Factors influencing salaries of intercollegiate athletic head mens and head womens basketball coaches as perceived by ncaa athletic directors

by LaWana Lynn Sweet

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education
Montana State University

Abstract:
The problem of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in salaries and between the factors influencing salaries of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I head men's and women's basketball coaches as perceived by their athletic directors.

A review of related literature showed a non-existence of athletic salary plans in place. Most articles addressed recent events leading to the need for such plans but did not propose guidelines for doing so.

This review was divided into five sections: (a) Purpose of the NCAA and its position on gender equity and discrimination; (b) History and rationales behind the equity movement; (c) Existing higher education faculty salary plans; (d) Current "policies" for determining head men's and head women's basketball coaches' salaries; and (e) Suggested factors in determining head men's and head women's basketball coaches' salaries.

The study was conducted in the spring and summer of 1996. The population sample was 311 athletic directors at the 302 NCAA Division I institutions. Two questionnaires developed by the researcher were used to gather data. Questionnaires were sent to 156 athletic directors regarding their head men's basketball coach and 155 athletic directors regarding their head women's basketball coach. Information solicited included: (1) characteristics of head basketball coaches; (2) general salary and contract information relative to these coaches; and, (3) ranking of 13 items for assessing athletic directors' perceptions on salary-related variables.

Two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires were returned (an 83 % return rate). The researcher conducted 30 telephone interviews, randomly choosing non-respondents, to determine whether they differed from respondents with regard to questionnaire variables. These interviews were not included in the total number of responses; however, data gathered from these telephone calls was provided.

Eight questions were answered and 15 hypotheses tested. Data was analyzed through the use of chi-square, t-test, Pearson-r correlation, multiple regression, and descriptive statistics. Six of the 15 hypotheses were rejected due to statistical significance. Most notably, the data showed there were significant differences between base salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches as well as between endorsement opportunities and publicity opportunities, all in favor of the men's coaches.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SALARIES OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC HEAD MEN'S AND HEAD WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COACHES AS PERCEIVED BY NCAA DIVISION I ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

by

LaWana Lynn Sweet

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

Doctor of Education

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY-BOZEMAN
Bozeman, Montana

August 1997

APPROVAL

of a thesis submitted by

LaWana Lynn Sweet

This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Aug 8, 1997
Date

John W. Kohl
Chairperson, Graduate Committee

Approved for the Major Department

Aug. 8, 1997
Date

John A. Clegg
Head, Major Department

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

8/15/97
Date

R. Brown
Graduate Dean

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a doctoral degree at Montana State University-Bozeman, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. I further agree that copying of this thesis is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U. S. Copyright Law. Requests for extensive copying or reproduction of this thesis should be referred to University Microfilms International, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106, to whom I have granted "the exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my dissertation in and from microform along with the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my abstract in any format in whole or in part."

Signature LaWana Lynn Sweet

Date Aug. 11, 1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The assistance I received from my entire graduate committee is appreciated. Dr. John Kohl and Dr. Eric Strohmeyer, my committee co-chairs, were tremendous guides and mentors throughout my graduate studies. I also thank the other members of my committee -- Dr. Bob Fellenz, Dr. Keith Chambers, Dr. Ralph Brigham, and Dr. Richard Haines -- for their contributions, time, and advice. A special thank you to Dr. Larry Baker for his invaluable assistance in data analysis.

I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the contributions made to this study by Dan Davies, Doug Fullerton, Earl Hanson, Ginny Hunt, Sue Jacobson, Pat Kicker, Tom Parac, Bruce Parker, and Joe Roberts. Also, big "thank you's" to Joan Sweet, Toni Gordon, Dave Sweet, Addie Lux, Jessica Sweet, and Lynel Willems for their proofreading and to Joan Sweet for all her typing! Finally, thanks to my entire family for their support and encouragement throughout this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in salaries and between the factors influencing salaries of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I head men's and women's basketball coaches as perceived by their athletic directors.

A review of related literature showed a non-existence of athletic salary plans in place. Most articles addressed recent events leading to the need for such plans but did not propose guidelines for doing so.

This review was divided into five sections: (a) Purpose of the NCAA and its position on gender equity and discrimination; (b) History and rationales behind the equity movement; (c) Existing higher education faculty salary plans; (d) Current "policies" for determining head men's and head women's basketball coaches' salaries; and (e) Suggested factors in determining head men's and head women's basketball coaches' salaries.

The study was conducted in the spring and summer of 1996. The population sample was 311 athletic directors at the 302 NCAA Division I institutions. Two questionnaires developed by the researcher were used to gather data. Questionnaires were sent to 156 athletic directors regarding their head men's basketball coach and 155 athletic directors regarding their head women's basketball coach. Information solicited included: (1) characteristics of head basketball coaches; (2) general salary and contract information relative to these coaches; and, (3) ranking of 13 items for assessing athletic directors' perceptions on salary-related variables.

Two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires were returned (an 83% return rate). The researcher conducted 30 telephone interviews, randomly choosing non-respondents, to determine whether they differed from respondents with regard to questionnaire variables. These interviews were not included in the total number of responses; however, data gathered from these telephone calls was provided.

Eight questions were answered and 15 hypotheses tested. Data was analyzed through the use of chi-square, t-test, Pearson-r correlation, multiple regression, and descriptive statistics. Six of the 15 hypotheses were rejected due to statistical significance. Most notably, the data showed there were significant differences between base salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches as well as between endorsement opportunities and publicity opportunities, all in favor of the men's coaches.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

At most institutions, football coaches and men's basketball coaches earn far more money than either women's team coaches or coaches of men's teams that are non-revenue producing. It is common for men's coaches to receive additional compensation for endorsements, summer camps, and radio and television shows. Women's coaches may earn some money from summer camps, but not always; and beyond that, they rarely receive any other extra monies (Blum, 1994). As Blum also pointed out,

> "Many college administrators who determine the size of coaches' paychecks say coaches of men's teams make more money because colleges are competing in a national market in which such a differential is a fact of life. They say that in basketball, men's teams are expected to bring in fans and revenue. Therefore, the jobs of men's and women's coaches are not the same and thus should not receive the same compensation."

On the other hand, Jill Hutchison, women's basketball coach at Illinois State University, stated,

> "There's no question the jobs (of coaching men's and women's basketball) are comparable. . .recruiting is the same. . .on-the-floor coaching is the same. The argument seems to be that. . .the crowds are different. But in some locations you can even say the crowds for women's basketball are greater. There's a definite desire to have equal pay for equal work" (1993).

A 1992 survey by the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) found that the average base salary of NCAA Division I head women's basketball coaches was

59% of the average base salary of the head men's basketball coaches (Blum, 1994). Then in the summer of 1993, the issue of equal pay for coaches attracted real attention after a court ordered Howard University to pay over $1 million to their head women's basketball coach who sued the University on grounds of sexual discrimination. She claimed that, even though she and the head men's basketball coach both performed the same duties, her salary was approximately half of his (Sports Law Monthly-NCAA, November 1993).

Another court case probably attracted the most attention to the salary equity issue. Marianne Stanley, former University of Southern California women's basketball coach, sued USC for $8 million, claiming she had been forced from her job after she (1) asked for equal pay relative to George Raveling's, the USC head men's basketball coach, and (2) refused a one-year contract for much less than what Raveling earned. Although the courts found for USC in this case, Ellen J. Vargyas, senior counsel of the National Women's Law Center (a women's-rights advocacy group) pointed out that "we have to remember not to put too much emphasis on the outcome of this case. . .the law in this area still has a lot of developing to do" (Blum, 1994).

Coakley (1994) pointed out that while people should get equal pay for equal work, coaches of women's teams almost always make much less money than coaches of men's teams in the same sports. As of November 1993, 29 gender-equity related lawsuits had been filed against colleges throughout the country. Some of these lawsuits were filed by female athletes against their schools for eliminating varsity sports or for failing to create teams for interested athletes. Other lawsuits were filed by coaches over disparities

between men's and women's coaching salaries (Nelson, 1993). Not all of these recent suits sought monetary damages, but the 1992 decision of the Supreme Court that monetary damages may be awarded to enforce Title IX was one reason that the number of these suits may have risen (Franklin vs. Gwinnett County Public Schools, 1992).

According to Blum (1994), as the emphasis on equity in intercollegiate athletics continued to increase, the NCAA, colleges and universities, and athletic directors needed to recognize that equal opportunities cannot be systematically denied to individuals based on either (1) the gender of the coach or (2) the gender of the athletes that they coach. They need to do everything possible before they are faced with litigation to ensure that athletes, coaches, and programs are afforded fair and equitable circumstances under which to participate, work, and operate. Disparate compensation, or differing salaries, to two coaches performing the same duties, must be due to legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons. As Ellen Vargyas said, "the idea here is not to have to rely on the law, but to push institutions to think about treating coaches of women's teams fairly. In many places, the salaries are still completely out of whack" (Blum, 1994).

Problem of the Study

The problem of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in salaries and between the factors influencing salaries of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I intercollegiate athletic head men's and head women's basketball coaches as perceived by their NCAA Division I athletic directors.

Need for the Study

One current debate in athletic departments regarding staff and personnel is centered around provisions of Title IX and the Federal Pay Equity Act (Title VII). Specifically, the issues are comparable pay and contracts for coaches of women's sports. Title IX and Title VII prohibit discrimination in the opportunity to receive coaching assignments and the compensation associated with those assignments. The provisions are being used to challenge the current practice of paying coaches of male athletes a higher base salary than coaches of female athletes.

C. Timothy Stoner, attorney for the Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA), stated,

> "There's no legal justification for paying men's and women's coaches differently, but the practice has gone on for years. Now, with. . .more attention paid to women's programs and more pressure on women's teams to win and bring in money, coaches of women's teams see that they need to be treated fairly and that there is something they can do about it if they are not" (NCAA News, September 27, 1993).

Diane Henson, attorney in a Title IX lawsuit against the University of Texas-Austin said that, "colleges and universities that do not take steps to end the pervasive gender-based discrimination. . .will find themselves looking down the barrel of a Title IX Federal Court action" (NCAA News, August 4, 1993). Michael L. Williams, attorney (and former U. S. Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights) stated,

> "Female athletes have a strong noose to put around the neck of recalcitrant athletic directors and pull them into compliance with the Federal law. It would be so much easier for school officials to go on their own rather than to be dragged kicking and screaming and paying through the nose" (NCAA News, August 4, 1993).

The NCAA supports gender equity (NCAA Manual, Principles 2.3.1, 2.3.2, and 2.3.3), but they have left the issue in the hands of courts as to what comparable salaries mean. In the spring of 1993, NCAA Executive Director Richard D. Schultz said, "We must be proactive, we must be a leader. . . .This is more than a financial issue, it's a moral issue as well." Schultz established the NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force as the first step in solving this problem. He charged the Task Force with (1) examining NCAA policies to evaluate their impact on gender equity, and (2) recommending a path toward measuring and realizing gender equity in intercollegiate athletics (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force). A subcommittee of that Task Force asked any interested individuals or parties to aid them in the development of a source book designed to communicate ideas to enhance gender equity and Title IX compliance (NCAA News, September 27, 1993). This researcher felt that there was a need to examine salary equity between NCAA Division I head men's and head women's basketball coaches and the factors influencing these salaries as perceived by NCAA Division I athletic directors.

Questions to be Answered

1. What was the overall mean rank order of the factors used to establish salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches as perceived by NCAA Division I athletic directors?
2. What were the other/unique duties for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
3. What were the causes for termination for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
4. What were the endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
5. What were the publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
6. What were the courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
7. What were the housing opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?
8. What were the basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches?

Research Hypotheses

1. There were no significant differences between the base salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches.
2. The proportion of the variability (R^2) in coaches' salaries that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:
   A. Gender of the coach
   B. Gender of the athlete
   C. Age of the coach
   D. Total number of years coached
   E. Number of years as a head coach at this institution
   F. The coaches' levels of education
   G. Proportion of wins of the coaches
3. There was no significant relationship between the mean rank order of the factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.
4. There were no significant differences between the bonuses of head men's and head women's basketball coaches.
5. The proportion of the variability (R^2) in coaches' bonuses that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:
   A. Number of years as head coach at this institution
   B. Proportion of wins

6. There were no significant differences between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

7. There was no significant relationship between the lengths of the contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the number of years coached.

8. There was no significant relationship between the lengths of the contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the proportion of wins.

9. There were no significant differences between basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

10. There were no significant differences between endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

11. There were no significant differences between publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

12. There were no significant differences between courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

13. There were no significant differences between housing opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

14. There were no significant relationships between educational backgrounds of the head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

15. There were no significant differences in the percentage of male coaches and female coaches with written contracts.

Definitions

Athletic Director -- one of the 311 administrators who is contracted to organize and direct an NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic program in the United States. (There are 302 NCAA Division I institutions, but nine of these have dual athletic departments, thus bringing the total number of athletic directors to 311.)

Coach -- a head coach who is contracted to organize and direct an NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic basketball team in the United States.

Division I -- To be classified as NCAA Division I, an institution must:

1. sponsor football and/or basketball and strive to finance its athletic program insofar as possible from revenues generated by the program itself;
2. offer 14 acceptable sports -- either six for men and eight for women or seven for men and seven for women (an acceptable sport is a varsity sport, not a club sport. It is also one in which there is an NCAA championship.);
3. meet financial aid and scholarship requirements as dictated;
4. meet minimum contest and participation requirements for Division I sports sponsorship;
5. schedule primarily with other Division I schools (1994-95 NCAA Manual, Bylaw 20.9).

Equity -- fairness, impartiality, and reasonable treatment thereof (Funk and Wagnalls, 1984).

Member Institution -- one of the 302 institutions classified as Division I that fall under the jurisdiction of the NCAA.

Men's Coach -- an individual, regardless of gender, who coaches a men's team.

NCAA -- National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Perceive -- to judge or discern intuitively (Funk & Wagnalls, 1984).

Win-Loss Record -- the difference in number between wins and losses.

Women's Coach -- an individual, regardless of gender, who coaches a women's team.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of related literature on factors influencing the salaries of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic head men's and head women's basketball coaches showed a limited number of journal articles and a non-existence of intercollegiate athletic salary plans in place from which information was obtained. There were many sources dealing with higher education faculty salary equity plans, but most of these focused on academic variables influencing salaries.

The majority of the articles on athletic salary equity plans for basketball or any intercollegiate sports or programs merely addressed the recent events that led to the need for such plans. They did not propose any guidelines that would aid athletic directors in pursuing salary equity in their programs.

The review of related literature was divided into five sections: (a) the purpose of the NCAA and its position on gender equity and discrimination; (b) the history and rationales behind the equity movement; (c) existing higher education faculty salary plans; (d) current "policies" for determining salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches; and (e) suggested factors in determining salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

The Purpose of the NCAA and Its Position On Principles of Gender Equity and Discrimination

The NCAA is an organization whose basic purpose is "...to maintain intercollegiate athletics as an integral part of the educational program and the athlete as an integral part of the student body and, by so doing, retain a clear line of demarcation between intercollegiate athletics and professional sports" (NCAA Manual, 1994, Bylaw 1.3.1).

The NCAA has recognized the growing importance over both nondiscrimination and gender equity in intercollegiate athletics. In January 1993, the NCAA adopted a principle of nondiscrimination. This principle stated that the NCAA "shall promote an atmosphere of respect for and sensitivity to the dignity of every person." It further stated that the NCAA will "refrain from discrimination with respect to its governance policies, educational programs, activities and employment policies" (NCAA Manual, 1994, Bylaw 2.6). The NCAA defined gender equity as,:

> "an environment in which fair and equitable distribution of overall athletic opportunities, benefits, and resources is available to women and men, in which both would accept the overall program of the other gender, and in which student-athletes, coaches, and athletics administrators are not subject to gender-based discrimination institutionally or nationally" (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993).

The NCAA also adopted a three-fold principle with regard to gender equity in January 1994. Principle 2.3.1 discussed compliance with federal and state laws regarding gender equity. Principle 2.3.2 warned the NCAA and member institutions to guard against adopting legislation that would prevent compliance with gender-equity laws.

Principle 2.3.3 stated that the NCAA and member institutions should conduct all activities free of gender bias (NCAA Manual, 1994). The NCAA also stated that an athletic program would be considered gender equitable when participants in both men's and women's programs accepted the overall program of the other gender as fair and equitable. The NCAA believes that no individual should be discriminated against on the basis of gender or on the gender of the athletes he or she coaches, in any situation, especially intercollegiate athletics (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, July 26, 1993).

The History and Rationales Behind the Equity Movement

Intercollegiate athletics offers interested and talented college students opportunities to experience competition, develop physical and leadership skills, be part of a team, and enjoy themselves. Athletic departments and the NCAA are supposed to require competitive parity, universal rules that are consistently applied, and an equal opportunity to participate. However, there was evidence that this consistency has not occurred.

