

5-2015

Athletic Governing Body and Gender Equality in Intercollegiate Athletics

Megan Rabe

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, rabe.megan@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp

Recommended Citation

Rabe, Megan. "Athletic Governing Body and Gender Equality in Intercollegiate Athletics." (May 2015).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

ATHLETIC GOVERNING BODY AND GENDER EQUALITY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

by

Megan Rabe

B.S., Illinois College, 2013

A Research Paper
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts

Department of Sociology
In the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 2015

Copyright by Megan Rabe, 2015
All Rights Reserved

RESEARCH PAPER APPROVAL
ATHLETIC GOVERNING BODY AND GENDER EQUALITY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE
ATHLETICS

By
Megan Rabe

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in the field of Sociology

Approved by:
Dr. Rachel Whaley, Chair
Dr. Kelsey Kretschmer

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
April 7, 2015

AN ABSTRACT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER OF

MEGAN RABE, for the Master of Arts degree in SOCIOLOGY, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale

TITLE: ATHLETIC GOVERNING BODY AND GENDER EQUALITY IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS.

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Rachel Whaley

Since the enactment of Title IX, there has been a proliferation of research on gender equality in intercollegiate sports. These studies, however, have focused on institutions that are a part of the National Colligate Athletic Association (NCAA), ignoring institutions under other smaller governing bodies. In this paper I include lesser-known governing organizations such as National Association of Intercollegiate Athletes (NAIA), National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA), the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA), and the California Community College Athletic Association (CCCAA) as factors affecting athletic participation rates for male and female student athletes. By using the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool for the 2012/2013 school year, I find that both the NCCAA and the NCAA have more equitable participation rates than the other governing agencies. I further compare these effects to the effects of other variables found to be significant in determining participation rates. Examining differences in gender equality based on governing organizations is important to understanding gender equity in intercollegiate athletics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank Dr. Rachel Whaley for letting me ask her hundreds of questions and for providing invaluable feedback. I also want to thank Dr. Kelsey Kretschmer for giving me direction, support, and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – Theoretical Significance.....	3
CHAPTER 3 – Literature Review.....	13
CHAPTER 4 – Methods.....	24
CHAPTER 5 – Results.....	30
CHAPTER 6 – Discussion.....	37
CHAPTER 7 – Conclusion.....	41
REFERENCES.....	43
VITA.....	48

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1.....	25
Table 2.....	33
Table 3.....	34

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

On June 23, 1972, the U.S. Department of Education enacted Title IX of the Education Amendment—a law prohibiting gender discrimination in education. It is best known stating:

No person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal Financial Assistance (U.S. Department of Education).

Although this act pertained to all areas of education, it created uproar in the intercollegiate athletic arena, exemplified by Senator John Tower's 1974 campaign to omit intercollegiate sports from Title IX's policy completely. Recently, organizations such as the National Wrestling Coaches Association and The College Sports Council have challenged the courts on Title IX's reach over athletic programs (Staurowsky 2003). Despite these attempts, the rule of Title IX persists today as one of the most important wins for women's rights.

Because of its sweeping effects, there has been a proliferation of research on gender equality in intercollegiate sports. Researchers have found that attributes such as being located in the South (Rishe 1999; Stafford 2004; Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg 2006), having a football team (Rishe 1999; Anderson et al. 2006) being a historical black college or university (Rishe 1999; Anderson et al. 2006), having a higher percentage of female undergraduates (Stafford 2004), having a sexist athletic name (Pelak 2008), being a smaller college (Suggs 2004), being a part of Division II of the NCAA, and having lower tuition and fees (Anderson et al. 2006) are all related to higher rates of noncompliance with Title IX.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) argue that umbrella organizations can use coercive powers to shape their governed organizations. Research on college athletics has largely borne this relationship out. Studies on gender equality in intercollegiate sports have mostly examined member schools of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), the major athletic governing organization, and found that it has enormous coercive power to influence its members' policies and practices. But by focusing on only NCAA members, while ignoring institutions under smaller governing bodies, researchers have overlooked almost 1,000 institutions with athletic programs. This begs the question, what is the relationship between athletic governing bodies and gender equality in intercollegiate athletics?

In this paper I examine if lesser-known and smaller governing organizations such as the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletes (NAIA), National Christian College Athletic Association (NCCAA), the National Junior College Athletic Association (NJCAA), and the California Community College Athletic Association (CCCAA) are able to uphold more or less athletic gender equality, as measured by participation rates. I hypothesize that due to higher surveillance, athletic teams governed by the NCAA will have more equitable participation rates than the NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, and CCCAA.

To answer the question, I analyze data from the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool for the 2012/2013¹ school year. This database contains information on 2,090 schools. By examining differences in gender equality based on these less powerful governing organizations, one can better understand the influence of athletic governing bodies on gender equality in intercollegiate athletics.

¹ For the rest of the paper, I will simply state 2012 instead of 2012/2013 to indicate the school year.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The sociological study of organizations has been a continuous investigation since the 1940s and 1950s. Organizations are able to take action, achieve goals, utilize resources, enter into contracts, and extensively shape the lives of individuals (Scott 2003). Furthermore, organizations are important because they “provide the setting for a wide variety of basic sociological processes, such as socialization, communication, ranking, the formation of norms, the exercise of power, and goal setting and attainment” (Scott 2003: 8). Organizations can also have political and cultural effects on the environment (Pfeffer 1997). Athletic governing organizations, like the NCAA, NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, and CCCAA organize tournaments, sponsor events, and help foster recruiting opportunities for member institutions. In turn, members pay the governing organizations fees and agree to follow their rules and regulations. Academic institutions that are not a part of an athletic governing organization have far fewer opportunities for athletic competition, and this creates an enormous amount of pressure for schools to submit to these institutions. In this way, governing organizations have significant power in shaping intercollegiate athletics.

Organizations also have the ability to create social ills (Mills 1956) and bureaucracy (Weber 1946). This type of power structure can create gender inequality as some feminist theorists argue that bureaucratic structures favor masculine traits and values (Scott 2003). Phillips’ (2005) study on law firms exemplifies how gender inequality is reproduced across organization generations; organizational structure of a parent organization is often reproduced in “offspring” organizations, so organizations can have a role in the reproduction of social ills. This

is why it is vital to examine the impact of the NCAA, NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, and CCCAA. These organizations have the power to form norms and exercise power that can uphold gender inequality over the institutions they govern.

Organizations, including athletic governing bodies, can produce power over other organizations through two types of institutional isomorphism. Isomorphism, explained by DiMaggio and Powell (1983) is “the constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions” (149). The NJCAA currently governs athletics at 525 institutions of higher education (NJCAA 2014), so presumably the athletic departments at these institutions face similar sets of rules and regulations set by the NJCAA. Isomorphism also happens through less formal procedures. One example of this is when students base the legitimacy of their institution on the presence of a men’s basketball team. In this way, cultural expectations can play a role on the organizations’ structure. In both cases, isomorphism shapes members’ behaviors, expectations, and structures.

Another type of isomorphism, mimetic isomorphism, occurs when organizations model themselves after other organizations, often to ensure legitimacy (DiMaggio and Powell 1983). If a junior college succeeds in fulfilling NJCAA requirements and is held in esteem in the community, it is likely that other junior colleges will model themselves on this college’s structure, believing that this will create success for them as well. DiMaggio and Powell hypothesize, “Organizations that incorporate socially legitimized rationalized elements in their formal structures maximize their legitimacy and increase their resources on survival capability” (1983:53). Because colleges want both their academic and athletic programs to survive to stabilize enrollment, they will turn to organizational structures legitimized by their governing

body. This gives governing bodies such as the NCAA, NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, and CCCAA the potential for substantial structural power.

