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| Slide 6 |  | - This chart shows the distribution of teams across the US.  - We divided the continental US into regions according to census regions.  - As you can see, the teams are clearly not evenly distributed, so the distances of schools to professional teams varies greatly.  -Categorization of states into regions is relevant to the aggregation of college revenue, not professional sports team location. |
| Slide 7 |  | - Axes are median revenues for regions.  - Color is region.  - Size is number of schools in that region.  - Not saying there’s a correlation between revenues.  - But does not appear to be correlation between number of schools and revenues. |
| Slide 8 |  | -Little obvious correlation for all college basketball teams and distance to nearest professional team. (R2 = 7.8\*10^-5, p = .716) |
| Slide 9 |  | - Slightly better for baseball. (.0258 = R2, p = .096) |
| Slide 10 |  | - Top chart = median rev by region, middle = mean, bottom = difference  - The darker blue bars are regions with higher avg. dist. the light teal ones are lower.  - When we aggregate by region, the regions with higher avg. distance tend to have higher revenues. |
| Slide 11 |  | - Similar, but not as strong a correlation. |
| Slide 12 |  | - Mountain (MNT, think mountain time zone), East South Central (ESC, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky), and South Atlantic (SA, Atlantic coast from Maryland southward.) did well in both revenue categories. They also had the highest avg distance for both sports. |
| Slide 13 |  | - Enrollment does seem to correlate better to revenue overall. (R2 = .266, p = .0001)  - Models seemed to suggest that Enrollment, followed by Dist to professional venue were the most important factors\*\*\* |
| Slide 14 |  | - (R2 = .370, p = .0001) |
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