

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

Spring 2013

# A saga of power, money, and sex in women's athletics: a presidents' history of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW)

Amy Sue Wilson  
*University of Iowa*

Copyright 2013 Amy Sue Wilson

This dissertation is available at Iowa Research Online: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/2661>

---

## Recommended Citation

Wilson, Amy Sue. "A saga of power, money, and sex in women's athletics: a presidents' history of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW)." PhD (Doctor of Philosophy) thesis, University of Iowa, 2013.  
<https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.jtytlrvj>.

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.uiowa.edu/etd>



Part of the [Exercise Physiology Commons](#)

**A ‘SAGA OF POWER, MONEY, AND SEX’ IN WOMEN’S  
ATHLETICS: A PRESIDENTS’ HISTORY OF THE ASSOCIATION  
FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS FOR WOMEN (AIAW)**

by

Amy Sue Wilson

An Abstract

Of a thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Health and Sport Studies in the Graduate College of the University of Iowa

May 2013

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Susan Birrell

## ABSTRACT

In 1971, female professional physical educators in higher education formed the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) to govern women's college athletics. The AIAW presidents gathered at the University of Iowa in July 1980 for a five-day conference: "AIAW . . . A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review" to create a "living history" of their Association. This qualitative research project uses a critical feminist cultural studies approach to analyze the Presidential Review, a primary source that has never been studied in its entirety. At the Review, the presidents offered insights on their pathways to sport leadership, explained how they understood and lived out the AIAW's philosophy and key principles, and described how they faced constant crisis management during their presidencies. Their journeys to leadership in women's athletics featured both blatant discrimination and transformative opportunities that furthered their understanding of sexism in the patriarchal sport domain and kindled their desire to provide meaningful movement opportunities for girls and women. The presidents carried out this goal through a philosophy they collectively affirmed at the Review: the purpose of athletics is to enrich the lives of participants. Through a democratic and inclusive annual Delegate Assembly, the presidents debated extensively to establish principles such as due process and student representation in their governance structure to ensure the Association's central focus on student welfare. As they developed their alternative model of athletics, the AIAW presidents faced constant crises during their Association's brief existence (1971-82). They confronted lack of awareness and misconceptions about their philosophy, and their most formidable crisis was the threat of the NCAA starting women's programs--a "unilateral takeover" that resulted in the demise of the AIAW. The

presidents portrayed the AIAW history as a “saga of power, money, and sex” that involved an intense struggle with the NCAA in which they encountered much resistance to their entry into intercollegiate athletics. Through their involvement in the Review, the presidents contributed dynamic insiders’ perspectives on significant circumstances and events that occurred during their leadership years. These serve as an important contribution to the sparse written history of the AIAW.

Abstract Approved:

---

Thesis Supervisor

---

Title and Department

---

Date

**A ‘SAGA OF POWER, MONEY, AND SEX’ IN WOMEN’S  
ATHLETICS: A PRESIDENTS’ HISTORY OF THE ASSOCIATION  
FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS FOR WOMEN (AIAW)**

by

Amy Sue Wilson

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of  
Philosophy degree in Health and Sport Studies in the Graduate College of  
the University of Iowa

May 2013

Thesis Supervisor: Professor Susan Birrell

Graduate College  
The University of Iowa  
Iowa City, Iowa

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

---

PH.D. THESIS

---

This is to certify that the Ph.D. thesis of

Amy Sue Wilson

has been approved by the Examining Committee for the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Health and Sports Studies at the May 2013 graduation.

Thesis Committee: \_\_\_\_\_

Susan Birrell, Thesis Supervisor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas Oates

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christine Ogren

\_\_\_\_\_  
Catriona Parratt

\_\_\_\_\_  
Yvonne Slatton

To the AIAW Leaders  
for having the courage and audacity to develop an educational model of  
intercollegiate athletics that valued the welfare and the rights of student  
athletes above all else

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During her presentation at the AIAW Presidential Review, Peg Burke noted that the state motto for Iowa was “A Place to Grow,” and acknowledged that the University of Iowa was a place of tremendous growth for her. Peg’s observation immediately inspired me to think of my substantial personal development in Iowa’s Ph.D. program in the Department of Health and Sport Studies: a department with a rich history that features so many remarkable women who have had a major impact on physical education, sport studies, and women’s athletics. It has been invigorating and life-changing to learn from and to have as mentors Christine Grant, Bonnie Slatton, Peg Burke, Susan Birrell, and Tina Parratt.

Considering the impressive influences and legacies of these amazing women and their predecessors in the Department of Health and Sport Studies, I was extremely saddened to learn as I was working on this dissertation that the University of Iowa had decided to disband the Department. While I am very thankful that the Department of American Studies welcomed Sport Studies, I am profoundly disappointed that the Department of Health and Sport Studies no longer exists and that I am the last Ph.D. student to graduate from the University of Iowa in this Department with a specialization in athletics administration.

This turn of events makes me even more thankful for the opportunities I have had to study with such outstanding scholars and leaders in the Department of Health and Sport Studies. I initially learned about the AIAW from Susan Birrell in her Critical Perspectives class, the first of many transformative learning experiences in her courses that have forever changed my view of the world. Bonnie Slatton compelled me to think



intently about my philosophy of athletics, which was so essential at the start of my graduate work. Bonnie and Tina Parratt ignited in me a passion for studying sport philosophy and history, and while Peg Burke had already retired when I arrived at Iowa, it has been wonderful to get to know her and to talk with her about the AIAW. I gained much valuable knowledge about intercollegiate athletics, Title IX, and the AIAW in my classes with Christine Grant, who is an excellent mentor and phenomenal role model. My internship with Dr. Grant early in my studies at Iowa set me on the pathway to work with her on Title IX advocacy, an immensely rewarding endeavor that connects in a meaningful way to many of the women I write about in this dissertation who have so fervently defended and supported Title IX.

I thank Susan Birrell for supervising this dissertation as well as those who generously gave their time to serve on my dissertation committee: Tina Parratt, Bonnie Slatton, Chris Ogren, and Tom Oates. I am very glad that I met Chris Ogren through coursework in higher education history and issues/policies. She is an outstanding scholar and teacher from whom I learned so much in challenging courses. Susan Birrell highly recommended Tom Oates when I needed to replace a committee member. I am grateful to Tom for joining this committee towards the end of the process and for his worthwhile input.

I would like to thank my parents, Roger and Becky, who have always encouraged and supported me in my educational endeavors and pushed me to reach my potential. I also appreciate the many kind words and the support from my siblings and their partners: Shana, Brad, Nate, Lani, and Adam. My nieces--Layne and Paiten--and nephews--Ty, Reed, and Jack--are a great joy in my life, and I have appreciated their affection and

encouragement. They brought a smile to my face by asking frequently when my book report would be finished!

I extend a very special thanks to my sister Shana, my best friend, whose unwavering support and sense of humor allowed me to reach the finish line. Her expertise in technology and formatting was indispensable. She never likes to take credit for accomplishments and likes to be a team player, but she is usually the most capable and smartest person in the room.

My dear friend Bill offered his cheerful spirit on a daily basis and was always there to lend a helping hand and his constant support. Walter and Laura said many prayers and sent many positive messages my way. Walter completed his exceptional life just as I was typing the last words of this dissertation. A number of other family members, friends, and colleagues—too many to mention here, but they know who they are—shared encouraging words for which I will always be grateful.

A heartfelt thanks to my partner RJ for being willing to experience the trials of a dissertation with me after already having endured it herself a handful of years ago. Her patience and love have sustained me and given me hope throughout this process. Thank you for helping me to believe in myself and to see this through to the end.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
CHAPTER1: INTRODUCTION, THEORY, AND METHODOLOGY .....	1
Theoretical Considerations .....	17
Methodology .....	21
CHAPTER 2: LOCATING THE AIAW IN THE HISTORICAL RECORD .....	28
CHAPTER 3: THE AIAW PRESIDENTS: PERSONAL JOURNEYS TO LEADERSHIP IN ATHLETICS .....	51
Access Denied: No Girls Allowed! .....	52
Growing Opportunities and Growing Pains .....	55
‘The Fun of Really Being Good’ .....	66
Experiencing Sexism and Understanding Patriarchy .....	70
The Power of Sorority .....	76
CHAPTER 4: THE AIAW PHILOSOPHY .....	82
The Context: ‘Power, Money, and Sex’ and the NCAA .....	83
The Presidents’ Philosophy in Words .....	92
The Presidents’ Philosophy in Action .....	98
CHAPTER 5: THE AIAW PRESIDENTS: LEADING IN CONSTANT CRISIS MANAGEMENT .....	120
Understanding their Philosophy: Challenges and Misconceptions .....	125
The Constant Crisis: The AIAW’s Battle with the NCAA .....	139
Lopiano’s AIAW Prophecy .....	159
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION .....	165
NOTES.....	176
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	199

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Presenters at the AIAW Presidential Review .....	8
Table 2. University of Iowa, Department of Physical Education and Dance, Women as Leaders Conferences .....	13
Table 3. Acronym Table .....	17
Table 4. 1980 AIAW Presidential Review DVD Identification .....	25

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION, THEORY, AND METHODOLOGY**

The Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was founded in 1971 by female physical educators in higher education who agreed that the time had come for young women across the United States to have the opportunity to compete in organized, high-level intercollegiate athletics and national championship play. Affiliated with the Division of Girls and Women in Sport (DGWS), an Association within the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD), these professors and athletics administrators set out to develop national championships for female college students eager to test their athletic potential on courts and fields long occupied and dominated by their male peers. Male athletes on college campuses all across the country had long enjoyed participation in national championships under the direction of organizations such as the National Association of Collegiate Athletics (NCAA) and the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics (NAIA). Since these men's associations had no plans in the late 1960s to incorporate women into their existing governance systems and national championship sport tournaments, the development of the AIAW was a logical move by women leaders in physical education to meet talented college female athletes' desires for challenging sport competition.

The decision by female physical educators and athletics administrators to sponsor more elite level play may have met the needs of the skilled young women in their charge; however, this was generally a radical departure from their previous outlook on competitive athletics for college women. Prior to the AIAW era, female leaders in physical education in the United States were sometimes opposed to competitive experiences for girls and women and often emphasized broad-based participation;

therefore, they developed alternatives to the men's model of varsity intercollegiate competition. Martha Verbrugge's recently published book, *Active Bodies: A History of Women's Physical Education in Twentieth-Century America*, explores how doors to competitive play were often closed to girls and women due to both biological and cultural rationales: many questioned whether girls and women's bodies were physiologically able to withstand the rigors of high-level competition and expressed concern about the ways participation in sports altered societal expectations about femininity and sexuality.<sup>1</sup>

Reflecting these conservative views, female physical education professors who administered intramural and extracurricular movement experiences for women on their campuses organized events that focused as much on socializing as competing. During the 1920s and 1930s, colleges and universities sponsored Play Days at which participants from each school were dispersed on various teams for a day of athletic events followed by socializing that might include tea and cookies and sometimes skits and games.<sup>2</sup> Telegraphic meets were also popular during this era and required each school to send its results from individual efforts on its own campus to a central location to determine ranking and achievement. A female athlete could be the top swimmer in an athletic event without ever being in the same swimming pool as her competitor. The 1940s featured the development of Sports Days and the opportunity for student athletes to represent their own institution in competition, a departure from the Play Day strategy of mixing participants to form new teams.<sup>3</sup>

As Verbrugge describes the ways college women participated in athletics in the first half of the twentieth century, she problematizes the notion that women physical educators moved from being uniformly against competitive intercollegiate contests to

suddenly supporting these endeavors in the 1960s and 1970s. In her treatment of “Case Studies in Resistance,” Verbrugge shows that high-level competition and intercollegiate contests for women were occurring to some degree at both predominantly white and black institutions before the AIAW formed to sponsor national championship play.<sup>4</sup>

Verbrugge’s analysis suggests that the AIAW era followed decades when “institutional identity determined women’s physical activities at American colleges and universities,” and “single factors such as race, class, locale, or educational mission” could not explain “the complex historical patterns within extracurricular programs for undergraduate women, especially the extent of skilled competition.”<sup>5</sup> Thus, in creating the AIAW, female physical education leaders in higher education were building on previous resistance efforts that would this time expand beyond opportunities at various individual institutions to make accessible intercollegiate competition for women on a national level. As the AIAW presidents took on this task, they were working to effectuate change within a dominant narrative of women’s sport participation marked by ongoing debates “over the meaning of active womanhood, difference, and fairness.”<sup>6</sup>

The female physical education leaders who engaged in the initial discussions about forming an organization to oversee a national athletics program for college women were well aware that men’s athletics at four-year institutions were overseen by the powerful NCAA, founded in 1906, and the NAIA, started in 1940 to administer sports at smaller colleges. In January 1964, female DGWS representatives attended the NCAA Convention to give a presentation that highlighted their organization’s ongoing efforts to initiate women’s national intercollegiate competition.<sup>7</sup> Just months after these discussions, the NCAA revised its eligibility statement and specifically limited NCAA

Championship participation to male students. The DGWS Study Committee on Intercollegiate Competition for Women considered this action a sign that the NCAA was not interested in getting involved in women's athletics. Charles Neinas, Assistant to the NCAA Director, offered further proof when he stated in a letter that the NCAA was an organization to serve male athletes and that the DGWS could move forward with its own efforts to start a national athletics organization for women. The NCAA would "stand ready to be of assistance in an advisory capacity" and wished "the DGWS well in this important endeavor."<sup>8</sup>

Responsive to the NCAA's initial hands-off approach to women's athletics, the DGWS leaders set off to establish their model of athletics governance with the intention of avoiding the scandals and commercialization that pervaded men's college sports.<sup>9</sup> They formed the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) in 1967 to develop guidelines and standards for national championships, and in 1971, the CIAW became a college and university institutional membership organization: the AIAW.<sup>10</sup>

The AIAW administered intercollegiate sport championships for women that emphasized regional competition and eventually culminated in national championship sport tournaments. The Association sponsored these participation opportunities across the country compelled by a distinct and clearly stated belief in the purpose of college athletics. The first lines in a 1974 AIAW position paper on intercollegiate athletics state concisely the Association's philosophy: "The enrichment of the life of the participant is the focus and reason for the existence of any athletic program. All decisions should be made with this fact in mind."<sup>11</sup> Guided by this basic principle, the AIAW grew at an amazing pace. The 1980-1981 AIAW Directory indicates that in less than 10 years the



Association had 967 college/university members and was organizing and administering 35 national championships in 17 sports.<sup>12</sup> The Directory also clarifies the AIAW's foremost function on the national sport scene—it was “designed to provide governance and leadership dedicated to the assurance of standards of excellence and educational soundness in women's intercollegiate athletics.”<sup>13</sup> A list of 10 AIAW “Purposes” in the directory reveals the Association's pursuit of goals even beyond overseeing an educational model of athletics. The AIAW also aimed “to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and value of sports and athletics as they contribute to the enrichment of the life of the woman.”<sup>14</sup> Indeed, the AIAW would find itself in the position to be a representative voice for women's sports and to support a new federal law that would lead to an explosion of sport participation opportunities for girls and women across the country.

In fortuitous step with the newly formed AIAW's efforts to establish women's intercollegiate participation and championship opportunities, the U.S. Congress passed the Education Amendments of 1972. These additions to 1964 Civil Rights Legislation included Title IX, which made illegal widespread discrimination based on sex in educational settings. Title IX opened new opportunities for women—at that time by far the underrepresented sex in education—to earn degrees, direct classrooms, and enter professions such as law and medicine that previously had been male-dominated. At the time Title IX was passed, 86 percent of the 10,435 graduate students entering medical schools in the U.S. were men, and over 90 percent of students in law schools were men.<sup>15</sup> In many areas and at all levels of education, women were frequently second-class citizens.

