

**PERCEPTIONS OF ADDING COLLEGIATE SPORTS BY TEAM  
STAKEHOLDERS**

An Undergraduate Research Scholars Thesis

by

GRETA SWIFT

Submitted to the Undergraduate Research Scholars program at  
Texas A&M University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the designation as an

UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH SCHOLAR

Approved by Research Advisor:

Dr. Sloane Milstein

May 2017

Major: Sport Management  
Kinesiology

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	1
Thesis .....	1
Theoretical Framework .....	1
Project Description.....	1
CHAPTER	
I.    INTRODUCTION .....	3
Collegiate History .....	4
Varsity and Club Sports Defined .....	4
Governance .....	7
Demographics – Mixed Sport .....	9
Feasibility.....	15
Liability.....	17
Social Economics.....	17
II.   METHODS .....	20
Survey .....	21
Design and Analyses .....	21
III.  RESULTS .....	23
Factor Importance .....	24
Gender.....	26
Who Adds Sports .....	26
Descriptive Explanations .....	27
Institution Size .....	28
IV.  DISCUSSION.....	29
Distinction Between Varsity and Club .....	29
Most Influential Factors.....	30
Discrepancies Amongst Groups.....	31
Who Adds Sports .....	32

Limitations .....	33
Future Research .....	33
V. CONCLUSION.....	34
REFERENCES .....	36

# **ABSTRACT**

## **Perceptions of Adding Collegiate Sports By Team Stakeholders**

Greta Swift  
Department of Health and Kinesiology  
Texas A&M University

Research Advisor: Dr. Sloane Milstein  
Department of Health and Kinesiology  
Texas A&M University

### **Thesis**

The purpose of this pilot study is to gauge the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. By measuring the awareness of the stakeholders, this research will be able to identify what factors they found important in the process of adding sports.

### **Theoretical Framework**

Trends show that enrollment in United States universities have dramatically increased since 1970 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016). It has become commonplace in the U.S. for a citizen to continue on to a higher education after high school. With this increase in attendance, universities have been seeking new ways to attract potential students.

### **Project Description**

As universities seek new ways to remain competitive, they're discovering that adding new sports are an efficient and effective way of attracting potential students. Due to lack of experience, the suspected problem is that various stakeholders interested in adding their sport do

not know how to go about the process. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to gauge the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. Using a questionnaire, a sample population of key stakeholders, such as athletic directors, team captains and club coaches, were surveyed on their knowledge of the factors, the processes, and priorities. The data collected by this study will inform the creation of proposal template or sport addition protocol. This will assist interested stakeholders in proposing an addition of sports program at their individual institutions.

Further research conducted beyond this pilot study will include additional sport offerings. Once the study has been replicated among diverse sports, results will be further compared and analyzed for consistencies and gaps. Rather than “spinning their wheels” with the wrong marketing messages—they will gain insight into effective messaging to promote their product. With this information, the proposed template will better guide key stakeholders to include important factors from both athletic and institutional administrators.

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

Trends show that enrollment in United States universities have dramatically increased since 1970 (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2016). It has become commonplace in the U.S. for a citizen to continue on to a higher education after high school. With this increase in attendance, universities have been seeking new ways to attract prospective students. According to *NCAA Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report*, each year hundreds of NCAA institutions adopt new sports to their individual institutions. In 2014-15, NCAA institutions added 319 teams, 140 men's teams and 179 women's teams. Since 1988-89 (when the NCAA began recording sponsorship numbers), historical trends indicate that more women's teams were added than men's (i.e. 3,912 men's teams added and 5,464 women's teams added (2014). One method of increasing a school's marketability is through adding sports programs that appeals to different demographics.

When a university considers adding a sport program, the school must consider the feasibility of it first. The school should consider whether or not the sport program would fulfill it's present needs. These needs could be found in the form of fulfilling Title IX requirements or attracting a particular student demographic. It is also important that a college consider if their area is geographically suitable for such program and if they have the proper financials to properly implement. A research study conducted on the decision-making factors of adding a sport to a university identified the following factors as important to the process: sport popularity, association membership, access and opportunity, and university viability (Milstein, 2014, p.3).

Using the factors highlighted in the 2014 study, an instrument was developed to consider both the key stakeholders' and the athletic directors' perceptions of the sport addition process.

### **Collegiate History**

In the summer of 1928, the first official intercollegiate sailing regatta organized by Arthur Knapp took place as a competition amongst Princeton, Yale, and Harvard. Over the course of the next two years, several small intercollegiate regattas took place without the assistance of a governing body. On June 16<sup>th</sup>, 1930, the Intercollegiate Yacht Racing Association (ICYRA) was formed at the Boston Dinghy Club Challenge Cup with the help of representatives from the 34 universities that attended the event. Since the formation, the name of the organization has been changed to the Intercollegiate Sailing Association (ICSA)(Rousmaniere, n.d.). As of 2016, the ICSA is the governing authority for all collegiate level sailing competitions in the United States and some parts of Canada and has grown to encompass over 250 university members.

### **Varsity and Club Sports Defined**

According to dictionary.com, a varsity sport is “any first-string team, especially in sports, that represents a school, college, university” (“Varsity”, n.d.). Meanwhile, Assumption College defines a collegiate club sport as “student organizations that have been established to promote and develop individual interest in various sports and recreational activities. Club Sports may be instructional, recreational, social, or competitive in nature” (“Club Sport”, n.d., para. 2).

Table 1. Program Types Among Intercollegiate Sailing Association Recognized Schools.

