

National Running Club Database: Assessing Collegiate Club Athletes' Cross Country Race Results

Jonathan A. Karr Jr^{a,b}, Ben Darden^c, Nicholas Pell^d, Ryan M. Fryer^a, Kayla Ambrose^a, Evan Hall^a, Ramzi K. Bualuan^a, and Nitesh V. Chawla^a

^aUniversity of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN, USA; ^bNational Running Club Database; ^cVirginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA, USA; ^dUniversity of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

ABSTRACT

The National Running Club Database (NRCD) aggregates 15,397 race results of 5,585 athletes from the 2023 and 2024 cross country seasons. This paper introduces the NRCD dataset, which provides insights into individual athlete progressions, enabling data-driven decision-making. Analysis reveals that runners' improvement per calendar day for women, racing 6,000m, and men, racing 8,000m, is more pronounced in athletes with slower initial race times and those who race more frequently. Additionally, we factor in course conditions, including weather and elevation gain, to standardize improvement. While the NRCD shows a gender imbalance, 3,484 men vs. 2,101 women, the racing frequency between genders is comparable. This publication makes the NRCD dataset accessible to the research community, addressing a previous challenge where smaller datasets, often limited to 500 entries, had to be manually scraped from the internet. Focusing on club athletes rather than elite professionals offers a unique lens into the performance of "real-world" runners who balance competition with academics and other commitments. These results serve as a valuable resource for runners, coaches, and teams, bridging the gap between raw data and applied sports science.

KEYWORDS

cross country, collegiate running, real-world athletes, data-driven performance analysis, athlete progression

Dataset: <https://zenodo.org/uploads/16652626>

Code: https://github.com/National-Running-Club-Database/nrcd_xc_paper

CONTACT Jonathan A. Karr Jr. Email: jkarr@nd.edu; nationalrunningclubdatabase@gmail.com
Ben Darden. Email: bdarden1205@vt.edu
Nicholas Pell. Email: pryann@unc.edu
Ryan M. Fryer. Email: rfryer@nd.edu
Kayla Ambrose. Email: kambrose@alumni.nd.edu
Evan Hall. Email: ehall9@alumni.nd.edu
Ramzi K. Bualuan. Email: rbualuan@nd.edu
Nitesh V. Chawla. Email: nchawla@nd.edu

1. Introduction

Running is a sport that is accessible to those of many ages [1]. The rise of running has led over 100,000,000 users to download running tracking apps, including Adidas Runtastic, Nike Run Club, Pacer, and Strava [2]. Specifically, running promotes college students' motivation in the classroom while providing an opportunity for students to remain healthy [3]. Since NCAA rosters are limited to top-tier runners who participate on university teams in the United States [4], several runners run for pleasure since they choose not to compete at the highest level. Some runners who want to compete in college while pursuing academics participate in university running clubs that compete in the National Intercollegiate Running Club Association (NIRCA) [5].

NCAA cross country data is hosted on a variety of websites such as Athletic.net [6], MileSplit [7], and TFRS [8]. Unfortunately, these websites do not provide the public a way to download these large datasets. This has prohibited several researchers from analyzing the results. Because of this, prior work that has analyzed NCAA cross country and track and field data has been limited to datasets of approximately 500 records due to resource constraints [9]. Additionally, a significant amount of prior research has focused on men and not both men and women [10, 11].

We release a dataset and perform analysis on 15,397 race results of 5,585 NIRCA athletes from the 2023 and 2024 cross country seasons. This dataset includes 3,484 collegiate men who race 8,000m and 2,101 collegiate women who race 6,000m. The dataset is needed for the NIRCA club running community and the greater research community. Prior to the NRCD, collegiate club data were published on a Google Sheet. Additionally, there was a subset of results on collegiate proprietary databases where many club runners are listed as unattached in meets [12]. Therefore, there was no way for all the results to be gathered and analyzed in one dataset. The National Running Club Database solves these issues by unifying club running results from the NIRCA website and collegiate proprietary databases.

