby, R. (2008). Introduction. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 1-46). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Greenwood, R., Suddaby, R., & Hinings, C. R. (2002). Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields. *Academy of Management Journal*, 45, 58-80.
- Greve, H. R. (1995). Jumping ship: The diffusion of strategy abandonment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 40, 444-473.
- Greve, H. R. (1996). Patterns of competition: The diffusion of a market position in radio broadcasting. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 29-60.
- Greve, H. R. (1998). Managerial cognition and the mimetic adoption of market positions: What you see is what you do. *Strategic Management Journal*, 19, 967-988.
- Grewal, R., Cote, J. A., & Baumgartner, H. (2004). Multicollinearity and measurement error in structural equation models: Implications for theory testing. *Marketing Science*, 23, 519-529.
- Grimsley, W. (1948, March 22). Olympic cage trials open; 8 teams ready. *Times Daily*, pp. 11.
- Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Governance approval highlights convention. (1981, January 31). *The NCAA News*, 18(1), pp. 1, 6.
- Gross, J. (1980, January 9). Old transfer rule restored by women. *The New York Times*, Section D, pp. D16.
- Hall, J. (1975, January 1). Women's athletics gain acceptance on campus. *The NCAA News*, 12(1), pp. 2.
- Hansen, J. M. (2011). *The effects of athletic success on college enrollment applications*. (unpublished Master's Thesis). Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX.
- Hartnett, D. (1994, March 13). NAIA tournament impact to top \$11 million. *Tulsa World*, Section B, pp. B1.

- Hasse, R., & Krücken, G. (2008). Systems theory, societal contexts, and organizational heterogeneity. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 539-559). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Haveman, H. A., & David, R. J. (2008). Ecologists and institutionalists: Friends or foes? In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 573-595). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hawthorne, J. J. (1964-65). NAIA president attends Olympics in Tokyo. *The NAIA News*, 14(1), pp. 3.
- Hayes equals world record in taking Olympic 'century'. (1964, October 14). *Toledo Blade*, pp. 31.
- H.E.W. head says Title IX won't 'bankrupt' schools. (1975, June 27). *The New York Times*, pp. 15-16.
- Henkel, C. (1981, May 2). Tome for women to make their choice. *Eugene Register-Guard*, Section B, pp. 1B-2B.
- Henry, K. (1994, February). The beginnings of the nation's oldest college basketball hoops fest. *NAIA News*, pp. 10.
- Higgins, M. C., & Gulati, R. (2003). Getting off to a good start: The effects of upper echelon affiliations on underwriter prestige. *Organization Science*, 14, 244-263.
- Higgins, M. C., & Gulati, R. (2006). Stacking the deck: The effects of top management backgrounds on investor decisions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 1-25.
- High scoring bowls the rule on eve of the battle for No. 1. (1996, January 2). *The Nevada Daily Mail*, pp. 5.
- Hinings, C. R., & Greenwood, R. (1988). *The dynamics of strategic change*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Hinrichs, P. (2011). The effects of affirmative action bans on college enrollment, educational attainment, and the demographic composition of universities. *Review of Econometrics and Statistics*, 94, 712-722.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1975). Organizational effectiveness and the institutional environment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 327-344.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1977). Occupational, organizational, and institutional models in mass media research: Towards an integrated framework. In P. M. Hirsch,

P. V. Miller, & F. G. Kline (Eds.), *Strategies for communication research* (pp. 13-40). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

His wish granted. (1982, January 28). *Eugene Register-Guard*, Section C, pp. 2C.

History. (n.d.). *The Common Application*. Retrieved from <https://www.commonapp.org/Login#!PublicPages/History>.

History of the women's final four. (2001). *CNN Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved from http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/basketball/college/women/features/finalfour_history/1982

Holiday Bowl foes get here Saturday. (1958, December 10). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.

Hogg, M. A., & Terry, D. J. (2000). Social identity and self-categorization processes in organizational contexts. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 121-140.

Hoover, F. L. (1958). *A history of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

Howard, J. (2011, January 20). The life of a Pittsburgh Steelers fan. *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://sports.espn.go.com/espn/commentary/news/story?id=6041096>.

Huggins, S. (1996, May 27). Stronger NAIA eases threat of excessive growth in Division III. *The NCAA News*. Retrieved from <http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/NCAANewsArchive/1996/19960527/active/3321n02.html>.

Humboldt State loses 15-14, in Holiday Bowl. (1960, December 11). *The Modesto Bee*, Section C, pp. C-3.

Iowa Intercollegiate Athletic Conference. (1976, May 12). News release from IOWA Conference. [Press release].

Itule, B. D., & Anderson, D. A. (1994). *News writing and reporting for today's media* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ivy loop, led by Yale, defies NCAA boycott. (1964, December 12). *The Morning Record*, pp. 4.

Jablonski, R. (1987, March 7). Cougars to play Western St. *The News and Courier*, Section C, pp. 1-C, 6-C.

Jackets nip tigers; W. Virginia St. in NAIA finals. (1987, March 17). *Boca Raton News*, Section D, pp. 1D.

- Jackson, L., Sullivan, L., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. (1996). Achieving social identity: Social mobility, social creativity and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 241-254.
- Jacoby, D. (2006). Effects of part-time faculty employment on community college graduation rates. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77, 1081-1103.
- Jepperson, R. L. (1991). Institutions, institutional effects, and institutionalism. In W. W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 143-163). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jennings, P. D., Greenwood, R., Lounsbury, M. D., & Suddaby, R. (2013). Institutions, entrepreneurs, and communities: A special issue on entrepreneurship. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 28, 1-9.
- Johnson, C. (2004). Introduction: Legitimacy processes in organizations. In C. Johnson (Ed.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (Vol. 22, pp. 1-24). Amsterdam: Elsevier JAI.
- Kahn, L. M. (2007). Markets: Cartel behavior and amateurism in college sports. *The Journal of Economics Perspectives*, 21, 209-226.
- Katz, M. J., & Seifried, C. (in press). And then there were three: The NCAA's struggle for reorganization and the emergence of Division III athletics. *Sport History Review*.
- Katz, M. S. (1990). Coach John B. McLendon Jr. and the integration of intercollegiate and professional athletics in post World War II America. *Journal of American Culture*, 13(4), 35-39.
- Katz, M. S. & McLendon, J. B. (1988). *Breaking through: The NAIA and the integration of intercollegiate athletics in post-World War II America*. Kansas City, MO: National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics.
- Keenan, S. (2006, January 14). WVU Tech says move back to NAIA 'a good fit.' *The Register-Herald*. Retrieved from <http://www.register-herald.com/sports/x519056927/WVU-Tech-AD-says-move-back-to-NAIA-a-good-fit>.
- Keller, G. (2004). *Transforming a college: The story of a little-known college's strategic climb to national distinction*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kentucky, Baylor win Olympic trials; Phillips, Denver also in semi-finals. (1948, March 28). *The Pittsburgh Press*, pp. 26.

