

Clemson University

TigerPrints

---

Publications

Educational & Organizational Leadership

---

1-1-2023

## Shooting for Equity: Division II Basketball Coaches' Perspectives of Gender Discrimination

Caroline George Fletcher  
*Delta State University*

Sarah Stokowski  
*Clemson University, stoko@clemson.edu*

Michael S. Carroll  
*Troy University*

Jonathan E. Westfall  
*Delta State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ed\\_org\\_ldrshp\\_pub](https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ed_org_ldrshp_pub)

---

### Recommended Citation

George Fletcher, Caroline; Stokowski, Sarah; Carroll, Michael S.; and Westfall, Jonathan E., "Shooting for Equity: Division II Basketball Coaches' Perspectives of Gender Discrimination" (2023). *Publications*. 4. [https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ed\\_org\\_ldrshp\\_pub/4](https://tigerprints.clemson.edu/ed_org_ldrshp_pub/4)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational & Organizational Leadership at TigerPrints. It has been accepted for inclusion in Publications by an authorized administrator of TigerPrints. For more information, please contact [kokeefe@clemson.edu](mailto:kokeefe@clemson.edu).

*Leadership*, 38(1), 107–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143209351810>

Whisenant, W.A., Pedersen, P.M., & Obenour, G. (2002). Success and gender determining the rate of advancement for intercollegiate athletic directors. *Sex Roles*, 47(9/10), 485–491. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1021656628604>

## Shooting for Equality: Division II Basketball Coaches' Perceptions of Gender Discrimination

Caroline George Fletcher

Delta State University

Sarah Stokowski

Clemson University

Michael S. Carroll

Troy University

Jonathan E. Westfall

Delta State University

The implementation of Title IX brought hope and infinite possibilities for women in sport; however, less than half of women's athletic teams are coached by women. Women in sport often face discrimination and harassment, and this population often receive less compensation than their male counterparts. Informed by equity theory, the purpose of this study was to examine potential gender discrimination in Division II basketball. Division II Head Men's and Women's Basketball Coaches (N=74) were administered a modified version of the General Ethnic Discrimination Scale (GEDS). The results indicated that Division II coaches felt they were treated unfairly based on gender ( $p = .008$ ), as female head coaches reported feelings of discrimination. Considering the findings of the present study, the NCAA and its member institutions should promote inclusive hiring practices and assist athletic departments in program-

ming that promotes gender equity. *Keywords: Division II, Basketball Coaches, Gender Discrimination*

When the Equal Pay Act was enacted in 1963, women were paid 58.9 cents for every dollar a man earned. By 2015, that number rose to 80 cents (Zerunyan, 2018). In total, such discrepancy equates to women losing \$10,470 in median earnings a year (or \$418,800 over 40 years). To close that gap, a woman would need to work 10 years longer than her male counterpart (Barroso & Brown, 2021; Graf et al., 2018; Zerunyan, 2018). Often pay inequities are due to quantifiable factors, such as education, occupational segregation, and work experience.

In 2017, 42% of women reported they had experienced gender discrimination at work with one of the most common forms of discrimination being financial compensation (Graf et al., 2018). Sport has been recognized as an area where women suffer frequent discrimination and harassment (Aitchison et al., 1999; Norman, 2010). Within the disproportionate organizational structure of coaching women receive less benefits when compared to men in similar positions. Knoppers (1994) analyzed the lack of female coaches by explaining gender differences in the workplace, incorporating Kanter's (1977) theory of structural influences. According to Knoppers (1994), these structural influences included opportunity, power, and proportion. Further, Knoppers (1994) argued that opportunities arise based on gender and career projection for male and female coaches. Similarly, men largely hold positions of influence because it is believed that women do not possess the characteristics associated with control or influ-

ence. This leads to women leaving the coaching profession because they feel they do not have control over their career projection.

Previous research has examined factors that influence salaries of Division I coaches. Brook and Foster (2010) studied NCAA basketball coaches salary disparities, citing market forces as a cause of gender compensation discrimination. To determine the existence of compensation disparities, Brook and Foster (2010) controlled for factors that affected a coach's salary, including variables regarding revenue production, a variable estimating a coach's productivity, and a variable for overall quality. The study found statistically significant differences in coaching salaries between men and women in 2004-05. The results of the study did not find employer discrimination to be a factor, but total revenue and ticket sales contributed to differences in salary.

