

St. John Fisher College

## Fisher Digital Publications

---

Sport Management Undergraduate

Sport Management Department

---

Spring 5-1-2014

# The Financial Gap Between Athletic Scholarships and Athlete Expenses

Marykate Edmunds  
mkedmunds@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: [https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport\\_undergrad](https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad)



Part of the Sports Management Commons

## [How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Edmunds, Marykate, "The Financial Gap Between Athletic Scholarships and Athlete Expenses" (2014). *Sport Management Undergraduate*. Paper 5.

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 [https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport\\_undergrad/5](https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/sport_undergrad/5) 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](mailto:fisherpub@sjfc.edu).

---

# The Financial Gap Between Athletic Scholarships and Athlete Expenses

## Abstract

This research examined the financial gap between athletic scholarships and athlete expenditures. The literature shows that several parties feel athletes are being undercompensated for their efforts at their institutions. Therefore, this research was conducted to determine how much money athletes are actually missing out on. The population was DI football players receiving a full ride scholarship at SEC and ACC institutions. Data was collected from the College Board and the US Census Bureau to determine institution financial statistics and athlete expenditures respectively. Results showed a significant financial gap exists for all schools and that there is no significant difference of the financial gaps between conferences. This shows that athletes have to come up with thousands of dollars to get by while attending school.

## Document Type

Undergraduate Project

## Professor's Name

Dr. Dane-Staples

## Subject Categories

Sports Management

The Financial Gap Between Athletic Scholarships and Athlete Expenses  
Marykate Edmunds  
St. John Fisher College

**Abstract**

This research examined the financial gap between athletic scholarships and athlete expenditures. The literature shows that several parties feel athletes are being undercompensated for their efforts at their institutions. Therefore, this research was conducted to determine how much money athletes are actually missing out on. The population was DI football players receiving a full ride scholarship at SEC and ACC institutions. Data was collected from the College Board and the US Census Bureau to determine institution financial statistics and athlete expenditures respectively. Results showed a significant financial gap exists for all schools and that there is no significant difference of the financial gaps between conferences. This shows that athletes have to come up with thousands of dollars to get by while attending school.

### **The Financial Gap Between Athletic Scholarships and Athlete Expenses**

One of the major deciding factors when picking what college you want to attend is how expensive it is. More importantly, how much debt are you going to be in at the end? With college tuition rising on a year-to-year basis, making that ultimate decision seems to be getting more difficult. Teenagers are usually faced with the dilemma of picking the school they want to go to versus picking the school that they can go to. One way to make the financial decision easier is to qualify for scholarships. Scholarships are that prized possession of any potential college student and when it comes down to it, often determines where one goes to school.

The biggest scholarships are the ones offered by colleges and come in the form of either academics or athletics. Athletic scholarships are the dream of all high school athletes. If you get offered one of these prized scholarships, that means that you are one of the best and that someone wants you to come play for them. What's even more impressive is if you can be one of the few athletes that get's offered a full-tuition scholarship. If you are offered one of these scholarships, the first reaction is that you are now debt free after college any sort of debt is now non-existent. However, even if you are debt free, that doesn't mean money is no longer a problem.

The NCAA bylaws are put into place to ensure that athletes remain amateurs while attending a member institution. As the bylaws are written right now, athletes are not allowed to receive any sort of compensation while at school except for their scholarships (Clavio, Kaburakis, Pierce, Walsh, & Lawrence, 2013). Even though athletic scholarships may seem like a salary, athletes never actually see any of that money. Many people believe that the NCAA should be giving athletes compensation on top of their athletic scholarship to cover name usage and likeness in video games and on jerseys. Especially since the institutions they attend make

approximately \$35 million a year, so it seems feasible for athletes to receive a stipend for these things. Athletes also agree that they are not being fully compensated for the use of their name during their tenure at school (Clavio et al., 2013). However, the NCAA would quickly suspend an athlete from the league if they received any money besides for their approved scholarship.

These scholarships are supposed to be enough money to reward an athlete for their talent, but not so much that they could no longer be considered an amateur. Only the best players on a team will receive what is considered a “full ride”. According to Bylaw 15.02.5, these scholarships cover, “tuition and fees, room and board, and required course-related books” (NCAA Publications, 2013, 193). Even if teams choose to only give “full rides” to the best players, all FBS schools are allowed to give out 85 “full rides” per year (NCAA Publications, 2013). It is important to remember that just because teams are allowed this many scholarships, it doesn’t mean they have the money, or the want, to give out 85 full scholarships. The athletes that do receive these scholarships, however, are lucky enough to be free of *academic* expenses while at school.

Even if athletes are receiving tuition, room and board, and book fees, it is unclear if full scholarships are enough to rid them of all expenses incurred while at school. While there are several items covered through a “full ride”, athletes still have several expenses, such as transportation costs, food away from school, and alcohol that aren’t covered (US Census Bureau, 2011). The purpose of this research is to determine if there is financial gap between full scholarships and athletes’ expenses. If this gap exists, this could be very important information for recruiters, recruits, and the NCAA. Recruiters will be able to see what they actually offer when competing with other schools for one recruit. Likewise, recruits will be able to see which school is the best financial decision for them. This is also important for the NCAA because if this

gap exists it could possibly explain the reason for amateurism violations involving athletes accepting illegal payments.