---

<u>Program Types</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>	<u>%</u>
Varsity	32	13.33
Club	169	70.42
Inactive	39	16.2

---

*Note.* Inactive means that the university once had a program but the program is currently not active. However, the program may be reactivated at any time. All information is based on the sample population drawn from the list of ICSA member schools.

It can be concluded from the above data (*see Table 1*) the majority of collegiate sailing programs are categorized as club. However, a small amount of these programs are varsity thus making it important to establish the difference among the two. According to Karen Ekman-Baur, Director of College Counseling at Leysin American School (2016), when asked the difference between collegiate club and collegiate varsity sport:

“Varsity sports are those in which players are involved in representing their schools in competition with other colleges/universities at the highest levels...Depending on the institution, recruiting for specific varsity sports may be very intensive...Students who participate in varsity sports, especially those receiving scholarships, will be under a certain amount of pressure to commit the necessary effort to sports training while maintaining satisfactory grade averages. Club teams are those which, in principle, any student can join based on his/her



athletic abilities/interests. Weekly practices are usually held, sometimes more than once per week, and competitions are arranged with other institutions, but because the student's involvement is recreational in nature, there is less pressure with regard to meeting training and academic demands” (msg. 3).

To elaborate on this difference further Zotos and Lopiano (2014) explained the distinction between the two isn't always clear. Club sports tend to be student ran or have volunteer coaches, student fees, fund-raising, and out-of-pocket spending by participants. However, some varsity teams require these attributes, too (p. 122).

It is important to know that all NCAA Sports are varsity sports but not all varsity sports have to be apart of the NCAA. Sailing is an excellent example of this because all 201 active programs are governed by the ICSA, club or varsity, and not the NCAA.

Since the majority of programs are club, Rhoads' found that team leadership in collegiate sailing is usually student-led (1971, p.2). Since collegiate sailing is primarily student led, it is important to note the students as one of the most important stakeholders. This is because both the participants and the leaders are the students.

### *Varsity Teams*

The following teams are classified as “varsity” according to the team websites that were compiled from the ICSA member rosters: Brandels University, Christopher Newport University, College of Charleston, Connecticut College, Dartmouth University, Eckerd College, George Washington University, Georgetown University, Harvard University, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Jacksonville University, Johnson and Wales University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, McGill University, Old

Dominion University, Salve Regina University, Tufts University, US Coast Guard Academy, US Merchant Marine Academy, US Naval Academy, University of Hawaii at Manoa, University of Rhode Island, University of South Florida, University of Southern California, Washington College, Webb Institute, Yale University, University of Hawaii Boston College, Princeton University, Roger Williams University, Bow Doin University, Columbia University.

It is important to note that even though these programs are classified as varsity, they are still unable to give scholarships due to ICSA procedural rules. However, the universities with these teams have a larger financial obligation to these varsity programs due to their status (see *Scholarships* section for more information).

### **Governance**

Competitive collegiate sailing programs are governed by the Intercollegiate Sailing Association (ICSA). The duty of the association is to oversee the seven conferences, schedule interconference regattas, set procedural rules and guidelines and coordinate championships. The ICSA has over 200 university member programs that have club and/or varsity level sailing teams. The association is a volunteer organization that's primary goal is to educate and train the novice sailors (Inter Collegiate Sailing Association [ICSA], 2016). Note that the NCAA has no governing authority over the sport and unlike the NCAA, the schools are not split by divisions – only conferences.

### *Scholarships*

One of the major differences between ICSA member teams and NCAA member teams is that the ICSA forbids the providing of financial assistance to student-athletes. According to Rule 12.F. of the ICSA Procedural Rules (2015):

“No student-athlete shall receive financial assistance to attend college based upon sailing ability. Furthermore, no coach or representative of an athletic interest related to sailing shall influence, or attempt to influence, financial aid decisions on behalf of a prospective student-athlete. This shall not prohibit coaches or other representatives from providing and discussing general financial aid information with prospective student-athletes.” (p.4).

This lack of ability to give scholarships can economically benefit a university by freeing it of obligation to pay for these student-athletes. This gives the university the ability to allocate funds to other programs. According to the Knight Commission , Division I football schools spend on average \$91,936 per athlete and those without spend \$39,201 per athlete. Meanwhile, the average spending per student is just \$13,628 (About the data”, n.d.). To add another example to the mix, the median cost per athlete is \$164,000 at South Eastern Conference (SEC) universities (Petchesky, 2013). This large amount of spending per student-athlete causes universities to lose money (Peale, 2013). Even though no hard number be given, since sailing programs cannot provide scholarships, the number is guaranteed to be smaller than that of average student athlete at a Division I school. To provide a counter argument to the significance of scholarships, according to Texas A&M University scholarship data, only 1.318279% of need-based scholarships and .62845% of non-need-based scholarships are for athletic awards in the 2014-2015 school year. (“Common data set”, 2015, p. 2) This data shows the relatively small portion of money that is already allocated to athletic scholarships.

## Demographics – Mixed Sport

US Sailing is the United States national governing association of sailing and all participating members of the ICSA are required to have a US Sailing Membership per the procedural rules (“Procedural rules”, 2015, p.2). In 2007, 9% of US Sailing members were classified as youth (or under 18) and 60% were classified as individual memberships (non-family over 18) out of the 37,000 members. Currently, the age group of below 21 comprises 11% of memberships and age group of 21 to 35 comprises 7% of memberships. These two specific age groups contain the usual age of college students (“Demographics”, 2002). US Sailing does not provide demographics beyond this point for their youth membership and the ICSA does not keep a demographic log of specific students.