In addition to releasing this dataset, we perform analysis on the following Research Questions (RQs):

RQ1: How much do collegiate club runners improve over the course of a cross county season when accounting for outside factors (weather and course elevation)?

RQ2: Do collegiate club runners improve between two cross county seasons?

RQ3: How does racing differ for men and women in the collegiate club running space?

Our goal is to provide student-athletes with insights on how they might improve during a season. It is important to note that NIRCA club athletes are "real-world" athletes since they are primarily students and do not have coaches [5]. As a result, this is the first comprehensive dataset for collegiate club athletes.

2. Method

2.1. Data Collection

Prior to this dataset, there was no publicly downloadable database of collegiate or high school athletes for the United States running community. Since we are analyzing cross country race results and have a complete dataset for 2023 and 2024, we publish all the results as noted in Table 12. When publishing the dataset, we remove personally identifiable information (PII), including names and links to results. Yet we leave other

as this would be an unfair comparison since certain teams' seasons would be longer than others. It is also important to note that, unlike NCAA rules [15], NIRCA has no limit on the years of eligibility [5]. Therefore, any collegiate who is in valid academic standing can compete in NIRCA, including graduate students.

2.2. Data Standardization

To properly compare our data, it must be standardized. In addition to excluding nationals from result comparison, as noted in Section 2.1, we made sure that all data is converted to 6,000m for women and 8,000m for men. Additionally, we also standardized the data for weather, course elevation, and courses that measure slightly longer or shorter than the official distance. Since we have data for 2023 and 2024, we output four charts for each gender '2023 Converted Only (distance)', '2023 Standardized (weather & elevation)', '2024 Converted Only (distance)', and '2024 Standardized (weather & elevation)'.

2.2.1. Conversion

The standard cross country collegiate distance is 8,000m for men and 6,000m for women [5]. However, our results show that 19.5% of races for men and 34.4% of races for women do not follow these standards. This is because races of 5,000m, 6,000m, and 5 miles are common for men, while races of 5,000m are common for women. Therefore, we use the Riegel Race Time Prediction Formula, as noted in Equation 1 [16], to convert all men's races to 8,000m and all women's races to 6,000m.

$$t_2 = t_1 \times \left(\frac{d_2}{d_1} \right)^b \quad (1)$$

Equation 1. Riegel Race Time Prediction Formula [16]: Relationship between two distances, where t is time, d is distance, and b is an exponent that accounts for sex differences: $b = 1.055$ for men and $b = 1.080$ for women.

These adjustments allow all races during a runner's season to be included, which allows for more accurate predictions of improvement.

2.2.2. Standardization - (weather, elevation, and improper course length)

In addition to converting courses to appropriate distances, we also standardize the data for weather, elevation gain, and courses that are slightly longer or shorter than their official length.

Weather plays a significant role in how fast a runner can race. When the combination of dew point and temperature, in Fahrenheit, exceeds 100, the heat causes an athlete to run slower [13]. The greater the combined number is above 100, the greater the reduction in time is to convert it to standard conditions. Since cross country is a fall sport in the United States, from September to November, it is common to see this equation have a greater effect earlier in the season, when it is warmer outside. Additionally, performance can also vary depending on what air quality index (AQI) you are exposed to while training [17]. Since the AQI level depends not just on the race itself, and is correlated to temperature and humidity [18], which we already factor in, we do not standardize for AQI. However, we provide the information in our dataset.

Race times can also vary depending on elevation gain and loss. Hilly courses cause runners to run slower than on flat courses. Therefore, we use the 1.04 factor per percent grade for elevation gain and 0.9633 for elevation loss [19]. Our dataset only includes the elevation gain and loss, and not the complete course terrain. Therefore, we cannot adjust results based on factors such as whether there was one steep hill, compared to a gradual incline.

Finally, it is common for a course to be slightly short or long due to incorrect course measurement. For example, a man's 8,000m might actually be 8,100m long or 7,900m long. If the course is noted as short or long in accordingly our dataset, we adjust it using the Riegel Race Time Prediction Formula [16] as indicated in Section 2.2.1.

