

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS, SOCIOLOGY AND EDUCATION

GENDER EQUITY IN PENN STATE ATHLETICS: FEMALE STUDENT-ATHLETE  
PERCEPTIONS AND THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE CURRENT INSTITUTION

LAURA GEBHART  
SPRING 2015

A thesis  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements  
for a baccalaureate degree in Community, Environment and Development  
with honors in Community, Environment and Development

Reviewed and approved\* by the following:

Theodore Alter, Ph.D.  
Professor of Agricultural, Environmental, and Regional Economics  
Thesis Supervisor and Honors Adviser

Patreese Ingram, Ed.D.  
Assistant Dean of Multicultural Affairs  
Professor of Agricultural and Extension Education  
Faculty Reader

\* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

## ABSTRACT

The combination of historical injustices and formal rules have limited women's participation and opportunities in collegiate athletics. Although women's participation, opportunity, and treatment have improved over the past fifty years, inequity continues to exist between men's and women's collegiate athletics programs. Penn State is used as a case study to measure gender equity within Penn State athletics and assess whether statistical data aligns with the perceptions of women student-athletes. Archival research was used to perform an institutional change analysis to assess how formal and informal rule changes have affected gender equity in Penn State athletics. While results from the existing statistics research and key informant interviews suggest that treatment between Penn State's men's and women's programs was nearly equal, the institutional change analysis explained that slow-changing informal constraints caused key informants' remaining perceptions of gender inequity. Incremental changes in informal constraints must continue to move toward matching the purpose of Title IX, if gender equity is ever to be attained in collegiate athletics.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	V
Chapter 1 Introduction .....	1
Institutional Change Analysis .....	3
Equity versus Equality .....	4
Title IX .....	5
National Collegiate Athletic Association .....	7
Chapter 2 Literature Review .....	9
History of Men’s Collegiate Athletics .....	10
History of Women’s Collegiate Athletics .....	13
Gender Equity in Modern Collegiate Athletics .....	18
Institutional Change Analysis .....	20
Chapter 3 Methodology .....	24
Research Questions .....	24
Triangulation .....	25
Penn State as a Case Study .....	25
Archival Research .....	26
Existing Statistics Research .....	27
Key Informant Interviews .....	27
Chapter 4 Results and Analysis .....	32
Archival Research .....	32
Existing Statistics Research .....	36
Key Informant Interviews .....	41
Team to Team Comparison .....	41
Gender Equity in Penn State Athletics .....	43
Penn State Athletics Culture .....	46
Impact of Sport .....	47
Athletics in Society .....	48
Comparing Statistics to Perceptions .....	51
Chapter 5 Implications .....	54

Chapter 6 Conclusions .....56

Appendix A Organization Acronyms .....58

Appendix B Key Informant Interview Protocol.....59

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....60

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1: Team Sizes of Key Informants .....	29
Table 2: Penn State Athletics Teams and Number of Participants .....	37
Table 3: 2013-2014 Penn State Operating Expenses by Team.....	39
Table 4: 2013-2014 Total Expenses by Team.....	40

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A strong band of supporters helped make this thesis possible. I want to thank my Faculty Reader, Patreese Ingram, whose insight and advice was very much appreciated throughout this process. I wish to express my unending gratitude to Ted Alter for his persistent encouragement and motivation. The four years truly flew by and I am indebted to your advice, shared wisdom, and compassion.

I want to thank the strong women in Penn State athletics—both past and present who inspired me to write this paper. I was roused by the women I encountered and the stories I heard during the 50th Anniversary of Women in Sport. Past leaders such as Della Durant and current leaders such as Sandy Barbour and Charmelle Green have inspired me throughout this journey. I want to thank Char, LB, and Stu for being incredible role models, and for challenging me to grow in all aspects of life and leadership. Thank you to the wonderful people with whom I've had the privilege of playing—my teammates. Your strength on the field and in life has driven me to start this thesis. Your love and support helped me finish it.

Finally, I want to thank my family and friends for not only their support throughout this process, but for their contribution in molding me into a confident young woman. You've encouraged me to pursue my passions without regard for my gender and to advocate for what I believe.

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

*As we move into our tomorrow world let us proceed not only with caution and concern but also with the courage of our convictions and a firm commitment to the never-ending pursuit of excellence in every facet of Intercollegiate Competition. -Della Durant, 1979*

In 2014, Penn State celebrated its 50th Anniversary of Women in Sport. Pioneers of women's athletics and prominent leaders shared their stories of great adversity and great triumph. The gap in participation and treatment between men and women student-athletes was much greater throughout those fifty years than existed in 2014, but does an improvement for women's student-athletes mean we can no longer advocate for equity? The 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary inspired an appreciation for the progress that has been made in women's athletics, but it also spurred the research question: Is there gender equity in Penn State athletics? Objectives of this research include: (1) assessing gender equity using the statistical data on participation, athletic financial assistance, and treatment, (2) finding if the perceptions of women student-athletes align with the results from the existing statistics research, (3) defining the opportunities and barriers to improving gender equity in Penn State athletics, and (4) understanding the impact of institutional change on gender equity in Penn State athletics.

This methodology used to address the research question and objectives include existing statistics research, key informant interviews, and archival research. The combination of research methods was used to triangulate gender equity in Penn State athletics. The results from the existing statistics research revealed that Penn State athletics men's and women's programs were

considered equitable in 2013-2014. Results from the key informant interviews substantiated what the numbers confirmed. Key informants perceived nearly equal treatment when directly comparing their teams to men counterparts. Gender equity at a broader scope—between the men’s and women’s programs at Penn State—was perceived as fair, with an exception of a perceived difference between the football program and the women’s programs. When gender equity was considered at the societal level, key informants perceived some inequity based on differences in treatment and popularity of men’s versus women’s athletics.

An institutional change analysis considered the constraints within which Penn State athletics was founded, and analyzed how subsequent changes in the institution affected gender equity. The state of gender equity in Penn State athletics in 2013-2014 was related to the evolution of formal rules, social perceptions, and social conventions that dictated gender equity throughout the organization’s history. Results from the institutional change analysis implied that barriers to gender equity existed in informal constraints. Continued research must determine how alternative rules may improve gender equity in collegiate athletics. There must be continued advocacy to improve gender equity in collegiate athletics in order to facilitate the continuation of incremental informal rule change.



## **Institutional Change Analysis**

Institutional change analysis is a model for understanding institutional change embedded in institutional and behavioral economic theory. Institutional and behavioral economic theory suggests that individuals and organizations make rational choices, but that those choices are limited by human behavior, existing rules, and social norms. Institutional change analysis is used to examine how opportunity for women in athletics has been affected by institutions. It examines the institution within which collegiate athletics was formed and how changing institutions have affected gender equity within the organization.

Institutions are the elements of society that provide structure to human interaction (North, 1990, p. 5). They include formal rules, informal rules—social norms and conventions—and the characteristic of their enforcement (North, 1993, p. 2). Institutional change analysis examines how institutions change over time and what influences change. This paper focuses on how institutions have affected gender equity in collegiate athletics over time. It examines the formal and informal rules that have influenced change in the organization of collegiate athletics and how those changes impacted gender equity.

The distinction between organizations and institutions must be understood. The two terms are often used interchangeably, but have different meanings in the context of institutional economic theory. Institutions are the rules that bring meaning to human interaction, while organizations are groups of people that come together to act collectively within those constraints (Schmid, 2004, p. 74). Organizations are formed within the bounds of existing institutions and are affected by changing formal and informal rules. As North explains, “Change typically

consists of marginal adjustments to the complex of rules, norms, and enforcement that constitute the institutional framework.” (North, 1990, p. 83) Legislative change, judicial change, regulatory rule change, or constitutional change can cause formal and informal rule change (North, 1990, p. 6). While formal rule changes respond fairly rapidly to legislative, judicial, or regulatory changes, informal rules change more slowly and incrementally over time. Accidents, learning, and natural selection all contribute to the gradual change of informal rules, but as North explains, “changes are an aggregation of literally thousands of specific small alterations (North, 1990, p. 89). Schmid believes it is first necessary “to understand the learning process of belief and ideology” to understand the changes in informal rules (Schmid, 2004, p. 12). Institutional change is a continuous feedback loop of formal and informal rules that adjust to one another to achieve an institutional equilibrium.

### **Equity versus Equality**

Equality and equity have different meanings and interpretations. Equality is defined as having the same access and opportunity, given that all parties begin at the same level (Kranich, 2005). Equity provides “fair” treatment that takes into consideration historical laws, rules, and norms that have created an uneven distribution of wealth—be it knowledge, material goods, or social clout (Kranich, 2005). Those differences are taken into account to try to provide equal access and opportunities to all parties.

Historical injustices and social norms have situated women’s access to opportunities at a lower level than men’s. Gender equity is considered a fairness between genders that accounts for the constructed differences between men and women. In order to attain fair and just treatment

between genders, the differences manifested throughout history and perpetuated by institutions must be considered. This paper focuses on gender equity in collegiate athletics. It recognizes the differences between genders due to past and evolving institutions, and strives to provide fair access and opportunity.

### **Title IX**

Title IX was passed as part of the 1972 Education Amendments, which formally banned discrimination on the basis of sex. The legislation reads,

“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.” (Office for Civil Rights, 1979)

Initially, there was confusion about whether collegiate athletics programs fell under the jurisdiction of Title IX. In 1975, The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued an interpretation of Title IX that explicitly included collegiate athletics (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). Interpretation of the legislation was muddled again when in the 1984 Supreme Court ruling of *Grove City College v. Bell*, the Court indicated that only programs receiving direct federal aid had to comply with Title IX (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). In 1988, Title IX was reclassified in the Civil Rights Restoration Act, stating that all programs at federally funded institutions were subject to Title IX (Anderson, 2006, p. 6). Since nearly all colleges and universities received some form of Federal assistance, collegiate athletics programs were officially subject to recognize Title IX.

In order to comply with Title IX, colleges and universities must pass a three-prong test, addressing equity in participation, athletic financial assistance, and treatment. There are specific criteria for each prong. To pass participation requirements, an organization must pass one of three tests: (1) proportionality, (2) history and continuing practice, or (3) effectively accommodating interests and abilities (“Standard Language”, 2011). The test for proportionality requires that the proportion of male student-athletes to male full-time undergraduate students be equal to the proportion of female student-athletes to female full-time undergraduate students. The second test considers the “history and continuing practice” of equitable participation in an athletic program. This test examines whether the program has made concerted efforts toward improving participation of the underrepresented sex and that they have established efforts to continue improving participation.

The third test of participation, “effectively accommodating interests and abilities,” considers whether the underrepresented sex is “fully and effectively” accommodated by the university athletics program (“Standard Language”, 2011). Because the second two tests are relatively subjective, schools often focus on fulfilling the proportionality requirement. The proportions do not have to be exactly equal; a university is still considered compliant if the proportions are “substantially proportionate.” (Anderson, 2006, p. 229) Although no standard amount has been established to determine “substantial proportionality,” a range of five percent between male and female ratios has been considered compliant (Forman, 2001, p. 2).