Table 2. High School Sailing Data by the Interscholastic Sailing Association

---

<u>Conference</u>	<u>Number of Teams</u>	<u>Number of Sailors</u>
Mid Atlantic	98	1034
Midwest	85	558
New England	73	660
Northwest	32	268
Pacific Coast	103	947
South Atlantic	97	849
Southeast	32	214

---

(“High School Sailing”, 2015, p.7)

The Interscholastic Sailing Association, the governing body of all United States high school sailing teams, has a total of 520 teams meanwhile the ICSA has 240 member universities ((“High

School Sailing”, 2015, p.7). Table 2 (*above*) illustrates the geographic disparity between teams. This shows a clear drop in participation between high school and college.

## **Feasibility**

### *Geographic*

All information is based on the sample population drawn from the list of ICSA member schools. The Intercollegiate Sailing Association has seven conferences: Middle Atlantic Intercollegiate Sailing Conference (MAISA), Midwest Collegiate Sailing Association (MCSA), New England Intercollegiate Sailing Association (NEISA), Northwest Intercollegiate Sailing Association (NWICSA), Pacific Coast Collegiate Sailing Conference (PCCSC), South Atlantic Intercollegiate Sailing Association (SAISA), and South Eastern Intercollegiate Sailing Association (SEISA) (“About ICSA”, n.d.).

Like sailing, skiing is a highly weather dependent sport. Skiing requires snow to be on the ground, while sailing requires the water to not be frozen due to temperatures. The United States Skiing Association (USSA) has standard course requirements that the officials must check to be fulfilled before a race occurs. Similarly (and more obviously) for sailing, the officials must ensure that the water is deep enough and there is no ice to be found. When it comes to lightening, both sailing and skiing competitions must be postponed/cancelled when it comes inside a certain radius of the competition location (“Competition Guide”, 2017; “Procedural Rules”, 2015). Interestingly, the majority of sailing programs, as seen on the above chart, are found in the New England area where the sport can only be seasonal. This lack of winter season may economically benefit these schools by not having to pay for training during that time.

Table 3. Collegiate Sailing Program Conferences.

---

<u>Conference Name</u>	<u>Number of Schools</u>	<u>%</u>
MAISA	52	21.67
MCSA	38	15.83
NEISA	52	21.67
NWICSA	10	4.17
PCCSC	32	13.33
SAISA	31	12.92
SEISA	19	7.92

---

*Note.* These sailing conferences are regionally based according to their perspective names.

*Economic*

Studying the sociological side of sailing and why it attracts certain populations, it is important to consider the effects of the sports expansion. Historically, it has been found that newcomers to the upper class are more likely than the average person to participate in the sport due to excitement of newfound wealth. Table 3 (*above*) illustrates the regional geographic locations of collegiate sailing teams. Meanwhile, the national expansion of sailing schools and boat dealerships has made it easier for lower class citizens to access the sport (Aversa, 1986). This lower class inclusion has diversified sailing and is expected to continue to do so in the future. Currently, if a school were to start a team from scratch, the cost of a new club 420 sailboat that two students can sail is \$8,500. This price includes all associated equipment except for trailers. The 420 sailboat is the most common sailboat used in collegiate sailing a school can have a fleet consisting of at least four boats. Using these numbers, the minimum start up cost,

given the school uses new equipment, will be approximately \$34,000 for new equipment (“New club 420 sailboats”, 2015).

### **Liability (injury)**

Sailing is a physically demanding sport that can create liability for injury. Especially on heavy wind sailing days, the most common sailing injuries include concussions and back pain. However, it is not a highly stressful sport on the body. Physiologically, dinghy racing won’t cause excessive muscle fatigue (Shephard, p.1).

Interestingly, it was found that women can be held more liable than men because men have been proven to have better spatial recognition abilities than women. Spatial awareness is critical to performing well while sailing (Dabbs, Chang, Strong, & Milun, 1998).

When a university joins the ICSA as a member school, they are required to adhere to the safety measures of the Safety Handbook. This guide encompasses topics that range from personal equipment to personal training to capsizing to safety boat and crew. All member schools are required to adhere to this guide and this helps decrease liability. An example of these safety measures is Rule 13 of the ICSA’s procedural rules requires that all schools make sure the student-athletes meet a minimum swimming requirement and wearing a PFD (“Safety Handbook”, 2002, p.3).

### **Social Economics**

When studying the sociological side of sailing and why it attracts certain populations, it is important to consider the effects of the sports expansion. Historically, it has been found that newcomers to the upper class are more likely than the average person to participate in the sport due to excitement of newfound wealth. Meanwhile, the national expansion of sailing schools and

boat dealerships has made it easier for lower class citizens to access the sport (Aversa, 1986). This lower class inclusion has diversified sailing and is expected to continue to do so.

### *Stereotypes*

With the expanded inclusion of minorities, as stated in the above section, the model for the stereotypical sailor is being broken and expanded. It used to be a white rich man's sport but now has evolved to encompass the lower class, minorities, and women (Aversa, 1986). Women were once just viewed as the captain's wife that had some nautical knowledge in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, but this has evolved to the point to where women are equals to men at the helm (insert NPS citation). In fact, according to the sample population drawn from the ICSA school's, only one two features only men, 4 teams feature only women, and the other 235 are mixed or unknown. When a university is seeking to add a sport that will attract a variety of people, sailing is a viable option.

