St. John Fisher College
Fisher Digital Publications

Sport Management Undergraduate | Sport Management Department

Fall 2014

College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis

André Remillard
St. John Fisher College

How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?
Follow this and additional works at: http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad
Part of the Sports Management Commons

Recommended Citation
Remillard, André, "College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis" (2014). *Sport Management Undergraduate.* Paper 77.

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations.

This document is posted at http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad/77 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.

College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis

Abstract
The college athletics recruiting landscape is one littered with many different factors. While previous studies have analyzed institutional and social factors as impacting a prospective student-athletes' recruitment process, there's a gap in understanding the role an athletes' demographics play in how athletes make their college decision. Previous literature has indicated that the impact social and institutional factors play during the recruitment process varies based on individual demographics. This research uncovers any correlations between athlete demographics and how they weigh the importance of recruitment components. Surveys were administered to 1,029 randomly selected Division I student athletes. One team from each conference at the FBS, FCS, and non-football divisions of Division I were selected. At each school four teams were randomly selected using a random number generator and one out of every three student athletes were selected from each team to participate in this survey. The results found that institutional factors were more influential during recruitment when compared to social recruitment factors. In addition there was a significant difference between males and females in relation to parental influence as females valued parents more throughout the recruitment process. These findings are important as it provides athletic departments with better knowledge as to where to focus recruiting time and resources.

Document Type
Undergraduate Project

Professor's Name
Katharine Burakowski

Subject Categories
Sports Management

This undergraduate project is available at Fisher Digital Publications: http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad/77

College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis

André Remillard

St. John Fisher College

Abstract

The college athletics recruiting landscape is one littered with many different factors. While previous studies have analyzed institutional and social factors as impacting a prospective student-athletes' recruitment process, there's a gap in understanding the role an athletes' demographics play in how athletes make their college decision. Previous literature has indicated that the impact social and institutional factors play during the recruitment process varies based on individual demographics. This research uncovers any correlations between athlete demographics and how they weigh the importance of recruitment components. Surveys were administered to 1,029 randomly selected Division I student athletes. One team from each conference at the FBS, FCS, and non-football divisions of Division I were selected. At each school four teams were randomly selected using a random number generator and one out of every three student athletes were selected from each team to participate in this survey. The results found that institutional factors were more influential during recruitment when compared to social recruitment factors. In addition there was a significant difference between males and females in relation to parental influence as females valued parents more throughout the recruitment process. These findings are important as it provides athletic departments with better knowledge as to where to focus recruiting time and resources.

College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis

The Division I college athletics landscape is a large part of what the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) hopes to offer it's students. According to the official 2010-2011 NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report, there were a total of 444,000 student athletes competing at the Division I, II, and III, while finding over 130,00 Division I student athletes (NCAA). This number comprises 3.5% of the student body at Division I institutions. With all these student athletes involved in athletics, most of the student athletes have been actively recruited to play for their respective institution. It is important that this study clearly defines the three criteria that will shape what a prospective recruit will weigh in the recruitment process. The basis of this research was finding how recruits are impacted by their own demographics when considering social and institutional factors during the recruitment process. The personal demographics referred to the distinct factors that make up a student athlete (Huffman & Cooper, 2012). The psyche of an athlete, the sport played (revenue or non-revenue), socioeconomic status, differing high school backgrounds, financial aid received, and potential accolades received were all considered when looking at how athlete demographics influence how recruits weigh the recruitment factors. For this study when referring to the social factors of the recruitment process, it was in reference to all individuals a recruit interacts with during the recruitment process. Ferrante argues recruits are impacted by high school coaches, peers, teachers, and parents to the collegiate level such as current athletes and friends attending the institution, as well as coaches, administrators, and advisors (2010). The institutional factors of the recruitment aims to look at tangible aspects such as housing, athletic facilities, educational opportunities, campus life, and game day atmosphere (Schneder & Messenger, 2012. It is

important to establish the confines for which to define the student athlete demographics, and social and institutional factors during recruitment for student athletes.

The NCAA Division I athletics landscape is a large enterprise as recent studies have found that some school budgets have exceeded $100,000,000 from 2006-2011 (USA Today, 2012). In today's society the collegiate athletics recruiting landscape is influenced by a number of factors. The stakes and money invested in solidifying quality recruiting classes has created a pressure on institutions and individuals (Sparvero & Warner, 2013). The college recruiting landscape is changing, as rules and regulations have changed, so have the expectations (Sparvero & Warner, 2013). Today studies have indicated that prospective student athletes are influenced by a number of factors (Ferrante, 2010). In an effort to ensure better quality recruiting classes student athlete demographics, as well as institutional and social factors will be measured to develop a clear understanding of the relationship. The role demographics play during recruitment has not been specifically studied.

This objective of this paper was to analyze the factors playing into a college athletes' recruitment. A number of prior research has found relations between social and institutional factors of recruitment in regards to the student athlete college selection (Pauline). However through exploratory research this research administered a survey to a random sample of NCAA Division I student athletes. This research attempted to answer how student athlete demographics relate to college selection. The purpose of this study was to analyze how student athlete demographics relate the college selection process. The research question of this study was:

How do demographics relate to student athlete college decision-making?

An athletes demographics and backgrounds is something previous studies have not considered when looking at what impacts a recruits college decision. One factor that impacts a

recruit's decision is the socioeconomic status of an individual. The financial position from which an individual comes from was found to be a huge factor during the recruitment process (Huffman & Cooper, 2012). For example, the lower a socioeconomic status background, the more apt the individual is to attend a state college (2012). Obtaining this information of socioeconomic status will help create trends and patterns based on selection of school and what motivates them. If, for example, an athlete comes from a low socioeconomic background they may feel an institutional factor such as athletic scholarship received would weigh heaviest on their mind. Another factor that impacts a recruit's future is their criminal background (Benedict & Keteyian, 2011). Many Division I schools are supporting the idea of creating a universal system under which high school recruits may be analyzed for criminal background checks (2011). This research is beneficial to the academic community as it provides further understanding of the college selection process building upon the prior literature. Up to this point no exact study has measured demographics in relation to college selection factors. This research also has a practical application as it provides a deeper understanding of where to allocate funds within college athletic departments. This study aims to give college athletic departments a better idea as to where and how to focus recruiting efforts to ensure better recruiting practice.

Literature Review

Student Athlete Recruitment

In today's college recruiting landscape prospective student athletes are being subject to a number of recruiting tactics in an effort to get them to attend an institution. As athletic departments budgets are growing it is clear that investing more in the recruiting process affords these schools the ability to remain competitive at the Division I level (Lavigne, 2010). In recent

years a number of different tactics implemented by coaches, recruiters, and institutions have left prospective student athletes scratching their heads in terms of the extent the recruiters are willing to go to.

In an effort to differentiate themselves from other schools, coaches and recruiters are going to great lengths to make each prospective student athletes recruitment process unique. One way in which schools are doing so is by portraying the recruit as a “Cover Boy” (Keeley, 2014). Schools such as Syracuse University have recently sent out recruiting letters, also known as general correspondence, to prospective student athletes in unique ways to depict what they could become if they were to commit to that particular school (NCAA, 2014). These letters depicted recruits as video game and magazine cover boys as well as posing with the Heisman trophy (2014). This tactic has received positive feedback from potential recruits as they have taken to social media to express their appreciation for this unique recruiting tactic (2014). In a recent Sports Illustrated article, Treadway highlighted some of the most absurd recruiting tactics in college football that players have experienced (2014). Another form of correspondence recruits experienced was receiving more recruiting letters than ever, as is evidence by Alabama football head coach Nick Saban sending potential recruit Alvin Kamara one hundred five letters in one day (Treadway, 2014). This has become a common trend at the Division I athletics as more and more schools are doing the same (Mink, 2014).

Just as more money is being poured into athletic facilities, more is being poured into enhancing recruiting visits when a coach comes in contact with a recruit (Rickman, 2013). According to the official bylaw Article 13 for Division I recruitment, contact is defined as “Any face-to-face encounter between a prospective student-athlete or the prospective student-athlete's parents, relatives or legal guardians and an institutional staff member or athletics representative

during which any dialogue occurs in excess of an exchange of a greeting." (NCAA, 2014). In 2013 Texas A & M went to great lengths to make this contact with recruits extra special as they flew their "swagcopter" helicopter to high schools in an effort to woo recruits and entice them to commit to Texas A & M (Rickman, 2013). Treadway noted that programs are also singing to recruits on the over the phone, drawing hand drawn pictures, and even wrestling with recruits (2014). These tactics were all implemented as a means of distinguishing themselves during the recruitment process. While all these recruiting tactics are ethical within the scope of NCAA Division I, it is clear recruits are feeling a pressure to attend respective institutions.