In line with previous research (Brook & Foster, 2010; Humphreys, 2000), Lange (2014) stated that male coaches earn higher salaries than their female counterparts, regardless of sport classification, due to labor-market discrimination. Lange (2014) sought to determine whether gender and/or race influenced coaches' salaries and found that neither gender nor race played a statistically significant part in a coach's salary. The most significant determinant of compensation proved to be winning percentage.

Evidence of the gender pay gap in college coaching has been substantiated in previous studies. Sweet (1997) surveyed 311 Division I athletic directors and found that the base salaries for men's head basketball coaches for the 1995-96 season were 125% more than the base salaries for women's head basketball coaches, despite the perception of athletic directors that the men's and women's coaches

perform similar duties and possess similar responsibilities. Further, Sweet (1997) deduced that male coaches of women's basketball teams receive more publicity opportunities and earn a higher dollar amount than female coaches. Humphrey (2000) study found that both men and women who coach women's basketball earned almost half of what men's basketball coaches made when taking into consideration experience, performance, and program revenues.

### *Gender Bias*

Women are often viewed as intruders in sport spaces (Hasbrook, 1988; Knopper et al., 1991). Previous research has found that the drastic difference in the media coverage of men's and women's sports only amplifies the stigma that associates sport with masculinity (Hardin & Greer, 2009; Kian et al., 2008). Sage (1990) confirmed that if women are consistently being excluded from positions of power that this would only further the issue of their underrepresentation in sport. Bryson (1994) suggested the link from sport to masculinity to leadership skills will further prolong male hegemonic gender ideologies, and without a disruption in those ideologies, females will continue to be underrepresented in all areas of sport (Theberge & Birrell, 1994).

Gender bias dips into various aspects of sports, including the media. In an analysis of ESPN's Sport Science online video library, Shifflett et al. (2016) discovered that 88% of the total time for all 99 videos analyzed was devoted to male athletes, backing up previous research. More specifically, of the over 230 minutes of video, 205 minutes focused on male athletes, whereas 28.6 minutes (12%) focused on females. Sabo et al. (2016) discovered that both

male and female coaches were apprehensive about voicing problems of gender bias within their athletic departments. Overall, in a study of 356 collegiate coaches, 31% of female coaches and 20% of male coaches felt their jobs would be at risk if they took Title IX and gender equity issues to upper administration, whether it be the athletic department or university administration.

Burton and Parker (2010) found that women who exude aggressive, confident, independent behavior are viewed as acting inconsistent with their societal norms. This inconsistency with traditional female gender roles and a leader's roles is often the culprit of women's hardships in college athletic leadership positions (Galloway, 2013). Women reported significant barriers standing in the way of their upward trajectory toward athletic administration, but the most significant obstacle is experiencing "negative perceptions about their knowledge of intercollegiate athletics, questions regarding their ability to be effective leaders and a lack of respect" (Burton & Parker, 2010, p. 4). When males exhibit strong leadership qualities within their organization, they are seen as being direct. However, women who possess the same strong leadership qualities are viewed as being strict or corrective (Galloway, 2013).

### *Theoretical Framework: Organizational Justice and Equity Theory*

Organizational justice is the overall perception of what is fair in the workplace. Three components make up this idea: (1) distributive justice, (2) procedural justice, and (3) interactional justice. Distributive justice deals with appropriateness of outcomes or allocations that some receive

while others do not. Procedural justice contends with the allocation process or fairness of the outcome process. Interactional justice focuses on the treatment employees receive from superiors and has two forms: interpersonal justice and information justice. People are inherently concerned with what they perceive as fair, especially in the workplace, but the reality is too often that workers are not treated alike, or the allocation of outcomes is distinguished at work. An example of distributive justice in the workplace includes the most competent employee receiving a promotion. Inversely, it is considered unjust when a promotion or other upward mobility is given to someone solely based on a relationship within the organization. The role of distributive justice is to reward employees based on their contributions, provide each employee with roughly the same compensation, and offer a benefit based on an employee's personal requirements. Procedural justice is the employee's perception in fairness of the process used in determining the allocation of rewards. A just process is consistent, unbiased, precise, all-encompassing, amenable, and ethical. Procedural justice incites intellectual and emotional acknowledgement, which in turn leads to loyalty, trust, and commitment by employees. On the other hand, procedural injustice creates resentment and distrust of the organization from the employee perspective. Interactional justice refers to the way employees are treated during interactions with others, primarily superiors. Two aspects of interactional justice exist—informational and interpersonal. Informational justice includes sharing pertinent information with employees, while interpersonal justice involves treating employees with respect.