What few realized when Title IX became the law of the land was that it would become one of the most intensely debated pieces of federal legislation in the United States. Title IX has dominated the headlines and elicited controversy because of the new opportunities it has created for women to participate in sport. It was one thing for women to occupy classroom seats and faculty positions in greater numbers but quite another for them to enter the courts and fields of the patriarchal environment of college athletics.

The AIAW and Title IX were crafted and came of age together during the 1970s, an era that featured both the well-documented Women's Movement fueled by second-wave feminism and a women's sport revolution. Yet, while popular culture and sport academics have focused on Title IX, the AIAW's history and mission have remained mostly a footnote to the many and multifaceted Title IX narratives. This omission occurs despite the fact that the AIAW had become the largest sport governance association in the country by 1980 and was establishing itself as a powerful player in the structures and politics of the national sport scene. In general, sport studies scholars have conducted a small amount of research on the AIAW, and those treatments of it that do exist have reached some contradictory conclusions. Moreover, the AIAW is conspicuously absent from scholarly work on the Women's Movement of the 1960s and 1970s.

This dissertation focuses on the lived experiences of the AIAW presidents through an analysis of a 1980 primary source that has not previously been examined. This research project privileges the insiders' perspectives—that is, it is based on the viewpoints of the presidents who led the AIAW and lived at the center of the women's sport revolution of the 1970s. The primary material central to this project is video footage of the AIAW presidents who were involved in a summer symposium at the

University of Iowa. Determined to make certain their story of their relatively young Association was preserved for the historical record, all 10 of the AIAW leaders travelled to the Midwest in July, 1980.

The AIAW presidents had good cause to come together in Iowa City to contemplate both their Association's history and future. A number of high-ranking NCAA administrators vigorously challenged Title IX's application to athletics for most of the 1970s while simultaneously working behind the scenes to implement their own women's national championship program. AIAW leaders and members tirelessly battled these NCAA initiatives, realizing both the importance of defending Title IX and the need to protect the right to self-governance of women's athletics that their Association ensured.

Within this tumultuous context, University of Iowa Women's Athletics Director Dr. Christine Grant, then president of the AIAW, and Dr. Peg Burke, chair of Iowa's Department of Physical Education and Dance and AIAW president in 1976, teamed up with their colleague Dr. Bonnie Slatton, who had just served as the AIAW's interim Executive Director, to host a five-day conference featuring the AIAW presidents on Iowa's campus. This workshop, which ran from July 14-18, 1980, was titled "AIAW . . . A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review." All 10 of the Association's presidents accepted the invitation (see Table 1).<sup>16</sup>

**Table 1: Presenters at the AIAW Presidential Review**

AIAW President	Term in Office	Education	Professional Position in 1980
Carole Oglesby	1972-73	Ph.D., Purdue University	Associate Professor of Sports Psychology, Temple University
Carol Gordon	1973-74	Ph.D., University of Utah	Chairperson, Department of Physical Education for Women, Washington State University
Lee Morrison	1974-75	Ph.D., Indiana University	Associate Director for Women's Intercollegiate Sports, James Madison University
Laurie Mabry	1975-76	Ph.D., University of Iowa	Director, Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, Illinois State University
Peg Burke	1976-77	Ph.D., University of Iowa	Chairperson, Department of Physical Education and Dance, University of Iowa
Judith Holland	1977-78	Ph.D., University of Southern California	Director, Department of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics
Charlotte West	1978-79	Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison	Director of Women's Athletics, Southern Illinois University
Carole Mushier	1979-80	Ph.D., University of Southern California	Director of Women's Athletics, State University of New York-Cortland
Christine Grant	1980-81	Ph.D., University of Iowa	Women's Athletic Director, University of Iowa
Donna Lopiano	1981-82	Ph.D., University of Southern California	Women's Athletic Director, University of Texas

*Source: Peg Burke, AIAW...A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review (Iowa City, IA: Department of Physical Education and Dance, 1980).*

It is appropriate that this forum was staged at the University of Iowa since women who served as faculty in the University's Department of Physical Education and Dance and who were affiliated with women's athletics at the University were central figures in the AIAW and the fight for gender equity in sport on a national level. These pioneers took on prominent roles in the AIAW, recognizing the Association as critical to advancing the cause for women in college athletics and in society at large. In recent years, they have been key figures in my graduate studies. As my professors and mentors, these former AIAW leaders have given me access to the video recordings of the Presidential Review as well as personal files related to the event. These materials are a significant primary source—soon to be in the Iowa Women's Archives at the University of Iowa—that provides the opportunity to contribute to the developing historical narrative on the AIAW.

The organizers of the AIAW Presidential Review invited the Association's eight former presidents, current president Christine Grant, and president-elect Donna Lopiano to speak the significant happenings during their terms in office and to comment on the Association's future. Their goal was to create a "living history" of the AIAW. In the invitation to the Presidential Review, which also served as an information piece for those who were interested in attending for academic credit, Department Chair Peg Burke noted that her department was:

very pleased to be a part of living history by having the opportunity to bring together all of the individuals who have served as president of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women during its short but significant existence. During the week of formal and informal presentations by the presidents and their interactions with each other and with seminar participants, it is hoped that the significant happenings, accomplishments, frustrations, light moments, and phenomenal growth of AIAW as an organization can be shared and captured for the historical record.<sup>17</sup>

In recent recollections regarding the purpose of the 1980 Presidential Review, Burke, Grant, and Slatton agreed that when the NCAA voted at their annual convention in January, 1980, to sponsor women's championships for two of their three divisions—Divisions II and III—the AIAW leadership realized that their Association's very existence was in peril.<sup>18</sup> Since the NCAA was moving to provide women's championships with financial incentives that the much younger AIAW was not yet in a position to offer on a broad scale, colleges and universities would be enticed by the NCAA's monetary support, particularly in the dire economic conditions of the late 1970s and early 1980s. Furthermore, not only would the AIAW's budget be negatively affected by loss of membership dues, but it would also likely lose the recently signed million dollar television contract with NBC, a deal negotiated with the expectation that the AIAW would be *the only* sponsor of women's national intercollegiate championships.

Another impediment was the tendency for most involved in college athletics to interpret Title IX to mean that moving towards gender equity meant establishing sameness between men's and women's programs. Throughout the 1970s all over the country men's and women's athletics departments, which had previously been separate entities, were combining at a rapid pace, and when such a merger occurred, the male athletics director with rare exceptions was placed in charge of the entire department. Along with this consolidation of power, a general sense began to pervade college athletics that for reasons of legality and simplicity, it would be beneficial for women's and men's athletics to exist under the same set of rules and governance system.<sup>19</sup>

According to Burke, Grant, and Slatton, at the time of the Presidential Review all signs pointed to the NCAA continuing to pursue women's intercollegiate sport

governance with little concern for the effects on or desires of female student athletes, coaches, and athletics administrators.<sup>20</sup> The AIAW leadership was certain that the NCAA membership would vote at its next convention in 1981 on legislation that, if passed, would establish women's championships for NCAA Division I.<sup>21</sup> This was not a new challenge for AIAW members, for they had staved off NCAA forays into women's intercollegiate sport governance since the mid-1970s. The NCAA's viewpoint at the end of the 1960s that women sport leaders should forge their own path in intercollegiate athletics governance had been short-lived. Since then, NCAA officials had come to be "dubious that a professional association of educators could manage a sports program, and they certainly did not think the women's organizations were up to the task of administering women's athletics."<sup>22</sup> In contrast to the NCAA's ongoing efforts to take control of women's intercollegiate athletics, the NAIA, a smaller and less powerful men's governance organization, remained supportive of the AIAW until the late 1970s.

The AIAW Presidential Review held in Iowa City in July of 1980 marked the exact midpoint between the two very crucial NCAA votes on women's athletics program sponsorship that would dramatically affect the AIAW's future. Grant recently reflected on the daunting environment in which the AIAW leaders found themselves and on the decision to hold the Presidential Review: "Some of us thought that the AIAW might not survive. We were doing our utmost to make sure that it did survive, but deep down we knew that there was a good possibility that we would not. And, I don't know who came up with the idea—it could have been Peg [Burke]. But, we wanted to preserve everything about our organization and that was the impetus behind getting everybody together."<sup>23</sup> Burke confirms this rationale, noting the importance of the AIAW

Presidential Review for “preserving the historical record.” Slatton’s recollection of the event depicts its significance to the organizers:

It was decided we really needed to bring all the presidents together while we had a vibrant organization to make sure that we had as accurately as possible reflected what the AIAW was all about. It wasn’t only about women’s athletics, although clearly that was a huge focus. It was about changing the nature of intercollegiate athletics, and we wanted the women who had been there from the very beginning, most of whom had moved from a career in physical education or were teachers into creating opportunities for women. And, we wanted them to reflect about how significant that was and how important it was to have a separate organization. We wanted to be able to communicate that to the presidents and chancellors of all the institutions.<sup>24</sup>

Slatton and her colleagues in the University of Iowa’s Department of Physical Education and Dance were dedicated to changing the nature of intercollegiate athletics as proven by the way they fostered meaningful discussion about the subject. They organized and participated in the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review as an event that was part of a larger project: an annual Women as Leaders Conference. From 1978 to 1988, the Department held summer conferences that focused on timely and significant topics connected to females and sport as well as other women’s issues. Slatton’s personal files reveal these conference titles and show that in addition to holding the AIAW Presidential Review in 1980, the Department of Physical Education and Dance also sponsored a conference titled Black Women in Sport that summer (see Table 2).<sup>25</sup> These annual conferences substantiate the idea that women sport academics and administrators at the University of Iowa were not only leaders in the AIAW, but they also took initiative to ensure that meaningful dialogue and subsequent activism were occurring for important matters involving women and their ongoing efforts to make progress in a patriarchal society.



**Table 2: University of Iowa, Department of Physical Education and Dance, Women as Leaders Conferences**

Year	Title
1978	Perspectives on Human Movement
1979	Women as Leaders in Physical Education and Sport
1980	AIAW—A Decade of Progress—Presidential Review
1980	Black Women in Sport
1981	Our Foremothers, Our Mentors, Our Friends
1982	Feminism and Sport: Connections and Directions
1983	Feminism and Sport: Continuity and Change
1984	Roots and Wings: The Heritage and Future of the Development of Physical Education and Dance
1985	Administrative Strategies for Women in the 80's
1986	Women on the Cutting Edge
1987	Breaking Barriers
1988	Get Serious about Women: Diverse Realities and Social Change

*Source:* Bonnie Slatton, Personal Papers. "Appendix D, Women as Leaders Conference Speakers and Topics, 1978-1988," *Women as Leaders Conferences*. Department of Physical Education and Dance, University of Iowa.

The AIAW had a brief existence following after the 1980 Presidential Review.

The Association shut its doors in 1982 after an epic power struggle between the NCAA and AIAW that centered on contrasting philosophical views and systems of rules as well as a heated debate over the right to self-governance. Ultimately, the AIAW was subjugated by the much wealthier and more established NCAA. At the Review, the presidents mulled over a multitude of reasons why the NCAA persisted in their efforts to govern women's intercollegiate athletics: to gain the AIAW's power and votes on the national sports scene, to control the expenditures on women's athletics, to reap the profits from the growing popularity of women's sports, and to rebound from their unsuccessful attempts to weaken Title IX's application to college athletics. When NCAA officials failed to curtail the law and the equity it mandated, they were in a better position if they had power over the women who were demanding more participation opportunities and resources on college and university campuses across the country.

By 1983, only three years after the still hopeful presidents met for the Review, any college woman competing in intercollegiate athletics at a four-year institution was doing so under the guidance of an organization designed by and run for men—the NCAA or NAIA. The gender dynamics that played out in this confrontation over sport governance are a telling commentary on what often happens when women enter previously male-dominated areas of society. The AIAW Presidential Review occurred as this gender battle was nearing its apex—at the exact midpoint between the two very crucial votes by NCAA members at their annual convention in favor of sponsoring women’s championships in January of 1980 and 1981 that would dramatically affect the AIAW’s future. The timing of the AIAW Presidential Review is one of many reasons that it is such fertile ground for sport studies research.

Another reason that the 1980 event in Iowa City is worth studying is due to the unique forum it provided for contemplating the AIAW’s first ten years. A full five days were dedicated to capturing the Association’s “living history” in an environment that welcomed debate and aimed to establish the most accurate record for posterity. The Presidential Review footage presents the key events in each president’s term as viewers might expect it would. The setting inspired the presidents to cover a wide range of topics in great depth from sharing intimate details about their pathways to the highest levels of women’s sport leadership to engaging in thoughtful and sometimes tense debates about how to handle the ever-threatening struggle with the NCAA. The video footage offers an extensive as well as intimate view of the presidents—depicting their humor, frustrations, convictions, and more—to a degree not found in more traditional archival sources. Over

30 years after the event, it gives a viewer the a sense of experiencing direct access to the AIAW's inside story as its central characters are writing it.

The AIAW narrative is also important to explore because it raises questions about who has and will continue to preserve, improve, and expand women's opportunities and equitable treatment in the sport domain. As AIAW President Lee Morrison reflected nearly 20 years after her presidency:

The AIAW left a heritage and a legacy of women leaders who examined, created, controlled, and supported a critical decade of intercollegiate athletics. That decade was a period of great accomplishment for women and for women's athletics, and the AIAW's success was a threat to the athletic establishment and precipitated the takeover by the NCAA. Looking back to the days of AIAW, one must now ask, who will act as the watchdog for those accomplishments, and who will assure the continuation of opportunity for girls and women in sport and athletics?<sup>26</sup>

A call to action is embedded in President Morrison's reflection, and such an appeal becomes more significant when one begins to understand the history of the AIAW through the 1980 Presidential Review narratives.

A pertinent consideration is whether current and future generations will heed Morrison's call to action to protect and grow opportunities for girls and women in sport or whether a sense of complacency has developed among many who believe that women have "made it" in the sport domain. This concern is expressed on a broader scope by Jennifer Hargreaves as she explored the efforts of sport feminist academics to make sense of dynamic feminist perspectives; she issued a reminder that "many beneficiaries of First and Second Wave feminism have lost the sense that women any longer have a political cause, believing that feminist activity and legislation have transformed the lives of women as a whole."<sup>27</sup> Rightfully so, increased female participation at all levels of sport has been celebrated extensively since the AIAW era and the passage of Title IX. Often

overlooked is the significant loss of leadership positions and power for women in intercollegiate athletics and on the national sport scene since the AIAW ceased to exist. Furthermore, most athletics departments are far from reaching equitable participation, funding, and treatment for female athletes even as many across the country are currently commemorating Title IX's 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary.<sup>28</sup>

Welch Suggs, author of *A Place on the Team: The Triumph and Tragedy of Title IX*, states that “because of the mania that scholastic and collegiate sports inspire, Title IX’s application to sports has been the most visible gender controversy of the past thirty years.”<sup>29</sup> Mostly, the AIAW has remained a footnote in both the celebration and controversy surrounding Title IX as well as in sport history narratives. The first access to an AIAW primary source in its entirety provides the opportunity for contributions not just to sport studies scholarship, but also to women’s history in general.

