Sage Journals

Sage Journals

We value your privacy

We and our partners store and/or access information on a device, such as cookies and process personal data, such as unique identifiers and standard information sent by a device for personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development. With your permission we and our partners may use precise geolocation data and identification through device scanning. You may click to consent to our and our 1438 partners' processing as described above. Alternatively you may click to refuse to consent or access more detailed information and change your preferences before consenting. Please note that some processing of your personal data may not require your consent, but you have a right to object to such processing. Your preferences will apply to this website only. You can change your preferences or withdraw your consent at any time by returning to this site and clicking the "Privacy" button at the bottom of the webpage.

ACCEPT ALL

MORE OPTIONS

DECLINE ALL

number of applicants at a university with a winning football team, but he found no such significance with men's or women's basketball success.

Toma and Cross (1998) analyzed the effects of winning a NCAA National Championship in football or men's basketball on the number of applications submitted to a school and detected a significant positive increase in applications after the championship. Their study was the first to claim that college athletics are a "front door" to a university because sports are the only aspect of an institution that reach outside the academic world. Pope and Pope (2009) measured athletic success in terms of playoff berths and found that a school's success in football or men's basketball is often accompanied by an increase of 2–8% in applications received, while Jones (2009) observed that simply appearing in a Bowl game caused an increase in applications received and admission yield. Interestingly, this increase was only found for male students while the admission yields for both male and female students were positively correlated with the Nielsen Rating of the Bowl Game. Mixon, Trevino, and Minto (2004) found a positive and significant relationship between football win percentage and applications received, supporting the idea that collegiate football impacts an institution's admission process.

More recently, Segura and Willner (2018) focused on football Bowl Game invitations and discovered that Bowl Game invitations served to increase the median SAT scores at the participating universities. However, Smith (2008) discerned that Division I basketball success does not influence the proportion of students from the top 10% of their class or the proportion of National Merit Scholars attending the university. In addition, Tucker and Amato (2006) found there is no consistent evidence to suggest a highly successful basketball team influences average SAT scores. Pope and Pope (2014), further studying SAT scores, determined that when a university has a stellar year in either football or basketball, the total number of test scores sent to that university increased by 10%. They further determined that Black students, males and students who played sports in high school, are more influenced by athletic success. Chung (2013) focused on SAT score distributions and found that lower than average SAT scoring students have a higher preference for athletic success than do high achieving SAT students.

Smith (2009) observed that prolonged success in athletics is much more beneficial for a university than a single upset win or acute advertising effects from playoff berths or bowl games. His contention is that continued athletic success leads to a more solid sports culture and therefore a higher perceived quality of the institution. Lastly, Caudill, Hourican, and Mixon (2018) detected that when a university eliminates a football team, their applicant pool shrinks and their ACT scores fall.

The literature in this area of study overwhelmingly suggests that athletic success positively influences both the quantity and quality of students at a university. To our knowledge, only Chressanthis and Grimes (1993), Smith (2015), and Groothuis, Eggers, and Redding (2019) have analyzed the influence of athletic malfeasance on a university's academic profile. The Chressanthis and Grimes study followed only one school over time and found that when the NCAA sanctioned the school, freshman enrollment

fell. Smith measured the effect that various NCAA sanctions levied against both football and basketball programs had on student applications and detected no significant change in number of applications received by a school. Groothuis et al., however, discerned that probations levied on a basketball program, while having no influence on applications, did lower the average SAT scores of incoming freshman students.

Our research differs from both Groothuis et al. (2019) and Smith (2015) by focusing solely on basketball postseason tournament bans, one of the harshest penalties imposed by the NCAA. Studying only postseason tournament bans, we then analyze the impact of this significant penalty on student applications, student admissions, student enrollment, and student quality. Additionally, instead of including all potential categories of NCAA sanctions as in Smith's (2015) study, where including major and minor sanctions together might have led to insignificant results or focusing solely on minor probations as in Groothuis et al. (2019), our research addresses only men's basketball postseason tournament bans and attempts to isolate the influence of this harsh penalty on both the quantity and academic quality of incoming students. Further, all but one of the postseason tournament bans identified in this study was self-imposed by the infracting university, while all the minor sanctions were mandated by the NCAA.