Equity theory, in a workplace setting, involves the ratio of how much employees receive compared to their contri-

bution. However, equity theory also considers a standard, typically comparing two similar people of employees. This can best be depicted with the following equation (Adams, 1965):

$$\frac{O_1}{I_1} = \frac{O_2}{I_2}$$

Based on equity theory, people are concerned with outcomes ( $O_i$ ) compared to inputs ( $I_i$ ). That is compared to their coworkers' outcomes ( $O_c$ ) and inputs ( $I_c$ ). When the ratios are equal, it is considered an "equitable" work environment. However, when it becomes unbalanced, an inequitable work environment exists (Cropanzano et al., 2007).

The purpose of this study is to examine potential gender discrimination in Division II coaching, looking specifically at the presence of a possible gender wage gap in Division II basketball, and considering the following research questions.

- RQ1: Do Division II basketball coaches feel they are treated unfairly based on gender?
- RQ2: Is there a relationship between sport classification and gender-based discrimination by Division II athletic departments?
- RQ3: Is there a salary discrepancy based upon gender-based discrimination?

### *Methods*

Based on data for the 2021-22 basketball season, women possessed 153 of the 307 (49.8%) women's basketball head coaching jobs and zero in men's basketball. Men held 154 of the 307 (50.2%) head coaching spots for women's basketball and 100% of the 305 head spots for

Table 1  
Demographics: Gender, Sport, Education, Institution

Gender	Sport	Education	Institution
Female	W. Basketball	Bachelor	Public
Male	M. Basketball	Master	Private
Other		Doctorate	
Total			
	45	13	37
	29	58	37
	3		
	74	74	74

Table 2  
Demographics: Race

Race	Percentage	Number
White	76.3%	58
Black/African American	17.1%	13
Hispanic	1.3%	1
Asian	1.3%	1
American Indian or Alaska Native	1.3%	1
Other	2.6%	2
Total		76

Table 3  
Coaching Experience

	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Total # of years	74	43	1	44	15.85	11.40
Years at current institution	74	34	1	35	9.07	8.44

Table 4  
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
Base Salary	61	\$115,000	\$15,000	\$130,000	\$77,293.44	\$20,340.75
Athletic Budget	17	\$4,615,000	\$385,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,069,705.88	\$1,263,566.96
Winning Percentage	61	.73	.15	.88	.57	.14

men's basketball. A total of 602 Division II head basketball coaches were emailed requesting survey participation over a 7-week period. Seventy-four (74) total responses were received for a 12.3% response rate. Responses were downloaded from Qualtrics into SPSS for analysis. Respondents answered several demographic questions (see Tables 1-4), as well as questions about his or her coaching history: gender, race, sport classification, total number of years as a head coach, number of years as a head coach at current institution, public or private institution, highest degree earned, winning percentage, current salary, institution's athletic budget, and sport's athletic budget.

### *General Ethnic Discrimination Scale (GEDS)*

The survey included a modified version of the General Ethnic Discrimination Scale (GEDS; Landrine et al. 2006). Because this study examined gender as opposed to race/ethnicity, the original purpose of the GEDS, alterations were made to the GEDS items to reflect a gender-based discrimination study. For example, Landrine et al. (2006) original GEDS scale asked, "How often have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because of your *race/ethnic group*" (p. 91)? This question was modified to, "How often have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because of your *gender*?" Using a six-point scale, 1 being "never" and 6 being "almost all of the time," each item in the scale evaluated how often discrimination occurs. Two subscales exist for each item: the frequency of discrimination in the previous year and frequency of discrimination in the participant's life. A third subscale, evaluation of the stressfulness of the event, was included in the original scale but will be omitted from the

present study, as it exceeds the scope of this study. The scores of the two subscales used in the current study ranged from 10-60.

## **Results**

### GENDER AND GENDER DISCRIMINATION

Incorporating the responses from the gender demographic question and results from the GEDS and running a Chi-Square Test for Association, it was determined that 18.8% of female head coaches felt discriminated against and no male head coaches felt discrimination. Further, 55.4% of responses were males and 43.2% were females. There is statistical significance to show Division II coaches feel they are treated unfairly based on gender ( $p = .008$ ), as shown in Table 5.

Table 5  
*Chi-Square Tests*

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.739	4	.008
Likelihood Ratio	14.336	4	.006
N of Valid Cases	74		

5 cells (55.6%) have expected count less than 5.  
The minimum expected count is .08.