For data that needs to be both standardized and converted, we first standardize the data and then convert it to the appropriate distance to ensure that the results are appropriately adjusted.

3. Results

3.1. Runners' Improvement Over a Season

Our first research question examines whether runners improve during a single cross country season. Our data analysis comes from our datasets of the 2023 and 2024 cross country seasons and is standardized as noted in Section 2.2 Data Standardization.

We look at improvement throughout a season in two ways:

1: What is the difference in time between a runner's first race of the season and their last race of the season?

2: What is the difference between a runner's first race of the season and their next fastest race of the season?

Note that this "next fastest race" of the season cannot be the runner's first race of the season.

For each comparison, we include all races during a season besides nationals. Nationals are excluded, given that not every runner in the dataset has the opportunity to compete. Therefore, by excluding nationals, improvement is not biased towards runners who did or did not qualify.

In order to study the difference between a runner's first and last race of the season, we perform a linear regression on the data from 2023 & 2024. All runners in our analysis had to compete in at least two races, and the analysis was based on gender. Additionally, we filtered out runners whose starting time fell outside of 1.5 times the interquartile range [20]. The results of our linear regression, based on gender and year, are presented in Figures 2 and 3. We calculate the median slope, where the x-axis is the number of days, and the y-axis is the change in race time. Therefore, a negative slope, which can be seen in all charts except the 2023 men, shows improvement per day. The median slope for all standardized charts shows less improvement. This is because we standardize for weather, and since cross country is a fall sport, it is typically warmer during the beginning of the season, which results in a greater standardization. As a result, the goal of the standardized change is meant to show an actual change in fitness, whereas the converted charts only show raw improvement. Our analysis shows that the slopes have a high coefficient of variation (CV) [21],

Athlete Performance Analysis with Linear Regression - Men




Figure 2.: Men's First-To-Last Race Linear Regression

which indicates that the average slope has a high variability due to individual runners' circumstances. However, when the CV is very high, as can be seen in the 2023 men's charts, the standardization chart results in the CV being greatly reduced.

Athlete Performance Analysis with Linear Regression - Women




Figure 3.: Women's First-To-Last Race Linear Regression

In 2024, we see that the athletes have a slightly better average improvement. This could be in part because in 2024 the season started earlier. In 2024, there were races in August, yet there were none in 2023. As seen in Table 2, 157 of the race results did not have course details. Therefore, if the race conditions were hot, the data could not be standardized for weather. This may affected the results.

Group	Total Results	Results With Course Details	Results Without Course Details	Percent With Course Details
2023 Sep Men	2110	1032	1078	49%
2023 Sep Women	1291	573	718	44%
2023 Oct Men	2005	443	1562	22%
2023 Oct Women	1068	206	862	19%
2023 Nov Men	4	3	1	75%
2024 Aug Men	104	96	8	92%
2024 Aug Women	45	43	2	96%
2024 Sep Men	2100	1945	155	93%
2024 Sep Women	1263	1175	88	93%
2024 Oct Men	2089	1984	105	95%
2024 Oct Women	1181	1146	35	97%
2024 Nov Men	18	9	9	50%
2024 Nov Women	6	1	5	17%

Table 2.: Availability of Course Details in Cross Country by Month, Year, and Gender

Another key consideration that these charts do not account for is the fitness level of the runners. To explore how much the fitness level of a runner impacts the median slope of improvement, we made the following adjustments to our analysis: Runners were categorized into one of ten percentile groups. The runners in each percentile group then had a linear regression done on the difference between their first and last race times of the season. The results for these percentile groups can be seen in Tables 3-9. The results indicate that runners with a slower starting time saw a greater reduction in time throughout the course of a season.

