C. Changes in number of coaches\textsuperscript{3} for women:

1. Per school changes in number of coaches for women:
   
   \begin{tabular}{lrr}
   & 1972 & 1978 \\
   Ball State & 7 & 8 \\
   Total Increase & 1 & \\
   Ohio University & 4 & 4 \\
   Total Increase & 0 & \\
   Toledo & 0 & 4 \\
   Total Increase & 4 & \\
   \end{tabular}

2. Per school changes in number of men's coaches:

   \begin{tabular}{lrr}
   & 1972 & 1978 \\
   Ball State & 17 & 17 \\
   Total Increase & 0 & \\
   Ohio University & 23 & 17 \\
   Total Decrease & 6 & \\
   Toledo & 18 & 19 \\
   Total Increase & 1 & \\
   \end{tabular}
3. Comparison of women's to men's totals by 1978:

Ball State - with an increase of 1 woman's coach - there are roughly half as many coaches for the women as for the men.

Ohio University - with the decrease in men's coaches of 6 - there are roughly one-fourth as many coaches for the women as for the men.

Toledo - with an increase of 4 women's coaches and one men's coach - there are roughly one-fifth as many coaches for the women as for the men.

D. Changes in number of scholarships for women:

1. Per school changes in number of women's scholarships:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>1972</th>
<th>1978</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball State</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Per school number of men's scholarships in 1978:

Ball State, 1978 ------- 128
Ohio University, 1978 --- 120
Toledo, 1978 --------- 118

3. Comparison of women's to men's totals by 1978:

Ball State - with a total of 195 full scholarships awarded, 34% went to women.
Ohio University - with a total of 174 full scholarships awarded, 31% went to women.
Toledo - with a total of 128 full scholarships awarded, 8% went to women.

E. Changes in numbers of trainers and training facilities:

1. What facilities available for women?

Ball State, 1972 - none
Ball State, 1978 - shared, with 1 training room in each gym
Ohio University, 1972 - shared
Ohio University, 1978 - shared since 1971
Toledo, 1972 - none
Toledo, 1978 - shared with men
2. Changes in number of trainers for women:
   Ball State, 1972 -------- 0 used three men
   Ball State, 1978 -------- 2
   Total Increase -------- 2
   Ohio University, 1972 --- 2
   Ohio University, 1978 --- 2 same two as men's
   Total Increase -------- 0
   Toledo, 1972 ------------ 2
   Toledo, 1978 ------------ 2 same two as men's
   Total Increase -------- 0

3. Number of trainers for men:
   Ball State -------------- 3
   Ohio University --------- 2 same two as
   women's
   Toledo ------------------ 2 - same two as
   women's

4. Comparison of men's and women's totals:
   Ball State - only school to show any
   change by the increase of two trainers for
   women.

5. Number of athletes, male and female, served
   by each trainer:
   Ball State, 1972 -------- 506 ÷ 3 = 168.6
   Ball State, 1978 -------- 555 ÷ 5 = 111.0
Ohio University, 1972 --- 475 + 2 = 237.5
Ohio University, 1978 --- 444 + 2 = 222.0
Toledo, 1972 ----------- not furnished
Toledo, 1978 ----------- 344 + 2 = 172

F. Membership in the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women:

1. Change in status:
   Toledo - only Toledo was not a member of AIAW in 1972. It has since become a member.

G. Women's Sports Information Directors

1. Changes in number of SID for women:
   All three reported having no SID in 1972.
   In 1978, Ball State and Toledo reported having SID's for women while Ohio University reported the use of a paid graduate assistant in this area.