Methods and Results

To test the impact of athletic malfeasance on a university as measured by NCAA men's postseason basketball tournament bans, we use data from 118 Division I (Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), formally D-1A) men's basketball programs from 2000 to 2012 for a 13-year panel.[1] The sample represents all schools from the Atlantic Coast Conference, the Big 12 Conference, the Big 10 Conference, Conference USA., the Mid-American Conference, the Mountain West Conference, the Pacific-12, the Southeastern Conference, the Sun Belt Conference, the Western Athletic Conference, and the Ivy League Conference. These schools represent the universities with the highest athletic budgets as well as the majority of bids to the NCAA postseason tournament each year. We identify the postseason tournament bans using a dummy variable equal to one if a school received an NCAA tournament ban during the postseason. A basketball tournament ban occurs when an athletics program at a university egregiously violates one or more of the rules outlined in the NCAA Division I Manual (NCAA rules). During the 14-year period of our study, only nine Division I men's basketball postseason tournament bans occurred. In our analysis, we focus on only eight of the bans and exclude Baylor University from our analysis.[2] The schools sanctioned with postseason tournament bans are listed in Table 1 along with the year of the ban as well as the rule violation. Although only a few universities received postseason tournament bans in men's basketball, the following section demonstrates that the impact of athletic malfeasance leading to a postseason tournament ban can be quite detrimental for these institutions.

Table 1. List of NCAA Men's Basketball Tournament Bans.

University	Year of Ban	Reason for Ban
New Mexico State University	2001	Academic fraud, unethical conduct, recruiting violations. Self-imposed
University of Nevada Las Vegas	2001	Improper recruiting inducements, extra benefits, unethical conduct, and failure to monitor. NOT self-imposed ban
University of Michigan	2002	Improper benefits, gambling. Self-imposed ban
Fresno State University	2003	Academic fraud. Self-imposed ban
University of Georgia	2003	Academic fraud, unethical conduct, and improper benefits. Self-imposed ban
The Ohio State University	2005	Improper benefits, impermissible academic assistance, failure to monitor. Self-imposed ban
Fresno State University	2006	Recruiting violations. Self-imposed ban
University of Southern California	2010	Improper benefits. Self-imposed ban

Note. We exclude Baylor University from our analysis. NCAA = National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Postseason tournament bans generally occur from one to several years after the NCAA has detected gross athletic malfeasance at a university. Barnhart (2012) outlined four stages that are part of a major infractions case brought by the NCAA against a university. The first stage involves investigating the infraction, the second is charging the athletic program, the third is a hearing conducted by the NCAA Committee of Infractions (COI), and finally a deliberation phase during which the COI can impose sanctions. The types of malfeasance that are considered major infractions that have led to tournament bans include academic fraud, improper payments to student athletes, recruitment violations, and loss of institutional control. Since the detection, and normally the publication, of the alleged athletic impropriety occurs before the imposition of the sanction, we include two lead variables in our analysis to measure the influence of the detected malfeasance on both the quality and quantity of students at a university that might occur before the ban is officially implemented. We find, however, no significant effects 2 years before the ban but do find significant results 1 year before the ban. We also include two

lag variables after the ban to measure if the detected malfeasance has a lasting effect on the university.

To control for team quality, we include the win percentage along with the postseason tournament ban data statistics as our independent variables. For our dependent variables, we use data from the NCAA and the Peterson Undergraduate Data Set, which provides our measure of both male and female freshman applications, admissions, and enrollment. We also examine the student quality at these universities by the percentage of the incoming freshman class that were in the top 10% and top 25% of their high school class, mean SAT score, as well as the high school grade point average (GPA) of the incoming freshman class.