- Keteyian, A., & Selcraig, B. (1986, July 7). A killer drug strikes again. *Sports Illustrated*. Retrieved from <http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/vault/article/magazine/MAG1064997/index.htm>.
- Klein, J. (2000, March 1). NAIA wonders if OC grass greener. *Tulsa World*, News Section, pp.1.
- Knoke, D. (1985). The political economies of associations. In R. G. Braungart, & M. M. Braungart (Eds.), *Research in political sociology* (Vol. 1, pp.1211-1242). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Krenz, K. (2011). *The perceived impact of winning an athletic championship*. (Unpublished Master's Thesis). University of Minnesota Duluth, Duluth, MN.
- Laband, D. N., & Lentz, B. F. (2004). Do costs differ between for-profit and not-for-profit producers of higher education? *Research in Higher Education*, 45, 429-441.
- Lamertz, K., Carney, M., & Bastien, F. (2008). Image on the internet: Inter-organisational isomorphism in image enhancement by professional soccer clubs. *International Journal Sport Management and Marketing*, 3, 242-262.
- Land, C. B. (1977). *A history of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.
- Larranaga signs extension through 2011-12 season. (2006, April 26). *GoMason.com*. Retrieved from <http://gomason.cstv.com/sports/m-baskbl/spec-rel/042606aaa.html>.
- Lawrence, T. B. (1999). Institutional strategy. *Journal of Management*, 25, 161-188.
- Lazaroff, D. E. (2007). The NCAA in its second century: Defender of amateurism or antitrust recidivist? *Oregon Law Review*, 86, 329-372.
- Leadley, J. C., & Zygmunt, Z. X. (2006). When is the honeymoon over? National Hockey League attendance, 1970-2003. *Canadian Public Policy*, 32, 213-232.
- Lederman, D. (1986, October 8). College president named to head sports-governing body for small colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 33(6), pp. 45-46.
- Lederman, D. (1989, October 11). Small-college athletic group cuts season lengths, numbers of contests; Director to retire in July. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 36(6), pp. A41-A42.
- Lederman, D. (1990a, October 10). President of 2 Ala. institutions picked to lead small-college sports group. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Section A, pp. A42.

- Lederman, D. (1990b, October 10). Small-college sports group votes to give presidents ultimate authority. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Section A, pp. A41-A42.
- Leitner, J. (1990, June 6). Pioneers switch to NCAA Division 3. *The Telegraph-Herald*, Section B, pp. 1B.
- Liberman, G. (1973, May 26). Women are participating in large sports program. *Lewiston Evening Journal*, Section A, pp. 5A.
- Liefner, I. (2003). Funding, resource allocation, and performance in higher education systems. *Higher Education*, 46, 469-489.
- Limits on playing season and on financial aid, new governance plan are on agenda of NAIA. (1985, March 13). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 30(2), pp. 30.
- Liska, J. (1965, January 14). NCAA takes step to end long dispute. *The Free Lance-Star*, pp. 8.
- Liska, J. (1973, August 7). NCAA splits into three divisions. *The Portsmouth Times*, pp. 8.
- Litan, R. E., Orszag, J. M., & Orszag, P. R. (2003). The empirical effects of intercollegiate athletics: An interim report. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Litsky, F. (1965, June 2). N.C.A.A. directive reaffirms A.A.U. track ban. *The New York Times*, pp. 59.
- Looking back: The history of Kemper Arena. (2011, October 25). *Kansas City Business Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/kansascity/news/2011/10/25/looking-back-the-history-of-kemper.html>.
- Louisiana Legislative Auditor. (2012). *Louisiana State University Athletic Department Agreed-Upon Procedures Report: Issued February 15, 2012*. Retrieved from <https://www.lsutaf.org/documents/2011NCAA.pdf>.
- Lounsbury, M. (2007). A tale of two cities: Competing logics and practice variation in the professionalizing of mutual funds. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, 289–307.
- Lowitt, B. (1986, January 15). NCAA: Drugs out for athletes, but boosters still in on campus. *Daily News*, Section A, pp. 6-A.
- LSU mission statement. (2012). *The Louisiana State University*. Retrieved from http://www.lsu.edu/faculty_staff/mission.shtml.

- Luder, B. (1992a, April 30). Opinions vary on reduction of athletic scholarships; NAIA players can get other types of aid if they need it. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D4.
- Luder, B. (1992b, September 25). NAIA to get jump on affiliation issue; National convention begins today in KC with eye toward future. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D6.
- Luder, B. (1992c, September 27). NAIA ponders change. *The Kansas City Star*, Section C, pp. C10.
- Luder, B. (1992d, September 30). Bigger share of spotlight is NAIA's reason for move; It will be No. 1 in Tulsa instead of one of many, officials say. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D4.
- Luder, B. (1992e, September 30). Athletic officials stunned; Loss of NAIA blow to KC area members. Some fault decision. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D4.
- Luder, B. (1992f, October 1). NAIA taking more to Tulsa; Tennis events to join basketball in move of national headquarters. *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D1.
- Luder, B. (1993, December 26). Schools divided on selection process for NAIA tourney; Conference coaches like the new format – but independents don't. *The Kansas City Star*, Section C, pp. C11.
- Luder, B., & Fitzpatrick, J. C. (1992, September 30). KC loses NAIA to Tulsa headquarters and tournament moving; announcement startles city. *The Kansas City Star*, Section A, pp. A1.
- Lumberjacks determined to return. (1958, December 22). *Prescott Evening Courier*, pp. 7.
- Luther, D. (2011, January 3). Minnesota-Duluth wins 2010 Division II Football National Championship. *Bleacher Report*. Retrieved from <http://bleacherreport.com/articles/560200-minnesota-duluth-wins-2010-division-ii-football-national-championship>.
- MacArthur tells feuding track bodies to heed to agreement. (1963, June 5). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, pp. 8.
- MacKay, B. (1991, November 10). NAIA split will help smaller schools. *The Wichita Eagle*, Section G, pp. 8G.
- Maddala, G. S. (1983). *Limited-dependent and qualitative variables in econometrics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103–123.
- Manhattan quits over no-Negro contract. (1948, March 4). *The Daytona Beach Morning Journal*, pp. 9.
- Marklein, M. B. (2001, March 20). *Colleges' sports success is not a major draw*. Retrieved from <http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/life/2001-03-20-college-sports.htm>.
- Marquis, C. (2003). The pressure of the past: Network imprinting in intercorporate communities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 48, 655–689.
- Marquis, C., & Battilana, J. (2009). Acting globally but thinking locally? The enduring influence of local communities on organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 29, 283-302.
- Maryland senator deplores feuding (1965, July 1). *The Spokesman-Review*, pp. 16.
- Marx, B. (2012). *Fall 2012 Experimental Statistics 7034: Lecture notes & sample exams*. Personal collection of B. Marx, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA.
- Mason, C. H., & Perreault, W. D. (1991). Collinearity, power, and interpretation of multiple regression analysis, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 268-280.
- May drop ban on Negroes in Holiday Bowl. (1960, November 2). *Daytona Beach Morning Journal*, pp. 9.
- McBride, C.E. (1945, March 12). Sporting comment. *The Kansas City Star*, pp. 8.
- McCormick, R. E., & Tinsley, M. (1984). Athletics versus academics? Evidence from SAT scores. *Journal of Political Economy*, 95, 1103-1116.
- McDonald, B. (2003). The "Flutie factor" is no received wisdom, but is it true? *Boston College Magazine*, Spring 2003. Retrieved from http://bcm.bc.edu/issues/spring_2003/11_phenomenology.html.
- McEvoy, C. D., Nagel, M. S., DeSchriver, T. D., & Brown, M. T. (2005). Facility age and attendance in Major League Baseball. *Sport Management Review*, 8, 19-41.
- McLendon, J. B. (1979). Black college basketball: An historical chronology. *Black College Basketball Yearbook*, I, pp. 7.
- Meakins, G. (1960, March 29). Buckeyes meet NAIA all-stars in Olympic trial. *The Deseret News and Telegram*, Section B, pp. B5.