"Title IX" refers to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, a federal civil rights statute that prohibits gender discrimination in institutions that receive federal funding, including athletic programs. Congress included Title IX in the Education Amendments of 1972 since there was no assurance of equal opportunity in education. This federal law states that: "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" (20 USC Sec. 1681 (a) — taken from WBCA Executive Committee, December 1993) .

The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) within the Department of Education is responsible for enforcing Title IX. A Title IX violation is a denial of equal opportunity on the basis of gender. The federal regulation implementing Title IX went into effect July 21, 1975. On December 11, 1979, OCR issued an Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Interpretation to clarify Title IX regulation requirements for athletic programs (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993).

The Title IX statute is the principal federal legislation enacted by the U. S. Congress stating the general requirements for nondiscrimination on the basis of gender. It has the force of law and is more specific than the Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Interpretation. Both the Title IX regulations and the Policy Interpretation are the two major sources applying to intercollegiate athletic programs (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993).

The 1979 Intercollegiate Athletic Policy Interpretation divides athletic issues into three major categories for compliance analysis: a sport offerings category, a scholarships category, and an "everything else" category which includes eleven program areas, one of which is coaching issues (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993).

During the decade following the passage of Title IX, many institutions at both the secondary and collegiate levels began dedicating more resources to provide similar numbers and qualities to male and female athletic programs. As a result, there was an

initial increase in participation by girls and women. For example, the percentage of girls in interscholastic programs rose from 7% of the student body in 1972 to 35% in 1990 (National Federation of State High School Associations, 1992). Much early growth took place as schools voluntarily began to comply with Title IX regulations prior to the regulations becoming official in 1975 (Durrant, 1992).

However, during this time, there was also a sudden drop in the number of female coaches and administrators. In 1972, 90% of collegiate coaches of women's programs were female, but by 1990, this percentage had dropped to 47.3%. Approximately the same percentages appeared at the high school level in most states. The reason for this drop appeared to be because many schools eliminated separate programs and departments to comply with Title IX. Generally, the director of the boys' and men's programs became the director of both programs because administrators were most familiar with male sports and therefore perceived male directors as more capable and experienced. At the same time, many new teams were added for girls and women, and although few males had chosen to coach females in the past, the coaching stipends required by Title IX made the jobs somewhat more attractive. It was during these transitional years that the most significant losses of female coaches and administrators occurred (Thongren and Eisenbarth, 1994).

As of 1994, the percentage of girls participating in high school sports was still only 37% and only 34% at the college level. These percentages may have been due in part to the Grove City vs. Bell decision (1984). In that case, the United States Supreme Court

ruled to suspend Title IX's application to athletics because athletics did not directly receive financial assistance from the federal government in terms of recruitment, travel and per diem allowance, coaches, medical and athletic training facilities, support and other services (Carroll and Ryder, 1994). Because few athletic programs received direct support, this decision effectively eliminated any power to enforce against sexual discrimination. As a result, over 800 cases of alleged discrimination at the U. S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights were dropped or narrowed (Sabo, 1988). Finally, in 1988, the Civil Rights Restoration Act (CRRA) restored the power of Title IX by mandating that all federally-funded institutions (the vast majority of all accredited colleges and universities) comply with Title IX in all programs, athletics included. That meant if any part of an organization received federal funding, the CRRA applied to all programs within it. This act was helpful to athletics; however, by itself, it didn't encourage people involved in athletics to really challenge inequities. In 1992, in Cook v. Colgate University, the U. S. District Court for the Northern District of New York emphasized that, "equal athletic treatment is not a luxury. . .to grant equivalent benefits and opportunities. . . .Equality and justice are. . .essential elements now codified under Title IX." Also in 1992, in Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled that "equal opportunity" does not require strict numerical equity between genders, rather it requires compliance in three areas, and that if schools intentionally violated any one of the three, women in athletics could sue for financial damages. The three areas are: (1) equitable participation opportunities provided to male and female students; (2) athletic financial aid

allocated to male and female participants must be proportionate to the numbers of athletes of each gender; and, (3) equity in all other benefits, opportunities, and treatment given participants of each gender (American Council on Education, 1993). This third item includes the following:

a. Equipment and supplies -- Uniforms and other apparel, sport-specific and general equipment and supplies, instructional devices, and conditioning/weight training equipment. Equivalence is measured by factors such as quality, amount, suitability, maintenance and replacement, and availability of equipment and supplies.

b. Scheduling -- Equivalence is measured by such factors as the number, length, and time of day of practice opportunities; the number and quality of competitive events and opportunities for pre- and post-season competition; and the times of days of these events. Prime practice time must be equally shared.

c. Opportunity to receive coaching (and academic tutoring), assignment, and salary of coaches (and tutors) -- Regarding assignment of coaches, equivalency is based on factors such as training, experience, professional qualifications, and standing. Equivalency in compensation is determined by comparing factors such as: pay rate, length of contracts, conditions of contract renewal, experience, coaching duties, and working conditions.

d. Travel and per diem allowances -- Equivalency is measured by factors such as modes of transportation; quality of housing, per diem allowances, and dining arrangements during travel; length of stays before and after competitive events.

e. Locker rooms, medical and other facilities -- Equivalence is measured by quality, availability, and exclusivity of use of practice and game facilities and locker rooms as well as the maintenance and preparation of these facilities. Equivalence for medical training facilities and services is measured by the availability of such as well as assistance by qualified personnel and insurance coverage. Equivalence for housing and dining hall opportunities must also be met.

f. Publicity and promotion opportunities and experiences -- Equivalence is measured by the availability and quality of sports information personnel, access to other publicity resources, and the quality and quantity of publications and other promotional devices.

As a result of this decision, over 300 lawsuits have been filed relative to gender equity in middle and secondary schools, as well as colleges and universities, particularly in athletics (Carroll and Ryder, 1994). Female student-athletes across the United States started using Title IX to challenge program cuts such as the dropping of women's sports or refusing to grant varsity status to a women's club sport in athletic departments. Now, college coaches and administrators are using Title IX to challenge differences in pay scales

between head coaches of men's sports and head coaches of women's sports. The number of salary equity discrimination suits brought by intercollegiate coaches of women's sports has grown markedly in recent years. The cases usually centered around two types of claims.

The first type was based on (1) Title IX; (2) the Federal Equal Pay Act of 1963; (3) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and, (4) a variety of state laws involving claims that coaches of same sport teams be paid the same amount regardless of gender. The second type of claims was based primarily on Title VII. These claims were brought by coaches who were terminated in retaliation for raising concerns about an institution's Title IX compliance (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993).

Federal legislation affecting equal employment opportunities of varying degrees include Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (amended in 1972), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (amended in 1986), the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, the Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. It was, however, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which came first and led the way for all subsequent legislation regarding equal employment opportunities. The Equal Pay Act requires that all employees, regardless of their gender, be given equal pay for equal work of equal skill, effort, and responsibility done under similar working conditions with the same employer. The jobs being compared do not need to be identical, but they must be substantially similar. A pay difference is permitted but must be attributed to a seniority system, a merit system, a commission system, or a system

based on any factor other than gender. (Salaries, employee benefits, and pensions are included for purposes of equal pay.) Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, a much broader law, prohibits employers from discrimination in employment opportunities or salaries on the basis of race, color, religion, gender, or national origin. These prohibitions apply to many types of employment situations such as: hiring, work assignment, transfers, promotions, layoffs, discharges, and compensation (NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force, Summer 1993). The authority of both of these federal statutes became unclear however when looking at coaching because, as Ira Shepard, legal counsel for the College and University Personnel Administrators, pointed out: "These acts were written for two people, a man and a woman, on an assembly line putting widgets in a box. It's tougher to fit it into a model where there are other factors and the comparisons are not cut and dried" (Blum, 1994). Some cases have been successful, others have not as courts have allowed salary disparities if there were qualitative differences in the coaches' responsibilities, experiences, or abilities to raise funds. The recent wave of pay equity litigation showed that compensation decisions were complex.

In Stanley v. University of Southern California (1994), the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit rejected Marianne Stanley's claim that the lower court had improperly denied her request to be reinstated as the university's head women's basketball coach until a trial on her claim could be held. Stanley had sued the University for $8 million contending that she was entitled to receive the same compensation as the head men's basketball coach because their jobs required equal effort, skill, and responsibility,

and were performed under similar working conditions. She claimed violations under the Equal Pay Act, Title IX, and various state laws. The court found that quality differences in responsibilities of these two coaches existed, that Raveling (the head men's basketball coach) had a more demanding job, and therefore a pay difference was justified. The court reviewed the head men's coach's qualifications and experience and stated that an employer may consider the market value of a coach's skills in determining salary and other compensations.

In Tyler v. Howard University (1993), a District of Columbia Superior Court jury awarded $2,452,000 (later reduced by the judge to $1,114,000) and legal fees to Howard's head women's basketball coach who claimed the university had discriminated against her, violating Title IX, the Equal Pay Act, and various state laws. Tyler alleged that she was paid half of what the head men's basketball coach made, had less support staff, and had unequal facilities. Howard University asserted that Tyler failed to prove that the head men's and head women's coaching positions were substantially equal and therefore, she had failed to prove a violation of either Title IX or the Equal Pay Act. Howard also argued that Tyler failed to prove gender was the reason for the pay difference. Instead, Howard stated that the difference was based on the qualifications of the head men's coach. The judge's revised award in favor of Tyler included the following:

$600,000 in lost wages on the grounds of gender discrimination under Title IX;

$138,000 in liquidated damages under the Equal Pay Act;

$72,000 for emotional distress under the gender discrimination claim; and

$250,000 for emotional distress under the retaliation claim under the Human Rights Act.

In addition to the $1,060,000 judgment against Howard University, a judgment of $54,000 was awarded against an individual defendant for defamation of character.

In Bowers v. Baylor University (1994), the former head women's basketball coach filed a $4,000,000 suit against Baylor University solely on Title IX violated claims. This case is still in the courts.

In action involving an athletics administrator, Mary Zimmerman, the former associate athletic director at San Jose State University, brought a suit against the university seeking $1,200,000 in damages. She claimed that she had been fired for advocating gender equity. Her claim was under Title VII, Title IX, and various state law claims. In May 1994, the two parties settled out of court and San Jose State University agreed to pay Zimmerman $328,000. With a 273-162 win-loss record over 13 years as the University of Minnesota's head volleyball coach, Stephanie Schleuder decided to challenge what she considered to be the status quo by asking for pay equal to that of coaches of revenue male teams. Her contract was not renewed. Also negotiating a contract at the University of Minnesota was Linda Hill-Macdonald, the head women's basketball coach. Her contract was negotiated to an $80,000 salary and a three-year contract. She previously made $65,000 but the $80,000 salary was still only about 65% of the $115,000 per year that Clem Haskins, the University of Minnesota head men's basketball coach, earned. Haskins

also received media contracts and endorsement fees which Hill-Macdonald did not (USSA Sports Supplement, Spring 1995).

Chris Voelz is the Women's Athletic Director at the University of Minnesota. She is also a well-known advocate for women's pay equity, but in these instances in her athletic department, Voelz said her choice was made because of a finite amount of money in the women's athletic budget. Voelz's own salary was about 85% of that of the men's athletic director, McKinley Boston. The University of Minnesota offered the same number of sports for men and women but the women's athletic budget was only $4.4 million, compared to the men's athletic budget of almost $13 million (USSA Sports Supplement, Spring 1995).

Women's Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) legal counsel C. Timothy Stoner stated that there were other inequities throughout the University of Minnesota athletic department. For example, head coaches of men's sports were allowed to run summer camps while the women's sports head coaches were required to run camps. As of Spring 1995, Stoner had advised University of Minnesota officials to review recent lawsuits over gender and salary equity and suggested that the University make advances in equity to avoid litigation (USSA Sports Supplement, Spring 1995).

When speaking of "equity," many administrators referred to a particular sport's ability to generate revenue, which, as specified by the federal Office of Civil Rights, is irrelevant as far as Title IX is concerned. Revenue-producing sports are not exempt from Title IX. With respect to coaches' salaries, Title IX and the Equal Pay Act of 1963

prohibit discrimination in the "opportunity to receive coaching as well as assignment and compensation for coaches" (34 CFR, Sec. 106.41 (c)(5) and (6) — taken from WBCA Executive Committee, December 1993). In other words, budget pressures, differences in revenue production, and other financial considerations do not override an institution's Title IX obligations (American Council on Education, September 1993). A U. S. District Court judge in an equity case at Colorado State University stated, "A financial crisis cannot justify gender discrimination" (Nelson, 1993).

At the conclusion of the 1992-93 women's basketball season, a survey was conducted by the WBCA. This survey showed that the majority of coaches of women's basketball were not paid comparably to coaches of men's basketball. The survey also showed that women's basketball coaches did not have written multi-year contracts, as the men's basketball coaches did. The WBCA contended that without a written contract, there was no "job security" for coaches of women's basketball. The WBCA also felt this disparity was in direct violation of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 (WBCA Executive Committee, December 1993).

The policy interpretations of Title IX and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 require that:

> "A recipient shall not make or enforce any policy or practice which, on the basis of sex: (a) makes distinctions in rates of pay or other compensation, or (b) results in payment of wages to employees of one sex at a rate less than that paid to employees of the opposite sex for equal work on jobs the performance of which requires equal skill, effort, and responsibility, and which are performed under similar working conditions" (43 CFR Sec. 106.54--Compensation — taken from WBCA Executive Committee, December 1993).

There are still widespread salary inequities in some programs even though Title IX has called for equity since 1972. However, Congress now seems ready to enforce equity whenever the NCAA is unwilling to take adequate action. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (also known as the "Improving America's Schools Act") was passed by Congress on October 5, 1994, and signed by President Clinton 15 days later on October 20, 1994. It is titled the "Equity in Athletics Disclosure" amendment and it requires colleges and universities to collect and publish in-depth annual reports on gender equity in their intercollegiate athletic programs. This act is similar to the Student Right-to-Know Act, which requires colleges and universities to publicize the graduation rates of those students participating in their institution's athletic programs. This gender-equity legislation require institutions that participate in federal student aid programs and intercollegiate athletics to publish annual reports containing specific information about the opportunities and benefits provided to male and female student-athletes. This information includes the number of participants, total operating expenses, the genders of head and assistant coaches, the amount of money spent on athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and coaches' salaries for all men's and women's teams (Gender-Equity Disclosure Act, December/January 1995).

Institutions were required to publish their first reports by October 1, 1996. High school students were then able to use this information to evaluate collegiate athletic programs (Gender-Equity Disclosure Act, December/January, 1995). Representative Cardiss L. Collins (Democrat, Illinois), chairwoman of the House Subcommittee on

Commerce, is also seeking to enhance the role of the Justice Department in enforcing Title IX by moving the enforcement of Title IX from the Education Department to the Justice Department. This change would push violators into federal courts (Gender-Equity Disclosure Act, December/January 1995). As courts' interpretations of Title IX become clearer, institutions which refuse to recognize this reality or which delay their adjustments to Title IX could be risking litigation. Allard (1985) stated, "Two decades' history of anti-discrimination legislation and litigation should provide sufficient incentive for colleges and universities to examine their employment statistics and take steps to eliminate any institutional discrimination they find," but Donna Lopiano, the executive director of the Women's Sports Foundation pointed out, "We are so far from gender equity in intercollegiate athletics that it is laughable" (Lopiano, 1992). In 1990, Henry Bellmon, Governor of Oklahoma, stated that in his opinion, "We have never had total equality in women's athletics, and I don't know that we ever will have" (cited in Coakley, 1994). Supporting her contention was C. Timothy Stoner, WBCA legal counsel. He said that people must understand what most coaches of women's basketball already know; that is, coaches of women's basketball are grossly underpaid in the base salary they receive when compared to the base salary of the coaches of men's basketball (Ahmann, 1993).

Existing Higher Education Faculty Salary Plans

Salary equity has been a major employment issue in academics for the last decade. Two pieces of legislation, the Equal Pay Act of 1963 and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act

of 1964, along with the notion of comparable worth, provided the primary basis for salary equity studies and legal proceedings with faculty in higher education. Salary equity is fair and equitable compensation for work performed. Its objective is to pay jobs of equal work content equally and just as importantly, to pay jobs with different work content differently. The jobs need not be exactly equal. It is sufficient that they are "substantially equal." Comparable worth, on the other hand, does not have as clear a definition. It is generally defined by stating that comparable jobs should be compensated at the same rate, but the problem comes in determining exactly what comparability is (Acker, 1989). Most often, comparability is determined by evaluating the jobs in question on the basis of skills performed, effort required, responsibility, and working conditions. If the jobs are not "equal" under even one of the previous standards, no violation will be found. In addition to the basic principles of salary equity, comparable worth also states that those jobs traditionally or stereotypically considered women's jobs, or associated with some supposed special talent of women, should be valued equally to jobs associated with men (McConkey, 1993). However, even if a plaintiff demonstrated that one academic position required about the same skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions as another and that a salary difference existed between the individuals in these two positions, the plaintiff's case still failed legally if the difference was attributed to a seniority system, merit system or factors other than gender. In other words, a school was likely to successfully defend its claim, that observed salary differences were appropriate, if there were some sort of justifiable salary plan in place (Koch, 1982).