While prospective student athletes are subject to "absurd" recruiting tactics, the Division I landscape also has a shadier side that subjects players to impropriations and illegal benefits (2014). Just recently as September 2013 Chuck Smrt investigated Oklahoma States football for illegal recruiting practices by NCAA standards (McMurphy, 2014). Upon investigation Orange pride, a female Oklahoma State student group, was found to have hosted prospective student athletes on their official and unofficial visits over an eight-year period (2014). According to the Associated Press, a similar recruiting violation occurred at West Point in January 2014 (2014). During recruits' visits at West Point female cadets have purposely been used as football recruiters, have used cheerleaders to kiss current players and recruits, as well as using female student athletes to serve as dinner dates for recruits (2014). This sexual exploitation recruits are subject to, is clearly being used by Division I schools, as is evidence from Oklahoma State and Army. In addition to women being used to persuade recruits, improper benefits have also been given to recruits. According to Emily James, Associate Director of Public and Media Relations at the NCAA, St. Francis has been conducting unethical recruiting practices from Summer 2011 to Spring 2013 (2014). According to reports, over $1,450 was given to prospective student

athletes in ways of lodging, transportation, and meals from head coaches as well as assistant coaches (James, 2014). In addition improper benefits, St. Francis impermissibly contacted recruits from June 2012 to May 2013 (2014). While cash benefits are given during a recruiting visit, money has been promised to a student athlete should they not visit another school (Schroeder, 2013). Schroeder writes, "Prior to taking an official visit to a different university, (Herring) told the recruit that if he did not take the visit, the recruit would be paid $6,000." (2013). According to Thamel, the Baylor men's and women's basketball programs bombarded recruits with impermissible phone calls, exceeding more than 1,200 during the 2011-2012 athletic season (2012). According to ESPN these impermissible phone calls included the recruitment of the highly touted Brittney Griner (Thamel, 2012). As is evidence from the literature it is clear that big time programs such as St. Francis, Mississippi St., Baylor, Army, and Oklahoma St. are exploiting prospective student athletes in recruiting efforts. This literature provides the clearer picture as to what recruits go through when selecting a college.

Rules & Regulations

The first factor to consider when understanding a student athletes decision on where to attend school are the NCAA rules and regulations. These regulations provide the boundaries by which institutions and personnel may legally and ethically reach out to recruits. Without rules and regulations in place recruits may be exposed to dangerous environments and make a clouded decision on where to attend school. One of the most important rules the NCAA harps on is the means by which coaches communicate with recruits.

The NCAA states that each institution is permitted to finance only one official visit for a recruit. According to the *Journal of NCAA Compliance*, colleges are not to announce any sort of recruiting information over social media accounts such as Twitter and Facebook until a recruit

has applied and been accepted into school (Clifton, 2012). In compliance with NCAA recruiting codes, schools are strictly monitored so as to not conduct unethical recruiting practices. Another rule that is important in collegiate athletics is the notion of amateurism. This term amateur refers to the increased idea that college athletics is turning into more like a professional industry. Amateurism is defined as playing sport for the health benefits and for reward in itself (Ridpath, 2013). This eliminates high school and college athletes from receiving salaries from participating in athletics, benefitting from an agent or prospective agent, or playing with professionals (Ridpath, 2013).

Student Athlete College Selection Factors

Social.

This study has categorized two main criteria by which to evaluate what a recruit is motivated by during the recruitment process. One of which are the social influences a recruit is exposed to. One social factor playing a role in college recruitment is whether a friend impacts a recruit's decision, both during high school and looking forward to future teammates. Ferrante argues that regulations must be made in enforcing package deal rules (Ferrante, 2010). A package deal is when two high school recruits from the same high school are recruited at the same time to attend a certain institution together to pursue athletics (Ferrante, 2010). It is stated that package deals are unethical and lead to the demise of the amateurism of collegiate athletics. With high school athletic peers impacting decisions during recruitment it's important to understand how much value is placed on this factor.

Also when examining social factors during the recruitment process one must consider how a recruit interacts on their official visit with an institution. As they're only allowed to attend once and for 48 hours the recruits must try to take in as much from the school as they can. One

factor influencing the recruit is the student host and what they do on the recruitment visit (Lawrence, Kaburakis, Merckx, 2008). Upon arriving to an institution for a visit a recruit is assigned a student host to show them around, as well as a $30 spending budget to entertain. Studies have found that recruits are partaking in risky behaviors such as drinking and attending parties (Lawrence, et al., 2008). This has lead to a corruption in the recruiting process and may influence a recruit to attend an institution for the wrong reasons.

In addition to current student hosts and athletes playing a role in the recruitment process, plenty of research has indicated coaches play a large role in the recruitment of athletes as well. As is evident from schools increasing the size of their college coaching staff, and having assistant coaches solely focused on building relationships with athletes, colleges feel the need to have plenty of coaching staff available (Mandel & Staples, 2013). With the mounting pressure to generate revenue, win, provide student athletes a healthy environment to play sport, all while abiding by NCAA rules, schools are putting added pressure on the coaches (Butt, Hays, Maynard, & Olusoga, 2009). Studies have shown that coaches experience ten higher order themes such as conflict, pressure and expectation, and athlete concern (Butt, et al., 2009). When examining some contracts of college coaches, some have shown to contain potentially unethical standards written in the contract, such as requiring a coach to fulfill receive a certain number of committed recruits per recruiting class (Pauline & Wolohan, 2012). These contracts often create an environment of intense pressure for coaches to recruit under. With this added pressure coaches may feel the need to recruit better for the sake of their own benefit to keep their own jobs. This impacts the college recruit as they may be pursued harder in order to fulfill the demands placed on the coaches from the institutions.

Institutional.

There are many institutional factors that must be attractive to recruits as they try to make their college decision. According to Breitbach, one of the institutional factors that play a role for college recruits is the role of admissions and other services offered to students (Breitbach, 2007). These other services include the institutional commitment in providing academic support to student athletes and maintaining a consistency amongst coaches and administration (Breitbach, 2007). This is telling in that a recruit will look for a place of stable administration as a motivational factor during recruitment, as it's proven to make the recruit feel more comfortable with their college decision (Breitbach, 2007). Another institutional factor that is large in college athletics is the money spent on stadiums and athletic facilities. Due to the competition in sports today, schools are spending more on facilities in hopes of getting a return on investment on the field. This return on investment is measured in on field performance, which will lead to increased attendance (Jones, 2013). Due to the competitive nature of Division I athletics, DI pours more money into athletics, sometimes upwards of $120 million (2013).

Also when examining institutional factors of the recruitment process it is important to understand the environment in which college visitations are conducted. Many colleges and universities run the risk of taking on any potential liabilities when student athletes make their official college visits (Lawrence, Kaburakis, & Merckx, 2008). In reference to a 2007 Title IX case, the University of Colorado settled a lawsuit over the alleged rape of two women while recruits were visiting (Lawrence, et al., 2008). As a result of the court case, there were new rules put in place that institutions were required to abide by to make sure visits are to be a safe and positive experience with an environment aligned with institutional values and moral precepts.

Finally when understanding the impact institutions have on a recruit it's important to note the success rate of student athletes. In addition to the budgets institutions are able to provide

athletic departments, they are also required to check academic progress. In August Division III adopted a Division I infractions model (James, 2013). This model states that institutions should place an importance on culture in order to uphold the values of college athletics. This is important as it increases the fairness and integrity of college sport. As selling point student athletes at the NCAA Division I level have proven to find more success graduating due to institutional resources (Brown, 2012).

Conceptual Framework

Using Jeffrey Pauline as basis for establishing factors to be measured in this research requires defining what academic, financial aid, athletic, social atmosphere, and coaching staff as important factors to consider throughout the recruitment process (Pauline, 2010). While all these are outlined as significant findings, this study intends to define social atmosphere and coaching staff as a social factor throughout the recruitment process. For the purpose of this research social factors will be defined as those involving communication between a prospective student athlete and anyone involved during the recruitment process. The following variables will be classified as social factors impacting a recruits' college decision: College coaches, high school coaches, parents, package deals, high school friend, academic advisor, academic support, future teammates, and director of major/ academic department.

As outlined by Pauline, academic, financial aid, and athletic will fall within the umbrella of institutional factors impacting a recruits decision (2010). For the purpose of this study institutional factors will be defined as any tangible aspect of an institution. The following variables will be classified as institutional factors impacting a recruits' college decision: Availability of desire major, workout facilities, academic reputation, gameday atmosphere, opportunity for immediate playing time, athletic facilities, dining/ food services, athletic

scholarship, academic scholarship, need based government financial aid, sports team reputation, geographic location, and recruitment visit.

There is some relationship that exists between social and institutional factors impacting a prospective student athletes decision on where to attend school (Pauline, 2010). For example an official college visit is not solely a tangible aspect of an institution (institutional factor) as it involves interactions with individuals impacting a college decision. As an official or unofficial visit involves touring the campus, facilities, and highlighting academic opportunities this study classified a college visit as an institutional factor. There are intervening variables that affect this studies ability to gain pertinent data. One of which is the inability to gain the socioeconomic status of all participants in this study. As one of the most important demographics to weigh when comparing to college selection factors, it is unfair to expect college athletes to divulge such personal information that they may or may not be aware of. Another intervening factor may be the length of the survey. With student athletes being pressed for time, there is the possibility that they will not take the time to answer every question on the survey honestly.

Summary

Prior research has shown that a number of personal, social, and institutional factors play a role in how a college athlete makes their decision to attend college. While prospective student athletes are currently subject to absurd and unethical recruiting tactics, the decision to choose a college is ultimately in the hands of the recruit. For this study a student athletes demographics was measured against a slew of social and institutional factors, in order help college athletic departments gain academic and practical understanding of the college recruiting landscape.