Not only is there a significant power relationship between athletic governing bodies and higher education institutions, but there is also an important dynamic with the United States' government. This is most exemplified by the enactment of the Title IX amendment. This amendment, prohibiting sex discrimination in educational programs, is a type of coercive isomorphism by the state over athletic governing bodies. Educational institutions that do not follow the law of Title IX can get their federal funding cancelled. However, the original language of Title IX was incredibly vague. According to Reuscher (2002), the original vague language of Title IX made it difficult to decipher the law's exact meaning and scope. Between 1975 and 1979, the government received a myriad of complaints about the ambiguity of the amendment (Reuscher 2002). Organizational theorists, Dobbin and Sutton (1998), render that because the state is administratively weak, it passes ambiguous regulations that lead to its "normative strengthening" (443). The ambiguity of the Title IX amendment led to questioning of its applicability on athletics. Because of this, organizations such as the NCAA quickly attacked the inclusion of intercollegiate athletes and moved to eliminate them from the jurisdictional scope of the legislation in *NCAA v. Califano*. When that failed, the NCAA felt that their existence was threatened, and so continued to attack the span of Title IX. In 1978, the NCAA supported Grove City College in the Supreme Court Case of *Grove City College V. Bell*. In this case, Grove City College argued that it did not receive federal funding and so should not have to comply with Title IX. The court sided with Grove City College, accepting the position that Title IX is only applicable to specific programs directly receiving federal funding (Hogshead-Maker and Zimbalist 2007). This decision led the Office of Civil Rights to discard pending Title IX

athletic cases. It was not until 1988 that the effectiveness of Title IX was restored (Staurowsky 2003).

Ambiguity of Title IX led to a plethora of challenges. In turn, this led to the actual normative weakening of Title IX disciplinary actions, meaning that the challenges based off of cultural ideas led to weaker Title IX standards. Although court cases have sided with women on actual instances of gender inequality (seen in *Cohen v. Brown University*; *Roberts v. Colorado State University*, *Favia v. Indiana University of Pennsylvania*), no school has lost federal funding for failing to comply with Title IX mandates (Thomas 2011; Bryant 2012). Edelman, Uggen, and Erlander (1999) argue that laws are not literal but socially constructed mandates and are responded to based on cultural ideas of rationality. Due to social ideas on gender and athletics, the NCAA was able to have a role in determining the applicability and disciplinary actions of Title IX policies. But in order to sustain themselves, organizations will practice cooptation, absorbing new structural elements to avert threats to their stability (Selznick 1948). So, the NCAA has accepted some aspects of Title IX, producing yearly statistics on gender proportionality and such in order to be recognized as a governing body that is concerned about gender equality. Exemplified here is that athletic governing organizations have a role in the normative construction of laws and are concerned about self-sustenance. Thus, other governing bodies, not studied as much as the NCAA, such as the NAIA, the NJCC, the CCCAA and the NCCAA, have the ability to interpret the Title IX amendment, while being concerned about their own existence within the field.

Although all of the governing bodies were affected by the U.S. Department of Education's Title IX amendment, it is important to examine the role of culture. Meyer and Rowan (1991) hypothesize that smaller organizations can use culture as a way of legitimizing

their practices. As opposed to the NCAA, the NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA and CCCAA are much smaller governing bodies with particular cultural atmospheres, especially for the NCCAA. The NCCAA, being based on a central religious ideal, may be able to use its culture to legitimize its practices of gender discrimination or gender equality. The CCCAA is also connected to a specific regional culture, as it only governs athletic programs in the state of California. California is often assumed to have a specific, often more progressive culture that the organization may mirror when acting on gender equality. So although all of the athletic governing bodies are susceptible to policies on Title IX, it is possible that they may be different in their focus on gender equality, legitimizing their practices based on regional and cultural norms.

Brief History of NCAA

In 1905, eighteen deaths and 159 serious injuries were reported due to playing football. Players, coaches, alumni, students, and fans were irate by the brutality of the sport, causing some universities to suspend their football programs. Due to this societal outrage, 62 higher-education institutions decided to create the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States in 1906 to produce new football regulations. This was the birth of the forward pass and penalties against unfair play (Watterson 2000). This organization was later named the National Collegiate Athletic Association in 1910: a rule-making body and discussion group. In 1921, the organization conducted its first national championship in Track and Field. Fifty-two years later, membership was divided into three legislative and competitive divisions: Divisions I, II, and III. Then in 1978, the NCAA formed the I-A and I-AA divisions, now named the Football Bowl Subdivision and the Football Championship Subdivision, respectively. They also created the NCAA I-AAA

division for schools that do not sponsor football teams. This segment is simply referred to as Division I (NCAA 2013).

The NCAA began its women's athletic program in 1980, establishing ten championships between 1981 and 1982. After administering an extensive governance plan to include women's athletic programs, an additional 19 women's events were created, many of them Division I and National Collegiate Championships (NCAA 2013).

Today, the NCAA governs around 450,000 student athletes, 18,000 teams, and three divisions. This includes 1,066 active member schools in the NCAA, 340 of them in Division I, 290 in Division II, 436 of them in Division III. The divisions are divided in terms of financial aid awarded to student athletes, with Division I providing the most athletically related financial aid. Division II offers limited financial aid, and Division III schools do not distribute athletically related financial aid. The association administers regulations that govern recruiting, eligibility, financial aid, and benefits. Although the NCAA originally fought the enactment of Title IX (*NCAA v. Califano*; also see Hogshead-Maker and Zimbalist 2007), today they have a Gender Equity Task Force that monitors gender equality in athletic programs. In order to be a certified Division I program, the NCAA requires institutions to maintain or further progress in gender equality (Stafford 2004). Moreover, the NCAA has created a Committee on Women's Athletics and a NCAA Equity and Title IX Manual (NCAA 2013). These monitoring and informational devices could play a role in the NCAA's ability to progress gender equality in intercollegiate athletics.

Brief History of NJCAA

The National Junior Collegiate Athletic Association formed in 1938 after years of organized competition at the local level. Coaches and administrators from 13 two-year colleges in California petitioned the NCAA requesting permission to enter the NCAA track and field championship, but their application was rejected. This led the coaches and administrators to create the NJCAA. They conducted their first national championship in track and field in 1939 (NJCAA 2013).

In 1972, in response to Title IX, the NJCAA launched a study committee to investigate the possibility of starting a women's division and championship program. In 1974 at their annual meeting, the NJCAA invited a women's representative from each of their 22 regions to the 1975 assembly with the goal of officially creating a women's division. The NJCAA was the first (comparing it to the NAIA, NCAA, CCCAA and NCCAA) to sponsor a women's championship tournament in 1975. It was also the first to provide qualification-based national championship tournament in women's basketball in 1976. By 1980, it sponsored national championships in women's basketball, cross-country, gymnastics, outdoor track and field, softball, swimming, diving, tennis, and volleyball. In further recognition of creating gender equality, in 1990, Lea Plaski became the organization's first female president. She was the first female to hold a top position of a national sports organization in the United States. In 2009, the NJCAA elected the first female chief executive of any national collegiate athletic organization in the United States.

Today the organization governs 525 institutions of higher education, making it a leading organization of two-year institutions of higher learning (NJCAA 2013).

Brief History of NAIA

The National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics was created in 1937 after the success of a basketball tipoff tournament in Kansas City, Missouri. It was the first governing organization to invite historic black institutions into membership and the first to sponsor both men's and women's national championship. In 1980, the NAIA had championships in women's basketball, cross-country, gymnastics, indoor track and field, outdoor track and field, softball, swimming, diving, tennis, and volleyball. In 1986, the organization moved from concentrating on simply advising to governing (NAIA 2013).

Today, the NAIA governs 300 colleges, universities, and conferences. With more than 60,000 athletes, the organization governs 13 sports and sponsors 23 national championships. The NAIA offers institutions lower average conference dues than the NCAA, and institutions governed by the NAIA have on average lower budgets than those at every Division of the NCAA. Because of this, the NAIA attracts smaller institutions. The NAIA also boasts being serious about academics and having straightforward rules that are often handled by the institution, not the NAIA (NAIA 2013).

Due to its early assurances of commitment to developing opportunities for women, Welch Suggs (2007) has described the NAIA as historically being extremely supportive of women's sport and the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW).² Like the NCAA, the NAIA has its own Gender Equity Committee that raises awareness about gender issues and provides resources on to maximize opportunities for coaches, players, and administrators of diverse backgrounds, and the NAIA lists having a gender equality philosophy

² The AIAW was one of the leading organizations for promoting and organizing women's sports. It was enacted in 1972 but was phased out in the 1980s when the NCAA took control of women's athletics (Suggs 2007).

as a requirement of becoming a member of the NAIA. The organization further states that institutes should try to distribute equal opportunities for men and women, but does not give specifics on how (NAIA 2013).