H. Increase in facilities:

1. New facilities:
   Both Toledo and Ball State reported the completion and opening of new gymnasiums during the time frame. Both reported that the facilities are used by both men and women. Ohio University reported opening a new athletic facility in 1968 that was used by both men and women.
2. Use of facilities (sharing):

Ball State, 1972 -------- Athletic Director
Ball State, 1978 -------- Athletic Facilities Committee, Coaches, Athletic Directors, Faculty
Ohio University, 1972 --- Athletic Director
Ohio University, 1978 --- Athletic Director and Coaches
Toledo, 1972 ----------- Athletic Director
Toledo, 1978 ----------- Athletic Director

I. Budgets:

1. Changes in total budget for women's intercollegiate athletics:
   Ball State, 1972 -------- 9,200
   Ball State, 1978 -------- 167,296
   Total Increase -------- 158,096
   Ohio University, 1972 --- 3,000
   Ohio University, 1978 --- 29,400
   Total Increase -------- 26,400
   Toledo, 1972 ----------- 0
   Toledo, 1978 ----------- 54,057
   Total Increase -------- 54,057
2. Changes in total budgets for men's intercollegiate athletics:
   Ball State, 1972 --------- 506,760
   Ball State, 1978 --------- 1,124,569
   Total Increase --------- 617,809
   Ohio University, 1972 --- 531,172
   Ohio University, 1978 --- 649,399
   Total Increase --- 118,227
   Toledo, 1972  not furnished
   Toledo, 1978 --------- 1,591,319
   Total Increase --------- Not known

3. Comparison of women's to men's totals by 1978:
   While it can be seen that each school made
   an increase in total expenditures for
   women's athletics, this must be tempered
   with the disparaging difference between the
   1978 men's totals and the 1978 women's totals.

   Overall Analysis of Questionnaire Answers

   For this analysis one must return to page 18
   in Chapter III which lists the HEW factors taken into
   consideration and then to page 20, which lists how these
   would be measured by areas. Each area will now be
   analyzed for each school involved.
Area 1 involved budgets. It can be seen from the figures preceding that while it cannot be said that the women's budgets are anywhere near the figures for the men's, the women's budgets are rising at a faster degree than are the men's.

Area 2 involved numbers of scholarships. While no athletic scholarships could be awarded to women in 1972, in 1978 they could be granted. As already stated, at both Ball State and Ohio University, better than 30% of the scholarships given went to female athletes. This cannot be said of Toledo.

Area 3 involved numbers of coaches. In this area only Toledo showed any marked increase in the number of women's coaches, but is must be remembered that they had none to begin with. This must be tempered with the knowledge that the men also showed no marked increase at any of the three institutions.

Area 4 involved numbers of teams. Here again no great increase, other than Toledo's women's teams could be shown in either men's or women's programs.

Area 5 involved numbers of athletes. It can be seen for both Ball State and Ohio University that while numbers of male athletes decreased, numbers of female athletes increased.
Area 6 involved training facilities. It can be seen that all three, in 1978, provided training facilities for women; while this was not so at Ball State and Toledo in 1972.

Area 7 involved numbers of trainers. Toledo and Ohio University provided the services of their male trainers to the females also; while Ball State had hired two female trainers by 1978.

Area 8 involved total enrollments of both schools. Since enrollment figures either remained constant or declined, this piece of information was deemed to be unnecessary later in the study.

Area 9 involved female enrollment of both schools. By combining these figures with the number of female athletic participants figures, it can be seen that a great increase has been made in number of participants even with a possible rise in the number of female students.

Area 10 involved the existence of a women's sports information director. All three schools reported not having such a post in 1972. In 1978, all three had a designated person to handle such duties.

Area 11 involved new athletic facilities. Ball State and Toledo reported opening new facilities within this time frame.
Area 12 involved sharing of facilities. Each school had a different method of deciding upon sharing. Both Ball State and Ohio University reported a change in the method of making any such decisions. Toledo did not.

Area 13 involved membership in the AIAW. Only Toledo was not a member of the AIAW in 1972 and they had no women's program then.

By observing the above figures, it can accurately be reported that only in two areas, these being number of coaches and number of teams, can no improvement of conditions be shown by the women's athletic programs at each school. The only other factor involved would be the rate of improvement versus what the rate of improvement should be; and it is not the intent of this study to make any recommendations along these lines.