Method

When looking at the data that will be gathered and analyzed it will be used to observe patterns in an effort to gain a better understanding of the Division I college-recruiting landscape. Ultimately the findings will help provide institutions the ability to more efficiently allocate their time, effort, and resources in improving social and institutional components of the recruitment process.

Design

This study was quantitative in nature and was a cross sectional research design. The data collected used participants with differing demographics in order to draw correlations between demographic and it's effect on student athlete college selection.

Sample Selection

This research aims to conduct research on Division I college athletes. Conducting this research fall of 2014 NCAA Division I student athletes are to be surveyed in a quantitative manner. Using stratified random sampling NCAA Division I schools were separated into three categories. The three categories were schools at the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), the Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and the Non-Football Conferences. Using a random number generator 33% of schools from each category were to be used in this study. This yielded 42 FBS schools, 46 FCS schools, and 35 Non-football. This selection process of colleges to be used in research ensured no bias would inhibit the data. At each school four teams were selected to be used in the study. These teams were randomly selected using a random number generator. In order to ensure that there was a proportionate ratio of student athletes included in the survey 1/3 of the team members were selected to participate. In total this study aims to survey 492 teams across the NCAA Division I landscape. The research participants are not representative of

the entire college student population as these are specifically college student athletes at the Division I level. The intent of this survey is to use a random sample of student athletes amongst a certain set of female and male teams so as to not skew the results.

Procedure

Participants in this survey were accessed using student directories on the main webpage of the college. In the event that there was not a student directory, college coaches and assistants were emailed in order for them to forward the survey to their student athletes. A link to my survey on Qualtrics was included on every email to the coaches and student athletes. After having sent out the email once it was sent out a week and a half later to remind the participants to complete the survey if they had not previously done so. By emailing the link connecting to the survey, all participants should be able to quickly finish the survey in 5-10 minutes. All results and responses will be private and the data collected is to be confidential. All data that was obtained was primary in nature. A majority of the survey is quantitative in nature while two open ended qualitative questions were asked at the end to gage what the student athletes felt the biggest overall factor was during the college recruitment process. In regards to factors influencing the college recruitment process an ordinal measurement was used using a scale from not influential to very influential. All personal demographic data is obtained on the beginning portion of the survey. One example of a question was to select their respective athletic conference. This information helps provide insight into the differing demographics throughout NCAA Division I recruitment.

Data Analysis Plan

The data will be analyzed using Qualtrics survey software. The data will be analyzed using crosstabs comparing personal factors such as socioeconomic status, and what motivated

them during recruitment. Other means of analysis may include generating means and modes from the questions in which participants are asked their rating on a scale not influential to very influential. This scale is significant as it provides the participant the ability to clearly express their belief on survey questions.

Results

Description of Sample

Ultimately one school from every conference at the FBS, FCS, and non-football division was used for research. One issue faced while selecting research participants was gaining access to their email. In the event a school's student athletes' emails could not be accessed, the next randomly selected school in the conference was selected. In collecting emails for the research participants, four teams from every school were randomly selected to be eligible. From every team, 1 out of every 3 student athletes was randomly selected to participate. This resulted in a total of 1,029 emails being sent out to NCAA Division I athletes. Initially this study yielded 96 responses but seven of the responses were not used during data collection due to incompletion of the survey. With 89 participants successfully completing this survey it resulted in an 8.6% participation rate.

There were a number of noteworthy descriptive statistics that shed light on the research sample. It is important to note that 62 out of the 89 research participants were female. Also 82% (N=73) of the research participants who completed this survey identified themselves as white. The remaining race options, black (N=5) and other (N=11) accounted for a total of 16 responses for the survey. Refer to table 1 for a class breakdown of the participants.

Table 1

Freshman	28
Sophomore	19
Junior	17
Senior	15
5th Year Senior	2
Redshirt Freshman	4
Redshirt Sophomore	3
Redshirt Junior	1

Forty-two FBS, thirty-one FCS, and fifteen non-football conference responses were recorded for this survey.

Descriptive Statistics

For the purpose of this study it was important to note how student athletes felt about college selection factors. The mean of the College Coach of a school (M=4.33, SD= 1.025, N=89) was the highest average response while the presence of a high school friend (M=1.52, SD=. 982, N=89) was the lowest among the college recruitment factors. The four highest college recruitment factors were College Coach (M=4.33, SD=1.025, N=88), Academic Reputation (M=4.27, SD=. 914, N=89), Athletic Scholarship (M=4.04, SD=1.331, N=89), and Geographic Location (M=3.95, SD=1.016, N=88), while the four lowest responses were High School Friend (M=1.52, SD=. 982, N=88), Package Deal (M=1.56, SD=1.081, N=88), Academic Advisor (M=1.69, SD=1.027, N=87), and Need for Financial Aid (M=2.25, SD=1.40, N=89) for the general sample.

Further Analysis

Five F Test for ANOVAs were run to further analyze the data. With five tests run, a Bonferroni adjusted alpha of .01 was used. The first ANOVA test [E] compared means on college selection factors with respect to race. There was no significant difference because none of the Bonferroni adjusted p-values were less than .01. Therefore the responses to recruitment factors do not differ with respect to race.

The second ANOVA test [F] compared the means of recruitment factors with respect to gender. There was a significant difference in the value of parents throughout the recruitment process with respect to gender [F(86,87) = 13.156, p<. 000] [G]. On average, females valued parents throughout the recruitment process (M=4.00, SD=. 894) more than males (M=3.11, SD=1.368) the difference was significant (t(86) = 11.472, p<. 000).

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Parents	Male	27	3.11	1.368	.263
	Female	61	4.00	.894	.115

The third ANOVA test [H] compared the means of recruitment factors and type of conference within Division I athletics, separated into Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), Football Championship Subdivision (FCS), and non-football schools. There was no significant difference because none of the p-values were less than the Bonferroni alpha .01.

The fourth ANOVA test [I] compared the means on college selection sport with respect to sport, revenue and non-revenue. Sports were separated into revenue generating sports such as Football and Basketball, and the remaining non-revenue generating sports. There was no significant difference between sport played and recruitment factors. Responses to recruitment factors do not differ with respect to sport played.

The fifth ANOVA test [J] compared the means on college selection factors with respect to class standing. There was no significant difference between class standing and recruitment factors.

From the data we can gather that there was no significant relationship between college selection factors with respect to class standing, sport, NCAA Division I level (FBS, FCS, or non-football conference), or race. We can however gather that there is a significant relationship amongst females and how they value parents during the recruitment compared to males. This indicates that females value parents more during recruitment than males.

Discussion

This study's initial intent was to evaluate how demographics played a role during a Division I student athlete's recruitment.

The findings for this study were varied as the college student athletes included in this sample felt differently about which college recruitment factors were most important to them. Having sent out the survey to over 1,000 Division I Student Athletes at the FBS, FCS, and non-football division level, it was clear that the 89 that completed this survey found similarities in what they valued during the recruitment process. The four highest college recruitment factors were College Coach (M=4.33), Academic Reputation (M=4.27), Athletic Scholarship (M=4.04), and Geographic Location (M=3.95). In reference to the literature review three of these factors, athletic scholarship, geographic location, and academic reputation are classified as institutional factors while the college coach was a social factor (Pauline, 2010). With the intent to weigh how different demographics impacted a college recruit, five F Test ANOVA tests were run, producing only one significant finding between the means. When running the Independent T Test between

gender, the females valued parents more throughout the recruitment process (M=4.00, SD=. 894) when compared to males (M=3.11, SD=1.368.) This data indicates that there was a significant difference in how male and females valued their parents' opinion during the recruitment process. When selecting a college to play and study at, this study can conclude that amongst Division I athletes, females value the opinion of their parents greater than males.

The first major objective of this study was to examine the importance of social and institutional college selection factors that influenced a random sample of Division I athletes across the FBS, FCS, and non-football divisions. With this sample selection it was the intent of this study to examine whether institutional or social college selection factors were more important throughout the recruitment process. While the top ranked recruitment factor, college coaches, is from the social classification of recruitment factors, the following highest ranking factors, academic reputation, athletic scholarship, geographic location, and athletic facilities are all related to institutional factors. In addition to these findings four out of the five lowest ranking factors during the recruitment process, high school friend, package deal, academic advisor, and director of major/ department head were amongst the social classification. From this data it is clear that in this study institutional factors were more important to a prospective athlete than social factors.

There are a number of previous studies with comparable findings to this current study. Recently, Pauline et al. (2008) found that universities offering a particular major ranked highest as the most important recruiting factor amongst softball players. While this only surveyed softball players, it does shed light on the importance of the institutional factors. In addition to Pauline et al. a number of studies, Baumgartner (1999), Johnson (1985), Mathes and Gurney (1985) found that academics, an institutional factor according to this study, was ranked first in

terms of importance to prospective student athletes. These findings support this study when not considering individual demographics, as academic reputation was the second highest factor amongst all participants in this study.

While this study found institutional factors to be the most important factor throughout the recruitment process, others have found social factors to be the most significant. According to Kent (1987) the recruiting visit and relationships with coaches were the top priorities for Division I football players. In accordance with this study, a recruiting visit and a relationship built with a coach would be classified as a social recruiting factor, and would be the most influential throughout the recruiting process. These findings may be attributed to the amount of time football players spend with their coaches during the season as a revenue sport. As this study was conducted in 1987, these findings may not be as legitimate as the recruiting landscape has changed and athletic budgets have increased (Jones).

