



3 1293 01007 5004



RETURNING MATERIALS:

Place in book drop to  
remove this checkout from  
your record. FINES will  
be charged if book is  
returned after the date  
stamped below.

SEP 26 1987  
APR 26 1987  
MAY 10 1987

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ROLE OF THE WOMAN ATHLETIC  
ADMINISTRATOR IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES  
REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE  
OF WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

By

Christine W. Hoyles

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1985

## ABSTRACT

### AN EXAMINATION OF THE ROLE OF THE WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE OF WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

By

Christine W. Hoyles

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. This was accomplished by studying the role of the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes related to the administration of the institutional women's athletic program, the conference in which the institutional women's athletic program competed, and the national governance structure.

#### Procedure

The examination was conducted through the use of two survey instruments which were developed to describe the roles of the institutional National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Primary Woman Administrator (PWA) and the institutional Director of Athletics in the decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The survey instruments were mailed to the PWA and the Director of Athletics at each

of the 284 member schools which comprised NCAA Division I. Participants were requested to answer questions which described their roles in the decision-making processes at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

### Analysis of Data

The results were reported as they applied to each of the seven purposes of the study. Where appropriate, the results were reported in descriptive form. Where hypotheses were being tested, the results were reported using chi-square values and comparative statistics such as the phi-coefficient and Cramer's V. The level of statistical significance established for this study was .05.

The data revealed that there was a significant difference between the perceived roles of the Director of Athletics and the woman athletic administrator at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

The results showed that a significant difference existed between the perceptions of the woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the woman athletic administrator at the institutional level but that no significant difference existed at the conference or national levels.

The responses received also indicated that a significant difference with the level of satisfaction with the role of the woman athletic administrator did exist between the Director of Athletics and the woman athletic



administrator at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Eldon R. Nonnamaker, my committee chairman and dissertation advisor for his guidance, support, and patience. I would also like to express my appreciation to my other committee members, Dr. Richard Featherstone, Dr. Lawrence Foster, and Dr. Gwendolyn Norrell for their contributions to this study.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	6
Focus of the Study . . . . .	7
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	7
Need for the Study . . . . .	9
Significance of the Study . . . . .	11
Hypotheses . . . . .	12
Definition of Terms . . . . .	13
Limitations and Delimitations . . . . .	15
Limitations . . . . .	15
Delimitations . . . . .	16
Design of the Study . . . . .	16
Organization of the Study . . . . .	17
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .	18
1833-1890 . . . . .	18
1890-1900 . . . . .	21
1900-1910 . . . . .	25
1910-1930 . . . . .	26
1930-1957 . . . . .	32
1957-1968 . . . . .	38
1968-1972 . . . . .	44
1972-1974 . . . . .	48
1974-1976 . . . . .	54
1976-1978 . . . . .	60
1978-1981 . . . . .	64
1981-1984 . . . . .	77
Summary . . . . .	82
3. METHODOLOGY . . . . .	88
Introduction . . . . .	88
Derivation of the Study . . . . .	89
Population . . . . .	91
Sampling Procedures . . . . .	92
Survey Instruments . . . . .	92
Data Collection . . . . .	94
Coding and Data Entry . . . . .	97
Data Analysis Procedures . . . . .	98

4.	ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	100
	Introduction . . . . .	100
	Analysis of Procedures . . . . .	101
	Analysis . . . . .	101
	Research Question 1 . . . . .	101
	Section I-Institutional Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	102
	Section II-Conference Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	106
	Section III-National Decision-Making	
	Processes . . . . .	108
	Section IV-Demographic Information . . .	111
	Research Question 2 . . . . .	111
	Section I-Institutional Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	111
	Section II-Conference Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	115
	Section III-National Decision-Making	
	Processes . . . . .	116
	Section IV-Demographic Information . . .	118
	Research Question 3 . . . . .	118
	Section I-Institutional Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	119
	Section II-Conference Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	122
	Section III-National Decision-Making	
	Processes . . . . .	123
	Summary . . . . .	126
	Research Question 4 . . . . .	126
	Section I-Institutional Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	126
	Section II-Conference Decision-	
	Making Processes . . . . .	129
	Section III-National Decision-Making	
	Processes . . . . .	130
	Summary . . . . .	131
	Research Question 5 . . . . .	132
	Research Question 6 . . . . .	135
	Research Question 7 . . . . .	136
	Summary . . . . .	137
5.	SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS, AND	
	IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	138
	Summary . . . . .	138
	Purposes . . . . .	139
	Design . . . . .	140
	Hypotheses . . . . .	141
	Limitations . . . . .	142
	Findings and Conclusions . . . . .	143
	Implications for Further Research . . . . .	146

## APPENDICES

A.	Letter of Approval from UCRIHS . . . . .	148
B.	The Survey Instrument for the Primary Women Administrators . . . . .	149
C.	The Survey Instrument for the Directors of Athletics . . . . .	164
D.	The Initial Cover Letter and the Results Request Form . . . . .	180
E.	Second Cover Letter . . . . .	184
F.	Questionnaire Response Rates . . . . .	185
G.	Frequency Counts and Percentages for Responses to Primary Woman Administrator Questionnaire .	186
H.	Frequency Counts and Percentages for Responses to Director of Athletics Questionnaire . . . .	242

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	298
------------------------	-----

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Response Percentages for Question 10 Regarding Type of Involvement by the Primary Woman Administrator in the Administration of Areas in Women's Athletics . . . . .	104
2.	Attendance at NCAA Conventions by Primary Women Administrators . . . . .	109
3.	Participation at NCAA Conventions by Primary Women Administrators . . . . .	109
4.	Response Percentages for Question 4 Regarding Type of Involvement by the Director of Athletics in the Administration of Areas in Women's Athletics . . . . .	112
5.	Response Percentages for Question 5 Regarding the Perception of the Director of Athletics of the Role of the Primary Woman Administrator in the Administration of Areas in Women's Athletics . . . . .	114
6.	Attendance at NCAA Conventions by Directors of Athletics . . . . .	116
7.	Participation at NCAA Conventions by Directors of Athletics . . . . .	117
8.	Comparison of the Perceived Role of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics at the Institutional Level . . . .	120
9.	Comparison of the Perceived Roles of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics at the Conference Level . . . . .	123
10.	Comparison of the Perceived Roles of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics at the National Level . . . . .	124
11.	Comparison of the Perceptions of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics Regarding the Role of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator . . . . .	127
12.	Comparison of the Perceptions of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics Regarding the Role of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator . . . . .	130
13.	Comparison of the Perceptions of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics Regarding the Role of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator . . . . .	131

14.	Satisfaction with the Impact on the Decision-Making Process . . . . .	132
15.	Satisfaction and Structure of the Decision-Making Process . . . . .	134
16.	Director of Athletics Satisfaction with Impact of Primary Woman Athletic Administrator . . . .	136
17.	Comparison of Satisfaction of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator and the Director of Athletics with the Role of the Primary Woman Athletic Administrator . . . . .	137
18.	Questionnaire Response Rates . . . . .	185
19.-		
173.	Frequency Counts and Percentages for Responses to Primary Woman Administrator Questionnaire . .	186
174.-		
334.	Frequency Counts and Percentages for Responses to Director of Athletics Questionnaire . . . . .	242

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

From its first mention in historical records, participation by women in athletic activities has been a subject surrounded by controversy. Accounts of the early Greek Olympics indicate that women were not permitted to participate in or even watch the games. They were, instead, often promised as rewards for successful male participants.<sup>1</sup>

Aristocratic women of the Middle Ages participated to a limited degree in early forms of games such as tennis and golf. However, the long-standing view of feminine frailty prevented serious participation. The role of the woman as a childbearer overshadowed all other parts of life. Participation in athletic activities was thought to affect the quality of the off-spring subsequently produced.<sup>2</sup> Even in early twentieth century America, women were thought to be hearty enough for the demanding physical labor of the fields yet "genuine women were physically weak."<sup>3</sup>

Just as participation by women in athletic activities has been an extensively debated issue, the organization of

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephanie L. Twin, Out of the Bleachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979), p. xvi.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. xviii.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. xix.



women's athletic activities as they were established has been a subject surrounded by controversy. First attempts to organize and establish standards for the conduct of women's sports date back to 1899 when the Conference on Physical Training, held in Springfield, Massachusetts, resulted in the appointment of a committee to study the modification of girls' basketball rules.<sup>4</sup> Formal organization grew from that point when the American Physical Education Association formally appointed its Women's Athletic Committee.<sup>5</sup>

At institutions of higher education, opportunities for participation in athletic activities by women centered around physical education classes.<sup>6</sup> Gymnastic activities and walking made up the majority of the offerings. Women were often left to organize their own sport activities. Early accounts of organized competition or intercollegiate activities are non-existent.

From the early 1900s until the early 1960s, women's athletics received organizational direction from several groups. The American Physical Education Association and the National Amateur Athletic Federation both had subdivisions

---

✓ <sup>4</sup>The Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973), p. 3.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

✓ <sup>6</sup>Betty Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 26.

concerned with programs for women.<sup>7</sup> During this period, attitudes toward and societal acceptance of organized women's participation in athletics ranged from totally acceptable to totally unacceptable. The women's subdivision of the National Amateur Athletic Federation grew and became a division of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER).

In the early 1960s, the Division for Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS) of the AAHPER was the primary group functioning in the area of the organization of women's athletics. It was then that a radical change in philosophy regarding competitive women's athletics became apparent. The DGWS revised its primary policy statement to include the encouragement of competitive athletics. This action led to the development of increased opportunities for women's participation in organized competition.<sup>8</sup>

The DGWS, realizing that the administration of organized competitive athletics at the collegiate level did not fit within its own existing structure, established the Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup>The Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973), p. 3.

✓<sup>8</sup>Lucille Magnusson, "The Development of Programs," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 56.

<sup>9</sup>Ibid.

This group served to encourage the development of intercollegiate athletic competition at the local, state, and regional levels as well as to organize DGWS collegiate national championships as the need developed.

The rapid growth of women's intercollegiate athletic programs at colleges and universities produced not only a need for national championships but also a need for well-organized leadership and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Without a framework of regulations for the administration of women's intercollegiate athletic programs, those programs could quickly become dissimilar enough to preclude equitable competition. A national structure to assure controlled development of these emergent programs and to regulate the activities of its member institutions was needed.

To meet the growing needs for national championships and governance, the CIAW became the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) in July, 1972.<sup>10</sup> This group continued to administer the collegiate national championship program and also emerged as the governance organization for its member institutions. The AIAW was, as were the DGWS and the CIAW, an organization developed by, led by, and composed of women representing its member institutions.

On July 21, 1975, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 went into effect. That act required the elimination

---

<sup>10</sup>Ibid.

of sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs.<sup>11</sup> As a result of its application, collegiate level women's athletic programs grew very rapidly. The AIAW became the largest collegiate athletic governance organization in the United States.<sup>12</sup>

During the late 1970s, there was growing dissatisfaction among a segment of AIAW members. The dissatisfaction stemmed from numerous AIAW rules, particularly those in the areas of the distribution of athletic grants-in-aid and the recruitment of prospective student-athletes, viewed by some member institutions as severely limiting. At the same time, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) interest in women's athletics began to be rekindled. Efforts to become involved in women's championships had surfaced at the 1975 and 1976 NCAA Conventions. Both had been unsuccessful but the perceived need for additional choices for member institutions resulted in renewed NCAA action in the area of women's championships and governance.<sup>13</sup> Following much debate and membership votes on the floors of the 1980 and 1981 AIAW Delegate Assemblies and the NCAA Conventions, the

---

<sup>11</sup>Margaret C. Dunkle, Competitive Athletics: In Search of Equal Opportunity, (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976), p. 1.

<sup>12</sup>Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, AIAW Directory 1980-81 (Washington, D.C.: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, 1980), p. 2.

<sup>13</sup>Randi J. Greenberg, "AIAW vs. NCAA: The Takeover and Implications," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Winter 1984, p. 29.

membership of the NCAA approved the initiation of women's national championships beginning in August, 1980. Also approved at the 1981 Convention were the structures necessary to govern women's intercollegiate athletics which would be fully implemented by August 1, 1985.<sup>14</sup>

These NCAA actions resulted in a division of the institutions which had previously held membership in the AIAW between that organization and the NCAA. During the 1981-82 academic year, both organizations sponsored comprehensive slates of national championships and governed women's athletics. Just prior to the start of the 1982-83 academic year, the number of institutions which had discontinued their memberships in AIAW had grown to the point where the organization had lost significant corporate sponsorships and faced certain financial insolvency. The AIAW then cancelled its national championship program and virtually ceased to exist.

#### Statement of the Problem

The problem which was addressed in this study was an examination of the role of the woman intercollegiate athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's athletics.

---

<sup>14</sup>The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1981 Convention Proceedings (Shawnee Mission, Kansas: The National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1981), p. A-59 & A-63.

### Focus of the Study

This study examined the role of the woman intercollegiate athletic administrator in institutional decision-making processes regarding administration and governance. This was accomplished by studying the role of the woman intercollegiate athletic administrator in the decision-making process related to the administration of the institutional women's athletic program, the conference in which the institution's women's programs compete, and the national governance system. While some comparisons were drawn with the role played by the Director of Athletics in the same processes, this study did not describe, in the same detail, the complete role of that individual. Likewise, neither the roles of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) nor the Faculty Representative were studied, but each was briefly discussed in an attempt to clarify the role of the woman administrator.

The impact of this issue on women's intercollegiate athletics received significant attention. It was not within the scope of this study to analyze the governance of men's intercollegiate athletics to the same degree.

### Purposes of the Study

The purposes this study attempted to achieve were to:

1. Describe the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's

intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

2. Describe the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
3. Compare the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
4. Compare the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator of her role in the same processes.
5. Determine the level of satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding

the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

6. Determine the level of satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
7. Compare the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the same processes.

#### Need for the Study

During the development of the mechanism for the NCAA governance of women's athletics and since the implementation of that mechanism, there has been criticism of the apparent lessened involvement of women in the institutional decision-making processes regarding administration and governance. During the existence of the AIAW, each member institution



had designated a Voting Representative, appointed by the CEO, who cast the vote of that institution on each issue at the AIAW Convention. Other responsibilities of that Voting Representative included the certification of student-athlete eligibility and the administration of compliance with the regulations of the organization. The AIAW Voting Representatives were primarily women and largely women administrators in athletics.

The NCAA system of institutional representation included the CEO of each member institution as the primary voting delegate. A Faculty Representative, who could cast the institutional vote in place of the CEO, was also a part of the structure. A third voting delegate was the Director of Athletics. The CEOs, the Faculty Representatives, and the Directors of Athletics of NCAA member institutions had largely been men.

Upon the inclusion of the governance of women's athletics in the scope of the NCAA in 1981, the position of Primary Woman Administrator (PWA) was developed to help ensure the representation of women at the NCAA Convention and in the legislative processes. This role was to be filled by the woman at each member institution who had the most significant amount of responsibility in the administration of the women's intercollegiate athletic program. In practice, the role of the PWA was most often filled by the woman who had been the AIAW Voting Representative.

While it appears that the PWA has been accorded the majority of the privileges and responsibilities of the Director of Athletics in the NCAA structure, it is also apparent that the role of the PWA in the decision-making processes on the individual campuses of member institutions differ dramatically. In many cases, the PWAs appear to have significant input in the development of the institutional position on NCAA issues. In other instances, PWAs appear to have little or no real input. The position of the PWA was initially developed by the NCAA to provide an avenue for women to speak on the floor of the Convention and to exercise voting privileges. Personal attendance at recent NCAA Conventions has shown, however, that many women who hold the position of PWA have not been authorized by institutional CEOs to receive the credentials necessary to use speaking and voting privileges.

#### Significance of the Study

Although there has been some speculation as to the impact of NCAA governance of women's intercollegiate athletics on women administrators, little formal study has been done in the area. This study will make a contribution to individuals, institutions, or associations wishing to determine whether the role of the woman administrator in intercollegiate athletics has been enhanced or diminished in the decision-making processes on administration and governance issues.

Additionally, this study may provide the basis for further study into the role of the PWA within the NCAA. Has this position been implemented as it was developed to be? Does the NCAA structure and incorporation of their position into that structure place barriers before women athletic administrators which limit professional growth? Has the definition of the role of the PWA expanded professional opportunities for women in athletic administration? The answers to these and other questions may come directly or indirectly from this study.

### Hypotheses

The emergence of the NCAA as the primary governance organization in women's intercollegiate athletics has led to questions as to the impact of the woman intercollegiate athletic administrator under that organization. Women administrators in intercollegiate athletics currently appear to have less involvement in institutional policy decisions regarding governance than they did under the AIAW structure. To examine the current impact of the woman administrator in the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics, three hypotheses were developed and stated in the null form. The hypotheses tested in this study were:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's

intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels and the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the same processes.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator and the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator of her own role.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role and the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator.

#### Definition of Terms

The following important terms will be used throughout this study and are defined to ensure clarity and continuity for the reader.

1. Conference -- an established group of institutions formed for the purpose of intercollegiate athletic competition.
2. Decision-making process -- "The systematic putting together of facts and experience to produce a better judgement. The organization of the relevant

information into a form that can be clearly understood and handled in the making of a choice. It is the manipulation of information so that a series of needed comparisons can be made."<sup>15</sup>

3. Faculty Representative -- a member of the faculty of each NCAA member institution appointed by the CEO to certify student-athlete eligibility, administer athletic financial aid, and to assist in the maintenance of adequate controls in an institution's intercollegiate athletic program.
4. Intercollegiate Athletics -- sport competition by students and/or teams from one college or university against students and/or teams from another college or university.
5. Member Institutions -- those colleges and universities who, for the purpose of regulating their intercollegiate athletic programs, have joined the AIAW and/or the NCAA.
6. Primary Woman Administrator -- an employee of each NCAA member institution who has the most significant amount of responsibility in the administration of the women's intercollegiate athletic program.

---

<sup>15</sup>Charles H. Kepner and Benjamin B. Tregoe, The Rational Manager (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), p. 180.

7. Role -- "those behaviors characteristic of one or more persons in a context."<sup>16</sup>
8. Voting Representative -- an employee of each AIAW member institution appointed by the CEO to certify student-athlete eligibility, athletic financial aid administration, and to oversee the application of AIAW rules on the women's intercollegiate athletic program.

### Limitations and Delimitations

#### Limitations

The major limitation of this study was the reliance on self-reported data from participating individuals as the basis for the conclusions drawn. Since the information provided on the survey instrument and the actual practice at any participating institution may differ, findings of this study must be evaluated with that in mind.

A second limitation of this study was the method of gathering data. A survey instrument was mailed to selected institutions. The returned responses may not constitute a representative sample. A third limitation of this study was the inability of the researcher to be certain that the individual to whom each questionnaire was sent actually completed the instrument rather than instructing someone else to do so. If such a situation did occur, the

---

<sup>16</sup>Bruce J. Biddle, Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors (New York: Academic Press, 1979), p. 58.

responses may or may not represent the feelings of the person to whom the questionnaire was originally directed.

#### Delimitations

The sample for this study was drawn from Division I NCAA member institutions. The findings of this study cannot accurately describe the activity at non-Division I NCAA member institutions or non-NCAA member institutions.

#### Design of the Study

To accomplish the purposes described, two survey instruments were developed. One instrument was designed to describe the role of the NCAA PWA in the institutional decision-making processes relative to the administration and governance of women's athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels. The second instrument was designed to evaluate the role of the Director of Athletics in the same processes and to describe his/her perceptions of the role of the PWA in those same processes.

The population for this study was NCAA member institutions which hold membership in Division I in 1984-85. The entire membership of the division was surveyed.

Survey instruments were mailed separately to NCAA PWAs and Directors of Athletics at those institutions selected for participation. Those instruments were each accompanied by a cover letter to the participant requesting their participation in the study and a return envelope. Individual responses remained confidential and this was indicated in the cover letter. Return envelopes were,

however, coded to permit the follow-up necessary to maximize the response rate. Instruments not returned in two weeks were identified and second requests for participation in the study were sent along with a second copy of the survey instrument.

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive and comparative techniques.

### Organization of the Study

This study is reported in five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, the statement of the problem, the focus of the study, the purposes of the study, the need for the study, the significance of the study, the hypotheses to be tested, the definitions of terms, the limitations and delimitations, the design of the study, and a description of the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 includes a review of the literature concerning the history of intercollegiate athletics with particular emphasis on the governance of those programs.

Chapter 3 describes the design of the study. The population and sampling procedures, the construction and content of the survey instruments used in the study, and the methodology employed in the analysis of the data gathered in the study will be explained.

Chapter 4 contains the findings of the study.

Chapter 5 contains a summary of the study as well as conclusions and recommendations.



## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The governance of women's intercollegiate athletics has been the responsibility of a number of different formal and informal organizations since the beginning of the programs. The following is a description of the history of the governance of women's intercollegiate athletic programs and the evolution of the form of governance in use today.

For the purpose of this study, the review of literature has been divided into major chronological periods of development. The description of each major period includes not only information relative to governance but also a summary of the status of women in sports during that time. In addition, descriptions of major historical events which have influenced collegiate sports for women are included.

#### 1833 -1890

The history of women's intercollegiate sports began during the period of 1833-1890 with the founding of many women's colleges. Betty Spears, a noted historian from Wellesley College and the University of Massachusetts, indicated that sport itself played a special role in the founding of those institutions. Prior to the development of

women's colleges, the idea of higher education for women was countered by two major objections. Women, Spears found, were thought to be mentally inferior to men. Additionally, they were thought to possess too little physical strength to withstand the rigors of college level study and daily classes.<sup>1</sup>

Much of this period was part of the Victorian Era. Ideal women of this time were expected to embody the concept of fragility. The image of delicacy as an accepted way of life was one which was fostered by fashion designers, clergymen, physicians, and journalists. Women of this era were expected to participate in sedentary indoor activities such as embroidery and painting on glass. Physical activity was limited by the costumes of the times. Women wore tightly laced corsets, bustles, hoops, and yards of trailing skirts.<sup>2</sup>

The ultimate goals of Victorian women were to attract a man and to bear children.<sup>3</sup> Spears' research showed that Victorian women accepted ill health as a way of life and that most were plagued by a monthly illness known as "the vapors". The fact that 45 percent of all women suffered

---

<sup>1</sup>Betty Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 27

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ellen W. Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1974), p. 12.

from menstrual cramps and another 20 percent from assorted ills indicated that the normal collegiate program of studies would have to be altered for 65 percent of all women. This was used by opponents of higher education for women to justify the denial of opportunity in that area. Spears also found research which indicated that overstudy by women would result in brain fever making them weak and unable to bear children.<sup>4</sup>

The latter half of the nineteenth century marked the beginning of a change in the Victorian ideals. This was due in part to the beginning of the feminist movement signalled by the Seneca Falls Convention on Women's Rights which was held in 1848. By the late 1860s women began to participate in sedate activities such as croquet, archery, bowling, lawn tennis, and golf. Activities of this era, according to Gerber, had three things in common. First, they could be performed without working up a sweat. Second, they could be performed gracefully. And third, they were performed primarily by upperclass women who had the leisure time and money available to make participation possible.<sup>5</sup>

The primary purpose of sport participation for women early in its development was the creation of an acceptable social encounter for men and women. Hence, most activities

---

<sup>4</sup>Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," p. 27.

<sup>5</sup>Ellen W. Gerber, "The Changing Female Image: A Brief Commentary on Sport Competition for Women," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, October 1971, p. 59.

were coeducational. The development of the women's colleges were responsible for the movement from coeducational activities to separate sports for men and women.<sup>6</sup> In 1865, Matthew Vassar planned a special school for instruction in physical activities suitable for women. He believed that good health was necessary for successful study. When Henry Durant founded Wellesley College in 1875, he carried on Vassar's idea of the important relationship between quality mental work and regular physical activity.<sup>7</sup>

The development of physical activity programs for women led to the development of team sports. Football was played by women at the University of California in 1878. Wellesley taught crew in 1890.<sup>8</sup>

#### 1890 - 1900

The introduction of the safety bicycle, with its two lower wheels and drop frame in the mid-1880s, opened the world of physical activity to many more women. The bicycle also significantly influenced the apparel for sportswomen. By the early 1890s, women cyclists were wearing dresses

---

<sup>6</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 6.

<sup>7</sup>Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport", p. 28.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 30.

without corsets, as well as blouse and skirt outfits.<sup>9</sup>

A leisurely fashion of playing sports was dictated by the long, full skirts and many petticoats worn by women of the mid-nineteenth century. This mode of dress gave way to a more functional style in the late 1880s which included divided skirts or bloomers and middy blouses. This style of dress allowed for greater freedom of movement which impacted the nature of sport activities for women.<sup>10</sup>

Competitive sport for women at the collegiate level was well established by the 1890s. Sports were defined as recreational physical activities characterized by competition, criteria for ascertaining a winner, codified rules, formal instruction for players and teams, as well as institutional organization.<sup>11</sup> Contests took place within colleges rather than between them. The primary competitive vehicle was interclass competition.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>Richard A. Swanson, "From Glide to Stride: Significant Events in a Century of American Women's Sports," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 45.

<sup>10</sup>Deobold B. VanDalen and Bruce L. Bennett, A World History of Physical Education (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 422.

<sup>11</sup>George, H. Sage, ed., Sport and American Society (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970), p.4.

<sup>12</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 56.

In 1892, the game of basketball was formulated by Dr. James Naismith. It was quickly introduced to women at Smith College by Senda Berenson. She developed extensive interclass competition but did not advocate intercollegiate events.<sup>13</sup> Loggia quoted Berenson as saying "competitive sports where a player becomes excited is beneficial to the nerves, heart, and lungs".<sup>14</sup> The game spread rapidly across the United States and intercollegiate competition was first recorded in 1896 between the University of California-Berkley and Stanford University as well as between the University of Washington and the Ellensburg Normal School.<sup>15</sup>

Gerber indicated that intercollegiate sport for women was not a controversial issue until basketball was introduced at Smith College. The general philosophy of the time was that sport participation was good for women but participation in schools was best because it lowered the physical risk for competitors.<sup>16</sup> However, as intercollegiate competition became more commonplace, antagonism toward it began to build.<sup>17</sup> Gerber noted that the beginning of basketball competition marked the start of a period in the history of women's sports which was

---

<sup>13</sup>Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," p. 32.

<sup>14</sup>Marjorie Loggia, "On the Playing Fields of History, Ms., July 1973, p. 63.

<sup>15</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 62.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 63.

permeated by never-ending debate about the values and practices of competition.<sup>18</sup>

Holbrook noted that the origination of basketball changed the sports scene for women in marked ways.<sup>19</sup> In June 1899, the Conference on Physical Training was held in Springfield, Massachusetts and the Women's Basketball Rules Committee (WBRC) was appointed to investigate the various rules modifications being used by institutions of higher education. The committee, led by Senda Berenson, developed a standardized set of rules. This conference marked the beginning of standardized conduct of women's sports as well as the beginning of governance of the programs.<sup>20</sup>

During this period of increasing participation, leadership for women's sports was provided by college physical directors. Where no women were available to take leadership roles, men stepped in to provide participation experiences for women. As the enthusiasm for these sports spread, the quality of the leadership was not always the highest. Coffey suggested that "thus the first seed was

---

<sup>18</sup>Gerber, "The Changing Female Image," p. 60.

<sup>19</sup>Leona Holbrook, "Women's Participation in American Sport," in Athletics in America, ed. Arnold Flath (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Press, 1972), p.46.

<sup>20</sup>Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973), p. 3.

planted for the ever-present controversy regarding the extent of sports competition for women."<sup>21</sup>

By 1900, sports instruction was an integral part of most physical education programs. Facilities for participation were being built and college faculties were being increased in size to provide the necessary instruction. The most important development of this era was the decreased interest in the gymnastic, or calisthenic, aspect of physical education which was coupled with the increased interest in sport activities.<sup>22</sup>

#### 1900 - 1910

The early 1900s found women competing in the Olympic Games although the United States had no female participants until 1920.<sup>23</sup> In the United States, President Theodore Roosevelt advocated the "strenuous life" and his participation in sport activities helped to enhance the credibility of sports participation and fitness. The general interest in sports and fitness which grew during the Roosevelt presidency included acceptance of programs for both men and women.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>Margaret A. Coffey, "The Sportswoman," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, February 1965, p. 39

<sup>22</sup>Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," p. 36.

<sup>23</sup>Gerber, "The Changing Female Image," p. 60.

<sup>24</sup>Holbrook, "Women's Participation in American Sport," p. 47.



By 1910, sport was the dominant element of the physical education curriculum at most institutions. Values other than health were being explored as benefits of participation. Beauty, grace, courage, enjoyment, as well as social and professional success were benefits thought to be derived from participation in sport. This broad range of study indicated complete acceptance of sport in physical education.<sup>25</sup>

#### 1910 - 1930

By 1910, sports programs for college women had grown both in size and scope. Unlike men's intercollegiate athletics where programs were organized and conducted by students, women's programs were under the tight control of physical educators. Since all three aspects of the physical education program (curricular, intramural, and intercollegiate) were under the control of professional educators, women's programs developed in unified, controlled patterns. There was very little external interference and a common philosophy dominated.<sup>26</sup>

As the women's sports programs grew in complexity, the American Physical Education Association (APEA) appointed a committee to set standards for women's activities. The Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA), constituted in 1917,

---

<sup>25</sup>Spears, "The Emergence of Women in Sport," pp. 37-38.