- Membership total hits 1,261 as moratorium goes into effect. (2000, September 11). *The NAIA News*. Retrieved from: <http://fs.ncaa.org/Docs/NCAANewsArchive/2000/association-wide/membership%20total%20hits%201%20c261%20as%20moratorium%20goes%20into%20effect%20-%209-11-00.html>.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 340-363.
- Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1983). *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Meyer, J. W., & Scott, W. R. (1992). Centralization and the legitimacy problems of local government. In J. W. Meyer, & W. R. Scott (Eds.). *Organizational environments: Ritual and Rationality* (pp. 199-216). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Middleton, L. (1981, March 23). NAIA, once all male, attracts women's teams. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 22(5), pp. 5.
- Mighty Bears push toward Aluminum bid. (1956, November 23). *The Robesonian*, pp. 9.
- Minnesota-Duluth wins first Division II football title. (2008, December 13). *USA Today*. Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/football/2008-12-13-dii-final_N.htm?csp=23&RM_Exclude=aol.
- Mintzberg, H., & Waters, J. (1985). Of strategies, deliberate and emergent. *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 257-272.
- Mission statement: South Georgia State College - Athletics. (2007). *South Georgia State College*. Retrieved from <http://www.sgc.edu/athletics/mission.html>.
- Missouri boys annex crown. (1952, March 15). *The Kentucky New Era*, pp. 9.
- Mitchell, M. M., Bradshaw, C. P., & Leaf, P. J. (2010). Student and teacher perceptions of school climate: A multilevel exploration of patterns of discrepancy. *Journal of School Health*, 80, 271-279.
- Mixon, F. G., & Hsing, Y. (1994). The determinants of out-of-state enrollments in higher education: A tobit analysis. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 329-335.
- Mixon, F. G., & Ressler, R. W. (1995). An empirical note on the impact of college athletics on tuition revenues. *Applied Economics Letters*, 2, 383-387.
- Mixon, F. G., Trevino, L. J., & Minto, T. C. (2004). Touchdowns and test scores: Exploring the relationship between athletics and academics. *Applied Economics Letters*, 11, 421-424.

- Molotch, H., Freudenburg, W., & Paulsen, K.E. (2000). History repeats itself, but how? City character, urban tradition, and the accomplishment of place. *American Sociological Review*, 65, 791–823.
- Monaghan, P. (1985, March 27). NAIA delegates back voting-procedure change, delay structural overhaul. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 30(4), pp. 32.
- Monaghan, P. (1995, October 6). Upbeat at the NAIA; Loss of members to NCAA fails to discourage leaders of small association. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 42(6), pp. A45-A46.
- Monroe leads NAIA all-stars in championship. (1967, April 7). *Sarasota Herald-Tribune*, pp. 20.
- Montagna, P. (1990). Accounting rationality and financial legitimation. In S. Zukin & P. DiMaggio (Eds.). *Structures of capital: The social organization of the economy* (pp. 227-260). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, J. (1989, November 7). Mines-cc rivalry still hot. *The Denver Post*. Retrieved from <http://global.factiva.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/ha/default.aspx>.
- More than 1,000 expected for NCAA convention. (1980). *The NCAA News*, 16(17), pp. 1, 4.
- Morgan, R. (1995, July 16). A matter of time? The NAIA is losing schools to the NCAA at an alarming rate. Its days may be numbered. *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. S1.
- Move to organize better US amateur sports teams. (1962, May 15). *The Telegraph*, pp. 11.
- Mullen, M. (2010, January 24). Athletics finances: A balancing act. *Minnesota Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.mndaily.com/2010/01/24/athletics-finances-balancing-act>.
- Murphy, R. G., & Trandel, G. A. (1994). The relation between a university's football record and the size of its applicant pool. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 265-270.
- NAIA News. (1953, May). Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 6.
- NAIA 4th in Olympic cage trials. (1960). *The NAIA News*, 9(4), pp. 5.
- NAIA acts to strengthen hand in rivalry. (1963, March 18). *Park City Daily News*, pp. 10.
- NAIA against expansion format. (1986, July 22). *The Daily Sentinel*, pp. 4.

NAIA all-stars win in trials. (1968, April 7). *Reading Eagle*, pp. 65.

NAIA and cable station reach five-year deal to broadcast championship games. (2003, December 13). *The Kansas City Star*, Section D, pp. D2.

NAIA announces redistricting plan. (1969). *The NAIA News*, 17(4), pp. 2.

NAIA annual meeting. (1959, March 12). *1959 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1961, March 17). *1961 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1962, March 16). *1962 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1963, March 15). *1963 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1964, March 13). *1964 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1965, March 12). *1965 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1967, March 17). *1967 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1968, March 15). *1968 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1969, March 14). *1969 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1970, March 15). *1970 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1971, March 12). *1971 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1973, March 16). *1973 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1974, March 15). *1974 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1975, March 14). *1975 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA annual meeting. (1976, March 12). *1976 NAIA Annual Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA approves legislation to strengthen academics. (1989, March 22). *The Herald-Journal*, Section D, pp. D8.

NAIA approves program for women's competition. (1980, May 7). *St. Joseph Gazette*, Section D, pp. 3D.

NAIA asks for Senate inquiry. (1963, March 16). *Meriden Record*, pp. 7.

NAIA asks voice in amateur field. (1962, January 19). *Christian Science Monitor*, pp. 6.

NAIA authorized to name 3 men to U.S. Olympic committee board. (1964). *The NAIA News*, 13(3), pp. 3.

NAIA bans NCAA events. (1963, March 17). *The Pittsburgh Press*, pp. 30.

NAIA clarifies academic rule. (1987, March 25). *The NCAA News*, 24(13), pp. 16.

NAIA considering tougher drug screening than NCAA. (1986, December 18). *The Herald-Journal*, Section D, pp. D7.

NAIA council of presidents meeting. (1986, July 14). *1986 NAIA COP Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA council of presidents meeting. (1989, April 1-3). *1989 NAIA COP Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA council of presidents meeting. (1990, April 23-25). *1990 NAIA COP Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA council of presidents meeting. (1995, April). *1995 NAIA COP Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA council of presidents meeting. (1996, October). *1996 NAIA COP Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA council proposes new governing structure. (1986, January 22). *The Daily Leader*, pp. 4.

NAIA-ESPN sign contract. (1987, October 7). *Factiva*. Retrieved from <http://global.factiva.com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/ha/default.aspx>.

