**Supplementary Appendix for “Gender Policy Feedback: Perceptions of Sex Equity, Title IX, and Political Mobilization Among College Athletes”**

1. **Sex Equity Policy Requirements: Title IX and the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act**

Here we provide detailed discussion about Title IX and its implementation with regard to college athletics. This provides context to the focus of the paper and motivates the particular items we used in surveying student-athletes’ opinions toward sex equity practices.

Importantly, although Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 provides the primary policy guidelines for implementing and complying with sex non-discrimination policy in athletics, the public reporting of equity practices is managed under the purview of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act (EADA), which requires institutions to annually report intercollegiate athletic equity statistics to the U.S. Department of Education. Title IX’s non-discrimination mandate applies to all institutions receiving federal funding (including through direct educational and research grants, as well as through federal grants and loans to students enrolled at the institution), with a few exemptions: private school admissions decisions, public elementary and secondary school admissions (meaning: single-sex schools at these levels are allowed), private schools controlled by religious organizations, military academies, fraternities or sororities, and some specific auxiliary programs (i.e., Boys and Girls State programs, the Boy Scout and Girl Scouts, etc.) (20 U.S.C. §1681-1688).

Intercollegiate athletic departments do not annually report Title IX statistics, per se, although they are required to account for all sex equity practices if the Office for Civil Rights opens a Title IX investigation of an educational institution. Instead, since the mid-1990s, college-level programs have been required to annually report on their equity practices using metrics required under the EADA. The reporting manual which all schools follow specifically notes that the data annually reported under the EADA “may not be the same as data used for determining compliance with other Federal or state laws, including Title IX” (see link in supplementary appendix footnote 3). Intercollegiate athletic programs are legally required to comply with both of these mandates.

We detail the differences and similarities between the two reporting requirements in Table A-1. As this table shows, public data on college athletics does not perfectly overlap with the requirements of compliance with Title IX. For the purpose of our research questions, and as detailed below in section III, we solicited college athlete opinion in 24 distinctive areas that draw on both the Title IX guidelines *and* the EADA data. The requirements of Title IX are the most comprehensive measures of sex equity practices and they have been the subject of the most legal scrutiny (Brake 2010), although the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) retains significant leeway in interpreting compliance with the measures.[[1]](#footnote-1) For our purposes, soliciting opinion on only either Title IX’s specific requirements or the EADA report requirements would have obscured major elements of equity practices in college athletics.

**Table A-1. Title IX compliance measures compared to the EADA requirements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title IX compliance measures**[[2]](#footnote-2) | **EADA annual reporting requirements**[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| Equitable participation opportunities, i.e., substantially proportional men’s and women’s athletic opportunities; or history and continuing practice of expanding opportunities for the underrepresented sex; or full and effective accommodation of the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex | Male and female athletic participants (counted on the first day of competition in the sport) |
| Substantially proportional men’s and women’s athletic aid | Athletically-related Student Aid (reported in $) |
| Equal treatment of the men’s and women’s athletic programs, considering such factors as: equipment and supplies, games and practice times, travel and per diem, coaching and academic tutoring, assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors, locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities, medical and training facilities, housing and dining facilities, publicity, recruitment, and support services. | Head Coaches of Men’s and Women’s Teams (full and part-time)  Assistant Coaches of Men’s and Women’s Teams (full and part-time)  Head Coaches’ Salaries  Assistant Coaches’ Salaries  Recruiting Expenses  Operating Expenses Per Team/per Participant  Total Expenses  Total Revenue |

1. **Objective Sex Inequities within Big Ten Intercollegiate Athletic Programs**

Next, we present the publicly available EADA data from Big Ten Conference institutions during the 2015-16 school year (and the year that our survey was in the field). The statistics presented demonstrate evidence of objective inequities in athletic opportunities and resources between women and men in the conference. These findings are reported in Table A-2.

Our source for these data is the publicly available EADA Online Cutting Tool (<https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/)>.[[4]](#footnote-4) The EADA requires all coeducational institutions of postsecondary education that participate in a Title IV federal student financial assistance program and have an intercollegiate athletic program to “prepare an annual report to the Department of Education on athletic participation, staffing, and revenues and expenses, by men's and women's teams.” In order to compile the information in Table A-2, we searched the online “cutting tool” for each institution in the Big Ten Conference and collected their EADA statistics for the 2015-16 academic year for items which directly correlate with equity measures on our survey. These include statistics on athletic participation (including total participants, unduplicated participants, and non-competing practice players),[[5]](#footnote-5) coaching staff (both full and part time), coaching salaries, athletically related student aid, recruiting expenses, and other expenses and revenues.

We then calculate the data in Table A-2 by determining the difference in men’s and women’s participation opportunities, scholarship dollars, number of teams,[[6]](#footnote-6) recruiting expenditures, full-time coaches (measured as coaches of men’s or women’s teams, regardless of the gender of the coaches employed), and overall annual expenditures. We present both count and percent differences for all measures except number of athletic teams. As we note in the text, these data demonstrate significant bias towards men’s opportunities, scholarships, expenditures, and coaching staffs. There exists some variation across schools in the conference in the magnitude of differential opportunities, spending, and support for men and women athletes, but Table A-2 demonstrates the overwhelming trend that men receive significantly more support in a number of domains.