Brief History of the NCCAA

Being the youngest of the five organizations, The National Christian College Athletic Association held its first men's basketball tournament in 1968, marking the organization's creation. It was originally created to provide a religious based organization to promote intercollegiate athletic competition with a Christian perspective. In 1975, it created a second division that does not offer athletic scholarships. After 1975, it included women's basketball, volleyball, soccer, and tennis (NCCAA 2013).

Along with being the youngest, the NCCAA is also the smallest, governing about 100 colleges. As from its creation, the organization is still very dedicated to its mission of exemplifying traditional Christian morals. Although it does not have a committee for gender issues, the organization includes treating all student-athletes equally regardless of gender, ethnicity, or cultural background as part of their code of ethics and conduct (NCCAA 2013).

Brief History of the CCCAA

Created nearly 80 years ago, the California Community College Athletic Association governs athletic programs at 107 colleges in California. With a \$1.7 billion budget, the organization monitors 71 districts with around 1.5 million students, 27,000 of those student athletes. They have the authority to manage 10 all sport conferences and two football only conferences. These conferences include 12 men's sports and 11 women's sports, including less

prevalent sports such as men's volleyball, women's badminton and men and women's water polo. The CCCAA, formerly the Commission on Athletics, was authorized by the state legislature to establish rules and policies for single athletic matches and tournaments, student athletes, and athletic departments. Like other athletic governing organizations, they are in charge of administrative duties and managing fiscal allocation. To be a part of the CCCAA, schools must pass a compliance exam each year with an 80% or above. The CCCAA believes that this ensures that participating schools are fluent in the governing organization's policies (CCCAA).

The CCCAA has its own gender equity committee that meets regularly to discuss and strategize ways to improve women's athletic opportunities in intercollegiate sports at the local level. The CCCAA boasts that it has created more women's sports in the recent past and currently monitors men and women's facilities for comparability. It also hosts sessions on gender equality in athletics at its conventions and makes several gender equity tools and sources available on its website, including the CCCAA gender equity self-review manual (CCCAA 2013). While the CCCAA is not be a national organization like the other athletic organizations in this study, the specific geographical and cultural dynamic of this organization make it important to consider in this study. It is also one of the largest non-national athletic governing organizations.

CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW

Title IX, Gender, and Sport

For most of the past few centuries, participation in athletics was reserved for boys and men. At the beginning of the 20th century, doctors still believed that women participating in athletics jeopardized their ability to bear children. Other issues of the day were the sexual pleasure women could allegedly gain from sports and the modesty of uniforms. Other setbacks in women's participation in athletics continued through ought the century. Examples include female sports being cut from the Olympics in the 1940s for their alleged risk of displacement and the search for the connection between sport and "lesbianism" in the 1960s. However, women did make gains in athletic participation throughout the 1900s, including the 1940s creation of the women's professional softball team and the enactment of Title IX (Rail 1990).

Driven by the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s, Title IX of the Educational Amendment to the 1964 Civil Rights Act was passed to create gender equality in educational programs receiving federal financial assistance. Although the amendment was passed in 1972, the deadline for institutions of higher education to comply was pushed to 1978, due to vagueness of the amendment. Since then the Office of Civil Rights has created several clarification policies to address the ambiguity (Anderson et al. 2006).

Due to the confusion over the applicability of the amendment, higher education institutions varied in their compliance of Title IX for their athletic programs. Several academic institutes and athletic governing organizations attempted to divorce athletics from Title IX. One finally succeeded with the *Grove City College v. Bell* Supreme Court case in 1984. In this case,

the Supreme Court exempted athletics from the reach of the amendment (Anderson et al. 2006). This caused current investigations on the compliance of Title IX to be dropped and enforcement to cease. Congress then looked to broaden the law. It was not until 1988 with the Civil Rights Restoration Act that athletics was again included under the rule of Title IX (Staurowsky 2003).

The 1990s was an era of awareness of compliance of Title IX and also signaled the beginning of major disputation by organizations with either interest in football or men's minor sports (Staurowsky 2003). The stance of the Title IX amendment was solidified in 1992 with the Court ruling that monetary damages may be awarded to a plaintiff if the violation of Title IX was intentional. The year of 1994 brought another major decision by the Courts; institutions now are obligated to provide information on the operation of women and men's athletics. A final major decision occurred in 1997 in the *Cohen v. Brown University* Court Case. Women on the volleyball and gymnastics teams sued Brown University after the school moved the teams from intercollegiate sports to club status. At the time, 36.7% of athletes were women and 63.3% were men. Although the proportionality was unequal, Brown University had more women's athletic teams than almost every other institution. However, the Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, issuing that Brown University had to move the volleyball and gymnastics teams back to intercollegiate status, so that the proportionality gap between men and women athletes would be smaller. This adherence to proportionality in athletics set a standard for all future cases (Reuscher 2002).

Around this time and since then, wrestling communities and other minor men's athletics have challenged the legislation. In 2001, then-Texas governor George W. Bush partnered Speaker of the House Dennis Hastert, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and a group of Iowa wrestling coaches to rewrite Title IX's policy interpretation. These wrestling coaches felt

that Title IX was responsible for the decrease in men's wrestling teams, and so was discriminating against men and holding schools to an unfair quota system. This led to the 2002 court case *National Wrestling Coaches Association v. Department of Education*. In reaction to this, the Department of Education created the Commission on Opportunities in Athletics to collect information and analyze issues with Title IX. The Commission, often reported as being composed of biased parties, released its report in 2003, calling for recommendations that would have harmed the scope of Title IX. These recommendations were met with public outrage. Many organizations, including the NCAA, lobbied for Title IX to stay the same and sent letters to Congress, the Department of Education, and President Bush. In the end, none of the Commission's recommendations were accepted, and the National Wrestling Coaches Association's lawsuit was dismissed (Hogshead-Maker and Zimbalist 2007; Ridpath et al. 2008).

Another attempt to hinder Title IX occurred in 2007. In this year, the organization Equity in Athletics (EIA) filed a lawsuit against the Department of Education arguing similar points to other lawsuits about the use of the three-prong system. They further stated that Title IX should base opportunities on the relative interest of males or females in athletics. If relative interest was the base of Title IX compliance, participation in future athletics for women would be severely limited. Another committee was created to assess the situation—the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. As of today, using male or female relative interest in athletic participation to measure Title IX compliance has been denied (Hogshead-Maker and Zimbalist 2007).

While Title IX was able to and continues to create opportunities for female athletes, gendered perceptions of sport remain. Whitson (1990) asserts that in our modern society, sports have become central to the production masculinity, and masculinity is often constructed as not being effeminate. Men are defensive about the entry of women into sport because masculinity is

seen as only being preserved through exclusion of women in sports. By the inclusion of women, male privileges and male companionship in sport has eroded (Whitson 1990). Messner (2002) agrees that when sport simply excluded girls, equating males with assertiveness and power and females with weakness and passivity was easier. Now, however, with the proliferation of girls and women in athletics, the process of exclusion has changed, often being more present in the language and media associated with sport. Messner (2002) argues that this is no less effective than past exclusions of girls and women and that, despite changes, the world of sport continues to assert traditional gender relations. So while it is important to examine the proportionality gap and the ways that women are still excluded from athletics visually, one must continue to be critical of the symbolic and subtler ways that gender inequality persists in sport.

Current Factors of Title IX Compliance

Title IX applies to three particular components: financial assistance to athletes; treatment, benefits, and support services; and participation. The last component listed, participation, tends to be most important (Anderson et al. 2006). The 1979 Policy Interpretation of Title IX instated the three-prong test to measure equal participation in institutions. This requires institutions to be in compliance with one of the following:

- 1: Substantial Proportionality: having participation opportunities for male and female students that are proportionate to their enrollment.
- 2: History and Continuing Practice of Program Expansion: showing a history and continuing practice of program expansion which demonstrates developing interests and abilities of the members of the under represented sex.
- 3: Interests and Abilities Fully and Effectively Accommodated: demonstrating that the interests and abilities of the members of the under representative sex have been fully and effectively accommodated by the present program (U.S. Department of Education 1996).

As mentioned, schools are able to meet any one of these three prongs to be in compliance, but if they aren't in compliance with number one, they have a very difficult time being in compliance with number two or three (Barr 2013). Clarification of the second two parts of the three-prong test has been nonexistent, making compliance very difficult. Stafford (2004) suggests that adding women's athletic teams or increasing the number of female athletes is presumably a way of adhering to the continuing practice of program expansion prong, yet the courts have found that no institution has been in compliance with this prong or prong three. This leaves the substantial proportionality prong as vital in measuring Title IX compliance, although it too is vague, as it has never been clearly defined by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) (Stafford 2004). But the United States Department of Education has deemed substantial proportionality a "safe harbor" for Title IX compliance, considering a plus or minus three to five percentage points as criterion to determining compliance (Pelak 2008). Thus, substantial proportionality is used the most to ensure equality for female athletes (Barr 2013).