NAIA executive committee meeting. (1959, March 6-14). *1959 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA executive committee meeting. (1961, March 9-18). *1961 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA executive committee meeting. (1963, March 7-11). *1963 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA executive committee meeting. (1964, March). *1965 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA executive committee meeting. (1965, March 4-14). *1965 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1966, March 3-13). *1966 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1967, March 9-18). *1967 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1968, March 7-15). *1968 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1969a, March 6-15). *1969 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1969b, August 6-8). *1969 NAIA Executive Committee Interim Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1970, March 6-14). *1970 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1971, March 5-13). *1971 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1972, March 10-18). *1972 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1973, August 10-11). *1973 NAIA Executive Committee Interim Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1974a, March 8-15). *1974 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1974b, August 9). *1974 NAIA Executive Committee Interim Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1975a, March 7-14). *1975 NAIA Executive Committee Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive committee meeting. (1975b, August 7-10). *1974 NAIA Executive Committee Interim Meeting*. Meeting minutes.
- NAIA executive highly critical of amateurism. (1963, March 20). *Times Daily*, Section 2, pp.6.
- NAIA fighting against NCAA. (1956, February 22). *The Washington Observer*, pp. 28.
- NAIA has first female president. (1988, August 2). *Akron Beacon Journal*, Section D, pp. D2.

NAIA is ailing financially. (1979, May 23). *The Herald-Journal*, Section C, pp. C3.

NAIA may withdraw ban on Negro clubs. (1960, November 2). *St. Joseph Gazette*, pp. 8.

NAIA members adopt drug screening program. (1986, July 23). *The Fort Scott Tribune*, pp. 6.

NAIA members must adopt drug program. (1986, July 23). *The Herald-Journal*, Section C, pp. C1.

NAIA men's basketball tournament top 75 moments. (2012, January 26). *National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics*. Retrieved from http://www.naia.org/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=27900&ATCLID=205360466.

NAIA national executive committee meeting. (1984, March 15-20). *1984 NAIA National Executive Committee Annual Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA national executive committee meeting. (1985, September 14-15). *1984 NAIA National Executive Committee Fall Meeting*. Meeting minutes.

NAIA national meeting. (1977, March). *1977 NAIA National Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA national meeting. (1979, March). *1979 NAIA National Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA national meeting. (1980, March). *1980 NAIA National Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA, NCAA get together. (1976, December 19). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, Section B, pp. 8B.

NAIA official outlines bowl game needs; Tri-City area stands small chance. (1957, November 1). *Tri-City Herald*, pp. 11.

NAIA officials compromise. (1990, October 3). *The Telegraph-Herald*, Section B, pp. 3B.

NAIA players take summer cage tour to far east. (1966). *The NAIA News*, 15(3), pp. 2, 10.

NAIA presidents' advisory committee meeting. (1961, January 9-10). *1961 Presidents' Advisory Committee Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA: presidents approve direct qualification. (2007, October 4). *TranSouth Athletic Conference*. Retrieved from <http://www.transouth.org/article/402.php>.

NAIA presidents joining forces. (1986, January 13). *Ocala Star-Banner*, Section C, pp. 2C.

NAIA puts 8 schools on probation. (1972, August 24). *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, Part 2, pp. 3.

NAIA regains control of athletics. (1986, January 13). *The Junction City Daily Union*, pp. 11.

NAIA refuses to join NCAA. (1963, January 17). *Lawrence Journal-World*, pp. 6.

NAIA selects playoff teams. (1958, November 25). *The Washington Observer*, pp. 24.

NAIA sets limits on sporting events. (1989, October 4). *Lawrence Journal-World*, Section D, pp. 8D.

NAIA shifts more responsibility to college presidents. (1986, January 22). *St. Joseph News-Press*, Section B, pp. 1B.

NAIA special event requirements & benefits. (1971). *The NAIA News*, 20(3), pp. 6.

NAIA split decision affects Berry, Shorter. (1990, October 4). *Rome News-Tribune*, Section B, pp. 6-B.

NAIA suffering financial woes. (1979, May 22). *Boca Raton News*, pp. 10.

NAIA summer meeting. (1985, July 12). *1985 NAIA Summer Meeting*, Meeting minutes.

NAIA to add a second national football championship in 1970. (1970). *The NAIA News*, 19(2), pp. 6.

NAIA to split in 4 sports. (1989, March 9). *The Wichita Eagle*, Section B, pp. 4B.

NAIA tournament gets snub from K.C. (1990, March 19). *Ellensburg Daily Record*, pp. 12.

NAIA unveils program on sportsmanship. (2000, October 12). *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 7.

NAIA votes to ditch district alignment. (1993, September 28). *The Spokesman-Review*, Section C, pp. C6.

NAIA votes to go with 2 divisions. (1990, October 4). *The Madison Courier*, Section B, pp. B2.

NAIA will crown football champions in two divisions for 1970 campaign. (1970, June 1). *Observer-Reporter*, Section C, pp. C-6.

NAIA will crown two football champions. (1970, June 3). *Ellensburg Daily Record*, pp. 5.

NAIA wins Pan-American basketball trials. (1967). *The NAIA News*, 16(3), pp. 3.

NAIA's Chasteen hanging it up. (1996, June 21). *Tulsa World*, Section B, pp. B1.

NAIB meet opens today in Kansas City. (1952, March 10). *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, pp. 21.

NAIB tourney lifts ban on Negro players. (1948, March 6). *The Herald-Journal*, pp. 5.

National cage meet opens in New York; Six entered. (1938, March 9). *The Telegraph-Herald*, pp. 9.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011a). *2011-12 NCAA Division II Manual*. Indianapolis, IN: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.utpbfalcons.com/custompages/compliance/2011-2012%20D2%20Manual.pdf>.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2011b). *2011-12 NCAA Division III Manual*. Indianapolis, IN: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D312.pdf>.

National Collegiate Athletic Association v. Califano, 444 F.Supp. 425 (Kan. 1978).

N.C.A.A. accused of 'power grab'. (1961, November 30). *The New York Times*, pp. 48.

N.C.A.A. council urges colleges to consider boycott of AAU. (1961, December 1). *The New York Times*, pp. 41.

N.C.A.A. 'plotting' charged by A.A.U. (1961, October 4). *The New York Times*, pp. 59.

N.C.A.A. upheld in trust case. (1983, March 1). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1983/03/01/sports/ncaa-upheld-in-trust-case.html>.

NCAA council report warns tougher policy. (1959, January 9). *Eugene Register-Guard*, Section B, pp. 3B.

NCAA denies 'war' with NAIA, discounts membership drives. (1958, April 13). *The Miami News*, Section C, pp. 6C.

NCAA division not likely. (1973, January 12). *Beaver County Times*, Section B, pp. B-2.

NCAA, ESPN agree to new deal. (2011, December 15). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/7357065/ncaa-espn-agree-tv-deal-2023-24.

NCAA group frets about Senate bill. (1973, August 22). *Spokane Daily Chronicle*, pp. 32.

NCAA may regret latest move. (1981, January 15). *Lodi News-Sentinel*, pp. 18.

NCAA meet disbands; Many changes listed. (1956, January 12). *Spokane Daily Chronicle*, pp. 34.