We also designate in the second row how these measures comport with our analytic indices for overall resources, opportunity, and personnel. We compute averages for all measures across the Big Ten Conference as a whole, and among our sampled schools. The EADA data represent the most systematic accounting of objective practices in athletics.

**Table A-2. Distribution of Opportunities and Expenditures in the Big Ten Conference, 2015-16**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution Name** | % difference (Men's - Women's) in Participation Opportunities \*\* | # difference (Men's - Women's) Participation Opportunity \*\* | % difference (Men's - Women's) in Scholarship Dollars | | $ difference (Men's - Women's) in Scholarship Dollars | # difference (Men's - Women's) in number of teams | % difference (Men's - Women's) in Recruiting Expenditures | $ difference (Men's - Women's) in Recruiting Expenditures | % difference (Men's - Women's) Full Time Coach | % difference (Men's - Women's) in Overall Expenditures | $ difference (Men's - Women's) in Overall Expenditures |
|  | **Opportunity Measures** | | | | | | **Personnel Measures** | | | **OVERALL** | |
| Indiana University-Bloomington | 7.22% | 49 | | 7.81% | $1,153,383 | -2 | 47.14% | $708,267 | 1.9% | 46.22% | $ 28,656,324 |
| Michigan State University | 3.00% | 22 | | 10.16% | $1,474,820 | -1 | 46.80% | $648,333 | 3.5% | 51.08% | $ 35,729,655 |
| Northwestern University | -2.42% | -12 | | 11.23% | $2,123,099 | -3 | 42.78% | $481,865 | 0.0% | 37.98% | $ 20,833,075 |
| Ohio State University-Main Campus+ | 13.69% | 138 | | 2.99% | $543,640 | -1 | 25.63% | $489,816 | 7.1% | 43.64% | $ 38,665,140 |
| Pennsylvania State University-Main Campus | 19.41% | 157 | | 15.06% | $2,835,767 | 1 | 49.95% | $1,079,769 | 8.2% | 46.88% | $ 37,028,681 |
| Purdue University-Main Campus | 19.76% | 100 | | 27.33% | $2,955,909 | 0 | 38.57% | $514,019 | 9.0% | 42.60% | $ 18,036,897 |
| Rutgers University-New Brunswick | 3.25% | 21 | | 5.28% | $681,059 | -4 | 38.27% | $485,641 | 4.0% | 40.06% | $ 21,568,565 |
| University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign | 23.01% | 107 | | 18.78% | $2,291,727 | -1 | 50.49% | $867,809 | 7.0% | 42.12% | $ 19,276,628 |
| University of Iowa | 3.86% | 26 | | 4.52% | $520,179 | -2 | 26.19% | $411,798 | -2.4% | 44.27% | $ 28,844,608 |
| University of Maryland-College Park\* | 20.08% | 104 | | 13.68% | $2,118,194 | -3 | 23.71% | $288,902 | 1.6% | 39.90% | $ 20,657,022 |
| University of Michigan-Ann Arbor | 4.23% | 37 | | 10.68% | $2,397,195 | -1 | 46.89% | $1,153,989 | 1.7% | 43.67% | $ 38,271,842 |
| University of Minnesota-Twin Cities | 5.03% | 36 | | 9.64% | $1,009,863 | -1 | 26.79% | $407,222 | -1.0% | 43.98% | $ 27,856,677 |
| University of Nebraska-Lincoln\* | 15.21% | 89 | | 12.48% | $1,378,835 | -4 | 41.73% | $885,722 | 5.5% | 37.01% | $ 23,230,116 |
| University of Wisconsin-Madison | 2.22% | 17 | | 9.12% | $1,271,168 | -1 | 16.38% | $184,764 | 3.4% | 41.90% | $ 33,097,322 |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AVERAGE across full Big Ten Conference | 9.82% | 64 | | 11.34% | $1,625,346 | -1.6 | 37.24% | $614,851 | 3.1% | 42.95% | $ 27,982,325 |
| AVERAGE within our sampled subset of schools | 8.52% | 58 | | 11.05% | $1,604,817 | -1.3 | 37.99% | $619,441 | 3.0% | 43.70% | $ 28,988,785 |

**Source: Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Online Cutting Tool (**<https://ope.ed.gov/athletics/)>**, Office of Postsecondary Education in the U.S. Department of Education**

Notes:

\* Institution excluded from survey sample (see Supplementary appendix Part III Survey Implementation and Sample)

\*\* Count based on data which excludes male practice players on women's team roster counts