### *Title IX Impact.*

Sailing is different from most a lot of other varsity and club sports at universities because the great majority of the teams found in the United States are mixed gender. This mixed gender status makes adding sailing to a university easier because it won't have an impact on the school's Title IX compliance status. The Education Amendment of 1972 Title IX requires all public schools to "provide equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes" and this can act as an incentive for universities to add new gender proportional sport teams (Education Amendment of 1972, Title IX). Title IX is a barrier that most sports have to overcome to become official – sailing is different. Equestrian, rifle shooting, and skiing are some other mixed gender sports that can be found at the collegiate level.

### *Gender Specific and Mixed*



Gender equity is becoming a more relevant issue in the sailing world. According to Dr. Crawley (1998):

Women who may be able to perform well at grinding or in other crew positions are unlikely to be given a chance to demonstrate their skills, because the men controlling America's Cup-style sailing perceive all women as incapable of competing. (p. 39)

This perception of women has evolved to be more gender equal thanks to feminist progress. However, women are still being excluded due to societal standards that still exist amongst some of the sailing community (Rhoads, 1971).

Fortunately, collegiate sailing has proven to be a more progressive than the rest of the sailing community. To clarify, the rest of the sailing community pertains to people that are not participating in collegiate sail racing, but are still involved in anything from leisurely yacht sailing to competing at the Olympic world stage. As discussed in the section above titled *Stereotypes*, at least 230 of the 240 ICSA member sailing teams are mixed and of the ten schools left four are women, one is male, and five are unknown. The ICSA provides no specific demographics on the composition of the entire student body of sailors but the presence the mixed teams guarantees there's at least one woman on each team. If a school were to want to add a women friendly sport, sailing is definitely an option.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **METHODS**

The purpose of this pilot study is to gauge the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. By measuring the awareness of the stakeholders, the research will attempt to identify what factors they found important in the process of adding sports.

This research utilized a mixed survey method approach having both qualitative and quantitative components. This method was selected because the survey presented an empirically clear way that one could gauge each stakeholder's qualitative opinion while also being able to compare each participant quantitatively. Using the dual survey approach, a deeper understanding of what factors team leaders find important in the process of adding a collegiate sport can be revealed. The purpose of this data collection is to be able to later utilize it in creation of a proposal template that stakeholders can use when attempting to expedite the process of adding their collegiate sport.

This study focused on two populations involved in the sport addition process. The first population was athletic directors that were planning to add new sports to their universities after 2011. This population was compiled from the approximately 1,300 athletic directors whose institutions have NCAA sports. Of the 1350 surveyed, 70 responded and of those who responded 39 were identified as athletic directors who were planning on adding a sport to their institution. The second population was composed of collegiate sailing team stakeholders that had leadership positions. Qualifying leadership positions included: coach, assistant coach, team captain,

commodore, advisor, and team executive. Both populations were identified through accessing public websites. The Intercollegiate Sailing Association [ICSA] has 240 listed member schools on their website (“About ICSA”, n.d.). ICSA affiliated schools were used because the ICSA is the governing body of collegiate sailing and any team operating outside of its jurisdiction in the United States is modestly extraneous to the collegiate sailing scene. Of the 240 listed member schools on the website, 159 schools listed valid team websites with viable team leader email addresses. Those 159 team leaders were identified as the sample population for this study.

### **Design and Analyses**

The data collected from the instrument was both quantitative and qualitative, the answers to the survey questions were examined both empirically and objectively. Questions that asked for the demographics of the participant (i.e. gender, team position, ethnicity/race) were empirically compared to be able to view the impact, if any, each particular demographic had on their other answers. Qualitative short answers questions within the instrument were asked in order to gain clarity on the participant’s position and identify new or reaffirm factors they perceive as important. Finally, quantitative questions like the one’s discussed in the survey section of this chapter allow for a numerical data comparison among participants.

### **Survey**

The two surveys for this research were designed with standard methodology in mind to ensure reliable data. The surveys were created using the Qualtrics survey building software. This software allowed for the easy distribution and tracking of the surveys. Before completing the surveys, each participant had to sign an electronic consent form. In order to confirm the accuracy of the instrument, a continuous feedback process was undergone until the survey appeared unbiased. Within the athletic director’s survey, thirty-one questions were asked pertaining to the

demographic of the surveyed, what factors they found important, and why. Within the collegiate sailing stakeholders survey, twenty-one of the thirty-one questions of the other survey were asked. Specifically, one question in both surveys asked the participants to rank the factors on a one-to-ten scale based on its priority. Questions like the one discussed previously explain will allow for an empirical comparison to be made among participants.

After the instrument had been reviewed and finalized, surveys with informed consent files were distributed via email to the 159 collegiate sailing stakeholders in March of 2017 and 1350 athletic directors in September of 2016. For future work associated with this study, an effort will be made to increase the power by garnering a higher response rate.

Using the results of this survey, rich data and descriptive statistics were generated. In accordance to standard survey methods, all collected data is confidential and participant identities are concealed.

## CHAPTER III

### RESULTS

This study was conducted using a mixed survey method approach that gauged the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. By measuring the awareness of the stakeholders, the research will be able to identify what factors they found important in the process of adding sports. This study had two populations: athletic directors and collegiate sailing stakeholders. The athletic director survey garnered a ~2.9% (39 participants) response rate and the team stakeholder survey garnered a ~9.4% (15 participants) response rate.