Most faculty salaries were determined on the basis of academic qualifications and professional merit. Qualifications typically included such variables as (1) formal education, (2) field of specialty, (3) types and years of professional experience, (4) rank (professor, instructor, etc.), (5) tenured or non-tenured, (6) publications quality, and (7) performance and exhibitions (Lassiter, 1983). Merit relates to actual job performance and productivity (Allard, 1984).

There have also been debates over whether or not market value should have any bearing in the determinations of academic salaries. Advocates for market values felt the supply and demand ratios were dramatically different from one field to another and not all teaching was the same nor was the amount and degree of professional preparation for all fields the same. They argued that the use of market values in setting academic salaries would improve the quality of education because more qualified faculty would be hired (Lassiter, 1983). Opponents argued that market values reflected a biased view and should be ignored. They felt salaries should simply be set by job descriptions and job expectations. They also felt utilizing market values created the problem of salary compression as schools were forced to bring in new faculty at starting salaries which were equal to or greater than mid-career faculty (Lee, 1987).

A 1994 survey by the American Association of University Professors found that disparities between the salaries of male and female faculty members of equal rank continued to exist. During the 1993-94 academic year, the average salary of a female professor was 11.5% lower than that of her male counterpart. Also, female lecturers

earned 10.8% less than male lecturers. The survey also showed that, for the 1988-89 through the 1993-94 school years, the gap between men's and women's salaries in all ranks narrowed only slightly. The differences in salaries paid to male and female professors decreased from 11.7% to 11.5% while that for male and female lecturers went from 13.5% to 10.8% (Horton, 1994). Many responses attributed this difference to market value, while others claimed discrimination.

Until challenged, an institution had the flexibility to decide how it would comply with Title IX. However, if a court were asked to address an alleged Title IX violation, the institution might have far less flexibility. If a court granted preliminary relief, a university would be required to comply with the preliminary order for as long as several years, until the case was somehow settled. After trial, a university would be required to comply with the order until the order was set aside on appeal or the court modified its order; and, even if the university were cleared of any wrongdoing, the damage was already done.

Dave O'Brien (January 1996), Director of Athletics at Long Beach State University, said that universities usually try to escape liability on pay disparity between coaches of same sports, by trying to prove that the pay disparity was based on a differential other than gender. O'Brien stated that universities would try to assert one of the following four arguments:

1. Revenue production was greater for the men's team than for the women's team;

2. Extra duties such as fund raising or media assignments were imposed on the head men's coach more than on the head women's coach;

3. Greater pressure and responsibility were placed on the head men's coach due to increased visibility, media attention, alumni following, and the need to generate revenue to help operate other programs within the athletic department; or,

4. Marketplace factors required the head men's coach to be compensated at a higher rate than the head women's coach.

O'Brien discussed each of these arguments in detail. The revenue-production defense, in his opinion, was an illusion. He stated that while men's basketball often does generate more revenue than women's basketball, it rarely met any department expenses other than those of men's basketball. O'Brien said that the "extra duties" defense was not convincing either. He contended that these duties must be real and capable of specificity. O'Brien questioned this argument by pointing out that many times men's programs had more assistant coaches and/or support staff than women's programs had, and if this were the case, these "extra duties" may in fact be handled by these people, thereby not justifying extra compensation.

A university may also assert that a head men's coach has greater pressure and responsibility than a head women's coach because many head men's coaches are expected to raise money, cultivate alumni, be more visible, and socialize with boosters. O'Brien

said that these factors are only a part of a head coach's employment, and will not alone justify a pay discrepancy.

Finally, an institution may argue that simple economic demand required that a head men's coach be paid more than a head women's coach. A department may argue that, in order to bring in the best possible head men's basketball coach, a more competitive compensation package must be offered than what would be required to secure the best possible head women's basketball coach. O'Brien felt that this argument was not credible if a university did not research the marketplace or if there were no real bargaining over initial salaries (Dave O'Brien, 1996).

Schrof (1993) stated that although gender norms have changed slowly on their own with Title IX, current legal and institutional efforts may help to speed that process. Lee (1987) also pointed out that losing any lawsuit, or for that matter, dealing with a lawsuit was damaging to an institution. The publicity was destructive, the litigation was costly and tensions on campus were likely to be high. She felt that the surest way to equity and fairness was to treat comparable worth and salary equity as things that could be established through "voluntary affirmative action. . .of sex-neutral salary treatment," before litigation arose. In fact, some schools are voluntarily re-evaluating their coaches' salaries in light of the gender equity court cases already filed. Georgia State University had openings for head coaches for both the women's and men's basketball teams. The University raised the salary for the head women's coach by about $20,000 while it lowered the one for the head men's coach by about the same amount so that each position would be offered $65,000 per

year. University of Kansas Athletic Director Bob Frederick, in April 1996, responded to a question from a Title IX seminar audience about the disparity in base salaries between coaches of same sports for men and women. He stated that at Kansas University, the base salaries are the same (Renfro, 1996).

Current "Policies" for Determining Salaries for Head Men's and Head Women's Basketball Coaches

The results of a recent survey of college athletic administrators, conducted by the United States Sports Academy (Spring 1995), indicated that compliance with Title IX was a major concern. Eliminating inequities had been a goal among some people in athletics, however, the development of guidelines to accomplish this goal had been a task which many have discussed yet few have actually attempted. Some changes have occurred and a few head women's coaches do have support similar to that given the head men's coaches, but major inequities remain because as important as equity is in sports, it is also difficult to achieve.

Although there are no known written salary equity plans in existence for determining coaches' salaries, many people in sports support fairness but only if the head men's coaches don't have to give up anything and only if head women's coaches don't want equal money to achieve it. This unwritten contention has been the pattern in many programs where men's programs receive the majority of the resources. Most head men's coaches will support gender equity but only as long as they are not required to sacrifice

participation, support, jobs, or resources to achieve it (Coakley, 1994). Also, if women's programs were treated equally only when cuts were made, real problems were created. Christine Grant, Women's Athletic Director at the University of Iowa pointed out, "women's sports were never equal in the first place, so when you cut equally, you're cutting. . .disproportionately" (quoted in Muscatine, 1991). And, according to C. Timothy Stoner, head coaches of women's basketball should not have to work five, ten, fifteen years or more and not have the same basic job security nor be paid a base salary comparable to the head coaches of men's basketball (Ahmann, 1993).

Donna Lopiano added that one of the real challenges was to establish a salary system applicable to head coaches of men's and women's teams that recognized common coaching expectations. Coaches are expected to recruit, teach, meet minimum performance standards, as well as student academic achievement levels while getting paid a certain amount. Lopiano said, "when we can create certain differences between coaches based on non-gender criteria; those rewards can be annual bonuses rather than perpetuated increases." She also believed there was a need to re-examine the issue of revenue production and make sure that if there were salary differences based on revenue production, both the head women's coach and the head men's coach had the same support system. In her words,

> "this is so we don't get into a system where we have a men's basketball coach with six promotional and fund-raising staff members helping raise money upon which his or her salary and bonus are based and the women's basketball coach has no such support system or a much lesser one, and is therefore never going to have the same opportunities to produce revenue" (1992).

Dave O'Brien (January 1996), Athletic Director at Long Beach State University, said that while pay-equity requirements apply to all coaching positions, the most notable disparities were found when comparing salaries of head men's basketball coaches to salaries of head women's basketball coaches.

As far as basketball coaches were concerned, there appeared to be two schools of thought among athletic administrators. The first was that a head women's basketball coach did not do the same job as a head men's basketball coach. There was the "value-added" factor to the men's game at most institutions as men's programs were expected to draw more fans, create more revenue, and add tremendous appeal to campus life, all of which added pressure on the head men's basketball coach and therefore warranted additional compensation to the head men's basketball coach. Supporting this viewpoint was Los Angeles Times columnist Michael Ventre who wrote the following when comparing the head men's and head women's basketball coaches at the University of Southern California: "Stanley (the head women's basketball coach) is not doing the same job as Raveling (the head men's basketball coach). It is not even close. What Stanley and her lawyer fail to recognize, or choose to ignore, is that she is coaching a lesser sport" (quoted in Ahmann, 1993).

The second school of thought was that if the job descriptions for the head men's and head women's basketball coaches read exactly the same, their base salaries should be equal and incentives and bonuses should be available through other avenues (i.e., shoe

contracts, camps, etc.) (Ahmann, 1993). Head women's basketball coaches generally made two arguments in support of their allegations of discrimination:

1. Head men's and head women's basketball coaches ARE doing the same work under the same conditions and consequently deserve the same pay, and
2. Pay discrepancies cannot be justified in terms of increased revenue-generation expectations, increased attendance requirements, or increased media coverage of the men's programs because those factors have grown out of the historical failure of universities to appropriately fund and promote the women's basketball programs, and not because of the superior abilities of head men's basketball coaches (NCAA News, June 7, 1995).

When asked about equal salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches, Dr. Karol Kahrs, Athletic Director at the University of Illinois, said that if the expectations for these two coaches were the same and if all factors of experience and qualifications were equal, then equal salaries would be appropriate. If these things were not equal, then a salary difference would seem to be justifiable. Kahrs also felt that coaches' salaries should be based upon missions of the institutions and philosophies of the athletic departments and that if there's a bonus in pay for success, it must be present in both coaches' contracts, not simply one or the other (Coaching Women's Basketball, 1994).

Chris Voelz, Director of Women's Athletics at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities, agreed with Dr. Kahrs and added that the issue of equity was far more complex than just one or two women's sport coaches being paid like the men's sport coaches. Voelz felt that many times the job descriptions of same sport coaches such as head men's and head women's basketball coaches, are not the same and that therefore quality doesn't mean replication. Voelz argued that market value played an important role in the hiring and salary levels of many more head men's coaches than that of head women's coaches (NCAA News, October 31, 1994).

Cheryl Levick, Athletic Director at Stanford, agreed with Voelz and Dr. Kahrs and added that, in her opinion, the responsibilities, time demands, recruiting concerns, number of games, and off-season responsibilities were the same for head men's and head women's basketball coaches of the same division, within the same program. She felt the only factors that would warrant salary differences would be the success of coaches (win-loss records), conference championships, NCAA or NIT berths, etc., and experience levels of the two coaches (Coaching Women's Basketball, 1994). Dave O'Brien (January 1996), Long Beach State Athletic Director, stated that the traditional duties of a head basketball coach of either men's or women's teams included recruiting, planning and running practices, scheduling games, making travel arrangements, supervising assistants, managing budgets, counseling students, public and media relations, and fund raising.

Suggested Factors in Determining Salaries
for Head Men's and Head Women's Basketball Coaches

WBCA Executive Director Betty Jaynes stated there should be comparable job security measures such as multi-year written contracts for women's sport coaches where there were multi-year written contracts for men's sport coaches. The WBCA contended that head women's basketball coaches should be paid a comparable base pay to head men's basketball coaches where the coaches work under similar conditions, exhibit the same degree of skill, effort, and responsibility. The WBCA also argued that, when the head women's basketball coach have been more successful than the head men's basketball coach, the individual deserved to be paid accordingly which may in fact mean a higher salary than the head men's coach. They emphasized that this policy would require an institution's salary plan to be completely gender neutral and that when hiring new coaches, athletic directors would simply have the duty of hiring the best person for the job, regardless of gender. The WBCA felt that coaches should be paid and evaluated on the basis of the following factors: (1) win-loss record, (2) conference championships, (3) NCAA tournament appearances, (4) experience of coach, (5) public relations activities, (6) academic success of student-athletes, and (7) recruiting success. The WBCA also believed that head men's and women's basketball coaches essentially perform the same job, with both coaches putting in approximately the same amount of time each week, and operating under the same rules and regulations. Both desire to win and be successful. Both supervise their staffs, recruit student-athletes, and comply with NCAA rules and

regulations. Therefore, as skills were relatively equal and duties were comparable, head women's and men's basketball coaches should be paid comparable salaries (WBCA Executive Committee, 1993). Many legal experts are predicting that lawsuits alleging violation of the Equal Pay Act will be the next major wave of litigation in the athletic arena.

The concept of equal pay for equal work suggested that there was equal responsibility, equal pressure for success, equal job qualifications, equal years of experiences, and comparable success records. In light of this, Dr. Cynthia Ryder, National Faculty at the United States Sports Academy, felt that to make comparisons between coaches' salaries, the following factors need to be analyzed: coaching, recruiting and administrative responsibilities of the job, requirements for public relations activities and speaking engagements, revenue production, win-loss records, coaching honors and achievements, educational credentials, professional experience and seniority at the institution (Ryder, 1995). University of Illinois Athletic Director Dr. Karol Kahrs said that "job descriptions are not the best tool to determine equal pay." Kahrs also added that the written and/or unwritten expectations and the success or failure to achieve certain performance levels were far better tools for evaluation of pay for respective coaches. While head men's and head women's basketball coaches' job descriptions were relatively similar, Kahrs said there may be differences in levels of expectations related to income generation, fund-raising or other responsibilities for the head men's basketball coaches that the head women's basketball coaches seldom have. Dr. Kahrs also felt that many coaches

were paid according to market value. On the other hand, Cheryl Levick said that there were no differences whatsoever between the job descriptions of the Stanford head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Jackie Shimp, Athletic Director at Olivet College, felt that equivalent salaries were not enough for head coaches and their programs. Shimp stated that systems and services such as assistant coaching staffs, sports information services, and home-game management teams should be examined for both men's and women's programs as well (Coaching Women's Basketball, 1994).

Finally, Dave O'Brien (January 1996) believed that base salaries of coaches should be similar, with variations for training, experience, education, and success. He also believed that supplemental salary categories outside of base salaries should be made available to both head men's and head women's coaches for such items as revenue production, record expectations, market factors, and pressure differences.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research methodology details the structure of the study, in order to obtain answers to the questions and research hypotheses listed in Chapter 1. It also details the overall scheme of this non-experimental exploratory field research.

Non-experimental exploratory field research is used in studies of "what is" rather than to predict relationships. Kerlinger (1986) noted that non-experimental research is systematic empirical inquiry in which the researcher does not have direct control of the independent variables because their manifestations have already occurred.

Kerlinger (1986) set forth three specific purposes for this type of research: (1) to discover significant variables in the field situation, (2) to discover relationships among variables, and (3) to lay the groundwork for later, more systematic and rigorous testing of hypotheses. He also noted specific, though not necessarily detrimental, limitations on the use of non-experimental research. One such limitation was the inability of the researcher to manipulate any of the independent factors. The researcher minimized this limitation through the development of an appropriate research design.

The research design serves as a control mechanism for the research by providing a model or a series of instructions and steps for the researcher to take in gathering and

analyzing the data in certain, specified ways. Field studies are very realistic rather than artificial as some laboratory research can be, and are accepted as non-experimental scientific inquiries.

Population and Sample

Ferguson and Tokane (1989) refer to the population as a group or aggregation defined by their descriptive properties which apply to the whole group rather than to the particular members. With the assistance of the NCAA, 302 institutions were identified as being current member Division I institutions as of May 8, 1996. Also, at nine member institutions, there were dual athletic departments; that is, there were two separate athletic directors, one for men's athletics and one for women's athletics (NCAA Membership, 1994). Therefore, the population sample used for this study included all 311 NCAA Division I member institutions' athletic directors. The 302 Division I institutions and the 311 athletic directors were selected for this study because they were a finite population for which a comprehensive study was feasible. Kalton (1983) stated that systematic sampling selection involved simply taking every n^{th} element after a random start. He also stated that "lists arranged in alphabetical order may often be reasonably treated in this way." This researcher obtained an alphabetized labeling list of all 311 NCAA I athletic directors and their respective athletic departments from the NCAA and used systematic sampling in this research. Questionnaires were sent to all 311 athletic directors, with 156 sent to athletic directors regarding their head men's basketball coaches, and 155 sent to athletic directors

regarding their head women's basketball coaches. There were nine NCAA Division I institutions with separate athletic departments. The nine men's program athletic directors at these schools all received questionnaires regarding their head men's basketball coaches, and the nine women's program athletic directors at these same schools received questionnaires regarding their head women's basketball coaches. The remaining 293 athletic directors were in charge of both men's and women's programs. These athletic directors were sampled as follows: A questionnaire regarding the head men's basketball coach was sent to the first athletic director on the list, a questionnaire regarding the head women's basketball coach was sent to the second athletic director of the list and thereafter alternated.