+ Participation information excludes coed sports

1. **Survey Implementation and Sample**

Our ideal population is all student-athletes affected by Title IX which would include virtually all high school and college athletes in the United States (except those enrolled in military institutions or religious schools granted exemption from the law). It was infeasible for us to obtain contact information from the 1,000s of secondary schools. We opted to focus on a single major NCAA Division I conference for three reasons. First, the funding and visibility of schools in NCAA’s Division I is notably higher than other colleges (NCAA 2017). As such, the respondents are student-athletes for whom Title IX’s influence may be most salient, making them a clear “target” population (i.e., athletic participation is a significant part of their lives and identities) (see also Ingram and Schneider 1991 for literature discussion of “target populations”).[[7]](#footnote-7)7 Second, we are unaware of an available list of contact information for all NCAA student-athletes. That means that we had to obtain contact information by visiting each school’s website, identifying student-athletes, and obtaining their e-mail addresses. Practical concerns about time and resources prevented us from drawing a random sample from the more than 170,000 student-athletes who participate on one of the more than 6,000 Division I teams (from roughly 350 schools; <http://www.ncaa.org/about?division=d1>). Third, these constraints meant one approach could have been to randomly select schools and then sports, and then student-athletes (or to target all student-athletes from a selected team given time constraints of searching for rosters and then e-mails). We opted to not take this approach as we wanted to ensure a sufficient number of student-athletes from the sports for which we controlled (some of which have been implicated in Title IX debates): football, men’s basketball, men’s and women’s track and field/cross country, and men’s wrestling. For these reasons, we opted to focus on a single Division I conference – the Big Ten – where our sampling frame could be the universe of student-athletes with publicly available contact information. Our population is thus Big Ten student-athletes.

The Big Ten Conference includes 14 major research universities located in the Midwest and Eastern parts of the country. We believe this is a strong starting point as it includes a large amount of variance among universities and includes schools that recruit nationally and internationally. Our focus on a single conference also follows other studies of student-athletes (e.g. Druckman et al. 2014; Fountain and Finley 2009). That said, we also recognize that the Big Ten may differ from other conferences/schools due to relatively high levels of media coverage (and the selling of media rights) and geographic considerations (e.g., the Big Ten includes many schools from relatively high social capital states). These factors may lead to, on average, relatively greater sensitivity to gender equality among these student-athletes – obviously further theorizing and empirical work is needed to explore this. Even so, ours is a reasonable starting point, and, if nothing else, we see no reason why our central explanatory variables (to explain our perceptions of discrimination, mobilization) would not generalize to all Division I student-athletes.

In the winter of 2016, we accessed the athletic websites of all the Big Ten schools and obtained the full rosters for all sports at every school. We then accessed each school’s website to locate and record the email address (and sport and gender) of every student-athlete listed on those rosters. This information was publicly available at all schools except for the University of Nebraska and the University of Maryland. These two schools thus are excluded from our sample. Overall, we located 7,977 names on rosters (which we believe is the full population of Big Ten student-athletes at the time, from all but the two schools). We found no e-mails for 788 student-athletes and subsequently we sent out 7,189 e-mails. Of them, 1,678 bounced back as no longer in service (which could be due to the students no longer being enrolled, database errors, website errors, or some other reason). Thus, we successfully sent (on March 30th, 2016) a total of 5,511 e-mails that, to our knowledge, reached their intended targets. We also sent out one reminder (on April 4th, 2016) to all respondents. The invitation letter (and the reminder) asked the student-athletes to participate in a survey aimed at understanding what student-athletes think about a range of relevant issues revolving around college athletics. They were directed to an encrypted link and assured of anonymity.

In the end, we received 1,615 responses leading to response rate of 1615/5511 = 29.3%. This rate exceeds the typical response rate in e-mail surveys of this length, especially those that do not employ incentives (see Couper 2008; Ritter and Sue 2007: 36; Shih and Fan 2008 for discussion of typical response rates in similar surveys). We report features of the sample in Table A-3. Tables A-4 and A-5 report the percentages of our sample from each school and sport. Sample size varied across schools due to variations in the number of sports each school sponsors. As explained in the text, we weighted all of our analyses so that our sample approaches population figures on gender, sport, and school (obtained from our download of the rosters). The descriptive statistics provided below are also weighted – the tables reveal that the weighted sample used in the analyses closely resembles the population.

**Table A-3. Sample Characteristics (Weighted)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Percent** |
| Female1 | 44.95% |
| Race/Ethnicity |  |
| White | 88.32% |
| Black | 8.86% |
| Asian | 2.67% |
| Hispanic | 2.61% |
| Year |  |
| Freshman | 25.83% |
| Sophomore | 27.31% |
| Junior | 23.19% |
| Senior | 19.67% |
| Graduate Student | 3.56% |
| Sport |  |
| Wrestling | 5.55% |
| Men’s Basketball | 1.52% |
| Football | 18.82% |
| Track & Field/Cross Country | 15.40% |
| Athletic Scholarship | 53.33% |
| US High School | 95.06% |
|  | **Mean (std. dev.)** |
| Familial Income (1-5 scale)2 | 3.67 (1.09) |
| Women Discrimination (1-5 scale) | 3.49 (.74) |
| Ideology (1-7 scale) | 4.12 (1.58) |

1We do not have population percentages on the demographic data, other than for gender for which the population is 44.30%female.

2 1=<$30,000, 2=$30,000-$69,999, 3=$70,000-$99,999, 4=$100,000-$200,000, 5= >$200,000.