The collegiate sailing stakeholders' survey asked 21 questions and the athletic directors' survey asked 31 questions. The stakeholder survey had many of the same questions as the athletic director survey. This chapter will highlight the results of 5 of the questions found to be most applicable to the purpose of this study – expediting the process of adding sports to universities.

Once the surveys were completed, the results of team leading stakeholder survey were split into two groups based on question responses: team leaders from teams that were NCAA or varsity level and team leaders from teams that were club or organization level. This group split was done to account for the differences in perspective amongst the two groups. For instance, club and organization level team leaders expressed interest in elevating their team status to NCAA and varsity level; meanwhile, the NCAA and varsity level teams had already completed the level elevation process.

## Factor Importance

The question asked the participants to rate on a scale of one to ten how important they thought each given factor was in the process of adding sports. Based on the results of the athletic directors' survey, the results found the following decision-making factors to be important ( $M > 6.0$ ): academic profile of the athlete participating in the sport ( $M = 7.07$ ), competitiveness of the sport ( $M = 6.50$ ), compliance in the area of gender equity ( $M = 6.79$ ), director or indirect, or detriments of the sport to the institution ( $M = 6.77$ ), NCAA sport status ( $M = 6.94$ ), and sport popularity and marketability ( $M = 6.61$ ).

Based on the results of the collegiate stakeholders' survey, the following decision-making factors were found to be important ( $M > 6.0$ ) to those who reported their team being a club or an organization: alumni, donor and sponsor support ( $M = 8.00$ ), compliance in the area of gender equity ( $M = 6.40$ ), direct or indirect expenses, or detriments of the sport to the institution ( $M = 7.00$ ), and education value of the sport ( $M = 6.75$ ).

Based on the responses by the athletic directors, NCAA and varsity team leaders, and organization/club team leaders, the results found the following decision-making factors to be most important in the process of adding sports amongst all three groups: (1) academic profile of the athlete participating in the sport, (2) compliance in the area of gender equity, and (3) direct or indirect expenses, or detriments of the sport to the institution. Also based on responses of the three groups, the results found the following decision-making factors to be least important amongst all three groups: (1) political influence on the decision making process, (2) risk of injuries, (3) timeline or constraint. Since three different groups were surveyed, large discrepancies in the importance of certain factors were identified. For example, alumni, donor,

and sponsor support was found to be more important for varsity/NCAA team leaders (M=8.00, SD=1.87) and club/organization team leaders (M=8.00, SD=1.41) than athletic directors (M=4.05, SD=3.04). In addition a large gap was identified where the athletic directors (M=6.61, SD=2.41) and club/organization team leaders (M=5.4, SD=2.45) thought that the sport popularity and marketability was more important than the NCAA and varsity team leaders (M=2, SD=1.22) thought. Table 4 (*below*) illustrates the full statistical results of the factor importance question.

Table 4. Differences Between Athletic Directions (n= 39), NCAA and Varsity Sailing Team Stakeholders (n= 4), and Club and Organization Team Sailing Team Stakeholders (n=11) Perceptions of Criteria

Criteria	AD Means	AD Standard Deviations	AD Count	NCAA and Varsity Means	NCAA and Varsity Standard Deviations	NCAA and Varsity Count	Club and Organization Means	Club and Organization Standard Deviation	Club and Organization Count
Academic profile of the athlete participating in the sport	7.07	2.25	30	7.75	1.48	4	4.75	3.27	4
Alumni, donor and sponsor support	4.05	3.04	22	8.00	1.87	4	8.00	1.41	4
Association requirements (NCAA division requirements or conference requirements)	4.23	3.72	22	5.67	3.09	3	5.00	2.61	5
Competitiveness of the sport	6.50	1.97	28	5.25	2.68	4	4.80	2.23	5
Compliance in the area of gender equity	6.79	3.81	29	8.50	2.06	4	6.40	3.50	5
Direct or indirect expenses, or detriments of the sport to the institution	6.77	2.69	26	7.50	2.50	4	7.00	3.00	4
Education value of the sport	5.96	2.71	23	5.50	2.29	4	6.75	3.70	4
NCAA sport status (championship or emerging)	6.94	3.17	18	6.00	2.94	3	3.80	2.79	5
Political influence on the decision making process	3.12	2.89	17	5.67	0.94	3	3.50	1.50	4
Risk of injuries	2.67	2.09	15	3.50	2.69	4	5.00	3.16	4
Sport logistics	5.69	2.88	26	3.50	0.50	4	5.00	2.45	4
Sport popularity & marketability	6.61	2.43	28	2.00	1.22	4	5.40	2.86	5
Timeline or constraint	4.47	2.53	15	3.67	1.25	3	5.25	0.43	4

## **Gender**

Questions one through five of the collegiate stakeholder survey established the basic demographics of the population questioned. Question six of the team leading stakeholder survey asked, “What category of sport does your team participate in?” Of the 15 participants, 14 said their team was a mixed (co-ed) team and 1 said their team was a woman’s team.

## **Who Adds Sports**

Question number 19 of the team leading stakeholder survey and question 17 of the athletic director survey asked who he/she thought initiated the process of adding sports. However, the team leading survey had participants respond using a percentage scale of how involved each group was in the process. Meanwhile, the athletic director survey had respondent’s select which groups they thought were involved. Since the answers were empirically different, they cannot be directly compared, but comparisons can still be made based on results. In table 5 (*below*), the distinction between club/organization level teams and NCAA and varsity level teams is made.