## **Literature Review**

### **Amateurism Bylaws**

Most of the research will be based off of the NCAA and how it defines amateurism. Currently, the NCAA first defines amateurism under Bylaw 2. Bylaw 2.9 explains that the purpose of athletes playing college athletics is to remain amateurs and to be motivated by education and athletics (NCAA Publications, 2013). It also states that the purpose of amateurism is to protect student-athletes from being exploited by professional leagues (NCAA Publications, 2013). Bylaw 12.1.2 states, “Amateur status is lost if the student-athlete uses athletics skill for pay” (Clavio et al., 2013, p. 297). Pay is further defined in Bylaw 12.1.2.1 as salary, gratuity or compensation, division or split of surplus, educational expenses, expenses, awards and benefits, and several more (NCAA Publications, 2013).

The rest of Bylaw 12 essentially gives players’ consent to their naming rights. The NCAA gives consent for an athlete’s name to be used when it is for charity or educational purposes and also if it is being used for any NCAA event (Clavio et al., 2013; NCAA Publications, 2013). Also anything with name likeness of the group can be used and sold at the college or anywhere the college has approved. This means that if the college approves the usage of a picture of one of its teams, their names can be used as well. However, this can only occur with an entire team, not an individual. When the school uses an athlete’s name individually for a product without the athlete’s consent it is considered illegal. Bylaw 12 also states that athletes cannot receive any compensation for their name usage, unknown use of their name is on the

institution to take care of, and an athlete's eligibility depends on how well they follow the rules (Clavio et al., 2013).

### **Fighting the NCAA**

Since the NCAA bylaws are so strict when it comes to amateurism, it is very difficult to see athletes receiving compensation for their efforts while amateurism is still being enforced. The literature shows that scholars have thought this problem through and have come up with hypothetical defenses in a court case that would ultimately end in compensation for the players. There have also been real court cases in which athletes have fought the NCAA in order to get what they think they deserve.

There is an ongoing question of whether a player's likeness in a video game violates the student's rights or not and if it should be brought to court. The key aspects of these cases would be whether the NCAA is in the wrong by violating the student's rights or if the student has given up their rights when they agreed to participate in a sport sponsored by the NCAA. Student athletes have thought about using the argument that their student rights were violated after their tenure when their eligibility expires, stating "their consent does not extend beyond [that] point", but haven't actually put this plan into action (Clavio et al., 2013, p. 297). This means that former student-athletes believe that their consent to their name and likeness usage in NCAA sponsored video games, expires once they graduate. However, their appearance in the video game doesn't stop and they still aren't receiving compensation. Since their consent has expired, but the video game is still being played, players think they could have a potential court case (Clavio et al., 2013).

It has also been determined that if student-athletes were willing, they could file a suit against the NCAA for violating Sherman-Anti Trust Laws (Goodwin, 2013). The NCAA is

illegally restricting student-athletes by capping the amount they can receive through their scholarship based off Section 1 of the Sherman Act (Goodwin, 2013). This part of the act states that “horizontal price-fixing” is illegal because it essentially creates a monopoly by controlling aspects of its organization that should be left up to its members (Goodwin, 2013). Both of these arguments are believed to be winning arguments in a hypothetical court case against the NCAA if students wanted to fight that they are being undercompensated.

Although the above arguments aren't guaranteed success, the following argument, put forth by Clavio et al., would not be successful if used in a hypothetical court case against the NCAA (2013). If a student tries to fight that they have no prior knowledge of the amateurism bylaws, the NCAA can simply defend that the student was asked to sign a consent form at the beginning of the athlete's tenure. If the athlete didn't receive this form, that's the institution's fault, not the NCAA (Clavio et al., 2013). The NCAA can also defend itself through “amateurism” and “competitive balance” (Goodwin, 2013). They simply defend that they are making the distinction between collegiate sports and professional sports through amateurism. The “competitive balance” argument defends “horizontal price-fixing” by fighting that it creates competition between member institutions, which increases interest in collegiate athletics (Goodwin, 2013).

There have been some known cases using the antitrust argument, but they usually fall in the NCAA's favor. This happens because the courts are also trying to protect amateurism (Goodwin, 2013). In *McCormack v. NCAA*, the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled in favor of the NCAA who used amateurism as a defense in their sanctions against Southern Methodist University (Goodwin, 2013). SMU was illegally paying their players and received the death penalty, starting the quick demise of their program (Perez, 2012). The NCAA was under fire for

the severity of the sanctions against SMU, but won the case because they protected amateurism (Goodwin, 2013). In 2006, *White v. NCAA*, the plaintiffs argued that they were not being paid the full cost of attending their institutions, carefully designing their argument to avoid any possibility of the NCAA fighting back with amateurism (Goodwin, 2013). *White* believed that by arguing against insufficient scholarships instead of an extra stipend, they would be able to avoid the amateurism defense. The result of this case is further explained in the follow section.

### **Amateurism Violations**

When athletes accept illegal gifts or money while at school they violate the rules of amateurism that explain athletes are not allowed to receive any form of compensation. This places a burden on the institution, because everyone on the team suffers and sometimes the entire athletic department. Teams are usually vacated of wins that were achieved with the help of the specific player. Once the school is given a bad reputation through this player, they lose out on valuable assets like recruits and donations. It seems that these violations could be a breach of loyalty to the institution. Adler and Adler have shown through research that the loyalty to a collegiate institution is strong (1988). Their research on this topic was about the loyalty people, in most cases student-athletes, have to their institution (Adler & Adler, 1988). It doesn't always go unnoticed when athletes and athletic departments violate amateurism bylaws. However, how violations are discovered and how sanctions are determined isn't always figured out in the same way for every institution.