The AIAW leaders determined in 1980 that it was important to create and preserve a “living history” of their organization. In doing so, they left behind a meaningful historical record that has the potential to elevate the AIAW from its footnote status. They intentionally documented the AIAW’s story from their perspectives, creating a primary source that features a “history from within” their Association. This research project explores the AIAW Presidents’ 1980 individual presentations and panel discussions to answer the following questions:

1. In what ways did the presidents depict their pathways to leadership in the AIAW, and how did their experiences influence their commitment to work for change in women’s sports?

2. How did the AIAW presidents understand and articulate their Association's philosophy and most significant principles, and how did these play out in and shape their actions and model of governance?

3. What challenges did the AIAW presidents face in their leadership roles?

**Table 3: Acronym Table**

Acronym	Full Name of Organization
AAHPERD	American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance
ACE	American Council on Education
AIAW	Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women
ASA	American Softball Association
CIAW	Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women
DGWS	Division for Girls' and Women's Sports
HEW	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
NAGWS	National Association for Girls and Women in Sport
NAIA	National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics
NASPE	National Association of Sport and Physical Education
NJCAA	National Junior College Athletic Association
NCAA	National Collegiate Athletic Association
USFHA	United States Field Hockey Association
USOC	United States Olympic Committee
USWLA	United States Women's Lacrosse Association

### Theoretical Considerations

Even before viewing any recordings of the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review, one can surmise that the presidents' desire to record a "living history" at the moment when their battle with the NCAA was most intense and their existence most in peril points to how important they thought it was for future generations to know their history. For the AIAW presidents, their experiences were much more than just sport stories; some of these leaders vividly describe the AIAW as a "saga of power, money, and sex."<sup>30</sup> The "power" component of this phrase had to do with several factors ranging from women having the right to control their own destiny in intercollegiate athletics to the AIAW's

actions to ensuring that their Association's inclusive philosophy was enacted by including women of color in leadership positions. The "money" concerns were replete for a fledgling young AIAW that was developing in the shadows of the much wealthier and more established NCAA. The reference to "sex" was a more sensational way for them to call attention to issues related to gender and power. At virtually every turn, the women of the AIAW had to deal with the mainstream social constructions of what it meant to be male versus female in the well-established patriarchy that infused intercollegiate athletics. The presenters at the 1980 Presidential Review frame the AIAW's existence as one enmeshed in struggles of power, and a critical feminist theoretical approach is an appropriate lens through which to analyze the AIAW Presidential Review.

My understanding of a feminist perspective in sport studies is shaped by Susan Birrell's work. Birrell's scholarship is particularly useful because she has been central to defining the dynamic nature of sport feminisms and provides guidance on feminist thinking in sport as it has evolved from the AIAW era to the present day.<sup>31</sup>

Birrell's influential chapter in the *Handbook of Sport Studies* (2000) provides an extensive analysis of feminist theories for sport and offers the means to understand and use the "coherent theoretical framework" of critical feminist cultural studies. Describing feminist theories in sport as a series of theoretical approaches that constitute a dynamic process, Birrell's main purpose is "to theorize about gender relations in our patriarchal society as they are evidenced by, played out in, and produced through sport and other body practices."<sup>32</sup> The 1980s featured a growing awareness by some sport scholars of the limits of liberal and radical feminisms for the reason that they focused solely on gender at

the exclusion of other categories of oppression. As a result, there was movement towards theories that synthesized or brought together the perspectives of two or more theories. According to Birrell, this change pointed to the need for the subject of feminist theory to “shift from woman to women to reflect the vast experiential diversity of women’s lives.”<sup>33</sup> Birrell offers the important reminder that “a central part of the contemporary feminist project is to discover and theorize links to the lived experiences of other oppressive relationships [besides gender].”

The synthesis theories that emerge create, in part, the pathway to critical feminist cultural studies, a form of cultural studies, which “is based on the assumption that power is distributed inequitably throughout society, often along the lines of gender, class, and race.”<sup>34</sup> Vital characteristics of these power lines include that they are always contested and that they are often not maintained by force; instead, they are frequently upheld “through more subtle forms of ideological dominance,” meaning that they are sustained through sets of ideas “that serve the interests of dominant groups but are taken up as the societal common sense even by those who are disempowered by them.”<sup>35</sup> Birrell recognizes Gramsci’s Hegemony Theory as central to the critical feminist cultural studies agenda. Hegemony refers to a “fairly complete system of ideological dominance that works through the apparent complicity of those disenfranchised by it.”<sup>36</sup> This perspective is especially useful in an analysis of the AIAW in 1980 because a handful of women supported the NCAA’s entry into women’s intercollegiate sport governance, despite the fact that the NCAA fought Title IX and was only willing to accommodate women into their governance structure with minimal leadership opportunities.

A feminist cultural studies perspective is also a useful means by which to interpret the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review because of its interventionist attributes. Hargreaves and McDonald explain that “the feminist cultural studies initiative has re-enlivened the politicization of theory. Feminist researchers of sport have systematically related their work to practice. They are not merely researchers who describe what women do; they also set out to transform structures that oppress women in sport and to create liberating changes.”<sup>37</sup> The AIAW story is an important one for current and future generations to know so that they are aware of the dedicated efforts and struggles of those who preceded them. There are negative aspects of the AIAW narrative that are best not repeated—women’s loss of power in athletics—and there are success stories that need to be preserved and protected—the emergence of a strong Title IX and the expansion of opportunities for girls and women.

In an analysis of the potential of critical feminist cultural studies, sport studies scholar Jennifer Hargreaves contemplates the question: “Has sport feminism lost the plot?”<sup>38</sup> Hargreaves reviews how academics have made sense of sport feminisms, expressing some weariness at postmodernism’s possible negative effects on the goal of effectuating positive and meaningful social change. She proposes that “because postmodernism does not prioritize praxis . . . it is especially urgent that those of us who maintain a feminist position review our histories and re-create our diverse and separate engagements in ways that have meaning for all women in sport.”<sup>39</sup> Hargreaves recognizes the value of the “intrinsically interventionist” nature of cultural studies and refers to Ann Hall’s argument for combining feminism with cultural studies, a merger which “recognizes the liberative *and* controlling features of sport.”<sup>40</sup> It is imperative to



heed Hargreaves' warning and guard against losing sight of the power of critical feminist work to effectuate positive change.

A foundational understanding of feminist theory in sport studies has evolved into explication of dynamic and multiple forms of feminist theories. One of these—critical feminist cultural studies—provides the opportunity to explore sport culture in specific contexts along the lines of gender, class, race, and the like, and to consider resulting ideological power struggles. This theoretical perspective also creates the possibility for a feminist intervention into history—to follow analysis with meaningful action to bring about positive change for women in sport and other traditionally male domains. For these reasons, critical feminist cultural studies is a useful theoretical lens through which to explore the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review.

### **Methodology**

The professors in the University of Iowa's Department of Physical Education and Dance had the foresight to video tape the majority of their annual Women as Leaders conferences, including the 1980 Presidential Review. Approximately 24 hours of video taped material exists from the five-day gathering, including both individual presentations and panel discussions. Some of the tapes were transcribed in the mid-1980s, but no researcher has ever studied these recordings in their entirety. Now, the complete set of BETA tapes has been converted to DVD and is available for viewing and analysis.

This qualitative research project focuses on the 1980 Presidential Review, thus privileging the AIAW narrative created in Iowa City. The presidents' goal was to establish a "living history" that captured the "truth" about their Association for posterity. This objective is reflected in the way the Presidential Review was organized: a

combination of individual and panel presentations allowed for the presidents to give in-depth accounts of the significant events that occurred during their leadership years. In particular, the panel discussions provided the opportunity for audience interaction through question and answer sessions and for the presidents to debate and to clarify issues, which involved sometimes correcting each other's previous statements or assertions. In other instances, the viewer is reminded of another narrative that was happening when the camera was turned off. As Donna Lopiano began the second segment of her individual presentation, she inquired if the camera has been turned on yet, and when she learned that it had, she let the audience know that she would "tell them later."<sup>41</sup> While the recordings of the event offer the viewer the exhilarating feeling of having access to the Presidents' "inside story," there are reminders of "the rest of the story" that week occurring away from the camera. What the camera did capture preserved a narrative that features multiple perspectives woven together to form a dynamic "living history."

Since 1980, the recordings of the AIAW Presidential Review had been stored in the Field House at the University of Iowa, the home of the Department of Health and Sport Studies (known at the time of the 1980 Review as the Department of Physical Education and Dance). The BETA tapes of the AIAW Presidential Review first came to my attention in a graduate course in athletics administration with Dr. Christine Grant. A cabinet in our classroom in the Field House contained an array of video tapes and some other very large, odd-sized cases tucked away among the cobwebs. Scrawled in faded blank ink on the spines of some of the tapes, the letters "AIAW" were barely visible. I inquired around the Department of Health and Sport Studies to see about accessing the

tapes and was given permission to begin locating and reviewing the tapes to determine their content.

Pursuing graduate studies at an institution that has a particularly strong commitment to and connection to the AIAW provided me with access to this primary source. Not only did I have the opportunity to be the first person to view the tapes in their entirety, but I also have benefitted from having as professors and mentors key persons in the AIAW leadership who were organizers of and participants in the Review. These associations have resulted in the opportunity to write a “history from within”: to capture a particular and significant AIAW event from close proximity and with the advantage of the perspectives of central figures who lived the history.

My first experiences with these tapes were both exciting and unsettling. This latter reaction was due to the fact that some tapes were missing from the collection; furthermore, they were in a format that prevented me from viewing them. It took several months to track down the complete set of AIAW tapes. A few of them had been converted to VHS, but most were still in the BETA format. The next step was to convert them to DVD, and the audio-visual expert at the university warned that the transfer of the footage to the new format might not work. After a few weeks, the news that the first conversion had been successful provided much welcomed relief and then was followed by a wait of several months for all of the tapes to be converted to DVD.

The video tape conversion produced 24 DVDs, each of which contains approximately 60 minutes of footage that is overall of good quality (see Table 4, page 25). The 10 AIAW presidents who participated in the Presidential Review (see Table 1, page 8) each spoke for approximately two hours; therefore, 20 of the 24 DVDs feature

individual president's presentations. The exception to this two hour timeframe is when AIAW president-elect Donna Lopiano speaks on DVD 24, the final recording, to offer a five minute prophecy on the future of the AIAW. Following this, those presidents still in attendance at the Review gathered on the stage to take some final questions from the audience and to read a resolution to be sent to the American Council on Education (ACE) that had been drafted during the week.

In addition to the panel of presidents featured in DVD 24, four of the DVDs are footage of panel sessions in which those leaders who served together--the AIAW president-elect, current president, and past-president--joined each other on stage and answered questions from the audience. Since Burke was the self-described "hostess" for the event, she was present on the stage for most of the panel sessions and facilitated the discussions between the presidents and the audience. President-elect Donna Lopiano was recruited to introduce each of the presidents, so she was at the podium at the start of nine of the DVDs.

**Table 4: 1980 AIAW Presidential Review DVD Identification**

AIAW President	Date	DVD
Carole Oglesby	July 14	DVD 1, 2
Carol Gordon	July 14	DVD 3, 4
Panel (Oglesby, Gordon, and Morrison)	July 14	DVD 5
Lee Morrison	July 15	DVD 6, 7
Laurie Mabry	July 15	DVD 8, 9
Panel (Gordon, Morrison, Mabry, and Burke)	July 15	DVD 10
Peg Burke	July 16	DVD 11, 12
Judie Holland	July 16	DVD 13, 14
Panel (Mabry, Burke, Holland, and West)	July 16	DVD 15
Charlotte West	July 17	DVD 16, 17
Carole Mushier	July 17	DVD 18, 19
Panel (Burke, West, Mushier, and Grant)	July 17	DVD 20
Christine Grant	July 18	DVD 21, 22
Donna Lopiano	July 18	DVD 23
Panel (Lopiano, All Presidents for Closing Remarks)	July 18	DVD 24

The individual presenters and panel participants referred at times to a “young man” who was filming the event from the back of the room. He kept the camera focused on the podium or the long table of panel participants. The audience was not filmed unless individuals happened to be sitting in the line of the camera’s focus on the stage.

Therefore, during the panel sessions, which feature question and answer between the

audience and presenters, it is not always clear who is asking the question or commenting. The panelists do sometimes address the audience members by first name, making it possible to discern who is speaking. A few of the panelists reminded each other that they need to repeat questions from the audience so that they were captured on tape, but this did not always occur. Although it is sometimes unclear who was speaking from the audience, it is possible to hear nearly all the dialogue between the panelists and audience. On occasion, there are brief instances in some of the footage when there is a blurry picture or a slight skip. The sound and picture quality issues are minor and do not have a significant effect on efforts to understand and/or transcribe the DVDs' content.

An important step in the process of reviewing the DVDs was to understand the context in which the tapes were created. For this information, I had the first-hand experience of two of the former AIAW presidents who were associated with my academic department, Dr. Peg Burke and Dr. Christine Grant. In addition, another recently retired professor in my department, Dr. Bonnie Slatton, served as AIAW Executive Director in 1978-79 and was present for the 1980 event. I was able to interview all three of them together, and in later weeks, to discover material related to the AIAW Presidential Review among Dr. Slatton's papers in the Department of Health and Sport Studies. Slatton's materials clarify that the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review was part of an annual series entitled "Women as Leaders" that was conducted by the University of Iowa Department of Physical Education and Dance from 1978-1988.<sup>42</sup> Slatton's personal files contain a brief folder on each annual conference that includes materials such as planning documents, agendas, and a few presentation manuscripts, all of which provide context for the Presidential Review.

Slatton's records provided some transcriptions of the individual presidents' presentations. I took copious notes on each DVD, finding the process beneficial due to the level of engagement with the material and because it created the first ever transcriptions of the presidents' panel discussions. I approached the material from 1980 with the intent of pursuing some particular questions. My primary focus was to review the material to learn in what ways the AIAW Presidential Review clarified the presidents' individual understanding of their Association's philosophy and principles and then to explore how the presidents lived out this philosophy and its central tenets through their actions as leaders. I was also interested in the significant challenges that the presidents faced during their AIAW leadership years. I designated a notebook for each of these questions and then scrutinized the content of the DVDs for evidence related to each. During the pursuit of evidence for the initial research questions, I observed the extent to which the presidents provided autobiographical information that yielded noteworthy insights on their life experiences in athletics and academia. Subsequently, I added a research question to address how the presidents' personal journeys shaped their pathways to leadership roles in the AIAW. Using the research question notes and the transcripts as a whole, I explored the AIAW leaders' lived experiences.

## CHAPTER 2 LOCATING THE AIAW IN THE HISTORICAL RECORD

Organized into main two sections, this literature review first substantiates the outgrowth of writing on women and sport during the 1970s to the mid-1980s with particular focus on contributions from AIAW leaders and texts that described and/or considered the AIAW. The second part of the review documents scholarly analysis of the AIAW over the past 25 years or so and shows that the Association has generally receded from both mainstream sport narratives and the scholarly landscape. The chapter concludes by analyzing the most recent AIAW scholarship with emphasis on the one book that focuses solely on the Association.

The AIAW leaders and others interested in the women's sport revolution that occurred during the 1970s and early 1980s were researching and providing commentary on women and sport. During the AIAW era, writing on this subject evolved from a virtually non-existent state to an abundant literature, thus mirroring the explosion of sport participation opportunities for female athletes. Many, it seemed, had something to say about women's sudden entry into the male bastion of sport. This included new-found interest in women's sport history, exploration of psychological issues related to the female athlete, and a focus on women's rights and equity in athletics, particularly due to the ramifications of Title IX. Some scholars were entering into new territory by examining sport from theoretical perspectives.