Table 5. Differences Between NCAA and Varsity Sailing Team Stakeholders (n= 4), and Club and Organization Team Sailing Team Stakeholders (n=11) Perceptions of Who Participates in the Sport Addition Process

Group	NCAA and Varsity Count	NCAA and Varsity Means	NCAA and Varsity Standard Deviations	Club and Organization Count	Club and Organization Means	Club and Organization Standard Deviation
Institution administration	3	11.67	2.36	4	32.50	23.44
Board of trustees	3	8.00	8.64	4	22.25	17.47
Athletic department	3	66.67	33.99	5	49.00	29.73
Admissions	1	0.00	0.00	2	26.00	24.00
Student group	3	25.33	32.26	3	39.00	30.74
Community	2	2.50	2.50.000	2	41.50	38.50
Association	1	0.00	15.00	4	16.50	9.45
Parents	2	15.00	0.00	3	18.33	22.43
Boosters	1	50.00	0.00	5	45.20	24.54
Governing	1	0.00	0.00	4	6.50	8.17
Coaches Associations	1	0.00	0.00	4	13.50	9.23

*Note: Participants were asked to answer question using a percentage scale of how involved they thought each group was.*

Table 6. Athletic Direction (n=39) Perceptions of Who Participates In The Sport Addition Process

Group	Athletic Director Count	Percent of Participants
Institution administration	15	38.46
Board of trustees	3	7.69
Athletic department	20	74.36
Admissions	1	2.56
Student group	2	5.13
Community	1	2.56
Association	0	0.00
Parents	0	0.00
Boosters	1	2.56
Governing	0	0.00
Coaches Associations	0	0.00

*Note: Participants were asked to pick what groups they thought were important – no percentage scale was used.*

## **Descriptive Explanations**

Questions in the team leader's survey were both qualitative and quantitative. The open-ended questions, like question 18, were asked to gain further insight into the participants' opinions. Question 18 asked the team leaders what they thought went into the process of getting a sport added to their institution. Overall, the participants expressed that the process was very political and money played a large influence on the institutions' decisions to add a sport like sailing. One participant stated: "Politics and money mostly, unless the sport can't self-fund, in which case there is next-to-no chance it can get added." Another participant admitted they didn't know anything about the process, while another just said, "extreme vetting and lots of lobbying".

## **Institution Size**

Both populations were asked about the size of their respective universities. Of the athletic directors (n=38), 52.63% reported being from a small institution (1,000 - 2,900 students), 23.68% reported being from a middle sized institution (3,000 – 9,999 students), and 23.69% reported being from a large institution (10,000 and more students). Of the collegiate stakeholders (n=15), 6.67% reported being from a small institution (1,000 - 2,900 students), 26.67% reported being from a middle sized institution (3,000 – 9,999 students), and 60% reported being from a large institution (10,000 and more students).

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this pilot study is to gauge the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. The understanding of what factors collegiate stakeholders find important in the addition process of a sport will help lead to the expedition of the sport addition process at universities. Over 240 universities have already participated in the process of adding sailing, but there's 4,140 total accredited universities in the United States – that's only roughly 6% of universities ("Number of US College and Universities, 2005). This means that the other 94% doesn't have sailing, but have the potential to add it. When a team stakeholder wants to make the sport seem appealing to university administration, they can address the factors the administration found important.

#### **Distinction Between Varsity and Club**

When interpreting the results of the team leading stakeholder survey, the answers were put into two groups: team leading stakeholders that belonged to sailing teams that were classified as a club or organizations and team leading stakeholders that belonged to teams that were classified as varsity or NCAA. Making this distinction was important because those that were club/organization level teams had not undergone the process of becoming a varsity/NCAA level sport.

This study was done to address all levels of sport ascending elevation. Whether the ascent was trying to add the sport, at any level, when it didn't exist at the institution or elevating a club sport to a varsity sport. The athletic directors' survey addressed the adding of a sport from

ground zero; meanwhile, the team leading stakeholder survey addressed the processes of both adding and elevating the sport.

### **Most Influential Factors**

Based on the results of the survey the following three factors were determined to be the most important among all three surveyed groups: (1) academic profile of the athlete participating in the sport, (2) compliance in the area of gender equity, and (3) direct or indirect expenses, or detriments of the sport to the institution. Academic profile of the athlete participating in the sport addresses the educational success of the perceived “average” person who participates in a sport. It can be assumed the more academically successful athletes of sport are perceived, the more appealing the sport would be to university administration.

Compliance in the area of gender equity is a direct reference to the Education Act of 1972 Title IX’s mandate that all public schools are to "provide equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes" (Education Amendment of 1972, Title IX). Frequently, universities struggle to balance their male and female athletic programs, but sailing, unlike many other sports, does not have to go through the Title IX accommodation process very often. This is because, as 14 out of 15 of the surveyed sailing teams reported, the sport is mixed gender. Since it’s mixed gender, it has little impact on the Title IX compliance of a university. The lack of impact of Title IX compliance causes the factor to be less important in the sailing sport addition process.