Data Collection

Data was collected through the use of two questionnaires to determine the factors influencing salaries of Division I intercollegiate athletic head men's and women's basketball coaches as perceived by NCAA Division I athletic directors. The questionnaires were developed by the researcher, based on a review of the related literature.

The questionnaires (Appendix C and D) consisted of three parts:

1. Characteristics of head basketball coaches, which consisted of gender and age, number of years in present position, educational background, and number of years of coaching and at what level.

2. General salary and contract information relative to these coaches' salaries included base salary information, bonus criteria, contract lengths, and other duties and opportunities.

3. The ranking of 13 items assessing perceptions of athletic directors on salary-related variables, such as win-loss records, conference championships and finishes, years of coaching experience and duties off the basketball court. (Ranking was from 1 to 13. Number 1 equated to the most important item, while number 13 equated to the least important item.)

Validity and Reliability

Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure. According to Gronlund (1985), "Validity is always concerned with the specific use of the results and the soundness of our proposed interpretations." Bohrnstedt (1983) defines validity as "the degree to which an instrument measures the construct under investigation." Carmines and Zeller (1979) stated that:

> "In a very general sense, any measuring device is valid if it does what it is intended to do. Validity concerns the crucial relationship between concept and indicator....Validity, then is evidenced by the degree that a particular indicator measures what it is supposed to measure rather than reflecting some other phenomenon."

For determination of the construct validity of the questionnaires and cover letters, the items were evaluated by a review committee of ten administrators. On April 26, 1996, these individuals were sent a cover letter (Appendix A) in which they were asked to assess the questionnaires and the cover letters for the study (Appendix B) according to factors identified by Gronlund (1985) that may lower the validity of the questionnaires' results:

1. Unclear directions
2. Reading vocabulary and sentence structure difficulty
3. Inappropriate level of difficulty of questionnaire
4. Poorly constructed questions
5. Ambiguity
6. Survey items inappropriate for the outcomes being measured
7. Survey item length
8. Improper arrangement of items
9. Identifiable patterns of answers

The questionnaires and cover letters were then revised based upon feedback from these individuals.

Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency or repeatability of test scores or data measurement. Gronlund (1985) stated that reliability is "how consistent scores or other evaluation results are from one measure to another." He further stated, "Next to validity,

reliability is the most important characteristic on evaluation results...Reliability (1) provides the consistency that makes validity possible and (2) indicates how much confidence we can place in our results."

The researcher formally tested the questionnaires for their reliability through the test-retest method. The test-retest method is when the same group of individuals is given the same test twice over an interval of time. On May 3, 1996, this researcher sent cover letters (Appendix A) and questionnaires to 32 current athletic administrators at National Intercollegiate Athletic Association (NAIA) four-year colleges, junior colleges, and community colleges, with 16 regarding head men's basketball coaches and 16 regarding head women's basketball coaches.

According to Shaw and Wright (1967), an ideal interval for test-retest is unknown, but most investigators use intervals ranging from two to six weeks. Thus, two weeks later (on May 17, 1996), the same form of the questionnaires was re-administered to these same 32 administrators. The questionnaires were then compared for their consistency in answer for each of the 32 administrators and for the group. The reliability coefficient was .8681 and therefore this researcher viewed the survey instrument as reliable.

Mailing the Questionnaires

After the validity and reliability of the questionnaires were established, the revised questionnaires were mailed to athletic directors at the NCAA Division I institutions. This mailing occurred on May 31, 1996. (The NCAA provided a set of mailing labels for all

311 Division I member institution athletic directors. These labels contained: (1) the name of the institution, (2) the name of the current athletic director, and (3) the mailing address of the institution.) Along with each questionnaire, a self-addressed, stamped envelope was sent to facilitate the return of the questionnaire. Also included was a cover letter on Montana State University-Bozeman letterhead (Appendix B). It contained the following: (1) information about the researcher, (2) instructions for completing the questionnaire, (3) related facts about the purpose of the study and the questionnaire, (4) the importance and significance of the athletic director participating in the study, (5) assurances regarding confidentiality, and (6) the deadline for return. An offer was made to send a copy of summarized findings, if requested, once the study was completed.

The researcher assigned a three-digit numeric code to each of the 311 Division I athletic directors on the list, but not in alphabetical order. This method helped the researcher attempt to eliminate possible breaches of confidentiality through identification of institutions by any party other than the researcher. The code was noted on a master list and on the questionnaires being mailed. A check mark was made on the master list upon receipt of an athletic director's response. This precaution eliminated needless and redundant follow-up requests for response.

If no response were received by June 14th, a follow-up letter (Appendix E) requesting participation was sent on June 17th to those who had not responded. If there were no response by July 12th, the non-responding participants were contacted by the

researcher via telephone and again asked for participation. Finally, on July 31st, after receiving the mail, those not responding were considered non-participants in the study.

Return Rate

Since the task in survey research is "to obtain information from a sample of respondents about their behaviors and/or attitudes" (Bradburn, 1983), a critical element of survey research is the response rate. According to Gay (1987), "if the percentage of returns is not 70% or above, the validity of conclusions will be weak." This researcher attempted to ensure a 70%+ return rate, by sending follow-up letters and questionnaires and by trying to contact non-respondents via the telephone, before the return deadline.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics describe the properties or characteristics of samples or populations where complete population data is available. With descriptive statistics, there is no inferring of causality from a sample to a population (Ferguson and Tokane, 1989). Questions 1 through 8 were answered through the use of descriptive statistics.

The **t-test** was used to compare two different means at a time. Hypotheses 1, 4, and 6 were tested through utilization of the t-test.

The **Pearson-r** correlation was used to analyze the proportion of variability between two sets of variables (Ferguson and Tokane, 1989). Hypotheses 3, 7, and 8 were tested through use of the Pearson-r.

The researcher used **multiple regression** in testing Hypotheses 2 and 5. Multiple regression was used to analyze the proportion of variability in a dependent variable that could be explained by two or more independent variables in combination (Ferguson and Tokane, 1989).

Finally, **chi-square** (X^2) was used to analyze Hypotheses 9 through 15. Hypotheses 9 through 14 were analyzed through use of chi-square tests of independence. For each of these hypotheses, data was comprised of paired observations on two variables. The data was then analyzed to determine whether or not the variables were independent of each other (Ferguson and Tokane, 1989). Hypothesis 15 was analyzed through use of chi-square test of proportions, which is done to test the significance of the differences between proportions for two independent samples (Ferguson and Tokane, 1989).

For all research hypotheses, the null hypothesis made clear the claim that no relationship existed between the two stated variables. The alternative hypothesis (symbolized by H_a) was tested against the null hypothesis (H_o), which stated that there was no relationship between said variables. Using the research data to test the null hypotheses, the potential existed for the researcher to commit one of two types of errors. A Type I error occurs when the researcher rejects a null hypothesis, even though it is true. In other words, the researcher falsely concludes that a statistic is reflecting a real effect when in reality it is an instance of sampling error. The probability of this occurring is the same as the value of the significance level that the researcher chooses. (The Greek letter alpha, α, is used to indicate significance levels.)

If the consequence of rejecting a true null hypothesis due to chance alone were critical, then it would perhaps be appropriate to select an error rate of $\alpha = .01$ (1.00%) or even less. A significance level of .01 means that there is a 1 in 100 chance of rejecting a null hypothesis when it is true. If the researcher could not afford to reject a true null hypothesis, even one in a hundred times due to chance alone, then an error rate as small as $\alpha = .001$ (0.1%) would be more appropriate.

Conversely, in research such as this, where the rejection of a true null hypothesis is not life-threatening, the probability of a Type I error occurring may consciously be set at $\alpha = .05$ for practical purposes. Thus, for the statistical tests of significance in this research project, the probability of committing a Type I error was set at $\alpha = .05$. The null hypothesis was retained whenever the p-value associated with an analysis exceeded alpha. If the p-value was less than or equal to alpha, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The other type of error which may be committed by the researcher is a Type II or Beta (ß) error. It occurs when the researcher retains the null hypothesis when in fact, the null is false. In other words, the researcher has falsely concluded that a statistic was due to sampling error and retained the null hypothesis when in reality, the statistic was something real and the null hypothesis should have been rejected. A Type II error is influenced by many things: (1) the size of the α (alpha), (2) how false the null hypothesis really is, and (3) the sample size "N" being used in the research. As the sample size increases, the probability of committing a Type II error decreases. In addition, as the researcher guards against committing a Type I error, the probability of committing a Type

II error increases and if the researcher attempts to minimize the possibility of committing a Type II error, the risk of committing a Type I error is heightened.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to the 311 NCAA Division I athletic directors for the 1995-96 academic year. An additional delimitation was that information was obtained concerning the salaries of head men's and women's basketball coaches. One final delimitation was that data was collected only during the spring and summer of 1996.

Limitations

This study was limited by the athletic directors' responses to the questionnaires. The review of related literature was limited to personal resources of the author and the resources of the Renne Library at Montana State University-Bozeman, including interlibrary loans, the ERIC system, and Dissertation Abstracts.

CHAPTER 4

SURVEY DATA ANALYSIS

Survey Response Rate

Questionnaires were sent to the 311 athletic directors at 302 NCAA Division I institutions (nine institutions have dual athletic departments). Of these, 156 were sent to athletic directors requesting information on their head men's basketball coaches, and 155 were sent to athletic directors requesting information on their head women's basketball coaches. Two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires were returned, for an overall return rate of 83%. Table 1 shows the breakdown in the numbers and percentages of responses received regarding head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Table 1: Numbers and Percentages of Responses Received

Questionnaires Regarding	Total Sent	Total Received	Percentage
Head Men's Basketball Coaches	156	118	0.76
Head Women's Basketball Coaches	155	139	0.90
Total	311	257	0.83

The researcher conducted 30 telephone interviews choosing non-respondents at random to determine whether the non-respondents differed from the respondents with

regard to questionnaire variables. If a particular athletic director were not available, another one was randomly added to the list of phone calls. (Forty-one calls were made in order to reach 30 athletic directors.) These interviews were not included in the total number of responses, however the data gathered from these phone calls is provided at the end of this chapter. Nineteen athletic directors were contacted regarding their head men's basketball coaches. Of these 19, 12 indicated that their department did not fill out surveys as they did not have the time to adequately do so, and four stated that it was their practice not to release information regarding salaries of personnel in their department. Information was obtained from the other three athletic directors. Likewise, eleven athletic directors were contacted regarding their head women's basketball coaches. Of these 11, five indicated as above that their departments did not complete surveys due to time constraints and two said they did not release salary information on personnel in their department. Information was obtained from the remaining four athletic directors. The researcher determined that this refusal by 23 of 30 athletic directors (16 of 19 regarding their head men's basketball coaches and seven of 11 regarding their head women's basketball coaches) to complete the questionnaire did not constitute a threat to the validity of this study, as the refusals were due to institutional/departmental policies and did not appear to be different from the respondents.

Of the 257 responses received, some athletic directors failed, for whatever reasons, to complete all items. Therefore, some data items indicated the responses to be less than 100% of the questionnaires received. It did not appear that there was any particular

pattern to the missed responses. The researcher determined that this loss of item response did not constitute a threat to the validity of the study, as the missing data did not appear to occur systematically.

The data received on each returned questionnaire was compiled into a master data file and encompassed three areas: (1) characteristics of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, (2) general salary and contract information relative to head men's and head women's basketball coaches, and (3) the importance of factors and responsibilities influencing the salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, as perceived by their athletic directors.

Data Analysis

Question 1 asked what the overall mean rank order of the factors used to establish salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches was, as perceived by their athletic directors. The following results were found:

Table 2: Rank Orders of Factors Influencing Salaries

Factors Influencing Salaries	**Mean Rank Order of Head Men's Basketball Coach**	**Mean Rank Order of Head Women's Basketball Coach**
Graduation Rate of Student-Athletes at This Institution	1	1
Win-Loss Record at Current Institution	2	2
Recruiting Success at This Institution	3	4
Conference Standings	4	3
Public Relations Activities Participated in at This Institution	5	6
Conference Championships While at This Institution	8	5
Market Value Factor	6	7
NCAA or NIT Tournament Appearances at This Institution	10	8
Overall Win-Loss Record	11	9
Attendance Goals at This Institution	9	10
Revenue-Production Goals at This Institution	7	12
Total Conference Championships	12	11
Overall NCAA or NIT Tournament Appearances	13	13

Out of the 13 factors analyzed, only three ranked identically for head men's and head women's basketball coaches — the top two (Graduation Rate of Student-Athletes and Win-Loss Records) and the 13th or least important factor (Overall NCAA or NIT

appearances). Of the remaining factors analyzed, Revenue-Production Goals was ranked most differently between the head men's and head women's basketball coaches by five (7 for men and 12 for women).

Question 2 asked what the other/unique duties for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. The researcher found that 34 of 118 (29%) of head men's basketball coaches had other/unique duties in their contracts. Twenty-three of 34 of the head men's basketball coaches had teaching duties, and 6 served as an assistant athletic director. Similarly, 39 of 139 (28%) of head women's basketball coaches had other/unique duties that they were required to perform. Over half of these coaches (20 of 38) had teaching duties, while six head women's basketball coaches served as the senior woman administrator. Table 3 shows the breakdown of answers given in response to this question. The percentages and kinds of duties performed by head men's and head women's basketball coaches, in addition to their coaching responsibilities, were similar in nature.

Table 3: Other/Unique Duties

Duty	No. of Men	No. of Women
Teaching	23	20
Asst AD (Men)/SWA (Women)	6	6
Public Relations	2	2
2nd Sport Assistant	2	2
Admissions/Academic Advisor	1	4
Other	0	5
Totals and Percentages	34/118 (29%)	39/139 (28%)

Question 3 asked what the causes for termination for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. The researcher found that 56 of 118 (47%) of head men's basketball coaches and 62 of 139 (45%) of head women's basketball coaches had causes for termination written into their contracts. Table 4 shows the breakdown of answers given for head men's and head women's basketball coaches in response to this question.

Table 4: Termination Causes

Causes for Termination	No. of Men	No. of Women
Poor Performance	1	2
NCAA, University, Conference Violations	46	48
Unethical Behavior	6	6
Insubordination	0	2
Without Cause (No reason needed)	2	2
Other	1	2
Totals and Percentages	56/118 (47%)	62/139 (45%)

The breakdown of answers above were very similar, with five different reasons given for the head men's basketball coaches and six different reasons given for the head women's basketball coaches. A violation of university, conference, or NCAA rules constituted approximately 80% of the responses for termination causes for both head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Question 4 asked what the endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. The researcher found that 63 of 118 (53%) of head men's basketball coaches had endorsement opportunities listed as part of their contracts while 51 of 139 (37%) of head women's basketball coaches had endorsement opportunities listed as part of their contracts. Of the head women's basketball coaches, 59 were males and 80 were females. Twenty-two of the 59 males (37%) had endorsement opportunities,

while 29 of 80 females (36%) had endorsement opportunities. Table 5 shows the breakdown of answers given by athletic directors to this question.

Table 5: Endorsement Opportunities

Endorsement Opportunities	Number of Men	Number of Women
Apparel	12	11
Shoes	39	30
Radio	3	1
Television	4	1
Other Merchandise or Equipment	2	5
Balls	3	3
Totals and Percentages	63/118 (53%)	51/139 (37%)

The head men's basketball coaches had more overall opportunities than the head women's basketball coaches did, but the proportions of the different endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were relatively similar.

Question 5 asked what the publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. The responses showed that 23 of 139 (17%) head women's basketball coaches had publicity opportunities written into their contracts while 41 of 118 (35%) head men's basketball coaches had publicity opportunities written into their contracts.

Interestingly, while the average number of publicity opportunities per season for head men's basketball coaches (20) and head women's basketball coaches (21) was very

similar, the average dollar amount earned per season was strikingly different, with the head men's basketball coaches earning almost $28,000.00 while the head women's basketball coaches earned just under $12,000.00, for a difference of nearly $16,000 earned per season. This difference came out to almost $1,389.00 earned per opportunity for head men's basketball coaches and $564.00 earned per opportunity for head women's basketball coaches, almost a 2.5:1 ratio in favor of head men's basketball coaches (an $825.00 difference earned for each opportunity). In looking at the head women's basketball coaches, the researcher found that of the 59 male coaches, 13 (22%) had publicity opportunities and earned an average of $13,182.15 per season through these opportunities. Of the 80 females coaching women's basketball, 10 (13%) had publicity opportunities and earned an average of $10,132.00 per season through their opportunities.

Question 6 asked what the courtesy car opportunities for head men's and women's basketball coaches were. Table 6 shows the breakdown of responses to the question.