Because the first prong—substantial proportionality—is used the most to measure compliance, this research concentrates on the substantial proportionality gap. The proportionality gap is the difference in the percentage of the unrepresented undergraduates and the percentage of unrepresentative athletes. Most institutions that are out of compliance with this prong are so because they have an unrepresentative percentage of female athletes,³ thus the current study sets up the proportionality gap in the following way:

Proportionality gap⁴ = (% of undergraduates who are female) - (% of athletes who are female)

³ In this study, only 3.2% of institutions do not meet the substantial proportionality prong because the athletic programs underrepresent male students. These institutions tend to be military or technical schools that have a small percentage of female students.

⁴ Also used in Anderson et al. (2006) and Rishe (1999).

Schools will have a positive proportionality gap when they have a smaller percentage of athletes who are female than percentage of undergraduates who are female. For example, at the Auburn University in 2012, 50.26% of undergraduates and 48.56% of athletes were female. So the Auburn University had a proportionality gap of 1.71% for the 2012 school year. Conversely, schools will have a negative proportionality gap when they have a larger percentage of athletes who are female than percentage of undergraduates who are female. For example, at the University of Alabama at Huntsville in 2012, 46.23% of undergraduates and 47.70% of athletes were female. The proportionality gap for the University of Alabama at Huntsville was -1.47% for the 2012 school year. As stated above, the United States Department of Education recognizes a difference of three to five percentage points as acceptable when measuring Title IX compliance with the substantial proportionality prong. Schools that have a proportionality gap greater than five, like Albany State University with a proportionality gap of 29.74%, have fewer female athletes than deemed acceptable, making them incompliant with Title IX in this manner. In this way, schools such as Auburn University and the University of Alabama at Huntsville were compliant for the 2012 school year.

Review of Significant Research and Research Hypothesis

Since the enactment of Title IX in 1972, several policy makers, academic researchers, and popular press sources have written articles on gender equity in college athletics, exploring legal literature, theoretical bases and personal anecdotes. Less attention has been directed at empirical explorations of factors that are involved with Title IX compliance. Rische (1999) analyzed how the presence and profitability of football affects female athletics. Rische (1999) hypothesized that because there is no female sport that has as high of expenditures-per-athlete as

a football teams do, the presence of a football team may make equality in participation and spending across gender difficult. Using data on NCAA Division I academic institutions during the 1995/1996 school year, Rische (1999) found that the presence and success of football teams have a positive effect on amount spent per female athlete but a negative effect on the total percentage of funds allocated to female athletics. He further found that schools with football teams have a higher substantial proportionality gap, meaning that these factors led to institutions having higher levels of inequality in participation between men and women. Stafford (2004), Anderson et al. (2006), and Pelak (2008) all found similar associations between presence of a football team and gender inequality. Based on this research, I hypothesize:

H1: The number of football participants will be positively related to gender inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap.

Rische (1999) also found that Southern schools and Historic Black Colleges and Universities have a higher substantial proportionality gap. Using data on athletic participation and funding for NCAA Division I teams from 1995 and 2001, Stafford (2004) replicated Rische's (1999) findings on the effects of Southern schools and Historic Black Colleges and Universities. While her findings were consistent with Riche's (1999) findings on Southern schools, she found less evidence on the effects of Historic Black Colleges and Universities. Neither Stafford (2004) nor Rische (1999) explain the relationship between location in the South and less equality in athletic participation. Suggs (2004) suggests that the Southern culture is one that highly reveres football, leaving fewer opportunities for other sports teams. Other work has been done on specific manifestations of masculinity and gender roles in the South (Rice and

Coates 1995; Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, and Schwarz 1996), but there is a lack of research on the connection between this and gender equality in athletics. Because South is a significant variable in several studies, I include it in my analysis.

H2: Schools located in the South are likely to have a larger proportionality gap.

Stafford (2004) also learned in her study that larger institutions and institutions with lower percentages of female undergraduates are more likely to be in compliance. Anderson et al. (2006) found similar results. They researched levels of noncompliance with Title IX measured by the substantial proportionality gap between the school years 1995/96 and 2001/02 by using the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA) data for 700 institutions at the Division I, II, and III level. They and Pelak (2008) concur in their research that smaller schools have higher levels of inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap. Anderson et al. (2006) and Stafford (2004) suggest that this may be due to larger schools' ability to attract more female athletes. Because the proportionality gap is computed based on percent of students who are female, it makes sense that the larger the percent of female students, the more difficult it will be to comply with the first prong of Title IX compliance.

H3: Enrollment is expected to be negatively related with gender inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap.

H4: Percent of female students will have a positive relationship with gender inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap.

Private status has also been a variable that has been studied in relation to gender equality in intercollegiate athletics. Pelak (2008) found private status to have a non-significant relationship with the proportionality gap; whereas, Anderson et al. (2006) found private status to be highly significant. Anderson et al. (2006) hypothesized that private schools have a higher proportionality gap, meaning less equality, because these schools may be more likely to use male athletics to attract potential students. Public institutions may also feel more pressure from the government to comply with Title IX.

H5: Private schools will be more likely to have higher levels of inequality compared to public schools.

Most studies on compliance with Title IX include some sort of indicator of school's financial capabilities. Pelak (2008) and Anderson et al. (2006) used tuition, room, and board as a variable that affects gender equality. Anderson et al. (2006) additionally used endowment assets and giving dollars, and Stafford (2004) used operating budget and football revenue. Stafford (2004) and Pelak (2008) found their variables to be non-significant in determining Title IX compliance; while, Anderson et al. (2006) found tuition and fees and giving dollars to be significant in determining the proportionality gap. Because schools with more resources may be able to create more opportunities for female athletes, I include total financial aid awarded to student athletes and total amount of money spent on recruiting athletes.

H6: Financial aid will be negatively related to gender inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap.

H7: Recruiting expense will have a negative relationship with gender inequality, as measured by the proportionality gap

Pelak (2008) significantly adds to the literature by looking at sexist naming of women's athletic teams at 4-year colleges and universities in the southern United States. She concentrates on the relationship between sexist naming and female athletic opportunities. Examples of sexist naming include adding "lady" before the mascot for women's teams (Lady Tigers verses Tigers at Grambling State University). The term "lady" often insinuates traits such as docility, politeness, and chivalry. When used in the context of competitive sports, "lady" can soften the threat of the female team and creates difference between women and men's sports. Other sexist naming includes having female and male paired polar names such as Sugar Bears and Bears (University of Central Arkansas) and Cotton Blossoms and Boll Weevils (University of Arkansas at Monticello). One of the variables in her study is the percentage of coaches that are female. It is possible that having more female coaches in an athletic department may create more gender inclusive practices. Pelak (2008) did not find this variable to be significant in her study; however, her sample size was restricted to schools located in the South, and so I add it to my analysis.

H7: Percentage of female coaches will be negatively related to gender inequality in intercollegiate athletics, as measured by the proportionality gap.

These studies and the others mentioned concentrated on one governing body: the NCAA. Moreover, of those studies concentrating on the NCAA, most of them limited the information

even more by analyzing only Division I schools. Pelak's (2008) study did find that non-NCAA schools tend to have more gender inequality, and Suggs (2004) found that junior colleges tend to offer less athletic opportunities for women. It makes sense that schools under smaller governing bodies would have higher rates of gender inequality due to less scrutiny. Foucault's (1977) discussion of the panopticon lends itself to the power of surveillance. However, Suggs (2004) also found that in terms of allocation of the budget for women's sports, schools in the NAIA spend 6% more than the average on women's sports. Furthermore, schools governed by the NAIA, NCCAA, CCCAA, and NJCAA are less likely to have football teams, increasing the likelihood of gender equity. The organizations also have other cultural and historical values that could play a part, such as concentrating on certain values or having a history of promoting gender equality. The absence of literature on the effects of governing body on gender equity in women athletics, leads me to ask the following research questions: What is the relationship between governing bodies (NCAA, NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, CCCAA) and gender equity in intercollegiate athletics? Further, how does division within these governing organizations play a role? And how does the effect of governing body on the proportionality gap compare with other variables such as football participation, location in the South, private status, and size of the institution, percent of female students, percent of female athletes, and financial power?