Using a fixed effect regression technique to control for differences between universities and differences over time, we analyze how gross athletic malfeasance leading to an NCAA men's basketball tournament ban, or a self-imposed tournament ban, influences applications, admissions, and enrollment as well as the quality of students enrolled at these schools. The university fixed effect controls for all university characteristics that are time invariant including whether the school is religious, private, or public. Given the small number of postseason bans, we are unable to split our sample into private and public schools. The year fixed effects control for changing demographics of students and macroeconomic conditions that change over time. In addition, we do not include control variables for university quality that changes over time as our hypothesis suggests that the athletic malfeasances serve as a signal for university quality.[3]

The model we estimate is:

$$Y_{it} = \beta_1 \text{lead2Ban} + \beta_2 \text{leadBan} + \beta_3 \text{Ban} + \beta_4 \text{lagBan} + \beta_5 \text{lag2Ban} + B_i \text{University} + B_t \text{Year} + \varepsilon.$$

We include only two lags because preliminary analysis finds there are no statistically significant effects 3 years after the ban is implemented.

We report the means and standard deviation of both the dependent and independent variables in Table 2. The average basketball win percentage at the schools studied was .562 that is higher than .500 because we focus only on the top conferences in the NCAA (who often play schools in smaller conferences not included in the data set). The average number of student applications at these schools were 6,360 men and 7,086 women. The average number of freshman admitted were 3,644 males and 4,275 females, and the average number of freshman enrolled were 1,554 males and 1,716 females. To account for differences in size between the universities in our analysis, we log the number of applications, admissions, and enrollment. In terms of measuring student quality, we find that 34% of freshman enrolled came from the top 10% of their high school class and 58% of freshman from the top 25% of their high school class. We also find that the mean GPA of enrolled freshman was 2.57.

Table 2. Means.

Independent Variables	Mean (Standard Deviation)
Basketball win percentage	.562 (.168)
Basketball tournament bans	.0055 (.074)
Dependent Variables	
Male application	6,360 (4,328)
Female application	7,086 (4,890)
Male admissions	3,644 (2,231)
Female admissions	4,275 (2,586)
Male enrollment	1,554 (814)
Female enrollment	1,716 (893)
Top 10% high school	34% (25)
Top 25% high school	58% (27)
Grade point average high school	2.57 (1.53)

Note. Colleges = 118 years = 13.

We report our results of basketball tournament bans on students in Tables 3 –5. In Table 3, we report the influence of athletic impropriety leading to a tournament ban on male applications, admittance, and enrollment. To help clarify our results, we convert the coefficient on the log variable to a percentage using the formula 100[exp(β) − 1], where β is the coefficient on the relevant dummy variable.

Table 3. Influence of Tournament Basketball Bans on Males.

	Log Male Applications	Log Male Admissions	Log Male Enrollment
Basketball win percentage	−.013 (.029)	−.002 .026	.017 (.021)
Lead2: Tournament ban	−.055 (.072)	−.096 (.064)	-.054 (.053)

	Log Male Applications	Log Male Admissions	Log Male Enrollment
Lead: Tournament ban	.024 (.042)	-.048 (.051)	−.084** (.042)
Tournament ban	.056 (.053)	−.052 (048)	−.061 (.039)
Lag: Tournament ban	.127** (.049)	.090** (.043)	.066* (.036)
Lag2: Tournament ban	.031 (.049)	.080* (.043)	.022 (.036)
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Time fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2			
Within	.574	.453	.254
Between	.012	.000	.014
Overall	.034	.021	.011
F test	86.57**	53.27**	22.12**

Note. Schools = 118 years = 13.

*Significant at the 90% level. **Significant at the 95% level.

Table 4. Influence of Tournament Basketball Bans on Females.