SPORT CLASSIFICATION AND GENDER DISCRIMINATION

Incorporating the responses from the sport classification demographic question and results from the GEDS and running a Chi-Square Test for Association, 13.3% of women's basketball coaches felt discriminated against, compared to 0% of male coaches. Further, it was determined there is marginal statistical significance to show Division II coaches feel they are treated unfairly based on sport classification ( $p = .094$ ), shown in Table 6. While this is not statistically significant at the .05 level, it is worth pointing out the marginal significance.

Table 6  
Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	4.738	2	.094
Likelihood Ratio	6.834	2	.033
N of Valid Cases	74		

3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5.  
The minimum expected count is 2.35

GENDER PAY GAP

A regression analysis was run with the dependent variable being current base salary and the two independent variables being sport classification and gender, all pulled from the demographics portion of the survey. It was determined there was no statistical significance ( $p > 0.05$ ),  $F(2, 58) = 1.329$ ,  $p = .273$ .

Table 7  
GEDS Results

Question	Never (1)	Once in a while (2)	Sometimes (3)	A lot (4)	Most of the Time (5)	Almost all of the Time (6)	Mean	SD	Response Rate
11: How often in your entire life have you been treated unfairly by athletic administrators because of your gender?	32.3% M=52.9 F=7.1	30.7% M=29.4 F=32.1	25.8% M=8.8 F=46.4	8.1% M=8.8 F=7.1	1.6% M=.00 F=3.6	1.6% M=.00 F=3.6	2.21	1.12	82.7%
12: How often in your entire life have you been treated unfairly by your university because of your gender?	35.5% M=52.9 F=14.3	38.7% M=41.2 F=35.7	17.7% M=5.9 F=32.1	6.5% M=.00 F=14.3	0.0% M=.00 F=3.6	1.6% M=.00 F=3.6	2.02	1.02	82.7%
14: How often in your entire life have people misunderstood your intentions and motives because of your gender?	19.7% M=36.4 F=0.0	27.9% M=39.4 F=14.3	26.2% M=21.2 F=32.1	21.3% M=3.0 F=42.9	4.9% M=.00 F=10.7	0.0% M=.00 F=3.6	2.64	1.16	81.3%



Question	Never (1)	Once in a while (2)	Sometimes (3)	A lot (4)	Most of the Time (5)	Almost all of the Time (6)	Mean	SD	Response Rate
14.1: How often in the past year?	34.4% M=54.5 F=10.7	39.4% M=39.4 F=39.3	14.8% M=3.0 F=28.6	9.8% M=3.0 F=17.9	0.0%	1.6% M=.00 F=3.6	2.07	1.07	81.3%
15: How often in your entire life did you want to tell someone off for being sexist towards you but didn't say anything?	35.0% M=54.5 F=11.1	28.3% M=30.3 F=25.9	13.3% M=9.1 F=18.5	13.3% M=.00 F=29.6	5.0% M=.00 F=11.1	5.0% M=6.1 F=3.7	2.40	1.45	80.0%
16: How often in your entire life have you been really angry about something sexist that was done to you?	38.3% M=66.7 F=3.7	30.0% M=24.2 F=37.0	18.3% M=6.1 F=33.3	10.0% M=0.0 F=22.2	0.0%	3.3% M=3.0 F=3.7	2.13	1.22	80.0%
20: How different would your life be if you had not been treated in a sexist and unfair way?	Not at all 51.7% M=71.0 F=29.6	A little 13.8% M=16.1 F=11.1	Somewhat 17.2% M=9.7 F=25.9	A lot 13.8% M=3.2 F=25.9	Mostly 1.7% M=.00 F=3.7	Totally 1.7% M=.00 F=3.7	2.05	1.29	77.3%

FURTHER GEDS FINDINGS

To gain an understanding of gender discrimination in Division II basketball coaching, all results from the GEDS section of the survey were considered and the most compelling results (mean values 2.00 and higher) are portrayed in Table 7. The results of the GEDS portion of the survey were dissected further. Means 2.00 and above were analyzed and broken down into themes: gender discrimination experienced within athletic administration and the university, perceived intentions, frustration, and career differences. A deeper dive into those results follows.

ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATION

Coaches were asked the frequency of being treated unfairly by athletic administrators ( $M = 2.21$ ) because of their gender. Out of the 62 respondents, 30.7% indicated "once in a while." Of the respondents to the forementioned question, 29.4% were males and 32.1% were females. Out of 25.8% of respondents who answered "sometimes," 8.8% were male and 46.4% were female. Of the 8.1% of respondents who answered "a lot," 8.8% were male and 7.1% were female, tilting more toward the male gender.