The second prong in assuring gender equity requires that athletic financial assistance is equal among men’s and women’s teams (“Standard Language,” 2011). This is measured in proportions of financial assistance awarded to male versus female student-athletes. The final prong of Title IX compliance assesses treatment. Equitable treatment does not require that

men's and women's sports receive exactly the same services and equipment, but requires that men's and women's sports are treated comparably similar to one another. Treatment considers eleven different criteria: (1) locker rooms, practice, and competitive facilities; (2) equipment and supplies, (3) scheduling of games and practice times, (4) publicity, (5) coaching, (6) travel and daily allowance, (7) academic tutoring, (8) provision of medical training facilities and services, (9) provision of housing and dining facilities and services, (10) recruitment of student-athletes, (11) support services ("Standard Language", 2011). The third prong can be evaluated by comparing men's and women's programs' operating expenses, recruiting expenses, total expenditures, and the quality of their facilities. The requirements of Title IX provide a relatively objective measure of gender equity in collegiate athletics.

### **National Collegiate Athletic Association**

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is the governing body for intercollegiate athletics. Its purpose is "To initiate, stimulate and improve intercollegiate athletics programs for student-athletes and to promote and develop educational leadership, physical fitness, athletics excellence and athletics participation as a recreational pursuit." (NCAA, 2014, p. 1) The NCAA creates and regulates rules that dictate the nature of competition and the eligibility of its participants. The NCAA was initially founded in 1905 to govern men's intercollegiate athletics programs. In 1982, it claimed jurisdiction over women's intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA is overseen by an executive committee and its membership is made up of "a diverse, voluntary, unincorporated association of four-year colleges and universities, conferences, affiliated associations and other educational institutions." (NCAA, 2014, p. 18) As

of 2014, there were over 1,200 schools, conferences, and affiliate organizations part of the NCAA. The organization oversees the welfare of more than 460,000 student-athletes (“About Us,” 2014).

The NCAA is divided into three divisions, based on schools’ level of competition and athletic program funding. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, hereafter referred to as Penn State, is a member of Division I, within the Big Ten Conference and member of the Football Bowl Subdivision. The NCAA’s website describes Division I members as schools with the largest student bodies, highest athletic participation, and largest athletic budgets in the country (“NCAA Division I”, 2014).

In October 2014, the NCAA granted autonomy to the five richest football conferences, giving them the ability to create their own rules (Hosick, 2015). These conferences included the Southeastern Conference, Atlantic Coast Conference, Big Ten Conference, Big Twelve Conference, and Pacific Twelve Conference. The group has been interchangeably referred to as the Power Five, the Big Five, and the autonomous group. The granted autonomy allows the Power Five to create their own formal rules that will be recognized by schools within the five conferences, and observed permissively by other Division I schools and athletic conferences. The group passed its first legislation at the 2015 NCAA Convention, during its first autonomy business session.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Literature Review**

Schmid (2004) states, “We want to learn how past formal and informal changes shape the field of choice today.” (Schmid, 2004, p. 4) The popularity of collegiate athletics in American society has provided a generous collection of news articles and media that has tracked changing rules and structures. Additionally, a substantial amount of literature exists on gender equity in collegiate athletics, describing the progress perception of progress in enacting and enforcing Title IX legislation. Men’s and women’s collegiate programs evolved separately from one another, and therefore require separate descriptions. Their separate histories contribute to the current institution that governs collegiate athletics. Men’s and women’s programs were created at separate times, within different temporal institutions, and subsequently affected by institutional changes differently. Knowing the history of collegiate athletics helps to understand the organization’s current structure and decision-making (North, 1990, p. 100).

The works of A. Alan Schmid (2004) and Douglass North (1990 & 1993) were used to explain and apply institutional change analysis to gender equity in collegiate athletics. A collection of books, scholarly articles, the Penn State University archives, and news media were used to gather information on the history of men’s and women’s collegiate athletic programs, the history of Penn State athletics, and the formal and informal rules that existed and changed throughout each of their existence.

## History of Men's Collegiate Athletics

Intramural sports were a common fixture at American colleges throughout the 1800s. By the mid-1800s, formal athletics programs were being organized to oversee sport. Harvard University hosted the first intercollegiate competition, a regatta against Yale University in 1852 ("Harvard-Yale Regatta," 2014). After its commencement, a growing number of schools began participating in intercollegiate competition. By the early 1900s, intercollegiate competition had increased so rapidly that the Intercollegiate Athletic Association (IAA) was commissioned in 1905 by 62 college presidents to oversee player safety and rules of fair play. In 1910, the name of the organization changed to the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Smith, 2000, p.12).

Throughout the 1920s, college admittance rates increased as higher education became more affordable. At the same rate, athletic participation grew, bringing with it concerns about increasing commercialization of intercollegiate sports. Harvard University President Charles William Eliot, who held office between 1869 and 1909, warned, "Lofty gate receipts from college athletics had turned amateur contests into major commercial spectacles." Around the same time, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) President Francis A. Walker said, "If the movement shall continue at the same rate, it will soon be fairly a question whether the letters B.A. stand more for Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Athletics." (Smith, 2000, p. 11) The NCAA continued to adjust its formal rules to the changing environment of collegiate athletics, but their efforts could not keep pace with rampant athletics programs, duplicitous coaches seeking a competitive edge, and the growing fan base (Smith, 2000, p. 14). A report released by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education in 1929 stated,

"A change of values is needed in a field that is sodden with the commercial and material and the vested interests that these forces have created. Commercialism



in college athletics must be diminished and college sport must rise to a point where it is esteemed primarily and sincerely for the opportunities it affords to mature youth.” (Scott, 2000, p. 13)

New rules had to consider the more aggressive and widespread recruiting tactics. In an excerpt from the first NCAA Constitution, the organization outlined its initial stance on the recruitment of student-athletes. It prohibited:

“proselytizing, the offering of inducements to players to enter colleges or universities because of their athletics abilities and of supporting or maintaining players while students on account of their athletics abilities, either by athletics organizations, individual alumni, or otherwise, indirectly or directly; the singling out of prominent athletic students of preparatory schools and endeavoring to influence them to enter a particular college or university; the playing of those ineligible as amateurs; the playing of those who are not bona fide students in good and regular standing; and improper and unsportsmanlike conduct of any sort whatsoever, either on the part of the contestants, the coaches, their assistants or the student body.” (Hawes, 2000)

College baseball in the early 1900s spurred greater debate on the definition and meaning of amateurism. Some players were competing for professional teams over the summer months and it was debated whether those athletes could still be considered amateurs. Some members of intercollegiate athletics believed competition in its purest form was driven by a love for the game, not monetary incentives. In 1908, J. P. Welsh from Penn State University countered this argument, stating, “The student in good collegiate standing who earns money during the summer vacation is not sick. He does not need treatment. He needs to be let alone in the full, free,

untrammelled exercise of his American citizenship, which entitles him to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, which sometimes means money.” (Hawes, 2000)

In 1948, the NCAA created the Constitutional Compliance Committee to specifically oversee rule interpretation and rule violations. The committee’s regulatory capacity was insufficient in administering control over programs and was replaced by a new model in 1951. The new Committee on Infractions was given broader scope in rule sanctioning authority (Smith, 2000, p. 15). The NCAA’s governing capacity continued to grow throughout the 1950s and 1960s, just as intercollegiate athletics grew in participation and popularity. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the NCAA struggled to contain the increasing commercialization of sport while continuing to regulate programs and advocate for student-athlete welfare.

The 1980s brought two major new changes to the structure of collegiate athletics. The first involved the control of television contracts. The NCAA formerly administered television contracts that allowed television broadcasting of intercollegiate competitions. The organization reaped the revenues generated by the contracts until a group of football programs brought suit against the NCAA. In the 1984 *NCAA v. the Board of Regents*, the US Supreme Court ruled that the NCAA had violated antitrust laws. The ruling allowed schools to contract their own television broadcasting deals, feeding millions of dollars into collegiate athletics programs (Smith, 2000, p. 19). The change further separated top tier football programs from smaller programs. The change ultimately created a new separation within Division I, later creating the Football Bowl Subdivision, Football Championship Subdivision, and schools that did not fund football programs.

In 1982, the NCAA took control over the governance of women’s collegiate athletics programs. The combination of men’s and women’s programs under one organization created

new formal rules and informal constraints that affected gender equity. The convergence also placed a new burden on revenue-generating sports to cover expenses of not only non-revenue-generating men's programs, but women's programs as well. Despite efforts to reign in excessive commercialization of sport, more money was demanded from athletics programs in order to cover costs and provide equal treatment, opportunities, and athletic scholarships to women student-athletes. The history of men's collegiate athletics is roiled in issues concerning the increasing commercialization of sport, unethical competitive practices, and definitions of amateurism. The history of women's collegiate athletics highlights different struggles for the athletics organization, and greater successes in preserving the well-being of its student-athletes.

### **History of Women's Collegiate Athletics**

The first women's intercollegiate competition was played in 1896, in a basketball game between the University of California and Stanford University, forty-four years after the first men's intercollegiate competition (Hult, 1994, p. 84). Men's and women's athletics programs were founded within different sets of constraints, and evolved differently as they responded to changing formal and informal rules. The perception of women in American society has dictated their participation in athletics. Women's participation and opportunities in athletics changed relative to women's participation and opportunities in American society. While athletics has been considered a rite of passage for boys and young men, girls and women have had to battle formal rules and deeply rooted informal constraints to participate in sport.

Throughout the 1800s, formal and informal rules restricted women's level of physical activity (Hult, 1994, p. 86). The "cult of womanhood," an idea adopted during the 1830s,

defined a woman's role as "domestic, maternal, religious, cultured, idle, and subservient."

(Griffith, 1984, p. 15) Physical activity within this lifestyle was restricted to domestic duties.

The antebellum period in American history initiated reform in various areas of society. The era experienced the abolitionist movement, women's rights movement, education and religious reform. The women's rights movement was part of a greater shift in American institutions.

Prominent leaders such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony headed a movement that championed a higher status for women in American society. Their sentiments challenged the existing perception of women's role in society. Incremental changes initiated by the efforts of women's rights advocates led to a changing perception of women's status.

While more and more men were populating colleges and participating in athletics programs during the late 1800s, women were just starting to achieve access to higher education. Strongly held social conventions influenced scientific research. Physicians throughout the 1800s claimed that formal education overwhelmed a woman's capabilities, which negatively affected her physical development and reproductive strength. The prominent English philosopher, Herbert Spencer, reported, "nature is a strict accountant...and if you demand of her in one direction more than she is prepared to lay out, she balances the account by making a deduction elsewhere." (Vertinsky, 1994, p. 68) Women were portrayed as intrinsically inferior to men.

While the idea of the "cult of womanhood" persisted throughout the late 1800s, Darwin's theories on natural selection and survival of the fittest challenged the lifestyle's promotion of sedentary physical activity. Darwin's theories emphasized that women's physical well-being required moderate physical activity to ensure healthy reproduction. With persisting fears that overly strenuous physical or mental activity could be detrimental to a woman's reproductive health, women's education and physical exertion was closely monitored with collegiate physical

education programs (Vertinsky, 1994, p. 68). Physical education programs became mandatory instillations at most colleges by the late 1880s. Gymnastics and calisthenics were the most popular programs, but basketball, cycling, baseball, swimming, golf, and field hockey were added to curricula by 1900 (Hult, 1994, p. 85).