	Log Female Applications	Log Female Admissions	Log Female Enrollment
Basketball win percentage	−.025 (.030)	−.033 (.026)	−.001 (.021)
Lead2: Tournament ban	−.047 (.074)	−.069 (.065)	−.067 (.054)
Lead: Tournament ban	.033 (.060)	−.015 (.052)	−.076* (.043)
Tournament ban	.014 (.055)	−.072 (.049)	−.049 (.040)
Lag: Tournament ban	.095* (.051)	.043 (.044)	.081** (.037)
Lag2: Tournament ban	−.003 (.050)	.056 (.044)	.024 (036)
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Log Female Applications	Log Female Admissions	Log Female Enrollment
Time fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2			
Within	.551	.410	.184
Between	.000	.003	.000
Overall	.036	.014	.004
F test	78.62**	44.06**	14.65**

Note. Schools = 118 years = 13.

*Significant at the 90% level. **Significant at the 95% level.

Table 5. Influence of Tournament Basketball Bans on Student Quality.

	Percent of Freshman Top 10% High School	Percent of Freshman Top 25% High School	Freshman High School Grade Point Average	Mean SAT Score
Basketball win percentage	1.24 (2.11)	2.47 (3.43)	.036 (.196)	−26.87 (58.05)
Lead2: Tournament ban	3.92 (5.33)	3.82 (8.62)	.124 .494)	42.02 (145.91)
Lead: Tournament ban	−1.48 (3.90)	−2.92 (6.31)	.170 (.361)	.65.05 (106.74)
Tournament ban	−16.12** (3.95)	−21.20** (6.41)	−.570 (.367)	47.04 (108.45)
Lag: Tournament ban	−7.88** (3.63)	−7.05 (5.88)	−.562* (.337)	−13.57 (99.53)
Lag2: Tournament ban	−6.92** (3.57)	−6.67 (5.78)	−.626* (.331)	−33.44 (97.86)
School fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Percent of Freshman Top 10% High School	Percent of Freshman Top 25% High School	Freshman High School Grade Point Average	Mean SAT Score
Time fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2				
Within	.066	.052	.019	.051
Between	.011	.042	.012	.000
Overall	.013	.027	.001	.014
F test	4.67**	3.68**	2.90**	3.55**

Note. Schools = 118 years = 13.

*Significant at the 90% level. **Significant at the 95% level.

Our results show that postseason basketball bans have no influence on male applications before or during the ban, and male applications actually increase by 14% the year after the ban. Our results suggest that prospective students see the acceptance of a postseason tournament ban as "wiping the slate clean" after the punishment has been served. A postseason tournament ban also increases male admittance to a university by 9% 1 year after the ban and 8% 2 years after the ban. However, the ban serves to lower male enrollment by 8% the year before the ban and increases enrollment by 7% the year after the ban.

Our results demonstrate that athletic malfeasance, which ultimately leads to a postseason tournament ban in men's basketball, significantly decreases the number of male enrollees at the sanctioned university the year after the ban is implemented; however, that number then rebounds the year after ban has ended. Our analysis suggests that when a school is banned from a postseason tournament, they receive no national exposure from participating in the event and indeed may receive negative exposure as commentators and other sportswriter mention that the school is missing from the tournament.[4]

In Table 4, we report the influence of NCAA postseason tournament bans on female applications, acceptance rates, and enrollment. For females, we find that athletic malfeasance culminating in a postseason tournament ban also increases female applications by 10% after the ban ended. We find no significant effect on the number of female admittances to a university either before or after the ban. Lastly, a postseason tournament ban lowers female enrollment 7% the year before the ban but that number also increased by 8% the year after the ban ended.

Our results suggest that athletic malfeasance as measured by a postseason tournament ban in men's basketball reduces female freshman enrollment at a sanctioned university the year preceding the ban, but that number then rebounds the year following the ban's conclusion.