NCAA meeting winds up on calm, peaceful note. (1958, January, 8). *Ocala Star-Banner*, pp. 4.

NCAA must change ways, says male official in women's athletic group. (1977, January 5). *St. Joseph Gazette*, Section B, pp. 2B.

NCAA, NAIA may be settling past rivalries. (1976, December 19). *The Herald-Journal*, Section B, pp. B6.

NCAA plans new policy; Revises sanity code to help de-emphasize college sports. (1951, November 20). *Youngstown Vindicator*, pp. 14.

NCAA plans no reprisal against Lindgren, others. (1965, June 29). *The Free Lance-Star*, pp. 8.

NCAA puts Cincy and Holiday Bowl playoff entry on probation. (1959, April 30). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.

NCAA releases first women's tournament pairings. (1982, March 7). *Lawrence Journal-World*, Section B, pp. 2B.

NCAA reorganization is rejected. (1973, January 13). *Sarasota Herald-Tribune*, Section C, pp. 1C-2C.

NCAA reorganization proposal formulated by special committee. (1973, February 15). *NCAA News*, 10(3), 1.

NCAA says college hoopsters can't play Russians. (1973, February 24). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, Section Two, pp. 13.

NCAA schools vote to test athletes for drug use. (1986, January 15). *The Palm Beach Post*, Section D, pp. D1, D5.

NCAA special convention to consider re-organizing. (1973, January 15). *Bangor Daily News*, pp. 15.

NCAA starts 67th annual meetings. (1973, January 10). *The Herald-Journal*, Section B, pp. B2.

- NCAA to split tourney into two divisions. (1956, January 12). *Meriden Record*, pp. 8.
- NCAA votes to kill sanity code by 130-60 tally. (1951, January 13). *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, Part 2, pp. 4
- NCAA will curb track activities. (1964, November 17). *Spokane Daily Chronicle*, pp. 17.
- NCAA worried over federal rules in sports. (1974, November 13). *The Prescott Courier*, pp. 10.
- NCAA yields to women. (1981, January 14). *The Evening Independent*, Section C, pp. 6-C.
- Negro ban hurts NAIB tourney. (1948, March 5). *Ellensburg Daily Record*, pp. 8.
- Negro schools in; The N.A.I.B. opens its membership to them, clearing way for tourney participation. (1952, March 12). *Kansas City Star*, pp. 32.
- New Orleans to join Southland. (2012, August 21). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/8289325/new-orleans-privateers-join-southland-conference-sources-say.
- Nevada dropped from NAIB list. (1950, March 11). *The Miami News*, Section B, pp. 1.
- New Army, Navy college training program planned. (1942, December 17). *The Evening Independent*, pp. 1.
- No drastic cutbacks yet; Palmetto Colleges cast weary eye on inflation. (1974, December 22). *The Herald-Journal*, Section B, pp. B4.
- No easing of inflation seen. (1979, June 27). *The Milwaukee Sentinel*, Part 1, pp. 2.
- Noll, R. G. (1974). Attendance and price-setting. In R.G. Noll (Ed.), *Government and the sports business* (pp. 115-157). Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute.
- O'Brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. *Quality & Quantity*, 41, 673-690.
- Oliver, C. (1997). Sustainable competitive advantage: Combining institutional and resource-based views. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, 697-713.
- Olympic committeeman suggests U.S. trials drop N.A.I.B. winner. (1948, March 5). *The New York Times*, pp. 25.

- Oslin, R. (2004, November 18). Remembering the "Miracle in Miami". *The Boston College Chronicle*, 13(6). Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/rvp/pubaf/chronicle/v13/n18/miracle.html.
- OU makes one-year commitment. (1981, May 1). *The Daily Sentinel*, Section C, pp. C-5.
- Owl cagers are honored (1938, March 17). *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, pp. 17.
- Padwe, S. (1964, April 6). Olympic basketball squad is selected. *Beaver County Times*, pp. 14.
- Pair teams today; The drawings for National Intercollegiate Basketball Tournament will be made. (1938, March 5). *Kansas City Times*, pp. 17.
- Palmer, T. (2011, March 28). William Jewell College leaves NAIA history behind for the NCAA. *The Kansas City Star*, Section B, pp. B10.
- Pepsi-cola company to assist NAIA. (1961). *The NAIA News*, 11(1), pp. 20.
- Pettigrew, A. M. (1987). Content and action in the transformation of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24, 649-670.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Pike, G. R., Smart, J. C., Kuh, G. D., & Hayek, J. C. (2006). Educational expenditures and student engagement: When does money matter? *Research in Higher Education*, 47, 847-872.
- Pitt Teacher club arrives here Saturday. (1957, December 12). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 1-C.
- Pittsburgh 27-26 victor in NAIA Holiday Bowl. (1957, December 22). *Eugene Register-Guard*, pp. 27.
- Prairie View tops NAIA. (1962, March 18). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, pp. 8.
- Pratt, M. G., & Foreman, P. O. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review*, 25, 18-42.
- Preliminary reorganization proposal issued by committee. (1973, March 1). *The NCAA News*, 10(4), pp. 1, 5.
- Preliminaries set for Holiday Bowl. (1959, November 27). *Lewiston Morning Tribune*, pp. 10.

- Presidents' Advisory Committee reports on activities. (1960). *The NAIA News*, 9(3), pp. 5, 8.
- Prewitt, E. (1974, January 9). NCAA to permit athletes to be pro in one sport and amateur in another. *The Gettysburg Times*, pp. 14.
- Price, J., & Wolfers, J. (2012). Biased referees? Reconciling results with the NBA's analysis. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 30, 320-328.
- Pollock, T. G., & Rindova, V. P. (2003). Media legitimation effects in the market for initial public offerings. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46, 631-642.
- Poor crowd at Ali exhibition. (1974, November 18). *The Montreal Gazette*, pp. 18.
- Poor K.C. turnout for Muhammad Ali. (1974, November 18). *St. Joseph Gazette*, Section B, pp. 2B.
- Pope, D. G., & Pope, J. C. (2009). The impact of college sports success on the quantity and quality of student applications. *Southern Economic Journal*, 75, 750-780.
- Potluck sports. (1964, December 12). *Meriden Journal*, pp. 4.
- Potter, B. N. (2005). Accounting as a social and institutional practice: Perspectives to enrich our understanding of accounting change. *Abacus*, 41, 265-289.
- Punishment not likely for collegians. (1965, June 29). *The Tuscaloosa News*, pp. 9.
- Putnam, P. (1957, December 23). Sports scrapbook. *Sarasota Journal*, pp. 18.
- Quack, S. (2007). Legal professionals and transitional law-making: A case of distributed agency. *Organization*, 14, 643-666.
- Questions and answers concerning association's drug-testing proposal. (1986, January 8). *The NCAA News*, 23(2), pp. 1, 3.
- Race issue held periling grid bowl. (1957, December 24). *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, pp. 14.
- Ranson, S., Hinings, B., & Greenwood, R. (1980). The structuring of organizational structures. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 1-17.
- Rao, H., Davis, G. F., & Ward, A. (2000). Embeddedness, social identity, and mobility: Why firms leave the NASDAQ and join the New York Stock Exchange. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 268-292.