**Table A-4. Sample Composition by University (Weighted)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **School** | **Percent of Sample** | **Percent of Population** |
| Illinois | 5.66% | 6.09% |
| Indiana | 7.16% | 7.99% |
| Iowa | 7.92% | 8.22% |
| Michigan | 10.29% | 10.24% |
| Michigan State | 8.60% | 8.95% |
| Minnesota | 8.70% | 8.89% |
| Northwestern | 6.96% | 6.12% |
| Ohio State | 10.56% | 10.49% |
| Penn State | 9.77% | 9.62% |
| Purdue | 6.34% | 6.52% |
| Rutgers | 7.86% | 7.31% |
| Wisconsin | 10.00% | 9.55% |

**Table A-5. Sample Composition by Sport (Weighted)**1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sport** | **Percent of Sample** | **Percent of Population** |
| Baseball | 4.08% | 4.43% |
| Basketball | 3.58% | 4.21% |
| Cross Country | 8.56% | 6.61% |
| Fencing | 1.76% | 1.59% |
| Field Hockey | 2.65% | 2.24% |
| Football | 18.82% | 16.64% |
| Golf | 2.74% | 2.81% |
| Gymnastics | 3.12% | 3.06% |
| Ice Hockey | 3.51% | 3.13% |
| Lacrosse | 4.96% | 4.46% |
| Lightweight Rowing | 0.83% | 0.66% |
| Pistol | 0.14% | 0.13% |
| Rifle | 0.15% | 0.18% |
| Rowing | 7.70% | 6.62% |
| Soccer | 5.93% | 6.59% |
| Softball | 3.51% | 3.10% |
| Swimming and Diving | 12.38% | 8.81% |
| Synchronized Swimming | 0.50% | 0.35% |
| Tennis | 2.72% | 2.85% |
| Track and Field | 15.19% | 14.04% |
| Volleyball | 2.65% | 2.32% |
| Water Polo | 0.38% | 0.29% |
| Wrestling | 5.55% | 4.88% |
| Other Sport | 0.18% | 0.00% |

1Of the total who participate in either cross-country or track, 54%(weighted) do both. Otherwise, less than 1% of the sample participates in more than one sport.

1. **Survey Instrument**

Survey question wordings appear below. As noted in the text, our sex discrimination scale (to measure general attitudes about sex discrimination) merged the four items (listed below) that ask about women and discrimination. The action/mobilization scale merged the seven “action” measures also listed below. The precise items that we used for our inequality batteries appear in a table in Table A-6, which appears below the question wordings.

What University do you attend?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ Indiana University | ☐ Ohio State University | ☐ University of Illinois | ☐ University of Minnesota |
| ☐ Michigan State University | ☐ Purdue University | ☐ University of Iowa | ☐ University of Wisconsin |
| ☐ Northwestern University | ☐ Pennsylvania State University | ☐ University of Michigan | ☐ University of Nebraska |
| ☐ Rutgers University | ☐ University of Maryland |

Which sport(s) do you or did you play at a varsity level this past academic year? (If you played on multiple varsity sports teams, select all teams on which you played.)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ☐ Baseball | ☐ Fencing | ☐ Lacrosse | ☐ Softball | ☐ Volleyball |
| ☐ Basketball | ☐ Field hockey | ☐ Lightweight Rowing | ☐ Swimming | ☐ Water polo |
| ☐ Beach Volleyball | ☐ Football | ☐ Pistol | ☐ Synchronized Swimming | ☐Wrestling |
| ☐ Bowling | ☐ Golf | ☐ Rifle | ☐ Tennis | ☐Other |
| ☐ Cross country | ☐ Gymnastics | ☐ Rowing | ☐ Track and Field |  |
| ☐ Diving | ☐ Ice Hockey | ☐ Soccer |  |

Are you male or female?

*Male Female*

Which of the following do you consider to be your primary racial or ethnic group (*you may check more than one*)?

*White African American Asian American Hispanic Native American Other*

What is your current year in school?

# *First year Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate student N/A*

What is your estimate of your family’s annual household income (before taxes)?

*< $30,000 $30,000 - $69,999 $70,000-$99,999 $100,000-$200,000 >$200,000*

Are you on a full or partial scholarship?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*No Scholarship Full Scholarship Partial Scholarship (including partial tuition and/or book scholarship)*

If you have a scholarship, is it for academics and/or for athletics?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*No Scholarship Academic Scholarship Athletic Scholarship Both (mix of Academic and Athletic)*

Below is a list of items relevant to intercollegiate sports. For each item, indicate whether you *believe your university, across all sports,* ***actually*** *distributes* the item such that women are extremely advantaged, women are somewhat advantaged, neither women nor men are advantaged, men are somewhat advantaged, or men are extremely advantaged. That is, how do you think these items are ***actually*** distributed at your university?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Overall resources | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Overall financial support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of opportunities to participate on athletic team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of sports teams | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of athletic scholarships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of practice times | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of competition times | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of team travel arrangements to competition (via bus, airplane, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of equipment for strength training (e.g., weight rooms) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of strength training opportunities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of press releases written about team performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of team media guides | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Quality of full-time coaches | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of full-time coaches | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of athletic medicine staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of academic support staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Support from athletic department administrators | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of support for recruiting new team members | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Quality of locker rooms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of practice facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of competition facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of uniforms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of apparel for sport-specific training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of equipment for sport-specific training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