Presentation of Material Gained Thru Interviews

As was stated in Chapter III, much of the interview was used as a vehicle to gain the athletic director's support and compliance, and as a learning tool for the interviewer. For these reasons only, those parts of the interviews which relate directly to the study will be presented.

During the course of these interviews, the interviewer gained the permission of each of the athletic directors to use direct quotes from them. This presentation
will try to make use of these quotes when possible.

It is the writer's contention that due to the fact that each of the answers given by the athletic directors was not fact but rather opinion, the answers cannot be analyzed separately but can be analyzed as they apply to the total scope of the study. For this reason, this section will consist of the whole interview of each school being presented and followed by a short analysis. Then the next school will be presented and analyzed, etc. The order of presentation will again be alphabetical.

Ball State, Dr. John Reno
1. What has been the most significant change Title IX has brought about within your athletic program?
Reno felt that the most significant change was in "the growth of the women's programs and the philosophy of women's athletics" at Ball State. He stated that whereas before the women's program was one of participation it now espoused "a philosophy of competition".

2. Did you feel the changes were justified in terms of the growth of women's athletics?
Reno answered thus, "Absolutely, whatever changes have been made were in the best interest of women's intercollegiate athletics and men's intercollegiate athletics."
3. If not forced to, would your institution have made the changes?
Reno replied, "Our institution was prepared to make the changes regardless of Title IX". "If it meant more dollars for the program, this is a step we were ready to take."

4. Given one sport exempt from the equality limitations, which one would you choose, and why?
"I would not want to select one sport to be exempt. I think we need to come to an agreement on the funding of our athletic program without exempting one sport."

5. If a sport produces revenue used in a non-discriminatory or non-athletic manner, should that sport be given special treatment? If so, what?
Reno had but one reply to this question. "Not in my opinion."

Questions 6 and 7 do not pertain directly to the study.

8. Should non-financially measurable factors - such as strength of schedule, practice time, and number of coaches - be considered when HEW measures equality?
Reno's answer to this was, "Yes, but women should
be given the opportunity to have less if this is the philosophy of the women's program".

9. If Title IX did not exist, what factors would you use to determine equality between a men's and a women's athletic program?

Reno had several replies to this. First he said need was the basic criteria. "We haven't considered capital expenditures. I recommend on the basis of need as reflected in the women's athletic director's budget." Then, "The same thing is true in the men's program." He also said, "If we didn't have Title IX at all we would be approaching both programs in the same fashion (as we do now)."

10. Do you feel if these guidelines are implemented that you will have to cut back the men's program?

Reno replied, "not in the immediate future". "We have been given great support by the university and I expect it to continue." He was quite hopeful that no cuts would need to be made in the men's program ever.

Reno's answers seemed to be quite consistent with the amount of change in the women's program during the period of the study. Ball State seemed to have the greatest amount of change in almost every category and their view of the women's athletic program seemed to be
reflected by such statements as, "If it meant more dollars for the program, this is a step we were ready to take."
Also, Reno was the only one to state that he would not want any sport to be exempt from the equality limitations.
It seemed to the interviewer that Reno spoke not as a man making concessions to the women's program but rather as an administrator trying to grapple with a tough internal problem.

Ohio University, Harold McElhaney

1. What has been the most significant change Title IX has brought about within your athletic program?
McElhaney felt that the greatest change was in the "unifying of the two areas into one program". He also mentioned a larger budget and more scholarships as very significant changes.

2. Do you feel the changes were justified in terms of the growth of women's athletics?
McElhaney began by simply answering, "yes". He then continued with, "If athletics is good, it is good for everyone... men and women."

3. If not forced to, would your institution have made the changes?
McElhaney said, "Changes were occurring prior to Title IX but they certainly would have taken longer."
He said that he was not certain that it was a good idea to force changes on athletic programs and that perhaps the pre-Title IX pace was a better one.