The 1970s and early 1980s featured a number of books on women and sport, many of which are collections of essays.<sup>43</sup> These ranged from descriptive history to manuals on how to ensure equity for women in sport to more critical works that viewed sport through a feminist theoretical lens. The studies of women and sport during this era



also featured descriptions and interpretations of the AIAW, and, in doing so, provided historical and social context for the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review. This literature offered insights into the mindsets and actions of AIAW leaders, many of whom were contributing scholarship about women and sport as they also played key roles in opening doors for women's participation in athletics and improving their status in the male sport domain.

Some of the analyses of women and sport during the AIAW era appeared within a broader treatment of the overall purpose of sport. These sources frequently describe the power of athletics to encourage desirable values and humanistic behaviors. For instance, in 1973, Springfield College joined the National Association of Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) and its parent organization the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (AAHPER) to sponsor a national conference entitled the Development of Human Values through Sport. Springfield College English professor Edward J. Sims, co-editor of the conference publication, states that its "chief thrust" is to analyze sport to identify "those human values worth fostering, problems and obstacles in their development, and specific recommendations for implementation."<sup>44</sup> Among the 15 recommendations Sims recounts is the fourth: "Expand opportunities for women at all levels of participation, coaching and administration."<sup>45</sup> John Loy's foreword to Gerber et al.'s *The American Woman in Sport* (1974) is another example of the ongoing discussion during the 1970s regarding human values and sport. Loy, in the role of consulting editor, comments: "My reading of their work has led me to entertain the notion that the critical test of sport's humanizing function in American society is man's estimation of the sportswoman."<sup>46</sup>

A similar but more expansive example is George Sage's "Fertile Field: Humanism in Sport," which is a presentation at the annual convention of the Central Association for Physical Education of College Women in October, 1975. Sage's goal is to "examine the relations between the concepts of humanism and sport" by engaging with "dramatic events going on in the social sciences" that are related to "new theories about humanity and methods of interpersonal relations."<sup>47</sup> Sage summarizes how humanism was developing in psychology, sociology, and business management on his way to expressing how humanistic values could transform sport. One of his first observations about humanism and sport is the necessity to reject "traditional sex-role stereotypes" and to regard sport as "a human province, not as either masculine or feminine."<sup>48</sup> Sage proceeds to contrast characteristics of an autocratic coach with a humanistic coach, pointing out that the latter "places individual expression above group conformity, self-discipline above authority, independence above dependence." He speaks of a model of sport in which the coach stresses cooperation above competition, gives attention to all players' growth and development, and "in short, . . . cares, really cares about each and every sports participant, not just her own athletes, but all athletes."<sup>49</sup>

Sage's vision also includes the mantra that winning is not an end, but a means since "using victory as the only end, the goal of sport competition, is too limiting, too confining, too shallow, too short-sighted for humanism." As Sage concludes his presentation, it is clear that he is speaking to female physical educators, coaches and administrators who might be in a position to alter the status quo in intercollegiate athletics. Sage contends: "one can hope that the basis of the women's sport movement is more than an effort to gain entrée into the American sport system and is instead a desire

to totally overhaul our sport system.”<sup>50</sup> The AIAW was founded and developed in a national sport environment that featured an underlying current that called for a more humanistic and value-driven athletics model.

Some scholars and practitioners writing on women and sport during the AIAW era scrutinized the ramifications of Title IX, exploring issues of equality for women in athletics. One analysis along this line of thinking is in a collection of essays, *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, developed from presentations at the 1973 AAHPERD National Convention. Editor Barbara J. Hoepner notes that “even though the official convention theme was ‘Unity through Diversity,’ every session I attended somehow commented on woman’s role in society and her desire to participate in athletics.”<sup>51</sup> Hoepner’s compilation of AAHPERD Convention essays reflects the emphasis on the “truly pertinent” topic of women’s athletics in the 1970s. Notable contributions include Margaret C. Dunkle’s essay, “Equal Opportunity for Women in Sports,” in which she begins by suggesting that “perhaps all women athletes should be mountain climbers because the plight of women in sports programs is clearly an uphill struggle.”<sup>52</sup> Dunkle navigates her reader through various pieces of federal legislation—particularly Title IX—and its implications for women in education and sport. Her essay ends with a signifier that times certainly were changing in regard to women’s activism in sport as she asserts that “women have found out that rocking the boat is much better exercise than rocking the cradle.”<sup>53</sup> Knowledge of Title IX’s application to athletics and its possible effects on sport inequities was expanding across the country.

Exploring equity in sport and much more, first AIAW President Carole Oglesby edited and contributed three chapters to *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*

(1978).<sup>54</sup> In the Preface, Oglesby indicates that the book is about “sport feminism,” a concept she hopes will support those interested in changing sport and will even “provide a psychological slap (thanks . . . I needed that) to individuals who have failed to see the changes demanded in sport as we have known it.”<sup>55</sup> The book delves into a variety of topics in the context of women’s sport: the female body, sexuality, factors impacting women’s involvement and achievement, Civil Rights Legislation, the ERA, and governance systems. Wilma Scott Heide’s contribution, “Feminism for a Sporting Future,” offers the radical feminist perspective in the collection of essays since she lays out specific ideas for redefining and transforming the sports world to one that empowers all persons, not just men.<sup>56</sup> The AIAW does not figure prominently in this text although it is discussed in some of the later chapters on legal issues and governance structure. However, this text serves as an important example of the way that female sport academics and leaders—organized by a former AIAW president in this case—were increasingly engaging in discussions about feminism and sport. Oglesby demonstrates the uphill battle for society’s acceptance of a feminist perspective in sport in the 1970s in her Epilogue: “As editor, I have been concerned that the work might be dismissed because it begins openly from a feminist perspective rather than being safely value-free.”<sup>57</sup>

As Oglesby and her contributors were furthering understanding of sport feminism, other AIAW leaders and their colleagues were engaged in a more pragmatic project. In perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of equity in sport during the AIAW era, colleagues in the University of Iowa’s Department of Physical Education and Dance collaborated to write *Equality in Sport for Women* (1977). Patricia Gaedelmann

establishes in the introduction that the book “was written to provide the public with the tools to ‘speak up’ against discrimination, to ‘speak up’ for equality.”<sup>58</sup> The influences of AIAW leaders loom large in this text as presidents Peg Burke and Christine Grant as well as executive director Bonnie Slatton contribute chapters. This text serves as a handbook for those who seek to know more about equity in terms of the conditions necessary to achieve it and who want detailed descriptions of the laws, compliance agencies, and organizations that can empower those who desire equality. Additionally, *Equality in Sport for Women* provides specific directions for effectuating changes that lead to equity in educational settings for women through both traditional channels and alternative routes.<sup>59</sup> These authors were activists for furthering the cause for women’s opportunities and rights in sports, and they sought to provide the blueprint for others to follow them. Burke, Grant, and Slatton continued to contribute writings that would both keep the public informed about equity issues in intercollegiate athletics and provide direction for achieving equity goals for girls and women in sport.<sup>60</sup>

In its role as the only national women’s collegiate sport association, the AIAW was a subject frequently addressed in the writings emerging out of the context of the women’s sport revolution of the 1970s and early 1980s. Just five years into its existence, the AIAW was already a dissertation subject. Virginia Hunt’s 1976 dissertation, “Governance of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics: An Historical Perspective,” seeks to “trace the conditions and circumstances which led to the formation of the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women and to study the inception of that organization;” it covers the time period of the First Women’s National Collegiate Golf Tournament in 1941 to January, 1976, when the NCAA first attempted a vote to sponsor women’s

intercollegiate athletics championships.<sup>61</sup> Hunt's dissertation is foundational to subsequent AIAW scholarship; if those writing about the AIAW do not cite Hunt, they refer to Joan Hult who relies heavily on Hunt's detailed narrative.

Another relevant point is that influential women's sport leaders Celeste Ulrich and Rachel Bryant were involved with Hunt's dissertation. Ulrich, chair of Hunt's dissertation committee, was a leader in AAHPERD, the parent organization of AIAW until the AIAW separated to become an independent entity in 1979. Bryant was one of the foremothers of the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW), which eventually transformed into the AIAW, and she was a leading voice and guide for women's first steps into organized intercollegiate sport. Hunt notes that her study "needed to be undertaken while people who had been intimately associated with the governance structures for women's intercollegiate athletics were still available to interview and their recollection of events still clear."<sup>62</sup> By engaging with Ulrich, Bryant, and other key women's sport leaders in the mid-1970s, Hunt wrote an invaluable AIAW history.

Hunt's dissertation offers valuable descriptive history, but its intention is not only to record facts for posterity. Emphatically stating early in the project that it is "absolutely essential" for others to "know the role women have taken in intercollegiate athletics," Hunt recognizes that the AIAW was putting forth a new way to govern athletics—one dedicated to student welfare—that differed markedly from the NCAA or men's model.<sup>63</sup> She does not explicitly state a feminist perspective but does include as a major research area the issue of sexism and how this and other factors will affect women's collegiate sport governance. Hunt's view of the problem of sexism is that it can only be

“overcome” by joining with the men in a new governance structure that ensures equal representation.<sup>64</sup> Her mantra for the AIAW’s future direction is that it should advocate for its transformation into a new organization, a truly educational model, overseeing all intercollegiate athletics (for women *and* men) for those institutions interested in such a direction.<sup>65</sup> While in principle a worthy idea, one must consider the unfortunate historical context: this notion of one association with men and women working together equitably in an educational model was suggested by Hunt in 1976 when the NCAA had just begun very forceful initiatives to govern women’s athletics. Future discussions and interactions would prove that the majority of NCAA representatives were unwilling to engage in meaningful discussions about equal representation and power for women within their governance structure and would not even consider joining women sports leaders to form a new athletics organization.

Hunt’s dissertation presents a very accessible history of the AIAW from its formation through its first five years. During the latter stages of the AIAW era, Bonnie Slatton, AIAW interim executive director in 1978-79, contributed a significant piece to a collection of essays on collegiate sport governance. “AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics” communicates thoroughly the AIAW’s alternate model of athletics governance.<sup>66</sup> Slatton argues that the AIAW has the potential for “creating radical change in intercollegiate sport” and proposes a key issue to consider:

The question is: to what extent is the philosophical foundation reflected in the rules and regulations of the Association? Any organization can list goals and objectives which would warm the heart of any true educator. But the test occurs only when the actual practices are analyzed in the light of goals and objectives. What does an educationally sound athletic program mean? It means that student rights are as important as institutional rights; and, it means that athletes where possible are treated like other undergraduate students. It means that an athlete’s life ought to permit her to attain her academic goals as well as her athletic goals.<sup>67</sup>

Slatton proceeds to explicate significant AIAW rules and policies in areas such as institutional rights versus student rights, student involvement in governance, recruitment, and transfer rules. Her review delineates the clear differences between the AIAW and NCAA governance model. Slatton portrays the power struggle between the AIAW and NCAA as not simply one that pits women and men against each other; rather, she describes it as a struggle that will determine if an alternative model in athletics will be allowed to exist and evolve.<sup>68</sup> Slatton concludes her analysis of the AIAW model of governance by stating that “the AIAW does offer viable alternatives in the governance of intercollegiate athletics,” and calls upon all involved in intercollegiate athletics—from university chief executive officers to students—to move beyond merely duplicating a women’s program in the NCAA to striving for “**real** solutions to the complex problems” in intercollegiate athletics.<sup>69</sup> Published not long after the Presidential Review, Slatton’s chapter establishes that the AIAW created and put in place an alternative model of sport governance that emphasized the well-being of student athletes.

Studies of the AIAW during the 1970s and early 1980s not only describe the Association’s history, purpose, and alternative model, but they also explore significant issues women faced as they entered the male domain of sport. These reflections often point to possible visions for the future of intercollegiate athletics. Such ideas include Hunt’s concluding remarks in her dissertation on the AIAW in which she suggests that like-minded men and women come together to create a completely new sport governance organization that would be an exemplar model of educational sport.<sup>70</sup> Carole Oglesby’s essay, “Future Directions and Issues,” describes the AIAW as “at once a product of the two most characteristic, frightening, exciting aspects of society: *liberation* and *change*. It



is a child and mother of liberation and change in women's collegiate athletics."<sup>71</sup> Early in her essay, she contemplates the AIAW's primary challenge in the "shifting scene" of sport and determines that the Association must resist the temptation to be passive about its future direction.<sup>72</sup> Oglesby maintains that many men's athletics programs feature excess and elitism; she questions why women's programs would want to follow a similar path. She clarifies an overall vision for women's intercollegiate athletics when she states: "What is wanted perhaps is not most accurately characterized by the word 'equality' (too easily supplanted by identicalness), but rather a triad condition of *self-determination*, *autonomy*, and *sufficiency*." Oglesby's vision proved to be prophetic at the end of the decade when the AIAW was fighting the male sport establishment for the right to self-governance.

The revolution for women in sport in the 1970s was followed by a generally dismal decade for those who championed Title IX and were affiliated with the AIAW. The overwhelming majority of the AIAW leadership who participated in the 1980 Presidential Review left Iowa City dedicated to giving their best efforts to preserve their Association and its principles. However, by the mid-1980s, the NCAA's women's athletics program was firmly in place, the AIAW had closed its doors, and a Supreme Court decision in the case *Grove City v. Bell* meant that Title IX would not apply to athletics from 1984 through 1988. Many colleges and universities had merged their men's and women's intercollegiate athletics programs with the result that many women athletics administrators lost significant voice and power at the local, conference, and national levels.

During this time of disillusionment for those who supported the AIAW and Title IX, a contingency of University of Iowa professors and athletics administrators who were involved with the Department of Physical Education and Dance's Women as Leaders Conferences joined together to edit and contribute to an issue of *Arena Review* (1984) on the topic of "The Politics of Women's Sport."<sup>73</sup> Bonnie Slatton and Susan Birrell explain that contributors' essays for the issue are "outgrowths of presentations" that were given at Iowa's summer workshops. The line-up of authors for this issue featured some of the nation's most accomplished women's sport administrators (Christine Grant, Donna Lopiano) and most prominent sport academics (Birrell, Ann Hall, Bonnie Slatton, and Nancy Theberge).<sup>74</sup> Slatton and Birrell served as editors for this volume, explaining that they had "attempted to go beyond the documentation of the systematic discrimination against females in sport, to reach for informed feminist analyses of its roots, and to provide practical strategies for change."<sup>75</sup> Even though the AIAW no longer existed, its leaders and scholars who supported the Association were some of the first to analyze sport from a critical feminist perspective.