Since it is often too difficult to directly discover a cheating scandal, the NCAA focuses on winning percentages (Fleisher, Shugart, & Tollison, 1988). Meaning, the schools who win more are the ones who will be looked at more. By using winning percentages the NCAA is more likely to crack down on successful schools as they have more to lose (Fleisher et al., 1988). This

shows that the NCAA is more concerned with successful schools because it seems that these institutions are the best at what they do. Since they are the best, it is likely-from the point-of-view of the NCAA-they are doing something illegal to get that success. Branch Jr. claims that “at any given time one can find some 25 Division 1-A athletic programs under NCAA sanctions” (1990, p. 163). However, the majority of things found at these institutions are minor recruiting infractions that everyone across the board is committing. This is also hard for institutions because success usually means more money for the college. Humphreys and Mondello (2007) explain their research on what post-season appearances and wins can do for an institution. Their research suggests that with the increased success there will be a direct relation to increased donations. However, it is important to realize that there are few other factors, such as reputation, mission, and geographic location, that also determine donations (Humphreys & Mondello, 2007). So, if a college does well they are under heat from the NCAA, but if college does poorly, they are under heat from boosters. This lose-lose situation creates the opportunity for NCAA member institutions to make bad decisions, which can in the end destroy their programs. However, sometimes it is the athlete that destroys an institution when laws of amateurism are violated.

### **Financial Gap**

To understand the financial gap that this research is looking into, it is important to realize the basics of some of these finances. Schools are investing a lot of money to make sure they are successful; success can be determined by a number of factors, one of which is the Director’s Cup. The Director’s Cup is a yearly award given to the best overall institution. This means that that have had great success in the most sports, not just a national championship in one sport (NACDA, 2011). Within the existing research is an article with the purpose of deciding what the major factors of success was when it comes to the Directors’ Cup (Lawrence, Regas, &

Kander, 2012). The variables that were considered factors were total expenses per team for women of all sports, total expenses not allocated by gender/sport, and average annual institutional salary. It was found that the more money invested would produce a higher standing in the Directors' Cup, but it had to be invested in the correct manor (Lawrence et al., 2012). This means that schools need to find the best possible investments for the money they have.

Part of the money being invested is in scholarships, but the question remains if this money covers an athlete's expenses? Athletes do not receive compensation for their play as to not violate amateurism, but they can receive scholarships to help with their tuition costs. While scholarships are a form of compensation, there are strict limits as to the amount. This means that athletes are receiving a specified amount for their full scholarship determined by the institution. The point of these "full rides" is to rid an athlete of all expenses while at school so they can focus on their academics and athletics. However, athletes still incur expenses while at school that their scholarship is not covering, which creates this financial gap. Furthermore, the lack of compensation could explain the reasoning behind players accepting gifts on this side. It has already been determined that 76.6% of student-athletes believe that their scholarship money covers the majority of their costs at school (Clavio et al., 2013).

As further research was done on this topic, students were surveyed and asked how they feel about their scholarship and what it covers (Clavio et al., 2013). Sixty-four percent of student athletes either answered, "strongly agree" or "agree" when asked if they should receive additional compensation for their likeness in video games (Clavio et al., 2013). Approximately 43% of the same population either answered, "disagree" or "strongly disagree" when asked if they thought their scholarship was sufficient compensation for the use of their name (Clavio et al., 2013).

Before moving onto the implications of *White v. NCAA*, it is necessary to revisit the purpose of this research. The basis of this research relies on NCAA amateurism bylaws that restrict athletes from receiving compensation for their efforts on the institution. Consequently, these bylaws make it so athletes cannot accept any money for their name and likeness usage in video games. Athletes feel that they these bylaws are restricting them unlawfully and that the NCAA owes them compensation. However, the NCAA wants to maintain the idea of amateurism and therefore will not pay their student-athletes. One way to make both the NCAA and the athletes happy is to cover the gap that is created between the amount of money an athlete receives for a “full ride” and the amount of money an athlete actually spends while at school.

In 2006 this gap was recognized by several former basketball and football players that feel the same as those athletes polled in Clavio et al.’s research (Goodwin, 2013). In the case *White v. NCAA*, they fought that they were not fully compensated for the cost of attendance at their institution (Goodwin, 2013). The NCAA was unable to argue that covering the full cost of attendance would be a violation of amateurism bylaws and created the MEA as a result to try and fix this problem. The “Miscellaneous Expense Allowance attempted to fill the gap in student-athletes’ financial aid that served as the basis for the complaint filed in 2006 in *White v. NCAA*” (Goodwin, 2013, 1301). The MEA did not achieve its goal of covering the gap between an athlete’s scholarship and actual tuition costs, as it only raised the scholarship cap, it didn’t actually fix the issue brought up by *White* (Goodwin, 2013). This case is very important to this study because it shows that this financial gap has been recognized in the past. However, the financial gap argued in this case only fought the difference between scholarship amount and cost of attendance. This research will further show how scholarships do not cover out-of-school expenses as well.

### **Athlete Compensation**

Some people believe that an athletic scholarship is no longer enough to fully compensate a football or basketball player for the revenue they bring into the school (Schroder, 2013). A common argument when talking about college athletics is whether or not athletes should receive compensation for naming rights; for example, in video games or jersey sales (Clavio et al., 2013). Past research has discovered a gamer's ability to identify a college player in the NCAA football video game created by EA Sports. It was found that college players are recognizable in these games by those who play the video game. They are being recognized because of the similarity in their physical attributes shown in the video games. There is a similar body type being portrayed through these avatars. It gives their height, weight, position, number, and team. It doesn't take much to figure out who the athlete is with all that information if the gamer follows college football. It was also discussed whether or not players should receive compensation on top of their scholarship for their representation in video games (Clavio et al., 2013). A similar article also focused on the player identification rate in the NCAA football video game (Kaburakis, Pierce, Cianfrone, & Paule, 2012). This identification was measured through research participants, not student-athletes. The researchers wanted to know if a position and number on the avatar's jersey was enough to identify a player. For example, it could say QB #3, indicating for a specific team, their position is quarter back and they wear number three. For the major marquee players like Tim Tebow, Sam Bradford, and Colt McCoy, their identification rate was over 72%. However, the overall rate for marquee players was 50%, which is considered high enough to fight in a court case, if a player decided to get the law involved (Kaburakis et al., 2012).