4. Given one sport exempt from the equality limitations, which one would you choose and why?

Football was picked immediately by McElhaney but he commented, "but football should not totally be exempt". He said that perhaps it should be exempt above a certain given figure or some certain areas of it, such as equipment costs, should be.

5. If a sport produces revenue used in a non-discriminatory or non-athletic manner, should that sport be given special treatment? If so what?

McElhaney said he felt that an exemption of some sort should be considered for such a sport. He also explained that at Ohio University, money goes into a general athletic budget therefore, "the more money we make in football, the more there is for the women's athletic budget".

Questions 6 and 7 do not pertain directly to the study.

8. Should non-financially measurable factors be considered when HEW measures equality?

All McElhaney said to this was that he felt that HEW should be concerned with these factors.
9. If Title IX did not exist, what factors would you use to determine equality between a men's and women's athletic program?

McElhaney said, "It must meet the needs of the students." "We oughta have a well balanced program with or without Title IX." He also gave several specific criterion -- these were numbers of people, types of goals, amount of revenue, if it helps other programs.

10. Do you feel that if the HEW guidelines for Title IX are implemented, you will have to make cuts in the men's program?

"No," McElhaney replied, "I have faith in my President to come up with any funds that might be needed. I don't have to worry about that." He also said, "It can't -- it won't -- be taken away from the men". He closed with, "Over my dead body it'll happen!"

McElhaney also had several other comments that are worth including. He stated, "why start at the college level, upgrade the level at the junior high first and in seven years it'll naturally reach the college level". He was refering to the level of competition in women's athletics. While this seems to be a very good idea and worth much merit, historically education has always moved in the opposite direction with almost all innovation
beginning at the college level and filtering downward. McElhaney said he felt too that the "AIAW rules are different, this hurts chances for equality." As examples he gave recruiting rules and transfer rules. This researcher believes that McElhaney raises a very valid point here. It is difficult to legislate equality to two groups that are governed by different bodies.

Overall, McElhaney seemed very sincere in his efforts to upgrade the women's program but the feeling did come across very strongly that it must be made at no expense to the men. Also this was only McElhaney's first year at the Ohio University post and it would really be unfair to judge his remarks in relationship to the present situation.

Toledo, Vernon Smith

1. What has been the most significant change Title IX has brought about within your athletic program? Smith replied, "Per capita expenditures for the women's program have increased and this has been the biggest change here at Toledo."

2. Did you feel the changes were justified in terms of the growth of women's athletics? Smith answered, "yes".

3. If not forced to, would your institution have made the changes?
Smith said, "Probably not, you must realize that none of these guidelines are definite yet and therefore we do not feel, legally, that we must comply."

4. Given one sport exempt from the equality limitations which one would you choose and why?

Smith said, "Football, although I would have to consider basketball -- it is our biggest money maker."

5. If a sport produces revenue used in a non-discriminatory or non-athletic manner should that sport be given special treatment? If so, what?

Smith replied, "That factor must be taken into consideration." He said he felt possibly these sports should receive some sort of partial exemptions.

Questions 6 and 7 do not pertain directly to the study.

8. Should non-financially measurable factors be considered when HEW measures equality.

Smith answered, "Yes, especially for a sport such as football."

9. If Title IX did not exist, what factors would you use to measure equality?

Smith answered, "A program must meet the needs of the students. I feel I am meeting the needs of my students as shown by their interests. If 9,000 persons attended one of my women's basketball games, then I might be inclined to change."
10. Do you feel that if these guidelines are implemented you will have to cut back the men's program?

"It would be ridiculous and impossible," Smith said, "to meet these guidelines here at Toledo without a much greater influx of money and I don't know where that money would come from."

Smith's interview certainly reflected the stance Toledo has taken on women's athletics as shown by the questionnaire. Smith feels, as he stated, that he is serving the needs of his students and therefore he is doing what is right. He also had several additional comments to back up this stance, one of which was, "I have only 2,000 students on campus, the rest are commuters and they do not care about a women's program." He also said that, "most guidelines will not be implemented, they are just scare tactics. "If they are, the state will have to fund it if it's considered educationally sound.