IQR-Based Subgroup Analysis - Men
10 subgroups within $1.5 \times IQR$ of first race times

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	23:44.7–27:14.1	1.163	2.020	110
10–20%	27:14.7–28:04.8	0.523	2.645	111
20–30%	28:05.8–28:48.0	1.055	3.731	111
30–40%	28:50.8–29:30.0	-0.249	9.080	112
40–50%	29:30.6–30:18.1	0.185	8.101	110
50–60%	30:18.7–31:10.0	0.528	5.222	111
60–70%	31:10.1–32:03.0	-0.424	77.913	111
70–80%	32:03.0–33:18.1	-0.810	7.083	111
80–90%	33:18.3–34:50.6	-1.770	3.653	111
90–100%	34:51.6–39:34.7	-2.000	3.005	111

Table 3.: Men 2023 Standardized (weather & elevation)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	24:58.3–27:17.0	0.963	2.065	111
10–20%	27:19.3–28:12.3	0.418	2.828	110
20–30%	28:12.4–28:56.3	0.757	4.110	112
30–40%	28:57.1–29:35.3	-0.082	8.623	111
40–50%	29:36.0–30:23.3	-0.005	15.563	111
50–60%	30:23.5–31:15.4	0.664	6.015	110
60–70%	31:16.4–32:12.0	-0.693	13.266	112
70–80%	32:12.7–33:28.2	-1.393	5.035	111
80–90%	33:28.9–35:02.6	-1.925	3.570	111
90–100%	35:04.0–39:42.5	-2.384	2.871	111

Table 4.: Men 2023 Converted Only (distance)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	23:45.5–26:29.5	0.634	3.185	112
10–20%	26:30.2–27:30.1	-0.028	6.029	112
20–30%	27:30.5–28:11.6	-1.034	26.374	113
30–40%	28:12.0–28:56.8	-0.681	14.461	112
40–50%	28:57.9–29:42.6	-1.068	3.100	113
50–60%	29:43.1–30:32.2	-1.301	3.636	112
60–70%	30:32.6–31:34.1	-0.761	9.466	112
70–80%	31:34.3–32:57.3	-3.044	1.952	113
80–90%	32:57.3–34:49.4	-3.177	2.092	112
90–100%	34:49.7–39:31.8	-5.073	1.784	113

Table 5.: Men 2024 Standardized (weather & elevation)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	24:34.0–27:20.0	-0.043	5.126	112
10–20%	27:20.3–28:17.2	-1.275	5.724	112
20–30%	28:17.8–29:03.1	-1.115	17.354	112
30–40%	29:03.2–29:50.1	-1.453	2.850	112
40–50%	29:50.1–30:33.6	-1.616	4.882	111
50–60%	30:34.8–31:35.6	-2.422	1.939	113
60–70%	31:35.7–32:38.2	-3.408	1.434	112
70–80%	32:38.5–33:47.3	-3.621	2.098	112
80–90%	33:49.7–36:01.0	-3.579	1.607	112
90–100%	36:03.9–40:36.2	-5.837	1.698	112

Table 6.: Men 2024 Converted Only (distance)

IQR-Based Subgroup Analysis - Women
10 subgroups within $1.5 \times IQR$ of first race times

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
10–20%	24:46.9–25:33.8	-0.191	5.286	62
20–30%	25:34.0–26:13.0	-0.766	11.385	62
30–40%	26:14.4–26:52.6	0.117	4.844	62
40–50%	26:53.0–27:33.0	-0.567	110.305	62
50–60%	27:34.0–28:24.7	-0.310	6.837	62
60–70%	28:25.5–29:07.1	-0.857	78.392	62
70–80%	29:07.6–30:09.3	-0.938	2.596	62
80–90%	30:11.0–31:45.0	-2.030	3.393	62
90–100%	31:47.0–35:28.9	-2.514	4.167	63