Some more information on this same topic includes the point of view of student athletes, focusing mainly on football players at the Division I level (Kaburakis et al., 2012). It dug into how they feel about their names being used in video games and not receiving compensation. Twenty-five percent of respondents in this case believed that athletes should be compensated for their usage in these games and 10% of the same group thought that the athletes were being compensated (Kaburakis et al., 2012). Another article found is about other people's opinions on paying student athletes. It compares and contrasts these opinions about paying student athletes. It was found that a lot of people would support the payment of student-athletes but based off of age, sex, and level of education. It was also found that African Americans were more likely to support athlete payments than Caucasians (Mondello, Piquero, & Piquero, 2012).

The main issue here is that players are clearly identifiable to those familiar with college football, especially the most popular players. However, the NCAA suggests that since there is no use of the player's name there is not a violation of the student's rights determined by the bylaws. This game is considered to directly represent the "'real' college football world" (Kaburaki et al., 2012, p. 72) that contains unlicensed usage of NCAA football players. Athletes feel that this is not a good enough explanation and are looking to do something about it. However, fighting the NCAA is not the easiest task and many things need to be considered.

### **Theoretical/Conceptual Framework**

In this research, General Strain Theory will be used to attempt to explain why violations are occurring. Further, why athletes may feel the need to commit the act that leads to a violation. Moon, Blurton, and McCluskey state that there is "a positive relationship between strain and delinquency" (2008, p. 583); when athletes commit violations, some would call that delinquent behavior. GST explores an individual's life situations and more specifically how they react to

negative ones (Polizzi, 2011). Polizzi explains that there are three types of strain that lead to criminal behavior, which are “the negative treatment by others, the loss of something of value, and the inability to achieve specific goals” (2011, p. 1052). This research will focus more on the second two strains.

The strain “the loss of something of value” (Polizzi, 2011, p. 1052), applies to athletes when they realize that their scholarship doesn’t cover all of their expenses. When athletes are promised a “full ride”, they believe they will not have to pay anything when they’re at school. So, when they realize that their scholarship doesn’t cover everything they feel the strain of losing something of value. Once that strain is applied, they are more likely to violate NCAA bylaws. This loss of value can also be seen through the studies that show the frustration of athletes not being compensated for use of their likeness. That is something of value that they have lost, which is perhaps justifying (at least to them) the acceptance of illegal gifts to recoup some of their value lost.

The second strain, “the inability to achieve specific goals” (Polizzi, 2011, p. 1052), can also be applied to athletes in this research. This was interpreted in two different ways. The first way an athlete can experience this is, like the first strain, when they realize their scholarship doesn’t cover all that they thought. When this happens they feel as though they haven’t reached the goal they originally thought they achieved. The second way an athlete can experience this is when they are succeeding at their school but their team is not. Both of these strains will drive an athlete to accept illegal gifts.

### **Purpose Paragraph**

Amateurism bylaws clearly define an athlete’s limitations and what is needed of them to remain eligible. Unfortunately, these limitations place a strain on athlete’s financial freedom

which may encourage delinquent behavior. As athletes continue to perceive this loss of value (through naming rights, use of likeness, and jersey sales), they will attempt to recoup what they feel is owed to them. What is unclear is how much is really “owed to them”. If the NCAA wants to keep their amateurism and not allow schools to pay anything above actual costs of college attendance, the value of this actual cost needs to be determined. The goal of this research is to uncover a potential reason for athletes accepting money on the side. This will be answered by addressing the following questions:

1. Is there a gap between full-tuition athletic-scholarships and an athlete’s expenses while at school for Division 1, Football Bowl Subdivision players South Eastern Conference and Atlantic Coast Conference?
2. If yes, what is the gap?
3. To what extent is the financial gap different between SEC and ACC schools?

By asking the questions listed above, the gap between financial aid and athlete expenses can be further defined. The questions will determine if there is a better economic choice in attending a SEC school or an ACC school.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

This research was accomplished by comparing tuition and personal expenses to scholarship amount at certain institutions. This sample was made up of football players that received a “full ride” scholarship. It did not involve specific individuals, but rather specific institutions. The football teams looked at were Division I (DI), Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) schools in the South Eastern Conference (SEC) and the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC). These conferences were chosen based on their history. The SEC is considered the powerhouse

conference in DI FBS football, winning seven BCS National Championships in the last eight years (BCS Football, 2013). The ACC is always considered beneath the SEC, never winning a BCS National Championship since the game's inception in 2006 until 2014 when Florida State beat Auburn (BCS Football, 2013). Second, the conferences were picked so they could be compared. The SEC contains dream schools for any aspiring football player, whereas the ACC is considered second best. Dependent on the results of the research, the final product will show which schools offer a better financial opportunity than others. This means that even though a recruit is being offered a full ride at two different institutions, one school could be a better financial opportunity.