Smith seemed to not want to answer any of the questions very thoroughly, preferring one, or few, word answers. It seemed to the interviewer as though this were one subject that the athletic director would rather were just not discussed.

Smith did end the interview on a positive note, however; he noted that, "This is the first time the government has recognized athletics as a major part of the
university, therefore it may serve to help the men's program as well as the women's.

Overall the interviews were most insightful and, in review, it would seem that the policies of each athletic department were very reflective of the views of the people who ran them.
FOOTNOTES

1 All figures have been rounded to the nearest percent.

2 It must be noted that Toledo began with 0 female athletes.

3 Total includes both assistant and head coaches but not graduate students.

4 Only the number of full scholarships was asked for. In many instances these full scholarships are split and shared by several people.

5 Same totals for both years were received.

6 While it is impossible to know what goes into the make-up (travel, recruiting, salaries, etc.) of each school's budget, it can be assumed that this make-up remained constant from 1972 - 1978.

7 See A-4.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY

The question posed by this research paper was whether or not any changes had occurred at three Mid-American Conference schools -- Ball State University, Ohio University, and the University of Toledo -- during the period from 1972 to 1978 in the athletic departments. The changes referred to were those brought on by the Title IX legislation enacted by Congress in 1972 and pertaining specifically to equal rights for women athletes at the universities. The methods used to obtain the answers to this question were an interview of the athletic director of each institution and a questionnaire given also to each institution.

What the researcher found was that it was impossible in two of the three cases involved to stipulate that changes occurred directly because of the onset of Title IX. Only in the case of Toledo was the researcher told that change had been brought about specifically to comply with the governmental guidelines. The researcher did find, however, that in each case changes had been made in the women's athletic program both in emphasis and in funding. The most dramatic changes in each instance appeared in the area of numbers of scholarships granted to women and in
the area of total dollars spent on women's athletics. In several instances these rises also appeared in the figures for the men's program but by proportion were greatest in the women's.

It must be stated once more that it was not the intent of this research to compare the three schools included, but rather to measure the amount of change at the three during a given time period -- 1972 to 1978. For this reason any comparison by the reader is strictly incidental.

The hypothesis stated in the introduction of this research was that very little, if any, measurable change could be seen at the three institutions. While one may argue semantically over the verb seen, it can be stated correctly that measurable change -- and in some instances drastic change -- could be found in both the emphasis and budgeting of the women's athletic programs at the three schools. Therefore, the hypothesis proved to be wrong.

An interesting study stemming from the research already completed here would be to expand this research to include all ten of the Mid-American Conference schools. Other possible fields of research would be in the areas of the women's athletic directors' or co-ordinators' opinions of the study and the amount and pace of change at these
institutions, a comparison of the changes in a private institution and a public one, and a possible follow-up study using Secretary of HEW Harris' new guidelines for funding and scholarships.
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APPENDIX B

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

1. What was the total enrollment at your university in 1972? 1978?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>11,215</td>
<td>5,372</td>
<td>16,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>13,823</td>
<td>13,372</td>
<td>27,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Was the total female enrollment at your university in 1972? 1978?

- 1972: 5,372
- 1978: 13,372

3. In 1972 how many men's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978?

- 1972: 12
- 1978: 12

4. In 1972 how many women's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978?

- 1972: 10
- 1978: 11

5. In 1972 how many male athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Letterman</th>
<th>Leaguer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In 1972 how many female athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978?

- 1972: 150
- 1978: 135

7. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for men's athletics in 1972? in 1978?

- 1972: 216
- 1978: 17

8. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for women's athletics in 1972? in 1978?

- 1972: 7
- 1978: 8

9. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to men? in 1978?