- Rao, H., Monin, P., & Durand, R. (2003). Institutional change in Toque Ville: Nouvelle Cuisine as an identity movement in French Gastronomy. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108, 795-843.
- Reorganization for the N.A.I.A. (1993, September 30). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/09/30/sports/reorganization-for-the-naia.html>.
- Reorganization plan revised by committee. (1973, April 15). *The NCAA News*, 10(5), pp. 1, 4.
- Rerup, C., & Feldman, M. S. (2011). Routines as a source of change in organizational schemata: The role of trial-and-error learning. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54, 577-610.
- Restructuring prompts moratorium. (1995, August 16). *The NCAA News*, 31(30), pp. 8-9.
- Rhoden, W. C. (1989, October 5). Presidents want to curb pressures. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/10/05/sports/presidents-want-to-curb-pressures.html>.
- Rindova, V. P., Williamson, I. O., Petkova, A. P., & Sever, J. M. (2005). Being good or being known: An empirical examination of the dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of organizational reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 1033-1050.
- Robertson, C., & Krauss, C. (2010, August 2). Gulf spill is the largest of its kind, scientists say. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/03/us/03spill.html?_r=2&fta=y&.
- Rothenberg, F. (1974, November 12). Athletic directors view equal opportunity law as enemy. *Ocala Star Banner*, Section B, pp. 3B.
- Ruef, M., & Scott, W. R. (1998). A multidimensional model of organizational legitimacy: Hospital survival in changing institutional environments. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43, 877-904.
- Salwasser, H. (2011, April 14). NAIA timeline-evolution of the district system. *NAIA History Forum*. Retrieved from <http://naiahistoryforum.freeforums.org/naia-timeline-evolution-of-the-district-system-t83.html>.
- Sambol, R. (1975, March 13). Duer retires as NAIA guiding light. *Kansas City Times*, Section D, pp. 1D.

- Sami, J. (1985, January 2). *Flutie struggles as BC grounds Houston 45-28 for first bowl win*. Retrieved from http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/1985-01-02/sports/8501010107_1_final-college-game-cotton-bowl-troy-stradford.
- Sanity code vote causes confusion. (1950, January 16). *St. Petersburg Times*, pp. 8.
- Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and social science*. London: Sage.
- Scandal brings major problem. (1945, January 31). *The Tuscaloosa News*, pp. 7.
- Scandal reaches Kentucky. (1951, October 21). *Tri-City Herald*, pp. 6.
- Scandal rocks cage game. (1951, February 19). *Toledo Blade*, pp. 18.
- Schneiberg, M., & Lounsbury, M. (2008). Social movement and institutional analysis. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin, & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 650-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Schultz seeks members' ideas on revenue sharing. (1989, November 27). *The NCAA News*, 26(42), pp. 1, 3.
- Schroeder, L. D., Sjoquist, D. L., & Stephan, P. E. (1986). *Understanding regression analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Scott, W. R. (1995). *Institutions and organizations*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- SD Mines, BHSU to move from NAIA to NCAA Division II. (2010, July 13). *Yankton Daily Press & Dakotan*. Retrieved from: http://www.yankton.net/sports/article_f61812fb-53ed-528e-9f8c-f90b66c90646.html.
- SEC accepts Missouri for 2012-2013. (2011, November 7). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/7199062/missouri-tigers-move-sec-official-big-12-hurdles-remain.
- Segregation issue pops on eve of Holiday Bowl. (1960, December 12). *The Dispatch*, pp. 8.
- Seifried, C. (2007). Examining the contact sports exemption: Legal arguments and proposals. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 1, 295-320.
- Seifried, C. (2010). Introducing and analyzing historical methodology for sport management studies. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 11, 1-21.

- Selingo, J. (1997, October 31). In college sports, is bigger better? *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Section A, pp. A55.
- Selznick, P. (1996). Institutionalism “old” and “new”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 270-277.
- Senate to investigate national athletic feud. (1965, July 16). *The Herald-Journal*, pp. 19.
- Senators Kennedy, Jackson take floor for Lindgren. (1965, July 1). *The Spokesman-Review*, pp. 16.
- Seppy, T. (1975, April 16). Ford may enter sports feud. *The Times-News*, pp. 10.
- Seppy, T. (1978, July 7). The regulation of amateur athletics. *Reading Eagle*, pp. 22.
- Seven districts involved in NAIA redistricting plan. (1964). *The NAIA News*, 13(4), pp. 8.
- Sharp, B. (1975, March 2). Duer sees NAIA growth in Kemper Arena. *Kansas City Star*, pp. 4S.
- Shearer, E. (1973, January 24). SEC launches NCAA reorganization fight. *Kentucky New Era*, pp. 15.
- Sheehan, J. M. (1962, November 13). A.A.U. and N.C.A.A. make no progress toward mending rift. *The New York Times*, pp. 48.
- Shoemaker, P. J. (1996). Hardwired for news: Using biological and cultural evolution to explain the surveillance function. *Journal of Communication*, 46, 32-47.
- Singh, J. V., Tucker, D. J., & House, R. J. (1986). Organizational legitimacy and the liability of newness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 31, 171-193.
- Slack, T., & Hinings, B. (1994). Institutional pressures and isomorphic change: An empirical test. *Organization Studies*, 15, 803-827.
- Slippery Rock is Pa. champ for 3rd time. (1974, November 25). *The Gettysburg Times*, pp. 21.
- Small-college group eyes 2 divisions in 4 sports. (1983, March 9). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 26(2), pp. 17, 20.
- Small college bowl will not be in Memphis. (1957, November 6). *St. Joseph Gazette*, pp. 8.
- Small colleges battle for national grid title in Holiday Bowl Saturday. (1959, December 13). *Lakeland Ledger*, Section B, pp. 13-B.

- Small school ruling group says NCAA is dictatorial. (1963, March 16). *Lawrence Journal-World*, pp. 9.
- Smith, J. (2011). *The antecedents and consequences of intercollegiate athletic association change of colleges and universities in Canada and the United States*. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation) University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.
- Smith, J., Soebbing, B. P., & Washington, M. (in press). A case study surrounding a university's motivation for changing United States intercollegiate athletic associations. *Journal of Contemporary Athletics*.
- Smith, J., Williams, D., Soebbing, B. P., & Washington, M. (2013). The influence of a university's social identity on changing athletic affiliations. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 6, 22-40.
- Smith, R. (1964, December 12). NCAA termite at it again, says Red. *The Deseret News*, Section A, pp. A5.
- Smith, R. A. (1988). *Sports and freedom*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. K. (1987). The National Collegiate Athletic Association's Death Penalty: How educators punish themselves and others. *Indiana Law Journal*, 62, 985-1059.
- Smith, R. K. (2000). A brief history of the National Collegiate Athletic Association's role in regulating intercollegiate athletics. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 11, 9-22.
- Smith, S. (1944, February 10). Cage tourney may become drawing card. *Valley Morning Star*, pp. 7
- Snider, S. (1939, March 28). Oregon basketball team defeats Ohio State, wins championship. *The Bend Bulletin*, pp. 2.
- Soccer. (1960). *The NAIA News*, 9(3), pp. 8.
- Solon: Oklahoma schools should return to NAIA. (1999, April 2). *Tulsa World*, Sports Section, pp. 8.
- Some Big Eight women will compete in NCAA. (1981, August 31). *Daily Union*, pp. 14.
- SOSU leaves NAIA for NCAA Division II. (1994, December 23). *The Durant Daily Democrat*, Section A, pp. 1-A.
- Sports study set by association of small colleges. (1984, October 10). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 29(7), pp. 30.