University of Iowa doctoral student Kristin Burns played a part in organizing some of these summer workshops. It is logical, then, that her dissertation (1987) explores pertinent research questions about women in leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics. Burns' dissertation, "Reconstructing Leadership Experiences: Toward a Feminist Theory of Leadership," uses interviews with the AIAW presidents to form a theory of leadership to stand as an alternative to traditional male leadership frameworks.<sup>76</sup> By focusing on the "meaning the leaders of AIAW impute to their leadership experiences and how such meaning is communicated to others," Burns

identified five central concepts: fairness, commitment and responsibility, expansive leadership, trust, and empowerment.<sup>77</sup> These concepts led to identification of the theoretical concept of legitimization—the AIAW presidents were constantly working to legitimize their Association and its values as well as their own leadership abilities.<sup>78</sup> Burns concludes that her analysis of the AIAW presidents’ leadership experiences suggests a theory of feminist leadership: “Women in leadership positions have a distinct ideological approach that puts them in conflict with the dominant, i.e. male, ideology. Any challenging ideology has less direct access to the power of definition. Therefore, women must spend inordinate amount of time legitimizing that alternative ideology, and themselves as leaders.”<sup>79</sup> Burns’ dissertation explores the lived experiences of the AIAW presidents, considering the AIAW’s alternative model of athletics and the presidents’ leadership styles; therefore, her research that is carried out five to seven years after the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review is extremely relevant to this research project.

The most widely published AIAW scholar is Joan Hult, whose involvement with and scholarship on the Association began in the 1970s and continues to contemporary times. Hult was active in the AIAW governance structure, serving in various roles such as chair of the Ethics and Eligibility Committee. Under her guidance, most of the former AIAW Presidents chose to house their work in Special Collections in McKeldin Library at the University of Maryland, College Park, where Hult was a professor of kinesiology.<sup>80</sup> Therefore, Hult writes about the AIAW from the position of having experienced much of the Association’s history and of having immediate access to its archives.

Hult teamed up with Marianna Trezell in the early 1990s to edit *A Century of Women’s Basketball: From Frailty to Final Four* and included an essay on the AIAW’s

legacy.<sup>81</sup> In this essay, Hult chronicles the AIAW's evolution with particular emphasis on its governance structure, rules and regulations, liaisons and relationships, and budget. Hult ends by focusing on the AIAW's critical issues and struggles, a section that highlights the AIAW's battle with the NCAA. She concludes that the AIAW's legacy is "monumental," even though the Association did not survive, it succeeded in offering a worthwhile alternative model of athletics, expanding athletic opportunities for college women, and protecting Title IX's application to athletics.<sup>82</sup>

One of Hult's most recent articles of record about the AIAW, appearing in the *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance* in 1999, encompassed the goal of much of her work: to provide "an account of the trailblazing women's journey as they climbed rough terrain and built athletic trails for elite athletes, one grueling step at a time."<sup>83</sup> Hult uses the metaphor of climbing a mountain to chronicle the history of the development of women's intercollegiate competitive opportunities and portrays the growth and success of the AIAW in terms of reaching the summit. In addition to providing a detailed narrative of how the AIAW evolved, Hult outlines the contributions of key leaders in the Association, many of whom are described as "trailblazers par excellence."<sup>84</sup>

At the March 2007 "Girls and Women Rock: Celebrating 35 Years of Sport & Title IX" Academic and Legal Conference, Hult gave a presentation entitled "AIAW and Title IX: Unsung Heroes, Surprising Paths," in which she also focuses on the role of the Association's presidents. In this case, she moves from the descriptor "trailblazers" to speaking of former AIAW leaders as "infiltrators." Hult identifies as "infiltrators" former presidents Grant, Lopiano, and West who eventually rebounded from the NCAA

takeover of the AIAW to effectuate meaningful change in the NCAA and, in Lopiano's case, also the Women's Sport Foundation; however, she also describes as "infiltrators" and "unsung heroes" the small minority of AIAW women such as Judie Holland who took the opposite side of former presidents Grant, Lopiano, and West and supported the NCAA's entrance into women's sport governance. It is likely that this notion of infiltration and the roles of the AIAW leaders will be more thoroughly presented in Hult's upcoming book on the AIAW's legacy.<sup>85</sup>

Hult's scholarly work acknowledges that "gender is a fundamental historical variable which significantly affects the nature of power relations because sexism is institutionalized in all American sport organizations" and that "within and between voluntary organizations" there exists a "persistent pattern of male dominance and female subordination."<sup>86</sup> In support of these assertions, Hult presents the high numbers of women in leadership positions in sport during the AIAW era in contrast with the much lower representation of women in the NCAA and other sport governing bodies following the demise of the AIAW.<sup>87</sup>

Hult's scholarship on the AIAW fills an important role and is widely cited. She was one of the first and remains amongst the few scholars who have thoroughly studied the AIAW. The abstract of Hult's 1998 presentation at the North American Alliance for Sport History's (NASSH) annual conference refers to use of a "voluntary organization power model." Perhaps Hult's upcoming book on the AIAW will use the model cited above, introducing a new framework from which to interpret the AIAW leaders' experiences.<sup>88</sup>

In addition to Hult's scholarship, two dissertations that focus on the AIAW construct the Association's history. Hunt's dissertation (1976), written in the middle of the AIAW's existence, has already been discussed. Suzanne Willey's dissertation (1996) on the AIAW emerged 20 years later as a continuation of and certainly an important companion piece to Hunt's work. Willey covers the history of women's sport governance beginning in 1941, but her main focus is on the AIAW from 1976-1982.<sup>89</sup> She points out that Hunt's dissertation had depicted the AIAW era up to December, 1975, and that Hunt's work has been the "single most important resource utilized in her research." For Willey, it is "important that the ending of this story be documented."<sup>90</sup> In her study of the second half of the AIAW's brief existence, Willey records the Association's chronology, explores the major factors that influenced its growth, highlights the specific contributions of the fifth through tenth presidents, analyzes the effects of other athletic governance organizations on the AIAW, and contemplates the NCAA takeover, and what, if anything could have been done to save the AIAW.<sup>91</sup> Willey's in-depth interviews with the AIAW presidents provide fertile ground for analysis of the Association's internal dynamics.

The last few pages of Willey's dissertation, entitled "Confessional Tale," exhibit a high degree of authorial reflexivity. Writing in the mid-1990s, she regrets that so many college athletes today "have little or no idea that anything existed before the NCAA."<sup>92</sup> Willey's final comments acknowledge that "there are no simple answers" that emerge when one tries to understand the history of the AIAW; however, from her personal involvement with the Association and her study of it, she expresses admiration for its

leaders' principles and hopes that the best of the AIAW and NCAA will eventually be merged for the benefit of all student athletes.<sup>93</sup>

The AIAW is also treated in Allen Guttman's landmark 1991 book, *Women's Sports: A History*, the first thorough survey of women's sport history. In his chapter appropriately titled "Revolutionary Change," Guttman briefly describes the context of the AIAW's formation, rapid growth, and quick demise.<sup>94</sup> In his analysis of the AIAW's succinct existence, he points out the Association's shortcomings: it "was wracked internally by the same controversies that have marked the history of men's sports," and, women "accused each other of recruiting violations and other forms of skullduggery."<sup>95</sup> However, Guttman also refers to the AIAW's positive impact on women's sports: "Whatever one wants to say for or against the AIAW, no one can deny that women's athletic programs began, for the first time in American history, to rival men's programs in the number of contests staged and the amount of publicity received."<sup>96</sup>

It is understandable that Guttman had limited space to thoroughly treat the AIAW when his objective was to cover women's sport history from the ancient world to contemporary times. The result, though, is a surface analysis of the struggles related to gender that are integral to the AIAW and the women's sport revolution of the 1970s. In her 1993 review of his book, Catriona Parratt observes that "given the impact that feminist and gender studies have had in recent years, it is difficult to conceive that the author of any such future study will give as short shrift as Guttman does to the power dynamics of gender, sexuality, and women's sport."<sup>97</sup>

Three books published in the mid-1990s—Jennifer Hargreaves' *Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sports* (1994); Susan

Cahn's *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women's Sport* (1994); and Mary Jo Festle's *Playing Nice and Losing: Politics and Apologies in Women's Sports* (1996)—explore the AIAW in varying degrees and are similar in that they move beyond descriptive women's sport history and transcend the treatment of gender as another variable or category to be explored. These works thoughtfully treat gender as a social construction and focus on gender and sport in terms of power dynamics.

Hargreaves' main context is sport in the United Kingdom, but she includes examples from North America and Western Europe in her treatment of nineteenth and twentieth century women and sport. After noting that sport in popular culture and scholarly work is “predominantly about men,” Hargreaves states directly that her book is a “political intervention into the world of sports scholarship.”<sup>98</sup> She briefly addresses Title IX and the AIAW in her chapter on “gender relations of power” and “institutionalized discrimination.”<sup>99</sup> Referencing Hult's work, Hargreaves discusses Title IX's positive effects by highlighting dramatic increases in female interscholastic and intercollegiate sport participation; however, she also describes the “devastating drop” in the number of women coaches and athletic administrators from the early 1970s to the present.<sup>100</sup> Her remarks about the AIAW illustrate “the contradictory effects of legislation specifically intended to improve the position of women.” Title IX provided the impetus for developing new athletic opportunities for women, but it also was used by the NCAA and athletics administrators across the country to argue that equality meant that women needed to be in the *same* governance system as the men with the *same* rules and benefits. This perception of Title IX was one of a handful of factors that the NCAA



used to legitimize its calculated moves into women's sport governance. Hargreaves refers to "Title IX's mandate for parity between men and women" providing "the incentive for a merger with the men's association" and the subsequent end of the AIAW.<sup>101</sup>

In the "Preface" to *Coming on Strong* (1994), Susan Cahn shares her experiences of being a teenager who loved sport and took advantage of the "transformation" in women's athletics during the 1970s. She writes of being inspired by athletes of her time; however, she admits having only "some vague images of women athletes of the past" and that, as far as she knew, "no tradition of women's competitive sport paved the way for my generation."<sup>102</sup> To rectify this situation, Cahn conducted interviews with female athletes of previous eras to determine how, for generations, women "have promoted physical competence, celebrated the joy of play, developed a deep appreciation for athletic competition and excellence, and forged loving, supportive bonds among women in a nontraditional setting."<sup>103</sup> In doing so, Cahn carried out a significant study of how "gender and sexuality have been culturally constructed within and through twentieth-century U.S. women's sport."<sup>104</sup> She resurrected mostly forgotten or ignored women athletes' stories and analyzed them from a critical perspective.

Cahn's brief analysis of the AIAW is enlightening because it places the organization in the larger political and social context of the 1960s and 1970s.<sup>105</sup> Not surprisingly, a vital component of that context is Title IX. She describes how the "rhetorical battle of the sexes" between the NCAA and AIAW escalated dramatically when the former realized that Title IX would be applied to athletics, and it was becoming a reality on the college athletic scene. Despite Title IX's power to usher women into a

plethora of participation opportunities, Cahn remarks that “with ‘real’ sport and ‘real’ athletes defined as masculine” women have been left with “only a marginal space in the sports world and an even more tenuous position in athletic governance.”<sup>106</sup> Nowhere is this “tenuous position” better exemplified than in the history of the AIAW.

Cahn’s approach to writing women’s sport history signifies this endeavor’s importance beyond recording women’s sport stories. She proposes that “women’s athletic history offers a lens through which to understand both the complicated gender dynamics of sport and the social experience of women athletes. A century of women’s efforts to obtain a meaningful place in the sporting world provides critical insights into the history of gender relations in American history.”<sup>107</sup> The significance of Cahn’s *Coming on Strong* is eloquently captured by Parratt when she includes this work on a short list of a “growing body of literature in which feminist historians have employed postmodern concepts (such as representation, discourse, and language) without detaching them from the social, material world, and they have theorized about and analyzed gender without abandoning ‘real’ women and their experiences.”<sup>108</sup>

Of the three books published in the mid-1990s that examine the AIAW, Mary Jo Festle’s *Playing Nice: Politics and Apologies in Women’s Sports* provides the most in-depth narrative of the power struggles that consumed the AIAW. Festle’s overall goal is to bring to light the “complex and important history of women’s sports because these stories have often been hidden from view, and because this history still affects us today.”<sup>109</sup> Similar to Cahn, Festle’s understanding of feminist theory moves beyond focusing on only gender, instead arguing that “gender combines with race and sexuality to help determine not only who participates and how but also which sports become

socially acceptable for women.”<sup>110</sup> Her understanding of gender, and subsequently the AIAW leaders’ experiences, is also informed by historian Joan Scott’s analysis of how women are often forced into choosing between equality and difference. Additionally, Festle states the significance of how “feminists (and some Marxist theorists) also convinced me of the extraordinary (hegemonic) power of certain ideas and cultural experiences, such as femininity.”<sup>111</sup>

Festle’s book is the contemporary source that most fully and intricately interrogates the power issues that dominate and complicate the AIAW’s short existence. Most germane to my research project is her chapter, “Backsliding: AIAW, Title IX, and College Sports, 1980-1988,” which imparts an important women’s sport narrative beyond the often celebratory depiction of the women’s sport revolution. In this chapter, Festle carefully considers all of the causes and repercussions of the NCAA takeover of the AIAW to conclude that “regardless of their motives, however, even if they were ‘sincere,’ there is one damning fact: men in athletics were using their superior power to overrule the wishes of women.”<sup>112</sup>

To this date, only one monograph has been published which features the AIAW as its primary subject matter. Ying Wushanley’s 2004 book, *Playing Nice and Losing, The Struggle for Control of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000*, developed from a question posed by his doctoral advisor, sport historian Ronald A. Smith: “Why did women lose their control of women’s intercollegiate athletics after Title IX became the law of the land?”<sup>113</sup> Wushanley reminds readers that his goal is to study what “contributed to the demise of the AIAW,” and that he does not intend to write a laudatory narrative that praises any successes the organization may have achieved. By the end of

the short introduction, Wushanley states his work's main argument: "the demise of the AIAW was due to its own sex-separatist philosophy, internal conflict, and legal and financial problems." Furthermore, he purports that his study will reveal that the end of the AIAW was caused by much more than an "NCAA takeover."<sup>114</sup>

Wushanley portrays the motives of the AIAW and NCAA in similar ways when he contends that both Associations were focused on preserving and expanding their governance power. He alleges that "it is doubtful that the NCAA cared more about equal opportunity for women than about its power in U.S. amateur sports. It is, however, equally doubtful that the AIAW leaders cared more about the welfare of those they controlled than about their own power and control of women's intercollegiate athletics."<sup>115</sup> Wushanley's analysis of the AIAW clearly reaches conclusions about the Association's governance model that are contradictory to Festle's. This is evident from just Wushanley's choice of the title, *Playing Nice and Losing*, which seems to be a direct response to Festle's 1996 book, *Playing Nice, Politics and Apologies in Women's Sports*. A key idea that suffuses Wushanley's description of the AIAW is "hypocrisy," a word he often uses to characterize the AIAW leaders' actions.<sup>116</sup> He proposes that the AIAW leaders supported an educational model of athletics, but in reality, adopted the traditional male model of sport. Wushanley asserts:

One may wonder: Why did the AIAW leaders continue to claim the AIAW as an educational model while in reality that model no longer existed? Careful observers should find an analogy in the relationship between amateurism and big-time college athletics. Neither the educational model nor amateurism was a careless misnomer for their respective subjects. They were products of hypocrisy. Hypocrisy can serve a useful purpose when it comes down to power and control. When equal opportunity for men and women was the mandate of the law and the men's 'invasion' of women's 'separate sphere' became inevitable, the only remaining means to justify and defend the existence of the sex-separate organization seemed to be to maintain a noble appearance of its philosophy.<sup>117</sup>

Wushanley's charge of hypocrisy warrants consideration in the study of how the AIAW presidents interpreted their lived experiences during some very challenging and controversial times.