- 1972: 14.6
- 1978: 12.8

- Full ride
- 12.8
10. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to women? in 1972?

   none  67

11. What was the total budget for all athletics (scholarships, travel, coaching, recruiting, and maintenance) in 1972? in 1978?

   $406,760  $1,124,569

12. What was the total budget for women's athletics (same as above) in 1972? in 1978?

   $4,160  $167,296.89

13. Was your institution a member of the A.I.A.W. in 1972? in 1978?

   yes  yes

11. In 1972 did your university have a women's athletic training room? in 1978?

   no  yes

15. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for men's athletics? in 1978?

   3

16. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for women's athletics? in 1978? no 2 25 unpaid

17. In 1972 did your institution have a woman's sports information director? in 1978? no  yes

10. Between 1972 and 1978 were any new facilities for intercollegiate athletics opened? If yes, what were these and who used them?

   yes  b-ball  badminton  V-ball  s w m n
19. In 1972, where sharing of facilities between men's and women's teams was necessary, how was this sharing decided upon in 1973? (i.e., by coaches' agreement, by athletic director's decision, etc.)

Facilities Committee

20. Any further comments you may wish to make concerning either the interview or the questionnaire pertaining to the implementation of Title IX at your university.
1. What was the total enrollment at your university in 1972? in 1978? 
   1972 - 17,314
   1978 - 18,406

2. What was the total female enrollment at your university in 1972? in 1978? 
   1972 - 7,611
   1978 - 8,536

3. In 1972 how many men's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978? 
   1972 - 12
   1978 - 11

4. In 1972 how many women's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978? 
   1972 - 7
   1978 - 6

5. In 1972 how many male athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978? 
   1972 - 375
   1978 - 387

6. In 1972 how many female athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978? 
   1972 - 128
   1978 - 125

7. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for men's athletics in 1972? in 1978? 
   1972 - 23
   1978 - 17

8. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for women's athletics in 1972? in 1978? 
   1972 - 4
   1978 - 4

9. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to men? in 1978? 
   * The academic years dealt with in this questionnaire are 1972-73 and 1978-79.
   1972 - 12
   1978 - 12
10. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to women? in 1978?
   1972 - 0
   1978 - 5

11. What was the proposed total budget for men's athletics (scholarships, travel, and recruiting) in 1972? in 1978?
   1972 - 5,311,772
   1978 - 649,391

12. What was the proposed total budget for women's athletics (same as above) in 1972? in 1978?
   1972 - 0
   1978 - 2,960

13. Was your institution a member of the A.I.A.W. in 1972? in 1978?
   1972 - Y
   1978 - Y


15. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for men's athletics? in 1978?
   1972 - 2
   1978 - 2

16. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for women's athletics? in 1978?
   Both five worked men and women athletes

17. In 1972 did your institution have a women's sports information director? in 1978?
   1972 - No
   1978 - Yes, Carol

18. Between 1972 and 1978 were any new facilities for intercollegiate athletics opened? If yes, what were these and who used them?
   No new facilities
19. In 1972, where sharing of facilities between men's and women's teams was necessary, how was this sharing decided upon? In 1978? (i.e. by coaches's agreement, by athletic director's decision, etc.)

By establishment of joint administration.

20. Any further comments you may wish to make concerning either the interview or the questionnaire pertaining to the implementation of Title IX at your university.

Evident in the Title IX recommendations that were presented to the Higher Education Commission was the need for public information but for your files and

[Signature]
1. What was the total enrollment at your university in 1972?* in 1978?*

1972 - 14,669
1978 - 17,257

2. What was the total female enrollment at your university in 1972? in 1978?

1972 - 5,462
1978 - 8,268

3. In 1972 how many men's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978?

1972 - 9
1978 - 10

4. In 1972 how many women's intercollegiate teams did your institution have? in 1978?

1972 - 0
1978 - 4

5. In 1972 how many male athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978?

Do not have this information for 1972
1978 - 288

6. In 1972 how many female athletes participated in intercollegiate athletics at your institution? in 1978?

None in 1972
1978 - 56

7. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for men's athletics in 1972? in 1978?