- Spreitzer, E., & Snyder, E. E. (1990). Sports within the black subculture: A matter of social class or a distinctive subculture. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 14, 48-58.
- Springfield State wins; Beats Hamline five, 79-71, for 2nd straight N.A.I.A. title. (1953, March 15). *The New York Times*, Section 4, pp. 29.
- St. Joseph's meets Montana State today. (1956, December 22). *The News and Courier*, pp. 4-A.
- Stark schools are approved to join NCAA. (2010, July 13). *Vindy.com*, Retrieved from <http://www.vindy.com/news/2010/jul/13/stark-schools-are-approved-to-join-ncaa/>.
- Steelers-Ravens cream of the crop among NFL rivalries. (2012, November 16). *USA Today*. Retrieved from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/nfl/2012/11/16/nfl-top-five-rivalries/1705499/>.
- Steensland, B., Park, J. Z., Regnerus, M. D., Robinson, L. D., Wilcox, W. B., & Woodberry, R. D. (2000). The measure of American religion: Toward improving the state of the art. *Social Forces*, 79, 291-318.
- Stevens, J. A., & Slack, T. (1998). Integrating social action and structural constraints. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 33, 143-154.
- Strang, D., & Soule, S. A. (1998). Diffusion in organizations and social movements: From hybrid corn to poison pills. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 265-290.
- Straub, D. W. (1989). Validating instruments in MIS research. *MIS Quarterly*, 13, 147-169.
- Stryker, R. (1994). Rules, resources, and legitimacy processes: Some implications for social conflict, order, and change. *American Journal of Sociology*, 99, 847-910.
- Stooksbury, D. (2010). *National title: The unlikely tale of the NAIB tournament*. Bradenton Beach, FL: Higher Level Publishing.
- Students urged to stay in class until drafted; 200,000 to get military training in 350 colleges. (1942, December 18). *The Evening Independent*, pp. 1.
- Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 571-610.
- Suddaby, R., & Greenwood, R. (2005). Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 50, 35-67.

- Sumaedi, S., Bakti, I. G. M. Y., & Metasari, N. (2011). The effect of students' perceived science quality and perceived price on student satisfaction. *Management Science and Engineering*, 5, 88-97.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London, England: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1985). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W.G. Austin (Eds). *Psychology of intergroup relations*. (2nd ed. pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tampa picks college division. (1971, December 1). *St. Petersburg Times*, Section C, pp. 2-C.
- Taylor, D. M., & McKirnan, D. J. (1984). A five-stage model of intergroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 23, 291-300.
- Taylor, B. A., & Trogdon, J. G. (2002). Losing to win: Tournament incentives in the National Basketball Association. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20, 23-41.
- Texas A&M officially joins SEC. (2011, September 26). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-football/story/_/id/7019493/texas-aggies-officially-get-accepted-sec.
- The history of basketball. (1971). *Baker World of Sports*, p. 16.
- The laws that govern the securities industry. (2013). *Securities and Exchange Commission*. Retrieved from <http://www.sec.gov/about/whatwedo.shtml#laws>.
- The Ohio State University Vision. (2013). *The Ohio State University*. Retrieved from <http://www.osu.edu/academicplan/vision.php>.
- Thomas, T. E., & Lamm, E. (2012). Legitimacy and organizational sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 110, 191-203.
- Thompson, P. (1968, April 5). NCAA teams look poor in Olympic trials. *The Sumter Daily Item*, Section B, pp. 2B.
- Thompson, S. B. (2011). Simple formulas for standard errors that cluster by both firm and time. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 99, 1-10.
- Three placed on probation. (1970, October 18). *The Spokeman-Review*, Sports Section, pp. 2.

- Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, 20 U.S.C. §1681-1688. (1972).
- Tolbert, P. S., & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reforms 1880-1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 22-39.
- Toma, J. D., & Cross, M. E. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student choice: Exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 633-661.
- Tomasini, N. T. (2005). An assessment of the economic differences associated with reclassification to NCAA Division I-AA. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 14, 7-16.
- Top amateur cage teams set for Olympic trials. (1948, March 20). *The Toledo Blade*, pp. 20.
- Top 10 celebrity Lakers fans. (2007, March 9). *NBA.com*. Retrieved from http://www.nba.com/features/lakers_celebs_070309.html.
- Tucker, D. (1981, January 14). NCAA takes control in women's athletics. *The Miami News*, Section B, pp. 4B.
- Tucker, I. B. (2004). A reexamination of the effect of big-time football and basketball success on graduation rates and alumni giving rates. *Economics of Education Review*, 23, 655-661.
- Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparisons and social identity: Some prospects for \ intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 1-34.
- Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognition redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1984). Social identification and psychological group formation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *The social dimension: European developments in social psychology* (Vol. 2, pp. 518-538). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1985). Social categorization and the self-concept: A social cognitive theory of group behavior. In E. J. Lawler (ed.), *Advances in group processes* (2nd ed., pp.77-122). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Turner, J. C., & Oakes, P. J. (1986). The significance of the social identity concept for social psychology with reference to individualism, interactionism and social influence. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 237-252

- Two Rockhurst players on NAIA all-star club that vie for Olympics. (1964, March 30). *Lawrence Journal-World*, pp. 12.
- Utah excited by Pac-10 acceptance. (2010, June 22). *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://sports.espn.go.com/ncaa/news/story?id=5298238>.
- Washburn Ichabods edge West Virginia State, 79-77. (1987, March 18). *The Lakeland Ledger*, Section D, pp. 6D.
- Washington colleges could leave NAIA. (1991, January 14). *Eugene Register-Guard*, Section B, pp.2B.
- Washington, M. (2004). Field approaches to institutional change: The evolution of the National Collegiate Athletic Association 1906-1995. *Organization Studies*, 25, 393-414.
- Washington, M. (2004-05). Declining legitimacy and social mobility. *International Studies of Management and Organization*, 34(4), 32-51.
- Washington, M., Forman, P., Suddaby, R., & Ventresca, M. (2005). Strategies and struggles: The governance of U.S. collegiate athletics. In K. D. Elsbach (Ed.). *Qualitative organizational research, Vol. 1* (pp. 113-137). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Washington, M., & Patterson, K. D. W. (2011). Hostile takeover or joint venture: Connections between institutional theory and sport management research. *Sport Management Review*, 14, 1-12.
- Washington, M., & Ventresca, M. J. (2004). How institutions support organizational change: Three field-level mechanisms in U.S. collegiate athletics. *Organization Science*, 15, 82-97.
- Washington, M., & Ventresca, M. J. (2008). Institutional contradictions and struggles in the formation of U.S. collegiate basketball, 1880-1938. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 30-49.
- Washington, M., & Zajac, E. J. (2005). Status evolution and competition: Theory and evidence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48, 282-296.
- Waters, R. (1974, December 22). S.C. schools may start cutting athletic budgets. *The News and Courier*, Section B, pp. 2-B.
- Waynesburg NAIA king. (1966, December 12). *The Washington Reporter*, pp. 18.