### **Variable/Operationalizing**

For further clarification the SEC includes Alabama, Arkansas, Auburn, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana State, Mississippi, Mississippi State, Missouri, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas A&M, and Vanderbilt (SEC, 2013). The ACC includes Boston College, Clemson, Duke, Florida State, Georgia Tech, Maryland, Miami, North Carolina, North Carolina State, Pittsburgh, Syracuse, Virginia, Virginia Tech, and Wake Forest (ACC, 2013). Notre Dame is a member of the ACC but was excluded for this study because they are independent in football (ACC, 2013). (All of these schools can be seen in Table 1)

Non-academic athlete expenditures were taken from the US Census Bureau; the items that were counted as part of living wage are "food away from home", "alcoholic beverages", "apparel and services", "transportation", "entertainment", "personal care products and services", "tobacco products and smoking supplies", and "miscellaneous" (United States Census Bureau, 2011). This list includes other items that were excluded from this research. The first item, "food at home" was excluded under the assumption that this is included in a meal plan. "Food away

from home” was included in the assumption that this includes snacks and any food bought at a restaurant or store. The second item excluded was “housing” since this is included in tuition and room and board. This was also excluded because according to NCAA Bylaw 15.2.2.1.5, a student’s scholarship can cover an apartment instead of on-campus living up to the amount of the school’s dorm-living (NCAA Publications, 2013). To make it more specific, the research found these expenditures for the specific areas in which the colleges are located. This was based off of the population of these areas.

Tuition and room and board were found through College Board. This website had information on every college in the nation and had all colleges’ financial information. The scholarship values for a “full ride” football player were also based off of the numbers found on College Board.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

To complete this research, data was collected from a few different sources. The first set of data was collected from the College Board website. The second set of data was found through the US Census Bureau’s website. This data showed how much individuals spend in a year and is used to explain an athlete’s expenditures aside from tuition and room and board. Each one of these sets of data was found for each school within the SEC and the ACC.

All of this data was collected and organized in a spreadsheet. The columns in that spreadsheet are “school”, “nickname”, “conference”, “city, state”, “population”, “full ride scholarship value”, “tuition/room and board”, “athlete expenditures”, and “financial gap”. First, “school”, “nickname”, “conference”, “city, state”, and “population” were all filled in. Next were athlete expenditures, which were found based on the population of the city that the school is located. By using the population of the city, athlete expenditures were more specified toward

each institution (These numbers can be seen in Table 2). Then collected was the tuition and room and boards for each school. This was done on the College Board website by searching for the specific school and then looking at their financial information given (This can be found on Table 3). The third value collected was the full ride scholarship value, which was also found by adding financial information given on College Board (This can be found on Table 3). All three of these values will be quantified in dollar value.

### **Data Analysis**

After collecting the data, a formula was used to determine the gap between the amount of an athlete's scholarship and how much they spend while at school. The gap was found by first combining tuition and room and board with athlete expenditures. After this value was found, it was subtracted from the amount of aid given for a full ride at that specific institution. The formula looked as follows:

Full Ride Scholarship - (Tuition/Room and Board + Athlete Expenditures) = Financial Gap.

This value was found in the financial gap column for all institutions.

After the spreadsheet was complete, all the information was transferred over to the SPSS statistics program. By entering this information into SPSS, the data could be further analyzed. The first way the data was analyzed was through descriptive statistics; this included mean, minimum, and maximum. The overall mean was found for the financial gap for all institutions as was the minimum and maximum gap. The mean was found for each conference as well. The second way the data was analyzed was through an independent t-test. This test determines differences between variables. The t-test used the financial gap as the "dependent" and the conference as the "factor". The t-test determined if there was a significant difference in the financial gaps between the conferences.

## Results

After the data collection was completed, the data was run through the equation: financial gap = full ride scholarship – (tuition/room and board + athlete expenditures). The results of this equation showed that a financial gap exists and is present for all sampled schools (the financial gap can be found in Table 4).

Descriptive statistics were run in SPSS to find out more about the financial gap and found that the average financial gap for all sampled schools where N=28, was \$14,592.46. The minimum gap for all schools was \$13,044 and maximum gap was \$15,899. As for the SEC, where N=10, the average gap found was \$14,103.80. The minimum and maximum gap for the SEC were \$13,096 and \$15,789, respectively. The overall financial gap for the ACC, where N=18, was \$14,863.94, the minimum was \$13,044, and the maximum was \$15,899 (all descriptive statistics can be found in Table 5).

An independent t-test was run to see if there was a significant difference in the financial gap between conferences. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances resulted in a "sig"-value of .490, which is greater than .05 resulting in equal variances. Due to equal variances the t-test for Equality of Means showed that p=.093, meaning that there is no significant difference in the financial gap between conferences (Please refer to Table 6).

## Conclusion

This study supported the original hypothesis by showing that a financial gap exists between a full ride scholarship and athlete expenditures at the DI FBS level in SEC and ACC schools. The average gap for all these schools was pretty high at \$14, 592.46. There wasn't much of a deviation from this number as the minimum and maximum financial gap values were different by only \$2,855. This shows that athletes have to come up with the money in some other

way when they are not legally allowed to work for it (NCCA Publications, 2013). Also, the financial gap isn't just significant for some schools in the SEC and ACC; it exists for all of them. This study also showed that there was no significant difference in the financial gaps between conferences. This means that there is no economic advantage to attending a school in either conference.

This research poses one potential threat. The categories used from the US Census Bureau were picked out by what was believed to be of relevance to this study. Some were supported by literature and others were not. If all could be supported by literature some categories might have not been used and some others might have been used. This could have impacted the outcome for the financial gap for all institutions.