H8: Due to higher surveillance, athletic teams governed by the NCAA will have more equitable participation rates than athletic teams governed by the NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, or CCCAA.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

Research Design and Sample

Like Anderson et al. (2006), Pelak (2008), and Lumpkin (2012), this study uses data from the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool, concentrating on the 2012 school year. The U.S. Department of Education requires, under the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act, that institutions of higher education that receive federal funding and have an athletic program submit information on athletic participation, staffing, revenues and expenses by men's and women's athletic teams. The Department takes this information very seriously as it uses it to prepare a report on gender equity for Congress (U.S. Department of Education 2009). However because this data is self-reported, there are potential issues with reliability and disparate calculation methods.

Measures

The variables in my analysis consist of factors that have been found to be important in determining gender inequality in past research (Rishe 1999; Stafford 2004; Anderson et al. 2006; Suggs 2004, Pelak 2008) as well as a few new variables that need to be considered. Table 1 gives a summary of the operationalization of the variables and their descriptive statistics for the ordinary-least squares (OLS) regression analysis.

Other researchers have shown that presence of a football team is a significant contributor to proportionality gap. There are numerous ways that having a football team can affect gender equality at an academic institution. In my analysis, I measure football participation as the

Table 1: Regression Variables		
Variable	Operationalized	Descriptive Statistics
Independent Variables		
Football Participation	Discrete variable measured as the number of athletes on the football team.	Mean = 0% Median = 42.80% SD = 52.87 Range = 0 to 244 athletes
Location in the South	Dummy Variable 0 = not located in the South 1 = located in the South	Non-South = 66.73% South = 33.27%
Enrollment in 1,000s	Discrete variable measured as full-time undergraduate enrollment divided by 1,000.	Mean = 4.26 Median = 2.30 SD = 5.51 Range = 0.06 to 68.87
Percentage of Female Students	Continuous variable measured as the percentage of undergraduates who are female.	Mean = 55.24% Median = 55.25% SD = 7.44 Range = 10.12% to 85.56%
Private Status	Dummy Variable 0=public institution 1=private institution	Public = 55.91% Private = 44.09%
Ln Student Aid	Continuous variable measured as the natural logged amount of financial aid given to athletes.	Mean = 8.74 Median = 12.66 SD = 6.99 Range = -.69 to 16.78
Ln Recruiting Expense	Continuous variable measured as the natural logged amount of money spent on recruiting athletes.	Mean = 8.38 Median = 9.95 SD = 4.50 Range = -.69 to 14.84
Percentage of Female Coaches	Continuous variable measured as the percentage of female full-time and part-time head coaches.	Mean = 21.77% Median = 20.00% SD = 14.00 Range = 0% to 100%

Table 1: Continued

Governing Organization	Dummy set with each dummy coded 0, 1. NCAA is the reference group.	NCAA = 51.10% NAIA = 11.87% NJCAA = 22.60% NCCAA = 1.9% CCCAA = 5.06% Other = 7.46%
Division	Dummy set with each dummy coded 0, 1. NCAA DI-A is the reference group.	NCAA DI-A = 5.91% NCAA DI-AA = 6.06% NCAA DI-AAA = 4.81% NCAA DII = 14.83% NCAA DIII = 19.49% NAIA DI = 5.81% NAIA DII or DIII = 6.06% NJCAA DI = 11.62% NJCAA DII = 5.62% NJCAA DIII = 5.71%
Dependent Variable Title IX Proportionality Gap	Continuous variable measured as the % of undergraduates who are female minus % of athletes who are female.	Mean = 13.44% Median = 13.02 % SD = 9.82 Range = -4.93% to 66.04%

N=1996

reported number of male athletes who participate in intercollegiate football. I do this in order to try to separate the effects of the culture of having a football team from the simple effects of the number of football players on proportionality gap. Because half of the schools do not have a football team, the variable has a slight skew.

Schools are considered to be located in the South based on the U.S. Census definition. In other words, schools in the South are those located south of the Mason-Dixon line. Enrollment is defined as the total number of full-time undergraduate students, measured in thousands. Graduate students are not included in this measure since schools do not report them on the EADA. This makes sense since graduate students rarely are able to participate in athletics. Enrollment does

have a positive skew. A log transformation of enrollment did not produce much difference in skew or final results. Percentage of students who are female is the number of full time female undergraduate students divided by enrollment. This variable also has a slight negative skew, but nearly approximates normality. Private status is as reported on the EADA To measure financial power I include athletic aid. This is the total amount of scholarship money given to male and female student athletes. I also include total recruiting expenses—the reported amount of money spent on recruiting student athletes. Both of these variables have positive skews; the natural logged aid and recruitment variables were more normal, so they are used in this analysis. However, a slight skew is still present with these transformed variables. Percentage of coaches that are female is the total number of reported head full time or part time female coaches for men's or women's team divided by the total number of full time or part time coaches. Similar to percent of students who are female, this variable has a slight negative skew, but almost approximates normality.

There are six categories for athletic governing organization: NCAA, NAIA, NJCAA, NCCAA, CCCAA, and an Other category. These have been turned into a dummy set with the NCAA as the reference group. While the NCCAA may seem like too small of a category, it is the smallest governing organization, making the 38 schools included in the sample representative. Division further sorts institutions into specific divisions within governing organization. These groups include the NCAA DI-A, NCAA DI-AA, NCAA DI-AAA, NCAA DII, NCAA DIII, NAIA DI, NAIA DII or DIII, NJCAA DI, NJCAA DII, NJCAA DIII, NCCAA, CCCAA, and an Other category. Because of the small sample in NAIA DII, these schools were grouped with NAIA DII schools. While the NCCAA and the CCCAA have divisions, there were not enough schools in each to create division categories, and so these groups are left as governing

organizations. The dependent variable is the proportionality gap. This is measured as described earlier: the percentage of undergraduates who are female minus the percentage of athletes who are female.

Analytic Strategy

In this study, I use descriptive statistics to create a picture of Title IX compliance for the 2012 school year. I then use a one-way analysis of variance and post hoc tests to compare proportionality gap by athletic governing organization and division. Lastly, I use OLS regression to investigate the effects of governing body and division with other variables such as football participation, location in the South, enrollment, percentage of female students, private status, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and proportion of female coaches on proportionality gap.

This data set contains information on 2,090 schools. One school was omitted due to missing data. There are 28 schools that are historically or predominantly all male or all female schools.⁵ Because of the unique nature of these schools, I also omit them from my study, making my sample size 2,061. This is the sample size I use for the descriptive statistics and the one-way analysis of variance in order to give a more reliable picture of variance in proportionality gap. However, 65 of those schools have proportionality gaps that are noncompliant due to underrepresenting men. This means that they have a proportionality gap less than -5%. These schools are mostly military or technical schools that have a small percentage of female students. Because the relationship between the independent variables and the proportionality gap will be different for schools that significantly underrepresent men, these schools were excluded from the

⁵ These schools have a proportion of male or female students that is greater than 90%.

regression analysis. There were also 136 schools that had a proportionality gap between zero and negative five percent. Because these schools are compliant with the Title IX proportionality prong and similar to the rest of the sample, they were left in. The final sample size for the regression analysis is 1996.

While it is meaningful to understand the factors that are significant for having a negative noncompliant proportionality gap, it is beyond the scope of this paper to do so. Although a short discussion on this topic is necessary. The 191 (9%) schools that have a negative proportionality gap in this study is significantly more than the 34 (5%) institutions in Anderson et al.'s (2006) study and the one (0.4%) institution in Pelak's (2008) study, signifying a potential increase in this occurrence. However, my initial N of 2,061 is quite larger than Anderson et al.'s (2006) 684 observations and Pelak's (2008) N of 249, and so no generalization can be made.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

The mean proportionality gap for 2,061 schools for the 2012 school year was 12.68%. This means that schools on average had a percentage of female students 12.68 percentage points higher than their percentage of female athletes. This is higher than the average proportionality gap of 10% reported for the 2001/2002 school year, but lower than the average proportionality gap of 14% in the 1995/1996 school year (Anderson et al. 2006). The minimum proportionality gap was -27.96% and the maximum was 66.04%.