<sup>26</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, pp. 48-50.

was appointed to broaden the work of the WBRC which functioned as a sub-committee of the CWA. Elizabeth Burchenal, the first CWA chairman, sought to have the committee provide assistance to colleges regarding problems with athletic activities for women. By 1922, five sport sub-committees which made, revised, and interpreted rules were functioning within the CWA. The committee functioned as part of the APEA (the forerunner of the present American Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance; AAHPERD) from 1917 to 1922 with little fanfare.<sup>27</sup>

Organized opposition to women's competitive sports began to appear in 1917. Prior to that time, a minority of the women physical educators tried to convince the country that competition was injurious to the health of women participants. While that belief affected the types of activities available to women, it did not eliminate competitive activities entirely.<sup>28</sup> The development of the Athletic Conference of American College Women (ACACW) in 1917, however, gave structure to the arguments against competition for women.<sup>29</sup>

World War I and the ratification of the 19th Amendment resulted in great gains for women's sports. Gerber stated that in the times of the greatest American stress, women

---

<sup>27</sup>Ellen W. Gerber, "The Controlled Development of Collegiate Sport for Women 1923-1936," Journal of Sport History, Spring 1975, p. 5.

<sup>28</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 16.

<sup>29</sup>Swanson, "From Glide to Stride," p. 49.

have made big strides simply because the country could not afford to ignore the talents of one-half of its population. During the early 1920s, great changes were seen in the attitudes of the American public toward women. This era produced America's first heroines such as Amelia Earhart, Gertrude Ederle, and Mildred "Babe" Didrikson.<sup>30</sup>

In 1922, the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) legislated to provide competitive opportunities for women athletes. This action followed initial involvement by the AAU in 1914 and so angered women physical educators that they refused to serve on AAU committees. The source of this anger was the fact that coaches of high-level female competitors rarely were women, since women had had so little coaching experience.<sup>31</sup> Gerber also stated that the women physical educators felt that they were the only group with the proper expertise and interest in the welfare of women to govern women's sports. The physical educators contended that women participating in AAU events were being exploited and exhibited in a manner unfitting to the feminine image.<sup>32</sup>

In an attempt to unite men and women for the purpose of formulating principles, standards and regulations in athletics, the National Amateur Athletic Federation (NAAF) was established in 1923. A chief organizing group in the

---

<sup>30</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, pp. 18-20.

<sup>31</sup>Gerber, "The Controlled Development of Collegiate Sport for Women 1923-1936," pp. 6-7.

<sup>32</sup>Gerber, "The Changing Female Image," p. 60

formation of the NAAF was the War Department which saw an opportunity to promote the improvement of the general physical condition of the country. The Women's Division of the NAAF was headed by Mrs. Herbert Hoover and was led by an executive committee of women physical educators who were all active in the CWA. The Women's Division served to encourage sports activities for girls and women and to ensure the proper conduct and supervision of those activities. The membership was broad based, had wide geographic distribution, and reached most groups concerned with women's sports<sup>33</sup>.

The APEA, the ACACW, and the Women's Division of the NAAF favored play days as a substitute for women's intercollegiate activities. This type of activity started on the West Coast in 1926 and became very popular.<sup>34</sup> In play days, women from participating schools were divided into teams which had no more than one player from each school. Competition took place between the teams but the primary purpose of the participation was for enjoyment. There were no rewards to inspire competitive drive. Play days were said to foster friendship among the participants.

---

<sup>33</sup>Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports, p. 3.

<sup>34</sup>Mabel Lee, "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and the Situation Since 1923," Research Quarterly, May 1931, p. 108.

Opponents of play days indicated that they distracted from the students' academic pursuits.<sup>35</sup>

The attire of the 1920s increased women's mobility. The yardage of women's garments was reduced by one-half. Gymnasium bloomers were replaced by knickerbockers. One piece bathing suits, abbreviated to expose arms and limbs, were fashionable.<sup>36</sup>

Despite all of the progress which had been made by women in sports, the image of the sportsminded woman was slightly tarnished. The poor leadership given to certain programs resulted in displays of emotionalism and unladylike conduct in full view of the American public. The APEA, the ACACW, and the Women's Division of the NAAF began to gather support for their positions against intercollegiate competition for women. Mabel Lee reported that the number of colleges, which sponsored intercollegiate competition dropped from 22 percent in 1923 to 12 percent in 1930.<sup>37</sup> Collegiate play days were regularly replacing intercollegiate competition. Ryan, in The Literature of American School and College Athletics, discussed the issue of intercollegiate competition for women:

Considerable difference of opinion prevails as to the desirability of inter-institutional athletic

---

<sup>35</sup>Howard J. Savage, John T. McGovern, and Harold W. Bentley, Current Developments in American College Sport (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1931), p. 7.

<sup>36</sup>Coffey, "The Sportswoman," p. 39.

<sup>37</sup>Lee, "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women," p. 122.

contests for girls and women, with a strong trend at present against such contests, notwithstanding the insistence of a small group that girls and women are as capable of athletic competition as boys and need it more.<sup>38</sup>

In 1928, American women participated in track and field events in the Olympic Games for the first time. Representatives of the three governing organizations criticized the involvement of women in that competitive setting under the auspices of the AAU. The criticism revolved around action that appeared to be in direct opposition to the platform statement of the 1923 Conference on Athletics and Physical Education for Women and Girls. That statement, while it did not ban high-level competition, encouraged the development of programs where all could participate rather than those involving the training of a select few.<sup>39</sup>

The late 1920s found larger numbers of women physical educators opposing intercollegiate competition for women. The professionals continued to have tremendous influence because they controlled the activity programs, the sports programs, and the professional preparation programs for collegiate women. They were, therefore, able to produce a large body of professionals which held to a fairly consistent philosophy. During these times, teams sponsored

---

<sup>38</sup>W. Carson Ryan Jr., The Literature of American School and College Athletics (Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1929), p. xi.

<sup>39</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 73.

by business and industry contributed to the development of sports for women while the physical educators pretended not to notice their existence.<sup>40</sup>

### 1930-1957

The Great Depression sharply impacted the role of women in American society. In great numbers, they returned to the more traditional role of a woman. Women eagerly sought the security of marriage.<sup>41</sup>

The inability of women to cope with pressure and stress was a recurrent theme of this time. In 1933, Agnes Wayman, President of the APEA, characterized the feeling of the period:

External stimuli such as cheering audiences, bands, lights, etc., cause a great response in girls and are apt to upset the endocrine balance. Under emotional stress a girl may easily overdo. There is widespread agreement that girls should not be exposed to extremes of fatigue or strain either emotional or physical.... In addition, custom and good taste should always influence in questions of public display, costumes, publicity.<sup>42</sup>

The increase in opposition to competitive athletics for women was coupled with growing condemnation of men's

---

<sup>40</sup>William H. Freeman, "Controlling Athletics in Education: History and Perspective," paper presented at the pre-Convention Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Kansas City, Missouri, April 1978, p. 13.

<sup>41</sup>Coffey, "The Sportswoman," p. 40.

<sup>42</sup>Loggia, "On the Playing Fields of History," p. 64.

athletics. Mabel Lee, in "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and the Situation Since 1923," expressed a fear that once women's intercollegiate athletics were commonly accepted on campuses, college women might become involved in the same problems related to athletic participation as men.<sup>43</sup>

Coffey stated:

The impact of women's leadership in sports programs was more fully realized as increasing numbers of professionals entered the teaching field. However, there were conflicts in leadership in certain sections of the country and many sportswomen were under the jurisdiction of programs patterned on men's athletics. The guardians of morality had lived through the ballyhoo years, evidencing the emotionalism, the commercialism, the mannish attitude and the exploitation of the sportswoman under misguided leadership. Fundamentalists cried out for a return to sanity. The mannerisms of the sports woman became both an educational and public issue.<sup>44</sup>

The CWA of the APEA had evolved into the Section on Women's Athletics (SWA) by 1927 when it became evident to women physical educators that they needed more status and power following the AAU attempt to control women's sports. By 1932, the SWA had become the National Section on Women's Athletics (NSWA) with the reorganization of the APEA. This group had taken over the promotion of women's athletics in

---

<sup>43</sup>Lee, "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women," p. 124.

<sup>44</sup>Coffey, "The Sportswoman," p. 40.



earnest.<sup>45</sup> Under the leadership of this group, telegraphic meets and sports day competition peaked. Telegraph meets involved competition on a team's own campus, sending the results by telegraph to the team from another school which had also competed in its own campus, comparison of the results, and determination of winners. Sport days were much like play days except there was no mixing of teams. Playing rules were changed to accommodate the time available for the event which resulted in distorted contests. These activities were established to fill the void when the negative attitudes of most women physical educators lead to the end of virtually all other forms of competition.<sup>46</sup>

In 1933, the ACACW changed its name to the Athletic Federation of College Women (AFCW). While the name of the organization changed, the function of the group remained the same: to oppose competitive athletics for women. During this period, the Women's Division of the NAAF had become affiliated with the APEA and, in 1940, it merged with the NSWA.<sup>47</sup> Scott reported that: "In 1943, about 16 percent of the colleges, mainly in the east, had varsity teams. Eighty-one percent had some sort of extramural activity, largely as play days or by telegraph. The latter were

---

<sup>45</sup>Freeman, "Controlling Athletics in Education," p. 12.

<sup>46</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p.66.

<sup>47</sup>VanDalen and Bennett, A World History of Physical Education, p. 492.

especially popular in the west."<sup>48</sup> Women physical educators were doing little to promote varsity programs and much to oppose them.

During the 1930s and 1940s, there were very few opportunities for girls and women to meet high-level competition on a regular basis. Additionally, there was little opportunity for gifted female athletes to receive advanced training unless they trained with men or could afford private instruction or membership in specialized clubs. Swanson described the efforts of schools of this period:

There is no doubt that the vast majority of schools and colleges attempted to offer basic instruction and competition to the mass of girls under their direction as per the recommended standards of the watchdog agencies. However, in retrospect, it is obvious that little or no provision was made for the gifted athlete, or even the average woman who wanted to reach her maximum potential through advanced instruction and competitive experience. The very worthy objectives based upon very real fears and concerns of controlling groups, while protecting people from over-abuse, at the same time denied large numbers of girls and women over a period of two generations, the opportunity to achieve full actualization.<sup>49</sup>

In 1941, Gladys Palmer of Ohio State University proposed the formation of a Women's College Athletic Association to provide intercollegiate athletics for women. The first event to be sponsored by this group was a national

---

<sup>48</sup>M. Gladys Scott, "Competition for Women in American Colleges and Universities," Research Quarterly, May 1945, pp. 70-71.

<sup>49</sup>Swanson, "From Glide to Stride," p. 51.

collegiate golf tournament at Ohio State University. The National Association of Physical Education for Women (NAPECW) moved to prevent the formation of such a group but the tournament was played despite the opposition of a majority of the women's professional organizations.<sup>50</sup> Shortly after the tournament was played, the "Tripartite Golf Committee" was formed to assume organizational responsibility for that annual event. Three organizations, the ARFCW, the DGWS, and the NAPECW, had representatives on the committee.

Heusner noted:

World War II reopened industry to women and emphasized the need for every girl and woman to be physically fit. Physical educators accepted this need as their responsibility but an indoctrinated generation of professional leaders refused to accept inter-school sports as a logical vehicle for the task. Intramural sports developed and flourished, but there still was no avenue open for the highly skilled girl to realize her potential within the educational framework.<sup>51</sup>

By the end of World War II, the role of the American woman had been greatly enlarged. She continued to be a homemaker but was in a position of more equal responsibility with men due to her emancipation in the 1920s, her ability to supplement the family budget during the depression, and her fortitude in times of war. The period following World

---

<sup>50</sup>Freeman, "Controlling Athletics in Education," p. 14.

<sup>51</sup>W. W. Heusner, "Basic Physiological Concepts as They Relate to Girls' Sports," National Institute on Girls' Sports, September 28, 1965, p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

War II has been characterized more by the feminization of the male than by a change in the female role.<sup>52</sup>

During the 1950s, the governance structure for women's athletics underwent several changes. In the years following World War II, intercollegiate competition began to be more acceptable to women physical educators provided it took place in accordance with the strict guidelines published by the governing body. By 1951, however, only 28 percent of colleges had intercollegiate teams for women which suggests that women physical educators were far out of touch with the interests and desires of their students.<sup>53</sup>

In 1953, the NSWA became the National Section for Girls' and Women's Sports (NSGWS). In 1957, this section became a division of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER). No other division of the AAHPER had so much direct influence on the day to day functioning of its members as did the Division for Girls' and Women's Sports (DGWS). The DGWS policy statement, bowing to reality, indicated that intercollegiate sports programs may exist. In 1958, one-third of all colleges were offering these programs for women.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>52</sup>Coffey, "The Sportswoman," p. 41.

<sup>53</sup>Freeman, "Controlling Athletics in Education," p. 14.

<sup>54</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 25.

1957-1968

The 1958 policy statement of the DGWS reaffirmed the organization's support of sport days, play days, and telegraphic meets. The philosophy of the time was "a girl for every sport, and a sport for every girl."<sup>55</sup> Intercollegiate activities were approved of by the DGWS only if they did not conflict with the intramural and extramural programs. That 1958 policy statement also pointed out that women could take advantage of opportunities to compete in sports sponsored by non-school agencies.<sup>56</sup>

In 1959, the AFCW expanded its function and changed its name to the Athletic and Recreation Federation of College Women (ARFCW). By that time, the growth of women's intercollegiate sport demanded that new attention be given to its organization and regulation. The tri-partite organizations, the ARFCW, the DGWS, and the NAPECW, formed the National Joint Committee on Extramural Sport for College Woman (NJCESCW) to sanction intercollegiate competition for women. Events that brought college teams together, including the Women's National Golf Tournament were reviewed by that committee. It also established some standards for

---

<sup>55</sup>Lucille Magnusson, "The Development of Programs," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 55.

<sup>56</sup>Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Standards in Sports for Girls and Women (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1958), pp. 46-51.

such events.<sup>57</sup> It is recognized as the first organization to attempt to guide and administer women's intercollegiate athletic programs exclusively.<sup>58</sup>

Wilma Rudolph won three gold medals in the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome. Rudolph, an attractive woman, did much to dispel the feeling that athletic training by women produced unsightly muscles. This long-held stereotype was destroyed, in part, by the television coverage of Rudolph and her performances. Television had long covered men's sports but, in the early 1960s, it discovered women's sports. The number of televised women's events grew slowly but the acceptance of women's athletics, by both men and women, was aided by that exposure.<sup>59</sup>

In addition to strides in the competitive arenas, women were beginning to be included in the Olympic governance structure. A Women's Board, which functioned under the auspices of the United States Olympic Development Committee (USODC) was formed in 1961. The AAHPER, which held one seat on the United States Olympic Committee (USOC), supported the inclusion of DGWS representatives on Sports Committees which dealt with women's activities.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>Magnusson, "The Development of Programs," p. 56.

<sup>58</sup>National Association for Girls and Women in Sport, AIAW Directory 1976-77 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1976), p. 11.

<sup>59</sup>Swanson, "From Glide to Stride," pp. 51-52.

<sup>60</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 165.

The climate for competition by college women was becoming more favorable. After studying its philosophy and the total picture of sports for women, the DGWS recognized that it had been discriminating against the highly-skilled woman athlete. The 1963 DGWS "Statement of Policies..." encouraged colleges and universities to provide opportunities for highly-skilled women athletes beyond the level of the extramural program. This represented a significant change in DGWS philosophy. Gerber stated: "After decades of believing that attention to high-level competitors would take something away from the majority of women, the women leaders came to understand that high-level sport brings something to the lesser-skilled women."<sup>61</sup>

These changes in attitudes toward competitive sport were fueled by the political climate of the 1960s. Women were becoming a much more significant political force. Yielding to great pressure to do so, President John F. Kennedy established an Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women in 1963 charged with the investigation of the progress of the government in the advancement of the status of women. The committee included cabinet members and heads of major departments. Working at the same time was the Citizen's Advisory Council on the Status of Women whose members came from business, professional, and volunteer groups. This group was promoting the advancement of women in the private sector.

---

<sup>61</sup>Ibid., p. 76.

Women's rights proponent Catherine East was named the executive director of both groups. All fifty states set up their own commissions to study women's status by 1967.<sup>62</sup>

The 1963 publication of The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan significantly changed the social and political scene for women. Friedan charged that women had been victims of a set of ideals she called the "feminine mystique" which saw feminine fulfillment being achieved only through the roles of wife and mother. The social and cultural conditioning existing in American society denied women the opportunity to develop a sense of themselves as people.<sup>63</sup>

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 banned sex and race discrimination in employment. The original bill did not include the sex discrimination provision but, in an effort to delay the passage of the race discrimination act, it was added by Congressman Howard Smith of Virginia. It quickly became evident that the government had no intention of enforcing the sex discrimination provisions. Betty Friedan led in the organization of a gathering of prominent women's groups in Washington, D.C. in 1965. That gathering resulted in the founding of the National Organization for Women (NOW). Friedan became the first president of the organization.

---

<sup>62</sup>Lucy Komisar, The New Feminism (New York: Franklin Watts, 1971), p. 112.

<sup>63</sup>Betty Friedan, The Feminine Mystique (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1974), p. 32.



The primary purpose of NOW was "to take action to bring women into full participation in the mainstream of society now, exercising all the privileges and responsibilities thereof, in truly equal partnership with men."<sup>64</sup> The National Organization of Women established chapters across the country to achieve its purpose. By 1970, nearly one hundred chapters were established. The organization provided women with a powerful forum from which to launch their efforts to end sex discrimination and educate the public as to the problems and needs of women.<sup>65</sup>

The rapid changes in the political and social arenas encouraged activity in the area of athletic opportunity for women. The substantial growth of women's intercollegiate athletics in the late 1960s was triggered in large measure by the Study Conference on Competition held in 1965 in Washington, D.C.. One result of this conference, "Guidelines for Intercollegiate Athletic Programs for Women", facilitated the development of sound athletic programs in individual institutions.<sup>66</sup>

In 1965, the NJCESCW was disbanded by the ARFCW and the NAPECW in recognition of the need for expanding national championships and the desire to have the governance of

---

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 384.

<sup>65</sup>Komisar, The New Feminism, p. 114.

<sup>66</sup>American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, AIAW Handbook of Policies and Interim Operating Procedures 1971-72 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1971), p.5.

women's intercollegiate athletics under the auspices of one organization. Its function was remanded to the DGWS. Since no existing area of the DGWS was appropriate to assume the role of sanctioning intercollegiate athletic events for women, the DGWS appointed the Committee on Intercollegiate Sports for Women (CISW) in 1966. The CISW was to function within the DGWS structure and was to assist in the conduct of intercollegiate sports for women. In 1967, the CISW was renamed the Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) to give weight to its high-level purpose.<sup>67</sup> Katherine Ley was named CIAW chairman and the organization took over the task of sponsoring DGWS national championships.

The initial purposes of the Commission were:

1. To encourage the organization of colleges and universities or organizations of women physical educators to govern intercollegiate competition for women at the local, state or regional levels.
2. To hold DGWS national championships as the need for them became apparent.
3. To sanction closed intercollegiate events at which at least five colleges or universities were participating.<sup>68</sup>

Magnusson stated: "A major concern was the establishment of policy-making bodies at the local or regional levels which

---

<sup>67</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, pp. 83-84.

<sup>68</sup>American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, AIAW Handbook of Policies and Interim Operating Procedures 1971-72, p. 5.

would adopt the DGWS Guidelines and enforce them as policy and, in addition, add other necessary policies."<sup>69</sup>

An important question which the Commission had to answer was whether growth in a given sport should be from the top, meaning the establishment of a national championship as a motivating factor, or whether growth should come from the bottom, meaning local level participation would create the need for a national championship. The CIAW and the DGWS decided to promote growth from both the top and the bottom. A schedule of national championships to be sponsored was developed. It included the continuation of golf, the addition of gymnastics and track and field in 1969, badminton, swimming and diving, and volleyball in 1970, and basketball in 1972.<sup>70</sup>

#### 1968-1972

The late 1960s and the early 1970s saw women make great strides in many different arenas. The number of women's rights groups increased significantly. In 1968, the Women's Equity Action League (WEAL) and Human Rights for Women (HRW) broke from NOW, under whose auspices they had previously operated, and became separate organizations.

---

<sup>69</sup>Magnusson, "The Development of Programs," p. 56.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

Also, in 1968, the Organization of Federally Employed Women (FEW) was begun.<sup>71</sup>

The sporting arena was also the site of many changes for women during this period. A female athlete, Janice Lee York Romary, became the first woman chosen to carry the flag of the United States in the opening ceremonies of the 1968 Olympic Games.<sup>72</sup> In 1970, Bernice Gera ended a ten-year struggle to become an umpire in professional baseball. After having been accepted at an umpires' school, Ms. Gera was denied access to the program when it was discovered that she was a female. After a series of lawsuits, a State Court of Appeals upheld a 1970 Human Rights Commission ruling and ruled Gera eligible to umpire in the New York-Pennsylvania League. She umpired one game in that league but, due to the extreme harassment she received during her ten-year fight and during that one game, she discontinued her fight. Gera's battle stood as proof that women's opportunities in sport could be expanded through the courts. Other court action during this period resulted in access to the professions of horse and motorcycle racing for Tuesdee Testa and Kerry Kleid as well as a seat in the press box for Elinor Kaine.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood, Academic Women on the Move (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973), pp. 25-26.

<sup>72</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 146.

<sup>73</sup>Ibid., pp. 215-218.

Collegiate sport for women also grew from 1968-1972. Participation by women in intercollegiate athletics increased significantly. By 1972, many colleges and universities were sponsoring sports programs through Women's Athletic Associations (WAAs) and nearly 32,000 women were participating.<sup>74</sup>

The CIAW guided DGWS national championships, gave assistance to regional and local governing groups, and implemented the CIAW established policies. Nine regional representatives and one junior college representative worked in an advisory capacity to lay the foundation for the development of a constitution and to conduct an election of officers.<sup>75</sup>

In 1971, the ARFCW and the ACACW merged and became College Women In Sport (CWS). CWS was a body of representatives of WAAs which held national, regional, and local meetings. The purpose of the biennial national conventions was to bring college women together to exchange ideas, encourage leadership, and further national interest in sport for college women.<sup>76</sup>

The growth of collegiate sport programs for women developed the need for a more structured governing body to

---

<sup>74</sup>Dave Daniel, ed., "Colleges Seek Input to Title IX," NCAA News, March 15, 1974, p. 1.

<sup>75</sup>American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, AIAW Handbook of Policies and Interim Operating Procedures 1971-72, p. 6.

<sup>76</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 79.

provide leadership and maintain standards of excellence in intercollegiate competition for all college women. To meet this need, the CIAW became the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW). The formation of the AIAW had been approved by the DGWS Council and the AAHPER Board of Directors in 1971 but the CIAW continued to operate until July 1, 1972. During the 1971-72 academic year, membership in the new organization had been solicited and approximately 275 institutions joined.<sup>77</sup>

The AIAW purposes and philosophy remained much the same as those of the CIAW. The purposes of the AIAW were:

1. to foster broad programs of women's intercollegiate athletics which are consistent with the educational objectives of member schools;
2. to assist member schools to extend and enrich their programs of intercollegiate athletics for women;
3. to stimulate the development of quality leadership among persons responsible for women's intercollegiate athletic programs;
4. to encourage excellence in performance of participants in women's intercollegiate athletics.<sup>78</sup>

The two major differences in the organizations were the method of obtaining leadership and the development of major policy. The leadership of the CIAW was appointed by

---

<sup>77</sup>Lucille Magnusson, "The What and Why of AIAW," Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, March 1972, p. 71.

<sup>78</sup>American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, AIAW Handbook of Policies and Interim Operating Procedures 1971-72, p. 6.

the DGWS. The leadership of the AIAW was to be elected by the membership. In the area of policy development, each member institution was to have a vote in major policy issues under the AIAW. That was unlike the CIAW method where policies were handed down by the DGWS.<sup>79</sup> With its formation, the AIAW became the first governing body for women's intercollegiate sports with the power to enforce its own policies.<sup>80</sup>

#### 1972-1974

The period from 1972 to 1974 was perhaps the most political period in the evolution of women's sports. On March 22, 1972 the Equal Rights Amendment was passed by the United States Senate. This legislation provided the foundation for the improvement of the legal and economic status of women.<sup>81</sup>

The women's liberation movement, while it had created some interest in the plight of women in sport, actually paid little attention to athletic equality. Robin Morgan, an early and aggressive leader of the women's rights movement, stated that the slow entrance into concern for sport was due to a common lack of understanding of the field.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup>Magnusson, "The Development of Programs," pp. 57-58.

<sup>80</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 84.

<sup>81</sup>Ibid., p. 212.

<sup>82</sup>Bil Gilbert and Mary Williamson, "Programmed to be Losers," Sports Illustrated, June 11, 1973, p. 65.

Attention was, however, focused on equality in athletics with the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.

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 education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.<sup>83</sup>

The Act made no mention of athletics or athletic programs but instead referred to sex discrimination in educational programs and activities. Hogan stated, however:

Fueled by an almost chemical interaction of a federal anti-sex discrimination law, the women's liberation movement, and what is called the temper of the times, women's sports took off like a rocket in 1972.<sup>84</sup>

Following the passage of the Act, women's groups were quick to press for action in the area of athletics. Both NOW and WEAL issued strong statements concerning necessary improvement of opportunities for women in sports. The WEAL statement read:

In terms of athletic programs... the thrust of the efforts to bring about equal opportunity for women must be twofold: While outstanding female athletes should not be excluded from competition because their schools provide teams only for males, separate but equal programs should be

---

<sup>83</sup>20 United States Code, Education Amendments of 1972 (Washington, D.C.: United States Printing Office, 1972), section 1681(a).

<sup>84</sup>Candace Lyle Hogan, "From Here to Equality: Title IX," womenSports, September 1977, p. 16.



provided for average female students, who cannot compete equally in athletics with male students.<sup>85</sup>

The National Organization for Women passed a resolution concerning equality for college women in sport at its sixth annual convention in February 1973. It stated:

- Whereas: Women represent more than half of the population of American college students.
- Whereas: Women pay the same tuition fees and athletic fees as men.
- Whereas: Women have traditionally been required to meet higher standards for admission to many colleges.
- Whereas: Women students and academic personnel receive less grant, scholarships, fellowships, and other forms of financial aid.
- Whereas: Women have the same right and desire to maintain their physical health, experience the joy of movement, and the challenge of competition.
- Whereas: There now exist Federal and State laws which prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex.
- Resolved: That women in collegiate sport demand equality and freedom from discrimination, as granted them by the attached Federal Laws and Regulations Concerning Sex Discrimination in Educational Institutions.
- Resolved: That women in collegiate sport, both students and staff, insist upon correcting inequities in the following areas.

Those areas included admissions and appointments, financial aid and scholarships, personnel, organization and administration, finances, facilities and services, and

---

<sup>85</sup>Margaret C. Dunkle, "Equal Opportunity for Women in Sports," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 17.

sports programming. A task force to implement sports policies was also created.<sup>86</sup>

In its May 1973 report, The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women identified physical education, sports, and extracurricular activities as areas in which sex discrimination was most likely to exist. The American notion of sports being good for people, building better citizens, vigorous minds and bodies, promoting a better society, was actually being applied to only one-half of the population. Gilbert and Williamson stated:

Sports may be good for people, but they are considered a lot gooder for male people than for female people.<sup>87</sup>

During this period, the AIAW continued to develop as an organization mirroring the growth of intercollegiate sports programs for women. The AIAW leadership, following that of the DGWS, worked diligently to avoid what it saw as abuses in the system of men's intercollegiate athletics. The most significant of these issues was the avoidance of athletic scholarship programs for female athletes. The 1972-73 AIAW Handbook included the DGWS Scholarship Statement which described that position as intended to protect, rather than diminish, the continued development of athletics for women. It was intended to discourage the

---

<sup>86</sup>National Organization for Women, "Towards Equality in Sport--Recommendations," resolution passed at the NOW National Conference, Washington, D.C., February 1973.

<sup>87</sup>Bil Gilbert and Mary Williamson, "Sport is Unfair to Women," Sports Illustrated, May 21, 1973, p. 90.

buying or retaining of athletic talent by any college or university.<sup>88</sup>

The policy prohibiting the awarding of athletic scholarships to female athletes was rescinded by both the DGWS and the AIAW on April 2, 1973 following legal challenges. The 1973-74 AIAW Handbook carried the following policy revision:

The DGWS is concerned that many collegiate athletic programs, as currently administered, do not make available to female students benefits equivalent in nature or extent to those made available to male students. While a curtailment of programs of financial aid to female students involved in athletics does eliminate the potential for abuses inherent in such programs, this remedy is overly broad--because it operates inequitably to deny female students benefits available to their male counterparts. Specifically, these benefits might include the recognition of athletic excellence and the opportunity for economic assistance to secure an education. Therefore, DGWS believes that the appropriate solution in our contemporary society is one directed to avoiding abuses while providing to female students, on an equitable basis, benefits comparable to those available to male students similarly situated.<sup>89</sup>

This statement marked a significant philosophical change for the AIAW. Athletic scholarships were permitted but the development of such programs was not encouraged.

Athletic leaders began to realize the impact of the passage of Title IX. Dr. Katherine Ley, president of the AAHPER, stated:

---

<sup>88</sup>Division for Girls and Women's Sports, Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports, p. 27.