In Table 5, we report the results of how a postseason men's basketball ban can affect the quality of freshman enrolled at a university. Our results show that athletic malfeasance leading to a postseason tournament ban lowers the number of enrolled students from the top 10% of their high school class by 16% in the year of the ban, 8% the year after the ban, and 7% 2 years after the ban. We also find that bans lower the number of enrolled students from the top 25% of their high school class by 21% the year of the ban. Lastly, in terms of student quality, we find that bans lower the incoming freshman's average high school GPA by .56 1 year after the ban and .63 2 years after the ban. However, we find no significant effect on mean SAT score either before or after the ban. Unlike the results pertaining to the quantity of students, where the influence of the malfeasance occurred before the tournament ban, the influence of athletic malfeasance appears to have a lasting effect on student quality in the years after the postseason ban occurs. Our results are consistent with the supposition that prospective students use athletics as a signal for university quality. Given that high academically achieving students are sought after by many universities, the detected malfeasance of an infracting sports program could serve as a signal to these students to select another university given their large choice set of universities available.

Overall, our results indicate that gross malfeasance in a men's basketball program that leads to a postseason tournament ban lowers both the quantity and quality of male and female students enrolling in the school, with a more lasting influence on student quality. Our results suggest that high-achieving students do indeed utilize athletic malfeasances as a signal regarding the quality of the university.

Discussion and Conclusion

In their article, "The National Collegiate Athletic Association Cartel: Why It Exists, How It Works, and What It Does," Sanderson and Siegfried (2018) posit the question:

> How have over 100 of the top 128 athletics departments persuaded their university presidents and trustees to continue devoting scarce general funding to intercollegiate sports? When these institutions incur financial losses on athletics, universities seem to double down, spending even more on salaries for coaches, and improving physical facilities, rather than viewing losses as a signal to redeploy assets and efforts.

Sanderson and Siegfried (2018) offer three answers to the above question: First, intercollegiate athletics might attract greater appropriations from state legislators; second, intercollegiate athletics

may boost private donations; and third, high-profile sports programs, like other campus amenities, may attract more applicants and thus additional enrollment (or allow the school to increase the quality of applicants accepted). Using Peterson's Undergraduate Data Set, coupled with NCAA's data on men's basketball wins, losses, and tournament bans, we empirically address the impact of athletic malfeasance, as measured by tournament bans, on the quantity and quality of student applications, admissions, and enrollment. We indeed find that athletics matters to both the quantity and quality of students the university attracts.

The results of our study demonstrate that athletic malfeasance leading to an NCAA postseason tournament ban in men's basketball leads to a significant reduction in both the quantity and quality of students opting to attend the sanctioned university. Given the negative media attention surrounding a postseason tournament ban, these events may serve as a signal to prospective students regarding the overall quality of the university, which in turn could lead the most qualified students to seek other institutions of higher learning. Our results show that malfeasance has a significant impact on nonathlete students and the university as a whole. If collegiate athletics departments abuse NCAA basketball regulations, the result can be a decrease in more academically achieving students attending the university. Ultimately, our study demonstrates that university athletics are indeed the front porch to a university leading students to the door to enroll.

Authors' Note

Any mistakes are authors' own.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The research in this article was funded by the Lee Barnes Benefaction for Learning Enhancement and Enrichment Fund.

Footnotes

1. Although there are more than 300 schools that can qualify for the men's basketball tournament, these schools represent the schools with the largest athletic budgets and most of the tournament bids. FBS (formally D1-A) are included in this data set, whereas Football Championship Subdivision (FCS) (formally D1-AA, smaller football schools) and No Football Subdivison (NFS) (formerly D1-AAA

(formally D1-AA, smaller football schools) and No Football Subdivison (NFS) (formerly D1-AAA, nonfootball schools) are not included in these data.