Table 7.: Women 2023 Standardized (weather & elevation)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	22:33.6–24:50.5	-0.148	5.407	62
10–20%	24:51.3–25:40.1	0.134	5.565	61
20–30%	25:41.8–26:18.1	-0.344	7.720	63
30–40%	26:18.5–26:58.6	0.456	4.062	61
40–50%	26:58.7–27:39.0	-1.057	8.832	63
50–60%	27:39.9–28:32.0	-0.475	7.096	62
60–70%	28:32.5–29:13.8	-0.399	111.151	62
70–80%	29:14.3–30:15.7	-0.936	2.680	62
80–90%	30:16.4–32:00.5	-2.198	3.320	62
90–100%	32:02.5–35:46.1	-2.706	4.311	62

Table 8.: Women 2023 Converted Only (distance)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	CV	Num Athletes
0–10%	20:08.5–23:58.7	0.027	3.932	63
10–20%	23:59.5–24:55.1	-0.731	20.389	64
20–30%	24:55.4–25:44.8	-1.090	9.434	63
30–40%	25:45.5–26:23.0	-1.110	19.867	64
40–50%	26:25.1–27:03.2	-1.321	1.875	64
50–60%	27:05.6–27:55.0	-1.369	20.404	63
60–70%	27:55.9–29:01.6	-2.668	2.071	64
70–80%	29:01.6–29:54.1	-2.971	1.421	63
80–90%	29:55.4–31:26.7	-2.315	2.128	64
90–100%	31:28.3–35:37.4	-4.258	1.633	64

Table 9.: Women 2024 Standardized (weather & elevation)

Subgroup	Time Range	Median Slope	Slope	Num Athletes
0–10%	20:58.5–24:36.3	0.526	3.894	63
10–20%	24:39.2–25:35.1	-0.696	6.686	64
20–30%	25:35.6–26:15.5	-1.363	5.229	63
30–40%	26:16.5–26:56.9	-0.854	22.176	64
40–50%	26:57.0–27:36.3	-1.586	1.716	63
50–60%	27:36.8–28:32.0	-1.713	5.481	64
60–70%	28:32.2–29:36.0	-2.764	1.270	63
70–80%	29:36.3–30:30.6	-2.538	3.177	64
80–90%	30:31.2–32:01.9	-2.474	1.718	63
90–100%	32:02.4–36:22.1	-3.967	2.560	64

Table 10.: Women 2024 Converted Only (distance)

The charts and figures above indicate how runners improved between their first and last race, independent of the number of races they ran. We then compare whether runners, who competed in a different number of races, had different improvements. As noted in Figure 4. Analysis shows that overall, runners who raced more experienced more improvement. However, the data size of runners gets substantially smaller for those who run more, which could reduce the overall significance.




Figure 4.: First to Last Race Improvement vs Number of Races

Next, we address how a runner's race times differ throughout a single cross country season when accounting for both starting time and number of races. For this analysis, we looked for the change in time between a runner's first race and their fastest race during the season (excluding their first race). We grouped runners based on the number of races they completed during a season (excluding nationals). Finally, we grouped these runners further based on the minute value of their first race of the season. This allowed us to visually see the trends we found in our percentile analysis, as shown in Figures 5 and 6. The analysis reveals that for runners starting times in the IQR, overall, runners improve more during a season if they have a slower starting time and compete more.

Combined Overlay Plots: Males - Avg (First Race - Fastest Other Race) vs. First Race Minute
2023 & 2024 with IQR Regions and Outlier Boundaries




Figure 5.: Average Improvement vs. Number of Races and First Race Time - Males

Combined Overlay Plots: Females - Avg (First Race - Fastest Other Race) vs. First Race Minute
2023 & 2024 with IQR Regions and Outlier Boundaries




Figure 6.: Average Improvement vs. Number of Races and First Race Time - Females

3.2. Runners' Improvement Over Multiple Seasons

We then examine how runners' times change over the course of multiple seasons. Analysis was done on athletes who competed in both the 2023 and 2024 datasets to compare their performance over the two seasons. A key consideration made to the data was to only include an athlete in the analysis if the number of races they completed in 2023 and 2024 differed by at most one race. The decision here was made to ensure runners were competing at a similar level across both seasons, which provides more standardized results.