The lack of consistency amongst findings may be attributed to the research participants. For the purpose of this study a random sample of Division I athletes were surveyed while other studies used specific sports. This study gained data from 21 different sports while others have focused solely on either softball and baseball (Pauline et al., 2004) or solely football players (Kent). Another factor that may attribute to the inconsistency in findings between present and previous studies may be the amount of women participating in the study. This study found an unequal distribution of sample participants who completed this study in entirety as 27 males (30.3%) and 62 females (69.7%) finished this survey. This may have skewed data as the female population represented more than doubled that of the males.

The second major objective of this study was to examine any relationships that may have existed between individual demographics and college selection factors. This portion of the study

is limited in its ability to compare to others as there is little prior literature comparing how student athletes of different demographics value recruitment factors. For this study, there were no significant findings amongst NCAA Division level (FBS, FCS, or non-football), sport (revenue vs. non revenue), class standing, or race (whites, blacks, and other) in regards to college recruitment factors. This may be attributed the lack of research participants as only 89 student athletes qualified for data collection. Had every research participant completed the survey in entirety (1,029) it may have yielded more legitimate findings. The one recruitment factor that was found to be significant amongst the differing demographics, gender, was that of parental influence during the recruitment process. The results revealed that female's valued parents during recruitment a significant amount more than males. The reason for the differences in gender may be attributed to the emotional attachment females develop with their parents, thus having more of an influence during the recruitment process. These findings are significant as Division I athletic departments may place a greater importance on appeasing the parents of females more than males during the recruitment process.

Limitations

There were significant changes that were made in the methods as participants were selected for this study. As indicated in the sample selection section, a total of 123 schools across the FBS, FCS, and non-football conference schools were to be used in this study. Instead 35 randomly selected schools, one from each conference, were used for the purpose of this study. This may be attributed to the time consuming task of acquiring emails as well as blocks encountered when gaining access to emails from all schools. One issue faced while selecting research participants was gaining access to their email, as some of the schools selected did not have an online student directory, or required logging in to the school's student account service to

gain access to the student athletes' emails. From each school selected that successfully had access to students' emails, four teams were used while one out of every 3 athletes from the team were randomly selected to participate. Ultimately this yielded 1,029 emails that were distributed to Division I athletes. Instead of reaching out to college assistant and head coaches to forward this survey to their athletes, another school was selected that did have access to students' emails via the student directory. This meant going to the next randomly selected school from the conference that was to be selected.

Delimitations

For this study I gained 96 responses from a diverse representation of Division I student athletes. In order to ensure complete validity a 100% completion rate was required of the participants. This number yielded 89 participants, as 7 research participants did not complete this survey in entirety. This study did not analyze Division II or III recruitment factors, as the focus was solely on Division I athletes. The only schools included in this study were those that provided an adequate amount of student emails, as detailed in the methods section. This study did not consider the promise of any potential bribes, or improper benefits. This includes but is not limited to the promise of drugs, money, or sexual exploitation (*Associated Press*, 2014). It would not have been possible for this survey to ask specifically if these unethical promises were made at all during recruitment for this sample of student athletes. Finally this study is not representative of the population. With over 130,000 Division I student athletes, 89 students is not enough to represent the experiences of thousands of others (NCAA, 2014).

Recommendations

When studying college selection factors in the future it is important to consider the time that goes into the process. With more time this study would be better served as longitudinal in

nature as one could gauge the values of a recruit throughout the recruitment process. In addition to time, it is important to take into account socioeconomic status of the student athletes. This study was unsuccessful in gaining the socioeconomic status of the student athletes, and this would provide another demographic by which to compare means with the college selection factors. With this study only yielding an 8.6% participant response rate it is recommended that more surveys be sent out to the selected sample. With only 89 participants of 1,029 successfully completing this survey it would be better served in sending out emails to over 2,000 Division I student athletes in order to yield about 200 legitimate responses. It may also be best to survey Division I, II, and III level schools as another means of comparison amongst NCAA student athletes.

Summary

This research has increased the understanding of college recruitment factors for Division I student athletes. Based on the data female Division I athletes value parents more during the recruitment process than males. In addition, this study has supported former studies in finding institutional factors more influential than social factors during the recruitment process. While Division I athletic programs grow in terms of budget (Jones), it is clear they should be channeling their resources into institutional factors such as better facilities, developing a prestigious academic program, and offering more athletic scholarships to students. This study has found that Division I athletes value institutional factors a significant amount more than social factors during the recruitment process.

References

Abolt, C., Gilson, T., & Stults-Kolehmainen, H. (2013). Feelings of acceptance and intimacy among teammates predict motivation in intercollegiate sport. . *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *36*(3), 306-328.

Ayers , K., Dobose , C., & Pazmino-Cevallos , M. (2012). The 20 hour rule: Student-athletes time commitment to academics and athletics. *Virginia Journal*, *33*(1), 22-27.

Akerlof, R. (2008). A theory of social motivation. *Department of Economics, Harvard University*, 1-62.

Barden, J. Q., Bluhm, D. J., Mitchell, T. R., & Lee, T. W. (2013). Hometown Proximity, Coaching Change, and the Success of College Basketball Recruits. *Journal Of Sport Management*, *27*(3), 230-246.

Benedict, J., & Keteyian, A. (2011). New scrutiny for recruits? . *Sports Illustrated*, *114*(10), 38-40.

Bernstein, D. (2010). *Essentials of psychology*. Cengage Learning.

Breitbach, A. P. (2007). *The effect of student athlete recruitment, admissions and services in the success of intercollegiate men's basketball programs.* (Order No. 3324140, Saint Louis University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, , 99-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/304805909?accountid=27700. (304805909).

Brown, G. (2012). *D iii graduation rates reflect student athlete success*. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/Resources/Latest News/2012/October/DIII graduation rates reflect student athlete success

Brown, G. (2011). Diii aid violations may generate broader allegations. *NCAA News*, 5.

Butt, J., Hays, K., Maynard, I., & Olusoga, P. (2009). Stress in elite sports coaching: Identifying stressors. .*Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*(4), 442-460.

Castle, J. (2010). *The impact of the academic progress rating on the retention and recruiting strategies of NCAA division I football programs.* (Order No. 3422386, The University of New Mexico). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* , 116-n/a. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/757731920?accountid=27700. (757731920).

Clifton, G. (2012). NCAA Basketball Softens Communication Limits In Recruiting. *Journal Of NCAA Compliance,* 3.

Ferrante, L. (2010). Two for One: How the NCAA Rules Do Not Adequately Address Package Deals and a Proposed Rule to Prohibit Them. *Texas Review Of Entertainment & Sports Law*, *12*(1), 77-89.

Greenberg, M. (2006). Termination of college coaching contracts: When does adequate cause to terminate exist and who determines its existence?. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, *16*(1), 197-258.

Greenberg, M., & Paul , D. (2013). Coaches' contracts: Terminating a coach without cause and the obligation to mitigate damages. . *Marquette Sports Law Review*, *23*(2), 339-392.

Hosick , M. (2013). Rules working group recruiting proposals moving forward. *NCAA News*, 1.

Huffman, L. T., & Cooper, C. G. (2012). I'm Taking my Talents to…An Examination of Hometown Socio-Economic Status on the College-Choice Factors of Football Student-Athletes at a Southeastern University. *Journal Of Issues In Intercollegiate Athletics,* 5335-246.

James, E. (2013). *New reform efforts take hold august 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/resources/latest news/2013/august/new reform efforts take hold august 1

James, E. (2014). Saint Francis football program provides extra benefits, commits recruiting violations. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/media-center/press-releases/saint-francis-football-program-provides-extra-benefits-commits-recruiting-violations

Jeff Monken takes violations blame. (2014, October 28). Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://espn.go.com/college-football/story/_/id/11780302/army-black-knights-coach-jeff-monken-accepts-blame-ncaa-violations

Johnson, G. (2012). Division iii discusses potential benefit of recruiting calendar. . *NCAA News* , 7.

Jones, W. (2013). Exploring the relationship between intercollegiate athletic expenditures and team on-field success among ncaa division i institutions. .*Journal of Sports Economics*, *14*(6), 584-606.

Kaburakis, A., Lawrence, H., & Merckx, C. (2008). Ncaa division i recruiting: Identifying and mitigating institutional risk associated with the official visit.*Journal of Legal Aspects of Sport*, *18*(1), 89-126.

Klungseth, S. (2005). The five ncaa recruiting rules that high school coaches should know. *Coach & Athletic Director*, *74*(9), 75.

Lawrence, H. (2013). The impact of intercollegiate athletics financial inequalities. . *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, *6*(1), 25-44.

Machida, M., Marie, R., & Vealey , R. (2012). Predictors of sources of self-confidence in collegiate athletes. .*International Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *10*(3), 172-

Mandel, S., Staples, A. (2013). Go for It on Fourth And Multiply. *Sports Illustrated, 118*(24), 46.

McCollins. (2012). Need achievement motivation.*ICSC.edu*, 1-4.