The findings of this study are important because it shows that athletes truly are being put out of a large sum of money. This relates back to athletes wanting compensation on top of their scholarships. They have realized that they are missing out on a lot of money that they should be getting back based on their contribution to their institution. With the amount of money the NCAA and member institutions make, there should be an effort to put that money towards this financial gap. By just covering the financial gap, athletes would be more satisfied during their time at the institution and this could potentially decrease their fight in the pay-for-play argument.

Further studies done on this research should explore ways to cover this existing gap in ways that comply with amateurism. The financial gap that was found is significant enough that athletes should be helped out with the expense. If there was a way to have this gap compensated for while complying with amateurism bylaws that would be ideal. However, it seems that the

only way this could be done would be to change the amateurism bylaws, specifically the restrictions on athletes being able to work.

### References

- ACC (2013). *ACC schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.theacc.com/#/>.
- Adler, P. A., & Adler, P. (1988). Intense loyalty in organizations: A case study of college athletics. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(3), 401-417. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2392716>
- Auburn University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/auburn-university>
- BCS Football (2013). *All-time results*. Retrieved from <http://www.bcsfootball.org/news/story?id=4809856>
- Branch, D. J. (1990). Athletic director leader behavior as a predictor of intercollegiate athletic organizational effectiveness. *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 161-173.
- Boston College, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/boston-college>
- Clavio, G., Kaburakis, A., Pierce, D. A., Walsh, P., & Lawrence, H. (2013). College athlete representations in sports video games. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 6, 57-80. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=6&sid=72f4fdff-de76-4eeb-92f1-21886afc9dc4%40sessionmgr10&hid=20&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWwhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRl#db=s3h&AN=89521163>

Clemson University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/clemson-university>

Duke University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/duke-university>

Fleisher, A. A., Shugart, W. F., & Tollison, R. D. (1988). Crime or punishment?: Enforcement of the NCAA football cartel. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 10(4), 433-451.

Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0167268188900637>

Florida State University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/florida-state-university>

Georgia Institute of Technology, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/georgia-institute-of-technology>

Goodwin, D. N. (2013). Not quite filling the gap: why the miscellaneous expense allowance

leave the NCAA vulnerable to antitrust litigation. *Boston College Law Review*, 54(3), 1277-

1315. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D114.pdf>

Humphreys, B., & Mondello, M. (2007). Intercollegiate athletic success and donations at NCAA

Division I institutions. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 265-280.

Kaburakis, A., Pierce, D. A., Cianfrone, B. A., & Paule, A. L. (2012). Is it still “in the game”; or has amateurism left the building? NCAA student-athletes’ perceptions of commercial activity and sports video games. *Journal of Sport Management*, 26(4), 295-309. Retrieved from

<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=6&sid=72f4fdff-de76-4eeb-92f1-21886afc9dc4%40sessionmgr10&hid=20&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#db=s3h&AN=78382938>

Lawrence, H. J., Li, M., Regas, J. S., & Kander, J. (2012). National association of collegiate directors of athletics directors' cup standings: Predictors of success. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 5, 207-225. Retrieved from

<http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=5&sid=72f4fdff-de76-4eeb-92f1-218864fc9dc4%40sessionmgr10&hid=20&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZSZzY29wZT1zaXRI#db=s3h&AN=89496629>

Louisiana State University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/louisiana-state-university-and-agricultural-and-mechanical-college>

Mississippi State University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-mississippi>

Mondello, M., Piquero, A. R., & Piquero, N. L. (2012). Public perceptions on paying student athletes. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 16(1), 106-119. Retrieved

from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17430437.2012.690408#.UIH06GTwJOF>

Moon, B., Blurton, D., & McCluskey, J. D. (2008). General strain theory and delinquency:

Focusing on the influences of key strain characteristics on delinquency. *Crime &*

*Delinquency*, 54(4), 582-613. Retrieved from

<http://cad.sagepub.com.pluma.sjfc.edu/content/54/4/582.full.pdf+html>

- NACDA (2011). Learfield sports director's cup general information. Retrieved from
- NCAA (2012). *About the NCAA*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacda.com/directorscup/nacda-directorscup.html><http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/about+the+ncaa/membership+new>
- NCAA (2013). *Division I facts and figures*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/divisioni/di+facts+and+figures>
- NCAA Publications (2013). *2013-2014 Division I manual: Effective August 1, 2013* [Adobe Digital Editions version]. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/D114.pdf>
- North Carolina State University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/north-carolina-state-university>
- Paule, A. L., & Gilson, T. A. (2010). Current collegiate experiences of big-time, non-revenue, NCAA athletes. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 3(2), 333-347. Retrieved from <http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/20113168264.html;jsessionid=5C15E4CB5683677F097CCFFB5788BA47>
- Perez, A. J. (2012). Comparing PSU penalties to SMU. *Fox Sports*. Retrieved from <http://msn.foxsports.com/collegefootball/story/comparing-penn-state-ncaa-penalties-to-southern-methodist-072312>
- Polizzi, D. (2011). Agnew's general strain theory reconsidered: A phenomenological perspective. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(7), 1051-1071. Retrieved from <http://ijo.sagepub.com.pluma.sjfc.edu/content/55/7/1051.full.pdf+html>

Ridpath, B. (2013). Amateurism will die and we must be prepared. *Journal Of NCAA Compliance, Jul/Aug*, 4-5.

SEC (2013). *SEC schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.secdigitalnetwork.com/>

Schroder, E. (2011). Everyone gets paid but the players. *SportsTurf, September 2011*, 6.