Table 6: Courtesy Car Opportunities

Courtesy Car Opportunities	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Head Men's Basketball Coaches	63 (53%)	55 (47%)	118
Head Women's Basketball Coaches	73 (53%)	66 (47%)	139

There was no difference in the percentage of courtesy car opportunities between head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Question 7 asked what the housing opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Table 7 shows the breakdown of responses to this question.

Table 7: Housing Opportunities

Housing Opportunities	**Yes**	**No**	**Total**
Head Men's Basketball Coaches	3 (2.5%)	115 (97.5%)	118
Head Women's Basketball Coaches	2 (2.2%)	137 (98.6%)	139

The housing opportunities did not differ significantly between head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Question 8 asked what the basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. On the average, 99 of 118 head men's basketball coaches with basketball camp opportunities made $14,984.00 while 117 of 139 head women's basketball coaches made $11,767.00 through their opportunities. This monetary difference in basketball camp opportunities amounted to $3,217.00.

The first null hypothesis stated there was no significant difference between the base salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. The average base salary for 99 of 118 head men's basketball coaches for which data was gathered was $74,006.98, as compared with the average base salary for 119 of 139 head women's basketball coaches for which data was gathered was of $59,111.64, a difference of $14,895.34. Using a t-test, a t of 10.068 was found with an associated p-value of .002. Testing the null hypothesis at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected. Head men's basketball

coaches had a significantly higher base salary than that of head women's basketball coaches. In fact, the head men's basketball coaches' earnings was computed to be 125% of what the head women's basketball coaches earned. Of the 119 head women's basketball coaches, 52 were male and 67 were female. The males coaching women's basketball had an average base salary of $61,542.49, while the females coaching women's basketball had an average base salary of $57,225.01.

The second null hypothesis stated the proportion of variability (R^2) in coaches' salaries that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:

A. Gender of the coach

B. Gender of the athlete

C. Age of the coach

D. Total number of years coached

E. Number of years as a head coach at this institution

F. The coaches' levels of education

G. Proportion of wins of the coaches

Using multiple regression, an R^2 of .09508 with an associated p-value of .1027 was found. Testing the null hypothesis at the .05 level, this null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant amount of variance (R^2) in coaches' salaries that could be explained by the above combination of variables. Only 9.5% of the variability in coaches' salaries was explained by the aforementioned combination of variables; however, this researcher feels that part of this variability may be explained because there were 217

complete data sets analyzed in Hypothesis 1 where there was a significant difference in base salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, but only 125 complete data sets were obtained for analysis for Hypothesis 2. In looking at these 125 data sets, the researcher determined that 69 were for head women's basketball coaches and 56 were for head men's basketball coaches. The average base salary for these 56 head men's basketball coaches was $75,073.32 as compared with the average base salaries for the 69 head women's basketball coaches which was $54,661.30. This difference amounted to $20,412.02, an even greater difference than that found in Hypothesis 1 ($14,895.34).

Hypothesis 3 stated that there was no significant relationship between the mean rank order of factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. At first glance, the rank orders for the head men's and head women's basketball coaches were remarkably similar despite some obvious differences. Using a Pearson-r, an r value of .8681 was found with an associated p-value of .0000. Testing the hypothesis at the .05 level, the researcher rejected the null. There was a significant relationship between the mean rank order of factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

The fourth hypothesis stated there were no significant differences between the bonuses of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Thirty-five of 118 (30%) head men's basketball coaches had bonuses while 44 of 139 (32%) of head women's basketball coaches had bonuses. The average bonus for head men's basketball coaches was $8,302.37 while the average bonus for head women's basketball coaches was $6,208.70,

a difference of $2,093.67 in favor of head men's basketball coaches. Using a t-test, a t of 2.379 and an associated p-value of .127 were found. Testing the null hypothesis at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a statistically significant difference between the bonuses of head men's and head women's basketball coaches even though there was more than a $2,000.00 difference in the average bonuses.

The fifth hypothesis stated the proportion of variability (R^2) in coaches' bonuses that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:

A. Number of years as head coach at this institution

B. Proportion of wins

Using multiple regression, an R^2 of .03874 and an associated p-value of .4911 were found. Testing the null hypothesis at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. Only 3.9% of the variability in coaches' bonuses was explained by the combination of variables listed above. Bonuses received by coaches did not depend on how long a head coach had coached at his/her school nor on his/her win-loss percentage.

Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8 all dealt with coaching contracts. Hypothesis six stated there were no significant differences between the lengths of contracts for head mens' and head women's basketball coaches. Using a t-test, a t of 1.458 and an associated p-value of .229 were found. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant difference between contract lengths for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. The average contract length for head men's basketball coaches was

2.9 years, while the average contract length for head women's basketball coaches was 2.6 years.

The seventh hypothesis stated there were no significant relationships between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the number of years coached. Using Pearson-r, an r of .32051 and an associated p-value of .0000 were found. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant relationship between contract lengths for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the number of years coached. The more years a coach had coached, the longer the length of his/her contract.

Hypothesis number eight stated there was no significant relationship between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the proportion of wins. Again, Pearson-r was utilized. An r of .35482 and an associated p-value of .0001 were found. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected. There was a significant relationship between contract lengths for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the proportion of wins. The better the win-loss record of a coach (the higher his/her proportion of wins), the greater the length of his/her contract. Not only was winning an important factor in determining contract length, but when coupled with the results of Question 1 (Factors Influencing Salaries), where winning ranked as the second most important factor in determining salaries for both head men's and head women's basketball coaches, the results showed, as the researcher expected, that a winning coach had a higher salary and more contract components.

Hypothesis 9 stated there were no significant differences between basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Ninety-nine of 118 (84%) head men's basketball coaches had basketball camp opportunities while 117 of 139 (84%) head women's basketball coaches had basketball camp opportunities. Using chi-square, an X^2 of .13945 was found with an associated p-value of .70882. Testing this null at .05, the null hypothesis was retained. There was no significant difference between basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches, even though men's basketball coaches earned over $3,200.00 more through their basketball camp opportunities than the women's basketball coaches did through theirs.

Hypothesis 10 stated there were no significant differences between endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Using chi-square, an X^2 of 7.65475 and an associated p-value of .02177 were found. As noted in Table 5, there were 63 of 118 (53%) head men's basketball coaches with endorsement opportunities as compared with 51 of 139 (37%) head women's basketball coaches. Testing the null hypothesis at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was rejected. There were significant differences between the endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches in favor of head men's basketball coaches.

Hypothesis 11 stated there were no significant differences between publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Using a chi-square, a X^2 of 13.91677 and an associated p-value of .00095 were found. Testing the null hypothesis at .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. There were significant differences

between the publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Also, as stated earlier, not only did head men's coaches have more publicity opportunities than head women's basketball coaches (41:23), head men's basketball coaches also earned nearly two and one-half times as much through these opportunities as the head women's basketball coaches did.

Hypothesis 12 stated there were no significant differences between courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Sixty-three of 118 (53%) head men's basketball coaches and 73 of 139 (53%) head women's basketball coaches had courtesy car opportunities. Using chi-square, an X^2 of .00141 and an associated p-value of .97006 were found. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant difference between courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Hypothesis 13 stated there were no significant differences between housing opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Three of 118 (2.5%) head men's basketball coaches and 2 of 139 (2.2%) head women's basketball coaches had housing opportunities. Using chi-square analysis, the researcher found a X^2 of 3.16676 and an associated p-value of .40241. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant difference between housing opportunities of head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

Hypothesis 14 stated there were no significant relationships between the educational backgrounds of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Table 8 shows the breakdown of answers received in relation to this hypothesis.

Table 8: Educational Backgrounds

Educational Background	B. S.	M. S.	Ed. D./Ph. D.	N/A
Head Men's Basketball Coaches	18	78	6	16
Head Women's Basketball Coaches	30	92	4	13

Using chi-square, a X^2 of 3.27594 and an associated p-value of .35101 were found. Testing at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant relationship between the educational backgrounds of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Data analysis revealed that 86% and 91% of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, respectively, have earned at least a B. S. degree with approximately 70% of head men's and head women's basketball coaches having earned a post-baccalaureate degree.

Lastly, Hypothesis 15 stated there were no significant differences in percentages of male coaches and female coaches with written contracts. Using chi-square, an X^2 of 2.74363 and an associated p-value of .60160 were found. There were 150 of 158 (94.9%) male coaches with written contracts: 98 of 99 (99%) were head men's basketball coaches, and 52 of 59 (88%) were head women's basketball coaches. The 73 of 80 (91.3%) female coaches with written contracts were all head women's basketball coaches. Testing the null

hypothesis at the .05 level, the null hypothesis was retained. There was not a significant difference in the percentages of male coaches and female coaches with written contracts. In retrospect, to remain consistent with the rest of the study, the researcher should have asked this question differently so that percentages of head men's and head women's basketball coaches with written contracts could have been compared instead of percentages of male and female coaches with written contracts.

Information Obtained From Athletic Directors Via Telephone

As stated earlier, this researcher conducted 30 telephone interviews with non-responding athletic directors. In 19 of the 30 telephone interviews, the researcher attempted to gather information on head men's basketball coaches and in the remaining 11, an attempt was made to gather information on head women's basketball coaches. Of those 30 telephone interviews, 23 refused to participate. The remaining seven athletic directors provided information on their head men's and head women's basketball coaches.

All three head men's basketball coaches had written contracts as did all four head women's basketball coaches. This data did not surprise the researcher as 93.7% of head men's and head women's basketball coaches did have written contracts according to the information received from returned questionnaires.

The average base salary for these three head men's basketball coaches was $69,500. This average was $4,500.00 lower than the head men's basketball coaches' average base salary obtained from the returned questionnaires. The average base salary

for these four head women's basketball coaches was $55,425.00, which was almost $3,700.00 lower than the head women's basketball coaches' average base salary obtained from the returned questionnaires.

Two of three head men's basketball coaches (67%) and two of four head women's basketball coaches (50%) had bonus criteria written into their contracts. These numbers are higher than the researcher expected, as only 30% of head men's basketball coaches and 32% of head women's basketball coaches reported bonuses in their contracts according to data received from returned questionnaires. All three (100%) of the head men's basketball coaches had causes for termination in their contracts as compared with 47% of head men's basketball coaches on returned questionnaires. All four (100%) of the head women's basketball coaches had termination causes in their contracts as compared with 45% of head women's basketball coaches on returned questionnaires.

Two of three (67%) of the head men's basketball coaches had publicity opportunities, all three (100%) had basketball camp opportunities, two of three (67%) had endorsement opportunities, while none of the three (0%) had other/unique duties. The corresponding data from the returned questionnaires was as follows: 35% of head men's basketball coaches had publicity opportunities, 84% had basketball camp opportunities, 53% had endorsement opportunities, and 29% had other/unique duties. Three of four (75%) of the head women's basketball coaches had basketball camp opportunities, two of four (50%) had endorsement opportunities, one of four (25%) had publicity opportunities, and two of the four (50%) had other/unique duties. The corresponding data from the

returned questionnaires was as follows: 84% of head women's basketball coaches had basketball camp opportunities, 37% had endorsement opportunities, 17% had publicity opportunities, and 28% had other/unique duties.

One of three (33%) of the head men's basketball coaches had a courtesy car as compared with 53% of head men's basketball coaches from returned questionnaires. None of the four (0%) head women's basketball coaches had courtesy car allowances as compared with 53% of head women's basketball coaches from returned data.

All three (100%) of the head men's basketball coaches and three of four (75%) of the head women's basketball coaches had obtained their master's degrees. The returned questionnaires showed 71% of head men's basketball coaches and 69% of head women's basketball coaches had earned at least an M. S. degree.

The researcher felt that although there were differences in the percentages between data received on the telephone and data from returned questionnaires regarding head men's and/or head women's basketball coaches, those differences did not constitute a threat to the validity of this study.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter contains: (1) a summary of the study, (2) conclusions which include a discussion of how the findings compare with the research information found in the review of related literature, (3) recommendations, (4) issues for further study, and (5) a closing.

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in salaries and between the factors influencing salaries of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I intercollegiate athletic head men's and head women's basketball coaches as perceived by their NCAA Division I athletic directors.

A review of related literature on factors influencing the salaries of NCAA Division I intercollegiate athletic head men's and women's basketball coaches showed a limited number of journal articles and a non-existence of intercollegiate athletic salary plans in place from which information was obtained. There were many sources dealing with higher

education faculty salary equity plans, but most of these focused on academic variables influencing salaries.

The majority of the articles on athletic salary equity plans for basketball or any intercollegiate sports or programs merely addressed the recent events that led to the need for such plans. They did not propose any guidelines that would aid athletic directors in pursuing salary equity in their programs.

The review of related literature was divided into five sections: (a) Purpose of the NCAA and its position on gender equity and discrimination; (b) History and rationales behind the equity movement; (c) Existing higher education faculty salary plans; (d) Current "policies" for determining salaries for head men's and women's basketball coaches; and (e) Suggested factors in determining salaries for head men's and women's basketball coaches.

The study was conducted in the spring and summer of 1996. The population sample used for this study was all 311 NCAA Division I member institutions' athletic directors at the 302 NCAA Division I institutions.

Data for the study was gathered through the use of two questionnaires developed by the researcher based on the review of related literature. These questionnaires were sent to the 311 athletic directors with 156 sent to the athletic directors regarding their head men's basketball coach and 155 to athletic directors regarding their head women's basketball coach. The information solicited in these questionnaires included: (1) characteristics of head basketball coaches, which consisted of gender, age, number of years

in present position, educational background, and number of years coaching and at what level; (2) general salary and contract information relative to these coaches' salaries including base salary information, bonus criteria, contract lengths, and other duties and opportunities; and, (3) ranking 13 items for assessing perceptions of athletic directors on salary-related variables, such as win-loss records, conference championships and finishes, years of coaching experience, and duties off the basketball court.

Two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires were returned, for an overall return rate of 83%. The researcher conducted 30 telephone interviews choosing non-respondents at random to determine whether the non-respondents differed from the respondents with regard to questionnaire variables. These interviews were not included in the total analysis of responses, however the data gathered from these telephone calls is provided.

There were eight questions answered and 15 research hypotheses tested. The data received from the returned questionnaires was compiled into a master data file and then analyzed through the use of chi-square, t-test, Pearson-r correlation, multiple regression, and descriptive statistics using MSU Stat at Montana State University-Bozeman. Questions 1-8 were answered and presented through the use of **descriptive statistics**. Hypotheses 1, 4, and 6 were tested through the use of the **t-test**. Hypotheses 3, 7, and 8 were tested through the use of the **Pearson-r** correlation. **Multiple regression** was used to test hypotheses 2 and 5. Hypotheses 9-15 were tested through the use of **chi-square** analysis. Of the 15 hypotheses tested, six were rejected due to findings of statistical significance.

Conclusions

Conclusions Regarding "Questions to be Answered"

Question 1 asked what the overall mean rank order of the factors used to establish salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches was, as perceived by their athletic directors.

For both head men's and head women's basketball coaches, graduation rate of student-athletes ranked most important, followed by win-loss record of the coach. Overall NCAA or NIT tournament appearances ranked at number 13 for both head men's and head women's basketball coaches, having had the least amount of influence on their salaries.

Of the remaining factors, the most noticeable difference was in revenue-production goals where it ranked 7th for head men's basketball coaches and 12th for head women's basketball coaches. In the review of literature, the federal Office of Civil Rights specified that a sports ability to generate revenue was irrelevant as far as Title IX was concerned and that budget pressures, differences in revenue production, and other financial considerations did not exempt an institution from its Title IX obligations (American Council on Education, September 1993). Despite this, revenue-production goals had more influence on head men's basketball coaches' salaries than on head women's basketball coaches' salaries. This influence should be a concern for institutions and their athletic departments.

Question 2 asked what the other/unique duties for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Twenty-nine percent of head men's basketball coaches and 28% of head women's basketball coaches had other/unique duties, the majority of which were teaching. This researcher also found the breakdown in the overall of percentages for head men's basketball coaches to be similar in nature with that of head women's basketball coaches. Since this researcher did not obtain data on head men's and head women's basketball coaches from the same schools, it was not possible to determine whether or not both coaches at these particular schools had comparable other/unique duties. This information would be important in re-examining an institution's salary equity plan, as indicated by Dave O'Brien (January 1996), Athletic Director at Long Beach State University. He said that the "extra pay" for extra duty defense is not convincing. He felt that these duties must be real and capable of specificity. He pointed out that many times men's programs have more assistant coaches and/or support staff than the women's programs have; and, if this is the case, these "extra duties" may in fact be handled by these people, thereby not justifying extra compensation.