McMurphy, B. (2014, October 21). Charges 'fundamentally unfounded' Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://espn.go.com/college-football/story/_/id/11738510/oklahoma-state-cowboys-ncaa-say-si-allegations-unfounded

Meyer, C. (2012). *The flutie effect: Effects of a successful athletic department on college enrollment*. Grand Valley Sports, Grand Valley State University, Retrieved from http://cammeyerportfolio.blogspot.com/2012/04/flutie-effect-effects-of-successful.html

Mink, N. (2014). Syracuse coach Scott Shafer says 64-letter recruiting tactic is 'money well spent' Retrieved November 30, 2014, from http://www.syracuse.com/orangefootball/index.ssf/2014/06/syracuse_coach_scott_shafer_says_64-letter_recruiting_tactic_is_money_well_spent.html

NCAA college athletics department finances database. (2012, May 16). *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/sports/college/story/2012-05-14/ncaa-college-athletics-finances-database/54955804/1

NCAA Division I Recruiting Rules. (2014). Retrieved November 30, 2014, from https://web1.ncaa.org/LSDBi/exec/bylawSearch

NCAA participation rates going up. (2011). Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.com/news/ncaa/article/2011-11-02/ncaa-participation-rates-going

Pauline, J. S., Pauline, G. A., & Allen, C. (2008). Factors influencing college selection by NCAA division I, II, and III softball student-athletes. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education,* 2(3), 363-378.

Pauline, J. S., Pauline, G. A., & Stevens, A. J. (2004). Influential factors in the college selection process of baseball student-athletes. *Journal of Contemporary Athleticds, 1,* 153-166.

Pauline, G. A., & Wolohan, J. T. (2012). An Examination of the Non-Recruit Clause in Intercollegiate Coaching Contracts. *Journal Of Legal Aspects Of Sport, 21*(2), 210-238.

Pauline, J. (2010). Factors Influencing College Selection by NCAA Division I, II, and III Lacrosse Players. ICHPER – SD Journal Of Research In Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Sport & Dance, 5(2), 62-69.

Rickman, M. (2013, November 27). Texas A&M's 'Swagcopter' gets a new paint job. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from http://www.si.com/college-football/campus-union/2013/11/27/texas-am-swagcopter-paint-job

Ridpath, D. (2013). Amateurism will die and we must be prepared. *Journal of NCAA Compliance*, 4-5.

Schneder, R., & Messenger, S. (2012). THE IMPACT OF ATHLETIC FACILITIES ON THE RECRUITMENT OF POTENTIAL STUDENT-ATHLETES. *College Student Journal*, 46(4), 805-811

Schroeder, G. (2013). NCAA penalizes Mississippi State for recruiting violations. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from http://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/ncaaf/2013/06/07/ncaa-penalizes-mississippi-state-for-recruiting-violations/2400367/

Social Media Meets NCAA Recruiting. (2012). *Journal of NCAA Compliance,* 3-4.

Sparvero, E., & Warner, S. (2013). The price of winning and the impact on the ncaa community. . *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, *6*(1), 120-143.

Stott, M. J. (2010). Recruiting Looking for the Right Fit. *Swimming World, 51*(11), 25-27.

Thamel, P. (2012, April 9). 'Major' Violations Reported at Baylor. Retrieved December 1, 2014, from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/10/sports/ncaabasketball/ncaa-report-lists-major-violations-for-baylor-basketball.html?_r=0

Treadway, D. (2014, June 13). 11 Absurd Recruiting Tactics That College Football Coaches Have Recently Attempted. Retrieved November 30, 2014, from http://www.si.com/extra-mustard/2014/05/19/11-college-football-recruiting-tactics-stories-methods

Appendices

[A] Survey Questions

Directions: Please answer questions with honesty and to the best of your ability. If unsure of an answer to a question, or if a question does not apply to you, please proceed to the next question without answering. Any responses are appreciated and useful for the purpose of this research.

Demographics

1) Age-
2) Race- ☐White ☐Hispanic Latino ☐Black/ African American ☐Native American ☐Asian ☐Pacific Islander ☐Other
3) Current Athletic Conference
4) Gender- ☐ Male ☐Female ☐Other
5) Schooling attended prior to college- ☐ Private ☐Public ☐Home schooled ☐Other ☐ Junior College ☐ Prep School
6) Current Collegiate Sport
7) Full Athletic Scholarship- ☐ Yes ☐No

8) Partial Athletic Scholarship- ☐ Yes ☐No

9) Full Academic Scholarship- ☐ Yes ☐No

10) Partial Academic Scholarship- ☐ Yes ☐No

11) Financial Aid Received as a result of Household Income- ☐ Yes ☐No

12) Are you a first generation student? ☐ Yes ☐No

Please rate how influential each factor was throughout your college recruitment process

	No Influence	Very Little Influence	Little Influence	Moderate Influence	Great Influence
Availability of Desired Major	○	○	○	○	○
Academic Support	○	○	○	○	○
Workout Facilities	○	○	○	○	○
Academic Reputation	○	○	○	○	○
Gameday Atmosphere	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunity For Immediate Playing Time	○	○	○	○	○
Athletic Facilities	○	○	○	○	○
Dining/ Food Services	○	○	○	○	○
Athletic Scholarship	○	○	○	○	○
Academic Scholarship	○	○	○	○	○
Need Based Governmental Financial Aid	○	○	○	○	○

	No Influence	Very Little Influence	Little Influence	Moderate Influence	Great Influence
Sport Team's Reputation	○	○	○	○	○
Geographical Location	○	○	○	○	○
College Coaches	○	○	○	○	○
High School Coaches	○	○	○	○	○
Parents	○	○	○	○	○
Package Deal (DescriptionTwo high school recruits from the same high school are recruited at the same time to attend a certain institution together to pursue athletics)	○	○	○	○	○
High School Friend	○	○	○	○	○
Academic Advisor	○	○	○	○	○
Future Teammates	○	○	○	○	○
Recruitment Visit	○	○	○	○	○
Director of Major/ Academic Department	○	○	○	○	○

[B] Consent Letter

Project Title: NCAA Division I College Athletics Recruitment: A Deeper Analysis
Researcher: André C. Remillard E-mail: acr03103@sjfc.edu
Advisor: Dr. Katharine A. Burakowski E-mail: kburakowski@sjfc.edu
Phone: (585) 385-7389

Purpose and Description: The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding as to what factors play the biggest role in a student athletes' college decision making process. As a participant in this research, you are being asked to complete a survey regarding the social, institutional, and individual factors playing into your college recruitment. For example, you will be asked on a scale of 1-5 how strongly you felt potential playing time factored in to your college decision. This survey should take 10-15 minutes to complete.

The information you provide may assist college athletic departments better allocate their time, money, and efforts throughout the recruitment process. Risks associated with this survey may include divulging personal information such as amount of scholarship money received. Also one runs the risk of having a coach see you filling out this survey and may not be pleased with your responses. However, personal information in this survey will remain anonymous and results will be analyzed as a collection of data. Names and contact information will not be included in the presentation of results.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. You may decline to participate in this study and if you begin completing the survey you may still decide to stop and withdraw at any time. Your decision to refrain from completing the survey will be respected and is welcomed if you experience any sort of uncomfortability. Having read the above and having an opportunity to ask

any questions with the contact information provided please complete the survey if you would like to participate in this research. By completing the survey you give permission to use your responses in the study. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participant, please contact the Dr. Katharine A. Burakowski, St. John Fisher College, NY 14618; (585) 385-7389

[C] Invitation to Participate

Hello!

My name is André Remillard and I am a senior sport management major at St. John Fisher College in Rochester, NY. I am currently conducting research on NCAA Division I recruitment and I need your help! You have been randomly selected as a Division I student athlete to participate in this survey. In completing this short survey you can help improve the college recruitment landscape for future student athletes. The link to the survey is provided below. I appreciate your participation!

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

André Remillard

St. John Fisher College
Class of 2014
Sport Management
Acr03103@sjfc.edu

[D] Data Frequencies

Frequencies

Statistics

		Race_Recoded	Race	Conference	ClassStanding	Gender	Schooling	Sport	Fu
N	Valid	89	89	88	89	89	89	87	
	Missing	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	
Mean		1.3034	1.54	12.48	2.6966	1.70	1.78	21.03	

Median	1.0000	1.00	10.00	2.0000	2.00	2.00	26.00
Mode	1.00	1	9	1.00	2	2	28
Std. Deviation	.68098	1.399	8.507	1.70163	.462	.670	10.864

Statistics

		PartialSchol	FullAcSchol	PartialAcSchol	FinancialAid	FirstGen	MajorAvailability	Academ po
N	Valid	88	88	88	87	89	89	
	Missing	1	1	1	2	0	0	
Mean		1.50	1.94	1.59	1.71	1.78	3.84	
Median		1.50	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	
Mode		1	2	2	2	2	5	
Std. Deviation		.503	.233	.494	.455	.420	1.224	

Statistics

		WorkoutFacilities	AcademicReputation	GamedayAtmosphere	PlayingTime	AthleticFacilities	Dining	Athletic arsh
N	Valid	89	89	89	89	89	89	
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Mean		3.82	4.27	3.46	3.82	3.98	3.27	
Median		4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	
Mode		4	5	3	4	4	3	
Std. Deviation		1.103	.914	1.159	1.103	1.033	1.136	