Figure 7 demonstrates the differences between men's and women's distributions across seasons. While women's times across seasons tend to follow a normal distribution, men's times between seasons tend to skew left. We found these results encouraging, especially for men, as it implies that men's fitness levels tend to grow and hold across seasons well if there is similar consistency in racing.




Figure 7.: Difference in Fastest Times Across Seasons

3.3. Differences in Races Between Genders

In analyzing the men's and women's races from 2023 and 2024, we noticed key similarities and differences. A major item of note is that significantly more men are in the data compared to women. The ratio between unique men and women in 2023 was 1.64 : 1 ($p < 0.001$), and in 2024 was 1.71 : 1 ($p < 0.001$). Despite the difference in the number of men vs. the number of women competing, we found that they tend to have a similar commitment level to racing. The average number of races each gender competed in differed by only .12 in 2023 and a mere .01 in 2024. Our data shows that if an athlete is willing to compete in one race, they tend to have a similar commitment level on average, regardless of gender.

It is also important to note the similarities in the frequency of men and women competing in races. In both 2023 and 2024, the number of athletes competing in one race from September - October made up 45 - 50% of the total number of athletes in that season's dataset. Even more similar are the percentages of runners who compete in 2, 3, and 4 or more races. Tables 12 and 13 show that the corresponding metric between men and women differed by as little as 0% in some cases and only as much as 2%. We see here how very alike men and women are in their frequency of racing.

We also highlight the number of unique athletes who raced each month. The total number of males and females competing in September vs. October tends to stay pretty similar. In 2024, we even saw an increase in males competing in October compared to September. There are insights that were made between seasons as well. 831 males (39%) and 480 females (37%) who competed in the 2023 season also competed in the 2024 season. When factoring in runners who graduate or do not enroll year over year, the retention percentage is higher than that.

Category	Men	Women
Number of Unique Athletes	2124	1298
Total Races	4113	2359
Average Number of Races	1.94	1.82
Ratio of Runners in October vs September	.90	.81

Table 11.: 2023 Gender Analysis

Category	Men	Women
Number of Unique Athletes	2148	1254
Total Races	4124	2389
Average Number of Races	1.92	1.91
Ratio of Runners in October vs September	1.02	.99

Table 12.: 2024 Gender Analysis

Race Count Category	Men	Women
1 Race	967 (45.5%)	657 (50.6%)
2 Races	556 (26.2%)	332 (25.6%)
3 Races	388 (18.3%)	206 (15.9%)
4+ Races	213 (10.0%)	103 (7.9%)

Table 13.: 2023 Race Count Distribution by Gender

Race Count Category	Men	Women
1 Race	1,007 (46.9%)	608 (48.5%)
2 Races	570 (26.5%)	313 (25.0%)
3 Races	354 (16.5%)	207 (16.5%)
4+ Races	217 (10.1%)	126 (10.0%)

Table 14.: 2024 Race Count Distribution by Gender

4. Discussion

We find two major trends within our research:

We believe improvements in time across a season are heavily dependent on the fitness level of the runner. Our analysis in RQ1 demonstrates how runners at a lesser fitness level can have greater improvements in time on average compared to runners at a higher fitness level. This helps provide better context to athletes and coaches as they develop a training plan. It also demonstrates the physical phenomenon that a runner’s V02 max improves as they gain fitness, but those who begin with a high one see less of an improvement [22].

In addition, our research indicates there is a vast benefit to runners who compete in many races throughout a season. Runners who competed in four races tended to have a larger drop in race times the majority of the time compared to those who competed in two or three races in the same timespan.

The implications of our research are profound in the college running space. Our research found that competing in more races in a certain timespan improves the difference in time between the runner’s first race and next fastest race on average. However, most club runners are missing out on this benefit. In 2023, only 10% of men and just 7.9% of women competed in four races during the September-October timespan. Similar trends hold in 2024, with 10% of men and 10% of women competing in four races in the timespan. Therefore, we encourage any club runner to compete in races more often during the September-October regular season to see a greater benefit from their training. We also notice an opportunity for more teams to reap the benefits of frequent racing. In 2023, only 22% of men’s teams and 8.5% of women’s teams had at least five runners competing in four or more races from September-October. 2024 had a similar trend, with 14% of men’s teams and 12% of women’s teams fitting the same criteria. However, teams that run in at least four races during the season up to and including Regionals have a significantly higher chance of making the top 15 teams at Nationals, which can be seen in Table 15.