Athletics programs began evolving from women's physical education programs, with various organized sports programs springing up at colleges throughout the United States in the early 1900s. Still, there remained specific restrictions to women athlete's physicality, competitiveness, and vanity (Hult, 1994, p. 86). Physical educators promoted broad-based programming to ensure all girls and women had an opportunity to participate in and benefit from sport. This philosophy was expressed by the Committee on Women's Athletics (CWA), an organization created to oversee rules and regulations for women's athletics programs in the early 1900s (Bell, 2008). The organization's original mission came into conflict with a few elite female athletes who aspired for greater athletic competition. Some turned to the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU), a male-dominated organization that coordinated men's athletic competitions. The AAU began programming for women athletes that facilitated more competitive play (Hult, 1994, p. 90).

Women physical educators became concerned for female athletes entering a male-dominated organization. They were losing the power to determine the rules and regulations that governed women's athletics. The CWA condemned the pursuit of increased competition, clarifying that, "the organization was not anti-competition, but merely against the 'wrong kind' of competition, that is, varsity or elite athletics at the expense of opportunities for the majority of girls and women." (Hult, 1994, p. 90) The CWA rationalized that their limited resources could

either be devoted to a large number of female athletes, or concentrated on an elite few. The organization advocated the opportunity for all women in college to participate in athletics.

America's entrance into World War II forced many women into factories and into other previously male-dominated jobs. Women's actions during World War II effectively shifted the social perception of women's strength and abilities and women's participation in athletics became more socially acceptable. Women's participation in athletics increased dramatically into the 1950s. More women athletes desired increased competition, but members of the CWA were torn between distributing resources to either an elite few or a less-competitive many (Hult, 1994, p. 94) In 1952, the CWA changed to the Division for Girls and Women's Sports (DGWS), and made a shift toward facilitating more elite competition in intercollegiate athletics.

The 1960s experienced a significant increase in women's athletic participation. Society had an increasingly more positive perception of women in sport, yet women's programs remained separate from men's. The governing organization for women's athletics experienced another name change, and became the National Association for Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS). In 1967, the NAGWS formed the substructure, the Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW). The CIAW operated with an emphasis on caring for the needs of student-athletes and rejecting commercialization of collegiate sport (Hult, 1994, p. 97).

Throughout the 1970s, the CIAW fought off the NCAA for control of women's collegiate athletics. The CIAW had philosophical differences with the NCAA, and believed the NCAA only wanted control of women's sports to increase its clout among international governing bodies for sports. The CIAW resisted the merge with the NCAA, and instead presented its own plan for intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA rebutted by taking the word "men" out of its constitution, posturing to take over women's intercollegiate athletic programs (Hult, 1994, p.

96). Between 1971 and 1972, the CIAW passed its oversight of women's collegiate programs to the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) (Forman, 2001, p. 4). The AIAW worked to preserve the original purpose of women's athletics programs, which focused on promoting a student-athlete's education and the experiential benefit of sport (Bell, 2008).

In 1972, Title IX was passed as part of the Education Amendments to the Civil Rights Act, barring discrimination on the basis of sex. Title IX was instrumental to increasing women's participation and opportunities in collegiate athletics. Hult claims it "was the single most significant piece of legislation to affect the direction and philosophical tenets of women in sport." (Hult, 1994, p. 95) As evidence, an average of 2.5 women's teams per school in 1970 and the 1977-1978 academic year, there was an average of 7.71 women's teams per school. Increases in funding and support allowed women's programs to flourish, but issues of governance persisted. The passage of Title IX marked a monumental change in the formal rules dictating gender equity in collegiate athletics. Colleges and universities were given a deadline to comply by regulations by 1978. The new rule prompted accelerated efforts to increase women's athletic participation, but the ubiquity of the rules and the reluctance of informal rule change left participation and opportunity in many athletics programs unequal.

In 1982, the NCAA finally absorbed women's programs into its jurisdiction, strong-arming control from the AIAW. The AIAW President at the time, Donna Lopiano, described the dispute as a "rowboat fighting an aircraft carrier." (Forman, 2001, p. 5). The merge, in addition to new Title IX legislation created tremors in the institutional framework. Formal and informal rules had to change in reaction to the legislative, judicial, and regulatory changes.

### **Gender Equity in Modern Collegiate Athletics**

Since Title IX's passage in 1972, the formal and informal rules related to gender equity have changed numerous times, yet men's and women's athletics programs cannot yet be considered equal to each other. With many formal rules set in place to promote gender equity, it is the enforcement of formal rules and informal constraints that preserve a difference in participation, opportunity, and treatment between genders. Despite significant improvements in those areas, inequity persists.

In 2014, Acosta and Carpenter reported that opportunities for women's participation in intercollegiate athletics is the highest it has ever been (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). In that year, there were 9,581 women's collegiate teams, an increase of 307 teams since 2012. Schools supported an average of 8.83 women's teams per school (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014).

At the same time women's participation in collegiate programs has increased, women's leadership roles have decreased since the 1970s. While many connect this phenomenon to the passage of Title IX, it is a post hoc fallacy. A drop in women leadership resulted from the NCAA takeover of women's athletics programs. Before the merge of men's and women's athletics programs under the governance of the NCAA, women's programs were largely regulated by women educators and administrators. In 1972, nine out of ten coaches for women's teams were female. In 2014, only four out of ten coaches for women's teams are female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Similarly, 90 percent of women's programs had female administrators in 1972, while only 17.8 percent of athletic programs had a female head administrator in 2000 (Forman, 2001, p. 2). In 2014, one out of five athletics directors was female (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Although women's athletics experienced a significant drop in female



leadership since the 1970s, there have been incremental increases in women head coaches, assistant coaches, and athletic directors since 2012 (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014).

Acosta and Carpenter's longitudinal, national study of women in intercollegiate sport has tracked women's participation and changing opportunities since 1977 (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Their most recent report showed that the number of women participants and women's teams was the highest ever (Acosta & Carpenter, 2014). Despite growing numbers in participation and opportunity, the data does not compare values to men's athletics programs. Therefore the data gives no indication to the level of gender equity in collegiate athletics.

The numbers show increases in women's participation and opportunities, but Forman warns, "While the popular media lauds the gains made by women athletes in the post-Title IX era, this rosy portrayal neglects the vast discrepancies that remain between women's and men's athletics programs." (Forman, 2001, p. 2) Anderson, Cheslock, and Ehrenberg investigated gender equity in intercollegiate athletics by evaluating change in the proportion between men's and women's participation between the 1995-1996 school year to the 2001-2002 school year (Anderson, et al., 2006).

Assessing schools based on the substantial proportionality measurement, one of Title IX's tests of proportionality, the study found that "improvements in gender equity are smaller than previously thought." (Anderson, et al., 2006, p. 245) Based on their regression analyses found that 82-89 percent of schools in 2001-2002 were considered non-compliant based on the substantial proportionality test. The average gap between school's proportions of participants was 13 percent (Anderson, et al., 2006, p. 245). It was a slight improvement from the 1995-1996 school year, when between 90-93 percent of schools were considered non-compliant under the substantial proportionality test (Anderson, et al., 2006, p. 245). Their research found that

compliance varied regionally and between divisions. Division I schools, especially those in the Bowl Coalition Series (BCS), showed greater progress in gender equity than Division II and III schools (Anderson, et al., 2006, p. 226).

Although women's participation and opportunity has increased dramatically since the 1970s, a difference remains between men's and women's programs and how society views men and women athletes. Later, an overview of women's participation and opportunities at Penn State will provide comparison to the larger scope of gender equity in collegiate athletics.

### **Institutional Change Analysis**

Collegiate athletics is an organization comprised of student-athletes, coaches, and administrators. The organization originated within the constraints of the 1800s when men's intercollegiate competition commenced. The organization broadened its membership when women's programs became an official part of intercollegiate athletics, when schools recognized them varsity sports throughout the 1960s and 1970s. Formal and informal rules adjusted to include a greater number of women in collegiate athletics and improve gender equity. Title IX was the first major formal rule change to advocate for gender equity in collegiate programs. The legislation set a hallmark for equal participation, opportunities, and treatment between genders, but social norms and perceptions were slower to change. Considering the historical influences of formal and informal rules that defined gender in American society, this institutional change analysis considers the institutional change after 1970—the time when women's sports were formally recognized by their colleges.

“The notion that girls as a whole are weaker and thus more injury-prone if they compete with boys, especially in contact sports, cannot justify the By-Law in light of the ERA. Nor can we consider the argument that boys are generally more skilled. The existence of certain characteristics to a greater degree in one sex does not justify classification by sex rather than by the particular characteristic...If any individual girl is too weak, injury-prone, or unskilled, she may, of course, be excluded from competition on that basis, but she cannot be excluded solely because of her sex without regard to her relevant qualifications.” (“Commonwealth of PA v. PIAA,” 1974, p. 5)

Disregarding the judicial jargon, the word choice in this court ruling is indicative of the social view of women in sport around the time it was issued in 1973. As Schmid states, “Sharing a language facilitates the understanding of relative opportunities. The meaning we attach to words is vital.” (Schmid, 2004, p. 7) The ruling uses the language “weaker and more injury-prone” to describe girls. The ruling may advocate fair treatment, but the language is diminishing to women.

North describes informal rule change—the changing of social norms and conventions—as “overwhelmingly incremental.” (North, 1993, p. 89) The court ruling displays the tension between the formal rule change elicited by Title IX and the lagging social norms and perceptions. Even though formal rule changes in the 1970s established rules to promote gender equity, social perceptions have not recognized women athletes and women’s programs as equal to men’s. Perceptions are slowly moving from those expressed by the 1973 court ruling, to a genuine acceptance that women deserve an equal place in collegiate athletics.

North describes the role of external environments and entrepreneurs on changing the existing institutions. The external environment may influence transaction costs, while the

entrepreneur interprets opportunities to take advantage of changing transaction costs (North, 1993, p. 5). The external environment in the 1960s and 1970s changed transaction costs that provided an opportunity for women to challenge and change the existing institutions.

Entrepreneurs (women's rights advocates) see the opportunity to alter the relative price structure, and take initiative to change institutions to do so (North, 1993, p. 5).

Similar to the social movements occurring in the late 1800s, groups were unsatisfied with the existing power dynamics established by the institutions. They challenged those institutions and elicited formal and informal rule changes. Schmid explains, "New institutions arise when groups in society perceive a possibility of availing themselves of profits that cannot be realized under prevailing institutional conditions. If external factors permit an increase in income, but is prevented by institutional factors, then new institutional arrangements are likely to develop." (Schmid, 2004, p. 258) Women's increasing dissatisfaction within the institution, and the influence of an external environment experiencing strong challenges to other constraints in American society (e.g. the Civil Rights Movement), changed the perceived transaction costs of inciting institutional change.