Twenty-one percent of schools in 2012 were compliant with Title IX's substantial proportionality prong. Seventy-nine percent of schools were not in acquiescence with the first prong of Title IX, 75.8% because they underrepresented female students and 3.2% because they underrepresented male students. The percentage of schools not compliant because of underrepresenting females is less than Anderson et al.'s (2006) estimate of 82-89% of schools in 2002. However, it is crucial to note that Anderson et al.'s (2006) study included only institutions affiliated with the NCAA, and so we should take caution when comparing the average proportionality gap and the percentage of schools that are noncompliant.

I conducted a one-way, between-group analysis of variance to determine if the proportionality gap differed by athletic governing organization. The average proportionality gap for the NCAA was 11.43 ($SD = 9.24$). In general, other governing organizations that receive less attention than the NCAA had higher mean proportionality gaps ($Welch F(5, 271) = 12.78, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$). The NCCAA, however, did not follow that pattern. This organization had an average proportionality gap of 7.10 ($SD = 10.62$). Although the NCCAA had a mean

proportionality gap lower than the NCAA's, a Tamhane's post-hoc test indicated that it was not a significant difference ($p = .173$) The NCCAA did have a mean proportionality gap that was significantly lower than the NJCAA's, NAIA's, and the CCCAA's mean proportionality gaps. The NAIA had the next lowest proportionality gap with a mean gap of 12.75 ($SD = 10.15$). Tamhane's post-hoc tests indicated that this was significantly different than the NJCAA's gap. The NJCAA had the next lowest proportionality gap of 15.37 ($SD = 12.12$); the CCCAA followed the NJCAA with a mean gap of 16.06 ($SD = 9.83$). Tamhane's post-hoc tests indicated that both the NJCAA and the CCCAA have mean proportionality gaps significantly higher than the NCAA's gap. Schools that were governed by governing organizations other than the NCAA, NAIA, NJCAA, NCCAA, and the CCCAA were put into an other category. These schools had mean proportionality gap of 12.35 ($SD = 12.77$). This category was not significantly different from any of the athletic governing organization's mean proportionality gaps.

In addition to analyzing athletic governing organization, I also conducted a one-way, between-group analysis of variance for proportionality gaps and the divisions within governing athletic organizations. The average proportionality gap for the NCAA DI-A was 4.65 ($SD = 6.98$). The NCAA DI-AAA had a similar mean proportionality gap of 4.47 ($SD = 6.21$). These gaps are considered to be compliant with Title IX regulations. All other divisions had higher mean proportionality gaps ($Welch F(12, 563) = 31.263, p < .001, \eta^2 = .10$). Tamhane's post-hoc tests indicated that these two divisions were significantly different from all divisions except the NCCAA. While the NCCAA has two divisions, sample size prohibited the creation of two groups. The NCCAA as a whole had the next lowest mean proportionality gap of 7.10 ($SD = 10.62$). Tamhane's post-hoc tests indicated that this was significantly lower than the NCAA DII's, the NJCAA DI's, the NJCAA DII's, the NJCAA's DIII, and the CCCAA's mean

proportionality gaps. The NCAA DI-AA had the next lowest mean proportionality gap of 10.27 ($SD = 8.67$). This was significantly different from all divisions with higher proportionality gaps. The NAIA DII or DIII follows with a mean proportionality gap of 12.29 ($SD = 9.03$). This was similar to the gap for schools in the other category ($M = 12.35$, $SD = 12.77$). Neither of these categories was significantly different from the remaining groups. The NCAA DIII ($M = 13.09$, $SD = 8.64$), the NAIA DI ($M = 13.23$, $SD = 11.24$), the NCAA DII ($M = 14.70$, $SD = 9.24$) had proportionality gaps that were the next lowest. None of these were significantly different from each other or the remaining categories. The groups with the highest mean proportionality gaps were the NJCAA DI ($M = 14.90$, $SD = 12.14$), the NJCAA DII ($M = 15.26$, $SD = 12.86$), the NJCAA DIII ($M = 16.46$, $SD = 11.37$), and the CCCAA ($M = 16.06$, $SD = 9.83$). The CCCAA was not divided into division due to it being a small category. None of these divisions were significantly different from each other.

Table 2 and Table 3 show the results of an OLS regression analysis. In Table 2, model 1 regresses proportionality gap on institutional characteristics: football participation, location in the South, enrollment, percent of students that are female, private status, athletically related student aid, recruiting expense, percent of female coaches. Model 2 regresses proportionality gap on governing organizations. Because of its size and notability, NCAA is coded as the reference variable. Model 3 includes all of the independent variables. In Table 3, model 4 includes governing organizations with divisions as the independent variables. The NCAA Division I-A is coded as the reference variable. The CCCAA and the NCCCAA were not divided into divisions due to the small number of schools in each division. Model 5 includes institutional characteristics and governing organizations with divisions.

Independent Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b (SE)	Beta	b (SE)	Beta	b (SE)	Beta
Football Participation	.077*** (.004)	.415			.090*** (.004)	.485
Location in the South	2.286*** (.371)	.110			2.151*** (.369)	.103
Enrollment in 1,000s	-.528*** (.036)	-.296			-.409*** (.037)	-.229
% of Female Students	.653*** (.024)	.495			.688*** (.024)	.521
Private Status	-2.006*** (.386)	-.101			.115 (.451)	.006
Ln Aid	-.120*** (.028)	-.086			-.169*** (.029)	-.120
Ln Expenses	-.452*** (.047)	-.207			-.234*** (.054)	-.107
% of Female Coaches	-.096*** (.012)	-.137			-.087*** (.012)	-.124
NAIA			1.774** (.695)	.058	2.439*** (.600)	.080
NJCAA			4.189*** (.545)	.179	6.726*** (.581)	.287
NCCAA			-2.706* (1.593)	-.038	3.493*** (1.325)	.049
CCCAA			4.504*** (1.006)	.101	3.796*** (.970)	.085
Other			1.549* (.846)	.041	4.748*** (.773)	.127
Constant		-16.59		12.00		-24.516
Adjusted R ²		.407		.035		.444

N=1996, * p <.10, ** p <.05, *** p <.01

Institutional characteristics account for 40.7% of the variation in proportionality gap. There is a positive significant relationship between football participation and proportionality gap. For every one player added, the proportionality gap increases by about .077. Location in the South is also significantly related to proportionality gap. Institutions located in the South tend to have higher proportionality gaps than institutions in other regions of the country. As expected,

Table 3: OLS Regression of Proportionality Gap and Division

Independent Variables	Model 4		Model 5	
	b (SE)	Beta	b (SE)	Beta
Football Participation			.097*** (.004)	.521
Location in the South			2.459*** (.374)	.118
Enrollment in 1,000s			-.255*** (.044)	-.143
% of Female Students			.686*** (.024)	.520
Private Status			.341 (.450)	.017
Ln Aid			-.271*** (.057)	-.193
Ln Expense			-.128** (-.128)	-.059
% of Female Coaches			-.082*** (.012)	-.116
NCAA DI-AA	5.288*** (1.198)	.129	1.700 (1.033)	.041
NCAA DI-AAA	-.362 (1.272)	-.008	4.561*** (1.167)	.099
NCAA DII	9.842*** (1.008)	.356	7.104*** (1.022)	.257
NCAA DIII	8.840*** (.973)	.357	3.186** (1.354)	.129
NAIA DI	9.016*** (1.210)	.215	7.875*** (1.230)	.188
NAIA DII or DIII	8.190*** (1.198)	.199	7.774*** (1.224)	.189
NJCAA DI	10.700*** (1.047)	.349	11.556*** (1.171)	.377
NJCAA DII	11.153*** (1.242)	.254	13.348*** (1.337)	.304
NJCAA DIII	11.508*** (1.216)	.272	11.983*** (1.511)	.283
NCCAA	4.115** (1.727)	.057	8.656*** (1.808)	.121
CCCAA	11.325*** (1.255)	.253	8.400*** (1.578)	.188
Other	8.370*** (1.141)	.224	10.341*** (1.341)	.277
Constant	5.175		-30.251	
Adjusted R ²	.110		.463	

N=1996, * p <.10, ** p <.05, *** p <.01

enrollment has a negative relationship with proportionality gap. For every 1,000 students more a school has, the proportionality gap decreases by .528. Percentage of students that are female has strong significant relationship with proportionality gap. A 1% increase in percentage of female students is related to a .653 increase in proportionality gap. This has the greatest effect on the dependent variable ($B = .495$). There is a significant negative relationship between private status and proportionality gap in the first model, but this varies in other models. A negative relationship exists between athletically related student aid and proportionality gap and recruiting expense and proportionality gap. Percentage of coaches that are female is also negatively related to proportionality gap.