We just asked you about how you think various items are *actually* distributed, across gender, at your university? We are now going to list the same items, but this time, we are interesting in knowing, across sports, the *extent to which you think the distribution, at your university,* ***should*** extremely advantage women, somewhat advantage women, neither advantage women nor men, somewhat advantage men, or extremely advantage men. That is, how do you think things ***should*** be distributed at your university, regardless of the actual distribution?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Overall resources | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Overall financial support | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of opportunities to participate on athletic team | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of sports teams | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of athletic scholarships | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of practice times | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of competition times | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of team travel arrangements to competition (via bus, airplane, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of equipment for strength training (e.g., weight rooms) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Scheduling of strength training opportunities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of press releases written about team performance | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of team media guides | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Quality of full-time coaches | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of full-time coaches | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of athletic medicine staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of academic support staff | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Support from athletic department administrators | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of support for recruiting new team members | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Women extremely advantaged | Women somewhat advantaged | Neither men nor women advantaged | Men somewhat advantaged | Men extremely advantaged |
| Quality of locker rooms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of practice facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of competition facilities | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of uniforms | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of apparel for sport-specific training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quality of equipment for sport-specific training | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Do you think men’s football and/or men’s basketball should be excluded or included when universities consider gender equality in the *overall* *distribution of all resources*? *Included Excluded Not sure*

When it comes the gender distribution of ***all*** resources across sports, but ***excluding*** men’s football and men’s basketball, which of the following best describes your view about how resources are ***actually*** distributed?

*Women extremely Women somewhat Neither women Men somewhat Men extremely*

*advantaged advantaged nor men advantaged advantaged*

*advantaged*

When it comes the gender distribution of ***all*** resources across sports, but ***excluding*** men’s football and men’s basketball, which of the following best describes your view about how resources ***should*** be distributed?

*Women extremely Women somewhat Neither women Men somewhat Men extremely*

*advantaged advantaged nor men advantaged advantaged*

Have you heard of a piece of legislation called Title IX?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Yes No Don’t Know*

Do you know if Title IX applies to college spending on athletics, on education, on both, or on neither?

*Only Athletics Only Education Both Athletics and Education Neither Athletics nor*

*Education*

Given your own knowledge about Title IX, do you disagree or agree with its requirements?

*Definitely Mostly Slightly Neither Slightly Mostly Definitely*

*Disagree Disagree Disagree Disagree Nor Agree Agree Agree*

How unlikely or likely is it that you would ever take one of the following actions (at least once) to express your opinion about gender equity in sports? (If you have already taken such an action, check the appropriate box.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Extremely unlikely | Somewhat unlikely | Neither unlikely nor likely | Somewhat likely | Extremely likely |
| Talk to your coach about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Talk to your athletic director about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Talk with your teammates about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write a letter or email to your university president about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sign a petition about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participate in a protest about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |
| Participate in a protest about unequal treatment in your athletic department |  |  |  |  |  |

**[The following four questions comprise our sex discrimination scale]**

How serious a problem is discrimination against women in the United States?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*An extremely serious a very serious a moderately a minor not a problem at all*

*Problem problem serious problem problem*

When women demand equality these days, how often are they actually seeking special favors?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Never some of the time about half the time most of the time always*

Although women can achieve the highest levels of professional success, they often have to overcome more obstacles than men to get there.

\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Strongly agree somewhat disagree somewhat strongly disagree*

*agree*

When women complain about discrimination, how often do they cause more problems than they solve?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Never some of the time about half of the time most of the time always*

Did you go to high school in the United States?

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Yes No*

Please state the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements ***about your university*:**

“People like me don’t have any say about what my university does.”

*Disagree Disagree Neither disagree Agree Agree*

*strongly somewhat nor agree somewhat strongly*

“Officials at my university don’t care much what people like me think.”

*Disagree Disagree Neither disagree Agree Agree*

*strongly somewhat nor agree somewhat strongly*

“Sometimes, the affairs of my university seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.”

*Disagree Disagree Neither disagree Agree Agree*

*strongly somewhat nor agree somewhat strongly*

“I feel that I have a pretty good understanding of the important issues facing my university.”

*Disagree Disagree Neither disagree Agree Agree*

*strongly somewhat nor agree somewhat strongly*

“How often can you trust your university to do what is right?”

*Never Some of About half Most of Always*

*the time of the time the time*

**Table A-6. Content of Indexed Equity Measures**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Resources** | **Opportunity Scale** | **Personnel Scale** | **Equipment Scale** |
| Overall resources | Overall financial support | Quality of full time coaches | Quality of locker rooms |
|  | Number of opportunities to participate on athletic team | Number of full time coaches | Quality of practice facilities |
|  | Number of athletic scholarships | Quality of athletic medicine staff | Quality of competition facilities |
|  | Scheduling of practice times | Quality of academic support staff | Quality of uniforms |
|  | Scheduling of competition times | Support from athletic department | Quality of apparel for sport-specific training |
|  | Quality of team travel arrangements to competition | Quality of support for recruiting new team members | Quality of equipment for sport-specific training |
|  | Scheduling of strength training opportunities |  | Quality of equipment for strength training |
|  | Quality of press releases |  |  |
|  | Quality of team media guides |  |  |

1. **Additional analyses**

In Table A-7, we present the results of our redistribution analyses, as discussed in the text. Recall the dependent variables are the differences between each respondent’s answer to the “should be” items and their perceptions of actual, existing distributions. Gender and discrimination perceptions remain highly significant.

As noted in the text, we asked respondents about objective and normative views of overall resource distribution if men’s football and basketball were excluded. We present those results in the Table A-8. These results, largely but do not entirely, echo our main results that do not explicitly exclude those sports. The main difference is that discrimination perceptions fall short of significance when it comes to perceptions of resource distribution (it remains positive and near significant – at the .15 level). This suggests that those who perceive societal discrimination put particular weight on football and men’s basketball when thinking about resource inequities. This is not the case for women student-athletes who perhaps are likely to consider their own experiences rather than larger distributional allocations.