Statistics

		AcademicScholarship	NeedFinancialAid	TeamReputation	Geographical Location	CollegeCoach	HighSchoolCoach	P
N	Valid	89	89	88	88	88	88	
	Missing	0	0	1	1	1	1	
Mean		2.98	2.25	3.78	3.95	4.33	2.44	
Median		3.00	2.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	2.50	
Mode		1	1	4	4	5	1	
Std. Deviation		1.492	1.400	1.022	1.016	1.025	1.346	

Statistics

		PackageDeal	HighSchoolFriend	AcademicAdvisor	FutureTeamates	RecruitmentVisit	Director or
N	Valid	88	88	87	88	88	
	Missing	1	1	2	1	1	

Mean	1.56	1.52	1.69	3.22	3.70	
Median	1.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	4.00	
Mode	1	1	1	4	5	
Std. Deviation	1.081	.982	1.027	1.426	1.357	

Statistics

		Age_Recoded
N	Valid	
	Missing	
Mean		1
Median		2
Mode		
Std. Deviation		1.

a. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Frequency Table

Race_Recoded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	73	82.0	82.0	82.0
	2.00	5	5.6	5.6	87.6
	3.00	11	12.4	12.4	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	73	82.0	82.0	82.0
	Hispanic/ Latino	4	4.5	4.5	86.5
	Black/ African American	5	5.6	5.6	92.1
	Native American	1	1.1	1.1	93.3

	Asian	2	2.2	2.2	95.5
	Pacific Islander	1	1.1	1.1	96.6
	Other	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Conference

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	America East Conference	3	3.4	3.4	3.4
	American Athletic Conference	8	9.0	9.1	12.5
	Atlantic 10 Conference	4	4.5	4.5	17.0
	Atlantic Coast Conference	6	6.7	6.8	23.9
	Big 12 Conference	6	6.7	6.8	30.7
	Big East Conference	4	4.5	4.5	35.2
	Big Sky Conference	2	2.2	2.3	37.5
	Big South Conference	9	10.1	10.2	47.7
	Big Ten Conference	4	4.5	4.5	52.3
	Colonial Athletic Association	5	5.6	5.7	58.0
	Conference USA	3	3.4	3.4	61.4
	Horizon League	3	3.4	3.4	64.8
	Mid-American Conference	6	6.7	6.8	71.6
	Missouri Valley Conference	4	4.5	4.5	76.1
	Northeast Conference	1	1.1	1.1	77.3
	Ohio Valley Conference	1	1.1	1.1	78.4
	Pac-12 Conference	5	5.6	5.7	84.1
	Patriot League	3	3.4	3.4	87.5
	Southeastern Conference	4	4.5	4.5	92.0
	Southern Conference	5	5.6	5.7	97.7
	The Ivy League	1	1.1	1.1	98.9
	Western Athletic Conference	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

ClassStanding

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Freshman	28	31.5	31.5	31.5
	Sophomore	19	21.3	21.3	52.8
	Junio	17	19.1	19.1	71.9
	Senior	15	16.9	16.9	88.8
	5th year Senior	2	2.2	2.2	91.0
	RedshirtFreshman	4	4.5	4.5	95.5
	RedshirtSophomore	3	3.4	3.4	98.9
	RedshirtJunior	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	27	30.3	30.3	30.3
	Female	62	69.7	69.7	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Schooling

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Private	26	29.2	29.2	29.2
	Public	61	68.5	68.5	97.8
	Junior College	2	2.2	2.2	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Sport

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	1	2	2.2	2.3	2.3
	2	2	2.2	2.3	4.6
	3	3	3.4	3.4	8.0
	5	5	5.6	5.7	13.8
	6	5	5.6	5.7	19.5
	10	2	2.2	2.3	21.8
	11	3	3.4	3.4	25.3
	13	3	3.4	3.4	28.7
	15	4	4.5	4.6	33.3
	16	1	1.1	1.1	34.5
	17	1	1.1	1.1	35.6
	19	9	10.1	10.3	46.0
	26	5	5.6	5.7	51.7
	27	9	10.1	10.3	62.1
	28	10	11.2	11.5	73.6
	29	2	2.2	2.3	75.9
	30	7	7.9	8.0	83.9
	31	1	1.1	1.1	85.1
	32	6	6.7	6.9	92.0
	35	2	2.2	2.3	94.3
	38	5	5.6	5.7	100.0
	Total	87	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.2		
Total		89	100.0		

FullSchol

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	33	37.1	37.1	37.1
	No	56	62.9	62.9	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

PartialSchol

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	44	49.4	50.0	50.0
	No	44	49.4	50.0	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

FullAcSchol

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	5	5.6	5.7	5.7
	No	83	93.3	94.3	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

PartialAcSchol

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	36	40.4	40.9	40.9
	No	52	58.4	59.1	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

FinancialAid

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	25	28.1	28.7	28.7
	No	62	69.7	71.3	100.0
	Total	87	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.2		

Total	89	100.0		

FirstGen

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	20	22.5	22.5	22.5
	No	69	77.5	77.5	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

MajorAvailability

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	7	7.9	7.9	7.9
	Very Little Influence	6	6.7	6.7	14.6
	Little Influence	14	15.7	15.7	30.3
	Moderate Influence	29	32.6	32.6	62.9
	Great Influence	33	37.1	37.1	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

AcademicSupport

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Very Little Influence	5	5.6	5.6	10.1
	Little Influence	13	14.6	14.6	24.7
	Moderate Influence	37	41.6	41.6	66.3
	Great Influence	30	33.7	33.7	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

WorkoutFacilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	5	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Very Little Influence	5	5.6	5.6	11.2
	Little Influence	18	20.2	20.2	31.5
	Moderate Influence	34	38.2	38.2	69.7
	Great Influence	27	30.3	30.3	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

AcademicReputation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	2	2.2	2.2	2.2
	Very Little Influence	3	3.4	3.4	5.6
	Little Influence	7	7.9	7.9	13.5
	Moderate Influence	34	38.2	38.2	51.7
	Great Influence	43	48.3	48.3	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

GamedayAtmosphere

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	6	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Very Little Influence	10	11.2	11.2	18.0
	Little Influence	30	33.7	33.7	51.7
	Moderate Influence	23	25.8	25.8	77.5
	Great Influence	20	22.5	22.5	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

PlayingTime

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid	No Influence	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Very Little Influence	9	10.1	10.1	14.6
	Little Influence	12	13.5	13.5	28.1
	Moderate Influence	38	42.7	42.7	70.8
	Great Influence	26	29.2	29.2	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

AthleticFacilities

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Very Little Influence	2	2.2	2.2	6.7
	Little Influence	18	20.2	20.2	27.0
	Moderate Influence	33	37.1	37.1	64.0
	Great Influence	32	36.0	36.0	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

Dining

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	6	6.7	6.7	6.7
	Very Little Influence	16	18.0	18.0	24.7
	Little Influence	29	32.6	32.6	57.3
	Moderate Influence	24	27.0	27.0	84.3
	Great Influence	14	15.7	15.7	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

AthleticScholarship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	9	10.1	10.1	10.1
	Very Little Influence	5	5.6	5.6	15.7

	Little Influence	7	7.9	7.9	23.6
	Moderate Influence	20	22.5	22.5	46.1
	Great Influence	48	53.9	53.9	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

AcademicSholarship

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	24	27.0	27.0	27.0
	Very Little Influence	9	10.1	10.1	37.1
	Little Influence	19	21.3	21.3	58.4
	Moderate Influence	19	21.3	21.3	79.8
	Great Influence	18	20.2	20.2	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

NeedFinancialAid

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	41	46.1	46.1	46.1
	Very Little Influence	14	15.7	15.7	61.8
	Little Influence	13	14.6	14.6	76.4
	Moderate Influence	13	14.6	14.6	91.0
	Great Influence	8	9.0	9.0	100.0
	Total	89	100.0	100.0	

TeamReputation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Very Little Influence	4	4.5	4.5	9.1
	Little Influence	21	23.6	23.9	33.0
	Moderate Influence	37	41.6	42.0	75.0

	Great Influence	22	24.7	25.0	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

GeographicalLocation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	3	3.4	3.4	3.4
	Very Little Influence	3	3.4	3.4	6.8
	Little Influence	20	22.5	22.7	29.5
	Moderate Influence	31	34.8	35.2	64.8
	Great Influence	31	34.8	35.2	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

CollegeCoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	4	4.5	4.5	4.5
	Very Little Influence	2	2.2	2.3	6.8
	Little Influence	6	6.7	6.8	13.6
	Moderate Influence	25	28.1	28.4	42.0
	Great Influence	51	57.3	58.0	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

HighSchoolCoach

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	33	37.1	37.5	37.5

	Very Little Influence	11	12.4	12.5	50.0
	Little Influence	23	25.8	26.1	76.1
	Moderate Influence	14	15.7	15.9	92.0
	Great Influence	7	7.9	8.0	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

Parents

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	6	6.7	6.8	6.8
	Very Little Influence	5	5.6	5.7	12.5
	Little Influence	20	22.5	22.7	35.2
	Moderate Influence	33	37.1	37.5	72.7
	Great Influence	24	27.0	27.3	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

PackageDeal

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	65	73.0	73.9	73.9
	Very Little Influence	8	9.0	9.1	83.0
	Little Influence	7	7.9	8.0	90.9
	Moderate Influence	5	5.6	5.7	96.6
	Great Influence	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