Direct or indirect expenses, or detriments of the sport to the institution is an extensive way of saying how much it will cost. Athletic directors reported the cost of the sport to be a major decision making factor in the process of adding – before adding the sport, they want to no the marginal cost versus the opportunity cost of it. Unfortunately for sailing, it’s an expensive

sport and typically can only be supported by larger (often wealthier) institutions. Nine out of the fifteen surveyed teams came from a large (10,000 and more students) school. Currently, if a school were to start a team from scratch, the cost of a new club 420 sailboat that two students can sail is \$8,500. This price includes all associated equipment except for trailers. Using these numbers, the minimum start up cost, given the school uses new equipment, will be approximately \$34,000 for new equipment (“New club 420 sailboats”, 2015). It is up to the team-leading stakeholder to help justify these expenses when proposing to add sailing. Fortunately for existent teams that are trying to elevate their team status to varsity, they most likely already have equipment and facilities and don’t need to worry about this factor. Since the Intercollegiate Sailing Association forbids any schools from giving sailing scholarships, even the teams seeking to gain varsity status, which typically involves the offering of scholarships in other sports, will not have to worry about the expense (ICSA, 2016). This lack of scholarship expense could also be very appealing to a university.

### **Discrepancies Amongst Groups**

Major discrepancies amongst the three groups about the importance of two particular factors were identified. First, alumni, donor, and sponsor support was found to be more important to varsity/NCAA team leaders and club/organization team leaders than athletic directors. This could imply that team stakeholders, both varsity and club, are more concerned with acquiring funds than athletic directors. It’s important to identify this gap for when team stakeholders approach athletic departments during the addition process because even though they find it important, the athletic department will not and will not need to be addressed in depth.

Second, a large gap was identified where the athletic directors and club/organization team leaders thought that the sport popularity and marketability was more important than the

NCAA and varsity team leaders thought. This gap could be due to comfort the NCAA and varsity teams may feel as they have already achieved their goal status and do not feel a need to market the sports the popularity. In this spirit of creating a larger pool of competitive programs, this attitude may prove to be short-sighted. The athletic directors, who are concerned with the sport addition process, and the club/organization teams, who are concerned with the sport elevation process, would want their sport to be more popular/marketable so that they can better promote it in their respective processes.

By understanding where the gaps lie amongst groups about the factors, decision makers on either side of the sport addition aspiration can tailor their pitch so that it better appeals to the targeted audience.

## **Limitations**

### *Who Adds Sports*

As discussed in the results chapter, question number 19 of the team leading stakeholder survey and question 17 of the athletic director survey asked who he/she thought initiated the process of adding sports. However, the team leading survey had participants respond using a percentage scale of how involved each group was in the process. Meanwhile, the athletic director survey had respondent's select which groups they thought were involved. Since the answers were empirically different, they cannot be directly compared. However, suggested inferences can be made. For example, 74.36% of athletic directors (n=39) said the athletic department plays a role in the adding of sports to an institution; meanwhile, NCAA and varsity team stakeholders (n=4) said 66.67% and club/organization team stakeholders (n=11) said 49.00% was the amount of how much the athletic department played a role in the addition process. Of the options for both surveys, the athletic department garnered the empirically highest responses of any of the listed

groups. Inferring from this indirect comparison between results, it may be concluded that the athletic department plays the most significant role in adding sports. Still, it is difficult to make indirect comparison between the two sets of results.

### *Power*

The athletic director survey garnered a ~2.9% (39 participants) response rate and the team stakeholder survey garnered a ~9.4% (15 participants) response rate. These low response rates make the power of the statistics drawn from the data low. This study was a pilot study and efforts to increase the response rate for the full study will be made.

### **Future Research**

This pilot study was done in an effort to create a baseline of data for the full study. In essence, this study will be repeated for a multitude of sports so that the results between each sport and the athletic directors can be compared. By comparing the results, consistencies and gaps will be identified and exploited. Using the priority factors for all populations, a tool that helps expedite the process of adding collegiate sports will be created. Collegiate team stakeholders and athletic directors can utilize this tool. One concept of the tool that could be created is a fill-in-the-blank template that covers all the identified important factors that the collegiate stakeholders have to fill out then submit to athletic administration.

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSIONS**

This research attempted to address the perception of collegiate athletic stakeholders during the sport addition process. The problem is that various stakeholders interested in adding their sport lack the necessary knowledge of the process to do so. The purpose of this study was to gauge the collegiate athletic stakeholders' awareness and level of knowledge of the factors, priorities and processes that institutions use when considering adding new sports to their athletic offerings. Using a questionnaire, a sample population of key stakeholders, such as athletic directors, team captains and club coaches, were surveyed on their knowledge of the factors, the processes, and priorities.

The data collected by this study will inform the creation of proposal template or sport addition protocol. This will assist interested stakeholders in proposing an addition of sports program at their individual institutions. For example, as discussed in chapter one, sailing can be an expensive sport and the results pointed out that athletic directors found the direct or indirect expenses, or detriments the sport has to the institution to be an important factor in the sport addition process. If a team stakeholder wants their sport to be considered to be added or elevated to the next level, they should explain to the university how and why their potential sailing program is cost efficient. The tool that will be created based off of further research will address the cost efficiency of the sport. By identifying this factor's and creating the tool based on these factors, the sport addition process will be expedited.

Further research conducted beyond this pilot study will include more collegiate sports. Once the premise of this study has been repeated on multiple other sports, results from the



stakeholders and athletic directors will be compared and analyzed for consistencies and gaps. With this study being replicated for other sports, the data pool will expand and the tool will better reflect the factor importance perceptions of all collegiate athletic stakeholders. This expansion study will be conducted during the 2017-2018 school year.