Although the creation of new formal rules, such as Title IX, responded quickly to the women's rights movement, the legislation underwent various amendments and interpretation changes to alleviate the conflict between the new formal rules and the slower changing informal constraints. North explains, "Inconsistency between the formal rules and the informal constraints results in tensions which typically get resolved by some restructuring of the overall constraints—in both directions—to produce a new equilibrium." (North, 1993, p. 9)

Collegiate athletics is still in a period of oscillation between adjusting formal and informal rules in order to attain a new equilibrium. The level of gender equity has improved in

collegiate athletics, but social norms and perceptions (informal rules) have not yet fully embraced women's athletics as equal to men's. The current language, social norms, and social conventions fail to recognize women's and athletes as prestigiously as men's. It is a change in thinking that can only happen incrementally over time. American society may not be there yet, but there has already been significant process, and with increasing participation and promotion of women's athletics, social perceptions will continue to change. After all, in 1873 it was believed that "the results of female education are monstrous brains and puny bodies; abnormally weak digestion; flowing thought and constipated bowels." (Hult, 1994). Today, we know women's higher education does not cause digestion issues, but we hold onto beliefs that influence perceptions of women's athletic capabilities.

With these national trends in mind, I investigated how gender equity in Penn State athletics currently exists and how it has been influenced by institutional change. I examined how the formal rules, informal constraints, and the characteristic of those rules' enforcement has affected gender equity at Penn State.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Methodology**

Penn State is used as a case study to examine gender equity in collegiate athletics. A combination of archival research, existing data research, and key informant interviews was used to triangulate how gender equity exists within Penn State athletics. The combination of research methods helps determine the state of gender equity from different angles and how it has been influenced by historical and current formal and informal rules. The secondary data describes gender equity as it exists in Penn State athletics based on Title IX requirements, while the key informant interviews help distinguish how it is perceived by current female Penn State student-athletes.

### **Research Questions**

The central focus of this thesis is to determine the real and perceived level of gender equity in Penn State athletics. The objectives of this research include determining gender equity in Penn State athletics based on number of participants, amount of athletic financial assistance, and comparative treatment; and how gender equity is perceived by current Penn State female student-athletes. Additionally, this research seeks to uncover the current barriers and opportunities to improving gender equity in Penn State athletics, and how past and current formal and informal rules affect gender equity in Penn State athletics.

## **Triangulation**

Triangulation is a method of combining multiple perspectives or methods to a single object or area of study to improve the accuracy of observation (Neuman, 2011, p. 164). I used the triangulation of methods to assess gender equity at Penn State, combining secondary data, archival research, and key informant interviews. The combination of study methods provides “richer and more comprehensive” results (Neuman, 2011, p. 65).

### **Penn State as a Case Study**

Case study research allows an intensive review of a single subject (Neuman, 2011, p. 42). Case studies provide substantial detail, allowing for the application of abstract ideas. In my research I used Penn State as a case study to investigate gender equity in collegiate athletics. I was able to explore the statistical as well as historical data about Penn State athletics, and apply theories of institutional change analysis. The data from Penn State was used to compare to the changing institutions affecting gender equity in national collegiate athletics.

Archival research, existing statistics research, and key informant interviews were used to uncover real and perceived levels of gender equity in Penn State’s athletics program. All three methods were used to study past and recent institutional change that affected gender equity in Penn State athletics. Archival data was acquired from the Penn State University archives, existing statistical data was acquired from the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis tool, and key informant interviews were carried out with Penn State women student-athletes.

A drawback to case study research is that its specificity limits its generalizability. Results from this research cannot be applied to other collegiate athletics programs. It can be used for comparison with other organizations, but results cannot be applied to other cases.

### **Archival Research**

Archival research gathers existing evidence and facts on historical data to address the research question. Archives are a source for primary historical materials, including letters, speeches, meeting records, and articles (Neuman, 2011, p. 479). I used archival research to gather information about the national history of collegiate athletics, gender equity in athletics, women in sports, the NCAA, and formal rule changes, along with the history of Penn State's athletics program and women athletes.

I used a combination of textbooks, journal articles, press releases, and news articles to gather information on collegiate athletics, and the Penn State Library archives for information on the history of Penn State athletics and women's participation. The drawback to archival research is its reliance on secondary data. Secondary data does not always provide direct answers to the research questions and research objectives. Although primary source documents provide helpful supportive evidence, it may not directly address the research question. Therefore, it was necessary to combine the archival research with other research methods.



### **Existing Statistics Research**

Existing statistics research gathers existing statistical data and analyzes it to address the research question (Neuman, 2011, p. 49). I used the most recent data provided by the Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Tool. The Data Analysis Tool provides a collection of data submitted by athletics programs at all federally funded colleges and universities. The data reports a program's number of participants by men's and women's teams, team expenses, and team revenues. The Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act requires collegiate athletics programs to submit data annually. Data submitted for the 2013-2014 school year was used to investigate gender equity in Penn State athletics. Similar to archival research, existing statistics research is limited by the resources available. Data that answers the research question may not exist or may not be accessible.

### **Key Informant Interviews**

Key informant interviews survey specific members of a community or organization, asking about their experiences within their community or organization (The Access Project, 1999 p. 2). Key informant interviews provide detailed information about members' experiences. A conversational interview model was used to gather information from respondents.

Conversational interviewing allows flexibility for the interviewer to collaborate with respondents to improve their understanding of the intent of the questions asked (Neuman, 2011, p. 341). The interview protocol was led by a specific set of questions, with an opportunity to use probing questions to seek clarification on certain responses. The interviewing method allows

respondents to properly interpret the interview questions and share their experiences. This method also poses a risk that the interviewer effect may distort or bias key informants' responses (Neuman, 2011, p. 342). Another limitation to key informant interviews is that responses provide information specific to the key informants. Just as a case study cannot be generalized to other subjects, answers gathered from key informants cannot be generalized to other members of the community or organization.

A pool of eight key informants and four alternative candidates were specifically selected to participate in the interviews. Potential participants were selected based on their team membership, years in school, and playing and leadership experience. I sought to provide a diverse group of key informants with variation in these characteristics. Student-athlete email addresses were gathered from the Penn State Directory. The eight potential key informants were sent emails on March 2nd requesting participation in a key informant interview. The email provided a summary explanation of the research. If selected participants consented to participation, a mutually convenient time and place was established to conduct a face to face interview. If the selected key informants did not respond to the initial email within three days, a follow-up email was sent. If there remained no response to the follow-up email after two days, an initial email was sent to one of the alternative candidates.

Three of the eight originally selected candidates agreed to participate in the key informant interview. Four did not respond to email requests, and one deferred participation due to time constraints and team obligations. All four alternative candidates were sent email requests for participation in the key informant interviews. Two consented to participation, while one never responded to the emails, and one deferred because of travel plans. Therefore, a total of five women student-athletes participated in the key informant interviews.

The five student-athletes were selected from a pool of 361 Penn State women student-athletes. The five key informants were members of the women’s golf, gymnastics, lacrosse, soccer, and softball teams. Women’s golf, gymnastics, lacrosse, and softball programs were part of the nine original sports to become recognized varsity programs in 1964. Soccer was added in 1994 (“History,” 2014). Women’s golf and gymnastics are considered small-roster sports with less than twenty student-athletes on the roster, while women’s lacrosse, soccer, and softball are all considered large-roster athletic programs.

**Table 1: Team Sizes of Key Informants**

<i>Team</i>	<i>Number of Participants</i>
Women’s Golf	11
Women’s Gymnastics	16
Women’s Lacrosse	31
Women’s Soccer	31
Softball	21

Women’s golf is an individual sport with a relatively small number of participants on the team’s roster. The athletic department reported eleven participants on the women’s golf team for the 2013-2014 academic school year, and the team has eleven participants on its online roster as of April 2015 (“Women’s Golf”, 2015). The women’s golf team competes both during the fall and spring. The men’s golf team is the male equivalent to their program.

The women’s gymnastics team is another individual sport that competes at Penn State, with sixteen women reported on its roster during the 2013-2014 season, and eleven participants currently included on their online team roster (“Women’s Gymnastics,” 2015). Women's

gymnastics is a winter season sport, spanning the months of December through April. The men's gymnastics program is the male equivalent to women's gymnastics.

Women's lacrosse is a team sport, reporting thirty-three participants for the 2013-2014 season. There continues to be thirty-three participants listed on their roster as of April 2015 ("Women's Lacrosse," 2015"). It is a spring sport, with competition starting in February and ending in late April or early May. The men's lacrosse team is the male equivalent to their program.

Women's soccer is a team sport, with thirty-one participants listed for the 2013-2014 season. As of April 2015, there is twenty-four players listed on the roster ("Women's Soccer," 2015). Women's soccer is a fall sport, competition spanning August through November. They have a male equivalent in the men's soccer program.

Softball is the third team sport, with twenty-one participants recorded for the 2013-2014 season. The program lists twenty-two women on its roster ("Softball," 2015). Softball is a spring sport, starting in February and ending in May. The baseball program is considered the male equivalent to softball.

The five key informants represented a mix of different years in school and different levels of playing and leadership experience. Out of the five key informants, three were sophomores and two were seniors. Two student-athletes considered themselves starters and said they played significant amounts of time in athletic competitions. One player considered herself a non-starter, playing an estimated 20 to 25 percent of her team's competitive games, another considered herself a non-starter, with minimal playing time. And the fifth key informant was ineligible for competition due to injury. All attended Penn State since their freshman year.

The key informant interviews were conducted between March 5th and March 20th, 2015, each lasting approximately thirty minutes. Upon meeting the key informants, I introduced myself and explained the purpose of the interview and my research. I provided each participant with a hard copy of the summary explanation of the research and asked for their verbal consent to participate in the key informant interview with permission for the interview to be audio recorded. After giving consent, the key informants were given the opportunity to ask any questions before the start of the interview. Once all questions were answered to the satisfaction of the key informants, the audio device was started and the interview officially began.

Key informants were asked a broad set of questions to explore their personal experience with athletics, specifically at Penn State. The full interview protocol is provided in the appendix. There were prescribed questions for the interview, with flexibility to ask probing questions if a response required further explanation or clarification. The purpose of the interviews was to gather information on the key informants' experiences as a student-athlete and how they perceived gender equity in Penn State athletics and society. Each key informant participated in a sport with a direct male equivalent, therefore the scope of the questions regarding gender equity began between comparisons of their sport and men sport equivalent. The scope of the questions then broadened to Penn State athletics in general. Lastly, key informants were asked about their experiences with gender equity as a woman student-athlete in American society. The interviews were transcribed and the responses analyzed. The audio recordings and files linking participant responses to their identity was destroyed after transcription of the interviews to maintain confidentiality.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Results and Analysis**

#### **Archival Research**

The archival research provided information about the history of Penn States athletics and the university's women's athletics program. The research mapped out the formal and informal rule changes that occurred throughout the program's history. The results provide insight into the influence of institutional change on gender equity in Penn State athletics.