HighSchoolFriend

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	63	70.8	71.6	71.6
	Very Little Influence	11	12.4	12.5	84.1
	Little Influence	10	11.2	11.4	95.5
	Moderate Influence	1	1.1	1.1	96.6
	Great Influence	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

AcademicAdvisor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	54	60.7	62.1	62.1
	Very Little Influence	14	15.7	16.1	78.2
	Little Influence	12	13.5	13.8	92.0
	Moderate Influence	6	6.7	6.9	98.9
	Great Influence	1	1.1	1.1	100.0
	Total	87	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.2		
Total		89	100.0		

FutureTeamates

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	19	21.3	21.6	21.6
	Very Little Influence	7	7.9	8.0	29.5
	Little Influence	15	16.9	17.0	46.6
	Moderate Influence	30	33.7	34.1	80.7
	Great Influence	17	19.1	19.3	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

RecruitmentVisit

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	11	12.4	12.5	12.5
	Very Little Influence	7	7.9	8.0	20.5
	Little Influence	10	11.2	11.4	31.8
	Moderate Influence	29	32.6	33.0	64.8
	Great Influence	31	34.8	35.2	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

DirectorofMajor

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No Influence	30	33.7	34.1	34.1
	Very Little Influence	16	18.0	18.2	52.3
	Little Influence	24	27.0	27.3	79.5
	Moderate Influence	12	13.5	13.6	93.2
	Great Influence	6	6.7	6.8	100.0
	Total	88	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	1	1.1		
Total		89	100.0		

Age_Recoded

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	18.00	24	27.0	27.6	27.6
	19.00	18	20.2	20.7	48.3
	20.00	22	24.7	25.3	73.6
	21.00	14	15.7	16.1	89.7
	22.00	6	6.7	6.9	96.6

	23.00	3	3.4	3.4	100.0
	Total	87	97.8	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.2		
Total		89	100.0		

[E] ANOVA 1- Race

ANOVA 1 - RACE

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
MajorAvailability	Between Groups	11.789	6	1.965	1.342	.248
	Within Groups	120.009	82	1.464		
	Total	131.798	88			
AcademicSupport	Between Groups	3.579	6	.596	.514	.796
	Within Groups	95.140	82	1.160		
	Total	98.719	88			
WorkoutFacilities	Between Groups	5.759	6	.960	.776	.591
	Within Groups	101.365	82	1.236		
	Total	107.124	88			
AcademicReputation	Between Groups	4.494	6	.749	.890	.507
	Within Groups	69.034	82	.842		
	Total	73.528	88			
GamedayAtmosphere	Between Groups	10.557	6	1.760	1.341	.248
	Within Groups	107.555	82	1.312		
	Total	118.112	88			
PlayingTime	Between Groups	2.130	6	.355	.277	.946
	Within Groups	104.993	82	1.280		
	Total	107.124	88			
AthleticFacilities	Between Groups	6.005	6	1.001	.933	.476
	Within Groups	87.950	82	1.073		
	Total	93.955	88			
Dining	Between Groups	13.593	6	2.266	1.859	.098
	Within Groups	99.935	82	1.219		
	Total	113.528	88			
AthleticScholarship	Between Groups	5.075	6	.846	.460	.836
	Within Groups	150.745	82	1.838		
	Total	155.820	88			
AcademicSholarship	Between Groups	18.660	6	3.110	1.438	.210
	Within Groups	177.295	82	2.162		

	Total	195.955	88			
	Between Groups	14.092	6	2.349	1.215	.307
NeedFinancialAid	Within Groups	158.470	82	1.933		
	Total	172.562	88			
	Between Groups	7.771	6	1.295	1.262	.284
TeamReputation	Within Groups	83.126	81	1.026		
	Total	90.898	87			
	Between Groups	10.127	6	1.688	1.716	.128
GeographicalLocation	Within Groups	79.691	81	.984		
	Total	89.818	87			
	Between Groups	4.800	6	.800	.748	.613
CollegeCoach	Within Groups	86.643	81	1.070		
	Total	91.443	87			
	Between Groups	11.103	6	1.850	1.022	.417
HighSchoolCoach	Within Groups	146.613	81	1.810		
	Total	157.716	87			
	Between Groups	6.529	6	1.088	.840	.543
Parents	Within Groups	104.926	81	1.295		
	Total	111.455	87			
	Between Groups	6.436	6	1.073	.912	.491
PackageDeal	Within Groups	95.280	81	1.176		
	Total	101.716	87			
	Between Groups	13.235	6	2.206	2.527	.027
HighSchoolFriend	Within Groups	70.719	81	.873		
	Total	83.955	87			
	Between Groups	5.643	6	.940	.885	.510
AcademicAdvisor	Within Groups	84.978	80	1.062		
	Total	90.621	86			
	Between Groups	6.038	6	1.006	.477	.824
FutureTeamates	Within Groups	170.860	81	2.109		
	Total	176.898	87			
	Between Groups	10.390	6	1.732	.936	.474
RecruitmentVisit	Within Groups	149.928	81	1.851		
	Total	160.318	87			
	Between Groups	19.379	6	3.230	2.146	.057
DirectorofMajor	Within Groups	121.894	81	1.505		
	Total	141.273	87			

[F] ANOVA 2- Gender

ANOVA2 = GENDER

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
MajorAvailability	Between Groups	3.196	1	3.196	2.162	.145
	Within Groups	128.602	87	1.478		
	Total	131.798	88			
AcademicSupport	Between Groups	2.977	1	2.977	2.705	.104
	Within Groups	95.742	87	1.100		
	Total	98.719	88			
WorkoutFacilities	Between Groups	.526	1	.526	.429	.514
	Within Groups	106.597	87	1.225		
	Total	107.124	88			
AcademicReputation	Between Groups	2.097	1	2.097	2.555	.114
	Within Groups	71.431	87	.821		
	Total	73.528	88			
GamedayAtmosphere	Between Groups	.130	1	.130	.096	.758
	Within Groups	117.983	87	1.356		
	Total	118.112	88			
PlayingTime	Between Groups	3.528	1	3.528	2.963	.089
	Within Groups	103.596	87	1.191		
	Total	107.124	88			
AthleticFacilities	Between Groups	.008	1	.008	.008	.931
	Within Groups	93.947	87	1.080		
	Total	93.955	88			
Dining	Between Groups	.004	1	.004	.003	.955
	Within Groups	113.524	87	1.305		
	Total	113.528	88			
AthleticScholarship	Between Groups	.549	1	.549	.308	.581
	Within Groups	155.271	87	1.785		
	Total	155.820	88			
AcademicSholarship	Between Groups	.612	1	.612	.273	.603
	Within Groups	195.343	87	2.245		
	Total	195.955	88			
NeedFinancialAid	Between Groups	.006	1	.006	.003	.958
	Within Groups	172.556	87	1.983		
	Total	172.562	88			
TeamReputation	Between Groups	.073	1	.073	.069	.793
	Within Groups	90.825	86	1.056		
	Total	90.898	87			

GeographicalLocation	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.003	.959
	Within Groups	89.815	86	1.044		
	Total	89.818	87			
CollegeCoach	Between Groups	1.858	1	1.858	1.784	.185
	Within Groups	89.585	86	1.042		
	Total	91.443	87			
HighSchoolCoach	Between Groups	.000	1	.000	.000	.995
	Within Groups	157.716	86	1.834		
	Total	157.716	87			
Parents	Between Groups	14.788	1	14.788	13.156	.000
	Within Groups	96.667	86	1.124		
	Total	111.455	87			
PackageDeal	Between Groups	.050	1	.050	.042	.838
	Within Groups	101.666	86	1.182		
	Total	101.716	87			
HighSchoolFriend	Between Groups	.239	1	.239	.245	.622
	Within Groups	83.716	86	.973		
	Total	83.955	87			
AcademicAdvisor	Between Groups	3.119	1	3.119	3.030	.085
	Within Groups	87.502	85	1.029		
	Total	90.621	86			
FutureTeamates	Between Groups	1.816	1	1.816	.892	.348
	Within Groups	175.082	86	2.036		
	Total	176.898	87			
RecruitmentVisit	Between Groups	4.350	1	4.350	2.398	.125
	Within Groups	155.968	86	1.814		
	Total	160.318	87			
DirectorofMajor	Between Groups	4.372	1	4.372	2.746	.101
	Within Groups	136.901	86	1.592		
	Total	141.273	87			

[G] ANOVA 2 Post Hoc- Gender

T-Test

Group Statistics

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Parents	Male	27	3.11	1.368	.263
	Female	61	4.00	.894	.115

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Parents	Equal variances assumed	11.472	.001	-3.627	86	.000	-.889
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.096	36.206	.004	-.889

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Lower	Upper
Parents	Equal variances assumed	.245	-1.376	-.402
	Equal variances not assumed	.287	-1.471	-.307

[H] ANOVA 3- Division

Oneway

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
MajorAvailability	Between Groups	4.500	2	2.250	1.503	.228
	Within Groups	127.273	85	1.497		
	Total	131.773	87			
AcademicSupport	Between Groups	1.531	2	.766	.736	.482
	Within Groups	88.423	85	1.040		
	Total	89.955	87			
WorkoutFacilities	Between Groups	5.648	2	2.824	2.569	.083
	Within Groups	93.432	85	1.099		
	Total	99.080	87			
AcademicReputation	Between Groups	1.946	2	.973	1.361	.262
	Within Groups	60.770	85	.715		
	Total	62.716	87			