In Table A-9, as noted in the text, we analyze the action variable by looking specifically at low and high familial income, and individual and team sports. In terms of the former, we re-ran our analyses separately for student-athletes from low-income and high-income families (using a median split on income). We find that for respondents from low-income families, gender remains significant but perception of discrimination does not (it falls just short of significance). For student-athletes from high-income families, gender is not significant but perception of discrimination is significant. Thus, there are contradictory patterns based on income differences. These findings are sensible, however, insofar as individuals from low-income families engage in protest activities when they feel they have a direct (possibly material) interest at stake. They otherwise may not have the resources to act. In contrast, individuals from high-income families do not feel the need to protest for their own interests (they have other sources of capital) but they do protest when they feel their values are violated. This is consistent with the notion that post-material concerns of justice and higher income lead to protest behaviors (Copeland 2014). We explored whether the nature of the sport matters with the idea that team-oriented sports may produce distinct types of social pressures to take actions.[[8]](#footnote-8) Consistent with this idea, we find that the effects of gender and discrimination perceptions are just short of significant in individual (non-team oriented) sports and strongly significant for team-oriented sports. In sum, familial income and the nature of the sport seem to somewhat moderate the impact of gender and discrimination perceptions in prompting people to take *action*.

In Table A-10, we present the results from our knowledge question about to what areas Title IX applies, as discussed in the text.

**Table A-7. Determinants of Redistribution Attitudes (probability-weighted OLS)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|  | Resources | Opportunity | Personnel | Equipment |
| Female | 0.536\*\*\* | 0.544\*\*\* | 0.223\*\*\* | 0.517\*\*\* |
|  | (0.066) | (0.042) | (0.030) | (0.038) |
| African-American | 0.085 | 0.041 | 0.017 | 0.085 |
|  | (0.121) | (0.074) | (0.063) | (0.088) |
| Asian | -0.069 | -0.107 | -0.168\*\*\* | -0.029 |
|  | (0.119) | (0.076) | (0.044) | (0.073) |
| Hispanic | -0.087 | -0.210\*\* | -0.016 | -0.143\* |
|  | (0.128) | (0.090) | (0.099) | (0.075) |
| U.S. High School | -0.228\*\* | -0.096 | -0.035 | -0.039 |
|  | (0.093) | (0.102) | (0.064) | (0.063) |
| Year | 0.025 | -0.001 | 0.028 | 0.009 |
|  | (0.023) | (0.018) | (0.022) | (0.018) |
| Familial Income | -0.024 | -0.031\* | 0.019 | 0.002 |
|  | (0.024) | (0.017) | (0.017) | (0.017) |
| Ideology | -0.037\*\* | -0.014 | -0.015 | -0.014 |
|  | (0.019) | (0.013) | (0.011) | (0.013) |
| Discrimination Perceptions | 0.237\*\*\* | 0.169\*\*\* | 0.102\*\*\* | 0.115\*\*\* |
|  | (0.051) | (0.032) | (0.029) | (0.030) |
| Athletic Scholarship | -0.021 | -0.036 | 0.005 | -0.034 |
|  | (0.059) | (0.041) | (0.037) | (0.041) |
| Wrestling | 0.287\*\*\* | 0.272\*\*\* | 0.062 | 0.060 |
|  | (0.101) | (0.068) | (0.047) | (0.060) |
| Football | 0.379\*\*\* | 0.352\*\*\* | 0.046 | 0.221\*\*\* |
|  | (0.116) | (0.089) | (0.085) | (0.081) |
| Men’s Basketball | 0.366\*\*\* | 0.304\*\*\* | -0.133 | 0.009 |
|  | (0.113) | (0.077) | (0.095) | (0.093) |
| Track & Field/Cross-Country | -0.088 | -0.161\*\*\* | -0.017 | -0.054 |
|  | (0.061) | (0.038) | (0.032) | (0.042) |
| Iowa | 0.069 | -0.145 | -0.072 | -0.055 |
|  | (0.132) | (0.101) | (0.084) | (0.086) |
| Minnesota | 0.114 | 0.033 | -0.016 | 0.071 |
|  | (0.086) | (0.048) | (0.038) | (0.048) |
| Constant | -0.507\*\* | -0.459\*\* | -0.319\* | -0.318\*\* |
|  | (0.226) | (0.191) | (0.169) | (0.137) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,133 | 1,135 | 1,133 | 1,135 |
| R-squared | 0.219 | 0.337 | 0.134 | 0.248 |

Standard errors are in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\**p* < 0.01, \*\**p* < 0.05, \**p* < 0.1 for two-tailed tests.