Penn State athletics programs followed a similar path to national men's and women's collegiate programs, but with a unique emphasis on promoting broad-based sports programming and women's athletic programs. Several prominent advocates for promoting women's athletics came from Penn State, including such leaders as Martha Adams, Della Durant, Lu Magnusson, and Ellen Perry. Women leaders at Penn State were instrumental to establishing and growing women's athletics programs at Penn State and more generally, women's collegiate programs in the United States. Penn State's athletics program began similarly to the nation's first collegiate programs, with athletic opportunities available only to men. The historical disadvantage created stark inequalities that women athletes and program leaders had to overcome when establishing varsity programs in the 1960s.

Penn State had its first intercollegiate competition in 1875, in a baseball game against a team from the neighboring town, Milesburg (Nelson, n.d.). The first intercollegiate football game was played in 1881. Baseball and football were the foundations. Penn State formed an

official athletic association in 1887 (Nelson, n.d.). Participation and popularity of Penn State athletics grew rapidly throughout the late 1800s. A small football stadium was built in 1892 to accommodate the increasing number of football spectators. In 1897, the athletic association added basketball to its program, and two years later, the school started a track and field program (Nelson, n.d.) From 1909 to 1919, Penn State added men's cross country, lacrosse, soccer, tennis, boxing, and wrestling teams (Nelson, n.d.). The 1920s and 1930s brought the addition of men's golf, fencing, and swimming. In 1960, Beaver Stadium was built to replace the Old Beaver Field for football competition to accommodate 46,264 spectators (Student Handbook Committee, 2013, p. 25).

Like most women's programs, Penn State's women's athletics evolved from its physical education program. In the late 1950s, Penn State offered health education classes and intramural and club sports. Women could participate in "Play Days," which invited friendly competition against other schools. At Play Days, women were mixed in with athletes from other schools and competed against one another (Hult, 1994, p. 89). Penn State collaborated with Juniata College, Lycoming College, Lock Haven University, and Bucknell University. Eventually, Play Days evolved into "Sports Days," which allowed players to represent their own schools in competition (Durant, 1980, p. 2).

Della Durant, the first coordinator for Penn State women's programs, described the evolution from intramural play to intercollegiate competition,

"The skilled performers were no longer satisfied with internal scrimmages or an occasional Sports Day with one of the nearby colleges. They wanted a coached team and scheduled contests. WRA (Women's Recreation Association) financed this program as much as it could. Our WRA club advisers became 'instant

coaches' and in 1963 we began unofficial dual meet competition.” (Durant, 1980, p. 2)

In 1964, Penn State officially recognized women's varsity intercollegiate sports. There were nine teams in the first year, including basketball, fencing, field hockey, golf, gymnastics, lacrosse, riflery, softball, and tennis (Nelson, n.d.). In 1967, bowling was added to the program, along with swimming and diving in 1969 (Nelson, n.d.). Della Durant shared the challenges in the women's effort to start a swimming and diving program saying,

“In our approach Ellen and I decided they'd be concerned about the added costs so we decided to play down the money angle. We wrote a lofty epistle that concluded that no equipment would be necessary and that it would not be necessary to order special suits.” (Durant, 1980, p. 6)

Perry and Durant were granted their swimming and diving program, with an additional comment, “the dean hoped that we would reconsider and allow our young women to wear suits.” (Durant, 1980, p. 6)

A women's track and field program was added in 1974, and volleyball joined the athletics program in 1976 (Nelson, n.d.). The program thrived due to its strong and tireless leaders and support from the administration. Martha Adams, Ellen Perry and Della Durant fought hard in the formative years to ensure the program's future growth and development. Support from Penn State administration was also essential to its success. Collaboration between men and women faculty and administration was unique to the University as Lu Magnusson observed when she first arrived at Penn State,

“Penn State was very far ahead of the Midwestern universities in one important regard: There was a good bit of interaction between the men and women's



department...That was, generally speaking, not true at many other schools. At Penn State, the male faculty and the female faculty would help each other have meaningful communication. It was truly unusual for that time.” (Sonenklar, 2006, p. 128)

Della Durant described the respectable and revolutionary culture at Penn State, which supported the growth and development of women’s athletics,

“From the inception of our women’s athletic program and long before Title IX, there was a positive commitment on the part of the University to our program for women. From the beginning there was equality of operation, and an equality of programs according to need and demand. The steps of equality were reached as the women’s programs grew. As inequalities between the men’s and women’s programs by students, coaches and administrators, positive steps were taken to rectify the differences.” (Durant, 1979, p. 6)

The women’s program experienced significant success throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the women’s teams combining for thirteen national team championships and ten national individual championships (“History,” 2014). In 1990, Penn State joined the Big Ten Conference, fielding a total of 29 sports. Men’s and women’s ice hockey joined the athletics program in 2012, increasing the total sports to thirty-one. The University houses athletic facilities to accommodate all thirty-one sports, along with facilities for academic and athletic support services. As of 2015, Penn State had over 800 student-athletes within its thirty-one sports, making it one of the largest athletic programs in the country (Nelson, n.d.).

The archival research reveals that Penn State athletics began similarly to other collegiate programs. Men’s teams were the first to be recognized and to begin intercollegiate competition.

Women's programs started at a disadvantage. To put into perspective, men's intercollegiate competition began just four years after the first women were admitted to Penn State (Sonklar, 2006). Women's varsity sports were officially begun four years after Beaver Stadium was constructed for the football team (Student Handbook Committee, 2013, p. 25). The women's program was formed within the informal constraints that boasted men's athletics and discouraged women's pursuit of athletic competition. Penn State departed from the trajectory of most collegiate programs due to its prominent woman leaders and supportive faculty and administration. Penn State had stronger advocates for women's programs than most schools, which effectively changed the formal and informal rules effecting gender equity at Penn State.

### **Existing Statistics Research**

Penn State athletics submits annual data on student-athlete participation, athletic funding, program expenses, and program revenues as mandated by the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act ("Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act," 2014). The data is used to assess the level of gender equity in Penn State athletics as is defined by Title IX's three-prong test, which measures participation, athletic financial assistance, and treatment ("Standard Language," 2011).

The table below shows the breakdown of participants among men's and women's teams. Under Title IX regulation, athletes who compete in more than one sport are double- or triple-counted when calculating total participants, and male practice players for women's teams are counted as participants for women's sports.

**Table 2: Penn State Athletics Teams and Number of Participants**

<i>Men's Teams</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Women's Teams</i>	<i>Participants</i>
Baseball	36		
Basketball	14	Basketball	32
Fencing	24	Fencing	39
		Field Hockey	23
Football	111		
Golf	9	Golf	11
Gymnastics	22	Gymnastics	16
Ice Hockey	27	Ice Hockey	28
Lacrosse	48	Lacrosse	33
Soccer	27	Soccer	31
		Softball	21
Swimming & Diving	39	Swimming & Diving	42
Tennis	14	Tennis	13
All Track Combined (includes Cross Country)	95	All Track Combined (includes Cross Country)	120
Volleyball	16	Volleyball	20
Wrestling	35		
<b>TOTAL</b>	517		429
<b>Unduplicated # of Participants</b>	476		361

Penn State measures gender equity in participation using the proportionality test. Proportionality requires that the ratio of male to female full-time undergraduate student is equal to the ratio of male to female student-athletes (“Standard Language,” 2011). Data from the 2013-2014 school year reported Penn State had a total 38,543 full-time undergraduate students, 20,614 men—53.4 percent of the population; and 17,929 women—46.6 percent of the undergraduate population (“Pennsylvania State University—Main Campus” [“Penn State”], 2014). Within its thirty-one sports, Penn State had a total of 837 student-athletes, consisting of 476 men and 361 women. Male student-athletes represented 56.9 percent of the student-athlete

population, while female student-athletes represented 43.1 of the student-athlete population. Proportionally, male student-athletes represented 2.31 percent of male full-time undergraduate students, while female student-athletes represented 2.01 percent of female full-time undergraduate students (“Penn State,” 2014). The proportions are nearly equal, suggesting that Penn State passes the proportionality test for equity in participation.

The second prong of Title IX compliance assesses the equality of athletic financial assistance to men and women student-athletes. Universities must provide athletic scholarships in proportion to its number of men and women student-athletes (“Standard Language”, 2011). In the 2013-2014 year, Penn State provided a total of \$14,679,249 in athletically-related student aid. Fifty-six percent (\$8,259,475) was designated to men’s teams, and 44 percent (\$6,419,774) was provided to women’s teams (“Penn State,” 2014). This allotment was nearly in exact proportion to the number of male and female student-athletes in relation to the total population of student-athletes. Men represented 56.8 percent of total student-athletes, while women represented 43.1 percent of all Penn State student-athletes. This suggests that Penn State is considered compliant under the second prong of Title IX requirements.

The final prong of Title IX assesses treatment between genders. The requirement does not stipulate that men’s and women’s sports must receive the exact same services and treatment, but that they are treated comparably equal to one another. The prong considers eleven different criteria (“Standard Language”, 2011). Compliance is assessed by comparing Penn State men’s and women’s teams’ operating expenses, recruiting expenses, and total expenses.

The table below shows team’s operating, or game-day, expenses for 2013-2014. Penn State spent a total of \$14,012,327 in operating expenses. Men’s teams accounted for 73.5

percent of the total spending, at \$10,310,797. Football accounted for the largest sum with \$6,123,518. Women accounted for 26.5 percent of the total operating expenses with \$2,701,530 (“Penn State,” 2014).

**Table 3: 2013-2014 Penn State Operating Expenses by Team**

<b>Men’s Teams</b>		<b>Women’s Teams</b>	
<b>Team</b>	<i>Operating Expenses</i>	<i>Operating Expenses</i>	<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>
Basketball	\$1,176,917	\$1,075,407	\$2,252,324
Football	\$6,123,518		\$6,123,518
Baseball	\$340,946		\$340,946
All Track Combined	\$315,187	\$311,507	\$626,694
Fencing	\$57,396	\$56,592	\$113,988
Field Hockey		\$136,045	\$136,045
Golf	\$60,420	\$112,963	\$173,383
Gymnastics	\$116,761	\$148,088	\$264,849
Ice Hockey	\$849,559	\$332,023	\$1,181,582
Lacrosse	\$148,126	\$153,686	\$301,812
Soccer	\$160,702	\$216,396	\$377,098
Softball		\$267,861	\$267,861
Swimming & Diving	\$151,876	\$194,502	\$265,896
Tennis	\$159,715	\$106,181	\$265,896
Volleyball	\$188,658	\$590,279	\$778,937
Wrestling	\$461,016		\$461,016
<b>Total Operating Expenses</b>	<b>\$10,310,797</b>	<b>\$3,701,530</b>	<b>\$14,012,327</b>

Penn State spent a total of \$2,398,794 on its recruitment of student-athletes. Men’s teams accounted for 82 percent (\$1,972,696) of that total, and women’s teams spent 18 percent (\$426,098) of that total (“Penn State,” 2014).