Question 3 asked what the causes for termination for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Forty-seven percent and 45% respectively of head men's and head women's basketball coaches had causes for termination written into their contracts. A violation of university, conference, or NCAA rules constituted the majority of the causes for termination of coaches. The breakdown in the overall percentages of responses for head men's and head women's basketball coaches was very similar. One noteworthy

item is that while win-loss record ranked 2nd out of 13 in influencing salaries (Question 1), only three responses out of 258 indicated that poor performance was written into their coach's contract as a specific reason for termination. It may be that "poor performance" is an unwritten assumption by all parties concerned as grounds for termination. However, it was this researcher's contention that, if it were important enough for athletic directors to rank it 2nd in importance in influencing coaches' salaries, it should have been important enough for athletic directors to list "poor performance" when writing the contracts.

Question 4 asked what the endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Fifty-three percent of head men's basketball coaches and 37% of head women's basketball coaches had endorsement opportunities in their contracts. Again, the breakdown of responses was similar even though the head men's basketball coaches had more overall endorsement opportunities than the head women's basketball coaches had. This difference in endorsement opportunities may have been partly because gender norms have changed slowly on their own and at times received minimal or no support outside of Title IX and legal mandates (Schrof, 1993). Los Angeles Times columnist Michael Ventre supported this contention and wrote that the head women's basketball coach at the University of Southern California was not doing the same job as USC's head men's basketball coach and that she was coaching a lesser sport (Ahmann, 1993).

As the literature pointed out, whether perceived or real, there is a "value-added" factor to the men's game at most institutions. Men's programs are expected to draw more

fans, create more revenue, and add tremendous appeal to campus life. These expectations all add pressure on the men's coach and therefore warrant additional compensation to the men's coach (Ahmann, 1993). For the above-mentioned reasons, men's basketball programs may appeal more to advertisers, promoters, and companies than a women's basketball program might. Thus more endorsement opportunities or better endorsement opportunities might be available to the men's programs because of the bigger profit opportunities seen by said advertisers.

Question 5 asked what the publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Head men's basketball coaches had more than twice as many opportunities as the head women's basketball coaches (35:17). The most money earned by a head men's basketball coach from publicity opportunities was $185,000.00 in a season, while the most money earned by a head women's basketball coach from publicity opportunities was $40,000.00 in a season. The least amount earned was $2,000.00, while the least amount earned by one of the head women's basketball coaches was one-eighth of that ($250.00). Likewise, the average publicity dollars earned per season by the head men's basketball coaches was more than double that of the average publicity dollars earned per season by the head women's basketball coaches ($27,785.00 to $11,856.00), even though the average number of opportunities per season was nearly identical for head men's basketball coaches (20) and head women's basketball coaches (21). Again, as pointed out before, many promoters may feel that the men's basketball programs are worth promoting whereas the women's basketball programs are not, or are worth promoting only at a

minimal level. This belief would perpetuate a continuous circle of mediocrity at best for many women's basketball programs and coaches. In seasons past, a women's basketball program may have received few, if any, publicity opportunities. In turn, with little or no publicity, the program may not have attracted much attention. This lack of attention could have resulted in small attendance turnouts which in turn would not have allowed for revenue-production. This lack of revenue-production would have stifled appropriate funding of promotional staff, thereby limiting publicity opportunities for the women's program the following season. Somewhere, this possible cycle must be broken. Dave O'Brien (1995) states that pay discrepancies cannot be justified in terms of increased revenue-generation expectations, increased attendance requirements, or increased media coverage of the men's programs because these factors have grown out of the historical failure of universities to appropriately fund and promote the women's basketball programs, and not because of the superior abilities of men's basketball coaches.

As Donna Lopiano (1992) pointed out, we can't

> "...get into a system where we have a men's basketball coach with six promotional and fund-raising staff members helping raise money upon which his or her salary and bonus are based and the women's basketball coach has no such support system or a much lesser one, and is therefore never going to have the same opportunity to produce revenue."

Jackie Shimp, Athletic Director at Olivet College added that equivalent salaries are not enough for coaches and their programs for achieving true gender equity. He stated that systems and services such as assistant coaching staffs, sports information services, and

home game management teams must be examined for both men's and women's programs as well (Coaching Women's Basketball, 1994).

Question 6 asked what the courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Fifty-three percent of head men's and head women's basketball coaches had courtesy car opportunities. There was no difference in percentages but the breakdown in the levels of opportunities and kinds of cars involved was unknown. That data may or may not have shown anything, but would have answered Question 6 better. Therefore, the researcher should have either asked "How many head men's and head women's basketball coaches had courtesy car opportunities?" or sought information pertaining specifically to the kinds of courtesy car opportunities.

Question 7 asked what the housing allowances for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Only three head men's basketball coaches and two head women's basketball coaches had housing allowances. The percentages are similar but again, the exact levels of opportunities were unknown and may have provided more information. Again, the researcher obtained "Yes/No" data, so the data actually answered the question, "How many head men's and head women's basketball coaches had housing opportunities?" The above question should have been asked, or the researcher should have sought out information pertaining specifically to the exact level of opportunity.

Question 8 asked what the basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches were. Eighty-four percent of head men's basketball coaches and 84% of head women's basketball coaches had basketball camp opportunities written

into their contracts. On the average, head men's basketball coaches made $14,984.00 through their basketball camp opportunities, while head women's basketball coaches made $11,767.00 through their basketball camp opportunities. This difference of $3,217.00 could be due to a number of factors, including numbers of campers attending the camps, attendance fees charged to campers, or other such items, but this information was not obtained. This researcher wondered if the publicity opportunities, which were reportedly double for head men's basketball coaches, could have had any influence on this difference (i.e., mailouts, advertising of camps). Information regarding specific publicity opportunities was not obtained, which may have been helpful in better answering this question as well.

Conclusions Regarding Research Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference between base salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. The average base salary for head men's and head women's basketball coaches was $74,006.98 and $59,111.64 respectively, for a difference of $14,895.34. This difference was found to be significant. Head men's basketball coaches did have a significantly higher base salary than head women's basketball coaches that was due to something other than chance. Data obtained here showed that these head women's basketball coaches earned 80% of what was earned by the head men's basketball coaches. This finding statistically supported the contention by C. Timothy Stoner, WBCA legal counsel, said that head women's basketball coaches

are grossly underpaid in their base salaries as compared to the base salaries of head men's basketball coaches (Ahmann, 1993). However, a 1992 survey by the WBCA found that the average base salary of NCAA Division I head women's basketball coaches was only 59% of the average base salary of the head men's basketball coaches (Blum, 1994). This contention shows that, even though there is still a significant difference between the salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches (in favor of head men's basketball coaches), the disparity is narrowing.

The second null hypothesis stated the proportion of the variability (R^2) in coaches' salaries that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:

A. Gender of the coach

B. Gender of the athlete

C. Age of the coach

D. Total number of years coached

E. Number of years as a head coach at this institution

F. The coaches' levels of education

G. The proportion of wins of the coaches

Through data analysis, it was determined that only 9.5% of the variability in coaches' salaries was explained by the aforementioned combination of variables. This variance was not a significant amount.

The third null hypothesis stated there was no significant relationship between the mean rank order of factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's

basketball coaches. Through data analysis, the researcher found that there was a significant relationship between mean rank order of factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. This result meant that, even though there are some ranking differences by the athletic directors in factors influencing salaries for head men's and head women's basketball coaches, the rankings are related.

Cheryl Levick, Athletic Director at Stanford, added that there are no differences whatsoever between the job descriptions of the Stanford head men's and head women's basketball coaches. She said that responsibilities, time demands, recruiting concerns, number of games and off-season responsibilities are the same for head men's and head women's basketball coaches of the same division, within the same program. She felt that the only factors warranting salary differences would be win-loss record and experience level of the two head coaches (Coaching Women's Basketball, 1994).

Hypothesis 4 stated there were no significant differences between bonuses of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Although data analysis did not reveal a significant difference between bonuses of these coaches, the amounts of the bonuses these coaches received on average differed by $2,093.67 in favor of head men's basketball coaches. Thirty percent of head men's basketball coaches and 32% of head women's basketball coaches had bonuses written into their contracts, but this researcher did not substantiate the exact criteria for these bonuses.

The fifth hypothesis stated the proportion of the variability (R^2) in coaches' bonuses that could be explained by the following combination of variables was zero:

A. Number of years as head coach at this institution

B. Proportion of wins

Through data analysis, it was determined that only 3.9% of the variability in coaches bonuses was explained by the variables above. This variance was not a significant amount. Bonuses received by a coach did not depend on the length of time a coach had coached at his/her present school nor on his/her win-loss record.

Hypotheses 6, 7, and 8 all dealt with coaching contracts. Hypothesis six stated there were no significant differences between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. The results showed that there were no significant differences between contract lengths for head men's basketball coaches (2.9 year average) and head women's basketball coaches (2.6 year average). This data contradicted a statement made by the WBCA that women's basketball coaches tend not to have written multi-year contracts as do the men's basketball coaches (WBCA Executive Committee, 1993).

The seventh hypothesis stated there were no significant relationships between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the number of years coached. Hypothesis number eight stated there was no significant relationship between the lengths of contracts for head men's and head women's basketball coaches depending on the proportion of wins. The data analysis for these two hypotheses showed significant relationships between contract lengths and the number of years a coach had coached and also contract lengths and a coach's proportion of wins. The longer tenure

a coach had at his/her current institution, the greater his/her contract length. Likewise, the better a coach's win-loss record, at his/her current institution, the greater the length of his/her contract. These results were expected by the researcher.

Hypothesis 9 stated there were no significant differences between basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. As revealed in Question 8, head men's basketball coaches did make on the average over $3200.00 more than head women's basketball coaches through these camp opportunities. However, data analysis showed no significant differences between the percentages of head men's basketball coaches with camp opportunities (84%) and percentages of camp opportunities (84%) held by the head women's basketball coaches. WBCA Legal Counsel C. Timothy Stoner pointed out one additional case of inequities that this researcher did not attempt to look into, but found worth noting. Stoner said that at the University of Minnesota, head men's sport coaches were allowed to run summer camps at their own discretion, but that the head coaches of women's sports had no choice in the matter. They were required to run camps (USSA Sports Supplement, Spring 1995).

Blum (1994) stated that it is common for head men's basketball coaches to receive additional compensation for endorsements, summer camps, and radio and television shows. Head women's basketball coaches may earn some money from summer camps, but not always; and beyond that, they rarely received any other extra monies.

Hypotheses 10 through 13 all deal with differences in opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Hypothesis 10 stated there were no significant

differences between endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Through data analysis, a significant difference was found in endorsement opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Head men's basketball coaches had more endorsement opportunities (53%) than the head women's basketball coaches had (37%).

Hypothesis 11 stated there were no significant differences between publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Here also, significant differences were found in publicity opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Thirty-five percent of head men's basketball coaches had publicity opportunities as compared with 17% of head women's basketball coaches, In addition, head men's basketball coaches earned nearly two and one-half times as much through their opportunities as the head women's basketball coaches earned through theirs.

Hypothesis 12 stated there were no significant differences between courtesy car opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Data analysis did not show a significant difference here. Fifty-three percent of head men's and head women's basketball coaches had courtesy car opportunities, but the exact levels of opportunities (free mileage, free car, etc.) or kinds of cars (2-door, 4-door, compact, sport utility, etc.) were not obtained by the researcher.

Hypothesis 13 stated there were no significant differences between housing opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Data analysis showed there was not a significant difference for head men's and head women's basketball coaches

in housing opportunities. Only three of 118 (2.5%) head men's basketball coaches and two of 139 (2.2%) head women's basketball coaches had housing opportunities. Again, this researcher did not attempt to solicit specific information related to exact levels of opportunities.

The results from data analysis on Hypotheses 10-13 supported Blum's contention (1994) that, outside of basketball camps, women's basketball coaches rarely received any other extras whereas the men's basketball coaches commonly received endorsement, basketball camp, and publicity opportunities.

In totaling the number of endorsement, publicity, courtesy car, and housing opportunities for head men's basketball coaches, and comparing them with the totals for the head women's basketball coaches, one can see in Table 9 that 32% of head men's basketball coaches received at least one opportunity in addition to their base salary, while only 26% of head women's basketball coaches received at least one additional opportunity on top of their base salary. The discrepancies in the dollar amounts earned through publicity opportunities was almost $16,000.00 in favor of head men's basketball coaches. It would have been interesting to compare average dollar amounts on endorsement, courtesy car, and housing opportunities as well, but this information was not obtained by the researcher.

Table 9: Numbers of Possible Opportunities

Possible Opportunities	Head Men's Basketball Coaches	Head Women's Basketball Coaches
Endorsement Opportunities	63/118	51/139
Publicity Opportunities	20/118	21/139
Courtesy Car Opportunities	63/118	73/139
Housing Opportunities	3/118	2/139
Totals	149/472 (32%)	147/556 (26%)

Hypothesis 14 stated there were no significant relationships between the educational backgrounds of head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Data analysis did not show otherwise. This researcher felt it noteworthy to mention that both head men's and head women's basketball coaches were well educated with approximately 70% of each having already obtained either a master's and/or a doctorate degree.

Lastly, Hypothesis 15 stated there were no significant differences in percentages of male coaches and female coaches with written contracts. Data analysis did not show a significant difference here. Despite the fact that other results discussed showed statistically significant differences in salaries and other opportunities for coaches, most men's and women's coaches did have written contracts — 93.7% to be exact. This data refutes a statement made by the WBCA that without a written contract there is no "job security" for women's basketball coaches (WBCA Executive Committee, 1993). The researcher should have tested the hypothesis regarding gender of the sport and not gender

of the coach. In other words, the researcher should have worded this hypothesis to analyze data regarding head men's and head women's basketball coaches instead of male and female coaches. This wording would have been more consistent with the rest of the study.

Other Conclusions

After analyzing data for all questions and hypotheses, the researcher noticed that there were two hypotheses and two questions where monetary information was obtained for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. Hypothesis 1 dealt with base salary, Hypothesis 4 dealt with bonus information, Question 5 dealt with publicity opportunities, and Question 8 dealt with basketball camp opportunities. A head men's or head women's basketball coach who had bonus opportunities, publicity opportunities, and/or basketball camp opportunities in addition to a base salary in his/her contract could increase his/her total earning capacity dramatically. When reviewing Table 10 below, one can compare the total possible earnings for head men's basketball coaches with that of head women's basketball coaches.

Table 10: Possible Earnings Comparisons

Average Possible Earnings From:	Head Men's Basketball Coaches	Head Women's Basketball Coaches	Difference
Base Salary (Hypothesis 1)	$74,006.98	$59,111.64	$14,895.34
Bonus (Hypothesis 4)	$8,302.37	$6,208.70	$2,093.67
Publicity Opportunities (Question 5)	$27,785.00	$11,856.00	$15,929.00
Basketball Camp Opportunities (Question 8)	$14,984.00	$11,767.00	$3,217.00
Totals	$125,078.35	$88,943.34	$36,135.01

There was a significant difference in the base salaries of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, and there was a significant difference in the publicity opportunities of these coaches. No statistically significant difference was found in the bonuses of head men's and head women's basketball coaches, and there was not a statistically significant difference found in the basketball camp opportunities for head men's and head women's basketball coaches. However, as Table 10 clearly showed, the difference in possible earnings for head men's and head women's basketball coaches was approximately $15,000.00 (comparing base salary only) to $36,000.00 (comparing base salaries, bonuses, publicity and basketball camp opportunities), always in favor of the head men's basketball coaches.

Put another way, a head women's basketball coach could have a salary ranging anywhere from approximately $59,000.00 to $89,000.00 depending on whether or not his/her contract stipulated any additional opportunities and/or bonuses on top of the base salary. Similarly, a head men's basketball coach could have a range in his salary, but his range would be much different — from approximately $74,000.00 to $125,000.00. The salary would depend on the terms of his contract, just as with that of the head women's basketball coach. On the average, a head women's basketball coach needed all four opportunities (base, bonus, publicity and basketball camp) in his/her contract to have earned what a head men's basketball coach would have earned with base salary and basketball camp opportunities alone (not including his bonus opportunity nor his publicity opportunity). If both coaches had all four opportunities, a head men's basketball coach could have earned up to 141% of what a head women's basketball coach earned; or, looking at it from the head women's basketball coach's standpoint, he or she could have earned 71% of the head men's basketball coach's salary. These figures support Coakley (1994) who pointed out that, while people should get equal pay for equal work, coaches of women's teams almost always make much less money than coaches of men's teams in the same sports.

Recommendations

For NCAA Division I institutions, administrators, and basketball coaches who seek information on salary equity in athletics, this study tends to support previous research and

contentions that there is a significant difference in head men's and head women's basketball coaches' salaries in favor of the men's coach.

Revenue-producing sports are not exempt from having to comply with the provisions of Title IX. Likewise, elimination of, or cutbacks to, men's programs in the name of salary and/or gender equity is not the solution. Similarly, budget pressures and other financial considerations do not override an institution's Title IX obligation.