GO TO FOOTNOTE

2. We exclude Baylor University from our analysis because Baylor was banned from tournament play after a former player murdered a teammate in 2003 (https://www.seattletimes.com/sports/briefs-ncaa-bans-baylor-from-playing-nonconference-basketball-games/). In addition, this was the first time the NCAA instituted a ban on regular season nonconference basketball games. Therefore, Baylor was also barred from playing any nonconference games for the 2005-2006 season. When Baylor is included in our analysis, we find that it is an outlier and changes our results. We find that no other banned schools were outliers.

GO TO FOOTNOTE

3. As a robustness check and to test for potential omitted variable bias, we included university endowment as a control variable and the results were essentially the same.

GO TO FOOTNOTE

4. Future research might want to address how schools that participate in the tournament differ from schools that fail to make the tournament.

GO TO FOOTNOTE

References

Baade R. A., Sundberg J. O. (1996). Fourth down and gold to go? Assessing the link between athletics and alumni giving. *Social Science Quarterly*, 77, 789–803.

GO TO REFERENCE

ISI

Google Scholar

Barnhart B. (2012). *Demystifying the NCAA enforcement and investigation process*. American Bar Association-Young Lawyers Division, Annual Meetings, August 3. Chicago, IL.

GO TO REFERENCE

Google Scholar

Caudill S. B., Hourican S., Mixon F. G. (2018). Does college football impact the size of university applicant pools and the quality of entering students? *Applied Economics*, 50, 1885–1890.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Chressanthis G. A., Grimes P. W. (1993). Intercollegiate sports success and first-year student enrollment demand. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 286–300.

+ SHOW REFERENCES

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Chung D. J. (2013). The dynamic advertising effect of collegiate athletics. *Marketing Science*, 32, 679–698.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Fisher B. (2009). Athletics success and institutional rankings. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 148, 45–53.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Groothuis P. A., Eggers A. F., Redding P. T. (2019). The impact of NCAA men's basketball probations on the quantity and quality of student applications and enrollment. *Applied Economic Letters*, 26(8).

+ SHOW REFERENCES

Crossref

Google Scholar

Hernandez-Julian R., Rotthoff K. W. (2014). The impact of college football on academic achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 43, 141–147.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Humphreys B. R. (2006). The relationship between big-time college football and state appropriations for higher education. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 1, 119–128.

GO TO REFERENCE

ISI

Google Scholar

Jacob B., McCall B., Stange K. (2018). College as country club: Do colleges cater to students' preferences for consumption? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 36, 309–348.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Jones A. (2009). Athletics, applications, and yields. *College and University*, 85, 10.

GO TO REFERENCE

Google Scholar

Lindo J. M., Siminski P., Swensen I. D. (2018). College party culture and sexual assault. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 10, 236–265.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Lindo J. M., Swensen I. D., Waddell G. R. (2012). Are big-time sports a threat to student achievement? *American Economic Journal of Applied Economics*, 4, 254–274.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

McCormick R. E., Tinsley M. (1987). Athletics versus academics? Evidence from SAT scores. *Journal of Political Economy*, 95, 1103–1116.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

McEvoy C. (2005). The relationship between dramatic changes in team performance and undergraduate admissions applications. *The SMART Journal*, 2, 17–24.

GO TO REFERENCE

Google Scholar

Mixon F. G., Trevino L. J. (2005). From kickoff to commencement: The positive role of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. *Economics of Education Review*, 24, 97–102.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Mixon F. G. Jr, Trevino L. J., Minto T. C. (2004). Touchdowns and test scores: Exploring the relationship between athletics and academics. *Applied Economics Letters*, 11, 421–424.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Mulholland S. E., Tomic A. S., Sholander S. N. (2014). The faculty Flutie factor: Does football performance affect a university's US News and World Report peer assessment score? *Economics of Education Review*, 43, 79–90.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Murphy R. G., Trandel G. A. (1994). The relation between a university's football record and the size of its applicant pool. *Economics of Education Review*, 13, 265–270.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Pope D. G., Pope J. C. (2009). The impact of college sports success on the quantity and quality of student applications. *Southern Economic Journal*, 75, 750–780.