<sup>89</sup>Mildred Barnes, ed., AIAW Handbook of Policies and Operating Procedures 1973-1974 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973), p. 24.

There is little doubt that Title IX represents a major breakthrough for women in education: certainly it has particular benefits for women in sports. In my opinion it is the greatest step forward for females since they were granted the right to vote.<sup>90</sup>

However, the total impact of the passage of Title IX was just beginning to be felt. In the fall of 1973, the first draft of The Guidelines for Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1972 were published. Included was the following broadened application of the law to athletics:

Except as provided in this section, no person shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, be treated differently from another person, or otherwise be discriminated against in any athletic program or activity operated by a recipient (one who receives federal aid) and no recipient shall provide any such program or activity separately on such basis.<sup>91</sup>

That draft set the stage for a long series of interpretations as to precisely what was covered by the law and the actions required of schools to comply with the regulations. Some interpretations required co-ed programs of athletics to be developed. Others interpreted the regulations to require separate but equal programs. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) Caspar W. Weinberger blamed Congress for enacting a broad

---

<sup>90</sup>Katherine Ley, "Women in Sports: Where Do We Go from Here, Boys?", Phi Delta Kappan, October 1974, p. 129.

<sup>91</sup>38 Federal Register (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, September 20, 1973), pp. 26384-26389.

anti-sex bias law "with little legislative history, debate, or thought about the difficult problems of application."<sup>92</sup>

Any interpretation, however, elicited strong reaction from administrators responsible for the conduct of men's intercollegiate athletics. During this period, the major governing body for men's intercollegiate athletics, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), worked hard to gain the exemption of athletics from Title IX. Since athletics had always been regarded as educational, the NCAA request was denied.<sup>93</sup>

#### 1974-1976

Reactions to the proposed application of Title IX to intercollegiate athletics by administrators of men's athletic programs continued to be frequent and severe. Don Canham, athletic director at the University of Michigan, expressed his concern about the implementation of the law in a letter to HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger. Canham stated that his primary concerns were in the areas of provision of equal equipment, facilities, scholarships, and budgets for women's sports. He indicated that, in his opinion, the present interest in women's programs did not warrant such regulations. In calling for the change of the regulations, Canham stated:

---

<sup>92</sup>Cheryl M. Fields, "HEW Softens Bias Stand," The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 7, 1975, p. 1.

<sup>93</sup>Ley, "Women in Sports," p. 130.

This proposal, Title IX, would be an absolute disaster for both men's and women's intercollegiate athletics.<sup>94</sup>

The NCAA also continued its effort to change the Title IX regulations. In the March 1, 1974 issue of the NCAA News, Robert C. James, chairman of the NCAA Joint Legislative Committee, stated that if athletics must be covered, then a reasonable and practical method should be developed to prevent severe damages to the revenue-producing sports and to prevent an increase in the 49.5 million dollar annual deficit presently incurred by NCAA member institutions in the conduct of their intercollegiate athletic programs.<sup>95</sup>

The NCAA published a request that Title IX regulations be withdrawn in the March 5, 1974 issue of the NCAA News. The NCAA charged that none of the bodies which administered intercollegiate athletics were contacted during the drafting of the Title IX regulations. The regulations demanded more from competitive athletics than from non-competitive athletics. While physical education classes could be offered without sex-related restriction, competitive programs for women must be offered if women lacked the skill to make an open team. The NCAA challenged the legal basis for that great variance in requirements.<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>94</sup>Don Canham, "Opposition Forwarded to Title IX Regulations," NCAA News, May 15, 1974, p. 6.

<sup>95</sup>Dave Daniel, ed., "HEW Regulations Threaten College Athletics," NCAA News, March 1, 1974, p. 2.

<sup>96</sup>Daniel, "Colleges Seek Input To Title IX," p. 1.

The debate over the applicability of Title IX to all phases of intercollegiate athletics continued in Congress also. The sponsor of the original bill in the Senate, Birch Bayh, indicated that the purpose of the bill was to provide equal access for men and women to the educational process and the extracurricular activities in a school where there was not a unique facet such as football involved. HEW, however, drafted regulations which proposed blanket rules to govern all athletic activities.<sup>97</sup>

Efforts were made in Congress to amend Title IX to exclude athletics from its jurisdiction. Senator John Tower proposed an amendment in May 1974 which would have exempted the revenue-producing sports. He stated that the purpose of this amendment was to preserve the revenue base of intercollegiate athletics so that it could provide for expanding opportunities for women athletes. The Senate passed the Tower amendment but, following debate in a Senate-House conference committee, the bill became a compromise sponsored by Senator Jacob Javits. The Javits amendment specified that HEW prepare and publish reasonable regulations for athletics which considered the nature of particular sports. The particular sports in question were

---

<sup>97</sup>Fred C. Davison, "Intercollegiate Athletics and Title IX: Equal Opportunity or Federal Incursion?," USA Today, July 1979, p. 36.

football and men's basketball.<sup>98</sup> The Javits amendment failed to gain Congressional approval.

A second draft of Guidelines to Title IX was issued by HEW on June 18, 1974. That draft was designed to be non-disruptive to existing intercollegiate athletic programs. Athletics would receive more leeway than most educational programs and would be asked to come into compliance voluntarily. Separate teams for males and females or single-sex teams could be provided if members were selected on the basis of skill. Equal expenditures would not be required but equitable programs to meet the needs and interests of both sexes would be required. Compliance at the institutional level would be made on the basis of the institution's total effort rather than on a sport-by-sport basis.<sup>99</sup> Representatives of the NCAA remained apprehensive but heartened by HEW's apparent recognition of the special characteristics of certain sports. Non-discriminatory factors which could justify differences in treatment among sports included: (1) the nature and level of competition; (2) variations in equipment costs; (3) the cost of publicity; and (4) the cost of travel.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup>More Hurdles to Clear: Women and Girls in Competitive Athletics (Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, [July 1980]), p. 7.

<sup>99</sup>E. Wentworth, "HEW Offers 'Nondisruptive' Bans in Sex Bias," The Washington Post, June 19, 1984.

<sup>100</sup>Thomas J. Flygare, "HEW's New Guidelines on Sex Discrimination in Collegiate Athletics," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1979, p. 530.



Between June 24, 1974 and August 2, 1974 twelve public hearings were held. In the eighteen month period following the June 1974 publication of the original Guidelines, over ninety-seven hundred responses were received by HEW.<sup>101</sup> Varied interpretations of the regulations continued to abound. Some felt that co-ed locker room and toilet facilities may be required by the Title IX guidelines. While women's groups fought to keep athletics from being entirely exempted from Title IX, others felt that change was necessary because the Guidelines were inconsistent with the original law.<sup>102</sup>

On May 27, 1975, HEW issued the final implementing regulations which President Gerald Ford signed and forwarded for congressional review. No changes were approved in the Congress so Title IX of the Education Amendments went into effect on July 21, 1975. The regulations took effect in July 1976 for elementary schools and in July 1978 for secondary schools and colleges.<sup>103</sup>

In September 1975, a memorandum was sent to school and college administrators by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare/Office for Civil Rights containing the final regulations barring sex discrimination in athletics. Educational institutions were required to

---

<sup>101</sup>Corbin Gwaltney, "Anti-Sex Bias Rules," The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 10, 1975, p. 10.

<sup>102</sup>Corbin Gwaltney, "Mood in Congress Alarms Women," The Chronicle of Higher Education, April 28, 1975, p. 7.

<sup>103</sup>More Hurdles to Clear, p. 7.

conduct a self-evaluation of current policies and practices in athletics by July 21, 1976. Following the self-evaluation, institutions were required to develop plans to correct existing inequities. Inequities were to be corrected by July 21, 1978. The two year period was to be considered as an adjustment period rather than as a waiting period. Few schools responded to the requirement to conduct the self-analysis.<sup>104</sup> Cox stated: "In view of the stiff opposition to the regulation among some members of Congress and the lobbying efforts of the NCAA, the final regulations may be more effective than should have been expected."<sup>105</sup>

In spite of much foot dragging in complying with the requirements of Title IX, women's intercollegiate athletic programs continued to grow in number and in size. The AIAW had grown to include almost six hundred members. The organization had replaced its practice of mail balloting on key issues with an annual Delegate Assembly. Each member institution had a presidentially-appointed Voting Representative. The national championship slate included ten championships in seven sports. In addition two other championships, the United States Tennis Association Championship and the Women's College World Series, were recognized by the AIAW. Philosophically, the AIAW continued to take the strong stand developed by its parent

---

<sup>104</sup>Hogan, "From Here to Equality," p. 17.

✓<sup>105</sup>Thomas A. Cox, "Intercollegiate Athletics and Title IX," George Washington Law Review, November 1977, p. 64.

organizations on the positive relationship of education and competitive athletic experiences.<sup>106</sup>

#### 1976-1978

Individual colleges and universities struggled with the implementation of the Title IX regulations on their own campuses. Roger Williams, in Saturday Review, stated that while some institutions had accepted the requirements and beefed up their women's programs, others had ignored the requirements hoping the law or its supporters would go away. Further, he said, that while overall progress was slow, institutions were not totally to blame. The language of Title IX was vague. Institutions which wanted to provide adequate funding for women's athletics were hard pressed to find the resources. Reductions in other areas of the institution or the receipt of new money from state legislatures were the only viable methods of providing continuous funding for such program adjustments. Some colleges did go to special fundraising efforts to improve with many institutions making improvements in the areas of athletic opportunities for women. Halting progress was made numbers of sports and operating budgets but resisting change

---

<sup>106</sup>Judith R. Holland, ed., AIAW Handbook of Policies and Operating Procedures 1974-75 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), pp. 33-34.

in the improvements of coaches' salaries, travel arrangements, or the use of facilities.<sup>107</sup>

The increase in the number of participants in women's intercollegiate athletics became significant. A 1977 survey conducted by the NCAA of its member institutions found that 170,384 men and 64,375 women had participated during 1976-77. That number of women represented 27.4 percent of the total athletic population and a 102.1 percent increase since 1971-72. It was suggested that those gains appeared to be so significant due to the very low starting point.<sup>108</sup>

According to LaNoue, the Title IX issues were further exacerbated by the hidden agendas of special interest groups. Feminists appeared to be striking back against the male culture as represented by certain athletic traditions. Other groups appeared to be using Title IX as a tool to cut back on expenditures and abuses in big-time intercollegiate sport. Major universities with football and men's basketball programs seemed to be trying to protect the competitive edge their affluence had previously bought.<sup>109</sup>

The many positive changes which occurred in women's intercollegiate athletics as a result of the passage of

---

<sup>107</sup>Roger Williams, "The Battle for Bucks in Women's Athletics," Saturday Review, January 21, 1978, p. 56.

<sup>108</sup>More Hurdles to Clear, p. 21.

<sup>109</sup>George R. LaNoue, "Athletics and Equality: How to Comply with Title IX Without Tearing Down the Stadium," Change, November 1976, p. 27.

Title IX were accompanied by some negative changes.

Katherine Ley wrote:

Many colleges and universities have merged men's and women's physical education departments in anticipation of Title IX. Where there have been two chairmen in the past there is now one. The influence of women in decision-making positions is being reduced. The greatest loss may very well be in the realm of philosophy, because the attitude of many women toward competition does differ from that of men.<sup>110</sup>

Women themselves disagreed on the direction in which athletic programs for women should head. One philosophy promoted the spending of larger amounts of money and effort on the intramural and recreational programs which offered participation opportunities for many. The opposing school of thought advocated the full development of programs for talented students. Women also disagreed regarding the speed with which to modify existing programs. Women who chose to move more slowly, spending time in planning and adjusting, were judged to have cold feet. The acronym DGWS was sometimes said to stand for Don't Give Women Sports.<sup>111</sup>

Much of the male athletic world spent time grumbling about the "they're going to rob Peter to pay Paula" theory. It was commonly felt that the financial resources necessary to expand women's sports programs would come from existing resources which supported men's programs. By and large, that proved to be a fallacy. Most institutions reported making no significant changes in their men's programs while

---

<sup>110</sup>Ley, "Women in Sports," p. 131.

<sup>111</sup>Gerber et al., The American Woman in Sport, p. 233.

they expanded opportunities for women.<sup>112</sup> This was due to the fact that women's sports were treated in much the same way as men's minor sports, low on the totem pole, when compared with the revenue-producing sports.

The Title IX enforcement regulations were guided by the 1964 Civil Rights Act (Title VI). The developed doctrine of equal protection as applied to women was used. Institutions found to be in non-compliance with the Title IX regulations risked the cut-off of federal funds.<sup>113</sup>

The NCAA challenge of the Title IX regulations continued. In 1976, the NCAA initiated a lawsuit which charged that athletic programs do not receive federal assistance and should, therefore, be exempt from the regulations.<sup>114</sup> Interestingly, the regulations failed to deal with athletic associations to which schools belonged such as the NCAA. These organizations had proven to be major obstacles to equalization efforts due to their political efforts and the fact that they publicized and supported men's athletics to the exclusion of women's sports.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup>Hogan, "From Here to Equality," pp. 26-27.

<sup>113</sup>"Sex Discrimination and Intercollegiate Athletics," Yale Law Review, May 1979, p. 1256.

<sup>114</sup>Patricia Huckle, "Back to the Starting Line," American Behavioral Scientist, January/February 1978 p. 384.

<sup>115</sup>"Sex Discrimination and Intercollegiate Athletics," p. 1276.

From 1976 to 1978, the AIAW underwent significant organizational changes. It began to recognize the differences inherent in collegiate institutions and divided its membership into three categories for competitive purposes. Those categories included: (1) large colleges (more than three thousand full-time undergraduate female students), (2) small colleges (less than three thousand full-time undergraduate female students), and (3) junior/community colleges. By 1978, national championships were held in twelve sports, a national letter of intent was being used, and the organization had 750 members.<sup>116</sup> The number of institutions giving athletic scholarships to females had sky-rocketed. By 1978, ten thousand women from 460 schools received scholarships worth over seven million dollars.<sup>117</sup>

#### 1978-1981

The ability of the AIAW to develop fully in all of the directions it had identified as important began to be hampered by its close association with its parent organizations. The AAHPERD (AAHPER had changed its name to give greater recognition to its dance sub-group in the early 1970s) and the NAGWS (DGWS had become the National

---

<sup>116</sup>National Association for Girls and Women in Sport, AIAW Handbook 1977-78 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1977), p. 2.

<sup>117</sup>"Comes the Revolution," Time, June 26, 1978, p. 54.

Association for Girls and Women in Sport in 1974) controlled the legal affairs of the AIAW and held the seats on the amateur sport governing body boards which the AIAW leadership felt should belong to its organization. In recognition of the need for change, the AIAW formed a committee to study the impact of leaving the AAHPERD umbrella and becoming a separate legal entity. Following study, the AIAW became legally separate from the AAHPERD on June 1, 1979 but continued programmatic and philosophical ties with both the AAHPERD and the NAGWS.<sup>118</sup> Regarding this action, Ulrich stated:

The metamorphosis of the AIAW from a group of women interested in the development of women's sport to a group of women interested in the development of women through athletics was a subtle but important one.<sup>119</sup>

As it continued to grow, the AIAW added to its national championship offerings until by 1980 it sponsored thirty-nine championships in seventeen sports. Nine hundred sixty-seven institutions held membership in 1980. Competitive divisions had been reorganized and divided into categories based on the amount of athletic financial aid given by a member school. Student representation was added to the governance structure at all levels and became a major

---

<sup>118</sup>Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, AIAW Handbook 1979-80 (Washington, D.C.: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, 1979), p. 1.

<sup>119</sup>Celeste Ulrich, "The End of an Era," Coaching: Women's Athletics, September/October 1980, p. 15.



difference between the AIAW and other major sport governing organizations.<sup>120</sup>

The AIAW realized the need to generate resources for the organization from sources other than membership dues. In 1978, it appointed a special committee to study the possibility of selling its championships to television.<sup>121</sup> At the January 1980 AIAW Delegate Assembly, the Television Committee announced the beginning of a three year, one million dollar contract with the National Broadcasting Corporation to televise several championships. That fact fueled discussion regarding the possibility of corruption in women's athletics, long regarded as a serious problem in the men's structure. Illegal competition for the dollar might increase if there were more dollars to be had. The AIAW had no enforcement arm to guarantee compliance with its regulations. Emphasis was, instead, placed on the credo that self-policing was the most appropriate method in which to deal with potential violations. The AIAW position was one of believing that conscience was more powerful than compulsion.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup>Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, AIAW Handbook 1979-80, p. 1.

<sup>121</sup>National Association for Girls and Women in Sport, AIAW Handbook 1978-79 (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1978), p. 1.

<sup>122</sup>"Comes the Revolution," p. 59.

With the Title IX issues still smoldering on most campuses, another major battle developed. That was: who was to govern women's intercollegiate athletics. That issue had early origins. The NCAA had indicated interest in women's athletic programs as early as the mid-1960s.<sup>123</sup> However, in 1964 The National Association of Physical Education for College Women (NAPECW) encouraged the NCAA to take a clear stand on a position to conduct activities for men only. The NCAA did so to the great satisfaction of the women physical educators but by mid-1971 some women began taking action against the NCAA for the exclusion.<sup>124</sup>

In June 1971, Walter Byers, Executive Director of the NCAA, expressed some interest in getting into the business of women's sports when the NCAA legal counsel found that the organization might be legally liable for not providing sports opportunities for women. NCAA and DGWS representatives met to discuss the possibilities. Byers suggested that if the AIAW disassociated itself from the AAHPER, the NCAA might accept it as its affiliated women's organization. Not anxious to lose control of women's sports

---

<sup>123</sup>Carole Oglesby, Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality (Philadelphia, PA: Lea and Febyer, 1978), p. 13.

<sup>124</sup>Holbrook, "Women's Participation in American Sport," p. 55.

programs, the DGWS decided against a move in that direction.<sup>125</sup>

In January 1975, the NCAA Convention was to vote on a proposal to begin the governance of women's sports. The AIAW Delegate Assembly was being held concurrently and, when word of the NCAA intention reached the AIAW representatives, they reacted with shock. The AIAW delegates contacted their institutional representatives at the NCAA convention to demand that the proposal be voted down. The AIAW, not expecting such a proposal and being relatively unschooled politically, did not have even one woman with speaking privileges on the floor of the NCAA Convention in Washington, D.C.<sup>126</sup>

The last minute effort by the AIAW accomplished its goal however. The NCAA had no choice but to refer the issue to a committee for further study. The AIAW and the NCAA formed a joint study committee to address the issue. The committee reached no mutually agreeable conclusions regarding the governance of women's sports. When, in April 1975, the NCAA distributed the redeveloped governance proposal to its membership, Roger Wiley, AAHPER president, requested its exclusion from the 1976 NCAA Convention agenda. The issue did reach the Convention floor but was

---

<sup>125</sup>Joanne Thorpe, "The Relationship of DGWS to AIAW," in Women's Athletics: Coping With Controversy (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974), p. 61.

<sup>126</sup>Celeste Ulrich, "Breakthrough or Breakdown," Coaching: Women's Athletics, January/February 1980, p. 18.

referred back for further committee study with little attention given. In 1977, it appeared as if the AIAW had won its battle to continue governing women's intercollegiate athletics.<sup>127</sup>

In the fall of 1979, the NCAA Council appointed the Special Committee on NCAA Governance, Organization, and Services. The task of the Committee was to study reports produced by another NCAA committee in the area of the organizational structures common in intercollegiate athletics. Those reports indicated that a substantial and growing percentage of men's and women's athletic departments had merged. The Special Committee reported that, in view of the findings of those reports, action to bring men's and women's athletic programs under a single competitive umbrella was appropriate.<sup>128</sup>

The issue of NCAA involvement in women's athletics resurfaced at the 1980 NCAA Convention when a proposal to establish women's championships in five sports for Divisions II and III (middle and small-sized schools) appeared on the agenda. The proposal included a 1981-82 starting date for the new championships. The AIAW petitioned strongly for a delay in the action. The 1980

---

<sup>127</sup>Candace Lyle Hogan, "NCAA and AIAW: Will the Men Score on Women's Athletics?," womenSports, January 1977, pp. 46-47.

<sup>128</sup>Randi Jean Greenberg, "AIAW vs NCAA: The Takeover and Implications," Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, Winter 1974, p. 30.

AIAW Delegate Assembly passed a resolution which called for a five-year moratorium on efforts to establish women's championships.

The NCAA proposal appeared to be the most significant threat to that date to the AIAW. Many women administrators in athletics were being pressured to apply the same rules to women's programs as were being applied to their institutions' men's programs. That pressure and the support for NCAA-sponsored women's championships increased when the NCAA proposed to pay expenses for teams which participated in its women's championships. The AIAW had not come close to the development of a financial base necessary to pay championship expenses. The NCAA proposal significantly increased the pressure on women administrators to defend the growing institutional financial commitment inherent in AIAW membership.<sup>129</sup>

Many institutions realized that they were in the untenable position of simultaneously supporting contradictory policies in athletics due to their membership obligations in the two organizations. Reconciliation of those differences was a major challenge which required prompt action.<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>129</sup>Cheryl M. Fields and Lorenzo Middleton, "Women's Sports Group Stunned, Angered by NCAA Vote on Female Championships," The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 14, 1980, p. 1.

<sup>130</sup>George Hanford, "Intercollegiate Athletics Today and Tomorrow: The Presidents' Challenge," Educational Record, 1977, p. 34.

Women were also divided on the issue. Some regarded the proposed NCAA action as a takeover and thought it represented a total loss of control by women for women. Not all women, however, disapproved of the NCAA effort. Some felt it was wiser to have the political power and status of the NCAA in support of women's programs.<sup>131</sup> Ulrich stated that the division of thought among women in athletics was evidence of the dissension which existed in the ranks of the AIAW. The social lures of status and money suggested a format that tended to emulate men's programs. Some AIAW members expressed anger at the slowness of the organization to extend opportunities for women in athletics. Some believed that an alliance among sport governing bodies was needed and that the AIAW should initiate that action. Others saw the AIAW as an interim organization which would permit the formation of a new organization for men's and women's athletics.<sup>132</sup>

The NCAA viewed the proposal to sponsor women's championships not as a takeover of women's athletics but as an additional opportunity for institutions which wished to sponsor women's programs. The proposal was seen as a response to the membership's expressed interest in such activity. No institution was to be required to affiliate its women's program with the NCAA even if its men's teams

---

<sup>131</sup>Huckle, "Back to the Starting Line," p. 388.

<sup>132</sup>Celeste Ulrich, "Valor in the Vanguard," Coaching: Women's Athletics, January/February 1981, p. 24.

participated in NCAA-sponsored competition. Burgess believed, however, that some NCAA delegates who were in favor of providing women's championships thought that women's athletics were expanding too rapidly and were concerned with balancing budgets. The control of women's athletics seemed to hold promise for affecting that balance.<sup>133</sup>

At the January, 1980 NCAA Convention, the proposal to sponsor women's championships in five sports for Divisions II and III passed and was set for implementation in August 1981.

The result of the study of the NCAA Special Committee on Governance, Organization, and Services was a plan which provided a comprehensive slate of women's championships for all divisions and a governance plan for women's programs. The governance plan included a period from 1981 to 1985 during which the applicability of NCAA regulations to women's programs would be studied. The plan also included guaranteed representation for women on NCAA committees at all levels. Allocations were to exist for almost every NCAA committee on a formula of one third of the positions allocated for women, one third for men, and one third unallocated. That formula was derived from the national

---

<sup>133</sup>William J. Burgess, "A Common Strategy," Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April 1981, p. 5.

average participation ratio in intercollegiate athletics of approximately two men to one woman.<sup>134</sup>

Dr. James Frank, then chairman of the Special Committee and later president of the NCAA, said:

In the final analysis, the plan does not attempt to decide what is right for women's athletics. The governance plan does represent a commitment to involve women professionals in an integrated structure for the administration of intercollegiate athletics. It is not a takeover. It is a direct response to the expressed interest of many NCAA member institutions to make available to their female athletes those benefits available to their male athletes as a result of NCAA membership, and to afford their professional staff in women's athletics the opportunity to be involved in the management of intercollegiate athletics at the national level.<sup>135</sup>

The proposed plan continued to reflect the strong NCAA commitment to the one institution/one vote principle. Women were, however, to be included in the voting structure at the institutional level. A fourth voting delegate was to be added to the institutional convention delegation. Prior to the proposed plan, only three voting delegates had been permitted. They were the chief executive officer, the faculty representative, and the director of athletics. The fourth delegate was to be added and the plan encouraged member institutions to appoint the women's athletic director or the assistant athletic director who was a woman to fill that spot. Ruth Berkey, who later became the NCAA Director of Women's Championships, stated:

---

<sup>134</sup>James Frank, "NCAA Governance," Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April 1981, p. 34.

<sup>135</sup>Ibid.



The NCAA addition of a fourth member to an institution's annual convention delegation, a female who understands and is associated with collegiate athletics, is an excellent way of insuring female strength in the NCAA.<sup>136</sup>

During the proposed phase-in period from 1981 to 1985, institutions would opt to apply NCAA regulations or the regulations of any other national organization to its women's programs. According to the NCAA plan, institutions would be permitted to participate in NCAA championships in addition to the championships of any other governing organization if such option was permitted by the other organization. The assumption made by the NCAA was that the AIAW would continue to coexist and sponsor championships. To explain the plan to women administrators and to gather support for its passage at the 1981 NCAA Convention, the NCAA held regional meetings during the summer of 1980 in Denver and Pittsburgh.<sup>137</sup>

There were many proponents of the plan as proposed by the NCAA. They cited five major reasons for supporting the plan over existing AIAW programs. They were:

1. The AIAW did not have enough money to serve its members and never would have enough.
2. There was financial as well as moral advantage to having both men and women students under one set of rules.
3. It was felt that the NCAA clout would get greater exposure for women's athletics, particularly in the area of television coverage.

---

<sup>136</sup>Ulrich, "Valor in the Vanguard," p. 26.

<sup>137</sup>Greenberg, "AIAW vs NCAA," p. 32.

4. The AIAW organizational hierarchy was seen to be less than responsive to the needs of the membership.
5. The needs of minority women among the AIAW membership had not been met.<sup>138</sup>

To meet the challenge from the NCAA, the AIAW resistance was directed at exposing the NCAA move as an attempt at takeover. AIAW leaders appealed to NCAA members to consider the legal, financial, and philosophical implications of including women's athletics under the NCAA structure. The AIAW leaders felt strongly that the true costs of expanding to serve women's programs were never described to the NCAA member institutions. Member schools were not, according to the AIAW, told of the higher institutional costs which would be required to maintain Title IX compliance. The focus of these costs was in the change of regulations in the area of recruitment of prospective student-athletes.<sup>139</sup>

Supporters of the AIAW criticized the NCAA governance plan vocally. Gary Engstrand said:

The plain fact is that the governance proposal is of, by, and for men. Even though there is token representation of women on committees, men drafted it and men will vote on it at the NCAA Convention.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup>Elizabeth Wheeler, "War of the Words," Women's Sports, June 1981, pp. 16-17.

<sup>139</sup>Cheryl M. Fields, "Sports Organizations Set to Debate Question of Women's Championships," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 8, 1980, p. 1.

<sup>140</sup>Gary Engstrand, "Don't Expect Fair Play from the NCAA for Women," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 15, 1980, p. 19.

Representative Patricia Schroeder observed that while men's organizations historically viewed women's athletes as "sheep to be slaughtered," since the advent of Title IX, they had viewed women's athletics as "sheep to be herded."<sup>141</sup>

Opponents of the NCAA plan believed that the plan was insincere, a smoke screen effort to thwart equal opportunity and preserve the traditional male domination in sports. They also stressed the affirmative nature of the AIAW, saying that it was an excellent training ground for women administrators at all levels.<sup>142</sup> William Burgess called the NCAA action "market-dumping"--the reduction of the AIAW with the simultaneous expansion of the NCAA.<sup>143</sup>

The AIAW response to the NCAA proposed governance plan and championship structure included details of requirements to keep institutional AIAW membership in good standing if the plan passed. The AIAW issued a statement which said schools would be required to follow all AIAW rules totally in order to be eligible to participate in any of its national championships.<sup>144</sup>

Following one of the most bitter debates in the history of the organization, the 1981 NCAA Convention

---

<sup>141</sup>"Texts of Statements by Three Sports Organizations on Championships," The Chronicle of Higher Education, December 8, 1980, p. 8.

<sup>142</sup>Elizabeth Wheeler, "NCAA vs AIAW," Women's Sports, June 1980, p. 22.

<sup>143</sup>Burgess, "A Common Strategy," p. 4.

<sup>144</sup>Wheeler, "War of the Words," p. 14.

adopted proposals to establish women's championships for Division I, add new championships to the list of those scheduled to begin in fall 1981 for Divisions II and III, and to establish a four year plan to develop policies to govern both men's and women's sports. James Frank, the NCAA president, called the move a "sincere and honorable commitment to women's athletics."<sup>145</sup> Candace Lyle Hogan commented:

After years of defeat in head-to-head competition with the AIAW over Title IX, the men found a way to beat Title IX by destroying the competition and making itself the 'representative' of women's athletics instead. It seems as if the fox has finally found a way to be the guardian of the chickens.<sup>146</sup>

#### 1981-1984

The adoption of proposals for governance of and championships for women's athletic programs by the NCAA forced the AIAW into immediate action to ascertain the future directions of its membership. The AIAW asked its member schools to declare whether they planned to participate in AIAW events during the 1981-82 school year by May 1, 1981. Following that declaration date, it was determined that the AIAW had suffered a 20 percent

---

<sup>145</sup>Lorenzo Middleton and Cheryl Fields, "NCAA Votes to Widen Role in Women's Sports; Action is Bitterly Debated, 'Power Play' Charged," The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 19, 1981, p. 6.