For NCAA Division I institutions, administrators, basketball coaches, and other sport coaches, this study supports the need to re-examine and accordingly adjust any and all written salary plans currently in existence.

It is important to have a basic and working knowledge of Title IX as well as a better understanding of the factors influencing coaches' salaries, their job descriptions, and their expectations. It is important to monitor salaries and any and all differences between coaches' salaries. It is important to be able to adjust these salaries as needed and/or adequately support them through a specific, written salary equity plan that is not only sensible, fair, and consistent, but also completely gender neutral for all of its coaches.

For administrators and coaches of NCAA Division II and Division III, NAIA, and community and junior college institutions who also seek information on salary equity in athletics, this study holds the potential to assist in the voluntary development and implementation of salary equity plans for all sport coaches. Achieving equity in coaches' salaries regardless of the gender of the sport coached is an on-going and evolving process that must occur according to the particular needs of each institution. Colleges and

universities need to take steps towards voluntary affirmative action before it becomes court-mandated. Losing a lawsuit can be damaging to an institution and its athletic department in many ways: unwanted publicity, monetary considerations, court mandates, and monitoring and other additional conditions that may be set down by the court. This situation is true even if the issue is settled out of court.

Institutions should focus on Title IX as a source of potential liability. The issue of salary equity for coaches is now "in our court" and the laws in this area are still evolving as every circumstance at every institution is unique. It is, therefore, important for institutions and their athletic departments to keep abreast of further legal developments and to analyze the possible implications for their particular schools and situations.

Issues for Further Studies

There are a number of issues which are readily available for further studies. The first might be a follow-up study with the same population (the 311 NCAA Division I athletic directors) to show any changes over time. (It is realistic to assume, however, that a certain percentage of the athletic directors who had originally completed the questionnaires might no longer be employed at the same institutions.) Further study might also involve a replication of the study with institutions in other divisions such as NCAA Division II and III schools, NAIA schools, and junior and community colleges.

This study was limited to the responses obtained by the NCAA Division I athletic directors. Further study could include replication of the study with responses not only

from the athletic directors but also from the institutions' presidents/chancellors, senior woman administrators, and/or the coaches themselves to determine if there are any differences in perceptions among these groups.

This study was also limited to information related solely to NCAA Division I head basketball coaches. Further study could involve replication of the study with responses obtained regarding head coaches of other NCAA Division I men's and women's sports and/or assistant coaches in basketball and other sports.

The researcher studied NCAA Division I head men's and head women's basketball coaches regardless of the gender of the coach. Further study might include a comparison of head women's basketball coaches that were male with head women's basketball coaches that were female. (There were no female head coaches of men's basketball at the time of this study, so all of the head men's basketball coaches were male.) It might also be informative to compare male coaches of women's basketball with the male coaches of men's basketball.

In sending the questionnaires to the 311 athletic directors, 156 were sent requesting information on the head men's basketball coaches while 155 were sent requesting information on the head women's basketball coaches. Further study might include sending those athletic directors who filled out information on their head men's basketball coach a questionnaire regarding their head women's basketball coach and sending those athletic directors who filled out information on their head women's basketball coach a

questionnaire regarding their head men's basketball coach. The surveys received could then be compared directly to each other.

Finally, the data from the athletic directors regarding the head men's and head women's basketball coaches can only be compared in terms of the relationship that these subjects had to each other. It might prove interesting to compare these findings to those of further studies as listed above.

Closing

This study was done to examine factors influencing the salaries of NCAA Division I head men's and head women's basketball coaches. It is hoped that this study may provide insight for further salary equity studies and eventual implementation of a model salary equity plan for Division I head men's and head women's basketball coaches as well as for head and assistant coaches of other Division I sports. It is also hoped that this study will provide insight for programs and coaches at the NCAA Division II and III levels, as well as NAIA schools, and junior and community colleges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, H. J. & Logy, C. M. (1986). The comparable worth controversy. Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution.

Acker, J. (1989). Doing comparable worth: Gender, class, and pay equity (p. 40). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Acosta, V. & Carpenter, L. (1990). Women in intercollegiate sports — A longitudinal study: 1977-1990. Brooklyn, NY: Brooklyn College.

Ahmann, M. (1993). The story of Marianne Stanley. Coaching Women's Basketball, pp. 28, 30-31, 33-35.

Allard, C. A. (1984, Fall). Assessing faculty salary equity. AIR Professional File, 20, pp. 1-7.

Allard, C. A., Langston, I. W., & Schmidtlein, F. A. (1985, December). Preparation, prevention, and response: Data elements and data bases for support. New Directions for Institutional Research; No. 48 (the Use of Data in Discrimination Issues Cases), 12 (4), pp. 19-34.

American Council on Education (1993, September 15). Title IX in Intercollegiate Athletics: Litigation Risks Facing Colleges and Universities.

Anderson, Dale. (1995, May 24). Another view of hearing on Title IX. NCAA News, p. 4.

Anderson, K. L. & Wilson, J. L. (1989, Fall). Pay equity in Florida. Thought and Action, 5 (2), pp. 61-70.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (1985). Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Astin, H. & Bayer, A. (1972, Spring). Sex discrimination in academe. Educational Record, pp. 101-118.

Athletic Management. (1995, June/July). Gender equity: The next step, pp. 4-5+.

Backstrom, C. H. & Hurst, G. D. (1963). Survey Research. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Bain, L. J. & Engelhardt, M. (1989). Introduction to Probability and Mathematical Statistics. Boston, MA: PNS-Kent Publishing.

Baize, Dr. S. (1995, October/November). Hiring for diversity. Athletic Management, pp. 40-43.

Bartz, A. E. (1988). Basic Statistical Concepts. New York: Macmillan.

Barzun, J. & Graff, H. F. (1957). The Modern Researcher. New York: Harcourt & Brace.

Berg, K. E. & Latin, R. W. (1994). Essentials of Modern Research Methods in Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bergman, B. R. (1985). Comparable worth for professors. Academe, 71, pp. 8-10.

Bergman, B. R. & Maxfield, M., Jr. (1978). How to analyze the fairness of faculty women's salaries on your own campus. AAUP Bulletin, pp. 262-265.

Blum, D. C. (1994, April 6). Pay equity for coaches. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A53-A54.

Bohrnstedt, G. W. (1983). Measurement. In P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook for Survey Research) (pp. 69-121). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. (1979). Educational Research. New York: Longman, Inc.

Bowers v. Baylor University, Civil No. W-94, CA-154 (W. D. Tex. August 11, 1994).

Bozzi, V. (1986, May). Comparable worth: Persuade women first. Psychology Today, 20, p. 16.

Bradburn, N. M. (1983). Response effects. In P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook for Survey Research (pp. 289-328). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Bradley, M. (1994, August). Cross-gender coaching. Athletic Management, pp. 18-26.

Braskamp, L. A., Muffo, J. A. & Langston, I. W. (1978). Determining salary equity. Journal of Higher Education, 49 (3), pp. 231-246.

Burstein, L., Freeman, H. E. & Rossi, P. H. (1985). Collecting Evaluation Data: Problems and Solutions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Caldwell, W. E. (1986, March). Equity in principal salaries — A model. NASSP Bulletin, 70 (488), pp. 67-71.

Cannon v. University of Chicago, 441 U. S. 677 (1979).

Carmines, E. G. & Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and Validity Assessment (p. 16). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Carroll, Dr. W. & Ryder, Dr. C. (1994, Winter). Women in sports Title IX: Major concern of athletic administrators. The United States Sports Academy's Sport Supplement, p. 9.

Carter, R. D., Das, R. S., Garnello, A. H., and Charboneau, R. C. (1984). Multivariable alternatives to regression analysis in the evaluation of salary equity parity. Research in Higher Education, 20 (2), pp. 167-179.

Coaching Women's Basketball. (1994). Two top athletic directors offer their insight into the question of who should be paid how much and why, pp. 36-37.

Coakley, J. J. (1994). Sport in Society: Issues and Controversies, 5th edition (p. 219).

Code of Federal Regulations. Washington: Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration.

Converse, J. M. & Presser, S. (1986). Survey Questions. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Cook vs. Colgate University, 802 F. Supp. 737 (N. D. N. Y. 1992), vacated as moot, 992 F. 2d 17 (2d Cir. 1993).

Deli v. University of Minnesota, Civil No. 91-11239 (D. C. Sup. Ct., June 24, 1993).

DeVore, J. & Peck, R. (1986). Statistics: The Exploration and Analysis of Data. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.

Dewey, B. J. (1985-1986, Winter). Job evaluation systems in academic libraries: Current issues and trends. Journal of Library Administration, 6 (4), pp. 23-31.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method. New York: Wiley-Interscience.

Downing, D. & Clark, J. (1989). Statistics: The Easy Way. New York, NY: Barron's Educational Series.

Dunteman, G. H. (1984). Introduction to Multivariate Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Durrant, S. M. (1992). Title IX -- Its power and its limitations. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 63 (3), pp. 60-64.

Economic Council of Canada. (1984, November). Towards Equity (pp. 61-70). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Government Publishing Center.

Fact file. (1994, July 6). The Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 438.

Ferguson, G. A. & Tokane, Y. (1989). Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ferraro, G. A. (1984). Bridging the wide gap: Pay equity and job evaluations. American Psychologist, 39, pp. 1166-70.

Fogiel, Dr. M., Director. (1985). The Statistics Problem Solver. New York, NY: Research and Education Association.

Fowler, F. J., Jr. (1988). Survey Research Methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Fox, J. A. & Tracy, P. E. (1986). Randomized Response: A Method for Sensitive Surveys. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Frankel, M. (1983). Sampling Theory. In P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.), Handbook of Survey Research (pp. 21-67). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools, 112 S. Ct. 1028 (1992).

Funk and Wagnalls Standard Desk Dictionary (1984).

Gay, L. R. (1987). Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application, 3rd Edition. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing.

Gaylord, T. A. (1983). University of Alaska 1983 Salary Equity Study: The Analytical Process. Alaska State Department of Education: Statewide Office of Budget Development.

Gender equity disclosure act signed into law. (1994, December/January), Athletic Management, p. 7.

Gold, M. E. (1983). A Dialogue on Comparable Worth. NY: Cornell University ILR Press.

Goldman, J. P. (1991). Leveling the playing field for female athletes. School Administrator, 48 (10), pp. 20-25.

Gray, M. W. (1990). Achieving Pay Equity on Campus. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Professors.

Greenfield, E. (1977). From equal to equivalent pay: Salary discrimination in academia. Journal of Law and Education, 6, pp. 41-62.

Gronlund, N. E. (1985). Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching (p. 55). New York: MacMillan Publishing.

Grove City vs. Bell, 465 U.S. 555, 104 S. Ct., 1211, 796, Ed. 2d 516, (1984).

Guilford, J. P. (1978). Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hays, W. L. (1981). Statistics. New York: CBS College Publishing.

Hayslett, H. T., Jr. (1968). Statistics Made Simple. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.

Henkel, R. E. (1976). Tests of Significance. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hill, M. A. & Killingsworth, M. R. (Eds.). (1989). Comparable Worth: Analyses and Evidence. NY: Cornell University ILR Press.

Horton, N. I. (1994, June 13). Female faculty members earn less than males. Higher Education and National Affairs, American Council on Education, p. 3.

Houston, S. R. & Bentzen, M. M. (Fall 1969). Teaching effectiveness in culturally deprived junior high mathematics classes. The Journal of Experimental Education, 38 (1).

Houston, S. R., Duff, L. W., Jr., & Roy, M. R. (1972, Summer). Judgement analysis as a technique for evaluating school effectiveness. The Journal of Experimental Education, 40 (4), pp. 56-61.

Huck, S. W., Cormier, W. H., & Bounds, W. G., Jr. (1974). Reading Statistics and Research. New York: Harper & Row.

Hutchinson, Jill. (1993, April). Opinions on equal pay. NCAA News, p. 2.

Joe, Billy. (1995, May 24). Title IX application needs further review. NCAA News, pp. 4-5.

Johnson, G. E. & Stafford, F. P. (1974). The earnings and promotion of women faculty. American Economic Review, 64, pp. 888-903.

Jonas, K. F. (1986, September 1). Sex, salaries and library support. Library Journal, 111 (14), pp. 145-153.

Josephine, H. (1982, December). All things being equal: Pay equity for library workers. Wilson Library Bulletin, pp. 301-303.

Judge, Janet, Esq. (1996, January). Defending pay equity complaints. Sports Management Chronicle, p. 5.

Kachigan, S. K. (1986). Statistical Analysis. New York: Radius Press.

Kalton, G. (1983). Introduction to Survey Sampling. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kelly v. Board of Trustees of University of Illinois, 832 F. Supp. 237 (C. D. Ill. 1993).

Kerlinger, F. N. (1986). Foundations of Behavioral Research. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Klockars, A. J. & Sax, G. (1986). Multiple Comparisons. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Koch, J. V. (1982, October). Salary equity issues in higher education: Where do we stand? AAHE Bulletin.

Krejcie, R. V. & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, pp. 607-610.

Kubiszyn, T. & Borich, G. (1990). Educational Testing and Measurement. Austin, TX: Harper Collins.

Landwehr, J. M. & Watkins, A. E. (1986). Exploring Data. Palo Alto, CA: Dale Seymour Publications.

Lasher, G. C. (1986). Judgement analysis (JAN) and simulation to capture policy decisions of school superintendents. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Montana State University-Bozeman.

Lassiter, R. L., Jr. (1983). The development and use of a faculty salary model for a higher education system. Research in Higher Education, 18 (3), pp. 333-358.

Lee, B. A., Leslie, D. W., & Olswing, S. G. (1987, November-December). Implications of comparable worth for academe. Journal of Higher Education, 58 (6), pp. 609-628.

Lenskyj, H. (1986). Out of Bounds: Women, Sport and Sexuality. Toronto: Women's Press.

Livernash, E. R. (Ed.). (1980). Comparable Worth: Issues and Alternatives (pp. 26-27, 34-36, 199-205, 212-231). Washington, D. C.: Equal Employment Advisory Council.

Lopiano, D. (1992). The stars are lining up in support of gender equity in sport. GWS News, 19 (3), pp. 3-4, 15-16.

Manning, M. K. & Avolio, B. J. (1985). The impact of blatant pay disclosure in a university environment. Research in Higher Education, 23 (2), pp. 135-149.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). Designing Qualitative Research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

McConkey, J., Anthes, S., Robertson, E., & Bintliff, B. (1993, January). Salary equity: A case study. College and Research Libraries, 54 (1), pp. 33-41.

McDowell, G. L. (1982). Equity and the Constitution: The Supreme Court, Equitable, Relief, and Public Policy. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michael, R. T., Hartmann, H. I., & O'Farrell, B. (Eds.). (1989). Pay Equity: Empirical Inequities. Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.

Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, M. & Jolley, J. (1988). Research Design Explained. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Moore, N. (1993, February). Faculty salary equity: Issues in regression model selection. Research in Higher Education, 34 (1), pp. 107-126.

Mott, Ronald D. (1995, May 17). Interested parties play wait-and-see following Title IX hearing. NCAA News (pp. 1+).

Mueller, D. J. (1986). Measuring Social Attitudes: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Muscatine, A. (1991). The status of women's sports. Women's Sports Pages, 3 (4), pp. 12-13, 18.

NCAA Council (1992, March). NCAA Gender-Equity Study: Summary of Results.

NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force (1993, May 14). A Preliminary Report on Gender Equity.

NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force (1993, Summer). Achieving Gender Equity, A Basic Guide to Title IX for Colleges and Universities.

NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force (1993, July 26). NCAA Gender-Equity Task Force Report (pp. 1-11+).

NCAA Manual (1994-95).

NCAA Membership (1994, July 12).

NCAA News. (1995, August 2). Opinions on gender equity, p. 4.

NCAA News. (1995, June 21). Opinions on gender equity, p. 4.

NCAA News. (1995, May 24). Opinions on Title IX, p. 4.

NCAA News. (1993, August 4). Opinions on gender equity, p. 2.

National Association of Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS). (1992). Title IX Toolbox.

National Federation of State High School Associations (1992). Sports Participation Survey, 1992. Kansas City, MO: NFSHSA.

Nelson, Dr. R. D. (1993, November). Gender equity and the courts. Scholastic Coach, pp. 5-6, 8.

O'Brien, Dave, Esq. (1996, January). Paying coaches equitably: Factors to consider. Sports Management Chronicle, p. 4.

O'Brien, Dave. (1995, June 7). Law can be complex on pay-equity issues. NCAA News, pp. 4-5.

O'Brien, Timothy, Esq. (1996, January). A coaching contract checklist. Sports Management Chronicle, p. 5.

On Campus With Women. (1984, Fall and 1985, Winter). Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C. Project on the Status and Education of Women.