Retrieved from

<http://web.a.ebscohost.com.pluma.sjfc.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=a7bda0ed-35d8-4018-9540-cf09a7618ca0%40sessionmgr4002&vid=23&hid=4106>

Sparvero, E. S., & Warner, S. (2013). The price of winning and the impact on the NCAA community. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 6, 120-142.

Syracuse University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/syracuse-university>

Texas A&M University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

[https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/texas-university?searchType=bf\\_site&q=&bf\\_cat=bf\\_](https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/texas-university?searchType=bf_site&q=&bf_cat=bf_)

Texas University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/texas-university>

United States Census Bureau. (2011). *Population size of area of residence: Average annual*

*expenditures and characteristics, Consumer Expenditure Survey, 2011*. [Data file]. Retrieved

from <http://www.bls.gov/cex/2011/Standard/population.pdf>

United States Department of Labor. (2012). *Young adults and the affordable care act: Protecting young adults and elimination burdens on businesses and families*. Retrieved from

<http://www.dol.gov/ebsa/faqs/faq-dependentcoverage.html>

University of Alabama, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-alabama>

University of Arkansas, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-arkansas>

University of Florida, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-florida>

University of Georgia, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-georgia>

University of Kentucky, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-kentucky>

University of Maryland, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-maryland-college-park>

University of Miami, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-miami>

University of Mississippi, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-mississippi>

University of Missouri, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-missouri-columbia>

University of North Carolina, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-north-carolina-at-chapel-hill>

University of Pittsburgh, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-pittsburgh>

University of South Carolina, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial

aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-south-carolina-columbia>

University of Tennessee, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board.* [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-tennessee-knoxville>

University of Virginia, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/university-of-virginia>

Vanderbilt University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/vanderbilt-university>

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid. *Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/virginia-polytechnic-institute-and-state-university>

Wake Forest University, The College Board. (2013). Published annual cost before financial aid.

*Bigfuture by the College Board*. [Data file]. Retrieved from

<https://bigfuture.collegeboard.org/college-university-search/wake-forest-university>

*Appendix A: Table 1*

<b>School</b>	<b>Nickname</b>	<b>Conference</b>
Auburn University	Auburn	SEC
Boston College	BC	ACC
Clemson University	Clemson	ACC
Duke University	Duke	ACC
Florida State University	Florida State/FSU	ACC
Georgia Institute of Technology	Georgia Tech	ACC
Louisiana State University	LSU	SEC
Mississippi State University	MSU	SEC
North Carolina State University	NC State	ACC
Syracuse University	SU	ACC
Texas A&M University	Texas A&M	SEC
University of Miami	Miami/The U	ACC
University of Alabama	Alabama/Bama	SEC
University of Arkansas	U of A/Arkansas	SEC
University of Florida	UF/Florida	SEC
University of Georgia	UGA/Georgia	SEC
University of Kentucky	Kentucky	SEC
University of Maryland: College Park	Maryland	ACC
University of Mississippi	Ole Miss	SEC
University of Missouri	Mizzou	SEC
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	UNC	ACC
University of Pittsburgh	Pitt	ACC
University of South Carolina	USC	SEC
University of Tennessee	Tennessee	SEC
University of Virginia	Virginia/UVA	ACC
Vanderbilt University	Vandy/Vanderbilt	SEC
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Virginia Tech	ACC
Wake Forest University	Wake Forest	ACC

*Appendix B: Table 2*

<b>School</b>	<b>City, State</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Athlete Expenditures</b>
Auburn University	Auburn, AL	56,908	\$14,424
Boston College	Boston, MA	636,479	\$16,699
Clemson University	Clemson, SC	14,089	\$14,424
Duke University	Durham, NC	239,358	\$16,568
Florida State University	Tallahassee, FL	186,971	\$16,568
Georgia Institute of Technology	Atlanta, GA	443,775	\$16,699
Louisiana State University	Baton Rouge, LA	230,058	\$16,568
Mississippi State University	Mississippi State, MS	4,005	\$14,424
North Carolina State University	Raleigh, NC	423,179	\$16,699
Syracuse University	Syracuse, NY	144,170	\$16,568
Texas A&M University	College Station, TX	97,801	\$14,424
University of Miami	Miami, FL	413,892	\$16,699
University of Alabama	Tuscaloosa, AL	93,357	\$14,424
University of Arkansas	Fayetteville, AR	76,899	\$14,424
University of Florida	Gainesville, FL	126,047	\$16,568
University of Georgia	Athens, GA	118,999	\$16,568
University of Kentucky	Lexington, KY	305,489	\$16,699
University of Maryland: College Park	College Park, MD	31,208	\$14,424
University of Mississippi	University, MS	4,202	\$14,424
University of Missouri	Columbia, MO	113,225	\$16,568
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Chapel Hill, NC	58,424	\$14,424
University of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh, PA	306,211	\$16,699
University of South Carolina	Columbia, SC	131,686	\$16,568
University of Tennessee	Knoxville, TN	182,200	\$16,568
University of Virginia	Charlottesville, VA	43,956	\$14,424
Vanderbilt University	Nashville, TN	609,644	\$16,699
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Blacksburg, VA	42,627	\$14,424
Wake Forest University	Winston-Salem, NC	234,349	\$16,568