The women's sport revolution and the AIAW grew through the 1970s as did the amount of scholarly treatment on women and sport. All of this developed in an environment in which a group of scholars and professionals were calling for a more humanistic and value-driven collegiate sport model. Many of the AIAW leaders were central figures in these efforts to shape a new vision of sport, and the AIAW was often discussed in the scholarship on women and sport during this era. As would be expected, the AIAW's position in this narrative changed in the early 1980s when it abruptly went from the largest sport Association in the nation to shutting down operations. With the exception of a handful of articles, some chapters, and one book, the AIAW is treated sparingly in sport studies scholarship. Furthermore, the AIAW is treated minimally in books on the Women's Movement and Second-Wave Feminism. Sara Evans' *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (2004) makes one brief reference to the AIAW, pointing out that the NCAA "destroyed" the AIAW when the men's organization realized it could not "reverse Title IX."<sup>118</sup> Evans offers some statistics to demonstrate the increase in women's intercollegiate athletics participation from the 1970s to 2000; however, these numbers are inaccurately reported since interscholastic participation numbers are actually used.<sup>119</sup>

The supposition that the story of the AIAW is but a footnote in the historical record in contrast to the extensive treatment of Title IX is supported by this literature review. What has been written about the AIAW reflects the Association's turbulent

history; contemporary scholars have portrayed the AIAW leaders on a wide continuum ranging from characterizing them as heroic figures to hypocrites. This research project engages this limited and contradictory body of scholarship with the goal of making a meaningful contribution to the ongoing AIAW narrative.

### CHAPTER 3

#### THE AIAW PRESIDENTS: PERSONAL JOURNEYS TO LEADERSHIP IN ATHLETICS

The invitation to the 1980 AIAW Presidential Review stated that through formal and informal presentations and interactions, the presidents would share the “significant happenings, accomplishments, frustrations, light moments, and phenomenal growth” of the AIAW.<sup>120</sup> Although the AIAW was clearly the Review’s focus, the majority of the presidents also provided accounts of their formative experiences in athletics in varying degrees of detail. Peg Burke remarked that she “did not anticipate at all” hearing about the personal evolution of the Association’s leaders and how they “came into leadership roles,” but found it to be fascinating.<sup>121</sup> Carole Oglesby established that the presidents’ sport narratives would be a significant part of the week’s discussions by beginning the Review with a “personal biography” meant to show the “astonishing rate of change” in women’s athletics.<sup>122</sup> Six of the presidents followed Oglesby’s lead, some even pointing out that they altered prepared remarks upon arriving in Iowa City in order to highlight their personal journeys in sport.

The presidents’ stories about their pathways to sport leadership featured a number of themes that collectively had an impact on their choice to pursue high-level leadership in women’s athletics. Some of the presidents described their intense disappointment of being denied sport participation opportunities while others recounted both accomplishments and challenges from their early playing and coaching days. A small group of the presidents conveyed their life-changing experiences of competing in sports at elite levels. Wherever they fell on this continuum of opportunities to be involved in athletics, the presidents consistently expressed a strong desire to open doors that were

closed to them and to duplicate the thrill of high-level competition for the benefit of other girls and women.

A few of the AIAW leaders also described personal growth that occurred through their evolving understanding of sexism and patriarchy. This discussion sheds light on the extent to which the presidents brought a feminist perspective to their leadership roles. Presidents Holland, West, and Grant offered fewer autobiographical details than their peers, but their remarks on the value that involvement in athletics added to women's lives clarify an impetus for their persistence as AIAW leaders. As the presidents shared significant aspects of their journeys to leadership and service in the AIAW, they established the benefits of sport participation and revealed their aspirations to grow quality athletics opportunities for girls and women.

#### **Access Denied: No Girls Allowed!**

Five of the presidents recalled disappointing and even heartbreaking occurrences of being denied the opportunity to play sport. Despite being talented and passionate about participating, they often found themselves left out just because they were girls. Carole Oglesby referred to an article about her elementary school class in an Oklahoma City newspaper that featured a picture with the caption: "Carole Oglesby, class star baseball player."<sup>123</sup> She was proud of the designation, but it did little to remedy her suffering from being denied the opportunity to play Little League Baseball or Junior League Football. Oglesby faced this "curious world" in which even though "she was one of the best kids on the block, there was no place to play."<sup>124</sup>

Two other presidents disclosed vivid details about being denied the opportunity to play football. For some, getting an opportunity on the field required going to the extreme



of pretending to be a boy. Carole Mushier explained how her football playing days came to an abrupt end: “my helmet fell off and my fellow participants found out that I was a girl. I had the full uniform, by the way: pants, shoulder pads, jersey, and helmet. And, I wore my hair in two braids that I carefully put up over the top, pinned them so that under the best of circumstances you would not have seen any of my feminine hair sticking out from the football helmet.”<sup>125</sup> Describing her formative years before entering a career in physical education and athletics administration, Lee Morrison identified herself as a child who “loved activity” and remarked that she was “good at football” until “her parents forbade her to play.”<sup>126</sup> Morrison also pointed out her recent realization that her limited competitive opportunities early in life meant she still did not know her full physical potential: “The real anger, as far as competition is concerned, didn’t really hit me until last fall, amazingly enough. I started running last summer, and I realized . . . when I finally hit my mile, that it was the first time I had ever run a continuous mile . . . and I suddenly realized that I was a pretty skilled person, and that I had never had a chance to really find out how good I was.”<sup>127</sup>

Other presidents who loved movement activities in childhood described how their high school years meant an end to any access to participation in sports. Laurie Mabry noted that as a girl growing up in Illinois, she was “involved in sports and loved sports” but “was disallowed to compete as a high school student.”<sup>128</sup> Thus, she explained that the “profession of physical education never entered my mind.”<sup>129</sup> Peg Burke’s opportunities for sport participation ended during her high school years. She pointed out that there was no required physical education for girls and certainly no opportunity for competitive

athletics: “I never stepped foot on the gymnasium floor in the four years that I was there.”<sup>130</sup>

Donna Lopiano disclosed the most detailed personal account of having the door to a coveted participation opportunity slammed in her face. She explained that one of two “turning points” in her life before she entered college was being denied access to Little League baseball.<sup>131</sup> Lopiano described how she always identified with boys and was accepted by them because she was a good athlete—she could play like a boy. Physically advanced to her male peers and an outstanding pitcher, Lopiano tried out for the local Little League team and easily made the team. She was excited the day when uniforms were to be handed out and thrilled about receiving her hat. Lopiano’s dream of beginning her baseball career was crushed when the president of the league approached her with rule book in hand to inform her that she could not play: “He showed me on page 32—and I can remember that to this day because, boy, was I going to check that out to make sure that wasn’t a doctored copy—on page 32 in the middle of the page on the right-hand side, number 3, four words: ‘No girls are allowed.’” Lopiano cried for four days straight, and her distraught parents sought another team and other sports for her to play. It was not until three years later that a lawsuit would force Little League Baseball to allow girls to participate. For Lopiano, this was the “disaster” that motivated her to set the goal of becoming a physical education teacher.<sup>132</sup>

During their childhoods, several of the AIAW leaders were denied the opportunities to participate in athletics simply because of their gender. These experiences had a deep impact as demonstrated by the vivid detail in which Lopiano remembered her devastating Little League experience over 30 years later. Despite these

disheartening experiences, the presidents persevered and would eventually put themselves in the position to open doors to sport opportunities that were previously closed to girls and women.

### **Growing Opportunities and Growing Pains**

The AIAW presidents experienced and influenced the changing narrative for girls and women from denial of sport participation to access to the fields and courts previously dominated by boys and men. At the Review, they shared stories of being thrilled to play, coach, and administer athletics even if they often had to do so under deficient and second-rate conditions as compared to their male peers. Revealing details about their pathways to leadership in athletics in 1980, the presidents conveyed excitement about growing sport participation opportunities despite some of the growing pains that accompanied them.

Carole Oglesby's childhood move from Arkansas to California afforded her the chance to play competitive softball. This new participation opportunity had very humble beginnings that become apparent when Oglesby described her first athletic experience on a "rag-tag" softball team.<sup>133</sup> This team talked the local mailman into being its coach and played on a field that had a very short centerfield bounded by the local swimming pool: the common post-game activity was diving in that pool to retrieve softballs. The very creative mailman/coach prepared game balls for the next contest by shoe polishing and baking the water-logged softballs. Oglesby mused that "many a pitcher lost their careers by trying to throw these two ton balls that had been treated by the swimming pool, shoe polish, and baking system."<sup>134</sup>

After playing on this “rag-tag” team and then progressing to an elite national softball team, Oglesby vowed to work to provide other girls and women with worthwhile sport experiences. She made this pledge a reality when she attended Purdue University in 1964 for graduate work and immediately got involved with running the entire women’s athletics program.<sup>135</sup> Oglesby admitted that trying to help young women to be the best they could be was difficult in the world of athletics in the mid-1960s. She was a full-time student and instructor as well as serving with one of her peers to lead the Women’s Recreation Association (WRA). In this role, Oglesby began challenging young female athletes to reach their potentials and took the first steps that would see her involved in coaching and administering athletics. She succinctly outlined the difficulties faced in these early years: “we had no money, no support, no time, no expertise.”<sup>136</sup> Oglesby took advantage of one initiative that was trying to remedy this uphill battle for women trying to coach and administer athletics. She went as a volleyball participant to the fourth National Institute on Girls and Women’s Sport, what she described as:

another experience that I would pair with that softball experience of seeing what incredible expertise was there--the way things could be if you really knew what you were doing, if you really put the time into preparation and materials. It was a very impressive experience, and I knew that something was going on within this group, which I didn’t have any knowledge of, the Division of Girls and Women in Sport. I knew something was going on that I wanted to have something to do with.”<sup>137</sup>

Oglesby’s enthusiasm for the change that was occurring on the women’s intercollegiate sport scene increased as national championship tournaments started to be organized.

When Oglesby learned that the first women’s national gymnastics championship would take place in 1968, she knew that she wanted to take her athletes to participate.<sup>138</sup> Her team at Purdue was not very good, but some of her athletes were able to participate

since there were two levels of competition. Oglesby referred to a memo that she wrote to these players about their trip to the gymnastics championship. The audience in Iowa City responded with laughter at the memo that called for the young women to wear comfortable clothes due to the 20 hour stretches of continuous driving in the car and stipulated that the student athletes could borrow the money—to be paid back by the end of the school year—from the physical education department for the one night of necessary lodging on route to the competition. Oglesby stated that even though the team was “terrible,” they had a “wonderful trip” and the girls “loved it.” This was the “real world” of women’s athletics, and she clearly remembered wanting to be involved with changing it for the better even if that meant surviving some early growing pains. Oglesby’s high-level of engagement with leadership roles in women’s sports was motivated by the desire to show girls and women the “fun of really being good,” to enjoy the “mind expanding” experience of being able to pull the game out no matter what through reaching their skill potential.<sup>139</sup>

Like Oglesby, Carol Gordon established herself as “someone who throughout her career in physical education and sport has been most concerned about the expansion of quality programs for women in sport.”<sup>140</sup> Gordon’s stories about her early career experiences such as coaching basketball at the University of Utah demonstrated that she was involved in the developing stages of intercollegiate athletics. Gordon described playing in the women’s gym with a ceiling that was “absolutely level” with the backboard.<sup>141</sup> Her student athletes were quite successful because they mastered “the flattest shots that anyone had ever seen” that no other teams could duplicate. Gordon also told about “all night rides” to places like the University of Colorado for Sports Days at

which her student athletes participated in three and four games in a day because “after all, we had to make the trip worthwhile.” According to Gordon, these experiences were a “far cry” from the 1980 version of women’s intercollegiate athletics; however, she was not complaining about the conditions of these earlier years: they “all survived” and had a “wonderful time.”<sup>142</sup> Gordon’s leadership in the AIAW during the Association’s formative years placed her in position to recreate the competition of Sports Days for young female college athletes in a more developed and widespread form.

Lee Morrison was also involved in the early stages of the development of women’s intercollegiate athletics and put herself in a position to effectuate positive change after bargaining to have the chance for an athletics experience in college. As she approached high school graduation, she worked out a deal with her mother: she would attend Ward-Belmont Junior College in Tennessee and expose herself to “the teas and formal sorts of things” if she could have a major in horse riding.<sup>143</sup> Belmont had a “fantastic physical education and sport program and a highly competitive in-house program” that Morrison loved. She designated Belmont as the school she thinks about “with the greatest amount of affection.” The athletics scene for women outside of Belmont proved to be more challenging as Morrison described her first teaching and coaching job in South Carolina. It was there that she first got involved with the Division of Girls and Women in Sport (DGWS) in the 1940s.<sup>144</sup> Morrison explained that she learned something that was “pretty important” from this experience: “you have to get involved if you really believe in something.” Her actions clearly reflected this principle as she outlined her extensive involvement in starting the Virginia Association for

Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (VAIAW) and her role in the early discussions and actions that led to the formation of the AIAW.<sup>145</sup>

While Morrison engaged in formal afternoon teas in order to have access to the athletics program that she craved, Peg Burke started her sports journey on a school playground in Kentucky. Although of modest beginnings, Burke’s story of her adventures at recess affirms the transformative nature of play when no adults are involved—of what can happen in the absence of institutional sport when kids are left to their own devices to play games of their own invention.<sup>146</sup> Burke acknowledged that she has heard some of her AIAW colleagues talk about their participation on elite national teams. She also told her story of being a “star,” but took the audience to a completely different type of sport environment with a description of her grade school playground experiences in Kentucky. Burke described playing softball on a gullied field that featured tree stumps and the girls’ outhouse down the first base line. She and her peers had “interesting equipment,” having fashioned their own ball using rocks and strings from feed sacks and made bats by cutting down saplings. They had to be creative about their ground rules since the makeshift ball often came unraveled and got stuck in the trees. Another issue to overcome was dealing with the ball being hit into the outhouse. The audience roared with laughter as Burke explained that if the ball was hit into the girls’ outhouse when it was occupied, it was automatically a ground rule double.

One begins to wonder how this sport experience at a country school set Burke on the path to a career in athletics. This was clarified when she explained how those ballgames on the playground were the “greatest learning experiences of her life.” She learned to cooperate with others and realized the value of encouraging other children to

achieve success on the playing field. Burke concluded that these “early opportunities to achieve success in a movement experience are what hooked me on movement for the rest of my life.”<sup>147</sup>

Not until college did Burke find herself in an educational environment that afforded her the movement experiences that she craved. She quickly changed her business major to physical education, a “decision I am very grateful for to this day.” Burke passionately conveyed her feelings about the importance of sport participation: “I believe in the movement experience. I believe it is the one area where people have an opportunity to put the whole thing together: the mental person, the physical person, the emotional person. And, I think it is just a beautiful thing. I am very proud to be a physical educator.”<sup>148</sup>

While Burke’s passion for movement grew during her college years, she also noted some of the growing pains that were part of this era. She identified some of the negatives as “hang-ups” about appearances and sexuality. Burke criticized some of the adverse effects of undergraduate physical education training in the 1950s:

I think we were carefully geared through those early experiences in undergraduate physical education to be terribly, terribly, terribly defensive. I think that kept us in our corners for years. I think we asked for little and demanded nothing . . . that is why today some of you young people still face inequities because those of us at that time did not become outspoken soon enough. The opportunities were limited and the attitudes were more oppressive . . . there was more emphasis on appearance; there was more concern about bust sizes than batting averages. The greatest compliment you could have was not whether or not someone was a superior athlete but whether or not they had won one of the beauty contests. That was the thing that physical educators strove to have happen at that point and time. I think it was the dark ages of sport.<sup>149</sup>



Burke was clearly relieved to have moved beyond the oppressiveness of her college days—the 1950s—and to be in a position to create a better situation for girls and women in sport.