For the 2013-2014 academic year, Penn State athletics’ expenses equaled \$108,772,934 (“Penn State,” 2014). Men’s teams accounted for 50 percent (\$51,543,758) of the total expenses, 61 percent of which was devoted solely to football (“Penn State,” 2014). Women’s teams

accounted for 17 percent (\$18,875,703) of total expenses, and 35.2 percent went to expenses not allocated by gender or sport (“Penn State,” 2014). Reports on expenses suggest some unfair treatment between men’s and women’s programs, but the difference may be in the differing costs of sporting equipment and number of participants. Title IX does not consider equity in treatment solely based on program expenditures; it considers the fulfillment of student-athletes’ needs and the equity in resources and services provided to men and women. Therefore, Penn State may still be considered compliant under the treatment prong of Title IX.

**Table 4: 2013-2014 Total Expenses by Team**

<b>Team</b>	<b>Men’s</b>	<b>Women's</b>	<b>Total Expenses By Team</b>
Football	\$31,488,036		\$31,488,036
Basketball	\$5,533,367	\$4,324,201	\$9,857,568
Total Expenses of all Sports, Except Football and Basketball	\$14,522,355	\$14,551,502	\$29,073,857
Total Expenses Men’s and Women’s Teams	\$51,543,758	\$18,875,703	\$70,419,461
Expenses not Allocated by Gender/Sport			\$38,353,473
<b>Grand Total Expenses</b>			\$108,772,934

The results from the existing data research suggest that Penn State is compliant with Title IX and promotes gender equity within its athletics programs. When considering Anderson, et al.’s study that found 82-89 percent of schools non-compliant with Title IX, Penn State is faring well in regard to gender equity (Anderson, et al., 2006).

### **Key Informant Interviews**

Gender equity can be measured by the numbers, but numbers do not always reveal the true level of gender equity. In an article released by the New York Times in 2011, Katie Thomas revealed schools' deceptive tactics to skew participation data in order to maintain Title IX compliance. It's not to infer that Penn State uses deception to maintain its Title IX compliance, but the article emphasizes the importance of considering gender equity from different angles. The purpose of the key informant interviews was to uncover the perceptions of Penn State women student-athletes on gender equity, and determine if their perceptions aligned with the results from the statistical data.

### **Team to Team Comparison**

The women's golf, gymnastics, lacrosse, soccer, and softball programs all have men's program equivalents, with baseball as a relative comparison to softball. With the exception of the softball and baseball programs, the other four sports represented in the key informant interviews played on the same practice and game day facilities as their men counterparts. All five student-athletes perceived equal treatment between their team and the men's teams. The key informant from women's lacrosse stated,

“We train in the same places, we have the same field, we have access to the same athletic trainer, strength and conditioning coaches, so I don't really think there's much of a difference between men's and women's lacrosse. I don't know if that's

different across the board, but from men's and women's lacrosse, I really don't see much of a difference."

The representative from women's soccer noted, "I think equipment-wise, facility-wise, we play on the same field, we play on the same practice fields, so we're treated the same way in that regard." The key informant from the women's golf team shared, "there hasn't really been many differences," both programs are provided with good coaches and "really great" facilities. The direct comparison between the participants' programs and their comparable men's programs yielded no significant differences in the perceptions of treatment, although key informants from women's soccer and gymnastics recognized the disparity between the numbers of scholarships in their own programs compared to the men's programs.

The NCAA enforces a limit to scholarships awarded per team in order to ensure equity between men's and women's athletics programs (NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs Staff [NCAA], 2014). For example, women's golf is allowed six athletic financial aid awards, while men's golf is only allowed 4.5. Women's gymnastics can award twelve financial aid awards, but the men's team can only provide 6.3. Women's soccer is allowed to grant 14 athletic scholarships, and men's soccer can award 9.9 (NCAA, 2014).

One student-athlete noted, "I think a lot of male sports have to split scholarships opposed to women." In the comparison between soccer programs, the women's player recognized,

"I know that the men's soccer team, I think they only have nine or eleven scholarship student-athletes. I can't remember what the exact number is, and we have fourteen. So even with that I think sometimes we have a leg up with our scholarships. Because I know we have more scholarships than the men's team



does, so maybe that would create a little inequity with them in that there's only nine of them that can get scholarships, but there's more of us that can."

The differences in scholarship limits between men's and women's sports, such as golf, gymnastics, and soccer are necessary to offset the difference in scholarships due to football programs, which allot 85 athletic scholarships per program. Although the scholarship limits create inequity between comparable programs, it provides equity overall between the number of men and women participants. Overall, the key informants did not acknowledge any overt gender inequity when comparing their own programs to their male counterparts.

### **Gender Equity in Penn State Athletics**

The participants were asked to explain how they perceived gender equity in Penn State athletics as a whole—comparing the men's program to the women's program. All five participants responded that they perceived equal treatment and opportunity when comparing the men's and women's programs. Three of the five specifically noted a difference manifested in the treatment and popularity of the football program. One student-athlete said, "I think overall Penn State has a great atmosphere, but I mean you're going to have the inequality with football because they're football...we're a heavily 'football' school." When asked about equity between men's and women's programs, another key informant shared,

"I think the biggest one would definitely be football, but I think sometimes when we do look at the differences they have, we do justify it because they bring in so much revenue and it's hard for us as a non-revenue-producing sport. It's hard to think that we should get as nice facilities or the training table they do or access to

training facilities like Holuba, or things like that. I think it is kind of hard to justify why we should receive the same things as them because we don't bring in the same things as them."

The third participant who shared the same revelation noted, "I think especially towards the money-making sports, like football and basketball, I feel like there's a lot of emphasis and recognition towards those teams, and those sports, which is fine because they're usually what people think of Penn State. They think of the football team." The same student-athlete recognized the disparity in media coverage of team success. She referred to the women's basketball team and track and field team winning Big Ten Championships, but not receiving much recognition "because they're not the big sports. They're not those money-making sports that have a large following or that fan base."

The three respondents who recognized a specific difference between treatment of the football program and women's programs were asked a probing question to elaborate on what they thought caused that inequity. One student-athlete responded, "I think it has to do with a national perception," while the other two said it was related to how society values football, which suggests influence from an informal constraint existing in the larger society rather than at Penn State.

The two student-athletes who did not reference football when considering gender equity in Penn State athletics had positive perceptions of treatment between genders. One student-athlete said, "From what I've seen and have been a part of I think we're pretty equal...I haven't had like a negative experience." The second student-athlete responded similarly, saying, "I think for the most part it's pretty fair...I mean I haven't personally noticed differences in sports and stuff." When specifically asked if she perceived any opportunities or barriers to address gender

equity in Penn State athletics, she reiterated, “I mean, I think we’re pretty fair. I don’t think there’s anything that can be improved, because I don’t see anything that leans one way more than the other.”

The key informants talked about how they personally perceived their treatment as student-athletes, how the department and administration value women’s programs, and their access to services, facilities, and equipment. Referring to the athletic administration, one student-athlete said, “Especially at Penn State, I think they’re very good about focusing on both men and women’s sports.” Another student-athlete observed,

“I think overall at Penn State I never felt inferior to men’s program, specifically...I was trying to think if I’ve seen anything with gender equity that I thought was alarming, and I didn’t. And I think that kind of speaks to Penn State...I don’t know, we just have this culture that men’s and women’s [programs] are relatively equal.”

When asked if they perceived any barriers to improving gender equity in Penn State athletics, none of the participants could recognize specific barriers. The same question was asked with different word choice in order to elicit a different way to perceive the question. Instead of asking if there were any barriers to improving gender equity, key informants were asked they perceived any opportunities to improving gender equity. Three of the key informants referenced the opportunity provided by the athletic department’s existing structure and the Penn State athletics culture to improve gender equity. One student-athlete said, “Our University has created so many avenues for those issues that I think that if gender equity is an issue, that we can open that conversation and that there could be a forum or there could be a task force that works

towards a plan to implement.” The same student-athlete mentioned a “free channel of communication with administration” that allows student-athletes to voice their concerns.

Three key informants referred specifically to Penn State’s Associate Athletics Director and Senior Woman Administrator, Charmelle Green, and the comfort they felt in going to her if ever they had issues regarding gender equity. Charmelle and Penn State’s current Director of Athletics, Sandy Barbour, are two examples of the woman leadership currently established in Penn State athletics. One key informant commented,

“I think it’s really neat that even within athletics there are a lot of women present in the coaching staffs and the administration. I think it helps to, not inspire, but let us know that they might know what we’re going through as female student-athletes, and know that they’re not just focused on the guys. They’re focused on us as well.”

### **Penn State Athletics Culture**

While the key informants shared their perceptions about gender equity in Penn State athletics, they described the unique culture that exists in Penn State athletics. The respondents elicited their respect for the school and substantiated their claims with personal experiences. According to the respondents, Penn State provides its student-athletes with high-quality resources to succeed in athletics and academics.

Two participants explained that part of the reason they chose to attend Penn State was because the school allowed them to pursue a specific undergraduate program. One mentioned, “Penn state was one of the first universities that I talked to that allowed me to major in premed and still play...a lot of schools wanted to pick my major or they gave me like five options of a

major to pick.” She continued on to say, “Penn State let me balance education and athletics.”

The second respondent also referred to taking an academic route that was discouraged by other athletic programs, but encouraged within Penn State.

In describing the culture of Penn State athletics, one respondent said, “There is a lot of appreciation for women’s sports and women’s athletes.” Another student-athlete noted, “Penn State offers our student-athletes so much that I don’t even think about gender equity when I’m here.” A third respondent mentioned, “I think just knowing that you have all of these people that are behind you and supporting you, especially with our athletic department, there’s so many resources that we have to really bring us to our full potential—academically, athletically, all across the board. It’s a huge thing here at Penn State.”

### **Impact of Sport**

The key informants shared how athletics directly impacted their lives. They said that some of their experiences had been challenging, but suggested those experiences contributed to personal development. They cited the development of such attributes as leadership, teamwork, work ethic, time management, discipline, focus, and mental toughness as results from athletic participation. The key informants also said athletics taught them how to manage difficult situations, manage people, and deal with adversity. One student-athlete summarized the impact of sport, by saying, “It builds values and it instills competition and it instills work ethic. It just has so much to offer.” Beyond personal development, the key informants also shared that athletics had provided them with an outlet for their competitiveness and the opportunity to form tight social bonds with teammates.

## **Athletics in Society**

Four of the five key informants made connected gender equity in collegiate athletics to women's role in American society. When questions about gender inequity were broadened to a larger scope beyond just Penn State athletics, participants referred to experiences with subtle discrimination as women in sport. All five key informants made reference to the women's historical role in American society. They connected social perceptions that existed in the past and that persist today effect how women are viewed in athletics. The key informants pointed out key differences in how women athletes are perceived compared to men athletes, and how men's sports are more popular than women's sports.

One respondent explained, "More people would want to watch men's football or men's basketball than would want to watch women's lacrosse." Another student-athlete shared, "I think especially towards the money-making sports, like football and basketball, I feel there's a lot of emphasis and recognition towards those teams and those sports." She went on to say, "it's hard to get that attention and get that following because society is more concentrated on the athleticism and talent of the men instead of the women." One respondent said,

"I think across the board, men's sports are more appreciated and revered. Men's athletes are more highly revered than women's athletes. I think a lot of times they're looked at as butch or too strong or anything like that, but if a man is strong or incredibly athletic then he's 'holier than thou.' But for a woman, a lot of times it's not the greatest thing."