<sup>146</sup>Candace Lyle Hogan, "A Token of Friendship," Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April 1981, p. 21.

membership loss and an additional 12 percent of its membership, while retaining its active membership status, would not participate in AIAW championships. The loss of membership and championship participation came predominantly from Division I, the highest level competitive division. Previously, the AIAW had derived 50 percent of all of its revenue from Division I. The financial impact of the decisions of those institutions to leave the AIAW fold was extreme.<sup>147</sup>

The National Broadcasting Corporation cancelled its contract to broadcast Division I championships with the AIAW due to the dilution of the quality of those events. The AIAW charged that the loss of that contract as well as the loss of membership and championship participants was directly attributable to the NCAA decision to begin women's championships. In an effort to prevent further damage to the organization, the AIAW leadership filed suit against the NCAA in October 1981. The suit charged the NCAA with violating anti-trust laws and asked that the court require the NCAA to refrain from sponsoring women's championships. The AIAW suit alleged that the NCAA persuaded the commercial sponsors which the organization had acquired and the broadcaster to withdraw support from the remaining AIAW events. In response to the charges, William D. Kramer, attorney for the NCAA said:

---

<sup>147</sup>Lea Pierce, "AIAW/NCAA: The Big Switch," Sportswoman's T.E.A.M. Basketball Digest, October 1981, p. 34.

The field, until very recently, has been exclusively controlled by the AIAW. The anti-trust laws are designed to promote competition, not to preserve the position of an organization already dominant in a particular field.<sup>148</sup>

The AIAW completed its 1981-82 championship format. At what was to be the last AIAW Delegate Assembly in January 1981, delegates approved a resolution which stated that if judicial relief was not received by July 1, 1982, no members would be accepted for 1982-83. Merrily Baker, incoming AIAW president said:

Regardless of what the future held for the organization, delegates could be proud that they had created an alternative governance structure for women's athletics, one that gave women a chance to develop as athletic leaders and recognized that athletic administrators must consider students as students above all else and construct athletic programs and models of governance so that their time to develop as thinking and feeling human beings is not deformed by the demands of athletic pursuits.<sup>149</sup>

The court took no action to bar the NCAA championships and the AIAW sent out no membership applications for 1982-83. It was felt that if the AIAW should win its suit, it could resume operations in 1983-84. On June 30, 1982, the AIAW suspended all organizational activities and virtually ceased to exist. On March 9, 1983, Judge Thomas P. Jackson of the United States District Court for the District of

---

<sup>148</sup>Cheryl M. Fields, "Ban Sought Against NCAA Women's Championships," The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 21, 1981, p. 13.

<sup>149</sup>Cheryl M. Fields, "Women's Sports Group Plans for Possible Dissolution," The Chronicle of Higher Education, January 20, 1982, p. 5.

Columbia ruled that the NCAA did not violate the anti-trust laws in the development and sponsorship of women's intercollegiate championships.<sup>150</sup> The NCAA became the only organization governing and sponsoring championships for major college athletic programs. The organization continued to add championship offerings until it reached a total of thirty-one championships sponsored for women in 1983-84.<sup>151</sup>

The impact of the activity in the areas of sport governance and Title IX has been seen to have been both positive and negative. A September 1975 statement by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated that changes in administrative structure or coaching assignment which had disproportionately adverse effect on the employment opportunities of one sex were prohibited by the Title IX regulations.<sup>152</sup> While Sisley felt that Title IX legislation had created opportunities for women in leadership positions in girls and women's athletics, many disagreed with her.<sup>153</sup> In spite of the HEW statement, most

---

<sup>150</sup>Cheryl M. Fields, "Court Rejects Claim of Women's Group that NCAA Violated Anti-Trust Law," The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 9, 1983, p. 17.

<sup>151</sup>National Collegiate Athletic Association, NCAA Championships: Dates and Sites (Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, September 1983), p. 15.

<sup>152</sup>Bonnie L. Parkhouse and Jackie Lapin, Women Who Win (Englewood, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1980), p. 35.

<sup>153</sup>Becky L. Sisley, "Women in Administration: A Quest for Leadership," Journal of Physical Education and Recreation, April 1981, p. 77.

women's intercollegiate athletic departments have been merged with men's departments. Hult stated:

Women are now losing decision-making power on individual campuses. When women's athletics are combined with men's athletics, men are most often delegated as administrators of the entire program and the women relegated to assistants or associates.<sup>154</sup>

Lopiano reinforced Hult's earlier contention, saying that whereas 95 percent of all women's programs had previously been administered by women under separate department structures, the number was now down to 14 percent.<sup>155</sup>

In addition to apparent loss of ground in the administrative portion of employment and power of women in intercollegiate athletics, there have been significant changes in the composition of coaching staffs since the passage of Title IX. In the first eight years following its passage, the number of coaching positions available in women's athletics increased by 136 percent. Accompanying that, however, was a 20 percent decrease in the number of women who occupied these positions.<sup>156</sup>

On the positive side, nearly every writer in the area of Title IX indicated that due to the passage of the regulation, there was more money available in women's

---

<sup>154</sup>Joan S. Hult, "The Philosophical Conflicts in Men's and Women's Collegiate Athletics," Quest, 1980, p. 87.

<sup>155</sup>"A Donna Lopiano Eye-View of Women's Sports in America," Scholastic Coach, January 1984, p. 32.

<sup>156</sup>Ibid.



athletics, and therefore, competitive opportunities were better. Women's teams enjoy more and better travel, more competitive and longer schedules, more and better coaches, and far greater opportunities to receive athletic scholarships.

The struggle over the interpretation of Title IX and its relationship to intercollegiate athletics has continued. Since 1981, there has been very little enforcement of Title IX. Rather than finding institutions in violation of the Title IX regulations, five-year plans to come into compliance have been accepted from institutions who have been investigated. The February 1984 United States Supreme Court decision in the Grove City College v Bell case further reduced the pace of investigations of complaints. The Court indicated that Title IX was only applicable to programs which received direct federal funding. That decision significantly narrowed the focus of the legislation and created new vulnerabilities for women's athletics.<sup>157</sup>

### Summary

The founding of women's colleges in the United States provided the setting for the development of women's intercollegiate athletics. Prior to the existence of those schools, women were thought to be too delicate to withstand the rigors of college level study. Ideal women of the early

---

<sup>157</sup>"Equal Rights in Education," Capitol: Woman, November 1984, p. 1.

nineteenth century were expected to embody the concept of fragility. By the late 1860s, women had become active in physical activities such as croquet and archery which could be performed gracefully.

The introduction of the safety bicycle, along with the modification of previously bulky women's clothing, opened the door of active participation for many women. Competitive sport for women at the collegiate level was well established by the 1890s. Basketball became a very popular activity. Extensive discussion over the appropriateness of that sport for college women led to the beginning of standardized conduct and governance of collegiate programs. By 1900, sport was an integral part of most collegiate physical education programs.

Women's collegiate sport was firmly in the control of women physical educators in the early twentieth century. As the programs grew in complexity, the American Physical Education Association appointed a committee to set standards for women's activities. Organized opposition to competitive sports for women grew at the same time. Many women felt that competition was injurious to the health of the participants.

World War I and the ratification of the 19th Amendment resulted in great gains for women's sports. Women were encouraged to be physically strong to respond to the new responsibilities placed on them during war. The Women's Division of the National Amateur Athletic Federation was

established in 1923 to regulate women's sport activities. It, and several other groups active in the area of women's sports, developed and promoted the play day concept. Play days included sport activities where play for its own sake was emphasized over competition or rewards. As a result of the promotion of the play day concept, competitive intercollegiate athletics for women were virtually eliminated.

The Great Depression further traditionalized the role of women. Sport activities took place on individual college campuses but did not involve competition with outside groups. There were few opportunities for high-level competition and no support for gifted female athletes.

World War II re-emphasized the need for every girl and woman to be physically fit. Physical education and intramural programs flourished at the collegiate level but no avenue existed for the highly skilled female. The Division for Girls and Women's Sports governed intercollegiate activity and that organization supported sports days, play days, and telegraphic meets.

In 1958, the DGWS expanded its statement of philosophy to endorse competitive activities for highly-skilled women sponsored by non-school agencies. The stereotype of the athletic female was destroyed by Wilma Rudolph who, with beauty and grace, won three gold medals in the 1960 Olympics. The DGWS responded in 1963 by encouraging the

development of competitive opportunities for highly-skilled women athletes at the collegiate level.

The governance of women's intercollegiate athletics came to rest with the Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. The CIAW was appointed in 1967 by the DGWS to create the leadership necessary for the expanding women's intercollegiate athletic programs. That organization began the administration of women's collegiate national championships in four sports. In 1972, the CIAW became the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women which continued to provide leadership for women's programs and expanded the national championship format to meet the growing needs.

The passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 resulted in significant changes to competitive opportunities for collegiate women. The law prohibited sex discrimination in federally funded programs and provided the impetus necessary to markedly improve many collegiate programs. Women's programs were to be provided with equal shares of athletic budget money, equipment, and facilities.

The potential impact of the law on men's athletics stirred the National Collegiate Athletic Association to lobby strongly for its change and later for the exclusion of athletics from its provisions. The NCAA cited the fact that most men's programs were already operating in a deficit mode as support for the non-expansion of women's athletics. Women's groups, such as the AIAW, hailed the law as the

leverage required to make great improvements in the quality of services and programs provided for female athletes.

After much discussion and several draft sets of interpretations by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's Office for Civil Rights, the law became effective on July 21, 1975. Institutions were required to conduct self-evaluations as well as submit and implement plans to remedy deficiencies identified in the study.

While individual institutions struggled with the implementation of Title IX, women administrators began to disagree as to the direction for women's competitive programs. While some believed programs should stay small in scale, others promoted the development of wide scale, visible programs of women's athletics much like existing men's programs.

That philosophical difference resulted in NCAA action to govern women's intercollegiate sports. In 1980, amid much controversy, the NCAA voted to sponsor five women's championships. The following year, in 1981, additional championships and a governance plan for women's athletics were approved by the NCAA membership.

The AIAW fought against those NCAA actions and charged that the NCAA was attempting to take over women's athletics. The AIAW charged that women would effectively lose control of women's sports and filed a lawsuit which alleged that the NCAA had violated anti-trust laws.

That lawsuit was denied and the AIAW, after significant membership loss, ceased all activities on June 30, 1982. The NCAA was left as the only sport governing organization for major college athletics.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

As indicated in Chapter 1, this study was an examination of the role of the woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes related to the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The examination included a description of the role of the woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels. Secondly, a somewhat briefer description of the role of the Director of Athletics in the same processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics was included. Finally, the perceptions of the woman athletic administrator regarding her role in the institutional decision-making processes relative to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics were compared with the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the same process.

Chapter 2 contained a review of the literature in the area of the history of the administration and governance of

women's intercollegiate athletics. The review detailed the variety of organizations which have governed or attempted to govern women's athletics from 1833 to the present.

This chapter includes descriptions of the derivation of the study, the population, the sampling procedures used, the survey instruments, the method of data collection, and details of the coding and data analysis procedures used.

### Derivation of the Study

The researcher has been an Associate Director of Athletics at Western Michigan University since 1976. During this period, she has experienced, both on a personal and on a professional level, the growth of women's intercollegiate athletics, the development and dissolution of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), and the entry of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) into the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. It has appeared to the researcher that the role of the woman administrator in the decision-making processes of administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics has changed often throughout the last decade.

As evidenced by the review of literature in Chapter 2, many women athletic administrators felt that the entry of the NCAA into the arena of women's intercollegiate athletics would severely limit the impact of and potential for leadership opportunities for women administrators. These critics felt that the leaders of the NCAA, being



almost entirely male, would engineer a system of administration and governance which would not recognize the existing differences between the needs of fledgling women's programs and well-established men's programs. Further, it was speculated by many critics that women administrators and their input would be swallowed up by the male-dominated structure of the organization.

The governance plan adopted by the NCAA membership for application to women's programs did include modifications of the structure to include the input of women administrators. The most visible modification was the addition of a fourth delegate to the annual Convention with the power to speak on the Convention floor and to vote on legislation presented. Personal attendance by the researcher at recent NCAA Conventions has shown that fewer women each year appear to have been certified by their institutional Chief Executive Officers to receive delegate or alternate credentials. They have, instead, received visitors credentials which do not entitle the wearer to speak on the Convention floor or to vote. This personal observation led the researcher to speculate as to whether the apparent decrease in the impact of women administrators at the national level of governance was a reflection of what was occurring at the conference and/or institutional levels.

The original intent of the researcher was to compare the role of the woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the

national governance of women's intercollegiate athletics under the AIAW with the role of the woman administrator in the same processes under NCAA governance. It quickly became apparent that there were significant problems inherent in a study which spanned time. The researcher then decided to focus on a description of the role of the present day woman athletic administrator.

### Population

To determine the role of the woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics, the NCAA member institutions in Division I were chosen for study. The Division I member institutions have committed themselves, by virtue of their Division I membership, to competition at the highest level within the NCAA. Although the member institutions within Division I are heterogeneous in many respects, they are homogeneous with regard to their aspirations for high-level athletic excellence.

The Directors of Athletics and Primary Women Administrators at institutions which held membership in NCAA Division I during the 1984-85 academic year represented the population for this study. Membership in Division I was determined by use of the NCAA Directory 1984-85. The names of the Directors of Athletics and Primary Women

Administrators at each Division I institution were also obtained by using the listings provided in that publication.

The NCAA Directory 1984-85 indicated that 284 institutions held membership in Division I during that academic year.<sup>1</sup> The Directors of Athletics and the Primary Women Administrators at all 284 institutions were surveyed for this study. The population, therefore, totaled 568 individuals.

Prior to the distribution of any survey materials to the participants, approval for the study was sought from the University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects (UCRIHS). On June 27, 1985 such approval was received. A copy of the UCRIHS approval letter is found in Appendix A.

#### Sampling Procedures

The Directors of Athletics and the Primary Women Administrators at all of the 284 NCAA Division I institutions served as the population for this study. There was no sample drawn from the population. The population was, instead, surveyed in its entirety. The population size was 568.

#### Survey Instruments

For the purpose of generating data to examine the role of the woman athletic administrator, two survey instruments were developed.

---

<sup>1</sup>National Collegiate Athletic Association, NCAA Directory 1984-85 (Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1984), pp. 40-96.

The first instrument was designed to describe the role of the woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The questionnaire was divided into four sections. They dealt with: (1) institutional administration and governance, (2) conference administration and governance, (3) national administration and governance, and (4) demographic information. This survey instrument was sent to Primary Women Administrators.

The second instrument was designed to describe the role of the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Additionally, this instrument was designed to determine the role of the woman athletic administrator in the same processes as perceived by the Director of Athletics. The second questionnaire was also divided into the same four sections: (1) institutional administration and governance, (2) conference administration and governance, (3) national administration and governance, and (4) demographic information.

Each questionnaire was field tested to ensure that the questions contained were as clear as possible, the order in which the questions were presented was logical, and that the kind of data which would be returned would be usable to the researcher. The field testing identified several major

problems, primarily in the area of terminology, which were corrected before the instruments were distributed.

A copy of the first questionnaire, that which went to Primary Women Administrators, is included as Appendix B. A copy of the second questionnaire, that which went to Directors of Athletics, can be found in Appendix C.

The survey instruments distributed in this study were professionally type-set and printed. The result of that effort was a questionnaire which was attractive, professional in appearance, and as easy to complete as possible. Comments made by respondents on the instruments supported that statement and most certainly contributed to the rate of response.

#### Data Collection

A mail survey was employed to collect data for this study. Given the large number of individuals selected for participation (568) and the geographic locations of the institutions at which they were employed, that method was the only reasonable approach.

The first mailing was sent via first-class mail to each of the 568 participants on July 27, 1985. The mailing contained a highly personalized cover letter which explained the purpose of the study and requested the participation of the individual. The mailing also contained the appropriate survey instrument, a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire, and a postcard on which participants could indicate their desire to receive a

summary of the results of the study. Great care was taken, due to the size of the mailing, to ensure the accuracy of the materials which were mailed. Effort was also spent in the preparation of the mailing to ensure the professional and personal appearance of each item. Each letter and envelope were personalized to maximize the response rate. Nothing was mailed which had the appearance of being part of a mass mailing. The cover letters were typed on paper with no letterhead. The researcher did, however, use her professional title on the cover letter and the return envelopes were printed with the logo of the Western Michigan University Division of Intercollegiate Athletics. Copies of the cover letters used and the results request form are included in Appendix D.

The first returns were received on August 1, 1985. The initial cover letter had requested that the participants return their questionnaires by August 16, 1985.

Prior to mailing, each questionnaire had been coded to permit the researcher to do a follow-up mailing to non-respondents. This coding was accomplished by the development of a master list of all Division I institutions and the assignment of a distinct code to each Director of Athletics' questionnaire as well as to each Primary Woman Administrator's questionnaire.

A second mailing was sent via first-class mail to non-respondents on August 18, 1985. That mailing included a cover letter which again requested participation in the

study, a second copy of the appropriate survey instrument, a self-addressed, stamped envelope for return of the questionnaire, and a results request postcard. The cover letter requested the return of the survey instrument by August 30, 1985. A copy of the second cover letter can be found in Appendix E.

A total of 291 survey instruments were returned. That number constituted a response rate of 51 percent. Of the 291 which were returned, forty-seven were judged by the researcher to be inappropriate for inclusion in the study. Those forty-seven fell into one of the following categories of unusable questionnaires:

1. The questionnaire was returned uncompleted with a note which indicated that the institution had no woman athletic administrator.
2. The questionnaire was returned completed but with a note which indicated that it had not been completed by the person to whom it had originally been sent. Questionnaires were returned with notes which indicated that the Director of Athletics had requested that the Primary Woman Administrator complete the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
3. The questionnaire was returned uncompleted with a note which indicated that the institutional athletic departmental structure did not permit completion of the questionnaire.

Of the forty-seven questionnaires judged to be inappropriate for inclusion in the study, the largest number (thirty-five or 74 percent) were in category 1.

A summary of the response rates is included in Appendix F.

### Coding and Data Entry

As each returned questionnaire was received, it was recorded as having been received and the data contained in the response were prepared for entry into the computer. The responses on each questionnaire were carefully checked for accuracy and consistency.

There were questionnaires returned which were incomplete. The section on conference processes on each questionnaire resulted in the largest occurrence of unanswered questions. That can be attributed to the fact that not all Division I institutions are members of conferences. Those questionnaires from individuals whose institutions are not members of conferences were identified and were not included in the analysis of those questions. All other questions which were not completed were recorded as missing data. The incidence of uncompleted questions was so small that it was judged by statistical consultants at the Western Michigan University Computer Center as being statistically insignificant.



The data were entered into the computer in early September 1985. Following the entry of the data, they were edited to further check for accuracy and consistency.

### Data Analysis Procedures

Following the identification of the research questions listed in the Purposes section of Chapter 1 and the generation of the data through the use of the two survey instruments, the data gathered were categorized with regard to their pertinence to each research question. It was determined by the researcher that four of the questions (1, 2, 5, & 6) were descriptive in nature and the data were analyzed using frequency counts and response percentages.

The remaining three questions (3, 4, & 7) required other methods of analysis. It was determined by the researcher that the calculation of chi-square values and probabilities would speak to the statistical significance of the items pertinent to those questions. In each instance where statistical significance was determined, either the phi coefficient or Cramer's V value was calculated to determine the strength of the association between variables.

That method of data analysis was judged to be appropriate by the statistical consultants at the Western Michigan University Computer Center. With the assistance of

that office, the data were analyzed by the computer using  
The System for Statistics program (SYSTAT).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>The Systat Network, The System for Statistics  
(SYSTAT) version 2.1 (Evanston, Illinois: SYSTAT, Inc.,  
1984).

## CHAPTER 4

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The role of the woman athletic administrator in institutional administration and governance, conference governance, and national governance was studied. Comparisons between the roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the same sets of processes were drawn. This chapter contains the analysis of the data generated by means of the two survey instruments described in Chapter 3.

Due to the large volume of data, the frequencies and response percentages for both questionnaires are detailed in the Appendices. The frequencies and percentages for the primary woman athletic administrator instrument are found in Appendix G. The data generated by the Director of Athletics instrument are found in Appendix H.

This chapter is sub-divided to facilitate the reporting of the data. Each of the seven research questions identified in Chapter 1 is listed, if appropriate the

hypothesis being tested is stated, the data are detailed, and the hypothesis, if stated, is accepted or rejected.

### Analysis of Procedures

The descriptive method of research was followed where its application was appropriate in this study. Where the data permitted, statistical significance was determined by the calculation of the chi-square value. The Pearson chi-square value was calculated in most instances. In the cases where the expected frequency in any cell was less than five, Yates correction was applied.

The level of statistical significance established for this study was .05. Where significance was shown at the .05 level, the phi-coefficient or Cramer's V value was calculated to further define the association of the variables. The phi-coefficient was used for all fourfold tables. Cramer's V was employed to adjust for the unequal dimensions of all other tables.

In the testing of the hypotheses, the finding of statistical significance or the lack of statistical significance in a majority of the items studied led to the rejection or non-rejection of the null hypotheses.

### Analysis

#### Research Question 1

Research question 1 was as follows:

Describe the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's

intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

As has been previously indicated, the frequency counts and response percentages for each question included in the primary woman athletic administrator survey instrument appear in Appendix G. The data are summarized and discussed here.

### Section I - Institutional Decision-Making Processes

The questions in Section I asked the primary woman athletic administrator to describe her role in the institutional administrative and governance processes related to women's intercollegiate athletics.

The responses to question 1.a. clearly indicate (87.6 percent) that the decisions made by the primary woman athletic administrator can be overruled by another athletic administrator. That administrator, in 88.2 percent of the responses, is the Director of Athletics as is indicated by the responses to question 1.b. The small percentage of respondents who report that no athletic administrator can overrule their decisions are those individuals whose titles are Director of Women's Athletics.

The data indicate that the woman athletic administrator meets regularly with the Director of Athletics and other athletic administrators such as Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors. The primary woman athletic administrator meets occasionally with the Faculty Athletic Representative, the administrative officer to whom Athletics

reports if any, and the institutional Chief Executive Officer.

Almost 60 percent of the women administrators who responded to the survey serve as members of their institutional Athletic Board or Council. The appointment of the woman administrator is ex-officio in nature and she has no vote. Of the respondents who do not have appointments to their institutional Athletic Board or Council, 72.3 percent do not regularly attend the meetings of the group and 78 percent do not meet regularly with the Athletic Board or Council chair.

The data reveal that the primary woman athletic administrator is active in intra-institutional committees and in extra-institutional organizations. Over 50 percent of the respondents indicate that they serve on institutional standing and/or special committees. These positions are clearly appointed rather than elected as evidenced by the responses to questions 8.c., 8.d., 9.b., and 9.c.

The responses to question 10 are capsulized in Table 1. The table provides the response percentage for each response category and indicates the modal response.

TABLE 1

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR QUESTION 10  
REGARDING TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT BY THE  
PRIMARY WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR IN THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF AREAS IN  
WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Question	Decision- Maker (1)	Consultative Capacity (2)	Advisory Capacity (3)	Modal Response
10a	32.4	44.1	23.5	2
10b	55.0	26.7	18.3	1
10c	34.6	35.4	30.0	2
10d	58.4	34.3	7.3	1
10e	29.1	50.0	20.9	2
10f	38.9	26.7	34.4	1
10g	45.9	37.8	16.3	1
10h	31.3	38.8	29.9	2
10i	38.2	25.2	36.6	1
10j	62.8	24.8	12.4	1
10k	41.2	39.0	19.9	1
10l	48.9	23.7	27.5	1
10m	27.5	44.3	28.2	2
10n	26.5	43.9	29.6	2
10o	20.3	38.3	41.4	3
10p	22.0	34.1	43.9	3
10q	58.5	28.9	12.6	1
10r	38.2	42.7	19.1	2
10s	22.7	32.0	45.3	3
10t	16.2	42.3	41.5	2
10u	13.0	42.0	45.0	3
10v <sub>1</sub>	50.4	33.8	15.8	1
10v <sub>2</sub>	50.4	33.1	16.5	1
10v <sub>3</sub>	38.6	40.2	21.2	2
10w	45.7	38.8	15.5	1
10x	17.0	24.1	58.9	3
10y	13.0	30.5	56.5	3
10z	37.3	32.5	30.2	1
10aa	43.8	33.1	23.1	1
10bb	36.6	43.3	20.1	2
10cc	40.7	28.9	30.4	1
10dd	23.1	49.3	27.6	2
10ee	28.6	37.6	33.8	2
10ff	24.0	38.0	38.0	2 and 3
10gg	19.4	56.7	23.9	2
10hh	29.0	32.1	38.9	3

The primary woman athletic administrator views her role as being that of a decision-maker in fifteen of the thirty-six categories. The most significant of the areas are the hiring of coaching personnel and athletic scholarship allocation.

In thirteen of the thirty-six categories, the primary woman athletic administrator describes her role as having a consultative capacity. Of those thirteen areas, the most significant are budget development, the size of the intercollegiate athletic program, and the development of institutional athletic policy.

An advisory capacity describes the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in seven of the thirty-six categories. Notations appear on many of the returned surveys indicating that no athletic administrator has any more than advisory role in non-athletic financial aid allocation, admission of student-athletes, and academic advisement of student-athletes.

The response percentages are equal (38.0 percent) in the consultative capacity and advisory capacity categories in the area of fund raising.

Over 66 percent of the respondents indicate that their institution has sports which have been identified to strive for national prominence. The primary woman athletic administrator indicates involvement in the identification process in 83.9 percent of the cases as evidenced by the responses to question 12.



The woman athletic administrator does not appear to have sports assigned to her for which her administrative decisions cannot be overruled by another athletic administrator. Of the small percentage (25.4 percent) of women administrators who do have such authority in certain sports, the sports assigned are largely women's sports. Only two individuals report having men's sports under their complete administrative control.

## Section II - Conference Decision-Making Processes

The data show that 93.5 percent of the respondents are employed by institutions which are affiliated with a conference for women's sports. The responses to question 3 indicate that the conferences to which the respondents belong are integrated in 69.8 percent of the cases. A large number of respondents indicate that even though their institutions currently belong to a segregated (women's only) conference, integration of the conference in which their men's programs participate is in the near future.

The responses to questions 8 and 9 indicate that conference affiliation for women's programs is a fairly recent happening. Both conference affiliation and conference governance of women's programs has occurred in over 50 percent of the cases since 1981. That date coincides with the year in which the NCAA began its formal involvement in the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics on a national level.

The institutions which hold membership in the same integrated conference for men's and women's programs have conference regulations which are similar for men and women. Comments in response to question 10 indicate that the differences which do exist in some conferences relate to sport playing rules and the method of conducting conference championships.

The data reveal that the primary woman athletic administrator is recognized as a part of the conference governance structure. The woman administrator does have a role in the decision-making process at the conference level. In 58 percent of the cases, the woman administrator views that role as consultative in nature. The responses to question 15 indicate that the input of the conference women administrators is referred to the conference Directors of Athletics group in 33.6 percent of the instances. The input of the woman administrator on conference issues is referred to more than one of the groups as is indicated in 31 percent of the instances.

The primary women athletic administrators group in the conference structure meets on a regular basis and those meetings are held in conjunction with other regularly scheduled conference meetings. The responses to question 18 indicate that 78.6 percent of the responding primary women athletic administrators regularly attend the meetings of their conference.

The conference commissioner meets with the primary women administrators group as reported by 80.6 percent of the respondents. Of the respondents who indicate that the conference commissioner does meet with the women administrators group, 61.5 percent indicate that that individual meets regularly with the group. Over 55 percent of the conferences identified in this study have a woman administrator on staff. That individual most often carries the title of Assistant Commissioner.

The data show that women do have a role in the conference structure through participation in conference governance. Women conference officers or committee chairs are indicated as existing by 62.8 percent of the respondents. A large number of respondents indicate that women serve on standing and special committees. That statement is supported by affirmative response percentages to questions 23.a. and 23.b. of over 84 percent.

### Section III - National Decision-Making Processes

Of the individuals who completed the questionnaire, 94.8 percent are the institutionally-designated NCAA Primary Woman Administrator.

The data indicate that attendance at NCAA Conventions by the woman athletic administrator has increased each year since 1981. Table 2 describes the increases reported.

TABLE 2

ATTENDANCE AT NCAA CONVENTIONS BY  
PRIMARY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

Year (Site)	Percentage of Respondents Who Attended
1981 (Miami Beach)	41.8
1982 (Houston)	55.6
1983 (San Diego)	69.6
1984 (Dallas)	78.2
1985 (Nashville)	78.4

The responses to questions 2.a.2., 2.b.2., 2.c.2., 2.d.2., and 2.e.2. indicate that a very large percentage of those women administrators who attended the NCAA Conventions in the years specified were issued delegate credentials. The specific percentages range from 57.5 in 1981 to 64.6 in 1983.

Table 3 addresses participation at NCAA Conventions. The responses to questions 3 and 4 in the areas of voting and speaking at the Conventions are indicated.