In the current landscape of college athletics, the NCAA requires athletic departments appoint a women to the role of the Senior Woman Administrator (SWA), which is more of a designation than an actual position of authority. Hoffman's (2010) study on NCAA Division I Senior Woman Administrators illustrated the various dilemmas faced by women in the SWA role, many of which led to unfair treatment based on gender, as only females can hold that designation. Four themes arose that describe the dilemmas: SWA's job responsibilities justify having only one

woman in administration; raising gender equity issues often falls solely on the SWA; the SWA role becomes a terminal position with little preparation and room for advancement; and as the SWA is viewed as an advocate for women's sports and student-athletes, it overshadows the athletic department's primary responsibility of serving the interest of all coaches and student-athletes.

#### UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL

Discrimination can be at the athletic department level, as well as the university. Coaches face being treated unfairly by their university because of their gender ( $M = 2.02$ ). Out of 62 coaches, 38.7% felt that have been treated unfairly by their university because of their gender "once in a while." Of those, 41.2% were male and 35.7% were female. Out of 17.7% of respondents who answered "sometimes," 5.9% were male and 32.1% were female. Other research found a similar trend in female coaches and athletic administrators (Fink & Pastore, 1999; Inglis et al., 2000). Wasserman (2000) attributes this to (the lack of mentors for women the lack of access to unofficial networks like the "Ole Boys Club,") and difficulty fitting in.

#### PERCEIVED INTENTIONS

Previous research proved that women experience double standards, specifically perceptions of their leadership skills being misinterpreted in a negative way (Bass, 2016; Bower & Hums, 2013; Burton & Parker, 2010; Gallo-way, 2013; Smith et al., 2018). For instance, confident women can be viewed as arrogant. Assertive women are seen as aggressive, and leaders are seen as bossy (Smith et al., 2018). When asked how often the coaches felt people

misunderstood their intentions and motives because of their gender ( $M = 2.64$ ), 19.7% of the 61 respondents answered "never," but they were all males. Of the 27.9% of coaches who answered "once in a while," 39.4% were male and 14.3% were female. Out of 26.2% of respondents who answered "sometimes," 21.2% were male and 32.1% were female. Of the 21.3% who answered "a lot," 3.0% were male and 42.9% were female. While no men answered "most of the time," 3 female coaches did. Not only did both genders feel their intentions had been misunderstood at some point in their careers, both genders also had experienced it in the last year. Out of 61 coaches who answered, 39.4% answered "once in a while." Of those, 39.4% were male and 39.3% were female. Of the 14.8% who answered "sometimes," 3.0% were men and 28.6% were women. Out of 9.8% who answered "a lot," 3.0% were male and 17.9% were female. Although no men answered "almost all of the time," one female coach did.

#### FRUSTRATION

From the GEDS it can be inferred that the participants experiences of gender discrimination left this population feeling felt angry and frustrated. As in most professional settings, women often feel unable to speak up and address sexist behavior because this population does not want to appear as sensitive or ungrateful. When asked how often coaches wanted to tell someone off for being sexist toward them but instead remained quiet ( $M = 2.40$ ), 28.3% of coaches answered, "once in a while." Of those, 30.3% were men and 25.9% were female. Out of 61 respondents, 13.3% answered "sometimes," where 9.1% were male and 18.5% were female. While no men answered "a lot" or "most of the time," 11 female coaches did, 8 and 3, respectively. Of

the 5.0% who answered "almost all of the time," 6.1% were male and 3.7% were female. This echoes the findings by Rhode & Walker (2008) and Walker & Bopp (2011) who each found women, in sports and other male-dominated professions, experience frustration with the "Ole Boys Club" and the lack of an equivalent network for females.

When asked how often coaches had been "really angry about something sexist that was done to them" ( $M = 2.13$ ), 30.0% of coaches answered, "once in a while," where 24.2% were male and 37.0% were female. Of the 18.3% who answered "sometimes," 6.1% were male and 33.3% were female. No men answered "a lot," but 7 women did. Of the 3.3% who answered "almost all of the time," 3.0% were male and 3.7% were female. Similarly, Dresden et al. (2017) found women in male-dominated college majors experience sexist treatment, like being told sexist remarks and offensive jokes and being mistreated, slighted or ignored because of their sex.