**Table A-8. Determinants of Resource Distribution Perceptions and Redistribution Preferences, Excluding Football and Men’s Basketball (probability-weighted OLS)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) |
|  | Perception | Redistribution |
| Female | 0.857\*\*\* | -0.951\*\*\* |
|  | (0.075) | (0.090) |
| African-American | 0.121 | -0.043 |
|  | (0.105) | (0.123) |
| Asian | 0.144 | -0.121 |
|  | (0.110) | (0.119) |
| Hispanic | 0.217 | -0.167 |
|  | (0.185) | (0.193) |
| U.S. High School | -0.284\*\* | 0.158 |
|  | (0.116) | (0.120) |
| Year | -0.066\*\*\* | 0.052\*\* |
|  | (0.025) | (0.026) |
| Familial Income | -0.040 | 0.050\* |
|  | (0.026) | (0.026) |
| Ideology | -0.006 | 0.023 |
|  | (0.019) | (0.023) |
| Discrimination Perceptions | 0.068 | -0.095\* |
|  | (0.047) | (0.058) |
| Athletic Scholarship | 0.060 | -0.041 |
|  | (0.061) | (0.064) |
| Wrestling | 0.246 | -0.171 |
|  | (0.178) | (0.187) |
| Football | 0.679\*\*\* | -0.764\*\*\* |
|  | (0.114) | (0.124) |
| Men’s Basketball | 0.611\*\*\* | -0.710\*\*\* |
|  | (0.146) | (0.184) |
| Track & Field/Cross-Country | -0.117 | 0.069 |
|  | (0.079) | (0.082) |
| Iowa | -0.059 | 0.132 |
|  | (0.105) | (0.116) |
| Minnesota | -0.027 | 0.040 |
|  | (0.082) | (0.081) |
| Constant | 2.638\*\*\* | 0.563\*\* |
|  | (0.240) | (0.278) |
|  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,136 | 1,135 |
| R-squared | 0.240 | 0.271 |

Standard errors are in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\**p* < 0.01, \*\**p* < 0.05, \**p* < 0.105 for two-tailed tests. We used “\*” for .105 significance (rather than .100) as that is the level for discrimination perception and felt it worth noting given our focus.

**Table A-9. Determinants of Actions By Familial Income and Sport Type (probability-weighted OLS)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| VARIABLES | Low Income | High Income | Individual Sport | Team Sport |
| Female | 0.348\*\*\* | 0.120 | 0.142 | 0.336\*\* |
|  | (0.120) | (0.105) | (0.098) | (0.133) |
| African-American | 0.131 | 0.356 | 0.085 | 0.349\*\* |
|  | (0.161) | (0.218) | (0.193) | (0.168) |
| Asian | 0.292\*\* | 0.103 | 0.162 | -0.092 |
|  | (0.145) | (0.222) | (0.188) | (0.269) |
| Hispanic | -0.078 | 0.223 | -0.413 | 0.606\*\*\* |
|  | (0.354) | (0.251) | (0.348) | (0.171) |
| U.S. High School | 0.433\*\* | -0.055 | 0.080 | 0.327 |
|  | (0.207) | (0.204) | (0.175) | (0.280) |
| Year | 0.024 | -0.041 | -0.019 | -0.013 |
|  | (0.039) | (0.031) | (0.035) | (0.034) |
| Familial Income | -0.087 | -0.108 | -0.049 | -0.109\*\*\* |
|  | (0.069) | (0.080) | (0.039) | (0.039) |
| Ideology | -0.080\*\* | -0.005 | -0.052 | -0.008 |
|  | (0.036) | (0.027) | (0.032) | (0.030) |
| Discrimination Perceptions | 0.136 | 0.151\*\* | 0.125 | 0.143\* |
|  | (0.088) | (0.065) | (0.079) | (0.075) |
| Athletic Scholarship | -0.153 | 0.052 | -0.064 | -0.030 |
|  | (0.101) | (0.084) | (0.086) | (0.093) |
| Wrestling | 0.174 | 0.031 | -0.019 | n/a |
|  | (0.250) | (0.198) | (0.171) |  |
| Football | 0.004 | -0.333\*\* | n/a | -0.139 |
|  | (0.217) | (0.163) |  | (0.165) |
| Men’s Basketball | 0.027 | -0.623\*\* | n/a | -0.398 |
|  | (0.278) | (0.317) |  | (0.247) |
| Track & Field/Cross-Country | -0.009 | 0.230\*\* | 0.082 | n/a |
|  | (0.116) | (0.100) | (0.094) |  |
| External University | -0.086\* | -0.101\*\* | -0.084\* | -0.116\*\* |
| Efficacy | (0.048) | (0.045) | (0.046) | (0.048) |
| Internal University | 0.134 | 0.152\*\* | 0.147\* | 0.182\*\* |
| Efficacy | (0.091) | (0.076) | (0.076) | (0.086) |
| University Trust | -0.042 | -0.122\*\*\* | -0.081 | -0.093\* |
|  | (0.057) | (0.047) | (0.051) | (0.052) |
| Iowa | -0.010 | 0.388\*\* | 0.289\* | 0.120 |
|  | (0.190) | (0.164) | (0.159) | (0.181) |
| Minnesota | 0.145 | 0.090 | 0.122 | 0.103 |
|  | (0.126) | (0.125) | (0.128) | (0.128) |
| Constant | 2.165\*\*\* | 2.821\*\*\* | 2.630\*\*\* | 2.135\*\*\* |
|  | (0.627) | (0.535) | (0.501) | (0.589) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 431 | 668 | 533 | 561 |
| R-squared | 0.172 | 0.140 | 0.094 | 0.179 |

Standard errors are in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\**p* < 0.01, \*\**p* < 0.05, \**p* < 0.1 for two-tailed tests.