As teams look for ways to improve, our numbers indicate they should consider an emphasis on racing to increase their competitive stature.

Group	Total Teams	Total Teams That Race 4 Times	Those in the Top 15 at Nationals	p-value (χ^2)
2023 Men	94	36 (38%)	9 (60%)	0.0061
2023 Women	94	27 (29%)	9 (60%)	0.009
2024 Men	115	37 (32%)	11 (73%)	0.001
2024 Women	101	28 (27%)	11 (73%)	0.000

Table 15.: Percent of Teams in Top 15 at Nationals Who Race Four or More Times

5. Limitations

It is important to remember that we are only analyzing the raw result times. We do not have details of how a runner is progressing throughout a race. Additionally, runners have different racing and training strategies that we are not accounting for. We do not know if an athlete is injured during a race or conserving their energy for future races.

When calculating improvement per day in RQ1, we assume the slope is linear for both men and women. However, it is likely not. As runners race more during a season, the overall r^2 performance between races goes down. However, this does not detract from the main takeaway, that runners get faster on average by competing throughout the season. Further research could be conducted to determine if other scales, such as a logistic regression, better fit the data. Regardless of what scale is used, it is essential to remember that humans have a variety of factors that influence their running performance. Additionally, the scales are likely not the same for men and women, as women may follow a circular progression cycle [11] as well.

Additionally, the NRCDB only has a complete dataset for two seasons, 2023 and 2024. Therefore, we can only calculate improvement trends over two seasons, and cannot see if the trends hold over several seasons. The NRCDB is continuing to collect data each year. It is our commitment to release new data to the research community when new trends can be discovered.

Since 43.7% of the races in our dataset do not have race conditions, we cannot adjust all race times accordingly. Therefore, the standardized charts cannot be standardized for all races, because of insufficient data.

6. Ethics

All of our data is obtained from the National Running Club Database, which is publicly accessible. Additionally, all of this information also exists on other public websites. However, in order to maintain privacy, we remove all PII such as links and persons' names. We at the University of Notre Dame have permission from the National Running Club Database to use and publish their dataset. Even though we gained access from them, we still went through Notre Dame's IRB office, and they officially classified our research as not human subject research.

7. Conclusion

Our dataset was composed of club runners, not professional athletes. Our analysis shows that runners who have a slower initial starting time during a season and race more during a season see greater improvement. The club runners in our data are college students who balance academics, athletics, and other commitments. Our research shows these trends for athletes whose training is not the main focus of their lives. We find these trends encouraging, as they may be applicable to similar groups of real-world athletes, such as young adults outside of college. Our novel dataset is one of the largest in the domain and includes insights for both men and women, which provide a balanced insight into the young adult running community.

Contribution Statement

Jonathan A. Karr Jr.: Contributed to project formulation, database creation, data uploading, and played a primary role in writing and editing the manuscript.

Ben Darden and Nicholas Pell: Contributed to data uploading and editing of the manuscript.

Ryan M. Fryer: Responsible for coding the results, writing the results and discussion sections, and editing the manuscript.

Kayla Ambrose and Evan Hall: Contributed to the creation of the database.

Ramzi K. Bualuan: Provided expertise as the database professor.

Nitesh V. Chawla: Served as the project advisor.

Acknowledgments

We greatly appreciate Tom Meurer for supporting the initial project in Notre Dame's Advanced Database class. We also thank the members and staff of NIRCA, the CRC Coaches Poll, and the Notre Dame Running Club for their support.