- Weaver, A. (2010). Reevaluating prestige: The influence of history on the decision to reclassify to Division I: A case study. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 131-153.
- Weber, K., Davis, G. F., & Lounsbury, M. (2009). Policy as myth and ceremony?: The global spread of stock exchanges, 1980-2005. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52, 1319-1347.
- Westminster eying NAIA championship. (1962, March 16). *The Gettysburg Times*, pp. 5.
- Westminster seeking bid to Aluminum Bowl. (1956, November 17). *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, pp. 12.
- What makes a champion? (1959-60). *The NAIA News*, 9(3), pp. 8.
- White, G. S. (1964, January 4). Amateur sports truce to last until after Olympics in Tokyo. *The New York Times*, pp. 17.
- White, G. S. (1965, January 14). N.C.A.A. to penalize colleges competing in open track meets after March 1. *The New York Times*, pp. 17.
- White, G. S. (1978, January 10). Women fear interference by N.C.A.A. *The New York Times*, pp. 43.
- White, G. S. (1980, January 7). N.C.A.A. considers women's tournaments. *The New York Times*, Section C, pp. C5.
- White, G. S. (1980, May 6). Issue and debate: Are women's college sports units in peril? *The New York Times*, Section C, pp. C16.
- White, G. S. (1986, January 12). N.C.A.A. to review academic standard. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/1986/01/12/sports/ncaa-to-review-academic-standard.html>.
- Whitford, D. (2010, May 25). The king of the sports deal. *CNNMoney.com*. Retrieved from http://money.cnn.com/2010/05/10/news/companies/greenberg_sports_deal_king.fortune/.
- Williams, D. P., & Seifried, C. S. (2013). Analyzing the prospects of the unrelated business income tax and §501(c)(3) on Division I athletic activities. *The Journal of Sport*, 2, 22-60.
- Willis Reed named rookie of the year. (1965, March 24). *The Evening News*, Section B, pp. 9B.

- Wilson, J. R. M. (2005). *The history of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics: Competition, tradition, character*. Monterey, CA: Coaches Choice.
- Women cage powers vie for NCAA crown. (1982, March 25). *Toledo Blade*, pp. 38.
- Women fear power loss. (1981, January 1). *Spokane Daily Chronicle*, pp. 15.
- Women's organization promises to fight. (1980, January 10). *Wilmington Morning Star*, Section D, pp. 3-D.
- Yang, Z., Su, C., & Fam, K. (2012). Dealing with institutional distances in international marketing channels: Governance strategies that engender legitimacy and efficiency. *Journal of Marketing*, 76(3), 41-55.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (2000). Focusing the corporate product: Securities analysts and de-diversification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 45, 591-619.

Vita

Dylan P. Williams was born in 1986 in Hammond, Louisiana and grew up in Tickfaw, Louisiana. Dylan showed very early on in life his passion for learning by excelling in school. He consistently earned Honor Roll and other academic praises from his elementary and secondary teachers. He graduated from Independence High School in 2004 where he was named the Salutatorian of his graduating class. While at Independence, Dylan also excelled athletically on both the Tiger football and track and field teams. In his senior year, he received All-District and All-State honors from the Louisiana High School Athletic Association. Upon completion of high school, Dylan continued his academic pursuits at Southeastern Louisiana University.

During his academic tenure at Southeastern, Dylan was exposed to the science of accounting by Drs. Dean DiGregorio, Bob Braun, and William Simpson. During his sophomore and junior years, he participated with the Beta Alpha Psi accounting fraternity and was able to make presentations at their regional conference. Prior to graduating in 2007 with his Bachelors of Science degree in Accounting, Dylan's academic achievements were recognized by being inducted into the Beta Gamma Sigma and Phi Epsilon Kappa honors fraternities and graduated Summa Cum Laude.

After graduating, Dylan chose to continue his education at Southeastern when he applied and was accepted into the Masters of Business Administration program. While working on his masters, he was introduced to Dr. Michael Budden who encouraged Dylan to pursue a concentration in marketing research. In addition to his required academic and university duties, Dylan was able to publish his first scholarly article in the *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*. He also wrote multiple news articles for

the university's newspaper, *The Lion's Roar*. Furthermore, Dylan was elected as the President of the Beta Alpha Psi fraternity. He completed his Masters in Business Administration coursework in 2008.

Dylan pursued a career in accounting and has worked for one of the Big Four accounting firms, KPMG, as an audit associate. While working with KPMG, Dylan successfully passed the Certified Public Accountant examination and is currently an active CPA in the State of Louisiana. He has also been a member of the Louisiana Society for Certified Public Accountants. After two years in accounting, Dylan wanted to pursue his doctorate degree in sport management within the College of Education at the Louisiana State University in August 2010 after being recruited by Dr. Aaron Clopton. Dr. Clopton served as his adviser until accepting a position at the University of Kansas in Spring 2011. After the departure of Dr. Clopton, Dr. Chad Seifried took Dylan on as a student starting in the Summer of 2011. With the help of his adviser, Dr. Seifried, as well as sport management colleagues Drs. Brian Soebbing and Kwame Agyemang, Dylan contributed much of his business background to study the place of sport business in education.

At LSU, Dylan has served as a Graduate Assistant or Adjunct Instructor for twelve consecutive semesters. He was the instructor of record for several core undergraduate sport management courses such as Introduction to Sport Administration, Sport in Society, Legal and Ethical Issues in Sport, Financial Issues in Sport, and a Sport Administration Seminar. In addition to these job responsibilities, Dylan served as a Teaching Assistant for Dr. Clopton in his Sport Administration seminar course. Dylan has stayed academically engaged with a multitude of regional and national presentations

at respected scholarly conferences including the North American Society for Sport Management (NAASM), the North American Society for Sport Sociology (NASSS), the College Sport Research Institute (CSRI), the Sport Marketing Association (SMA), the Sport and Recreational Law Association (SRLA), and the Southern Sport Management Association (SSMA). Additionally, in Spring 2012, he was recognized for his scholarly presentation achievements when he won First Place in the Bill Sutton Student Research Competition presented by SSMA and the *Journal of Sport Administration & Supervision*.

Dylan has also served as a Conference Referee for SRLA, the Southern Management Association, and the Academy of Management. Furthermore, he has authored and co-authored accepted peer-reviewed article journals in respected field journals such as the *Sport History Review*, the *Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, the *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, and *The Journal of Sport*. Dylan anticipates graduation with his Doctor of Philosophy in Kinesiology in August 2014. Upon successful defense of his dissertation, he will begin work as an Assistant Professor in Sport Management at the University of Alabama.

Outside of academics, Dylan is an avid spectator and fan of the New Orleans Saints (Who Dat!?!) and LSU Tiger Athletics (Geaux Tigers!!!) as well as professional wrestling. In addition, Dylan enjoys playing video games and spending time with his friends, his family, and most importantly, his fiancé, Kineta.