## REFERENCES

- Aversa Jr., A. (1986). Notes On Entry Routes Into A Sport/Recreational Role: The Case of Sailing. *Journal Of Sport & Social Issues*, 10(2), 49-59.
- Bøymo-Having, L., Grävare, M., & Silbernagel, K. G. (2013). A prospective study on dinghy sailors' training habits and injury incidence with a comparison between elite sailor and club sailor during a 12-month period. *British Journal Of Sports Medicine*, 47(13), 826-831.
- Cooper, C.G, Weight, E. A. (2011) Bridging the gap: the perceptions of athletic directors and coaches regarding nonrevenue program discontinuation decisions. *Michigan Publishing*, 3(1), 1-22.
- Crawley, S. L. (1998). Gender, class and the construction of masculinity in professional sailing. *International Review For The Sociology Of Sport*, 33(1), 33-42.
- Dabbs, J. M., Chang, E. L., Strong, R. A., & Milun, R. (1998). Spatial ability, navigation strategy, and geographic knowledge among men and women. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 19(2), 89-98.
- Ekam-Baur, K., (n.d.) What is the difference between club sports and varsity sports? (Msg 3). Message posted to <https://www.unigo.com/admissions-advice/what-is-the-difference-between-club-teams-and-varsity-sports/650/1>
- Enquirer, C. P. (2013). Athletics cost colleges, students millions. Retrieved October 02, 2016, from <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/09/15/athletics-cost-colleges-students-millions/2814455/>
- Greenlee, C. T. (1996). Sporting a new look: women's soccer, sailing, golf become additions to athletic menus. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education*, 13, 22-24.
- Intercollegiate Sailing Association. (2016). About ICSA. Retrieved from <http://collegesailing.org/about/overview>
- Milstein, S. (2014). Decision making in the NCAA athletics: factors associated with adding sports to division I institutions. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Southern Connecticut State University, New Haven, Connecticut.

- National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). Fast facts. . Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=98>
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2016). Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/inclusion/emerging-sports-women>
- Petchesky, B. (2013). SEC Schools Spend \$163,931 Per Athlete, And Other Ways The NCAA Is A Bonfire For Your Money. *Deadspin*. Retrieved from <http://deadspin.com/5976391/sec-schools-spend-163931-per-athlete-and-other-ways-the-ncaa-is-a-bonfire-for-your-money>
- Peter, N. (2014, June 20). Changing demographics dominate Sail America conference. Retrieved October 04, 2016, from <http://www.tradeonlytoday.com/2014/06/changing-demographics-dominate-sail-america-conference/>
- Rhoads, L. (1971). College sailing. *Journal of Health, Physical, Education, Recreation*, 42(5), 38-41.
- Singer, J. N. (2008). Benefits and detriments of African American male athletes' participation in a big-time college football program. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 43(4), 399-408.
- Shephard, R. J. (1997). Biology and medicine of sailing. *Sports medicine*, 23(6), 350-356.
- Texas A&M University. (2014). *Common data set 2014 – 2015* [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://financialaid.tamu.edu/Forms/1415CDS.aspx>
- Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972. (1972). Title IX, Education Amendments of 1972. (n.d.). *Women in maritime history*. Retrieved from <https://www.nps.gov/safr/learn/historyculture/maritimewomenhistory.htm>
- Varsity. (n.d.). In *dictionary.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/varsity>
- (2002) Safety practices. Retrieved from [http://collegesailing.org/documents/ICSA\\_Documentation/ICSA\\_Safety\\_Practices\\_Handbook.pdf](http://collegesailing.org/documents/ICSA_Documentation/ICSA_Safety_Practices_Handbook.pdf)

- (2002) *Demographics US Sailing member profiles*. Retrieved from <http://www.ussailing.org/wp-content/uploads/daroot/Racing/JO/JO%20Manual/Promote/Demographics.pdf>
- (2005). *Number of US college and universities and degrees awarded, 2005*. Retrieved from <https://www.infoplease.com/us/higher-education/number-us-colleges-and-universities-and-degrees-awarded-2005>
- (2007). *Your passion: organized*. Retrieved from <http://www.ussailing.org/wpcontent/uploads/daroot/Donations/2007%20Report%20to%20Members.pdf>
- (2015) *High School Sailing*. Retrieved from [http://hssailing.org/documents/High\\_School\\_Sailing2016.pdf](http://hssailing.org/documents/High_School_Sailing2016.pdf)
- (2015) *New club 420 sailboats*. Retrieved from <http://www.apsltd.com/buy-new-dinghy-sailboats/club-420.html>
- (2015) *Procedural rules for intercollegiate sailing association*. Retrieved from [http://collegesailing.org/documents/ICSA\\_Documentation/2013-2016\\_Procedural\\_Rules\\_9-24-15\\_edition.pdf](http://collegesailing.org/documents/ICSA_Documentation/2013-2016_Procedural_Rules_9-24-15_edition.pdf)
- (2016) *About the data: overview*. Retrieved from <http://spendingdatabase.knightcommission.org/about-the-data>
- (2016) *Club sports*. Retrieved from <https://www.assumption.edu/campus-life/campus-recreation/club-sports>
- (2016) *17 Alpine competition guide*. Retrieved from [http://ussa.org/sites/default/files/documents/athletics/compservices/2016-17/documents/2017\\_alp\\_comp\\_guide.pdf](http://ussa.org/sites/default/files/documents/athletics/compservices/2016-17/documents/2017_alp_comp_guide.pdf)
- (2004) *Graduation success rate*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/graduation-success-rate>

(2016) *Undergraduate retention and graduation rates*. Retrieved from [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator\\_ctr.a](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ctr.a)