#### CAREER DIFFERENCES

Previous research has laid out the different obstacles women can face in their professional upward mobility (Burton & Parker, 2010), especially in the male-dominated world of athletics. When asked how different their life would be had they not been treated in a sexist and unfair way, 13.8% answered "a little." Of those, 16.1% were male and 11.1% were female. Of the 58 respondents who answered this question, 17.2% answered "somewhat," where 9.7% were male and 25.9% were female. Of the 13.8% who answered "a lot," 3.2% were men and 25.9% were female. No men answered "mostly" or "totally," but one coach expressed their life would be "mostly" different if she had

not been treated in a sexist and unfair way. Another female coach expressed her life would be "totally" different.

Knoppers (1994) found that within the coaching profession, the issue of frequent turnover for women in leadership positions can be explained by looking closely at organizational factors within the athletic department; specifically, opportunities available to women, such as for training, power, and the proportion of females and males in the athletic department, or gender ratio. According to Vianello (2004), the perception of power was far less than the reality for women in athletic leadership positions.

#### Limitations

Several limitations exist in this study. First, the survey was sent to Division II basketball coaches while they were in-season. Although the survey was sent a total of four times over a 7-week period, the survey could have likely been overlooked by coaches in the middle of their seasons and busy with game and practice preparation. Second, given the sensitivity of the topic coaches could have foregone the decision to participate in the survey. Third, while the results from the GEDS portion of the survey are telling, only 58 to 62 participants answered those questions, a response rate of 9.6% to 10.3%. Some participants answered all questions while others did not.

Other limitations also exist. For instance, it is impossible to know how much of the discrimination is intentional/unintentional or systemic/circumstantial. The validity and truthfulness of the responses could also be questioned, as that is a natural concern with self-reporting. To gain an even greater understanding of the specific gender discrimination experiences faced by Division II basketball

coaches, a mixed methods approach that incorporates interviews and uses behavioral and historical data could be useful.

### *Future Research*

Given the oversaturation of research at the Division I classification, studies that examine Division II and III athletics are warranted. It is evident that gender discrimination exists in Division II head basketball coaches, but perhaps a higher response rate could further strengthen the evidence found in this study. Now that it has been proven that Division II female basketball coaches feel discriminated against in their profession, future research could extend into other sports with similar counterparts, like softball/baseball, soccer, tennis and golf. It would also be beneficial for research to extend into other areas in athletics where women are underrepresented, like athletic training and administration, specifically at the athletic director level. To gain a better understanding of the coaches in the study who feel they are treated differently by different entities in their coaching profession because of their gender, future research should extend into a qualitative study that interviews Division II basketball coaches to fully understand their lived experiences. Both genders should be interviewed, as this study proved that male and female coaches alike feel gender discrimination in their profession. Also, as stated above, future research should extend into other sports at the Division II level. This line of research could yield possible solutions for athletic directors and other athletic administrators to consider and implement to alleviate the issue of gender discrimination.

### *Implications*

Initially implemented in 2003 as a hiring policy within the National Football League (NFL), the Rooney Rule is a diversity policy that requires NFL teams to interview ethnic minority candidates outside their organizations for coaching and front office positions. This policy was expanded in 2009 to include general manager jobs and front office positions and expanded again this year to include women. Now the Rooney Rule requires all 32 NFL organizations to interview at least two women and/or people of color for prominent positions (Scott, 2022). Similar initiatives should be considered by the NCAA and membership institutions, specifically when hiring coaches. The NCAA has taken steps toward gender equity, primarily for student-athletes like similar experience opportunities at the Division I basketball championships. While some steps have been taken in job opportunities, like an increase in staff with expertise in Title IX and gender equity (NCAA, 2022), there are not any current initiatives similar to the NFL's Rooney Rule.

Arnold et al. (2015) urged sport educators to teach the next generation of students to challenge male hegemonic ideology and celebrate the women who have gone where previous women were not allowed nor welcome. "These types of negative cultural norms in sport journalism and broadcasting must be stopped and changed so that true gender equality can be achieved one day soon" (Arnold et al., 2015, p. 41). Similarly, Weatherford et al. (2018) recommended that sport leaders, specifically males, come around to the idea of women in sport having positions of power as society has begun to change to reflect this within

the business and general workforce. Refusing to accept this reality, coupled with the refusal to combat gender

discrimination, only stymies progress and marginalizes women further (Weatherford et al., 2018). Scholars are urging awareness and recognition of this issue because it is relevant and limits the opportunities for otherwise competent women.