TABLE 3

PARTICIPATION AT NCAA CONVENTIONS  
BY PRIMARY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

Year (Site)	Voted	Spoke on the Floor
1981 (Miami Beach)	70.3	38.5
1982 (Houston)	69.6	16.4
1983 (San Diego)	68.5	22.4
1984 (Dallas)	76.5	27.3
1985 (Nashville)	81.2	20.7

The responses to questions 7 and 10 indicate that the institutional position in NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations is determined through dialogue among the primary woman athletic administrator, the Director of Athletics, the Faculty Athletic Representative, and the institutional Chief Executive Officer. The primary woman athletic administrator does have input in the process as indicated by an affirmative response rate of 93.8 percent to question 8. Only 22.3 percent of the respondents indicate, however, that they make the final decision on the institutional position on NCAA legislation which affects women's rules and regulations.

The woman athletic administrator is able to propose NCAA legislation. That happens most often through the institutional Chief Executive Officer.

Fifty percent of the respondents indicate that they have contacted their conference representative to the NCAA Council or any NCAA Council member to affect change on proposals which affect women's rules and regulations. Over 59 percent indicate that they have contacted a woman on the NCAA Council for the same purpose.

The responses to questions 18.a. and 18.b. indicate that almost 85 percent of the responding primary women athletic administrators do not serve on any NCAA sports or standing committee.

#### Section IV - Demographic Information

The primary woman athletic administrator is most often (36.3 percent) an Associate Athletic Director. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents have been working in their present positions since 1977. Generally, the woman athletic administrator does not teach, coach, or perform any other duties. Of those who have responsibilities other than administrative duties in athletics, the largest number teach (26.4 percent). The woman athletic administrator is most often between forty-one and fifty years of age. She works largely in a structurally integrated athletic department as evidenced by an affirmative response to question 7 by 81.2 percent of the respondents.

#### Research Question 2

Research question 2 was as follows:

Describe the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

As has been previously indicated, the frequency counts and response percentages for each question included on the Director of Athletics survey instrument appear in Appendix H. The data are summarized and discussed here.

#### Section I - Institutional Decision-Making Processes

The responses generated by question 1.a. indicate that in 87.6 percent of the instances, the decisions of the primary woman athletic administrator can be overruled by

another athletic administrator. The individual most often able to overrule those decisions is the Director of Athletics.

The Director of Athletics meets regularly with the primary woman athletic administrator, other athletic administrators such as Associate and Assistant Athletic Directors, and with the administrative officer to whom Athletics reports. The Director of Athletics meets occasionally with the Faculty Athletic Representative and the Chief Executive Officer.

The responses to question 4 are capsulized in Table 4. The table provides the response percentage for each response category and indicates the modal response.

TABLE 4  
RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR QUESTION 4  
REGARDING TYPE OF INVOLVEMENT BY  
THE DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS IN THE  
ADMINISTRATION OF AREAS IN  
WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Question	Decision- Maker (1)	Consultative Capacity (2)	Advisory Capacity (3)	Modal Response
4a	73.1	19.2	7.7	1
4b	70.9	19.4	9.7	1
4c	67.7	25.3	7.1	1
4d	68.9	23.3	7.8	1
4e	65.7	24.8	9.5	1
4f	56.3	23.3	20.4	1
4g	73.1	17.3	9.6	1
4h	68.3	22.1	9.6	1
4i	51.5	30.1	18.4	1
4j	65.1	22.3	12.6	1
4k	59.2	26.2	14.6	1
4l	49.5	33.7	16.8	1
4m	68.0	23.3	8.7	1
4n	65.0	24.3	10.7	1

TABLE 4-Continued

Question	Decision-Maker (1)	Consultative Capacity (2)	Advisory Capacity (3)	Modal Response
4o	55.9	31.4	12.7	1
4p	45.5	32.3	22.2	1
4q	47.6	33.0	19.4	1
4r	51.9	31.7	16.3	1
4s	37.5	34.6	27.9	1
4t	51.5	39.8	8.7	1
4u	51.0	36.5	12.5	1
4v <sub>1</sub>	65.0	23.3	11.7	1
4v <sub>2</sub>	60.4	27.7	11.9	1
4v <sub>3</sub>	67.7	22.2	10.1	1
4w	56.1	29.6	14.3	1
4x	26.6	33.0	40.4	3
4y	15.4	35.2	49.5	3
4z	37.0	30.0	33.0	1
4aa	45.7	32.0	22.3	1
4bb	52.9	27.5	19.6	1
4cc	32.0	27.0	41.0	3
4dd	56.7	34.6	8.7	1
4ee	53.8	26.9	19.2	1
4ff	50.0	31.4	18.6	1
4gg	60.6	29.8	9.6	1
4hh	29.4	33.3	37.3	3

The Director of Athletics views his/her role as being that of a decision-maker in thirty-two of the thirty-six categories. Notations appear on many of the returned surveys indicating that no athletic administrator has any more than an advisory role in the allocation of non-athletic financial aid, the admission of student-athletes, and the academic advisement of student-athletes. As also noted by the respondents, the decision-making authority for the area of recruitment of student-athletes rests with the coaches.

The responses to question 5 are capsulized in Table 5. The table provides the response percentages for each response category and indicates the modal response. The



data reveal that the Director of Athletics views the role of the primary woman athletic administrator as consultative in all but three areas. In the areas of facility renovation, non-athletic financial aid allocation, and admission of student-athletes, the role of the primary woman athletic administrator is viewed as being advisory in nature.

TABLE 5

RESPONSE PERCENTAGES FOR QUESTION 5 REGARDING  
THE PERCEPTION OF THE DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS OF  
THE ROLE OF THE PRIMARY WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR  
IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF AREAS IN  
WOMEN'S ATHLETICS

Question	Decision- Maker (1)	Consultative Capacity (2)	Advisory Capacity (3)	Modal Response
5a	15.4	69.2	15.4	2
5b	30.8	53.8	15.4	2
5c	17.6	64.7	17.6	2
5d	26.0	63.5	10.5	2
5e	20.2	64.4	15.4	2
5f	20.8	48.5	30.7	2
5g	24.0	65.4	10.6	2
5h	20.2	64.4	15.4	2
5i	19.2	57.7	23.1	2
5j	33.7	53.8	12.5	2
5k	30.8	50.0	19.2	2
5l	29.1	44.7	26.2	2
5m	15.5	63.1	21.4	2
5n	14.6	60.2	25.2	2
5o	13.7	58.8	27.5	2
5p	13.9	54.5	31.7	2
5q	33.0	51.5	15.5	2
5r	19.4	56.3	24.3	2
5s	10.7	43.7	45.6	3
5t	7.7	58.3	34.0	2
5u	6.8	55.3	37.9	2
5v <sub>1</sub>	28.8	55.8	15.4	2
5v <sub>2</sub>	29.8	53.8	16.3	2
5v <sub>3</sub>	24.3	63.1	12.6	2
5w	26.3	54.5	19.2	2
5x	13.7	42.1	44.2	3
5y	11.0	41.7	47.3	3

TABLE 5-Continued

Question	Decision-Maker (1)	Consultative Capacity (2)	Advisory Capacity (3)	Modal Response
5z	15.3	51.0	33.7	2
5aa	24.0	48.0	28.0	2
5bb	19.8	58.4	21.8	2
5cc	23.0	44.0	33.0	2
5dd	13.9	63.4	22.7	2
5ee	17.6	55.9	26.5	2
5ff	11.0	57.0	32.0	2
5gg	11.9	71.3	16.8	2
5hh	14.1	48.5	37.4	2

Seventy-nine percent of the responding Directors of Athletics indicate that their institution has women's sports which have been identified to strive for national prominence. The data show that 86.8 percent of the Directors of Athletics at institutions with such sports have been involved in the identification process.

#### Section II - Conference Decision-Making Processes

At institutions which hold membership in conferences which govern women's intercollegiate athletics, the Director of Athletics is recognized as a formal part of the conference governance structure which regulates women's athletics. The data generated in response to question 4 indicate that that is true in 84 percent of the cases. Of those institutions in conferences where the Director of Athletics is recognized as part of the conference governance structure, the Director of Athletics has a role as the

decision-maker in matters pertinent to women's athletics in 55 percent of the instances reported.

The Director of Athletics is active in affecting change in conference matters pertinent to the governance of women's athletics. The data show that 66.7 percent of the respondents have contacted a conference administrator or officer to affect such change.

### Section III - National Decision-Making Processes

The data reveal that the Director of Athletics has identified a Primary Woman Administrator to the NCAA in 86.5 percent of the cases reported. That individual is a female in 85.6 percent of the instances. Fourteen percent of the Directors of Athletics have designated a male NCAA Primary Woman Administrator.

The data show that attendance by the Director of Athletics at NCAA Conventions has increased since 1981. Table 6 describes the nature of that increase.

TABLE 6

#### ATTENDANCE AT NCAA CONVENTIONS BY DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

Year (Site)	Percentage of Respondents Who Attended
1981 (Miami Beach)	79.3
1982 (Houston)	83.0
1983 (San Diego)	85.4
1984 (Dallas)	88.8
1985 (Nashville)	90.1

The responses to questions 3.a.2., 3.b.2., 3.c.2., 3.d.2., and 3.e.2. indicate that a very large percentage of respondents who attended the NCAA Conventions in the years specified were issued delegate credentials. The percentages ranged from a low of 77.3 in 1981 to a high of 84.3 in 1982.

Participation at NCAA Conventions is addressed in questions 4 and 5. The data contained in Table 7 indicate the response percentages obtained in the areas of voting and speaking at the Conventions.

TABLE 7  
PARTICIPATION AT NCAA CONVENTIONS  
BY DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

Year (Site)	Voted	Spoke on the Floor
1981 (Miami Beach)	92.5	26.1
1982 (Houston)	91.5	26.0
1983 (San Diego)	93.2	34.7
1984 (Dallas)	91.5	24.7
1985 (Nashville)	94.2	32.2

It can be seen that while over 90 percent of Directors of Athletics in attendance at NCAA Conventions have exercised their voting privileges less than one-third of all responding Directors of Athletics spoke on the floor of the Conventions.

The data reveal that the Director of Athletics has input in the determination of the institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations in 99.1 percent of the instances reported. That input is most

often accomplished through dialogue with the primary woman athletic administrator, the Faculty Athletic Representative, and the Chief Executive Officer. Almost 58 percent of the respondents indicate that the Director of Athletics does not make the final decision on the institutional position on NCAA proposals pertinent to women's athletics. Seventy-six percent of the respondents indicate that the final authority rests with the institutional Chief Executive Officer.

#### Section IV - Demographic Information

Of the respondents, 88.5 percent report that their title is Director of Athletics. The majority (54.4 percent) report to the institutional Chief Executive Officer. Over 50 percent have begun working in their present positions since 1979. The vast majority of respondents indicate that they do not teach, coach, or perform any duties other than their athletic administrative responsibilities. Of those who do perform other duties, the largest percentage teach (15 percent). Generally, the Director of Athletics is between the ages of fifty-one and sixty. Ninety-two percent of the respondents administer a structurally segregated department.

#### Research Question 3

Research question 3 was as follows:

Compare the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making

processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

The hypothesis being tested was:

Ho<sub>1</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels and the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the same processes.

### Section I - Institutional Decision-Making Processes

Table 8 details the comparison of the questions deemed appropriate in the comparison of the roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics at the institutional level. The table includes the questions being compared, the chi-square value for each comparison, the degrees of freedom, the probability, and an indication of the statistical significance at the .05 level. In addition, if significance at the .05 level is determined, the appropriate comparative statistic and its value are indicated. The same format is used for all tables used to describe the comparison in research question 3.

TABLE 8

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEIVED ROLES OF THE PRIMARY  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE  
DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS AT THE  
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
1a/1a	.04	1	.8491		
2b/2b	10.92	2	.0043	*	Cramer's V .2170
2c/2c	26.76	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3353
2d/2d	57.41	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4901
2e/2e	48.30	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4486
10a/4a	39.37	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4050
10b/4b	6.61	2	.0368	*	Cramer's V .1680
10c/4c	29.13	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3567
10d/4d	3.46	2	.1771		
10e/4e	31.89	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3653
10f/4f	7.99	2	.0184	*	Cramer's V .1848
10g/4g	17.98	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2743
10h/4h	33.41	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3746
10i/4i	9.49	2	.0087	*	Cramer's V .2014
10j/4j	.20	2	.9035		
10k/4k	7.68	2	.0215	*	Cramer's V .1793
10l/4l	4.87	2	.0875		
10m/4m	39.26	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4096
10n/4n	35.81	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3903
10o/4o	36.92	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4007
10p/4p	16.93	2	.0002	*	Cramer's V .2761
10q/4q	3.38	2	.1849		
10r/4r	4.58	2	.1013		

TABLE 8-Continued

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
10s/4s	9.08	2	.0107	*	Cramer's V .1978
10t/4t	45.50	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4419
10u/4u	48.55	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4545
10v <sub>1</sub> /4v <sub>1</sub>	5.11	2	.0775		
10v <sub>2</sub> /4v <sub>2</sub>	2.45	2	.2941		
10v <sub>3</sub> /4v <sub>3</sub>	19.19	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2882
10w/4w	2.60	2	.2730		
10x/4x	7.11	2	.0285	*	Cramer's V .1858
10y/4y	1.02	2	.5996		
10z/4z	.26	2	.8785		
10aa/4aa	.07	2	.9636		
10bb/4bb	7.55	2	.0229	*	Cramer's V .1789
10cc/4cc	3.12	2	.2103		
10dd/4dd	31.29	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3626
10ee/4ee	15.96	2	.0003	*	Cramer's V .2595
10ff/4ff	18.78	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2851
10gg/4gg	42.73	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .4237
10hh/10hh	.07	2	.9637		
11/6	3.94	1	.0471	*	phi coefficient .1366
12/7	.07	1	.7847		

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data contained in Table 8 reveal that there is difference in the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the



institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics in twenty-nine of the forty-three areas compared. The most significant differences appear in the areas of the frequency of the meetings with the college/university administrator to whom Athletics reports and the Chief Executive Officer, budget development, salary negotiations for coaching personnel, facility renovation, new construction, and the development of institutional athletic policy. The Cramer's V value in each of those areas is between .40 and .50.

On the basis of the significant difference identified in twenty-nine of the forty-three areas studied, the null hypothesis is rejected for Section I.

## Section II - Conference Decision-Making Processes

Table 9 describes the comparison of the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the conference decision-making processes related to the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics.

TABLE 9

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEIVED ROLES OF THE PRIMARY  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE  
DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS AT THE  
CONFERENCE LEVEL

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
14/6	5.99	2	.0005	*	Cramer's V .4810

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data contained in Table 9 show that there is a difference in the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the conference decision-making processes related to the governance of women's athletics. The Director of Athletics has a decision-making role in conference processes while the primary woman athletic administrator has a consultative role. The null hypothesis is rejected for Section II.

### Section III - National Decision-Making Processes

Table 10 describes the comparison of the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the national decision-making processes related to the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics.

TABLE 10

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEIVED ROLES OF THE PRIMARY  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE  
DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS AT THE  
NATIONAL LEVEL

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	x <sup>2</sup> Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
2a <sub>1</sub> /3a <sub>1</sub>	4.76	1	.0291	*	phi coefficient .1572
2a <sub>2</sub> /3a <sub>2</sub>	12.50	2	.0019	*	Cramer's V .2600
2b <sub>1</sub> /3b <sub>1</sub>	3.58	1	.0584		
2b <sub>2</sub> /3b <sub>2</sub>	9.91	2	.0101	*	Cramer's V .2266
2c <sub>1</sub> /3c <sub>1</sub>	6.13	1	.0133	*	phi coefficient .1850
2c <sub>2</sub> /3c <sub>2</sub>	no calculations possible-2			cells with frequency <5	
2d <sub>1</sub> /3d <sub>1</sub>	15.46	1	.0001	*	phi coefficient .2918
2d <sub>2</sub> /3d <sub>2</sub>	no calculations possible-2			cells with frequency <5	
2e <sub>1</sub> /3e <sub>1</sub>	25.32	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .3810
2e <sub>2</sub> /3e <sub>2</sub>	no calculations possible-2			cells with frequency <5	
3a/4A	5.56	1	.0183	*	phi coefficient .1982
3b/4b	5.86	1	.0155	*	phi coefficient .2036
3c/4c	15.31	2	.0005	*	phi coefficient .3227
3d/4d	8.71	1	.0032	*	phi coefficient .2824
3e/4e	7.45	1	.0063	*	phi coefficient .2955
4a/5a	2.39	1	.1218		
4b/5b	.04	1	.8326		
4c/5c	2.23	1	.1352		
4d/5d	1.20	1	.2743		
4e/5e	1.26	1	.2612		
8/9	2.92	1	.0872		
15a/14a	9.86	1	.0017	*	phi coefficient .2145
16/15	.10	1	.7573		

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data described in Table 10 indicate that there is a difference in the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the national decision-making processes related to the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics in twelve of the twenty areas studied.

The most significant areas of difference are in the frequencies with which the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics exercised voting privileges at the NCAA Conventions. The phi coefficient values range from .1982 to .3227 for the comparisons of the years studied.

It is interesting to note that differences are not present in the area of the type of credentials issued to the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics for NCAA Conventions. The data indicate that both groups of individuals are unclear as to the type of credentials they were issued. The primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics both indicate that they received Delegate credentials. Only one such certification may be issued per institution at each Convention.

On the basis of the significant difference identified in twelve of the twenty areas studied, the null hypothesis is rejected for Section III.

## Summary

The null hypothesis is rejected for each of the three sections of the comparison.

### Research Question 4

Research question 4 was as follows:

Compare the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator of her role in the same processes.

The hypothesis being tested was:

Ho<sub>2</sub>: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator and the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator of her own role.

## Section I - Institutional Decision-Making Processes

The data contained in Table 11 describe the comparison of the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The table includes the questions compared, the chi-square value for each comparison, the degrees of freedom, the probability, and an indication of statistical significance at the .05 level. In addition, if significance at the .05 level is determined, the appropriate comparative

statistic and its value are indicated. The same format is followed for all tables used to describe the comparison in research question 4.

TABLE 11

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRIMARY WOMAN  
ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE DIRECTOR OF  
ATHLETICS REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE  
PRIMARY WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	x <sup>2</sup> Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
2b/3b	3.26	2	.1959		
2c/3c	.11	2	.9482		
2d/3d	.73	2	.6935		
2e/3e	2.06	2	.3566		
10a/5a	15.50	2	.0004	*	Cramer's V .2541
10b/5b	18.98	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2842
10c/5c	19.79	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2921
10d/5d	25.45	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3250
10e/5e	4.97	2	.0833		
10f/5f	13.76	2	.0010	*	Cramer's V .2436
10g/5g	18.11	2	.0001	*	Cramer's V .2753
10h/5h	15.64	2	.0004	*	Cramer's V .2564
10i/5i	25.94	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3322
10j/5j	23.33	2	.0000	*	Cramer's V .3111
10k/5k	3.39	2	.1835		
10l/5l	13.35	2	.0013	*	Cramer's V .2388
10m/5m	8.68	2	.0130	*	Cramer's V .1926
10n/5n	7.27	2	.0264	*	Cramer's V .1758
10o/5o	9.61	2	.0082	*	Cramer's V .2044

TABLE 11-Continued

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
10p/5p	9.42	2	.0090	*	Cramer's V .2051
10q/5q	16.07	2	.0003	*	Cramer's V .2598
10r/5r	9.68	2	.0079	*	Cramer's V .2034
10s/5s	6.81	2	.0332	*	Cramer's V .1717
10t/5t	7.07	2	.0292	*	Cramer's V .1742
10u/5u	5.01	2	.0819		
10v <sub>1</sub> /5v <sub>1</sub>	13.08	2	.0014	*	Cramer's V .2349
10v <sub>2</sub> /5v <sub>2</sub>	11.94	2	.0026	*	Cramer's V .2244
10v <sub>3</sub> /5v <sub>3</sub>	12.21	2	.0022	*	Cramer's V .2279
10w/5w	9.20	2	.0100	*	Cramer's V .2009
10x/5x	7.64	2	.0220	*	Cramer's V .1921
10y/5y	2.85	2	.2408		
10z/5z	14.48	2	.0007	*	Cramer's V .2543
10aa/5aa	10.05	2	.0066	*	Cramer's V .2090
10bb/5bb	8.24	2	.0163	*	Cramer's V .1872
10cc/5cc	9.29	2	.0096	*	Cramer's V .1988
10dd/5dd	5.19	2	.0747		
10ee/5ee	8.15	2	.0170	*	Cramer's V .1863
10ff/5ff	10.19	2	.0061	*	Cramer's V .2109
10gg/5gg	5.13	2	.0696		
10hh/5hh	9.43	2	.0089	*	Cramer's V .2025
11/6	3.94	1	.0471	*	phi coefficient .1366
12/8	2.99	1	.0838		

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.

2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data contained in Table 11 reveal that there is a difference in the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in thirty-one of the forty-two areas studied. The most significant areas of perceptual difference between the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics include the areas of the hiring of coaching personnel, the firing of clerical and non-professional staff members, and the evaluation of coaching personnel. The Cramer's V value in each of those comparisons is .31 to .33.

On the basis of the significant difference identified in thirty-one of the forty-two areas studied, the null hypothesis is rejected for Section I.

## Section II - Conference Decision-Making Processes

The data contained in Table 12 describe the comparison of the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the conference decision-making processes related to the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics.



TABLE 12

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRIMARY WOMAN  
ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE DIRECTOR OF  
ATHLETICS REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE  
PRIMARY WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
12/7	.37	1	.5431		
13/8	.32	1	.5701		
14/9	5.99	2	.0005	*	Cramer's V .2750
15/10	2.80	5	.7309		

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data contained in Table 12 show that there is a difference in the perceptions of the role of the primary woman athletic administrator with conference decision-making processes as seen by the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator in only one of four areas studied. That area is the nature of the role played by the primary woman athletic administrator in the conference governance process.

On the basis of the significant difference identified in only one of four areas studied, the null hypothesis is not rejected for Section II.

### Section III - National Decision-Making Processes

Table 13 contains the data pertinent to the comparison of the perceptions of the primary woman athletic

administrator and the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes related to the national governance of women's intercollegiate athletics.

TABLE 13

COMPARISON OF THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE PRIMARY WOMAN  
ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE DIRECTOR OF  
ATHLETICS REGARDING THE ROLE OF THE  
PRIMARY WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
8/11	2.83	1	.0924		

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

The data presented in Table 13 indicate that there is no difference in the perceptions of the role of the primary woman athletic administrator as seen by the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator in the area studied. The null hypothesis is not rejected for Section III.

### Summary

The null hypothesis is not rejected for two of the three sections of the comparisons of perceptions.

## Research Question 5

Research question 5 was as follows:

Determine the level of satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

Table 14 contains data relevant to the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her impact on the decision-making process at each of the three levels being studied. The table indicates the level being addressed and the percentage of respondents answering yes and no.

TABLE 14

SATISFACTION WITH IMPACT ON THE  
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Level	Yes	No
Institutional	73.7	26.3
Conference	63.8	36.2
National	43.9	56.1

It is evident that the primary woman athletic administrator is satisfied with her impact on the institutional and conference levels but not satisfied with her impact on the national level. The percentage of respondents answering no at the institutional and conference levels are large enough to prevent an unchallengeable indication of satisfaction at either of those two levels.

Of the respondents who answered question I.15., the majority indicate that their impact is insufficient due to an unsupportive Director of Athletics. Most individuals indicate that if given an opportunity to participate in the institutional decision-making process in areas central to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics, they believe themselves to have the ability to demonstrate high-level administrative effectiveness.

Respondents to question II.27. indicate that the woman athletic administrator does not have sufficient impact on the conference decision-making process because the women administrators group generally refers its input to the Directors of Athletics group rather than to Faculty Athletic Representatives or Chief Executive Officers. The relatively short length of time during which women's programs have been a part of conference structures was identified as one of the possible causes of this disparity in administrative reporting relationships.

Respondents to question III.20. indicate that the Primary Woman Administrator does not have sufficient impact on the national decision-making process because she lacks a separate vote on matters pertinent to the governance of women's programs. Several respondents question the sincerity of the NCAA in providing opportunities for women administrators.

Table 15 reveals the data relevant to the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with the

decision-making process at each of the three levels being studied. The table also indicates the level being addressed and the percentage of respondents answering yes and no.

TABLE 15  
SATISFACTION WITH STRUCTURE OF  
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

Level	Yes	No
Institutional	67.2	32.8
Conference	62.8	37.2
National	56.6	43.4

Again it is evident that the primary woman athletic administrator is satisfied with the decision-making structure at each of the three levels being studied but the percentage of respondents answering no to the questions at all three levels is very significant.

Those individuals responding to question I.17. indicate that the institutional decision-making process relative to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics could be improved if women's programs were administered separately from men's programs. Many respondents comment on the decreasing numbers of women administrators in high-level women's athletic programs. This trend could be reversed, according to a number of respondents, if women were given back the administrative authority in women's athletics they once possessed.

Respondents to question II.29. indicate that the conference decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics should include a women administrators group which functions on the same administrative level as does the Directors of Athletics group. The input from the two groups should be referred to the same group and in the same fashion.

Most respondents to question III.21. advocate the return of a women's athletics governance organization in which women administrators could govern women's intercollegiate athletic programs. Some individuals favor the creation of a women's division within the NCAA which would hold meetings apart from the Annual Convention and enact legislation pertinent to women's programs.

#### Research Question 6

Research question 6 was as follows:

Determine the level of satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

Table 16 addresses the satisfaction of the Directors of Athletics with the impact of the primary woman athletic administrator on the decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics.

TABLE 16

DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS SATISFACTION WITH IMPACT  
OF PRIMARY WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR

Level	Yes	No
Institutional	93.3	6.7
Conference	95.9	4.1
National	92.1	7.9

It is evident that the Director of Athletics is very satisfied with the impact of the primary woman athletic administrator at all three levels being studied.

Research Question 7

Research question 7 was as follows:

Compare the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the same processes.

The hypothesis being tested was:

Ho<sub>3</sub>: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role and the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator.

Table 17 details the data pertinent to the comparison of the levels of satisfaction of the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator. Statistical significance at the .05 level is indicated in both of the

comparisons at each of the three levels. The null hypothesis is rejected for Sections I, II, and III.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF SATISFACTION OF THE PRIMARY WOMAN  
ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR AND THE DIRECTOR OF  
ATHLETICS WITH THE ROLE OF THE PRIMARY  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR

Questions Compared PWA/AD <sub>1</sub> .	$\chi^2$ Value	df	p	Significant at the .05 Level <sub>2</sub> .	Comparative Statistic & Value
Section I					
14/10	14.33	1	.0002	*	phi coefficient .2543
16/12	33.03	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .3832
Section II					
26/13	31.22	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .3833
28/15	33.14	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .3918
Section III					
19/17	54.95	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .5047
21/19	36.06	1	.0000	*	phi coefficient .4114

1. The first question number is from the primary woman administrator questionnaire. The second question number is from the Director of Athletics questionnaire.
2. \* = Significant at the .05 level.

Summary

The null hypothesis is rejected for all of the sections.



## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

This study was an examination of the role of the woman intercollegiate athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's athletics.

A review of the literature in the area of the history of the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics was conducted in preparation for the study. The review detailed the variety of organizations which have governed or attempted to govern women's athletics from 1833 to the present. The philosophical differences among the groups involved led to frequent changes in the direction of the women's athletic movement. The attitudes of the governing groups ranged from totally disapproving of competition for female athletes to the vigorous pursuit of competitive opportunities at the highest level. The review described how this range of attitudes strongly impacted the role of the woman administrator in intercollegiate athletics.

## Purposes

The purposes of this study were to:

1. Describe the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
2. Describe the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
3. Compare the perceived roles of the primary woman administrator and the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
4. Compare the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the

perceptions of the primary woman administrator of her role in the same processes.

5. Determine the level of satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
6. Determine the level of satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels.
7. Compare the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels with the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the same processes.

#### Design

The study was conducted through the administration of two survey instruments which were developed to describe

roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The information gathered by the survey instruments also enabled the researcher to compare the roles of the two responding groups within the levels studied.

The analysis of the data included the use of descriptive techniques where they were appropriate and comparative techniques in other instances. Three null hypotheses were developed to determine whether there were statistical differences of significance in the roles, perceptions of roles, and levels of satisfaction between the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics. The statistical significance level of .05 was used to test the hypotheses.

#### Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this study were stated in the null form. They were:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics at the

institutional, conference, and national levels and the perceived role of the Director of Athletics in the same processes.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the Director of Athletics regarding the role of the primary woman athletic administrator and the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator of her own role.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator with her role and the satisfaction of the Director of Athletics with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator.

#### Limitations

The limitations which must be considered when interpreting the results of the study were:

1. The data used in the study were self-reported.
2. The returned responses upon which the analyses of data is based may not constitute a representative sample of the population.
3. It was impossible to determine whether the person to whom the questionnaire was originally sent

actually completed the instrument or requested that another staff member complete it.

4. The response percentage judged to contain usable data was 43 percent.

### Findings and Conclusions

Hypothesis 1 was stated in the null form. It suggested no significant difference between the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics in the institutional decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's athletics at the institutional, conference, and national levels and was rejected at each of the three levels.