	Between Groups	6.249	2	3.125	2.512	.087
GamedayAtmosphere	Within Groups	105.739	85	1.244		
	Total	111.989	87			
	Between Groups	1.704	2	.852	.744	.478
PlayingTime	Within Groups	97.376	85	1.146		
	Total	99.080	87			
	Between Groups	2.984	2	1.492	1.409	.250
AthleticFacilities	Within Groups	90.005	85	1.059		
	Total	92.989	87			
	Between Groups	1.666	2	.833	.633	.533
Dining	Within Groups	111.789	85	1.315		
	Total	113.455	87			
	Between Groups	2.074	2	1.037	.577	.564
AthleticScholarship	Within Groups	152.823	85	1.798		
	Total	154.898	87			
	Between Groups	1.502	2	.751	.335	.716
AcademicSholarship	Within Groups	190.498	85	2.241		
	Total	192.000	87			
	Between Groups	9.506	2	4.753	2.502	.088
NeedFinancialAid	Within Groups	161.482	85	1.900		
	Total	170.989	87			
	Between Groups	2.413	2	1.207	1.257	.290
TeamReputation	Within Groups	80.644	84	.960		
	Total	83.057	86			
	Between Groups	5.099	2	2.549	2.822	.065
GeographicalLocation	Within Groups	75.890	84	.903		
	Total	80.989	86			
	Between Groups	.249	2	.124	.131	.878
CollegeCoach	Within Groups	79.981	84	.952		
	Total	80.230	86			
	Between Groups	7.604	2	3.802	2.158	.122
HighSchoolCoach	Within Groups	148.005	84	1.762		
	Total	155.609	86			
	Between Groups	1.552	2	.776	.637	.532
Parents	Within Groups	102.379	84	1.219		
	Total	103.931	86			
	Between Groups	.229	2	.115	.095	.909
PackageDeal	Within Groups	101.173	84	1.204		
	Total	101.402	86			
HighSchoolFriend	Between Groups	.579	2	.289	.292	.747

	Within Groups	83.100	84	.989		
	Total	83.678	86			
	Between Groups	2.038	2	1.019	.960	.387
AcademicAdvisor	Within Groups	88.102	83	1.061		
	Total	90.140	85			
	Between Groups	3.702	2	1.851	.924	.401
FutureTeamates	Within Groups	168.229	84	2.003		
	Total	171.931	86			
	Between Groups	1.101	2	.550	.305	.738
RecruitmentVisit	Within Groups	151.819	84	1.807		
	Total	152.920	86			
	Between Groups	3.977	2	1.989	1.240	.295
DirectorofMajor	Within Groups	134.735	84	1.604		
	Total	138.713	86			

[I] ANOVA 4- Sport

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	.228	1	.228	.147	.702
MajorAvailability	Within Groups	131.519	85	1.547		
	Total	131.747	86			
	Between Groups	3.832	1	3.832	3.829	.054
AcademicSupport	Within Groups	85.065	85	1.001		
	Total	88.897	86			
	Between Groups	3.178	1	3.178	2.817	.097
WorkoutFacilities	Within Groups	95.880	85	1.128		
	Total	99.057	86			

AcademicReputation	Between Groups	.266	1	.266	.365	.547
	Within Groups	61.964	85	.729		
	Total	62.230	86			
GamedayAtmosphere	Between Groups	.576	1	.576	.441	.509
	Within Groups	111.171	85	1.308		
	Total	111.747	86			
PlayingTime	Between Groups	.089	1	.089	.077	.783
	Within Groups	98.968	85	1.164		
	Total	99.057	86			
AthleticFacilities	Between Groups	3.316	1	3.316	3.143	.080
	Within Groups	89.672	85	1.055		
	Total	92.989	86			
Dining	Between Groups	.002	1	.002	.001	.971
	Within Groups	112.918	85	1.328		
	Total	112.920	86			
AthleticScholarship	Between Groups	.042	1	.042	.024	.876
	Within Groups	145.544	85	1.712		
	Total	145.586	86			
AcademicSholarship	Between Groups	3.316	1	3.316	1.502	.224
	Within Groups	187.672	85	2.208		
	Total	190.989	86			
NeedFinancialAid	Between Groups	7.150	1	7.150	3.746	.056
	Within Groups	162.229	85	1.909		

	Total	169.379	86			
	Between Groups	.315	1	.315	.320	.573
TeamReputation	Within Groups	82.708	84	.985		
	Total	83.023	85			
	Between Groups	.091	1	.091	.096	.757
GeographicalLocation	Within Groups	79.862	84	.951		
	Total	79.953	85			
	Between Groups	.489	1	.489	.518	.474
CollegeCoach	Within Groups	79.337	84	.944		
	Total	79.826	85			
	Between Groups	4.511	1	4.511	2.511	.117
HighSchoolCoach	Within Groups	150.885	84	1.796		
	Total	155.395	85			
	Between Groups	.179	1	.179	.146	.704
Parents	Within Groups	103.170	84	1.228		
	Total	103.349	85			
	Between Groups	.902	1	.902	.756	.387
PackageDeal	Within Groups	100.179	84	1.193		
	Total	101.081	85			
	Between Groups	.072	1	.072	.072	.789
HighSchoolFriend	Within Groups	83.324	84	.992		
	Total	83.395	85			
AcademicAdvisor	Between Groups	.058	1	.058	.054	.818

	Within Groups	89.589	83	1.079		
	Total	89.647	84			
	Between Groups	.003	1	.003	.001	.971
FutureTeamates	Within Groups	166.846	84	1.986		
	Total	166.849	85			
	Between Groups	1.128	1	1.128	.657	.420
RecruitmentVisit	Within Groups	144.221	84	1.717		
	Total	145.349	85			
	Between Groups	1.461	1	1.461	.907	.344
DirectorofMajor	Within Groups	135.295	84	1.611		
	Total	136.756	85			

[J] ANOVA 5- Class Standing

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Between Groups	11.679	7	1.668	1.125	.356
MajorAvailability	Within Groups	120.119	81	1.483		
	Total	131.798	88			
	Between Groups	6.233	7	.890	.780	.606
AcademicSupport	Within Groups	92.487	81	1.142		
	Total	98.719	88			

WorkoutFacilities	Between Groups	5.289	7	.756	.601	.753
	Within Groups	101.835	81	1.257		
	Total	107.124	88			
AcademicReputation	Between Groups	1.912	7	.273	.309	.948
	Within Groups	71.616	81	.884		
	Total	73.528	88			
GamedayAtmosphere	Between Groups	1.732	7	.247	.172	.990
	Within Groups	116.381	81	1.437		
	Total	118.112	88			
PlayingTime	Between Groups	3.005	7	.429	.334	.936
	Within Groups	104.118	81	1.285		
	Total	107.124	88			
AthleticFacilities	Between Groups	3.483	7	.498	.445	.870
	Within Groups	90.472	81	1.117		
	Total	93.955	88			
Dining	Between Groups	3.909	7	.558	.413	.892
	Within Groups	109.619	81	1.353		
	Total	113.528	88			
AthleticScholarship	Between Groups	14.049	7	2.007	1.147	.343
	Within Groups	141.772	81	1.750		
	Total	155.820	88			
AcademicSholarship	Between Groups	19.135	7	2.734	1.252	.285
	Within Groups	176.820	81	2.183		

	Total	195.955	88			
	Between Groups	17.205	7	2.458	1.282	.270
NeedFinancialAid	Within Groups	155.356	81	1.918		
	Total	172.562	88			
	Between Groups	5.563	7	.795	.745	.635
TeamReputation	Within Groups	85.335	80	1.067		
	Total	90.898	87			
	Between Groups	5.072	7	.725	.684	.685
GeographicalLocation	Within Groups	84.747	80	1.059		
	Total	89.818	87			
	Between Groups	3.922	7	.560	.512	.823
CollegeCoach	Within Groups	87.521	80	1.094		
	Total	91.443	87			
	Between Groups	23.889	7	3.413	2.040	.060
HighSchoolCoach	Within Groups	133.827	80	1.673		
	Total	157.716	87			
	Between Groups	11.688	7	1.670	1.339	.243
Parents	Within Groups	99.766	80	1.247		
	Total	111.455	87			
	Between Groups	3.257	7	.465	.378	.913
PackageDeal	Within Groups	98.459	80	1.231		
	Total	101.716	87			
HighSchoolFriend	Between Groups	3.463	7	.495	.492	.838

	Within Groups	80.491	80	1.006		
	Total	83.955	87			
	Between Groups	3.737	7	.534	.485	.842
AcademicAdvisor	Within Groups	86.884	79	1.100		
	Total	90.621	86			
	Between Groups	8.380	7	1.197	.568	.779
FutureTeamates	Within Groups	168.517	80	2.106		
	Total	176.898	87			
	Between Groups	15.225	7	2.175	1.199	.313
RecruitmentVisit	Within Groups	145.093	80	1.814		
	Total	160.318	87			
	Between Groups	10.977	7	1.568	.963	.464
DirectorofMajor	Within Groups	130.295	80	1.629		
	Total	141.273	87			