Carole Mushier’s personal sport narrative also featured being confronted with conservative views about women in sport during her college and early professional years. However, Mushier’s childhood sport story was a sharp contrast to the one Burke shared about navigating games around the outhouse and gullies on the grounds of a one-room Kentucky school house. Though these were dissimilar experiences, they resulted in fostering similar aspirations to provide movement experiences for other girls and women. As already noted, Mushier had a childhood experience of being denied access to football.<sup>150</sup> But, she enjoyed an excellent five-day a week physical education program in elementary school as well as highly competitive interscholastic participation opportunities. Mushier’s high school athletics experience in Long Island, New York, in the early 1950s featured very competitive sports days in field hockey where an event winner and all-star team were chosen. Mushier realized how unique her opportunity was for high school girls in this era, particularly after hearing stories of so many other schools having no athletics programs for girls. Her story is testimony to the fact that there were “pockets in this country” that had meaningful competitive opportunities for high school girls.<sup>151</sup> Mushier experienced organized, elite play at a young age and was preparing herself take on a leadership role in athletics.

In college in Boston, Mushier found herself in an entirely different world, noting that “in 1954 there was no intercollegiate competition.”<sup>152</sup> Because she had been “unofficially” and probably “illegally” involved in Association field hockey and lacrosse

in high school, Mushier used sport participation in these national associations for competitive outlets to make up for the fact that she was denied such opportunities at the college level. She described the major impact of her involvement in the United States Field Hockey Association (USFHA) and the United States Women's Lacrosse Association (USWLA):

If it had not been for these two sports, I am sure that my life would have been very different. During college and my early professional years, I traveled more places, met more people in the fall and the spring than I ever would without them. The competition was intense, highly-skilled, challenging, and the opportunity to represent your country internationally was possible. That was, perhaps, one of the culminating events of my playing career . . . being a member of the United States team representing this country in Great Britain and Ireland.<sup>153</sup>

In addition to high-level playing experiences, Mushier explained that sport leadership opportunities early in her career set her on the path to achievements in administration. The USFHA and USWLA were “women’s sport organizations run and administered by women that gave the only primary opportunities in town to achieve governance positions. I was fortunate to have been allowed the full opportunity to participate in this governance.”<sup>154</sup> Mushier ran what was a forerunner to an AIAW national championship tournament when she directed the 1962 USWLA national tournament.

Mushier asserted that her teaching and coaching duties as a young professional also prepared her to change the world of women’s athletics.<sup>155</sup> Her interactions with an older generation of female physical educators fueled her desire to have an influence on how girls’ and women’s sports evolved. Mushier returned to Long Island as a teacher and coach and became involved with the Long Island Girls Association (LIGA), which governed high school girls competition for all the schools on Long Island’s South Shore. Through this experience, she met a “soul mate,” Ethel Kloberg, a “forerunner in women’s

athletics” who had been influential on the women’s field hockey scene. Mushier explained that she and Kloberg oversaw high school athletics programs that met the needs of the girls in each class, but they also paid attention to the “cream of the crop” by developing a full varsity program and forming “honor teams” comprised of their best athletes. They were told they could not practice these teams, a reality that Mushier feels “violated all concepts of competition.”<sup>156</sup> Coaches Kloberg and Mushier’s “well-practiced” and “well-seasoned” teams were usually successful, and at a subsequent LIGA meeting, Mushier remarked that upset colleagues called them heretics: “a finger was shook right in our faces,” and she and her colleague were admonished for practicing their teams before the competitive events. In regard to this frustrating situation, Mushier commented that she “was appalled then” and “would be appalled today.”<sup>157</sup>

Mushier had other experiences in athletics that impressed upon her that it was time for more receptive attitudes towards girls and women. When she was an undergraduate, her college “condoned and almost encouraged” her involvement in national association level field hockey and lacrosse, but “it was best not to mention” her participation in the Boston Park League in basketball where she competed against the telephone company women workers who played wearing their blue jeans.<sup>158</sup> Clearly, in some instance, sports of certain status were more acceptable to some of the “old guard” physical educators than others, thus forcing female undergraduates to sneak around to play a sport such as basketball or to just not play at all.

In a high school setting, Mushier had the chance to learn about track and field from a male coach, which was important since she was not taught anything about this sport during her college years. The female and male athletes alike called her “coach,”

which Mushier described as a “very real compliment since I thought they were recognizing that what the young women and I were trying to do was something that they could respect and understand.”<sup>159</sup> Not all on the scene saw this as a positive development. An older female physical education teacher cautioned Mushier about this practice, saying that it was disrespectful for male athletes to call a woman “coach.” Mushier was confronted with a similar situation when she worked at East Stroudsburg State College and in 1966 was appointed to coordinate women’s athletics and used the title “Director of Women’s Athletics.” She was cautioned by “concerned others” about the inappropriateness of assuming such a title in her professional life.<sup>160</sup>

On her journey to AIAW leadership, Mushier enjoyed elite school physical education and sport participation in the 1950s in contrast to many of her female peers. She experienced high-level competitive play in field hockey and lacrosse and held governance positions in USFHA and USWL that prepared her to show the way to other girls and women who followed in her footsteps. On more than one occasion, Mushier was confronted with disapproval from the elder generation of female physical educators as she tried to expand both her own and others’ athletics participation. Despite some admonitions, Mushier persisted to break new ground for women in competitive intercollegiate athletics.

Donna Lopiano outlined some of the influences that led her to the top tier of leadership in women’s intercollegiate athletics when she described her experience in graduate school at the University of Southern California.<sup>161</sup> Professor Eleanor Metheny was a “tremendous role model” and had a profound effect on Lopiano by helping her to comprehend why people participated in sport and showing her that “the sole purpose of

sport was to design a vehicle by which people could experience perfection.” Lopiano commented on the “really neat high” that comes from achieving this perfection and on how she began to realize that she had a responsibility “to demand perfection from her players” and lead them to “do things they never dreamed they were capable of doing.”<sup>162</sup>

In her first job teaching and coaching at Brooklyn College from 1971-1975, Lopiano experienced firsthand the growing pains in girls’ athletics. The student athletes she taught and coached were far from reaching the levels of perfection in sport that she had learned were possible from Professor Metheny: this “was the first time” she had “encountered non-highly skilled athletes.”<sup>163</sup> Lopiano’s softball team won only one game; the team was comprised of city kids who had never owned a glove nor ever had the opportunity to develop their skills. This was her initial experience teaching or coaching minority females who were from the inner-city. She could not believe how “the system” was “beating down” young people, especially women, who had no one to care about them. Lopiano reflected on her work with the student athletes at Brooklyn College, stating that “to this day, whatever I have done in sport, whatever I have done professionally can not begin to match what I consider to be and what will forever be the crowning achievement of my life.” Lopiano elaborated on this meaningful accomplishment:

I spent four years with nine kids. They didn’t know what volleyball was . . . we spent four years practicing at seven o’clock in the morning teaching city kids who didn’t know anything about it how to play volleyball. And, the one thing I gave them was not a regional championship in volleyball; it wasn’t going to a national championship . . . what I did was give them confidence. And the reason why I think it was the achievement of my life was that all but two of them are now living outside of New York. The first thing I said was get the hell out of the city. One became a member of the United States volleyball team. Two are college coaches right now. Two are completing their PhDs. One is a very successful restaurant/bar manager . . . And, the other four all have completed their master’s

degrees. Those were my kids, and I think of them as much as I think of the athletes that I have responsibility for at the University of Texas. To this day, I really do believe that sport is the most powerful—and I just echo the comments of other presidents—the most powerful educational tool that anyone can wield.<sup>164</sup>

Lopiano explained that she was in her last year at Brooklyn College in the mid-1970s when she approached Carole Oglesby after hearing her give a speech on a feminist and humanist approach to sport and asked for the opportunity to be involved in the AIAW. She offered “to do anything” to get involved and then went on to serve on numerous AIAW committees.<sup>165</sup> Lopiano commenced her many AIAW leadership positions with a firm belief in the power of educational sport and its ability to transform young women’s lives.

The AIAW presidents’ pathways to leadership were influenced by involvement in growing sport opportunities for girls and women as well as finding ways to overcome growing pains. In a variety of settings—from a Kentucky backwoods playground to national-level play and governance—they overcame obstacles and cultivated their dedication to provide meaningful movement experiences for others.

### **‘The Fun of Really Being Good’**

Some of the presidents rose from the humble beginnings of their early sport activities to enjoy the transformative experiences of participating in athletics at the highest levels available for women. Carole Oglesby and Donna Lopiano presented detailed accounts of the many rewards garnered from playing competitive softball on the best teams in the country. Carole Mushier explained the significance of her participation in national association field hockey and lacrosse. Charlotte West offered brief mention of being a member of an elite-level volleyball team that beat top men’s teams. These women knew the tremendous satisfaction of reaching the upper echelons of competitive

success and desired to lead other girls and women to maximize their potential in similar worthwhile experiences.

Oglesby recounted being on a top-notch team that competed for an American Softball Association (ASA) national championship. She showed a picture of this team and points out that Margot Polivy, who would later become AIAW's legal counsel, was her softball teammate in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Oglesby explained that Polivy was a "spirit guide" for her: "someone who takes you someplace that you can't even conceive of in your own thinking. Margot was convinced that we could win what was enthusiastically called a world championship. It was the ASA [American Softball Association] National Championship."<sup>166</sup> After years of practice, Oglesby noted that her 1961 GoldSox team did win the ASA Championship. Through this experience on an elite softball team, Oglesby experienced a "different kind of fun":

There was the fun of batting your brains out at practice and the camaraderie of the team. But, the second kind of fun was the fun of really being good, being the best, being the team that people came out to see, and knowing that no matter how many runs you fell behind, if the team really turned on, the skill was there to pull the game out. It was a wonderful sense, and one totally beyond what I had known before. I vowed that having experienced that with this team that I wanted to take other people there, that I wanted to be responsible in some way for having other people have that—particularly other girls and women—have that kind of mind expanding experience.<sup>167</sup>

As Oglesby was celebrating a national championship with her teammates, Donna Lopiano was emerging onto the softball scene.

Just a handful of years after her devastating Little League incident, Lopiano experienced her second "turning point" in athletics: playing elite-level softball.<sup>168</sup> At age 15, she traveled with some older friends to Stratford, Connecticut, to see the final game of the 1962 Women's World Softball Championships. Lopiano "was in awe" at the

perfect playing conditions and most of all at seeing for the first time “beautiful, skilled women athletes.” At that moment, Lopiano turned to her friends and announced that she would be playing shortstop for the World Champion Raybestos Brakettes the next summer.<sup>169</sup>

Lopiano’s path to becoming a Brakette was challenging for several reasons. She had never played shortstop, having only been a standout pitcher, so she had to learn a new position. She also had to convince her parents that getting to practices and games that were a distance of 60 miles roundtrip and spending all of her time with these “older, Amazon women” would be a worthwhile endeavor.<sup>170</sup> Lopiano admitted that she had a bit of luck on her side since her “dad’s best friend, a Major League baseball scout, was the best friend of the Raybestos head coach.” During dinner at her house with multiple bottles of wine, her supportive father and her mother—“a really tough lady”—convinced this family friend to drive their teenage daughter “sight unseen” to a try-out for the Raybestos Brakettes. Lopiano sat in total silence all the way to Stratford with an awareness that this pro scout had to be wondering what he was doing “taking this girl he had never seen play who was younger than anybody who had ever tried out for the dumb team to a try-out for a world championship softball team.” He introduced her to the Raybestos coach, “making all kinds of apologies” and admitting that he had no idea “what the kid has” and acknowledging she was “a little scrawny” and “might not even be able to reach first.” Her dad’s best friend then hid out in his car behind the outfield fence with arms firmly folded against his chest. He did not stay in the shadows of the outfield fence for long, moving steps closer to the dugout with each of Lopiano’s dazzling plays.



After excelling at the try-out, Lopiano was on her way to being a standout player for the Brakettes and to national prominence on the women's athletic scene.<sup>171</sup>

Making the Raybestos team was the beginning of a stellar career in athletics for Lopiano. Assigned the task of introducing Lopiano at the Presidential Review, Peg Burke explained that she was named the Most Valuable Player of the ASA softball championships three times, and at age 16, was the youngest player to ever be chosen as a softball All-American.<sup>172</sup> Lopiano participated in 23 national championships in four different sports and played professional softball at the international level. Her life experiences in sport ran the full gamut from a disappointing denial of opportunity to life-changing elite levels of play: from having page 32 of the Little League rulebook shoved in her face to remind her that no girls were allowed to being recognized as one of the premier female athletes in the country. Both experiences set Lopiano on the pathway to studying physical education, pursuing a teaching and coaching career, and ascending to top leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics.

Like Oglesby and Lopiano, Carole Mushier benefitted tremendously from her involvement in national level sport, in her case field hockey and lacrosse.<sup>173</sup> These transformative experiences afforded Mushier the chance to travel internationally, represent the United States, and compete against top caliber teams. These national sport associations also provided Mushier with leadership opportunities that were not available to women in other aspects of society.<sup>174</sup> Charlotte West also mentioned one of her high-level competitive accomplishments in order to establish her credibility for recognizing how much women's collegiate volleyball was improving during the 1970s. Growing up in Florida, West competed at a "very high level" on a women's team affiliated with the

United States Volleyball Association (USVBA).<sup>175</sup> To prepare for the state championship, West's team played the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) men's volleyball team that was ranked third in the nation and defeated them. She had playing experience in women's volleyball at its best prior to the AIAW era. When West had the opportunity to hold AIAW positions overseeing national championships and directing them on her own campus, she observed how college women were developing skills that were taking volleyball and other sports to even more remarkable heights.

It is noteworthy that the AIAW presidents who engaged in high caliber athletics all did so in sports sponsored by various national associations that were independent of their undergraduate institutions. Their leadership roles in the AIAW enabled them to create worthwhile participation opportunities on college campuses similar to those they had enjoyed outside of higher education. The presidents were dedicated to providing these transformative opportunities for female student athletes who came after them and were just as eager for the excitement of challenging competition.

### **Experiencing Sexism and Understanding Patriarchy**

The AIAW presidents had an array of athletic experiences that played a part in forming their views about the value of sport participation for girls and women. They also faced a society that often shut them out or stigmatized them for seeking entry into and power in the historically male-dominated realm of sport. As the presidents negotiated access to playing fields and courts for themselves and others, they evolved to varying degrees in their understanding of the nature of life in a patriarchal society. The leaders' dialogue at the Review demonstrated that the extent to which they acknowledged and

comprehended sexism and discrimination in their various roles in athletics and academics was integral to their development of a feminist consciousness.

Some of the AIAW presidents experienced the sobering reality that sport was a male domain when their childhood desires to participate were squelched by specific league rules barring girls from playing. Others realized their second-class status when they struggled to play, coach, and administer sports with resources and levels of acceptance that paled in comparison to their male peers. And, those few presidents lucky enough to play on the USFHA national team or on an ASA national championship softball team found few such options for this challenging competition at their college or university, where either no sport programs for women existed or those that did exist either had no budget or were allocated a paltry one or two percent of the total spent on the men's program. Some of the presidents' reflections at the 1980 Review demonstrated that the discrimination they experienced and witnessed in athletics and on the broader scene of higher education influenced their understandings of sexism and patriarchy, and in turn, shaped their approaches to sport leadership.