Governing organization alone accounts for 3.5% of the variation in proportionality gap. The means of the governing organizations are slightly different here than in the analysis of variance. This is due to the deletion of noncompliant proportionality gaps that underrepresent men. In this regression model, all governing organizations are significantly different from the NCAA. The NCCAA's mean proportionality gap is significantly lower the NCAA's, yet it is the NJCAA that is the greatest indicator of the dependent variable ($B = .179$).

Adding governing organizations to institutional characteristics significantly adds to the prediction of proportionality gap ($F(5, 1982) = 27.229, p < .001$). Model 3 explains 44.4% of the variation in proportionality gap. In this model, percentage of students that are female continues to be the biggest predictor of proportionality gap ($B = .521$). This is followed by football participation ($B = .485$) and NJCAA ($B = .287$). Private status is not significant in this model.

Model 4 shows the relationship between governing organization and division. These alone account for 11% of variation in proportionality gap. The NCAA DI-AAA's mean proportionality gap is not significantly different from the NCAA DI-AA's mean proportionality

gap. The rest of the divisions have a significant difference. Both the NCAA DI ($B = .356$) and DII ($B = .357$) are the best predictors of the proportionality gap. This is followed by all of the NJCAA's divisions.

Adding division to institutional characteristics significantly adds to the prediction of proportionality gap ($F(12, 1976)=18.127, p <.001$). Model 5 shows the inclusion of divisions with other institutional characteristics. This accounts for 46.3 of the variation in proportionality gap. In this model, football participation and percentage of female students have the greatest effect on the dependent variable with Beta coefficients of .521 and .520, respectively. These are again followed by all of the NJCAA's divisions. In this model, private status is not significant.⁶

⁶ There is an issue with multicollinearity in this model: NCAA DIII has a VIF of 11.096 Ln Aid has a VIF of 6.189 and NCAA DII has a VIF of 5.083. When proportionality gap is regressed on the NCAA DIII and Ln Aid alone, the issue of multicollinearity disappears. The issue in this model is likely due to the similarity between the NCAA DII and DIII schools in the sample.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

As expected, location in the South is significantly related to proportionality gap. This is consistent with other research done on this topic (Suggs 2004, Rishe 1999, Anderson et al. 2006, Pelak 2008). In reference to private status, Anderson et al. (2006) have shown that private schools have a significantly lower proportionality gap than public schools. In this analysis, private status is not significant in all models. An independent samples t-test showed that while private schools did have an average proportionality gap that was higher than public schools', the groups did not significantly differ ($t(1981) = -1.30, n.s.$). On average private schools had a proportionality gap of 13.88 ($SD = 8.75, n = 880$), and public schools had a proportionality gap of 13.23 ($SD = 10.25, n = 1116$). So it is likely not a predictor of proportionality gap.

As hypothesized, the number of football participants is significantly related to higher proportionality gaps. Because football teams tend to be larger than any other sports team, schools that have higher football participation rates are more likely to be in compliance with the substantial proportionality prong. Also as expected, there is a negative relationship between financial aid and proportionality gaps and recruiting expense and proportionality gap. Institutions that have more financial resources are more able to create opportunities for female athletes. As with other studies on proportionality gaps (Anderson et al. 2006; Stafford 2004), this analysis shows a significant negative relationship between enrollment and proportionality gap. Larger schools have more equitable athletic opportunities than smaller schools. This is possibly due to larger institution's ability to create more athletic opportunities for women or due to higher interest in athletic opportunities.

Only Pelak (2008) has used percentage of head coaches that are female when examining proportionality gaps. The mean percentage of female coaches for the 2012 school year was 21.86%. This variable is important for measuring the gender-equity climate of the school's athletic department. This variable was significant in all three of the models. Schools that have higher percentages of head coaches that are female tend to have lower proportionality gaps. In order to see to what extent this holds true, this dynamic should continue to be studied.

Unexpectedly, the analysis of variance and model 2 showed one of the lesser-known governing organizations having a smaller average proportionality gap than the NCAA. There are several possibilities to why the NCCAA has one of the lowest average proportionality gaps. First off, the NCCAA is one of the youngest governing organizations, and so does not have a long tradition of promoting and equating school pride and community with men's athletics, namely basketball and football. Kelly and Dixon (2011) explain how colleges will add football teams even with extensive budget cuts in athletics as part of a "vision for creating a better college product" (283; see also Jones 2014). In accordance with this philosophy, schools use advertisements with action shots of football or basketball players among a seamlessly unending amount of students in the background in hopes of attracting new students to this camaraderie. The NCCAA may have a different philosophy apart from promoting athletics. The NCCAA states on its website that it believes "athletics are a means to an end, not an end in themselves, the process is as important as the performance, [and] the person (student-athlete) is more important than the program" (NCCAA 2013). Their philosophy does not put importance on athletics as much as community and keeping religious based values. As an example, the organization requires each team to participate in a service project during national championships. Thus, the organization may be especially interested in creating athletic opportunities for women

as well as men, so that everyone has as a chance to be a part of a program where they can “exemplify Jesus in all they do” (NCCAA 2013).

Both the NJCAA and the CCCAA govern athletics at two-year academic institutions; both also had higher proportionality gaps. It is possible that the NJCAA and the CCCAA have certain organizational elements that do not actively promote gender equality. It is also potentially the nature of two-year institutions that tends to create higher proportionality gaps. Two-year institutions may attract more nontraditional students who are not as interested in participating in athletics. These institutions, due to the two-year degree, also have higher turnover rates than other traditional academic institutions. These two elements may limit participation in female athletics at two-year institutions. It is also possible, however, that there is less surveillance of two-year colleges, so they do not feel as pressured to take action to equal participation rates in athletics. More research needs to be done on this dynamic.

This data shows that the NCAA has the second smallest average proportionality gap. When the data is further sorted by division, both DI-A and the DI-AAA have average proportionality gaps that are compliant with the Title IX proportionally gap. They are the only two divisions to be so. While the NCAA fought hard to repel Title IX from involving athletics at its conception, today, the NCAA has the most resources to monitor gender equality in athletics out of all of the governing organizations. It is possible that the lower proportionality gaps are due to the NCAA’s concern over gender equality. The NCAA is by far the largest governing organization and controls the greatest amount of funds, and so they would be able to allocate more resources to analyze gender dynamics in athletic programs than other organizations. Because of its size, the NCAA is also under the most surveillance. The lower proportionality gap, especially for the DI schools, may be an effect of outside pressure. As shown by the data,

the NCAA DII and DIII schools do not have such low proportionality gaps. These schools are also not under as much surveillance as DI schools.

As shown through the regression, athletic governing organizations have some effect on proportionality gaps, with the NCAA and the NCCAA typically holding greater levels of equitable athletic proportionality. This is also the case for specific divisions within the governing organization. When athletic governing organizations are included with other institutional characteristics, the influence of the NJCAA is one of the greatest indicators of proportionality gaps. Thus, it is possible that athletic governing organizations can produce power over other organizations through institutional isomorphism (DiMaggio and Powell 1983), and yet more research needs to be conducted to see whether governing organizations, through rules and regulations, are effecting the proportionality gaps at these institutions of higher learning, or if other factors, such as the nature of two-year institutions are more significant contributors to the average proportionality gap.

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

Since the enactment of Title IX in 1972, much debate has surrounded the law's applicability to intercollegiate athletics and to what extent it can enforce athletic gender equality. This has led to an increase in research on gender equality in intercollegiate sports. However, this type of research has mostly examined athletic institutions that are a part of the NCAA, ignoring the influence of the NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, and CCCAA. Several organization theories show that governing organizations can have powerful influence on the structure of their governed institutions, so this research asked: what is the relationship between governing bodies (NCAA, NJCAA, NAIA, NCCAA, CCCAA) and gender equity in intercollegiate athletics? And how does this relationship compare with other factors such as football participation, percentage of female students, location in the south, private status, enrollment, total athletically related financial aid, total recruiting expense, and percentage of female coaches?