Considering the findings of the present study yields results that corroborate women's basketball coaches and female coaches experiencing gender discrimination, administration at all NCAA Division II institutions could implement a few possible techniques for awareness and prevention. For instance, administration could implement a 360-degree review of their respective athletic departments whether that be by conducting surveys or regular interviews with current coaches but also expanding into other areas like athletic training. From a practical perspective, results from a review or surveys within the athletic department allows athletic directors to determine a problem and solve it (Dixon & Warner, 2010). Regular gender discrimination trainings or workshops could also raise awareness within athletic departments. Matzler et al. (2004) and Martensen & Gronholdt (2001) determined that understanding employee wants and needs from the perspective of the employee helps managers, in this case athletic directors, understand what parts of the job most contributes to positive employee outcomes.

A NCAA Division II conference, the Lone Star Conference, holds an annual Women's Workshop, a professional development opportunity for female administrators within the conference. This workshop allows women the chance to learn about advancing in the sports industry, understanding the importance of finding and using one's voice,

standing firm in one's decisions, asking tough questions and staying informed about pertinent policies and practices that could affect college athletics. Again, this university is using this opportunity to advance long-term goals of gender equity and female representation in their Lone Star Conference. Providing opportunities like this can alleviate some of the strain that women in athletics face with the lack of a female equivalent to the "Ole Boys Club" (Walker & Bopp, 2011).

### Conclusion

This study sought to examine potential gender discrimination in Division II coaching, looking specifically at the presence of a possible gender wage gap in Division II basketball. While no evidence of a gender pay gap in Division II basketball coaching was found, the present study demonstrated that gender discrimination existed for Division II female head basketball coaches. Sport should be a space of possibilities and opportunities. However, consistently women have not been treated equally to their male counterparts. The NCAA and member institutions must demonstrate a commitment to gender equity that goes beyond simply providing sport participation opportunities for women. Women must be supported and should feel safe in the workplace. Not only will such efforts lead to increased job satisfaction, but a safe environment will often lead to success on the court.

### References

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299.

- Aitchison, C., Jordan, F., & Brackenridge, C. (1999). Women in leisure management: A survey of gender equity. *Women in Management Review, 14*, 121-127.
- Arnold, T., Chen, S., & Hey, W. (2015). The rise of women sportscasters: A struggle from sideline to the center-field. *Missouri Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 25*, 36-43.
- Barroso, A., & Brown, A. (2021, May 25). *Gender pay gap in U.S. held steady in 2020*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2021/05/25/gender-pay-gap-facts/>
- Bass, P. (2016). Second generation gender bias in college coaching: Can the law reach that far? *Marquette Sports Law Review, 26*(2), 671-711.
- Bower, G.G., & Hums, M.A. (2013). Career paths of women working in leadership positions within intercollegiate athletic administration. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 33*, 1-14.
- Brook, S.L., & Foster, S. (2010). Does gender affect compensation among NCAA basketball coaches? *International Journal of Sport Finance, 5*(2), 96-106.
- Bryson, L. (1994). Sport and maintenance of masculine hegemony. In S. Birrell & C.L. Cole (Eds.), *Women in sport: and culture* (pp. 47-65). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Burton, L., & Parker, H. (2010). Gender typing in management: Evaluation of managerial subroles for sport. *Advancing Women in Leadership Journal, 30*, 1-10.

- Cropanzano, R., Bowen, D.E., & Gilliland, S. W. (2007). The management of organizational justice. *Academy of Management Perspectives, 21*, 34-48.
- Dixon, M.A., & Warner, S. (2010). Employee satisfaction in sport: Development of a multi-dimensional model in coaching. *Journal of Sport Management, 24*, 139-168.
- Dresden, B.E., Dresden, A.Y., Ridge, R.D., & Yamawaki, N. (2017). No girls allowed: Women in male-dominated majors experience increased gender harassment and bias. *Psychology Reports, 121*(3), 459-474.
- Equal Pay Act*. (2017, November 30). History.com. <https://www.history.com/topics/womens-rights/equal-pay-act>
- Fink, J.S., & Pastore, D.L. (1999). Diversity in sport? Utilizing the business literature to devise a comprehensive framework of diversity initiatives. *Quest, 51*, 310-327.
- Galloway, B.J. (2013). *The glass ceiling: Examining leadership perceptions within the domain of athletic administration* (Publication No. 334) [Senior Honors Theses, Eastern Michigan University]. DigitalCommons@EMU.
- Graf, N., Brown, A., & Patten, E. (2018, April 9). *The narrowing, but persistent, gender gap in pay*. Pew Research Center. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/04/the-narrowing-but-persistent-gender-gap-in-pay>
- Hardin, M., & Greer, J D. (2009). The influence of gender-role socialization, media use and sports participation on perceptions of gender-appropriate sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 32*(2), 207-226.