On Campus With Women. (1986, Spring and Summer). Association of American Colleges, Washington, D. C. Project on the Status and Education of Women.

Oppenheim, A. N. (1986). Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books.

Osterlind, S. J. (1983). Test Item Bias. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paddio v. Board of Trustees for State Colleges and Universities, 61 Fair Empl. Prac. Cas. (BNA) 86 (E. D. LA. 1993).

Patton, M. Q. (1987). How to Use Qualitative Methods in Evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Paul, E. F. (1989). Equity and Gender: The Comparable Worth Debate. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Pitts v. Oklahoma State University, Civil No. 93-1341-A (W. D. Okla., April 21, 1994).

Policy Interpretations of Title IX and the Equal Pay Act of 1963. 34 CFR § 106.41 (c)(5) and (6) and 43 CFR § 106.54--Compensation.

Priest, Laurie. (1995, May 17). Time to play fair with resources. NCAA News, pp. 4+.

Priest, L. & Summerfield, L. M. (1994). Promoting Gender Equity in Middle and Secondary School Sports Programs, Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education.

Remick, H. (Ed.). (1984). Comparable Worth and Wage Discrimination (pp. 197-218). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Renfro, Wallace I. (1996, May 13). AD: Seeking gender equity is 'the right thing to do'. NCAA News, p. 3.

Reynolds, H. T. (1984). Analysis of Nominal Data. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Rhoads, S. E. (1994, March-April). Incomparable worth. The Futurist, 28, pp. 59-60.

Ryder, C., Dr. (1995, Spring). Equal pay act: The next litigation movement. The United States Sports Academy's Sport Supplement, p. 5.

Sabo, D. (1988). Title IX and athletics: Sex equity in schools. Updating School Board Policies), 19 (10), pp. 1-3.

Schau, C. G. & Heyward, V. H. (1987, Summer). Salary equity: Similarities and differences in outcomes form two common prediction models. American Educational Research Journal, 24 (2), pp. 271-286.

Schmidt, M. J. (1975). Understanding and Using Statistics. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Schrof, J. M. (1993, August 2). The gender machine. U. S. News and World Report, 115, pp. 42-44.

Scott, E. L. (1977). Higher Education Salary Education Kit. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Professors.

Shaw, M. W. & Wright, J. M. (1967). Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Smart, J. C. (1991, Summer). Gender equity in academic rank and salary. Review of Higher Education, pp. 511-526.

Sorensen, E. (1994). Comparable Worth: Is It a Worthy Policy? (p. 3). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Spector, P. E. (1981). Research Designs. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Spiegel, M. R. (1990). Theory and Problems of Probability and Statistics. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Spiegel, M. R. (1991). Theory and Problems of Statistics. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Sports Law Monthly-NCAA. (1993, November). Women coaches find the usefulness of Title IX, p. 5.

Stanley v. University of Southern California, 13 F. 3d 1313 (9th Cir. 1994).

Stevens, J. (1986). Applied Multivariable Statistics of the Social Sciences. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stoner, C. Timothy. (1993, September 27). No justification exists for pay discrepancies. NCAA News, p. 2

Sudman, S. (1983). Applied sampling. In P. H. Rossi, J. D. Wright, & A. B. Anderson (Eds.). Handbook for Survey Research (pp. 145-194). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Sul Lee, E., Forthofer, R. N., & Lorimor, R. J. (1989). Analyzing Complex Survey Data. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sweet, L. L. (1990). Professional preparation of high school coaches in Montana. Unpublished Professional Project, Montana State University-Bozeman.

Tanur, J. M. & Coser, R. L. (1978, March). Pockets of 'poverty' in the salaries of academic women. AAUP Bulletin, pp. 26-30.

Thongren, C. M. & Eisenbarth, B. S. (1994, June). Games yet to be played: Equity in sports leadership. Women's Educational Equity Act Publishing Center Digest, pp. 1-6.

Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments. 20 U.S.C. § 1681 (a).

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. 29 U.S.C. § 2000e.

Tolbert, P. S. (1986). Organizations and inequality: Sources of earning differences between male and female faculty. Sociology of Education, 59, pp. 227-235.

Treiman, D. J. & Hartmann, H. I. (Eds.). (1981). Women, Work, and Wages: Equal Pay for Jobs of Equal Value (pp. 3-5). Washington, D. C.: National Academy Press.

Tummala, K. K. (1989). Equity in Public Employment Across Nations. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Tyler v. Howard University, Civil No. 91-11239 (D. C. Sup. Ct., June 24, 1993).

United States Code. Washington: The Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the House of Representatives.

The United States Sports Academy's Sports Supplement. (1995, Spring). Pay equity for Minnesota coaches, p. 4.

The United States Sports Academy's Sports Supplement. (1995, Spring). Salary equity for coaches, p. 4.

Van Dalen, D. B. (1979). Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Voelz, Chris. (1994, October 31). Opinions on how pay fits in the equity debate. NCAA News, p. 4.

Ward, J. H. & Jennings, E. (1973). Introduction to Linear Models (p. 251). Englewood, NJ: Prentice Hall.

WBCA Executive Committee (1993, December 3). Job security: Equal pay for equal work. WBCA Position Paper, (pp.1-2).

Williams, J. D., Mabee, W. S., & Brekke, K. A. (1976). Faculty policies for granting salary increases. The Journal of Experimental Education, 45, pp. 65-69.

Williamson, C., Jr. (1989, August 4). Equity and gender: The comparable worth debate. The National Review, 41, p. 48.

Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal. (1993, Spring). Title IX: Twenty-one years of progress?, pp. 73-79.

Women's Sports Foundation. (1992). Playing Fair: A Guide to Gender Equity in High School and College Sports.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Cover Letters for Pilot Study and Review of Questionnaires

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
May 3, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(4):

I am a doctoral student at Montana State University-Bozeman. The purpose of my doctoral study is to determine if there are significant differences between the factors influencing salaries of National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Division I head men's and head women's basketball coaches as perceived by their athletic directors. Since the study is limited to NCAA Division I schools, to assess the reliability of my instrument, a pilot study must be conducted with athletic departments from other than NCAA Division I schools.

Therefore, would you please complete the proposed survey instrument enclosed and record on it the time it took you to complete it, along with your comments and suggestions. Please return the questionnaire to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by May 14, 1996.

Thank you again for your willingness to assist with my study.

Sincerely,

LaWana L. Sweet

Enclosures

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
May 17, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(4):

Recently you were sent a letter and a questionnaire asking for your participation in a pilot study of the questionnaire. Thank you for your response to my request.

However, in order to assess reliability of this instrument, I am using a test-retest format. This format that requires that I send you the same questionnaire again after a two-week period and ask you to fill it out again.

Therefore, would you please complete the proposed survey instrument enclosed and record on it the time it took you to complete it, along with your comments and suggestions. Please return the questionnaire to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by May 28, 1996.

Thank you again for your willingness to assist with my study.

Sincerely,

LaWana L. Sweet

Enclosures

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
April 26, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(4):

Thank you for agreeing to review the instrument for my study entitled, Factors Influencing Salaries of Intercollegiate Athletic Head Basketball Coaches as Perceived by NCAA Division I Athletic Directors.

Would you please review the enclosed proposed survey instrument and cover letter using the following criteria:

1. Unclear directions
2. Reading vocabulary and sentence structure difficulty
3. Inappropriate level of difficulty of questionnaire
4. Poorly constructed questions
5. Ambiguity
6. Survey items inappropriate for the outcomes being measured
7. Improper arrangement of items
8. Identifiable patterns of answers

After reviewing it, please send me any comments and suggestions you may have for me and return them in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Your reply by May 7 would be appreciated. Thank you again for your willingness to participate in this review of my survey instrument.

Sincerely,

LaWana L. "Lu" Sweet

Enclosures

APPENDIX B

Cover Letter for Study

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
May 31, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(4):

As a doctoral student in Higher Education at Montana State University-Bozeman, my graduate research is on the factors influencing salaries of intercollegiate athletic head basketball coaches, as perceived by NCAA Division I athletic directors.

If you would take a few minutes of your time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire, it would be greatly appreciated. Completion of the questionnaire should require approximately 10 to 15 minutes. If you wish to comment on any question or qualify your answer, please feel free to do so on the back of a page or on a separate sheet of paper. Your comments will be read and taken into consideration.

All questions can be answered in one of three ways: (1) by checking either "Yes" or "No," (2) by filling in a blank with a short response, or (3) by ranking factors for importance. All questionnaires have been coded for statistical purposes only. Confidentiality of your response will be respected and protected. Data will be compiled in group statistics only. Individual and school names will not be associated in any way with the information on this questionnaire, nor will the findings of this study be used as a standard upon which to base the salaries or hiring of coaches.

A summary of the findings of this study will be available to you upon request. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your cooperation is most important to the success of my study and is most appreciated. Could you please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire by May 17th. Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

LaWana L. Sweet

Sincerely,

John Kohl, EdD.
College of Education, MSU-Bozeman

Enclosures

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire to Athletic Directors Regarding
Head Men's Basketball Coaches

FACTORS INFLUENCING SALARIES OF HEAD MEN'S BASKETBALL COACHES AS PERCEIVED BY NCAA DIVISION I ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

The information asked for in this questionnaire is essential to the outcome of the researcher's study. ALL information will remain confidential. No individual nor institution will be identified in this scientific study. Questionnaires have been coded for one purpose only: to facilitate the process of follow-up.

Would you like a copy of the findings of this study? _____Yes_____No

I. Characteristics

A. Athletic Director

1. Gender: _____Male _____Female
2. Age _____
3. Educational Background (check all that apply):

   Bachelor's_____ Master's_____ Doctorate_____
   Other (please specify)_____

4. Years at This Institution in This Position _____

B. Head Men's Basketball Coach

1. Gender: _____Male _____Female
2. Age _____
3. Educational Background (check all that apply):

   Bachelor's_____ Master's_____ Doctorate_____
   Other (please specify)_____

4. Years at This Institution in This Position _____
5. Win-Loss Record as a Head Coach at This Institution _____
6. Years at This Institution as Assistant Coach _____
7. Overall Years as Head College Coach _____

II. General Salary and Contract Information Relative to Head Men's Basketball Coach

A. Does your head coach have a written contract? _____Yes ____No

B. What is the base salary for this coach? $_____

C. Besides base salary, which of the following are written into your head coach's contract?

1. Bonuses for meeting criteria such as conference championships or NCAA/NIT berths:

_____Yes ____No

If yes, what is the amount of the bonus? $_____
Other_____

2. Contract terms such as:

a. **Length of Contract** _____Yes ____No

If "yes," what is the length of contract? _____

b. **Other duties/Unique duties** (teaching/IM director, etc.)

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the duties? Compensation?

_____

_____

$_____ Other_____

c. **Causes for Termination**

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," please specify:

_____

_____

3. Additional Compensation or Opportunities such as:

a. **Endorsements** (e.g., apparel or shoe contracts, other)

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the endorsements?

_____

_____

$ earned_____

b. **Radio, TV, and Other Publicity and Promotion Activities and Appearances**

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the number of appearances each season?

_____ $ earned_____

c. **Courtesy Car** _____Yes ____No

d. **Housing Allowances** _____Yes _____No

$_____ Other_____

e. **Right to Run Basketball Camps** _____Yes ____No

$ earned_____

f. **Other Opportunities (Please specify opportunity and compensation).**

_____

_____

$_____

Other_____

III. The Importance of Factors Influencing the Salary of Your Head Men's Basketball Coach

Rank the 13 items below from 1-13 to indicate the importance of the factors, as you see them, in determining the salary of your head men's basketball coach (incoming or current), based on where the program is at this time.

Ranking Key: 1 = Most Important; 13 = Least Important

WIN-LOSS RECORD AT CURRENT INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
OVERALL WIN-LOSS RECORD	RANK:_____
CONFERENCE STANDINGS	RANK:_____
CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS WHILE AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
TOTAL CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS	RANK:_____
NCAA OR NIT TOURNAMENT APPEARANCES AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
OVERALL NCAA OR NIT TOURNAMENT APPEARANCES	RANK:_____
PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
GRADUATION RATE OF STUDENT-ATHLETES AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
RECRUITING SUCCESS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
MARKET VALUE FACTOR	RANK:_____
ATTENDANCE GOALS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
REVENUE-PRODUCTION GOALS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire to Athletic Directors Regarding
Head Women's Basketball Coaches

FACTORS INFLUENCING SALARIES OF HEAD WOMEN'S BASKETBALL COACHES AS PERCEIVED BY NCAA DIVISION I ATHLETIC DIRECTORS

The information asked for in this questionnaire is essential to the outcome of the researcher's study. **ALL** information will remain confidential. No individual nor institution will be identified in this scientific study. Questionnaires have been coded for one purpose only: to facilitate the process of follow-up.

Would you like a copy of the findings of this study? _____Yes _____No

I. Characteristics

A. Athletic Director

1. Gender: _____Male _____Female
2. Age _____
3. Educational Background (check all that apply):

   Bachelor's_____ Master's_____ Doctorate_____
   Other (please specify)_____

4. Years at This Institution in This Position _____

B. Head Women's Basketball Coach

1. Gender: _____Male _____Female
2. Age _____
3. Educational Background (check all that apply):

   Bachelor's_____ Master's_____ Doctorate_____
   Other (please specify)_____

4. Years at This Institution in This Position _____
5. Win-Loss Record as a Head Coach at This Institution _____
6. Years at This Institution as Assistant Coach _____
7. Overall Years as Head College Coach _____

II. General Salary and Contract Information Relative to Head Women's Basketball Coach

A. Does your head coach have a written contract? _____Yes ____No

B. What is the base salary for this coach? $_____

C. Besides base salary, which of the following are written into your head coach's contract?

1. Bonuses for meeting criteria such as conference championships or NCAA/NIT berths:

_____Yes ____No

If yes, what is the amount of the bonus? $_____
Other_____

2. Contract terms such as:

a. Length of Contract _____Yes ____No

If "yes," what is the length of contract? _____

b. Other duties/Unique duties (teaching/IM director, etc.)

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the duties? Compensation?

_____

_____

$_____ Other_____

c. Causes for Termination

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," please specify:

_____

_____

3. Additional Compensation or Opportunities such as:

a. **Endorsements** (e.g., apparel or shoe contracts, other)

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the endorsements?

_____

_____

$ earned_____

b. **Radio, TV, and Other Publicity and Promotion Activities and Appearances**

_____Yes ____No

If "yes," what are the number of appearances each season?

_____ $ earned_____

c. **Courtesy Car** _____Yes ____No

d. **Housing Allowances** _____Yes _____No

$_____ Other_____

e. **Right to Run Basketball Camps** _____Yes ____No

$ earned_____

f. **Other Opportunities (Please specify opportunity and compensation).**

_____

_____

$_____

Other_____

III. The Importance of Factors Influencing the Salary of Your Head Women's Basketball Coach

Rank the 13 items below from 1-13 to indicate the importance of the factors, as you see them, in determining the salary of your head women's basketball coach (incoming or current), based on where the program is at this time.

Ranking Key: 1 = Most Important; 13 = Least Important

WIN-LOSS RECORD AT CURRENT INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
OVERALL WIN-LOSS RECORD	RANK:_____
CONFERENCE STANDINGS	RANK:_____
CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS WHILE AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
TOTAL CONFERENCE CHAMPIONSHIPS	RANK:_____
NCAA OR NIT TOURNAMENT APPEARANCES AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
OVERALL NCAA OR NIT TOURNAMENT APPEARANCES	RANK:_____
PUBLIC RELATIONS ACTIVITIES PARTICIPATED IN AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
GRADUATION RATE OF STUDENT-ATHLETES AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
RECRUITING SUCCESS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
MARKET VALUE FACTOR	RANK:_____
ATTENDANCE GOALS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____
REVENUE-PRODUCTION GOALS AT THIS INSTITUTION	RANK:_____

APPENDIX E

Follow-up Letters

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
June 17, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(3):

Recently you were sent a questionnaire on the factors influencing the salaries of your head men's basketball coach. I am sending this follow-up letter and the enclosed questionnaire. The deadline for return of questionnaires is July 12, 1996.

If you have already returned the questionnaire to me, please disregard this second request. Your assistance in this survey is greatly appreciated. Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

LaWana Sweet
Doctoral Student
Montana State University-Bozeman

Enclosures

1017 Brentwood Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59715
June 17, 1996

FIELD(1)
FIELD(2)
FIELD(3)

Dear FIELD(4):

Recently you were sent a questionnaire on the factors influencing the salaries of your head women's basketball coach. I am sending this follow-up letter and the enclosed questionnaire. The deadline for return of questionnaires is July 12, 1996.

If you have already returned the questionnaire to me, please disregard this second request. Your assistance in this survey is greatly appreciated. Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

LaWana Sweet
Doctoral Student
Montana State University-Bozeman

Enclosures