1972 - 18
1978 - 19

8. How many coaches (head and assistant) did you employ for women's athletics in 1972? in 1978?

1972 - 0
1978 - 4

9. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to men? in 1978? 1972 - Do not have the record 1978 - 118

* The academic years dealt with in this questionnaire are 1972-73 and 1978-79.
10. In 1972 how many athletic scholarships (full or otherwise) were given to women? in 1978?

1972 - None
1978 - 10

11. What was the proposed total budget for men's athletics (scholarships, travel, and recruiting) in 1972? in 1978?

Do not have a record of 1972
1978 - $1,591,319

12. What was the proposed total budget for women's athletics (same as above) in 1972? in 1978?

None
1978 - $54,057

13. Was your institution a member of the A.I.A.W. in 1972? in 1978?

1972 - No
1978 - Yes

14. In 1972 did your university have a women's athletic training room? in 1978?

1972 - No
1978 No; share equally with men

15. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for men's athletics? in 1978?

1972 - 2
1978 - 2

16. In 1972 how many athletic trainers (paid) were there for women's athletics? in 1978?

Same two as in # 15

17. In 1972 did your institution have a women's sports information director? in 1978?

1972 - No
1978 - Yes

18. Between 1972 and 1978 were any new facilities for intercollegiate athletics opened? If yes, what were these and who used them?

Yes; Centennial Hall. The multi-purpose building is used by all sports.
19. In 1972, where sharing of facilities between men's and women's teams was necessary, how was this sharing decided upon? in 1978? (ie. by coaches's agreement, by athletic director's decision, etc.)

1972 - There were no women enrolled
1978 - The philosophy behind the construction of the new Centennial Hall was that it would be shared by all. Decision arrived at when Centennial Hall was built.

20. Any further comments you may wish to make concerning either the interview or the questionnaire pertaining to the implementation of Title IX at your university.

No further comments
APPENDIX C

This questionnaire is concerned with Title IX and the years 1972 and 1978 -- 1972 being the year Title IX was introduced into law and 1978 the year by which its guidelines were to be implemented. The title of my study is "The implementation of Title IX at selected Mid-American Conference schools". I have selected five schools; these being Ball State, Bowling Green, Miami, Ohio University, and Toledo. The reasons for this selection were time, budget, and proximity. The reason for my study is that I hope to gain insight into how far the Title IX guidelines have been carried out. I have come to you, the Athletic Director, because in most cases you gentlemen have had a major role in the policy making of your institution's intercollegiate athletic program.

In the space provided below these questions would you please either place the answers to the questions or the name of someone at your university with whom I could get in contact with concerning the answer. I must ask that you please be as specific as possible as most of the questions do require a set number.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for your time and to express the thought that I have been most impressed by your professionalism, integrity, and helpfulness. Already in this study I have come to realize what a hard task you gentlemen have. I have also come to the realization that you are the most capable persons to make the decisions that you must make. You gentlemen are the epitome of the standard of excellence set by athletics in the Mid-American Conference. Thank you again.

Respectfully,

Steve Moniaci
APPENDIX D

1. What has been the most significant change Title IX has brought about within your athletic program?

2. Did you feel the changes were justified in terms of the growth of women's athletics?

3. If not forced to, would your institution have made the changes?

4. Given one sport exempt from the equality limitations which one would you choose and why?

5. If a sport produces revenue used in a non-discriminatory or non-athletic manner should that sport be given special treatment? If so, what?

6. Is the "non-discriminatory factors" clause too big a loophole in the Title IX text?

7. Do you agree with the "scope of competition" clause in Title IX? Is this not simply continuing the discrimination by use of an old discrimination?

8. Should non-financially measurable factors -- such as strength of schedule, practice time, and number of coaches -- be considered when HEW measures equality?

9. If Title IX did not exist, what factors would you use to determine equality between a men's and women's athletic program?