- Hasbrook, C. (1988). Female coaches: Why the declining numbers and percentages? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 59, 59-63.
- Hoffman, J. (2010). The dilemma of the Senior Women's Administrator role in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 3, 53-75.
- Humphreys, B.R. (2000). Equal pay on the hardwood: The earnings gap between male and female NCAA Division I basketball coaches. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 1(3), 299-307.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K.E., & Pastore, D.L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 9(2), 1-26.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Kian, E.M., Vincent, J., & Mondello, M. (2008). Masculine hegemonic hoops: An analysis of media coverage of March Madness. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 25(2), 223-242.
- Knoppers, A. (1994). Gender and the coaching profession. In S. Birrell & C.L. Cole (Eds.), *Women in sport and culture* (pp. 119-135). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Landrine, H., Klonoff, E.A., Corral, I., Fernandez, S., & Roesch, S. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring ethnic discrimination in health research. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, 29(1), 79-94.
- Lange, T. (2014). *What variables explain differences in coaches' salaries for Division I women's sports?* (Publication No.

- 149) [Honors Program Theses, University of Northern Iowa]. UNI ScholarWorks.
- Martensen, A., & Gronholdt, L. (2001). Using employee satisfaction measurement to improve people management: An adaptation of Kano's quality types. *Total Quality Management*, 12(7), 949-957.
- Matzler, K., Fuchs, M., & Schubert, A. (2004). Employee satisfaction: Does Kano's model apply? *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 15(9/10), 1179-1198.
- NCAA. (2022). *Gender Equity Updates*. NCAA. <https://www.ncaa.org/sports/2021/9/27/genderequityupdates.aspx>
- Niemeier, D.A., & Gonzalez, C. (2004). Breaking into the Guildmasters' Club: What we know about women science and engineering chairs at AAU Universities. *NWSA Journal*, 16(1), 157-171.
- Norman, L. (2010). Bearing the burden of doubt: Female coaches' experiences of gender relations. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport* 81(4), 506-517.
- Rhode, D.L., & Walker, C.J. (2007). Gender equity in college athletics: Women coaches as a case study. *Stanford Journal of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties*, 4, 1-50.
- Ruderman, M.N., & Ohlott, P.J. (2004). What women leaders want. *Leader to Leader*, 41-47.
- Sabo, D., Veliz, P., & Staurowsky, E.J. (2016). Beyond X's & O's: Gender bias and coaches of women's college sports. *Women's Sports Foundation*. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED570470.pdf>

- Sage, G. (1990). *Power and ideology in American sport: A critical perspective*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Books.
- Scott, J. (2022, March 28). NFL expands Rooney Rule to include women, required hiring of one minority assistant. *Sports Illustrated*. <https://www.si.com/nfl/2022/03/29/nfl-expands-rooney-rule-include-women-required-one-minority-assistant#:~:text=Established%20in%202003%2C%20the%20Rooney,to%20comply%20with%20the%20policy>.
- Shifflett, B., Murphy, D., Ghiasvand, F., Carlton, M., & Cuevas, M. (2016). Gender bias in sports-media analytics. *Journal of Sports Media*, 11(2), 111-128.
- Sweet, L. (1997). *Factors influencing salaries of intercollegiate athletic head men's and women's basketball coaches as perceived by athletic directors*. (PhD dissertation). Montana State University.
- Theberge, N., & Birrell, S. (1994). The sociological study of women and sport. In D.M. Costa & S.R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 323-331). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Vianello, M. (2004). Gender differences in access to and exercise of power. *Current Sociology*, 52(3), 501-518.
- Walker, N., Bopp, T., & Sagas, M. (2011). Gender bias in the perception of women as collegiate men's basketball coaches. *Journal for the Study of Sports and Athletes in Education*, 5(2), 157-176.
- Wasserman, E. (2000). *The Door in the dream: Conversations with eminent women in science*. Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press.

- Weatherford, G.M., Wagner, F.L., & Block, B.A. (2018). The Complexity of Sport: Universal Challenges and Their Impact on Women in Sport. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 26(2), 89-98.
- Zerunyan, N. (2018). Time's up: Addressing gender-based wage discrimination in professional sports. *Loyola of Los Angeles Entertainment Law Review*, 38(3), 229-259.