**Table A-10. Determinants of Knowledge About Title IX (probability-weighted Multinomial Logit with excluded category being the correct answer of applies to both “athletics and education”)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (1) | (2) | (4) |
|  | Applies Only to Athletics | Applies Only to Education | Applies Neither to Athletics nor Education |
| Female | 0.553\*\*\* | -1.468\*\* | 0.851 |
|  | (0.203) | (0.692) | (0.932) |
| African-American | -0.193 | 0.443 | 1.189\*\* |
|  | (0.399) | (1.048) | (0.568) |
| Asian | 0.092 | -15.692\*\*\* | 0.001 |
|  | (0.382) | (0.534) | (1.130) |
| Hispanic | -0.095 | 1.100 | 1.084 |
|  | (0.458) | (1.071) | (1.083) |
| U.S. High School | 0.403 | 15.934\*\*\* | -0.019 |
|  | (0.388) | (0.430) | (1.123) |
| Year | -0.028 | 0.249 | -0.465\* |
|  | (0.069) | (0.252) | (0.237) |
| Familial Income | 0.118 | 0.009 | -0.231 |
|  | (0.086) | (0.228) | (0.294) |
| Ideology | 0.011 | 0.100 | 0.025 |
|  | (0.058) | (0.154) | (0.217) |
| Discrimination Perceptions | -0.185 | -0.408 | -0.263 |
|  | (0.145) | (0.472) | (0.450) |
| Athletic Scholarship | -0.103 | -0.294 | -0.386 |
|  | (0.190) | (0.639) | (0.535) |
| Wrestling | -0.203 | -1.189 | 0.716 |
|  | (0.497) | (0.969) | (1.132) |
| Football | -0.118 | -1.240 | 1.463 |
|  | (0.472) | (1.207) | (0.900) |
| Men’s Basketball | -1.585 | -17.753\*\*\* | 1.299 |
|  | (1.086) | (1.018) | (1.310) |
| Track & Field/Cross-Country | 0.151 | 0.124 | -0.058 |
|  | (0.195) | (0.698) | (0.825) |
| Iowa | 0.297 | 0.015 | -16.186\*\*\* |
|  | (0.292) | (1.156) | (0.516) |
| Minnesota | -0.029 | 0.517 | -16.257\*\*\* |
|  | (0.267) | (0.767) | (0.408) |
| Constant | -1.566\*\* | -18.745\*\*\* | -1.478 |
|  | (0.753) | (2.221) | (2.412) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Observations | 1,129 | 1,129 | 1,129 |

Standard errors are in parentheses. Statistical significance is denoted by: \*\*\**p* < 0.01, \*\**p* < 0.05, \**p* < 0.1 for two-tailed tests.
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1. It is also worth noting that no institution has ever been subjected to having their federal funding revoked as a result of a Title IX investigation. More typically, the result of an OCR investigation is an agreement between the federal government and the institution, which will guide future practices towards sex equity at the institution under investigation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Title IX’s 1979 policy implementation guidelines provide an interpretation of policy for intercollegiate athletics (OCR 1979) and they operate in tandem with a second clarification in 1996 (OCR 1996) to produce this list of requirements. The guidelines focus on the meanings of “equal opportunity” in athletics, delineating three domains (often referred to as the “three-part test” of compliance), which we delineate in this column: participation opportunities, athletic aid, and equal treatment (see 34 C.F.R. § 106.1). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://surveys.ope.ed.gov/athletics/images/Instructions/2016_EADA_user_s_Guide.pdf> See also the EADA reporting website: <https://surveys.ope.ed.gov/athletics/> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. According to the U.S. Department of Education: “The data are drawn from the OPE Equity in Athletics Discloser Website database. This database consists of athletics data that are submitted annually as required by the EADA, via a Web-based data collection, by all co-educational postsecondary institutions that receive Title IV funding (i.e., those that participate in federal student aid programs and that have an intercollegiate athletics program.” See: <https://www2.ed.gov/finaid/prof/resources/athletics/eada.html>. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. We make our calculations based on unduplicated counts (i.e., not counting twice any athletes that compete in multiple sports – schools must report the “unduplicated numbers” across all sports), and we subtract male practice players who practice with women’s teams. This method reveals actual numbers of women’s participation opportunities (Cheslock and Eckes 2008). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Title IX does not require equity in number of teams offered for each sex, instead requiring substantially proportional opportunities between the sexes, across all sports. In fact, most schools in the Big Ten host more women’s teams than men’s teams because of the large numbers of men’s football players on Big Ten team’s rosters. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 7 College student-athletes are directly affected by the 1979 athletic guidelines (Sharrow 2017). That said, they are one type of the many groups targeted by Title IX, including girls and women in education (Rose 2015). Increasingly, other groups are mobilizing to make political claims under Title IX, including survivors of campus sexual assault (Reynolds n.d.). Our survey only explored opinion towards equity practices and Title IX among college athletes. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Sports for which there are *both* individual and team titles awarded at the NCAA Championship (or analogous competitions for sports for which the NCAA does not sponsor championships) classify as “individual sports” whereas sports for which there are only a team title awarded classify as “team sports.” Using this approach, the “individual sports” are cross country, diving, fencing, golf, gymnastics, pistol, rifle, swimming, tennis, track and field, and wrestling. The “team sports” are: baseball, basketball, bowling, field hockey, football, ice hockey, lacrosse, rowing (lightweight and open weight), soccer, softball, synchronized swimming, volleyball (beach and regular), and water polo. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)