At the institutional level, the data indicated statistically significant differences between the perceived roles of the two individuals in twenty-nine of the forty-three areas studied. The most important of those areas in which differences were found were budget development, the hiring and firing of coaching personnel, goal setting, the availability of support services, the size of the intercollegiate sports program, and the development of institutional athletic policy. The null hypothesis was rejected at the institutional level.

At the conference level, the data indicated a statistically significant difference between the perceived roles of the primary woman athletic administrator and the

Director of Athletics in the one area studied. The Director of Athletics was found to have a decision-making role in the conference governance process relative to women's athletics. The primary woman athletic administrator was found to have a consultative role. The null hypothesis was rejected at the conference level.

At the national level, the data indicated statistically significant differences in twelve of the twenty areas studied. The most important of those areas in which differences were found included the rate of attendance at NCAA Conventions and the authority to make the final decision regarding the institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations. The null hypothesis was rejected at the national level.

The null hypothesis was rejected at each level studied. There is significant difference between the perceived roles of the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator at the institutional, conference, and national levels.

Hypothesis 2 was also stated in the null form. It suggested no significant difference between the perceptions of the role of the primary woman athletic administrator by the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator and was rejected at only one of the three levels studied.

At the institutional level, the data indicated statistically significant differences between the

perceptions of the two respondent groups in thirty-one of the forty-two areas studied. The most important of those areas where difference was found included budget development, the hiring and firing of coaching personnel, facility use, maintenance, and renovation, goal setting, fund raising, and the development of institutional athletic policy. The null hypothesis was rejected at the institutional level.

At the conference level, the data revealed statistically significant difference between the perceptions in only one of the four areas studied. That difference occurred in the determination of the group to which the input of the primary woman athletic administrator was referred. The null hypothesis was not rejected at the conference level.

At the national level, the data showed that statistically significant difference did not exist in the one area studied. The perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics on input in the determination of the institutional position on NCAA proposals were similar. The null hypothesis was not rejected at the national level.

The null hypothesis was rejected at one of the levels studied and not rejected at two of the levels. There is significant difference between the perceptions of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of



Athletics at the institutional level but no significant difference at the conference or national levels.

Hypothesis 3 was stated in the null form. It suggested no significant difference between the satisfaction with the role of the primary woman athletic administrator between the Director of Athletics and the primary woman athletic administrator. Hypothesis 3 was rejected at all three levels studied.

At the institutional, conference, and national levels, the data revealed statistically significant difference between the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics with the impact of the primary woman administrator in the decision-making processes. Statistically significant difference was also found in the comparison of satisfaction with the current structure of the decision-making processes at all levels.

The null hypothesis was rejected at each of the three levels. There is significant difference between the satisfaction of the primary woman athletic administrator and the Director of Athletics.

#### Implications for Further Research

A great amount of data were generated for this study. The purposes of the study limited the use of much of what was collected. Further studies could be developed using the data which exist in the following areas:

1. Does the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator differ among the three subdivisions of NCAA Division?
2. Does the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator differ among conferences?
3. Does the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator differ at institutions which have female Deans or Vice Presidents?
4. Does the perceived role of the primary woman athletic administrator differ at institutions which have a female NCAA Faculty Representative?

The researcher recommends that further study also be done in the following areas:

1. Why do a large number of institutions not have a woman involved in the administration of the athletic program?
2. Why do institutions have male NCAA Primary Woman Administrators?
3. What is the role of the primary woman athletic administrator in the institutional decision-making processes at the institutional, conference, and national levels in NCAA Division II and III institutions?

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LETTER OF APPROVAL FROM UCRIHS

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING  
HUMAN SUBJECTS (UCRIHS)  
238 ADMINISTRATION BUILDING  
(517) 355-2186

EAST LANSING · MICHIGAN · 48824

June 27, 1985

Ms. Christine W. Hoyles  
Associate Athletic Director  
Western Michigan University  
Division of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49008-3899

Dear Ms. Hoyles:

Subject: Proposal Entitled, "An Examination of the Role of the  
Woman Athlete Administrator in the Decision-Making  
Processes Regarding the Governance of Women's  
Intercollegiate Athletics"

I am pleased to advise that I concur with your evaluation that this project is exempt from full UCRIHS review, and approval is herewith granted for conduct of the project.

You are reminded that UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year. If you plan to continue this project beyond one year, please make provisions for obtaining appropriate UCRIHS approval prior to June 27, 1986.

Any changes in procedures involving human subjects must be reviewed by the UCRIHS prior to initiation of the change. UCRIHS must also be notified promptly of any problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects during the course of the work.

Thank you for bringing this project to my attention. If I can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely,



Henry E. Bredeck  
Chairman, UCRIHS

HEB/jms

cc: Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker

## APPENDIX B

### THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR THE PRIMARY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

APPENDIX B  
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR THE PRIMARY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS

THE ROLE OF THE  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR  
IN THE  
DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES  
REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE  
OF  
WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The following questionnaire has been designed to identify the role of the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The processes in three major areas will be studied. Those areas are: (1) institutional administration and governance, (2) conference governance, and (3) national governance.

The questionnaire is divided into sections which relate to those three major areas. A fourth section which requests demographic information completes the questionnaire. Please do add comments wherever you feel it is appropriate. A comment section has also been included at the end of each major section for your use if you so desire.

Your assistance with this project is greatly appreciated.

## SECTION I -- INSTITUTIONAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The questions in this section deal with the nature and degree of your involvement in the decisions made at your institution regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. a. Does any athletic administrator have the authority to overrule your decisions in the area of women's athletics?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes. b. If yes, who does (position only)

\_\_\_\_\_ No

2. How often do you meet with the following individuals or groups at your institution?

	Meet With Regularly	Meet With Occasionally	Don't Meet With
a. Director of Athletics	_____	_____	_____
b. Athletic Department management group (A.D., Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D., etc.)	_____	_____	_____
c. Faculty Athletic Representative	_____	_____	_____
d. College/university administrative officer to whom Athletics reports	_____	_____	_____
e. College/university CEO	_____	_____	_____

3. Do you serve as a member of your institutional Athletic Board or Council?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

4. If your answer to question 3 is yes, what type of membership do you hold?

\_\_\_\_\_ Regular appointment \_\_\_\_\_ Ex-officio

5. If your answer to question 3 is yes, do you serve as a voting member?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No



6. If your answer to question 3 is no, do you regularly attend the meetings of your institutional Athletic Board or Council?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
7. If you do not attend the meetings of your institutional Athletic Board or Council, do you meet regularly with the chair of the group?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
8. Do you serve on any institutional standing or special committees?  
 a. Standing committees                \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No  
 b. Special committees                \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No  
    If yes, please list the names of the committees and describe the nature of your position.
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- c. Number of elected positions:  
 d. Number of appointed positions:
9. a. Do you serve as the institutional representative to any outside organizations?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No  
    If yes, please list the organizations and the nature of your position.
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- \_\_\_\_\_                \_\_\_\_\_ Elected                \_\_\_\_\_ Appointed
- b. Number of elected positions:  
 c. Number of appointed positions:
10. How are you involved in the institutional decision-making process with regard to the administration of women's athletics in each of the following areas?
- Decision maker --                Responsibility for the final decision rests with you, subject only to approval by institutional CEO, his/her designate, or governing board.
- Consultative capacity --                You must be asked for your input on the subject but the final decision is made by someone else.

Advisory capacity --

You may be asked for your  
input on the subject.

	Decision Maker	Consultative Capacity	Advisory Capacity
a. Budget development	_____	_____	_____
b. Authorizing spending	_____	_____	_____
c. Mid-year budget adjustments	_____	_____	_____
d. Hiring of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
e. Hiring of support professionals (trainers, SIDs, equipment staff)	_____	_____	_____
f. Hiring of clerical and non-professional staff members (grounds, mainte- nance, custodial)	_____	_____	_____
g. Firing of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
h. Firing of support professionals	_____	_____	_____
i. Firing of clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
j. Evaluation of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
k. Evaluation of sup- port professionals	_____	_____	_____
l. Evaluation of cler- ical and non-profes- sional staff members	_____	_____	_____
m. Salary negotiations for coaching person- nel	_____	_____	_____
n. Salary adjustments for coaching per- sonnel	_____	_____	_____
o. Salary adjustments for support pro- fessionals	_____	_____	_____
p. Salary adjustments for clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
q. Event scheduling	_____	_____	_____
r. Facility use	_____	_____	_____
s. Facility maintenance (routine)	_____	_____	_____
t. Facility renovation	_____	_____	_____

- |     |                                                                                                                                                                            |       |       |       |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| u.  | New construction                                                                                                                                                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| v.  | Goal setting for:                                                                                                                                                          |       |       |       |
|     | 1. Sports                                                                                                                                                                  | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|     | 2. Coaches                                                                                                                                                                 | _____ | _____ | _____ |
|     | 3. Department                                                                                                                                                              | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| w.  | Athletic scholar-<br>ship allocation                                                                                                                                       | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| x.  | Non-athletic<br>financial aid<br>allocation                                                                                                                                | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| y.  | Admission of<br>student-athletes                                                                                                                                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| z.  | Eligibility deter-<br>mination of student-<br>athletes                                                                                                                     | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| aa. | Event management                                                                                                                                                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| bb. | Availability of sup-<br>port services such<br>as tutoring, promo-<br>tion, equipment room<br>services, medical<br>coverage, and sports<br>information to<br>women's sports | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| cc. | Recruitment of<br>student-athletes                                                                                                                                         | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| dd. | The size of the<br>intercollegiate<br>sports program                                                                                                                       | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ee. | Promotion of sports                                                                                                                                                        | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ff. | Fund raising                                                                                                                                                               | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| gg. | Development of<br>institutional<br>athletic policy                                                                                                                         | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| hh. | Academic advisement<br>of student-athletes                                                                                                                                 | _____ | _____ | _____ |
11. Does your institution have any women's sports which have been identified to strive for national prominence?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
12. If your answer to question 11 is yes, were you involved in the institutional identification process?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
13. a. Do you have specific men's or women's sports for which administrative decisions made by you cannot be overruled by any other athletic administrator?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes. b. If yes: \_\_\_\_\_ Men's sports \_\_\_\_\_ Women's Sports  
 \_\_\_\_\_ No

14. Do you think that you have sufficient impact on the institutional decision-making processes regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
15. If your answer to question 14 is no, why do you think that you do not have sufficient impact?
16. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the institutional decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
17. If your answer to question 16 is no, how would you change the process?

COMMENTS:

## SECTION II -- CONFERENCE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The questions in this section deal with the nature and degree of your involvement in the decisions made by your conference regarding the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. Does your institution hold membership in a conference which governs women's intercollegiate athletic programs?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
2. If your answer to question 1 is yes, what is the name of the conference in which your institution holds membership? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Is the conference in which your institution holds membership for women a segregated (women's only) or an integrated (men's and women's) conference?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Segregated                \_\_\_\_\_ Integrated

4. Does your institution hold membership in a conference which governs men's intercollegiate athletic programs?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, what is the name of the conference in which your institution holds membership? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Is the conference in which your institution holds membership for men a segregated (men's only) or an integrated (men's and women's) conference?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Segregated                \_\_\_\_\_ Integrated
7. If your institution holds membership in different conferences for men's and women's programs, why does the institution not hold membership in the same conference for men and women?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ No interest in governing women's athletics or offering women's championships shown by men's conference  
       \_\_\_\_\_ No interest in holding membership in the same conference for women shown by institutional representatives  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation with men's conference cost prohibitive  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation with men's conference inconsistent with institutional goals for women's athletic program  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_
8. In what year did your women's program become affiliated with its conference? \_\_\_\_\_
9. In what year did the integrated conference in which your institution holds membership begin to govern women's athletic programs? \_\_\_\_\_
10. If your institution holds membership in the same integrated conference for men's and women's athletics, are the conference rules and regulations governing men's and women's programs the same?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
11. If your answer to question 10 is no, please describe the major areas of difference and the rationale for those differences.

12. In the conference in which your institution holds membership for its women's programs, are the institutional primary women administrators recognized as a formal part of the conference governance structure?  
       \_\_\_ Yes                    \_\_\_ No
13. If your answer to question 12 is yes, does the primary women administrators group have a role in the decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_ Yes                    \_\_\_ No
14. If your answer to question 13 is yes, what kind of role does the primary women administrators group have in the governance process?  
       \_\_\_ Ultimate decision-makers  
       \_\_\_ Consultative role  
       \_\_\_ Advisory role
15. To what group or individual is the input of the primary women administrators group referred?  
       \_\_\_ Conference commissioner  
       \_\_\_ Conference officers  
       \_\_\_ Faculty athletic representatives group  
       \_\_\_ Directors of athletics group  
       \_\_\_ Chief executive officers group  
       \_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
16. Does the primary women administrators group meet on a regular basis?  
       \_\_\_ Yes                    \_\_\_ No
17. Are those meetings held in conjunction with other regularly scheduled conference meetings (i.e., faculty athletic representatives, directors of athletics)?  
       \_\_\_ Yes                    \_\_\_ No
18. Do you regularly attend conference meetings for primary women administrators?  
       \_\_\_ Yes                    \_\_\_ No
19. a. Does the conference commissioner meet with the primary women administrators group?  
       \_\_\_ Yes. b. If yes, meets: \_\_\_ Regularly  
       \_\_\_ Occasionally  
       \_\_\_ No
20. A. If your answer to question 19 is no, does any other conference staff member meet with the primary women administrators group?  
       \_\_\_ Yes. b. (Please specify the title of the staff member) \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_ No

21. a. Does the conference in which your institution holds membership for its women's program have a woman administrator on its staff?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes. b. (Please specify her title)  
       \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_ No
22. If the conference in which your institution holds membership for its women's programs elects officers or committee chairpersons, do women currently hold any of the major conference offices or committee chairs?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No
23. Are women currently serving on any of the following types of conference committees?  
     a. Standing committees        \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No  
     b. Special committees        \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No
24. Have you ever made contact with a conference administrator or officer to affect change in matters pertinent to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No
25. How many championships are sponsored by the conferences in which your institution holds membership?
- |                            | Men's Conference | Women's Conference |
|----------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Men's champion-<br>ships   | 25A1 _____       | 25A2 _____         |
| Women's champion-<br>ships | 25B1 _____       | 25B2 _____         |
26. Do you think that the primary women administrators group has sufficient impact on the decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No
27. If your answer to question 26 is no, why do you think that the primary women administrators group does not have sufficient impact?
28. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the conference decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No
29. If your answer to question 28 is no, how would you change the process?

## COMMENTS:

## SECTION III -- NATIONAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The questions in this section deal with the nature and degree of your involvement in the decisions made by your institution regarding the NCAA governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. Are you the designated NCAA Primary Woman Administrator at your institution?

\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

2. Did you attend any of the following NCAA Conventions and, if you did, what type of credentials were you issued?

	1 Attended Convention		2 Credentials	
a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor

3. If you attended any of the following NCAA Conventions and were issued delegate or alternate credentials, did you exercise your voting privileges?

a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No

4. If you attended any of the following NCAA Conventions and were issued delegate or alternate credentials, did you exercise your speaking privileges on the Convention floor?

a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No



5. How often do the following individuals or groups at your institution participate in the decision-making process on NCAA proposals affecting women's rules and regulations?

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Student-athletes	—	—	—	—	—
b. Coaches	—	—	—	—	—
c. Other athletic administrators (Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D.)	—	—	—	—	—
d. Director of Athletics	—	—	—	—	—
e. College/university faculty	—	—	—	—	—
f. College/university CEO	—	—	—	—	—
g. Governing board (regents, trustees)	—	—	—	—	—
h. Athletic faculty representative	—	—	—	—	—
i. College/university Athletic Board or Council	—	—	—	—	—
j. College/university administrators	—	—	—	—	—
k. Conference officers or administrators	—	—	—	—	—

6. What type of input, if any, do the following individuals or groups at your institution have in the decision-making process on NCAA proposals affecting women's rules and regulations?

Decision maker --

Responsibility for the final decision rests with group or individual, subject only to approval by institutional CEO, his/her designate, or governing board.

Consultative input --

Group or individual must be asked for input on the subject but the final decision is made by someone else.

Advisory input --

Group or individual may be asked for input on the subject.

	Not Involved	Advisory Input	Consultative Input	Decision Maker
a. Student-athletes	___	___	___	___
b. Coaches	___	___	___	___
c. Other athletic administrators (Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D.)	___	___	___	___
d. Director of Athletics	___	___	___	___
e. College/university faculty	___	___	___	___
f. College/university CEO	___	___	___	___
g. Governing board (regents, trustees)	___	___	___	___
h. Athletic faculty representative	___	___	___	___
i. College/university Athletic Board or Council	___	___	___	___
j. College/university administrators	___	___	___	___
k. Conference officers or administrators	___	___	___	___
7. How is the institutional vote on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations determined at your institution?				
8. In the process of determining the institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations, do you have input?				
___	Yes	___	No	
9. If your answer to question 8 is yes, how do you have input?				
10. If there are NCAA proposals which your institution feels have direct impact on women's rules and regulations, how is your institutional position on those proposals determined?				

11. a. Are you able to propose NCAA legislation?  
       Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 b. If yes, how are you able to propose NCAA legislation?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Independently  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Through institutional CEO  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Through NCAA faculty representative
12. Does your institutional voting delegation go to the NCAA Conventions with prepared positions on proposed legislation?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
13. Does your institutional voting delegation go to the NCAA Conventions with alternate positions on proposals in the event that they are amended at the Convention?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
14. If your answer to question 13 is no, what guidelines does your voting representative use to determine your institutional position?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ College/university philosophy  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Departmental philosophy  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Personal philosophy  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
       \_\_\_\_\_
15. a. Do you make the final decision on your institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
       \_\_\_\_\_ No. b. (If no, who does? Position title only)  
       \_\_\_\_\_
16. Have you ever contacted your conference NCAA Council representative or any NCAA Council representative to affect change on proposals which affect women's rules and regulations?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
17. Have you ever contacted a woman on the NCAA Council on proposals which affect women's rules and regulations?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
18. Do you currently serve on or as the chairperson of any NCAA committees?  
 a. Sports committees \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No - Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  
 b. Standing committees \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No - Chair \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
19. Do you think the Primary Woman Administrator has sufficient impact on the NCAA decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No

20. If your answer to question 19 is no, why do you think that the Primary Woman Administrator does not have sufficient impact?
21. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the NCAA decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                \_\_\_\_\_ No
22. If your answer to question 21 is no, how would you change the process?

COMMENTS:

#### SECTION IV -- DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The questions in this section relate to you, your administrative position, and your institution. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. What is your present title?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Director of Athletics  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Director of Women's Athletics  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Associate Director of Athletics  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Assistant Director of Athletics  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Coordinator of Women's Athletics  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
2. To whom do you report?  
    Position title only \_\_\_\_\_
3. In what academic year did you begin working in your present position? \_\_\_\_\_
4. In addition to your administrative duties in athletics, do you:  
    a. Teach        \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No  
    b. Coach        \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No  
    c. Perform any other duties        \_\_\_\_\_ Yes        \_\_\_\_\_ No  
    (If yes, please specify what other duties you perform.)  
    \_\_\_\_\_

5. What is your present age?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Under 30  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 31-40  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 41-50  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 51-60  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 61+
6. Of which sub-division of NCAA Division I is your institution a member?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Division I-A  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Division I-AA  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Division I-AAA
7. How would you describe the organizational structure of intercollegiate athletics at your institution?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Integrated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Segregated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
8. Is your institutional NCAA faculty athletic representative male or female?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female
9. What is the number of members of your institution's Athletic Board or Council? \_\_\_\_\_
10. What is the number of women who currently hold membership on your institution's Athletic Board or Council? \_\_\_\_\_
11. What is the number of women who currently hold positions as Vice Presidents or Deans at your institution? \_\_\_\_\_
12. Which of the following sets of rules does your institution apply to its women's intercollegiate athletic program?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ NCAA  
 \_\_\_\_\_ AIAW  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Institutional  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
13. Please use this space to make any comments you feel you would like to make.

Thank you for your assistance with this study.

## APPENDIX C

### THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR THE DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

APPENDIX C  
THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT FOR THE DIRECTORS OF ATHLETICS

THE ROLE OF THE  
WOMAN ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATOR  
IN THE  
DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES  
REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE  
OF  
WOMEN'S INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The following questionnaire has been designed to identify the roles of the Director of Athletics and the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes related to the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. The processes in three major areas will be studied. Those areas are: (1) institutional administration and governance, (2) conference governance, and (3) national governance.

The questionnaire is divided into sections which relate to those three major areas. A fourth section which requests demographic information completes the questionnaire. Please do add comments wherever you feel it is appropriate. A comment section has also been included at the end of each major section for your use if you so desire.

Your assistance with this project is greatly appreciated.

3. How often does the primary woman administrator meet with the following individuals or groups at your institution?

	Meet With Regularly	Meet With Occasionally	Don't Meet With
a. Director of Athletics	_____	_____	_____
b. Athletic Department management group (A.D., Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D., etc.)	_____	_____	_____
c. Faculty Athletic Representative	_____	_____	_____
d. College/university administrative officer to whom Athletics reports	_____	_____	_____
e. College/university CEO	_____	_____	_____

4. How are you involved in the institutional decision-making process with regard to the administration of women's athletics in each of the following areas?

Decision maker -- Responsibility for the final decision rests with you, subject only to approval by institutional CEO, his/her designate, or governing board.

Consultative capacity -- You must be asked for your input on the subject but the final decision is made by someone else.

Advisory capacity -- You may be asked for your input on the subject.

	Decision Maker	Consultative Capacity	Advisory Capacity
a. Budget development	_____	_____	_____
b. Authorizing spending	_____	_____	_____
c. Mid-year budget adjustments	_____	_____	_____
d. Hiring of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____



e.	Hiring of support professionals (trainers, SIDs, equipment staff)	_____	_____	_____
f.	Hiring of clerical and non-professional staff members (grounds, maintenance, custodial)	_____	_____	_____
g.	Firing of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
h.	Firing of support professionals	_____	_____	_____
i.	Firing of clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
j.	Evaluation of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
k.	Evaluation of support professionals	_____	_____	_____
l.	Evaluation of clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
m.	Salary negotiations for coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
n.	Salary adjustments for coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
o.	Salary adjustments for support professionals	_____	_____	_____
p.	Salary adjustments for clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
q.	Event scheduling	_____	_____	_____
r.	Facility use	_____	_____	_____
s.	Facility maintenance (routine)	_____	_____	_____
t.	Facility renovation	_____	_____	_____
u.	New construction	_____	_____	_____
v.	Goal setting for:	_____	_____	_____
	1. Sports	_____	_____	_____
	2. Coaches	_____	_____	_____
	3. Department	_____	_____	_____
w.	Athletic scholarship allocation	_____	_____	_____
x.	Non-athletic financial aid allocation	_____	_____	_____
y.	Admission of student-athletes	_____	_____	_____

z. Eligibility determination of student-athletes	_____	_____	_____
aa. Event management	_____	_____	_____
bb. Availability of support services such as tutoring, promotion, equipment room services, medical coverage, and sports information to women's sports	_____	_____	_____
cc. Recruitment of student-athletes	_____	_____	_____
dd. The size of the intercollegiate sports program	_____	_____	_____
ee. Promotion of sports	_____	_____	_____
ff. Fund raising	_____	_____	_____
gg. Development of institutional athletic policy	_____	_____	_____
hh. Academic advisement of student-athletes	_____	_____	_____

5. How is the primary woman administrator involved in the institutional decision-making process with regard to the administration of women's athletics in each of the following areas?

Decision maker --	Responsibility for the final decision rests with her, subject only to approval by institutional CEO, his/her designate, or governing board.
Consultative capacity --	She must be asked for her input on the subject but the final decision is made by someone else.
Advisory capacity --	She may be asked for her input on the subject.

	Decision Maker	Consultative Capacity	Advisory Capacity
a. Budget development	_____	_____	_____
b. Authorizing spending	_____	_____	_____
c. Mid-year budget adjustments	_____	_____	_____
d. Hiring of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____

e.	Hiring of support professionals (trainers, SIDs, equipment staff)	_____	_____	_____
f.	Hiring of clerical and non-professional staff members (grounds, maintenance, custodial)	_____	_____	_____
g.	Firing of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
h.	Firing of support professionals	_____	_____	_____
i.	Firing of clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
j.	Evaluation of coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
k.	Evaluation of support professionals	_____	_____	_____
l.	Evaluation of clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
m.	Salary negotiations for coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
n.	Salary adjustments for coaching personnel	_____	_____	_____
o.	Salary adjustments for support professionals	_____	_____	_____
p.	Salary adjustments for clerical and non-professional staff members	_____	_____	_____
q.	Event scheduling	_____	_____	_____
r.	Facility use	_____	_____	_____
s.	Facility maintenance (routine)	_____	_____	_____
t.	Facility renovation	_____	_____	_____
u.	New construction	_____	_____	_____
v.	Goal setting for:	_____	_____	_____
	1. Sports	_____	_____	_____
	2. Coaches	_____	_____	_____
	3. Department	_____	_____	_____
w.	Athletic scholarship allocation	_____	_____	_____
x.	Non-athletic financial aid allocation	_____	_____	_____
y.	Admission of student-athletes	_____	_____	_____

- |     |                                                                                                                                                   |       |       |       |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| z.  | Eligibility determination of student-athletes                                                                                                     | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| aa. | Event management                                                                                                                                  | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| bb. | Availability of support services such as tutoring, promotion, equipment room services, medical coverage, and sports information to women's sports | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| cc. | Recruitment of student-athletes                                                                                                                   | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| dd. | The size of the intercollegiate sports program                                                                                                    | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ee. | Promotion of sports                                                                                                                               | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| ff. | Fund raising                                                                                                                                      | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| gg. | Development of institutional athletic policy                                                                                                      | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| hh. | Academic advisement of student-athletes                                                                                                           | _____ | _____ | _____ |
6. Does your institution have any women's sports which have been identified to strive for national prominence?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
7. If your answer to question 6 is yes, were you involved in the institutional identification process?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
8. If your answer to question 6 is yes, was the primary woman administrator involved in the institutional identification process?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
9. Do you think that you have sufficient impact on the institutional decision-making processes regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
10. Do you think that the primary woman administrator has sufficient impact on the institutional decision-making processes regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
11. If your answer to question 9 or 10 is no, how would you change the impact?

12. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the institutional decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
       \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No
13. If your answer to question 12 is no, how would you change the structure?

COMMENTS:

## SECTION II -- CONFERENCE DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The questions in this section deal with the nature and degree of your involvement and the involvement of the primary woman administrator in the decisions made by your conference regarding the governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. If your institution holds membership in different conferences for men's and women's programs, why does the institution not hold membership in the same conference for men and women?
- \_\_\_\_\_ No interest in governing women's athletics or offering women's championships shown by men's conference
- \_\_\_\_\_ No interest in holding membership in the same conference for women shown by institutional representatives
- \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation with men's conference cost prohibitive
- \_\_\_\_\_ Affiliation with men's conference inconsistent with institutional goals for women's athletic program
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

2. If your institution holds membership in the same integrated conference for men's and women's athletics, are the conference rules and regulations governing men's and women's programs the same?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
3. If your answer to question 2 is no, please describe the major areas of difference and the rationale for those differences.
4. In the conference in which your institution holds membership for its women's programs, are the institutional Directors of Athletics recognized as a formal part of the conference governance structure which regulates women's athletes?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
5. If your answer to question 4 is yes, does the Directors of Athletics group have a role in the decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
6. If your answer to question 5 is yes, what kind of role does the Directors of Athletics group have in the governance process?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Ultimate decision-makers  
\_\_\_\_\_ Consultative role  
\_\_\_\_\_ Advisory role
7. In the conference in which your institution holds membership for its women's programs, are the institutional primary women administrators recognized as a formal part of the conference governance structure?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
8. If your answer to question 7 is yes, does the primary women administrators group have a role in the decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
9. If your answer to question 8 is yes, what kind of role does the primary women administrators group have in the governance process?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Ultimate decision-makers  
\_\_\_\_\_ Consultative role  
\_\_\_\_\_ Advisory role

10. To what group or individual is the input of the primary women administrators group referred?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Conference commissioner
- \_\_\_\_\_ Conference officers
- \_\_\_\_\_ Faculty athletic representatives group
- \_\_\_\_\_ Directors of athletics group
- \_\_\_\_\_ Chief executive officers group
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you ever made contact with a conference administrator or officer to affect change in matters pertinent to the governance of women's athletics?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
12. Do you think that the Directors of Athletics group has sufficient impact on the decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
13. Do you think that the primary women administrators group has sufficient impact on the decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
14. If your answer to question 12 or 13 is no, how would you change the impact?
- \_\_\_\_\_
15. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the conference decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
16. If your answer to question 15 is no, how would you change the process?
- \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

## SECTION III -- NATIONAL DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES

The questions in this section deal with the nature and degree of your involvement and the involvement of the primary woman administrator in the decisions made by your institution regarding the NCAA governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. Does your institution have a designated NCAA Primary Woman Administrator?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Yes                      \_\_\_\_\_ No
  
2. If your answer to question 1 is yes, what is the sex of the individual?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Male                      \_\_\_\_\_ Female
  
3. Did you attend any of the following NCAA Conventions and, if you did, what type of credentials were you issued?  

	1		2	
	Attended		Credentials	
	Convention			
a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No	delegate	alternate visitor
  
4. If you attended any of the following NCAA Conventions and were issued delegate or alternate credentials, did you exercise your voting privileges?  

a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No
  
5. If you attended any of the following NCAA Conventions and were issued delegate or alternate credentials, did you exercise your speaking privileges on the Convention floor?  

a. 1985 (Nashville)	Yes	No
b. 1984 (Dallas)	Yes	No
c. 1983 (San Diego)	Yes	No
d. 1982 (Houston)	Yes	No
e. 1981 (Miami Beach)	Yes	No



6. How often do the following individuals or groups at your institution participate in the decision-making process on NCAA proposals affecting women's rules and regulations?