All five key informants all spoke talked about the positive effects of sport on their own lives, yet they all referenced the effect of social norms that either limit girls' participation in athletics or diminish their self-esteem. One respondent spoke to the limits she experienced as a

young female athlete, fighting the perception her mother held that sports were too rough for girls. She suggested that current woman athletes should reach out to young girls “so girls aren’t so nervous to be sporty and be into athletics.” Another student-athlete said,

“I think it’s a societal belief dating back to when women didn’t have as many rights—just seeing the men as better and more powerful and just bigger...it’s kind of disappointing because women have made so many strides just within the past one hundred years, just getting the right to vote and being more involved with athletics. I think we should be recognized for what we’ve done and how far we’ve come...It’s something that will get better as women are given more opportunities in society and given more of a chance to advance themselves past where they are right now.”

Three of the five student-athletes recognized that current barriers for gender equity in collegiate athletics existed in the social perception of women’s gender role. One student-athlete recognized “it’s kind of a male-driven society where men kind of control the work place and that kind of thing. So I think it’s important for women, especially in college and in a school like Penn State—for us to show how it really is okay to be a powerful young woman.” Three key informants recognized a continuing, positive change for the role of women in society. They said:

“I think that finally times are changing and it’s catching up to us, so I think eventually in five to ten years it will be equal.”

“Historically, a woman’s place has been more in the home. It hasn’t really been to be an athlete or to be strong or to be bossy or to be a ‘go-getter’ or ‘bread-winner’ or anything like that, but I think moving forward, at least in the last ten to fifteen years, it’s been moving away from that.”

“As a society, I think we’re growing. You know women are getting closer to men in stuff like wages and their ability to do stuff because many times women are able to do the same stuff as men, but they’re seen as weaker or not as competent maybe because they are women. And that’s not fair when people could be more qualified for a certain position or they might be more athletically inclined than some male athletes...But I think as a society, it’s not something that will change overnight. I think it is something that will get better as women are given more opportunities in society and given more of a chance to advance themselves past where they are right now.”

To summarize, key informants did not perceive any gender inequity when comparing their own team to their male counterparts. At the broader scope, when generally comparing Penn State’s men’s and women’s programs, key informants perceived relative fairness in treatment, with some exception to the treatment of the football program. When asked to elaborate on perceived differences between the treatment of the football program and women’s programs, respondents linked their popularity and superior treatment to informal rules within society. Key informants expressed the greatest level of perceived inequity when comparing American society’s value of men’s athletics versus women’s athletics. Overall, results from the



key informant interviews suggest that Penn State's men's and women's athletics programs are relatively equitable.

### **Comparing Statistics to Perceptions**

Results from the existing statistics research suggest that Penn State is compliant with Title IX regulations. Responses gathered from the key informant interviews suggest the perceptions of women student-athletes aligned with the results from the existing statistics research. The multi-faceted approach to determining gender equity in Penn State athletics revealed that men's and women's athletics programs are relatively equitable. The results showed that men and women athletes are treated equitably, but that does not mean they are considered equal. The institutional change analysis and key informant interviews reveal that there remains disparity between the socially constructed value of men's and women's athletics.

Data from longitudinal study by Acosta and Carpenter (2014) and the research on Title IX compliance conducted by Anderson, et al. (2006) revealed gradual improvements in women athletes' participation, opportunities, and treatment over time, but again, the data does not infer women's athletics have reached an equal status to men's. Although gender inequity may not exist within Penn State athletics—at least not to a level of concern—women student-athletes still experience some form of gender inequity. The key informants recognized existing inequalities between the treatment and social perception of men athletes compared to women athletes in the broader scope of American society. The inequities are perpetuated by slow-changing informal

constraints. Social norms have yet to catch up with formal rules governing gender equity in athletics.

North explains, “Changes in informal constraints—norms, conventions, or personal standards of honesty, for example—occur gradually and sometimes quite subconsciously as individuals evolve alternative patterns of behavior consistent with their newly perceived evaluation of costs and benefits.” (North, 1993, p. 6) Dorothy Harris, Chairman of the DGWS Research Committee in 1971 described persisting informal constraints in her address to the 1971 DGWS National Conference on Girls’ and Women’s Sports Programs,

“As all of us know, the benefits and pleasures that are to be derived from experiences in sport and athletic competition should not be solely the prerogative of the male; women too, participate in and derive many benefits from sports. In general, programs for girls and women have been largely neglected due to a tenacious belief in outdated, old-fashioned taboos such as: ladies should not sweat, girls lose their femininity by participating in strenuous physical activity; vigorous competitive activities will cause girls to have menstrual difficulties or impair reproductive processes. We know these are old wives’ tales but still they hang on with little or no basis of fact in the eyes of many individuals in today’s society.”

Women are shaped and influenced by these social norms just as much as men. Although women’s acceptance of the socially constructed gender hierarchy seems self-deprecating, many women think and act within the informal constraints that label women as the inferior gender. Schmid describes this phenomenon in institutional economic theory, “Institutions, while contained in the minds of individuals, are real environmental entities that exist outside of any one

mind...The behavior of others is a feedback to a person's behavior and reinforces that behavior or extinguishes it." (Schmid, 2004, p. 8) Subscription to this institution passively accepts the inequality between men's and women's athletics.

The key informants' perceptions of gender equity in Penn State athletics aligned with the results from the existing statistics research, while their perceptions of how American society views women's athletics aligned with the results from the archival research and institutional change analysis. Equity may exist in Penn State athletics, but the effects of informal constraints dominating American society still pervade the Penn State athletic culture.

## **Chapter 5**

### **Implications**

The results from the existing statistics research and key informant interviews suggest that gender equity exists in Penn State athletics, but that slow-changing informal constraints have maintained inequities between men's and women's athletics. The results imply that efforts must continue to advocate for women's athletics in order foster change in social norms and perceptions. While Penn State is a positive display of gender equity in collegiate athletics, research shows that a significant number of NCAA schools remain non-compliant with Title IX regulations (Anderson, et al., 2006).

Title IX regulations must be more strictly enforced at these colleges and universities. More widely practiced adherence to the formal rules may accelerate the change in informal constraints within the society by increasing visibility of women's athletics. The case study of Penn State athletics provided a thorough assessment of the level of gender equity. A similar approach should be taken at other schools to thoroughly understand their level of gender equity and the impact of institutions on barriers and opportunities for improvement. Athletic programs must honestly evaluate their level of gender equity and implement change to improve its women's athletics programs.

If this research is to be replicated at other colleges or universities I would recommend performing key informant interviews in combination with a larger sample of student-athletes and to include men student-athletes in order to capture a broader range of student-athletes' perceptions of gender equity. Additionally, I would recommend distributing a survey to all

student-athletes, athletic administration, faculty, and staff to measure perceptions of gender equity. The data set would allow comparison between opinions across genders and roles within collegiate athletics. Results from the surveys can provide more poignant key informant interview questions that address questions raised by the survey data.

My recommendation for further research is to perform an impact analysis to examine how alternative formal and informal rules may affect gender equity in collegiate athletics (Schmid, 2004, p. 11). The analysis can be used to determine the next course of action for improving gender equity in collegiate athletics. The continued study of gender equity in collegiate athletics is important to its continued improvement. The state of gender equity must continue to be critically observed in order to inform athletics programs' actions and rule changes.

## **Chapter 6**

### **Conclusions**

My own experiences as a woman student-athlete inspired me to examine how gender equity exists within Penn State athletics. There are reports on gender equity based on data required by Title IX, but equity exists not just in the numbers. It exists in the perceptions of student-athletes and the institutions of society. I wanted to take a multi-faceted approach to examine how gender equity exists in Penn State athletics. Objectives of this research included (1) assessing gender equity based on the statistical data, (2) determining women student-athletes perceive gender equity, (3) determining the existing barriers and opportunities to improving gender equity in Penn State athletics, and (4) understanding the impact of institutional change on gender equity in Penn State athletics.

I used a variety of research methods to triangulate the state of gender equity in Penn State athletics. I combined archival research, existing statistics research, and key informant interviews to answer the research question and objectives. The existing statistics research found that Penn State athletics comply with gender equity standards set forth by Title IX. Responses from the key informant interviews found that the student-athletes perceived equity between the men's and women's programs, but that they perceived some inequity when considering the perceptions of American society. The institutional change analysis suggested that perceptions of inequity were derived from existing informal constraints.

The archival research provided data for the institutional change analysis. suggested that Penn State's varsity women's programs was founded in an environment unique from many other

colleges at the time. The university had a combination of strong women leaders, support from administration, and respectable interaction between men and female faculty. This allowed the women's program unprecedented success in developing and growing women's athletics at the University.

Research from Anderson, et al. (2006) suggests many schools remain non-compliant with Title IX. Title IX regulations must be more strictly enforced in these colleges and universities, while efforts continue to promote increased social value of gender equity in athletics. Schmid wisely says, "An institution contains an idea of critical mass. So even if one person wakes up in the morning with a different idea for behavior, unless a certain threshold of others join in that conception, the individual has little opportunity to accomplish a different result." (Schmid, 2004, p. 9) Gender equity in collegiate athletics is embedded in an evolving institution. It preserves elements of historical conventions that devalued women's athletics, yet as Dorothy Harris advocated, "experiences in sport and athletic competition should not be solely the prerogative of the male; women too, participate in and derive many benefits from sports." (Harris, 1971) We must continue to challenge the existing informal constraints and advocate for equity between men's and women's athletics programs.

**Appendix A**  
**Organization Acronyms**

<b>AIAW</b>	<b>Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women</b>
AAU	Amateur Athletic Union
CFA	College Football Association
CIAW	Commission for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women
CWA	Committee on Women's Athletics
DGWS	Division for Girls and Women's Sports
FBS	Football Bowl Subdivision
FCS	Football Championship Subdivision
IAA	Intercollegiate Athletic Association
NAGWS	National Association for Girls and Women in Sport
NCAA	National Collegiate Athletic Association
WRA	Women's Recreation Association



## Appendix B

### Key Informant Interview Protocol

1. Tell me about your involvement collegiate athletics.
2. How would you describe the impact sport has had on your life?
3. How do you perceive gender equity in Penn State athletics?
  - a. Compared to their male team counterpart
  - b. Penn State women's program compared to men's program
    - i. Do your perceptions change when comparing the women's program to the football program?
4. Why do you think those inequities exist?
5. What do you believe are the barriers for the improvement of gender equity in Penn State athletics?
6. What do you believe are the opportunities for gender equity to improve in Penn State athletics?
7. With which Penn State team do you participate (if not clearly answered during responses to other questions)
8. What year in school are you?
9. How would you describe your contribution to your team? (estimate playing time, leadership role, etc.)
10. Is there anything else you would like to add?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

“About Us.” NCAA.org. 2015. Web. 15 Mar 2015.

Acosta, R. Vivian & Carpenter, Linda Jean. “Women in Intercollegiate Sport: A Longitudinal, National Study Thirty-Seven Year Update.” *Smith College’s Project on Women and Social Change*. Brooklyn College of the City University of New York: 1977-2014. 3 Feb 2015. PDF.