*Appendix C: Table 3*

<b>School</b>	<b>Full Ride Scholarship Value</b>	<b>Tuition/Room and Board</b>
Auburn University	\$39,116 <sup>1</sup>	\$37,916 <sup>1</sup>
Boston College	\$59,506 <sup>2</sup>	\$58,506 <sup>2</sup>
Clemson University	\$40,080 <sup>3</sup>	\$38,968 <sup>3</sup>
Duke University	\$61,833 <sup>4</sup>	\$60,533 <sup>4</sup>
Florida State University	\$32,585 <sup>5</sup>	\$31,585 <sup>5</sup>
Georgia Institute of Technology	\$40,968 <sup>6</sup>	\$39,768 <sup>6</sup>
Louisiana State University	\$37,254 <sup>7</sup>	\$35,754 <sup>7</sup>
Mississippi State University	\$26,166 <sup>8</sup>	\$24,966 <sup>8</sup>
North Carolina State University	\$30,950 <sup>9</sup>	\$29,950 <sup>9</sup>
Syracuse University	\$55,872 <sup>10</sup>	\$54,512 <sup>10</sup>
Texas A&M University	\$34,822 <sup>11</sup>	\$33,576 <sup>11</sup>
University of Miami	\$56,076 <sup>12</sup>	\$55,166 <sup>12</sup>
University of Alabama	\$33,906 <sup>13</sup>	\$32,706 <sup>13</sup>
University of Arkansas	\$29,495 <sup>14</sup>	\$28,115 <sup>14</sup>
University of Florida	\$39,140 <sup>15</sup>	\$38,060 <sup>15</sup>
University of Georgia	\$38,116 <sup>16</sup>	\$37,200 <sup>16</sup>
University of Kentucky	\$29,148 <sup>17</sup>	\$28,348 <sup>17</sup>
University of Maryland: College Park	\$39,757 <sup>18</sup>	\$38,627 <sup>18</sup>
University of Mississippi	\$28,494 <sup>19</sup>	\$27,294 <sup>19</sup>
University of Missouri	\$34,674 <sup>20</sup>	\$33,744 <sup>20</sup>
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	\$41,458 <sup>21</sup>	\$40,130 <sup>21</sup>
University of Pittsburgh	\$38,958 <sup>22</sup>	\$37,806 <sup>22</sup>
University of South Carolina	\$38,414 <sup>23</sup>	\$37,436 <sup>23</sup>
University of Tennessee	\$40,090 <sup>24</sup>	\$38,554 <sup>24</sup>
University of Virginia	\$50,781 <sup>25</sup>	\$49,561 <sup>25</sup>
Vanderbilt University	\$58,832 <sup>26</sup>	\$57,462 <sup>26</sup>
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	\$35,377 <sup>27</sup>	\$34,257 <sup>27</sup>
Wake Forest University	\$60,138 <sup>28</sup>	\$58,838 <sup>28</sup>

1: (Auburn University, The College Board, 2013)

2: (Boston College, The College Board, 2013)

3: (Clemson University, The College Board, 2013)

4: (Duke University, The College Board, 2013)

5: (Florida State University, The College Board, 2013)

6: (Georgia Institute of Technology, The College Board, 2013)

7: (Louisiana State University, The College Board, 2013)

8: (Mississippi State University, The College Board, 2013)

9: (North Carolina State University, The College Board, 2013)

10: (Syracuse University, The College Board, 2013)

11: (Texas A&M University, The College Board, 2013)

12: (University of Miami, The College Board, 2013)

13: (University of Alabama, The College Board, 2013)

- 14: (University of Arkansas, The College Board, 2013)
- 15: (University of Florida, The College Board, 2013)
- 16: (University of Georgia, The College Board, 2013)
- 17: (University of Kentucky, The College Board, 2013)
- 18: (University of Maryland, The College Board, 2013)
- 19: (University of Mississippi, The College Board, 2013)
- 20: (University of Missouri, The College Board, 2013)
- 21: (University of North Carolina, The College Board, 2013)
- 22: (University of Pittsburgh, The College Board, 2013)
- 23: (University of South Carolina, The College Board, 2013)
- 24: (University of Tennessee, The College Board, 2013)
- 25: (University of Virginia, The College Board, 2013)
- 26: (Vanderbilt University, The College Board, 2013)
- 27: (Virginia Polytechnic Institute, The College Board, 2013)
- 28: (Wake Forest University, The College Board, 2013)

*Appendix D: Table 4: Financial Gap*

<b>School</b>	<b>Financial Gap</b>
Auburn University	\$13,224
Boston College	\$15,699
Clemson University	\$13,312
Duke University	\$15,268
Florida State University	\$15,568
Georgia Institute of Technology	\$15,499
Louisiana State University	\$15,068
Mississippi State University	\$13,224
North Carolina State University	\$15,699
Syracuse University	\$15,208
Texas A&M University	\$13,178
University of Miami	\$15,789
University of Alabama	\$13,224
University of Arkansas	\$13,044
University of Florida	\$15,488
University of Georgia	\$15,652
University of Kentucky	\$15,899
University of Maryland: College Park	\$13,294
University of Mississippi	\$13,224
University of Missouri	\$15,638
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	\$13,096
University of Pittsburgh	\$15,547
University of South Carolina	\$15,590
University of Tennessee	\$15,032
University of Virginia	\$13,204
Vanderbilt University	\$15,329
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	\$13,304
Wake Forest University	\$15,268

*Appendix E: Table 5: Descriptive Statistics*

	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Financial Gap	28	\$14,592.46	\$13,044	\$15,899
SEC Financial Gap	10	\$14,103.80	\$13,096	\$15,789
ACC Financial Gap	18	\$14,863.94	\$13,044	\$15,899

*Appendix F: Table 6: Independent Sample T-Test*

	Sig.	Sig. (2-tailed)/P-value
Financial Gap	.490	.093

*The 2-tailed significant value/p-value is greater than .05 indicating no significant difference.*