	Always	Frequently	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
a. Student-athletes	—	—	—	—	—
b. Coaches	—	—	—	—	—
c. Other athletic administrators (Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D.)	—	—	—	—	—
d. Director of Athletics	—	—	—	—	—
e. College/university faculty	—	—	—	—	—
f. College/university CEO	—	—	—	—	—
g. Governing board (regents, trustees)	—	—	—	—	—
h. Athletic faculty representative	—	—	—	—	—
i. College/university Athletic Board or Council	—	—	—	—	—
j. College/university administrators	—	—	—	—	—
k. Conference officers or administrators	—	—	—	—	—

7. What type of input, if any, do the following individuals or groups at your institution have in the decision-making process on NCAA proposals affecting women's rules and regulations?

Decision maker --	Responsibility for the final decision rests with group or individual, subject only to approval by institutional CEO, his/her designate, or governing board.
Consultative input --	Group or individual must be asked for input on the subject but the final decision is made by someone else.
Advisory input --	Group or individual may be asked for input on the subject.

	Not Involved	Advisory Input	Consultative Input	Decision Maker
a. Student-athletes	___	___	___	___
b. Coaches	___	___	___	___
c. Other athletic administrators (Assoc. A.D., Asst. A.D.)	___	___	___	___
d. Director of Athletics	___	___	___	___
e. College/university faculty	___	___	___	___
f. College/university CEO	___	___	___	___
g. Governing board (regents, trustees)	___	___	___	___
h. Athletic faculty representative	___	___	___	___
i. College/university Athletic Board or Council	___	___	___	___
j. College/university administrators	___	___	___	___
k. Conference officers or administrators	___	___	___	___

8. How is the institutional vote on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations determined at your institution?

9. In the process of determining the institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations, do you have input?  
 \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

10. If your answer to question 9 is yes, how do you have input?

11. In the process of determining the institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations, does the primary woman administrator have input?  
 \_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_ No

12. If your answer to question 11 is yes, how does that individual have input?
13. If there are NCAA proposals which your institution feels have direct impact on women's rules and regulations, how is your institutional position on those proposals determined?
14. a. Do you make the final decision on your institutional position on NCAA proposals which affect women's rules and regulations?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes  
\_\_\_\_\_ No. b. If no, who does? (Position title only)  
\_\_\_\_\_
15. Have you ever contacted your conference NCAA Council representative or any NCAA Council member to affect change on proposals which affect women's rules and regulations?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
16. Do you think the Director of Athletics has sufficient impact on the NCAA decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
17. Do you think the Primary Woman Administrator has sufficient impact on the NCAA decision-making process regarding the governance of women's athletics?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
18. If your answer to question 16 or 17 is no, how would you change the impact?
19. Are you satisfied with the current structure of the NCAA decision-making process relative to the governance of women's athletics?  
\_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No
20. If your answer to question 19 is no, how would you change the process?

## COMMENTS:

## SECTION IV -- DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

The questions in this section relate to you, your administrative position, and your institution. Please select the one best answer to each question or provide the brief response requested.

1. What is your present title?  
☐ Director of Athletics  
☐ Director of Men's Athletics  
☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
2. To whom do you report?  
 Position title only \_\_\_\_\_
3. In what academic year did you begin working in your present position? \_\_\_\_\_
4. In addition to your administrative duties in athletics, do you:  
 a. Teach ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 b. Coach ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 c. Perform any other duties ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 (If yes, please specify what other duties you perform.) \_\_\_\_\_
5. What is your present age?  
☐ Under 30  
☐ 31-40  
☐ 41-50  
☐ 51-60  
☐ 61+
6. Of which sub-division of NCAA Division I is your institution a member?  
☐ Division I-A  
☐ Division I-AA  
☐ Division I-AAA

7. How would you describe the organizational structure of intercollegiate athletics at your institution?
- \_\_\_\_\_ Integrated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics
- \_\_\_\_\_ Segregated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
8. Please use this space to make any comments you feel you would like to make.

Thank you for your assistance with this study.

APPENDIX D

THE INITIAL COVER LETTER AND  
THE RESULTS REQUEST FORM

## APPENDIX D

### THE INITIAL COVER LETTER AND THE RESULTS REQUEST FORM

July 29, 1985

Division of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Director of Athletics (Actual Name Inserted)  
Athletic Department  
College or University Name  
City, State, Zip Code

Dear Director of Athletics (Actual Name Inserted):

I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation at Michigan State University. My research topic is an examination of the role of the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. My doctoral committee chairman is Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker. Committee members include Drs. Richard Featherstone, Lawrence Foster, and Gwendolyn Norrell.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which asks you to describe the role of your institutional primary woman athletic administrator in the decision-making process related to the institutional, conference, and national governance of women's athletics. I would appreciate your completion of the questionnaire and participation in the study. Each questionnaire is coded for return identification purposes only. Upon its return, the code will be removed to insure the confidentiality of the responses. Your completion of the questionnaire indicates that you consent to become a participant in the study and gives me permission to use the data collected anonymously in my study.

Detailed instructions and definitions of the terms used are contained in the body of the questionnaire. In addition, your comments are welcome anywhere on the instrument itself. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope no later than August 16, 1985.

Director of Athletics

Page 2

July 29, 1985

Please feel free to contact me at 616-383-1930 for further information. Thank you for your assistance in making this a successful study.

Sincerely,

Christine W. Hoyles

Associate Director of Athletics



July 29, 1985

Division of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008

Primary Woman Administrator (Actual Name Inserted)  
Athletic Department  
College or University Name  
City, State, Zip Code

Dear Primary Woman Administrator (Actual Name Inserted):

I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation at Michigan State University. My research topic is an examination of the role of the woman athletic administrator in the decision-making processes regarding the administration and governance of women's intercollegiate athletics. My doctoral committee chairman is Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker. Committee members include Drs. Richard Featherstone, Lawrence Foster, and Gwendolyn Norrell.

Enclosed is a questionnaire which asks you to describe your role in the decision-making process related to the institutional, conference, and national governance of women's athletics. I would appreciate your completion of the questionnaire and participation in the study. Each questionnaire is coded for return identification purposes only. Upon its return, the code will be removed to insure the confidentiality of the responses. Your completion of the questionnaire indicates that you consent to become a participant in the study and gives me permission to use the data collected anonymously in my study.

Detailed instructions and definitions of the terms used are contained in the body of the questionnaire. In addition, your comments are welcome anywhere on the instrument itself. Please return the completed questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope no later than August 16, 1985.

Please feel free to contact me at 616-383-1930 for further information. Thank you for your assistance in making this a successful study.

Sincerely,

Christine W. Hoyles  
Associate Director of Athletics

I am interested in receiving a summary of the results of The Role of the Woman Athletic Administrator in the Decision-Making Processes Regarding the Administration and Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX E  
SECOND COVER LETTER

APPENDIX E  
SECOND COVER LETTER

Division of Intercollegiate Athletics  
Western Michigan University  
Kalamazoo, MI 49008  
August 19, 1985

Dear Colleague:

Approximately two weeks ago you received a questionnaire titled The Role of the Woman Athletic Administrator in the Decision-Making Processes Regarding the Administration and Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics. Thank you for your prompt response if you have already returned the questionnaire.

If you have not returned the questionnaire, I would certainly appreciate you taking just a few minutes to do so. Enclosed is another copy for your convenience. Your participation in the study would be greatly appreciated. Every member of the sample can provide data that will strengthen the study.

Please return your completed questionnaire to me by August 30, 1985. Thank you for your assistance in making this a successful study.

Sincerely,

Christine W. Hoyles  
Associate Director of Athletics

mbs

enclosure

**APPENDIX F**  
**QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATES**

APPENDIX F  
QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE RATES

TABLE 18  
NUMBER OF QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED EACH DAY

Date		Number
August	1	11
	2	31
	5	52
	6	07
	7	13
	8	17
	9	15
	12	26
	13	04
	14	07
	15	05
	16	08
	19	12
	20	04
	21	00
	22	03
	23	04
	26	36
	27	00
	28	02
	29	13
	30	03
September	3	06
	4	12
Total		291

APPENDIX G

FREQUENCY COUNTS AND PERCENTAGES FOR RESPONSES  
TO PRIMARY WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

# APPENDIX G

## FREQUENCY COUNTS AND PERCENTAGES FOR RESPONSES TO PRIMARY WOMAN ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 19  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.1.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	120	87.6
No	17	12.4
Total	137	100.0

TABLE 20  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.1.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Director of Athletics	104	88.2
Director of Men's Athletics	1	.8
Executive Director of Athletics	1	.8
Deputy Director	1	.8
Dean, College of Physical Education	1	.8
Vice President	3	2.6
More than one person	6	5.2
Other	1	.8
Total	118	100.0



TABLE 21

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	106	81.5
Meet with occasionally	20	15.4
Don't meet with	4	3.1
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 22

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	95	73.6
Meet with occasionally	22	17.1
Don't meet with	12	9.3
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 23

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	30	22.2
Meet with occasionally	85	63.0
Don't meet with	20	14.8
Total	135	100.0

TABLE 24  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	31	22.8
Meet with occasionally	76	55.9
Don't meet with	29	21.3
Total	136	100.0

TABLE 25  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	14	10.4
Meet with occasionally	71	53.0
Don't meet with	49	36.6
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 26  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	80	59.7
No	54	40.3
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 27  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Regular appointment	19	24.4
Ex-officio appointment	59	75.6
Total	78	100.0

TABLE 28  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	20	26.0
No	57	74.0
Total	77	100.0

TABLE 29  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	13	27.7
No	34	72.3
Total	47	100.0

TABLE 30  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	22.0
No	32	78.0
Total	41	100.0

TABLE 31  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.8.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	64	52.5
No	58	47.5
Total	122	100.0

TABLE 32  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.8.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	61	56.5
No	47	43.5
Total	108	100.0

TABLE 33

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.8.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 Elected positions	75	84.3
1 Elected positions	13	14.6
2 Elected positions	1	1.1
Total	89	100.0

TABLE 34

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.8.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 Appointed positions	4	4.4
1 Appointed positions	41	45.6
2 Appointed positions	28	31.1
3 Appointed positions	15	16.7
4 Appointed positions	2	2.2
Total	90	100.0

TABLE 35

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.9.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	59.6
No	55	40.4
Total	136	100.0

TABLE 36

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.9.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 Elected positions	64	84.2
1 Elected positions	11	14.5
2 Elected positions	1	1.3
Total	76	100.0

TABLE 37

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.9.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 Appointed positions	4	3.0
1 Appointed positions	52	39.4
2 Appointed positions	14	10.6
3 Appointed positions	8	6.1
Not applicable	54	40.9
Total	132	100.0

TABLE 38

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	32	23.5
Consultative capacity	60	44.1
Decision maker	44	32.4
Total	136	100.0

TABLE 39  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	24	18.3
Consultative capacity	35	26.7
Decision maker	72	55.0
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 40  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	39	30.0
Consultative capacity	46	35.4
Decision maker	45	34.6
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 41  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	7.3
Consultative capacity	47	34.3
Decision maker	80	58.4
Total	137	100.0

TABLE 42

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	28	20.9
Consultative capacity	67	50.0
Decision maker	39	29.1
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 43

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	45	34.4
Consultative capacity	35	26.7
Decision maker	51	38.9
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 44

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	22	16.3
Consultative capacity	51	37.8
Decision maker	62	45.9
Total	135	100.0



TABLE 45  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	40	29.9
Consultative capacity	52	38.8
Decision maker	42	31.3
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 46  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	48	36.6
Consultative capacity	33	25.2
Decision maker	50	38.2
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 47  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	12.4
Consultative capacity	34	24.8
Decision maker	86	62.8
Total	137	100.0

TABLE 48

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	27	19.9
Consultative capacity	53	39.0
Decision maker	56	41.2
Total	136	100.0

TABLE 49

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.l.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	36	27.5
Consultative capacity	31	23.7
Decision maker	64	48.8
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 50

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.m.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	37	28.2
Consultative capacity	58	44.3
Decision maker	36	27.5
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 51  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.n.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	39	29.6
Consultative capacity	58	43.9
Decision maker	35	26.5
Total	132	100.0

TABLE 52  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.o.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	53	41.4
Consultative capacity	49	38.3
Decision maker	26	20.3
Total	128	100.0

TABLE 53  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.p.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	54	43.9
Consultative capacity	42	34.1
Decision maker	27	22.0
Total	123	100.0

TABLE 54  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.q.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	12.6
Consultative capacity	39	28.9
Decision maker	79	58.5
Total	135	100.0

TABLE 55  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.r.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	25	19.1
Consultative capacity	56	42.7
Decision maker	50	38.2
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 56  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.s.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	58	45.3
Consultative capacity	41	32.0
Decision maker	29	22.7
Total	128	100.0

TABLE 57

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.t.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	54	41.5
Consultative capacity	55	42.3
Decision maker	21	16.2
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 58

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.u.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	59	45.0
Consultative capacity	55	42.0
Decision maker	17	13.0
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 59

RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.v<sub>1</sub>.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	21	15.8
Consultative capacity	45	33.8
Decision maker	67	50.4
Total	133	100.0

TABLE 60  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.v<sub>2</sub>

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	22	16.5
Consultative capacity	44	33.1
Decision maker	67	50.4
Total	133	100.0

TABLE 61  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.v<sub>3</sub>

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	28	21.2
Consultative capacity	53	40.2
Decision maker	51	38.6
Total	132	100.0

TABLE 62  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.w.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	20	15.5
Consultative capacity	50	38.8
Decision maker	59	45.7
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 63  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.x.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	66	58.9
Consultative capacity	27	24.1
Decision maker	19	17.0
Total	112	100.0

TABLE 64  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.y.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	65	56.5
Consultative capacity	35	30.5
Decision maker	15	13.0
Total	115	100.0

TABLE 65  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.z.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	38	30.2
Consultative capacity	41	32.5
Decision maker	47	37.3
Total	126	100.0

TABLE 66  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.aa.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	30	23.1
Consultative capacity	43	33.1
Decision maker	57	43.8
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 67  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.bb.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	27	20.1
Consultative capacity	58	43.3
Decision maker	49	36.6
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 68  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.cc.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	41	30.4
Consultative capacity	39	28.9
Decision maker	55	40.7
Total	135	100.0



TABLE 69

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.dd.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	37	27.6
Consultative capacity	66	49.3
Decision maker	31	23.1
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 70

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.ee.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	45	33.8
Consultative capacity	50	37.6
Decision maker	38	28.6
Total	133	100.0

TABLE 71

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.ff.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	49	38.0
Consultative capacity	49	38.0
Decision maker	31	24.0
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 72  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.gg.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	32	23.9
Consultative capacity	76	56.7
Decision maker	26	19.4
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 73  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.hh.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	51	38.9
Consultative capacity	42	32.1
Decision maker	38	29.0
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 74  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.11.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	92	66.7
No	46	33.3
Total	138	100.0

TABLE 75  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	73	83.9
No	14	16.1
Total	87	100.0

TABLE 76  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.13.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	35	25.4
No	103	74.6
Total	138	100.0

TABLE 77  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.13.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Men's sports	2	6.0
Women's sports	22	66.7
Both	9	27.3
Total	33	100.0

TABLE 78  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.14.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	73.7
No	36	26.3
Total	137	100.0

TABLE 79  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.16.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	92	67.2
No	45	32.8
Total	137	100.0

TABLE 80  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	129	93.5
No	9	6.5
Total	138	100.0

TABLE 81  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.2

Response	Frequency	Percent
Atlantic Coast Conference	7	5.6
Big East Conference	6	4.8
Big Eight Conference	4	3.2
Big Ten Conference	7	5.6
Colonial Athletic Association	1	.8
Continental Divide Conference	1	.8
Eastern College Athletic Conference	6	4.8
Gateway Collegiate Athletic Conference	6	4.8
Gulf Star Conference	1	.8
High Country Athletic Conference	6	4.8
Ivy League Athletic Conference	4	3.2
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	5	4.0
Mid-American Conference	10	7.9
Metro Conference	4	3.2
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	3	2.4
Mountain West Athletic Conference	5	4.0
Northern Pacific Athletic Conference	4	3.2
North Star Conference	6	4.8
Ohio Valley Conference	4	3.2
PAC-West Conference	4	3.2
Pacific Coast Athletic Association	5	4.0
Seaboard Conference	3	2.4
Southeastern Conference	3	2.4
Southern Conference	2	1.6
Southland Conference	2	1.6
Sun Belt Conference	3	2.4
Southwest Athletic Conference	4	3.2
West Coast Athletic Association	4	3.2
Atlantic 10 Conference	3	2.4
New South Conference	3	2.4
Total	126	100.0

TABLE 82  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.3.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Segregated	39	30.2
Integrated	90	69.8
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 83  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.4.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	120	90.2
No	13	9.8
Total	133	100.0

TABLE 84  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.5.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Atlantic Coast Conference	7	6.0
Big East Conference	6	5.1
Big Eight Conference	4	3.4
Big Sky Athletic Conference	4	3.4
Big Ten Conference	6	5.1
Colonial Athletic Association	1	.9
Eastern College Athletic Conference	7	6.0
Gulf Star Conference	1	.9
Ivy League Athletic Conference	3	2.6
Metro Atlantic Athletic Conference	4	3.4
Mid-American Conference	10	8.5
Metro Conference	4	3.4
Mid-Continent Conference	4	3.4
Mid-Eastern Athletic Conference	3	2.6

TABLE 84-Continued

Response	Frequency	Percent
Missouri Valley Conference	4	3.4
North Atlantic Conference	1	.9
Ohio Valley Conference	2	1.7
Pacific-10 Conference	8	6.8
Pacific Coast Athletic Association	4	3.4
Southeastern Conference	2	1.7
Southern Conference	2	1.7
Southland Conference	2	1.7
Sun Belt Conference	3	2.6
Southwest Athletic Conference	4	3.4
Western Athletic Conference	6	5.1
West Coast Athletic Association	5	4.3
Atlantic 10 Conference	3	2.6
Midwestern Collegiate Conference	2	1.7
Trans America Athletic Conference	5	4.3
Total	117	100.0

TABLE 85

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Segregated	34	28.6
Integrated	85	71.4
Total	119	100.0

TABLE 86  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
No interest in governing women's athletics or offering women's championships shown by men's conference	11	31.4
No interest in holding membership in the same conference for women shown by institutional representatives	0	0
Affiliation with men's conference cost prohibitive	3	8.6
Affiliation with men's conference inconsistent with institutional goals for women's athletic program	4	11.4
Other	17	48.6
Total	35	100.0

TABLE 87  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION 11.8.

Response	Frequency	Percent
1954	1	.8
1964	1	.8
1970	1	.8
1972	1	.8
1974	1	.8
1975	1	.8
1976	2	1.6
1977	4	3.2
1979	3	2.4
1980	15	12.0



TABLE 87-Continued

Response	Frequency	Percent
1981	19	15.2
1982	35	28.0
1983	17	13.6
1984	13	10.4
1985	11	8.8
Total	125	100.0

TABLE 88

RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.9.

Response	Frequency	Percent
1954	1	1.1
1970	1	1.1
1972	1	1.1
1975	1	1.1
1976	2	2.3
1977	2	2.3
1978	2	2.3
1979	2	2.3
1980	12	13.6
1981	17	19.3
1982	25	28.4
1983	13	14.8
1984	3	3.4
1985	6	6.8
Total	88	100.0

TABLE 89  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.10.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	75	87.2
No	11	12.8
Total	86	100.0

TABLE 90  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	78.9
No	27	21.1
Total	128	100.0

TABLE 91  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.13.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	99.0
No	1	1.0
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 92  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.14.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Ultimate decision-makers	29	29.0
Consultative role	58	58.0
Advisory role	13	13.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 93  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.15.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Conference Commissioner	13	11.5
Conference Officers	6	5.3
Faculty athletic representatives group	7	6.2
Directors of athletics group	38	33.6
Chief executive officers group	14	12.4
Other	35	31.0
Total	113	100.0

TABLE 94  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.16.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	104	81.9
No	23	18.1
Total	127	100.0

TABLE 95  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.17.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	79	78.2
No	22	21.8
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 96  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.18.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	99	78.6
No	27	21.4
Total	126	100.0

TABLE 97  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.19.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	100	80.6
No	24	19.4
Total	124	100.0

TABLE 98  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.19.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Regularly	48	61.5
Occasionally	30	38.5
Total	78	100.0

TABLE 99  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.20.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	4	17.4
No	19	82.6
Total	23	100.0

TABLE 100  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.20.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Assistant Commissioner	1	33.3
Coordinator of Women's Sports	2	66.7
Total	3	100.0

TABLE 101  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.21.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	72	55.8
No	57	44.2
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 102  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.21.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Commissioner	11	19.6
Assistant Commissioner	14	25.0
Assistant to the Commissioner	5	8.9
Executive Director	7	12.5
Director of Championships	6	10.7
Coordinator of Women's Sports	3	5.4
Women's Coordinator	1	1.8
Other	9	16.1
Total	56	100.0

TABLE 103  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.22.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	62.8
No	45	37.2
Total	121	100.0

TABLE 104  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.23.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	88	77.2
No	26	22.8
Total	114	100.0

TABLE 105  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.23.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	84.9
No	18	15.1
Total	119	100.0

TABLE 106  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.24.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	112	87.5
No	16	12.5
Total	128	100.0

TABLE 107  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.25.A.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
1 sport	1	.9
2 sports	2	1.8
4 sports	3	2.7
5 sports	3	2.7
6 sports	15	13.3
7 sports	13	11.5
8 sports	19	16.8
9 sports	20	17.7
10 sports	11	9.7
11 sports	13	11.5
12 sports	7	6.2
14 sports	1	.9
15 sports	3	2.7
16 sports	2	1.8
Total	113	100.0

TABLE 108  
 RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.25.A.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 sports	8	47.1
5 sports	1	5.9
6 sports	2	11.8
8 sports	1	5.9
9 sports	5	29.4
Total	17	100.0



TABLE 109  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.25.B.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 sports	8	20.0
1 sport	3	7.5
3 sports	1	2.5
4 sports	1	2.5
5 sports	7	17.5
6 sports	2	5.0
7 sports	2	5.0
8 sports	5	12.5
9 sports	5	12.5
11 sports	1	2.5
14 sports	2	5.0
15 sports	2	5.0
23 sports	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

TABLE 110  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.25.B.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0 sports	1	1.1
2 sports	3	3.4
4 sports	8	9.2
5 sports	7	8.0
6 sports	20	23.0
7 sports	7	8.0
8 sports	12	13.8
9 sports	17	19.5
10 sports	8	9.2
11 sports	2	2.3
12 sports	1	1.1
14 sports	1	1.1
Total	87	100.0

TABLE 111  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.26.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	63.8
No	46	36.2
Total	127	100.0

TABLE 112  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.28.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	62.8
No	48	37.2
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 113  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	127	94.8
No	7	5.2
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 114  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.a.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	98	78.4
No	27	21.6
Total	125	100.0

TABLE 115  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.a.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	61	63.5
Alternate	23	24.0
Visitor	12	12.5
Total	96	100.0

TABLE 116  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.b.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	97	78.2
No	27	21.8
Total	124	100.0

TABLE 117  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.b.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	60	63.2
Alternate	23	24.2
Visitor	12	12.6
Total	95	100.0

TABLE 118  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.c.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	80	69.6
No	35	30.4
Total	115	100.0

TABLE 119  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.c.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	51	64.6
Alternate	24	30.4
Visitor	4	5.0
Total	79	100.0

TABLE 120  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.d.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	60	55.6
No	48	44.4
Total	108	100.0

TABLE 121  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.d.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	38	64.4
Alternate	19	32.2
Visitor	2	3.4
Total	59	100.0

TABLE 122  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.e.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	41	41.8
No	57	58.2
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 123  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.e.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	23	57.5
Alternate	14	35.0
Visitor	3	7.5
Total	40	100.0

TABLE 124  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	81.2
No	16	18.8
Total	85	100.0

TABLE 125  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	65	76.5
No	20	23.5
Total	85	100.0

TABLE 126  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	50	68.5
No	23	31.5
Total	73	100.0

TABLE 127  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	39	69.6
No	17	30.4
Total	56	100.0

TABLE 128  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	26	70.3
No	11	29.7
Total	37	100.0

TABLE 129  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	20.7
No	69	79.3
Total	87	100.0

TABLE 130  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	24	27.3
No	64	72.7
Total	88	100.0

TABLE 131  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	22.4
No	59	77.6
Total	76	100.0



TABLE 132  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	16.4
No	46	83.6
Total	55	100.0

TABLE 133  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	38.5
No	24	61.5
Total	39	100.0

TABLE 134  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	4	3.1
Frequently	9	6.9
Sometimes	15	11.5
Seldom	55	42.3
Never	47	36.2
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 135  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	26	19.8
Frequently	38	29.0
Sometimes	43	32.8
Seldom	19	14.5
Never	5	3.8
Total	131	100.0

TABLE 136  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	48	37.2
Frequently	38	29.5
Sometimes	29	22.5
Seldom	7	5.4
Never	7	5.4
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 137  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	103	79.2
Frequently	16	12.3
Sometimes	8	6.2
Seldom	1	.8
Never	2	1.5
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 138  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	10	8.2
Frequently	13	10.7
Sometimes	23	18.9
Seldom	29	23.8
Never	47	38.5
Total	122	100.0

TABLE 139  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	65	50.4
Frequently	21	16.3
Sometimes	26	20.2
Seldom	12	9.3
Never	5	3.9
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 140  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	4	3.2
Frequently	15	12.1
Sometimes	25	20.2
Seldom	41	33.1
Never	39	31.5
Total	124	100.0

TABLE 141  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	66	51.6
Frequently	33	25.8
Sometimes	12	9.4
Seldom	10	7.8
Never	7	5.5
Total	128	100.0

TABLE 142  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	18	14.5
Frequently	31	25.0
Sometimes	33	26.6
Seldom	20	16.1
Never	22	17.7
Total	124	100.0

TABLE 143  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	14	11.0
Frequently	14	11.0
Sometimes	35	27.6
Seldom	30	23.6
Never	34	26.8
Total	127	100.0

TABLE 144  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	48	38.4
Frequently	36	28.8
Sometimes	19	15.2
Seldom	9	7.2
Never	13	10.4
Total	125	100.0

TABLE 145  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.a-k.

Due to a typographical error on the survey instrument, no data were recorded for these questions.

TABLE 146  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.8.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	122	93.8
No	8	6.2
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 147  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.11.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	112	89.6
No	13	10.4
Total	125	100.0

TABLE 148  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.11.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Independently	11	12.2
Through CEO	48	53.3
Through NCAA faculty representative	31	34.4
Total	90	100.0

TABLE 149  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	121	93.8
No	8	6.2
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 150  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.13.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	103	81.1
No	24	18.9
Total	127	100.0

TABLE 151  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.14.

Response	Frequency	Percent
College/university philosophy	14	58.3
Departmental philosophy	3	12.5
Personal philosophy	0	0.0
Other	7	29.2
Total	24	100.0

TABLE 152  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.15.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	29	22.3
No	101	77.7
Total	130	100.0

TABLE 153  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.15.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
CEO	37	38.1
Vice President	2	2.1
Director of Athletics	33	34.0
Faculty Representative	7	7.2
More than one person	12	12.4
Jointly by PWA and others	6	6.2
Total	97	100.0

TABLE 154  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.16.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	66	50.0
No	66	50.0
Total	132	100.0

TABLE 155  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.17.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	78	59.1
No	54	40.9
Total	132	100.0



TABLE 156  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.18.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
No	107	84.9
Serve as chair	4	3.2
Serve on committee	15	11.9
Total	126	100.0

TABLE 157  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.18.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
No	101	84.9
Serve as chair	1	.8
Serve on committee	17	14.3
Total	119	100.0

TABLE 158  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.19.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	54	43.9
No	69	56.1
Total	123	100.0

TABLE 159  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.21.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	56.6
No	53	43.4
Total	122	100.0

TABLE 160  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Director of Athletics	4	3.0
Director of Women's Athletics	27	20.0
Associate Director of Athletics	49	36.3
Assistant Director of Athletics	33	24.4
Coordinator of Women's Athletics	14	10.4
Other	8	5.9
Total	135	100.0

TABLE 161  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Vice President	12	9.0
Assistant to the President	1	.7
Dean, College of Physical Education	2	1.5
Assistant Director of Athletics	1	.7
Associate Director of Athletics	3	2.2
Director of Athletics	108	80.6
Executive Athletic Director	1	.7
Other	6	4.5
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 162  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.3.