GO TO REFERENCE

ISI

Google Scholar

Pope D. G., Pope J. C. (2014). Understanding college application decisions why college sports success matters. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 15, 107–131.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Sanderson A. R., Siegfried J. J. (2018). The national collegiate athletic association cartel: Why it exists, how it works, and what it does. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 52, 185–209.

+ SHOW REFERENCES

Crossref

Google Scholar

Segura J., Willner J. (2018). The game is good at the top. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 19, 645–676.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Smith D. (2008). Big-time college basketball and the advertising effect does success really matter? *Journal of Sports Economics*, 9, 387–406.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Smith D. (2009). College football and student quality: An advertising effect or culture and tradition? *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 68, 553–580.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Smith D. (2015). It pays to bend the rules: The consequences of NCAA athletic sanctions. *Sociological Perspectives*, 58, 97–119.

+ SHOW REFERENCES

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Toma J., Cross M. (1998). Intercollegiate athletics and student college choice: Exploring the impact of championship seasons on undergraduate applications. *Research in Higher Education*, 39, 633–661.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

ISI

Google Scholar

Tucker I. B., Amato L. T. (2006, November). A reinvestigation of the relationship between big-time basketball success and average SAT scores. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 7, 428–440.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

White D. R., Cowan B. W., Wooten J. (2019). March madness: NCAA tournament participation and college alcohol use. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 37(3), 449–461.

GO TO REFERENCE

Crossref

Google Scholar

Biographies

Austin F. Eggers is an assistant professor in the Department of Finance, Banking and Insurance in the Walker College of Business at Appalachian State University. His interest is in legal studies including malfeasance in university athletics.

Peter A. Groothuis is a professor in the Department of Economics in the Walker College of Business at Appalachian State University. His research interests are in labor market applications in sports economics and stated preference applications in environmental economics.

Parker Redding was a student in the Department of Economics in the Walker College of Business and Appalachian State University during the time of the research. He is currently enrolled at Michigan State University College of Law.

Kurt W. Rotthoff is a professor of economics and finance at the Stillman School of Business at Seton Hall University. His research interests are financial economics, industrial organization, economics of education, and economics and finance in sports.

Michael Solimini is a graduate of the Stillman School of Business with a degree in accounting and economics. He is currently an assurance associate at PwC.

Related content

Similar articles:

Restricted access

Big-Time College Basketball and the Advertising Effect: Does Success Really Matter?

Show details

Restricted access

The “Cinderella Effect”: The Value of Unexpected March Madness Runs as Advertising for the Schools

Show details

Restricted access

Does Intercollegiate Athletics Draw Local Students to a University?

Show details

View more

Sage recommends:

SAGE Knowledge
Case

The Decision by Western Kentucky University to Transition to NCAA Division I Athletics and the Football Bowl Subdivision

Show details

CQ Researcher
Report

College Sports

Show details

CQ Researcher
Report

Paying College Athletes

Show details

View more

Also from Sage

CQ Library

Elevating debate

Sage Data

Uncovering insight

Sage Business Cases

Shaping futures

Sage Campus

Unleashing potential

Sage Knowledge

Multimedia learning resources

Sage Research Methods

Supercharging research

Sage Video

Streaming knowledge

Technology from Sage

Library digital services

We value your privacy We and our partners store and/or access information on a device, such as cookies and process personal data, such as unique identifiers and standard information sent by a device for personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development. With your permission we and our partners may use precise geolocation data and identification through device scanning. You may click to consent to our and our 1438 partners' processing as described above. Alternatively you may click to refuse to consent or access more detailed information and change your preferences before consenting. Please note that some processing of your personal data may not require your consent, but you have a right to object to such processing. Your preferences will apply to this website only. You can change your preferences or withdraw your consent at any time by returning to this site and clicking the "Privacy" button at the bottom of the webpage.