Anderson, Deborah J., Cheslock, John Jesse, & Ehrenberg, Ronald G. “Gender Equity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Determinants of Title IX Compliance.” *The Journal of Higher Education*. Vol. 77. No. 2. p. 225-250. 2006 Article.

Associated Press. “Power 5 endorse benefits changes.” *ESPN College Football*. 1 Oct 2014. Web. 3 Oct 2014.

Bell, Richard C. “A History of Women in Sport Prior to Title IX.” *The Sport Journal*. 14 Mar 2008. Web. 12 Feb 2015.

Berkowitz, Steve. “NCAA increases value of scholarship in historic vote.” *USA TODAY Sports*. 17 Jan 2015. Web. 10 Feb 2015.

Berkowitz, Steve. “Judge releases ruling on O’Bannon case: NCAA loses.” *USA TODAY Sports*. 8 Aug 2014. Web. 3 Oct 2014.

Bloom, Howard. “Autonomy only serves the Power 5’s interests.” *Sporting News*. 7 Aug 2014. Web. 3 Feb 2015.

Burke, N. Peggy. “Intercollegiate Athletics: Education Activity or Big Business.” *EAPECW Fall Conference*. 26 Oct 1980. Penn State Archives.

- Champoux, Joseph E. *Organizational Behavior: Integrating Individuals, Groups, and Organizations*. New York: Routledge, 2011. Print.
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania v. PA Interscholastic Athletic Association. No. 1526 C. D. 1973. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. 2 Dec 1974. Penn State Archives.
- Durant, Della. "Defining the Gap." *EAPECW*. 1979. Speech. Penn State Archives.
- Durant, Della. "How Did We Get Where We Are." *Speech to Lady Lion Boosters*. 1980. Penn State Archives.
- Eder, Steve. "Fears Rise Over Wealth Gap as Top College Conferences Push Overhaul." *The New York Times*. 6 Aug 2014. Web. 3 Feb 2015.
- "Edward O'Bannon, Et. Al. v. NCAA, EA, Inc., Collegiate Licensing Company." *United States District Court for the Northern District of California*. 08 Aug. 2014. USA TODAY. USA TODAY, 08 Aug. 2014. Web. 12 Mar. 2015.
- "Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act." *U.S. Department of Education*. 26 Oct 2009. Web. 18 Mar 2015.
- Forman, Pamela J. *Contesting Gender Equity: The Cooptation of Women's Collegiate Athletics*. Diss. University of California, Davis, 2001. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2002. PDF.
- Ganim, Sara. "CNN Analysis: Some college athletes play like adults, read like 5th-graders." *CNN*. 8 Jan 2014. Web. 15 Mar 2015.
- Ganim, Sara. "NCAA discussing how it deals with academic fraud." *CNN*. 25 April 2014. Web. 15 Mar 2015.
- Goldberg, Rob. "Federal Judge Rules Against NCAA in O'Bannon Trial, NCAA to Appeal." *The Bleacher Report*. 8 Aug 2014. Web. 3 Oct 2014.

- Griffith, Elisabeth. *In Her Own Right: The Life of Elizabeth Cady Stanton*. London: Oxford University Press, 1985. Print.
- “Harvard-Yale Regatta-150 Years of Tradition.” *Official Website of Harvard Athletics*. 2014. Web. 18 Mar 2015.
- Harris, Dorothy V. “The Female in Athletic Competition.” *DGWS National Conference on Girls’ Sports Programs for Secondary Schools*. 20 Aug 1971. Estes Park, Colorado. Penn State Archives.
- Hawes, Kay. “Debate on amateurism has evolved over time.” *NCAA News Archive*. 3 Jan 2000. Web. 11 Mar 2015.
- “History.” *50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary for Women in Sport*. GoPSUsports.com. 2014. Web. 25 Mar 2015.
- “How NCAA’s board of directors voted on changes.” *Associated Press*. 7 Aug 2014. Web. 6 Oct 2014.
- Hosick, Michelle Brutlag. “Autonomy schools adopt cost of attendance scholarships.” *NCAA Media Center*. 18 Jan 2015. Web. 13 Mar 2015.
- Hosick, Michelle Brutlag. “Board adopts new Division I structure.” *NCAA.org*. 7 Aug 2014. Web. 12 Mar 2015.
- Hult, Joan S. “The Story of Women’s Athletics: Manipulating a Dream 1890-1985.” *Women and Sport: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. p. 83-106. Human Kinetics, 1994. Print.
- Kranich, Nancy. “Equality and Equity of Access: What’s the Difference?” *American Library Association*. 3 Mar 2005. Web. 25 Mar 2015.
- Lee, Anthony. “NCAA vs. Regents of the University of Oklahoma: History, aftermath, implications (and where we go from here).” *Berkeley Sports Law*. n.d. Web. 12 Mar 2015.

“Letter to the Editor: Collegian has problems.” *The Daily Collegian*. 1 Feb 1973. Penn State Archives.

*Mapping the Women’s Movement: Feminist Politics and Social Transformation in the North*. Ed. Monica Threlfall. New York: Verso, 1996. Print.

NCAA Academic and Membership Affairs Staff. *NCAA 2014-15 Division I Manual*. July 2014. PDF.

Nelson, Jeff. “History of Penn State Athletics.” *Spiritus Leoninus Induction Ceremony Materials*. n.d.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. 7th Ed. Boston: Pearson, 2011. Print.

“NLRB Grants Request for Review in Northwestern University Athletes Case.” *National Labor Relations Board*. 24 April 2014. Web. 12 Mar 2015.

North, Douglass C., *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance*. New York City: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.

Office for Civil Rights. “A Policy Interpretation: Title IX and intercollegiate athletics.” *US Department of Education*. 1979. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

“Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus.” *The Equity in Athletics Data Analysis Cutting Tool*. U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. 2014. Web. 18 Mar 2015.

Schmid, A. Alan. *Conflict and Cooperation: Institutional and Behavioral Economics*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. Print.

Schwarb, Amy Wimmer. “NCAA’s Mark Emmert reflects on progress, looks ahead to challenges.” *NCAA.com*. 16 Jan 2015. Web. 3 Feb 2015.

Sherman, Mitch. "Full cost of attendance passes 79-1." *ESPN College Sports*. 18 Jan 2015. Web. 10 Feb 2015.

Sherman, Rodger. "Northwestern football union stuff: Kain Colter and Pat Fitzgerald are yelling at each other, but neither's the villain." *SB Nation Inside NU*. 26 Feb 2014. Web. 12 Mar 2015.

Sherry, Susan T., et al. "Getting the Lay of the Land On Health: A Guide for Using Interviews to Gather Information." *The Access Project*. Dec 1999. PDF.

Smith, Rodney K. "A Brief History of the National Collegiate Athletic Association's Role in Regulating Collegiate Athletics." *Marquette Sports Law Review*. Vol 11. Issue 1 Fall. Article 5. 2000. PDF.

"Softball: 2015 Roster." *Penn State Athletics*. 2015. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

Solomon, Jon. "O'Bannon vs. NCAA: A cheat sheet for NCAA's appeal of paying players." *CBS Sports*. 13 Mar 2015. Web. 15 Mar 2015.

"Sports Programs for College Women." *DGWS National Conference on Sports Programs for College Women*. July 1969. Denver, Colorado. Penn State Archives.

Stonenklar, Carol. *We Are A Strong, Articulate Voice: A History of Women at Penn State*. University Park: Penn State University Press, 2006. Press.

Strauss, Ben. "Visions of New Era in College Sports Converge at N.C.A.A. Convention." *The New York Times*. 15 Jan 2015. Web. 3 Feb 2015.

Thomas, Leah Moore. "The student-athlete training table." *NCAA Sport Science Institute*. 14 Oct 2014. Web. 15 Mar 2015.

Tracy, Marc. "Areas of Autonomy, What Do They Mean." *The New York Times*. 6 Aug 2014. Web. 10 Feb 2015.

Tracy, Marc & Rohan, Tim. "What Made College Football More Like the Pros? \$7.3 Billion, for a Start." *The New York Times*. 30 Dec 2014. Web. 12 Mar 2015.

Trahan, Kevin. "The 4 things to know about the new NCAA's autonomy structure." *SB Nation*. 17 Jan 2015. Web. 10 Feb 2015.

Ulrich, Celeste. "The Role of Sports in Higher Education and in the American Civilization." *DGWS Conference Booklet Introduction*. June 1969. Denver, Colorado. Penn State Archives.

Vertinsky, Patricia. "Women, Sport, and Exercise in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century." *Women and Sport: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. p.63-82. Human Kinetics, 1994. Print.

Vint, Patrick. "Ranking the NCAA's Biggest Legal Battles, from least to most threatening." *SB Nation*. 20 March 2014. Web. 10 Feb 2015.

*Women and Sport: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. D. Margaret Costa and Sharon R. Guthrie. Human Kinetics, 1994. Print.

"Women's Golf: 2015 Roster." *Penn State Athletics*. 2015. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

"Women's Gymnastics: 2015 Roster." *Penn State Athletics*. 2015. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

"Women's Lacrosse: 2015 Roster." *Penn State Athletics*. 2015. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

"Women's Soccer: 2015 Roster." *Penn State Athletics*. 2015. Web. 25 Mar 2015.

ACADEMIC VITA  
**Laura Gebhart**

---

(717) 917-2033  
LMG5402@psu.edu

445 E Foster Ave.  
State College, PA 16801

---

## EDUCATION

The Pennsylvania State University □ University Park, PA

*Schreyer Honors College*

May 2015

Candidate for a Bachelor of Science in Community, Environment and Development

Focus in Economic Development

Specialization in Sociology

## ACTIVITIES

**Penn State Women's Field Hockey Team**

*2013 and 2014 Team Captain*

Led team events and activities

Coordinated communication between coaches and players

Managed time for practice, training, team meetings, and travel while enrolled in full course load

**Athletic Director's Leadership Institute**

Developed leadership strategies and experiences with fellow athletes and mentors

Reflected on panel discussions, presentations, and seminars

**Eco Action**

*2014-2015 President*

Coordinated student efforts to promote environmental awareness and sustainability on campus

Organized club events such as volunteer work, sustainability initiatives, and awareness campaigns

**Student-Athlete Advisory Board**

*Field Hockey Representative*

Contributed to monthly board meetings

Collaborated with student-athletes to improve the well-being of the University and local community

Participated in various community service activities

## PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

**USA Field Hockey**

*National team member 2013-Present*

Developed and assess physical, mental, tactical, and technical development goals

Promoted program development to younger players

**Lancaster County Planning Commission**

*2013 Summer Internship*

Analyzed GIS data for land use assessment and comprehensive planning

Applied pilot program to county parcels to assess agricultural land compatibility

## SKILLS

Microsoft Word, Excel, PowerPoint, Access, and Publisher; ArcGIS; IMPLAN; Grant-Writing

## AWARDS

4x NFHCA Academic National Squad, 2014 NFHCA Scholar of Distinction, 4x Academic All-Big Ten