References

- [1] A. Abbas, *The embodiment of class, gender and age through leisure: A realist analysis of long distance running*, *Leisure Studies* 23 (2004), pp. 159–175.
- [2] D. Gute, S. Schlögl, and A. Groth, *Keep on Running! An Analysis of Running Tracking Application Features and Their Potential Impact on Recreational Runner's Intrinsic Motivation*, in *International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction*. Springer, 2022, pp. 359–373.
- [3] Y. Liu, X. Zhai, Y. Zhang, *et al.*, *The promoting effect of exercise motivation on physical fitness in college students: a mediation effect model*, *BMC Public Health* 23 (2023), p. 2244, Available at <https://bmcpublihealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-023-17154-w>.
- [4] J.E. Johnson, R.D. Wessel, and D.A. Pierce, *The influence of selected variables on ncaa academic progress rate*, *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics* 5 (2012), p. 8.
- [5] National Intercollegiate Running Club Association, *NIRCA*, <https://clubrunning.org/> (2024).
- [6] Athletic.net, *Athletic.net*, <https://www.athletic.net/> (2024).
- [7] MileSplit, *MileSplit*, <https://www.milesplit.com/> (2024).
- [8] Track & Field Results Reporting System, *TFRRS: Track & Field Results Reporting System*, <https://tfrrs.org/> (2024).
- [9] M. Millett and T. Melanson, *Predicting running times from race history* (2015).
- [10] J.J. James, E.A. Klevenow, M.A. Atkinson, E.E. Vosters, E.P. Bueckers, M.E. Quinn, S.L. Kindy, A.P. Mason, S.K. Nelson, K.A. Rainwater, *et al.*, *Underrepresentation of women in exercise science and physiology research is associated with authorship gender*, *Journal of Applied Physiology* 135 (2023), pp. 932–942.
- [11] E.S. Smith, A.K. McKay, M. Kuikman, K.E. Ackerman, R. Harris, K.J. Elliott-Sale, T. Stellingwerff, and L.M. Burke, *Auditing the representation of female versus male athletes in sports science and sports medicine research: evidence-based performance supplements*, *Nutrients* 14 (2022), p. 953.
- [12] B. Darden, *Midwest does it best*, <https://nircacoachespoll.substack.com/p/midwest-does-it-best> (2024). CRC Coaches Poll.

- [13] M.P. Running, *Temperature and dew point*, <https://maximumperformancerunning.blogspot.com/2013/07/temperature-dew-point.html> (2013).
- [14] *Openweathermap api*, <https://openweathermap.org/api>.
- [15] D. Bakker, *Ncaa initial eligibility requirements: The case law behind the changes*, DePaul J. Sports L. & Contemp. Probs. 3 (2005), p. 160.
- [16] P.S. Riegel, *Athletic records and human endurance: A time-vs.-distance equation describing world-record performances may be used to compare the relative endurance capabilities of various groups of people*, American Scientist 69 (1981), pp. 285–290.
- [17] M. Cusick, S.T. Rowland, and N. DeFelice, *Impact of air pollution on running performance*, Scientific reports 13 (2023), p. 1832.
- [18] E. Zender-Świercz, B. Galiszewska, M. Telejko, and M. Starzomska, *The effect of temperature and humidity of air on the concentration of particulate matter-pm2. 5 and pm10*, Atmospheric Research 312 (2024), p. 107733.
- [19] J. Maurer, *Race time prediction on individual historical training data for hilly and non-hilly courses*, Master’s thesis, Saarland University, Saarbrücken, Germany, 2018, master’s Thesis, Master’s Program of Media Informatics.
- [20] X. Wan, W. Wang, J. Liu, and T. Tong, *Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range*, BMC medical research methodology 14 (2014), p. 135.
- [21] H. Abdi, *Coefficient of variation*, Encyclopedia of research design 1 (2010), pp. 169–171.
- [22] M. Niemeyer, R. Knaier, and R. Beneke, *The oxygen uptake plateau—a critical review of the frequently misunderstood phenomenon*, Sports medicine 51 (2021), pp. 1815–1834.