To answer these questions, I analyze proportionality gaps by using data from the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool for the year 2012/2013 school year. I find that the NCAA and the NCCAA have more equitable average athletic proportionality gaps, with 11.43% and 7.10% respectively. They are followed by the NAIA (12.75%), the NJCAA (15.37%) and the CCCAA (16.06%). When governing organizations are portioned into divisions, the NCAA DI-A (4.65%) and NCAA DI-AAA (4.47%) have the lowest proportionality gaps, and the NJCAA DIII (16.46%) has the highest. Including governing organization and division with other theorized about institutional characteristics added significantly to predicting proportionality gap. Along with finding trends in governing organization, the regression analysis also showed that

location in the South, the number of football participants, and percentage of female students all had significant positive relationships with proportionality gap. Further, athletically related financial aid, recruiting expenses, enrollment, and percentage of female head coaches had significant negative relationships with proportionality gap.

This research does have its limitations. First, it relies on data collected for the EADA, which is all self-reported. Thus, there may be issues of reliability. Second, while this research shows that proportionality gap does vary by governing organization, it cannot conclude on the specific reasons why this is so.

By only focusing on schools a part of the NCAA, students at over 1,000 colleges and universities are ignored. It is important to examine these lesser-known governing organizations, especially since they can have higher rates of gender inequality due to the lack of surveillance. By examining difference in gender equality based on these lesser powerful governing organizations, we can better understand the influence of these athletic governing bodies, determining more specific methods of increasing equality—even if that does not mean having the same participation rates. Studies show that there is still a large amount of noncompliance with Title IX; in relation, the findings of this study can help make more informed decisions on how to enforce and create gender equality in intercollegiate athletics.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Deborah J., John J. Cheslock, and Ronald G. Ehrenberg. 2006. "Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Determinants of Title IX Compliance." *The Journal of Higher Education* 77(2): 225-250.
- Barr, Kerensa. 2013. "How the 'Boys of Fall' are Failing Title IX." *UMKC Law Review* 82(1): 181.
- Bryant, Arthur H. 2012. "Title IX at 40: Most Schools Still Aren't in Compliance." *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 27. Retrieved November 27, 2013 (<http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2012/0627/Title-IX-at-40-Most-schools-still-aren-t-in-compliance>).
- California Community College Athletic Association. "Welcome to the CCCAA." Retrieved August 15, 2014 (<http://www.cccaasports.org/about/about>).
- Cohen, Dov, Richard E. Nisbett, Brian F. Bowdle, and Norbert Schwarz. 1996. "Insult, Aggression, and the Southern Culture of Honor: An 'Experimental Ethnography.'" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 70: 945-960.
- DiMaggio, Paul J. and Walter W. Powell. 1983. "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review* 48(2): 147-160.
- Dobbin, Frank and John R. Sutton. 1998. "The Strength of the Weak State: The Employment Rights Revolution and the Rise of Human Resource Management Divisions." *American Journal of Sociology* 104(2): 441-476.

- Edelman, Lauren, Christopher Uggen, and Howard Erlander. 1999. "The Endogeneity of Legal Regulation: Grievance Procedures as Rational Myth." *American Journal of Sociology* 150(2): 406-454.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, translated by Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books. First Published in French as *Surveiller et punir*, Gallimard, Paris, 1975.
- Hogshead-Maker, Nancy and Andrew Zimbalist. 2007. *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Jones, Willis. 2014. "Does Becoming a Member of the Football Bowl Subdivision Increase Institutional Attractiveness to potential Students." *Innovative Higher Education* 39(4): 293-306.
- Kelly, Darren and Marlene A. Dixon. 2011. "Becoming a 'Real University:' The Strategic Benefits of Adding Football for NCAA Division I Institutions." *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport* 4(2): 283-303.
- Lumpkin, Angela. 2012. "Title IX and Financing Intercollegiate Athletics." *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education* 6(3): 275-292.
- Meyer, John W. and Brian Rowan. 1991. "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." Pp. 41-62. In *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*, edited by Walter W. Powell and Paul J. DiMaggio. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Messner, Michael A. 2002. *Taking the Field: Women, Men, and Sports*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Mills, C Wright. 1956. *The Power Elite*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- U.S. National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics. "About the NAIA." Retrieved November 28, 2013. (http://www.naia.org/ViewArticle.dbml?DB_OEM_ID=27900&ATCLID=205323019).
- National Christian Collegiate Athletic Association. "History & Philosophy." Retrieved November 28, 2013. (http://www.thenccaa.org/sports/2012/5/7/about_us.aspx).
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. 2012. "History." Retrieved November 28, 2013. (<http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/About+the+NCAA/History>).
- National Junior Collegiate Athletic Association. "History." Retrieved November 28, 2013. (http://www.njcaa.org/todaysNJCAA_History.cfm?category=History).
- Pelak, Cynthia Fabrizio. 2008. "The Relationship Between Sexist Naming Practices and Athletic Opportunities at Colleges and Universities in the Southern United States." *Sociology of Education* 81(2): 189-210.
- Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 1997. *New Directions for Organization Theory: Problems and Prospects*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, Damon J. 2005. "Organizational Genealogies and the Persistence of Gender Inequality: The Case of Silicon Valley Law Firms." *American Science Quarterly* 50(3):
- Rail, Geneviève. 1990. "The Sporting Woman and Her Body: A Social-Historical-Point of View." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Academy of Sports Medicine, Mont Ste-Anne, Quebec.
- Reuscher, Christopher Paul. 2002. "Giving the Bat Back to Casey: Suggestions to Reform Title IX's Inequitable Application to Intercollegiate Athletics." *Akron Law Review* 35(1): 117-158.

- Rice, Tom W. and Diane L. Coates. 1995. "Gender Role Aptitudes in the Southern United States." *Gender and Society* 9: 744-756.
- Ridpath, Bradley David, Athena Yiamouyiannis, Heather Lawrence, and Kristen Galles. 2008. "Changing Sides: The Failure of the Wrestling Community's Challenges to Title IX and New Strategies for Saving NCAA Sport Teams." *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports* 1(2): 255-283.
- Rishe, Patrick James. 1999. "Gender Gaps and the Presence and Profitability of College Football." *Social Science Quarterly* 80(4): 702-717.
- Scott, W. Richard. 2003. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Selznick, Philip. 1948. "Foundations of the Theory of Organization." *American Sociological Review* 13(1): 25-35.
- Stafford, Sarah L. 2004. "Progress Toward Title IX Compliance: The Effect of Formal and Informal Enforcement Mechanisms." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(5): 1469-1486.
- Staurowsky, Ellen J. 2003. "Title IX and College Sport: The Long Painful Path to Compliance and Reform." *Marquette Sports Law Review* 14(1): 95-121.
- Suggs, Welch. 2004. "Small Colleges Lag on Sports Opportunities for Women." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 50(41): A1-A33.
- , 2007. "Heroines as Well as Heroes." Pp. 14-30 in *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*, edited by Nancy Hogshead-Maker and Andrew Zimbalist. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

- Thomas, Katie. 2011. "Long Fights for Sports Equity, Even with a Law." *The New York Times*, July 28. Retrieved December 4, 2013 (<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/29/sports/review-shows-title-ix-is-not-significantly-enforced.html?pagewanted=all>).
- U.S. Department of Education. 1972. Title IX of the Education Amendments Act. Title 20 U.S.C. Sections 1681-1688.
- , 1996. *Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy Guidance: The Three-Part Test*. Retrieved from (<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/oer/docs/clarific.html>).
- , 2009. "Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act." Retrieved December 2, 2013. (<http://www2.ed.gov/inaid/prof/resources/athletics/eada.html>).
- Watterson, John S. 2000. "The Gridiron Crisis of 1905: Was It Really a Crisis?" *Journal of Sport History* 27(2): 291- 298.
- Weber, Max. 1946. "Bureaucracy." Pp. 196-244 in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Whitson, D. 1990. "Sport in the Social Construction of Masculinity." Pp. 19-29 in *Sport, Men and the Gender Order: Critical Feminist Perspectives*, edited by M.A. Messner and D.F. Sabo Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Megan A. Rabe

meganrabe@hotmail.com

Illinois College
Bachelor of Science, Sociology, May 2013

Research Paper Title:
Athletic Governing Body and Gender Equality in Intercollegiate Athletics

Major Professor: Dr. Rachel Whaley.