Response	Frequency	Percent
1954	1	.8
1963	1	.8
1965	1	.8
1968	2	1.5
1969	1	.8
1970	3	2.3
1972	4	3.0
1973	4	3.0
1974	10	7.6
1975	11	8.3
1976	11	8.3
1977	8	6.1
1978	11	8.3
1979	10	7.6
1980	11	8.3
1981	9	6.8
1982	13	9.8
1983	8	6.1
1984	9	6.8
1985	4	3.0
Total	132	100.0

TABLE 163  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	32	26.4
No	89	73.6
Total	121	100.0

TABLE 164  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	28	22.8
No	95	77.2
Total	123	100.0

TABLE 165  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	27	23.9
No	86	76.1
Total	113	100.0

TABLE 166  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.5.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Under 30	11	8.1
31 - 40	53	39.6
41 - 50	45	33.6
51 - 60	25	18.7
61 +	0	0.0
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 167  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
I-A	65	48.5
I-AA	37	27.6
I-AAA	32	23.9
Total	134	100.0

TABLE 168  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Integrated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics	108	81.2
Segregated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics	19	14.3
Other	6	4.5
Total	133	100.0

TABLE 169  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.8.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Male	122	96.1
Female	5	3.9
Total	127	100.0

TABLE 170  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.9.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	3	2.3
4	1	.8
6	4	3.1
7	6	4.7
8	7	5.4
9	15	11.6
10	27	20.9
11	4	3.1
12	15	11.6
13	6	4.7
14	3	2.3
15	8	6.2
16	8	6.2
17	4	3.1
18	5	3.9
19	1	.8
20	4	3.1
21	1	.8
22	3	2.3
24	1	.8
25	1	.8
27	1	.8
32	1	.8
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 171  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.10.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	7	5.4
1	15	11.6
2	32	24.8
3	23	17.8
4	25	19.4
5	13	10.1
6	7	5.4
7	2	1.6
8	2	1.6

TABLE 171-Continued

Response	Frequency	Percent
10	2	1.6
17	1	.8
Total	129	100.0

TABLE 172

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.11.

Response	Frequency	Percent
0	25	20.0
1	37	29.6
2	26	20.8
3	14	11.2
4	11	8.8
5	4	3.2
6	5	4.0
7	1	.8
8	1	.8
18	1	.8
Total	125	100.0

TABLE 173

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
NCAA	135	100.0
AIAW	0	0.0
Institutional	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0
Total	135	100.0

APPENDIX H

FREQUENCY COUNTS AND PERCENTAGES FOR RESPONSES  
TO DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS QUESTIONNAIRE



APPENDIX H

FREQUENCY COUNTS AND PERCENTAGES FOR RESPONSES TO  
DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS QUESTIONNAIRE

TABLE 174

RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.1.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	92	87.6
No	13	12.4
Total	105	100.0

TABLE 175

RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.1.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Director of Athletics	81	78.6
Vice President	1	1.0
Associate Vice President	1	1.0
CEO	1	1.0
More than one person	6	5.8
Other	13	12.6
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 176

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	90	90.0
Meet with occasionally	8	8.0
Don't meet with	2	2.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 177

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	93	90.3
Meet with occasionally	8	7.8
Don't meet with	2	1.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 178

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	48	46.6
Meet with occasionally	55	53.4
Don't meet with	0	0.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 179

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	72	69.9
Meet with occasionally	29	28.2
Don't meet with	2	1.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 180

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.2.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	44	41.5
Meet with occasionally	56	52.8
Don't meet with	6	5.7
Total	106	100.0

TABLE 181

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	87	88.8
Meet with occasionally	9	9.2
Don't meet with	2	2.0
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 182

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	76	73.8
Meet with occasionally	23	22.3
Don't meet with	4	3.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 183

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	21	20.6
Meet with occasionally	65	63.7
Don't meet with	16	15.7
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 184

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	19	19.0
Meet with occasionally	56	56.0
Don't meet with	25	25.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 185

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.3.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Meet with regularly	6	5.8
Meet with occasionally	53	51.5
Don't meet with	44	42.7
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 186

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	8	7.7
Consultative capacity	20	19.2
Decision maker	76	73.1
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 187

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	9.7
Consultative capacity	20	19.4
Decision maker	73	70.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 188

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	7	7.1
Consultative capacity	25	25.3
Decision maker	67	67.7
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 189

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	8	7.8
Consultative capacity	24	23.3
Decision maker	71	68.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 190

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	9.5
Consultative capacity	26	24.8
Decision maker	69	65.7
Total	105	100.0

TABLE 191

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	21	20.4
Consultative capacity	24	23.3
Decision maker	58	56.3
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 192

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	9.6
Consultative capacity	18	17.3
Decision maker	76	73.1
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 193

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	9.6
Consultative capacity	23	22.1
Decision maker	71	68.3
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 194

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	19	18.4
Consultative capacity	31	30.1
Decision maker	53	51.5
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 195

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	13	12.6
Consultative capacity	23	22.3
Decision maker	67	65.1
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 196

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	15	14.6
Consultative capacity	27	26.2
Decision maker	61	59.2
Total	103	100.0



TABLE 197  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	16.8
Consultative capacity	34	33.4
Decision maker	50	49.5
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 198  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.m.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	9	8.7
Consultative capacity	24	23.3
Decision maker	70	68.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 199  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.n.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	11	10.7
Consultative capacity	25	24.3
Decision maker	67	65.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 200  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.o.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	13	12.7
Consultative capacity	32	31.4
Decision maker	57	55.9
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 201  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.p.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	22	22.2
Consultative capacity	32	32.3
Decision maker	45	45.5
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 202  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.q.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	20	19.4
Consultative capacity	34	33.0
Decision maker	49	47.6
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 203  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.r.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	16.3
Consultative capacity	33	31.7
Decision maker	54	51.9
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 204  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.s.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	29	27.9
Consultative capacity	36	34.6
Decision maker	39	37.5
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 205  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.t.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	9	8.7
Consultative capacity	41	39.8
Decision maker	53	51.5
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 206

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.u.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	13	12.5
Consultative capacity	38	36.5
Decision maker	53	51.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 207

RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.v.<sub>1</sub>

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	12	11.7
Consultative capacity	24	23.3
Decision maker	67	65.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 208

RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.v.<sub>2</sub>

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	12	11.9
Consultative capacity	28	27.7
Decision maker	61	60.4
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 209  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.v.3

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	10.1
Consultative capacity	22	22.2
Decision maker	67	67.7
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 210  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.w.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	14	14.3
Consultative capacity	29	29.6
Decision maker	55	56.1
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 211  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.x.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	38	40.4
Consultative capacity	31	33.0
Decision maker	25	26.6
Total	94	100.0

TABLE 212  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.y.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	45	49.5
Consultative capacity	32	35.1
Decision maker	14	15.4
Total	91	100.0

TABLE 213  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.z.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	33	33.0
Consultative capacity	30	30.0
Decision maker	37	37.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 214  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.aa.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	23	22.3
Consultative capacity	33	32.0
Decision maker	47	45.7
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 215

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.bb.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	20	19.6
Consultative capacity	28	27.5
Decision maker	54	52.9
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 216

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.cc.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	41	41.0
Consultative capacity	27	27.0
Decision maker	32	32.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 217

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.dd.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	9	8.7
Consultative capacity	36	34.6
Decision maker	59	56.7
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 218

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.ee.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	20	19.2
Consultative capacity	28	26.9
Decision maker	56	53.8
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 219

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.ff.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	19	18.6
Consultative capacity	32	31.4
Decision maker	51	50.0
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 220

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.gg.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	10	9.6
Consultative capacity	31	29.8
Decision maker	63	60.6
Total	104	100.0



TABLE 221

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.4.hh.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	38	37.3
Consultative capacity	34	33.3
Decision maker	30	29.4
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 222

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.4
Consultative capacity	72	69.2
Decision maker	16	15.4
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 223

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.4
Consultative capacity	56	53.8
Decision maker	32	30.8
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 224

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	18	17.6
Consultative capacity	66	64.7
Decision maker	18	17.6
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 225

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	11	10.6
Consultative capacity	66	63.5
Decision maker	27	26.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 226

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.4
Consultative capacity	67	64.4
Decision maker	21	20.2
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 227

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	31	30.7
Consultative capacity	49	48.5
Decision maker	21	20.8
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 228

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	11	10.6
Consultative capacity	68	65.4
Decision maker	25	24.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 229

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.4
Consultative capacity	67	64.4
Decision maker	21	20.2
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 230

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	24	23.1
Consultative capacity	60	57.7
Decision maker	20	19.2
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 231

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	13	12.5
Consultative capacity	56	53.8
Decision maker	35	33.7
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 232

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	20	19.2
Consultative capacity	52	50.0
Decision maker	32	30.8
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 233

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	27	26.2
Consultative capacity	46	44.7
Decision maker	30	29.1
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 234

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.m.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	22	21.4
Consultative capacity	65	63.1
Decision maker	16	15.5
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 235

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.n.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	26	25.2
Consultative capacity	62	60.2
Decision maker	15	14.6
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 236  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.o.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	28	27.5
Consultative capacity	60	58.8
Decision maker	14	13.7
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 237  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.p.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	32	31.7
Consultative capacity	55	54.5
Decision maker	14	13.9
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 238  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.q.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.5
Consultative capacity	53	51.5
Decision maker	34	33.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 239

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.r.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	25	24.3
Consultative capacity	58	56.3
Decision maker	20	19.4
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 240

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.s.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	47	45.6
Consultative capacity	45	43.7
Decision maker	11	10.7
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 241

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.t.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	35	34.0
Consultative capacity	60	58.3
Decision maker	8	7.7
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 242  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.u.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	39	37.9
Consultative capacity	57	55.3
Decision maker	7	6.8
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 243  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.v.1

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	16	15.4
Consultative capacity	58	55.8
Decision maker	30	28.8
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 244  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.v.2

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	16.3
Consultative capacity	56	53.8
Decision maker	31	29.8
Total	104	100.0



TABLE 245  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.v.3

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	13	12.6
Consultative capacity	65	63.1
Decision maker	25	24.3
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 246  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.w.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	19	19.2
Consultative capacity	54	54.5
Decision maker	26	26.3
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 247  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.x.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	42	44.2
Consultative capacity	40	42.1
Decision maker	13	13.7
Total	95	100.0

TABLE 248

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.y.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	43	47.3
Consultative capacity	38	41.8
Decision maker	10	11.0
Total	91	100.0

TABLE 249

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.z.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	33	33.7
Consultative capacity	50	51.0
Decision maker	15	15.3
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 250

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.aa.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	28	28.0
Consultative capacity	48	48.0
Decision maker	24	24.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 251  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.bb.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	22	21.8
Consultative capacity	59	58.4
Decision maker	20	19.8
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 252  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.cc.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	33	33.0
Consultative capacity	44	44.0
Decision maker	23	23.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 253  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.dd.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	23	22.8
Consultative capacity	64	63.4
Decision maker	14	13.9
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 254

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.ee.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	27	26.5
Consultative capacity	57	55.9
Decision maker	18	17.6
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 255

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.ff.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	32	32.0
Consultative capacity	57	57.0
Decision maker	11	11.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 256

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.gg.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	17	16.8
Consultative capacity	72	71.3
Decision maker	12	11.9
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 257

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.5.hh.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Advisory capacity	37	37.4
Consultative capacity	48	48.5
Decision maker	14	14.1
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 258

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	83	79.0
No	22	21.0
Total	105	100.0

TABLE 259

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	71	86.6
No	11	13.4
Total	82	100.0

TABLE 260  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.8.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	74	93.7
No	5	6.3
Total	79	100.0

TABLE 261  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.9.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	100	97.1
No	3	2.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 262  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.10.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	98	93.3
No	7	6.7
Total	105	100.0

TABLE 263  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION I.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	99	98.0
No	2	2.0
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 264  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
No interest in governing women's athletics or offering women's championships shown by men's conference	4	12.1
No interest in holding membership in the same conference for women shown by institutional representatives	1	3.0
Affiliation with men's conference cost prohibitive	8	24.3
Affiliation with men's conference inconsistent with institutional goals for the women's athletic program	3	9.1
Other	17	51.5
Total	33	100.0

TABLE 265  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	65	97.0
No	2	3.0
Total	67	100.0

TABLE 266  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.4.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	84	84.0
No	16	16.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 267  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.5.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	97.6
No	2	2.4
Total	83	100.0



TABLE 268  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Ultimate decision-maker	44	55.0
Consultative role	32	40.0
Advisory role	4	5.0
Total	80	100.0

TABLE 269  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	83	83.0
No	17	17.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 270  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.8.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	82	98.8
No	1	1.2
Total	83	100.0

TABLE 271

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.9.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Ultimate decision-makers	21	26.2
Consultative role	52	65.0
Advisory role	7	8.8
Total	80	100.0

TABLE 272

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.10.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Conference commissioner	14	14.3
Conference officers	6	6.1
Faculty athletic representatives group	5	5.1
Directors of athletics group	34	34.7
Chief executive officers group	6	6.1
Other	33	33.7
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 273

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.11.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	64	66.7
No	32	33.3
Total	96	100.0

TABLE 274  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.12.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	96	98.0
No	2	2.0
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 275  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.13.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	94	95.9
No	4	4.1
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 276  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION II.15.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	95	96.0
No	4	4.0
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 277  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	90	86.5
No	14	13.5
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 278  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Male	13	14.4
Female	77	85.6
Total	90	100.0

TABLE 279  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.a.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	91	90.1
No	10	9.9
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 280

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.a.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	74	83.1
Alternate	14	15.7
Visitor	1	1.1
Total	89	100.0

TABLE 281

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.b.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	87	88.8
No	11	11.2
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 282

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.b.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	68	81.0
Alternate	14	16.7
Visitor	2	2.4
Total	84	100.0

TABLE 283  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.c.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	85.4
No	13	14.6
Total	89	100.0

TABLE 284  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.c.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	58	79.5
Alternate	15	20.5
Visitor	0	0.0
Total	73	100.0

TABLE 285  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.d.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	73	83.0
No	15	17.0
Total	88	100.0

TABLE 286

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.d.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	59	84.3
Alternate	10	14.3
Visitor	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

TABLE 287

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.e.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	69	79.3
No	18	20.7
Total	87	100.0

TABLE 288

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.3.e.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Delegate	51	77.3
Alternate	15	22.7
Visitor	0	0.0
Total	66	100.0

TABLE 289

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	81	94.2
No	5	5.8
Total	86	100.0

TABLE 290

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	75	91.5
No	7	8.5
Total	82	100.0

TABLE 291

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	68	93.2
No	5	6.8
Total	73	100.0



TABLE 292  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	65	91.5
No	6	8.5
Total	71	100.0

TABLE 293  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.4.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	62	92.5
No	5	7.5
Total	67	100.0

TABLE 294  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	28	32.2
No	59	67.8
Total	87	100.0

TABLE 295  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	21	24.7
No	64	75.3
Total	85	100.0

TABLE 296  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	26	34.7
No	49	65.3
Total	75	100.0

TABLE 297  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	19	26.0
No	54	74.0
Total	73	100.0

TABLE 298  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.5.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	18	26.1
No	51	73.9
Total	69	100.0

TABLE 299  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	1	1.0
Frequently	6	5.9
Sometimes	22	21.6
Seldom	35	34.2
Never	38	37.3
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 300  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	16	15.5
Frequently	43	41.7
Sometimes	33	32.0
Seldom	8	7.9
Never	3	2.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 301  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	34	33.3
Frequently	39	38.2
Sometimes	25	24.6
Seldom	3	2.9
Never	1	1.0
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 302  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	86	82.8
Frequently	12	11.5
Sometimes	4	3.8
Seldom	2	1.9
Never	0	0.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 303  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	11	11.1
Frequently	13	13.1
Sometimes	29	29.3
Seldom	24	24.3
Never	22	22.2
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 304  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	60	57.7
Frequently	21	20.2
Sometimes	18	17.3
Seldom	5	4.8
Never	0	0.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 305  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	6	6.0
Frequently	8	8.0
Sometimes	24	24.0
Seldom	30	30.0
Never	32	32.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 306  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	56	54.4
Frequently	21	20.4
Sometimes	18	17.5
Seldom	6	5.8
Never	2	1.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 307

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	21	21.2
Frequently	21	21.2
Sometimes	28	28.3
Seldom	24	24.2
Never	5	5.1
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 308

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	9	9.0
Frequently	24	24.0
Sometimes	32	32.0
Seldom	21	21.0
Never	14	14.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 309

## RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.6.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Always	33	33.7
Frequently	29	29.6
Sometimes	23	23.5
Seldom	7	7.1
Never	6	6.1
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 310  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.a

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	0	0.0
Consultative input	6	5.9
Advisory input	27	26.5
Not involved	69	67.6
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 311  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	4	3.9
Consultative input	41	39.8
Advisory input	58	56.3
Not involved	0	0.0
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 312  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	8	8.0
Consultative input	63	63.0
Advisory input	28	28.0
Not involved	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 313  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.d.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	67	67.0
Consultative input	25	25.0
Advisory input	4	4.0
Not involved	4	4.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 314  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.e.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	3	3.0
Consultative input	16	16.2
Advisory input	43	43.4
Not involved	37	37.4
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 315  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.f.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	70	68.6
Consultative input	20	19.6
Advisory input	10	9.8
Not involved	2	2.0
Total	102	100.0



TABLE 316  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.g.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	10	9.9
Consultative input	15	14.9
Advisory input	36	35.6
Not involved	40	39.6
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 317  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.h.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	22	22.0
Consultative input	54	54.0
Advisory input	20	20.0
Not involved	4	4.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 318  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.i.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	4	4.1
Consultative input	40	40.8
Advisory input	46	46.9
Not involved	8	8.2
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 319  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.j.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	4	4.0
Consultative input	20	20.2
Advisory input	56	56.6
Not involved	19	19.2
Total	99	100.0

TABLE 320  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.7.k.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Decision maker	11	11.2
Consultative input	34	34.7
Advisory input	45	45.9
Not involved	8	8.2
Total	98	100.0

TABLE 321  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.9.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	103	99.0
No	1	1.0
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 322  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.11.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	101	99.0
No	1	1.0
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 323  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.14.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	44	42.3
No	60	57.7
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 324  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.14.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
CEO	45	76.2
Faculty Representative	2	3.4
PWA	3	5.1
More than one person	5	8.5
Director of Athletics	4	6.8
Total	59	100.0

TABLE 325  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.15.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	55	52.9
No	49	47.1
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 326  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.16.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	99	96.1
No	4	3.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 327  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.17.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	93	92.1
No	8	7.9
Total	101	100.0

TABLE 328  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION III.19.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	95	93.1
No	7	6.9
Total	102	100.0

TABLE 329  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.1.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Director of Athletics	92	88.5
Director of Men's Athletics	5	4.8
Other	7	6.7
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 330  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.2.

Response	Frequency	Percent
CEO	56	54.4
Vice President	30	29.1
Executive Vice President	2	1.9
Associate Vice President	1	1.0
Assistant to the President	4	3.9
Dean	6	5.8
Other	4	3.9
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 331  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.3.

Response	Frequency	Percent
1961	1	1.0
1963	2	1.9
1964	1	1.0
1965	2	1.9
1966	1	1.0
1967	2	1.9
1968	1	1.0
1969	2	1.9
1970	4	3.9
1971	1	1.0
1972	3	2.9
1973	2	1.9
1974	2	1.9
1975	4	3.9
1976	2	1.9
1977	7	6.8
1978	8	7.8
1979	6	5.8
1980	9	8.7
1981	4	3.9
1982	6	5.8
1983	12	11.7
1984	11	10.7
1985	10	9.7
Total	103	100.0

TABLE 332  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.a.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	15	15.0
No	85	85.0
Total	100	100.0

TABLE 333  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.b.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	9	9.4
No	87	90.6
Total	96	100.0

TABLE 334  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.4.c.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	5	5.9
No	80	94.1
Total	85	100.0

TABLE 335  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.5.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Under 30	1	1.0
31 - 40	17	16.3
41 - 50	35	33.7
51 - 60	42	40.4
61 +	9	8.7
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 336  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.6.

Response	Frequency	Percent
I-A	42	40.4
I-AA	30	28.8
I-AAA	32	30.8
Total	104	100.0

TABLE 337  
RESPONSES TO QUESTION IV.7.

Response	Frequency	Percent
Integrated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics	96	92.3
Segregated men's and women's intercollegiate athletics	8	7.7
Other	0	0.0
Total	104	100.0



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Books

American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. AIAW Handbook of Policies and Interim Operating Procedures 1971-72. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1971.

Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women. AIAW Directory 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. AIAW Handbook 1979-80. Washington, D.C.: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, 1979.

Barnes, Mildred, ed. AIAW Handbook of Policies and Operating Procedures 1973-74. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973.

Biddle, Bruce J. Role Theory: Expectations, Identities, and Behaviors. New York: Academic Press, 1979.

Division for Girls and Women's Sports. Philosophy and Standards for Girls and Women's Sports. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. Standards in Sports for Girls and Women. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1958.

Dunkle, Margaret C. Competitive Athletics: In Search of Equal Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Equal Opportunity for Women in Sports." In Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy, pp. 9-19. Edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.

38 Federal Register. Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal Register, 20 September 1973, pp. 26384-26389.

Gerber, Ellen; Felshin, Jan; Berlin, Pearl; and Wyrick, Waneen. The American Woman in Sport. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1974.

Holbrook, Leona. "Women's Participation in American Sport." In Athletics in America, pp. 43-59. Edited by Arnold Flath. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University Press, 1972.

Holland, Judith R., ed. AIAW Handbook of Policies and Operating Procedures 1974-75. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.

Kepner, Charles H., and Trejoe, Benjamin B. The Rational Manager. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Komisar, Lucy. The New Feminism. New York: Franklin Watts, 1971.

Magnusson, Lucille. "The Development of Programs." In Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy, pp. 55-58. Edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.

More Hurdles to Clear: Women and Girls in Competitive Athletics. Washington, D.C.: United States Commission on Civil Rights, [1980].

National Association for Girls and Women in Sport. AIAW Directory 1976-77. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. AIAW Handbook 1977-78. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. AIAW Handbook 1978-79. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1978.

National Collegiate Athletic Association. NCAA Championships: Dates and Sites. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. NCAA Directory 1984-85. Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1981 Convention Proceedings. Shawnee Mission, Kansas: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1981.

- Oglesby, Carole. Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1978.
- Parkhouse, Bonnie L. and Lapin, Jackie. Women Who Win. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1980.
- Rossi, Alice S. and Calderwood, Ann. Academic Women on the Move. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Ryan, W. Carson, Jr. The Literature of American School and College Athletics. Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1929.
- Sage, George H., ed. Sport and American Society. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970.
- Savage, Howard J.; McGovern, John T.; and Bentley, Harold W. Current Developments in American College Sports. Boston: The Merrymount Press, 1931.
- Spears, Betty. "The Emergence of Women in Sport." In Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy, pp. 26-40. Edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.
- Swanson, Richard A. "From Glide to Stride: Significant Events in a Century of American Women's Sport." In Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy, pp. 43-53. Edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.
- Thorpe, Joanne. "The Relationship of DGWS to AIAW." In Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy, pp. 59-63. Edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 1974.
- Twin, Stephanie L. Out of the Bleachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1979.
- 20 United States Code. Education Amendments of 1972, Section 1681(a), Washington, D.C.: United States Printing Office, 1972.
- VanDalen, Deobold B., and Bennett, Bruce L. A World History of Physical Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1971.

Periodicals

"A Donna Lopiano Eye-View of Women's Sports in America." Scholastic Coach, January 1984, pp. 30+.

Burgess, William J. "A Common Strategy." Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April 1981, pp. 4-5+.

Canham, Don. "Opposition Forwarded to Title IX Regulations." NCAA News, 15 May 1974, p. 6.

Coffey, Margaret A. "The Sportswoman." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 36 (February 1965): 38-42.

"Comes the Revolution." Time, 26 June 1978, pp. 54-59.

Cox, Thomas A. "Intercollegiate Athletics and Title IX." George Washington Law Review 46 (November 1977):34-64.

Daniel, Dave (ed.). "HEW Regulations Threaten College Athletics." NCAA News, 1 March 1974, p. 2.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Colleges Seek Input to Title IX." NCAA News, 15 March 1974, p. 1.

Davison, Fred C. "Intercollegiate Athletics and Title IX: Equal Opportunity or Federal Incursion?" USA Today, July 1979, pp. 35-37.

Engstrand, Gary. "Don't Expect Fair Play from the NCAA for Women." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 15 December 1980, p. 19.

"Equal Rights in Education." Capitol: Woman, November 1984, pp. 1+.

Fields, Cheryl M. "Ban Sought Against NCAA Women's Championships." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 21 October 1981, p. 1+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Court Rejects Claim of Women's Group that NCAA Violated Anti-trust Law." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 9 March 1983, p. 17.

\_\_\_\_\_. "HEW Softens Bias Stand." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 7 April 1975, p. 1+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sports Organizations Set to Debate Question of Women's Championships." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 8 December 1980, p. 1.

Fields, Cheryl M., and Middleton, Lorenzo. "Women's Sports Group Stunned, Angered by NCAA Vote on Female Championships." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 14 January 1980, p. 1.

Fields, Cheryl M. "Women's Sports Group Plans for Possible Dissolution." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 20 January 1982, p. 19.

Flygare, Thomas J. "HEW's New Guidelines on Sex Discrimination in Collegiate Athletics." Phi Delta Kappan 60 (March 1979): pp. 529-530.

Frank, James. "NCAA Governance." Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April 1981, pp. 31-34.

Freeman, William H. "Controlling Athletics in Education: History and Perspective." Paper presented at the Pre-Convention Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education, American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Kansas City, Missouri, April 1978.

Gerber, Ellen W. "The Changing Female Image: A Brief Commentary on Sport Competition for Women." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 42 (October 1971):59-61.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Controlled Development of Collegiate Sport for Women 1923-1936." Journal of Sport History 2 (Spring 1975):1-28.

Gilbert, Bil, and Williamson, Nancy. "Programmed to be Losers." Sports Illustrated, 11 June 1973, pp. 60-73.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sport is Unfair to Women." Sports Illustrated, 21 May 1973, pp. 88-98.

Greenberg, Randi Jean. "AIAW vs NCAA: The Takeover and Implications." Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors 47 (Winter 1974):29-36.

Gwaltney, Corbin. "Anti-Sex Bias Rules." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 10 March 1975, p. 10.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Mood in Congress Alarms Women." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28 April 1975, p. 7.

Hanford, George. "Intercollegiate Athletics Today and Tomorrow: The President's Challenge." Educational Record 57 (1977): pp. 232-235.

Hogan, Candace Lyle. "A Token of Friendship." Coaching: Women's Athletics, March/April, 1981, pp. 21-22.

\_\_\_\_\_. "From Here to Equality: Title IX." womenSports, September 1977, pp. 16-26+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "NCAA and AIAW: Will the Men Score on Women's Athletics?" womenSports, January 1977, pp. 46-49.

Huckle, Patricia. "Back to the Starting Line." American Behavioral Scientist 21 (January/February 1978):379-392.

Huesner, W. W. "Basic Physiological Concepts as They Relate to Girls' Sports." National Institute on Girl's Sports, 28 September 1965. (Mimeographed.)

Hult, Joan L. "The Philosophical Conflicts in Men's and Women's Collegiate Athletics." Quest 32(1980):77-94.

LaNoue, George R. "Athletics and Equality: How to Comply with Title IX Without Tearing Down the Stadium." Change 8 (November 1976):27-30+

Lee, Mabel. "The Case For and Against Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and the Situation Since 1923." Research Quarterly 2 (May 1931):93-127.

Ley, Katherine. "Women in Sports: Where Do We Go from Here, Boys?" Phi Delta Kappan 56 (October 1974):129-131.

Loggia, Marjorie. "On the Playing Fields of History." Ms., July 1973, pp. 63-64.

Magnusson, Lucille. "The What and Why of AIAW." Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation 43 (March 1972):71.

Middleton, Lorenzo, and Fields, Cheryl. "NCAA Votes to Widen Role in Women's Sports; Action is Bitterly Debated, 'Power Play' Charged." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 19 January 1981, p. 6.

National Organization for Women. "Towards Equality in Sport--Recommendations." Resolution passed at the National Organization for Women's National Conference, Washington, D.C., February 1973.

Pierce, Lea. "AIAW/NCAA: The Big Switch." Sportswoman's T.E.A.M. Basketball Digest, October 1981, pp. 34-35+.

Scott, M. Gladys. "Competition for Women in American Colleges and Universities." Research Quarterly 16 (May 1945):49-71.

"Sex Discrimination and Intercollegiate Athletics." Yale Law Review 86 (May 1979):1254-1279.

Sisley, Becky L. "Women in Administration: A Quest for Leadership." Journal of Physical Education and Recreation 52 (April 1981):77-78.

"Texts of Statements by Three Sports Organizations on Championships." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 8 December 1980, pp. 8-10.

Ulrich, Celeste. "Breakthrough or Breakdown." Coaching: Women's Athletics, January/February 1980, pp. 18-19+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The End of an Era." Coaching: Women's Athletics, September/October 1980, pp. 14-15+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Valor in the Vanguard." Coaching: Women's Athletics, January/February 1981, pp. 23-24+.

Wentworth, E. "HEW Offers 'Nondisruptive' Bans in Sex Bias." The Washington Post, 19 June 1974, Sec. A, p. 1.

Wheeler, Elizabeth. "NCAA vs AIAW." Women's Sports, June 1980, pp. 20-23+.

\_\_\_\_\_. "War of the Words." Women's Sports, June 1981, pp. 14-17.

Williams, Roger. "The Battle for Bucks in Women's Athletics." Saturday Review, 21 January 1978, pp. 56-57.



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293010075004