Laurie Mabry and Lee Morrison learned that being a female in higher education in the 1950s and 1960s often posed challenges. On her way to assuming leadership roles on the women's collegiate sport scene, Mabry faced sex discrimination as an undergraduate that affected her intellectual pursuits.<sup>176</sup> Mabry enrolled at Northwestern University and after shifting majors, ended up in business. In one of her classes, the business professor returned exams on a table for all of the students to see. Upon comparison of the quality of her exam to those of her male counterparts, Mabry came to the conclusion that her work was better, but she had received a lower grade. Feeling she

was at a disadvantage because of her gender, she switched to a physical education major.<sup>177</sup> Mabry pointed out just how exceptional women had to be to succeed in male-dominated majors at Northwestern in the 1950s.

Lee Morrison explained an incident that was pivotal in her awareness of sex discrimination, prefacing her account by acknowledging that “the anger of being a woman comes to you at different times and in different places.”<sup>178</sup> Morrison faced some “intellectual discrimination” in her role as a professor at James Madison University after being selected to write a university-wide study in the mid-1960s. At first, she thought the negative reaction was because a physical education faculty member had been chosen for this important endeavor, but she came to realize that some of the comments were the result of a woman being given this significant task.<sup>179</sup> Morrison remembered when she identified as being a humanist and not a women’s libber, but proclaims, “I am a women’s libber today!” She also included in her list of the “most significant AIAW events” the fact that sport had become a feminist issue. Morrison noted that this recognition is very recent for many, but that it should have happened earlier since the historically separate nature of men’s and women’s athletics made the inequities and the discrimination stand out so blatantly.<sup>180</sup>

Peg Burke’s strong belief in the value of movement opportunities came together with a feminist awakening during her PhD studies and subsequent faculty position at the University of Iowa. Burke explained the significance of her move to Iowa and the vital role it played on her pathway to sport leadership:

The slogan for the state of Iowa is ‘Iowa: A Place to Grow,’ and I have found that to be so very true at the University of Iowa . . . it has been a substantial place of growth for me. I guess a place of secondary growth because for years there was so much suppressed in me. I know now that I have been a feminist all my life, but

I also know now that I am a reborn feminist because I did not really get around to expressing it until my mid-thirties.<sup>181</sup>

Burke's early years at the University provided her with the occasion to join a group of staff and faculty women who were discussing inequities on campus. In particular, she cited the tremendous influence of Clara Oleson, a "bright, articulate young woman" who worked as a ghost writer for a professor in the pharmacy department. The talented Oleson found herself repeatedly passed over for promotions that less qualified men easily acquired; she trained men who were promoted to become her boss. Oleson "ultimately grew tired" of this discrimination and "started an investigation of discriminatory practices at the University of Iowa." Oleson and the other "agitators" that Burke encountered at Iowa were very "instrumental" and positioned her to be an articulate activist for women's rights, particularly in athletics.<sup>182</sup>

Donna Lopiano also commented on the transformation in her thinking about the effects of patriarchy on women's place in athletics and in society in general. She admitted looking down on other women for being noncompetitive and incompetent without realizing that "the system" taught them to be this way.<sup>183</sup> She "criticized women who sold out to men's organizations never realizing that they were taught to accept men taking care of them." Lopiano disclosed: "I lived for 33 years not realizing how important it was for me to give anything to women."<sup>184</sup> Citing Christine Grant as an influential mentor, Lopiano explained how she came to understand feminism:

I think the key that turned the lock, and I think Chris probably said this to me. The one thing that cut through the thick skull was that she pointed out that here I was, a woman in the upper 5% in terms of ability and experience and somebody that had the advantages of opportunity of all women. And, I could get anywhere I wanted, and I was good enough to overcome the crime of being a woman. And a guy who was in the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, or the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile, or the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile could get to where I busted my ass to get more easily than I could. And all the

sudden it occurred to me that that was really not fair. That just went against everything that my mother and father ever told me. I think that is what turned the key for me. Anyway, I am trying to improve.<sup>185</sup>

Lopiano's personal narrative showed that her leadership pathway was influenced by new-found views on patriarchal society and its effects on women.

While Burke and Lopiano articulated facets of their journeys to embracing feminism, Carole Oglesby also established that a feminist perspective was central to her leadership role in women's athletics. Oglesby came on to the AIAW scene already embracing feminism. As will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, Oglesby was the president who asserted that the AIAW is a "saga of power, money, and sex," and then explicated what each of these terms means to provide context for the Association's position in a patriarchal society. She described her office as a "foxhole of feminism" and acknowledged that the feminist paraphernalia all over her office made a number of "unliberated" visitors uneasy.<sup>186</sup> Oglesby also had an effect on the leaders that followed her: Donna Lopiano asked for the opportunity to be involved in the AIAW after hearing Oglesby give a speech on humanism and feminism in sport.<sup>187</sup> Moreover, as noted in this project's literature review, five years after her term as AIAW president, Oglesby served as the editor and contributed multiple essays to one of the first scholarly books that analyzed women and sport from a feminist perspective.

By demonstrating either existing or developing feminist thinking, some of the AIAW leaders showed that they were aware of the patriarchal forces affecting not only their personal journeys to sport leadership but also the fate of their Association. The presidents' invitation to the 1980 Review did not specify that they comment on if or how feminism affected their leadership, nor was this issue discussed at length in the panel

discussions. Consequently, it is problematic to reach overarching conclusions about the extent to which the AIAW was being guided by leaders with a feminist perspective. The overall limited references to feminism in a setting such as the Presidential Review are noticeable, considering the AIAW leaders were forging their way in one of the most male-dominated areas of society at a time when Second-Wave feminism was prevalent.

Reflecting recently on her leadership role in the AIAW, Christine Grant stated that she was a feminist, but that she deliberately chose not to use the word when speaking to various audiences about the AIAW: “It elicited such negative reactions from so many people that I had to be very careful about using the term.”<sup>188</sup> Bonnie Slatton, Grant’s colleague at the University of Iowa and AIAW Executive Director in 1978-79, reinforced the chilly climate for feminist women in athletics when she explained an interaction with Harry Fritz, the Executive Director of the NAIA. A leader in men’s intercollegiate athletics, Fritz identified for her AIAW’s problem: “The AIAW is too closely tied to the Women’s Movement.”<sup>189</sup> The AIAW leaders clearly had an uphill battle to initiate and develop a women’s athletic governance association in the patriarchal college sport environment.

Despite the reality that feminist views were unwelcome on the intercollegiate sport scene during the AIAW era, the 1980 Review offers insights on how some of the leaders’ sport leadership path included developing and even embracing feminism. The gathering in Iowa City proved to be an occasion that induced passionate conversation about the AIAW’s role and struggle for survival in the male domain of intercollegiate athletics. The presidents’ degree of understanding of patriarchy and their evolving

feminism or lack thereof had an impact on their interpretations and responses to the NCAA threat, and thus, the AIAW's future.

### **The Power of Sorority**

Judie Holland, Charlotte West, and Christine Grant maintained a focus on the AIAW in their presentations at the 1980 Review. Although they chose not to share their personal sport narratives in a way similar to their colleagues, these presidents gave insights into their reasons for persistence in sport leadership. Their involvement in athletics positioned them to observe and to celebrate sport's transformational power in the lives of girls and women.

One of Charlotte West's motivations for her work in women's sport leadership—her desire to provide quality competition for college women—is evident from her extensive commentary on student athletes' performances in AIAW National Championship tournaments. West was Commissioner of National Championships before being elected AIAW president, and she organized her presentation around these events, taking the time to share specific details about each one. At the Presidential Review, West proudly stated that she had attended 26 AIAW National Championships.<sup>190</sup>

West's "favorite story" about the national championships highlighted an ongoing disagreement about establishing qualifying times for swimming, and it pointed to what women were accomplishing with their new opportunities to pursue excellence in athletics. In her role as AIAW Commissioner of National Championships, West found herself refereeing a contentious conference call for the swimming committee: "One group said the standards were just too lax; everybody in the country would be coming to swim. And the other group said they were just too stringent and not anyone in the world could



qualify with those kinds of times. So, I went right into a hornet's nest."<sup>191</sup> In the previous year (1974), 525 swimmers had qualified for the national championship at Penn State, which many thought was an excessive number. After much back and forth, the committee finally agreed to make the "qualifying times much more rigorous," but not so tough that the other faction thought no one would qualify. With the new, tougher standards in place, West reported that over 600 female athletes qualified for the next swimming national championship at Arizona State. The argument started again about cutting the times, which the committee did again in 1975. And, the next year, 575 swimmers qualified for nationals at the University of Miami. West recalled the excitement of hearing the booming announcement over the loud speaker "that not only had an AIAW record been broken, but an American record had been broken, and then a pause, and a world record had been broken." This made quite an impression on West: "I coached swimming for two years while a teacher in Florida and had really an excellent swimming team. I would have bet my life on the fact that women could not make the times that they are making today. Yet, I was the one who always thought we could do all kinds of things, but I cite this to show that it is endless what women can do in sport."<sup>192</sup>

After West finished her term as Commissioner of National Championships, she kept her eye on how many swimmers continued to qualify for the national championship—the number of qualifiers remained consistent even as standards got tougher. This account of the swimming national championships demonstrated that women athletes' potentials were difficult to even imagine until once thought unreachable goals were not only accomplished but exceeded. Moreover, West's story about the swimming championships revealed the joy she experienced from being involved in

women's intercollegiate sport governance and facilitating female student athletes' achievements.

Judie Holland conveyed sentiments similar to West, ending her individual presentation by identifying the AIAW national championships as the “heart of what we do,” and declaring that she “loves every single minute” of the opportunity to “see great, beautiful women athletes and what they can do.”<sup>193</sup> The opportunity to facilitate these quality championship experiences for young women across the country was an impetus for Holland to pursue sport leadership.

Christine Grant disclosed a motivation for her involvement in sport leadership when she highlighted the value of athletics in her own life and proposed the transformative power it has for all women.<sup>194</sup> Grant's presentation at the Review shows that in her role as president-in-office, she was extremely focused on articulating the strengths of the Association and the importance of it surviving the NCAA's attempted unilateral takeover. However, she briefly departed to a more personal narrative about how sport participation had helped women to develop important character traits and to sustain meaningful relationships. Grant sought to inspire her peers by sharing what she had gained from involvement in athletics at all levels and pointing out that most women in sports had benefitted in similar ways.<sup>195</sup>

Grant identified the AIAW's greatest asset as the power of sorority: “the appreciation of the power of sorority is crucial, and in my opinion, in that one factor, may rest our defeat or success.”<sup>196</sup> She proceeded to contrast the definitions of “fraternity” and “sorority,” observing that the former was associated with the “the state of being brothers, brotherliness” while the latter was defined merely as “a club of girls or women

as in a college.” For Grant, the absence of a definition for sorority such as “the state of being sisters, sisterliness” was a “serious omission” . . . that “so clearly underscores what so many women have quietly thought and seldom articulated, namely that women have never been encouraged to be supportive of each other, to be concerned for another woman’s welfare and well-being, or to be appreciative of each other’s potential and abilities.”<sup>197</sup> Grant observed that many women in sport have transcended these societal attitudes and both recognized the value of and enjoyed sorority. In the most personal section of her presentation, Grant explained how sorority through sport had shaped and given meaning to her own life:

Sorority is important to me because I realize now that sport has given me more friends than any other aspect of my life. It was only recently that I fully realized how much sport has the capacity to give. To me, many years ago it was a challenge to myself as a competitor, then it was a challenge as a coach and an umpire, and now it is a challenge as an administrator. Looking back, I realize that sport has given me my role models, my support system, my achievement-oriented nature, as well as my friends. It was through sport that I discovered the meaning of sorority. What women in AIAW and the nation itself must demonstrate is a genuine caring for the welfare of another woman even if she may be in a sense a competitor. If we ever needed the active support of each other, it is now. To some in our society, we are perceived as threats. Some in our society are not quite ready for equal opportunity for female athletes or equal decision-making power for women. In brief, some are not ready for a redefinition of the role of women in our society. But, these forces cannot win if we exert the power of sorority.<sup>198</sup>

Grant gained much from the multiple roles she has filled in athletics; clearly, sport had enriched her life. Beyond its positive effects on her as an individual, Grant recognized that sport had afforded women leaders in athletics the opportunity for sorority. She concluded that this unity achieved through sport was what could empower women in athletics to persevere against the threat of the NCAA takeover. As Grant called attention to the importance of sorority, she acknowledged all that participation in athletics could

give to girls and women, thus reinforcing her Association's primary goal of enriching lives through athletics.

The Presidential Review was organized to create a "living history" of the AIAW and elicited very personal responses from most of the presenters. The individual and panel presentations shed light on the presidents' motivations for taking on leadership roles in the AIAW. These leaders were inspired to effectuate positive change for girls and women in sport not only after being denied sport opportunities but also after participating at the highest levels. They were dedicated to working through the growing pains of emerging women's athletics to facilitate quality participation opportunities for girls and women. Some of their autobiographical accounts showed their developing understanding of sexism in society and particularly of the male-dominated domain of sport. Because of discrimination experienced or observed, they sought out leadership positions that would allow them to create a more level playing field for females. Presidents West's and Grant's reflections on more recent aspects of their sport leadership journeys affirmed the transformative power of sport, whether occurring through a young woman reaching her potential to break a swimming record or by sport's capacity to foster sorority for women and to unite them in a worthwhile cause.

In the only book on the AIAW, Wushanley doubts that the AIAW leaders "cared more about the welfare of those they controlled than about their own power and control of women's intercollegiate athletics."<sup>199</sup> The AIAW presidents' depictions of their journeys to sport leadership contradict the idea that their main motivations for attaining positions at the highest level of athletics governance were self-serving—that they were seeking individual power and prestige. The presidents' autobiographical stories make the

case that they possessed a genuine desire to grow and change intercollegiate sports not just for their own advantage but for the benefit of current student athletes and of those who would come after them. The AIAW presidents' personal narratives at the Presidential Review suggest that a driving force for their extensive efforts and engagement in athletics governance was to provide other girls and women the opportunity to reap the rewards of meaningful movement experiences, including the sense of accomplishment from reaching their potential in competitive play. This purpose connects directly to the AIAW philosophy: athletics programs should focus on student athlete welfare and the enrichment of the life of the participant.

## CHAPTER 4 THE AIAW PHILOSOPHY

The AIAW presidents narrated a “living history” during the week of the Presidential Review that established the context in which their philosophy developed, offered their understanding of the AIAW philosophy and main principles, and pointed to ways that they lived out their Association’s key tenets. The presentations and panel discussions showed that the AIAW leadership had a deep and profound belief that their Association’s main purpose was to serve the best interests of student athletes by providing a model of educational sport that enriched their lives. To support their educational sport philosophy, the AIAW leaders established a fair and inclusive approach to governance—a system emphasizing equal voice and open debate best exemplified by the annual AIAW Delegate Assembly.

While the presidents ensured that their understanding of the AIAW philosophy was preserved for the historical record, they commented more extensively on the difficulties they faced in establishing and developing the philosophy. It was clearly a challenging undertaking to lead an organization run by and for women in the intercollegiate sport domain long dominated by men. Indeed, AIAW’s first president, Carole Oglesby, contended that her Association’s story was a “saga of power, money, and sex.”<sup>200</sup> For the AIAW leaders—pioneering figures in athletics—it was not as simple as stating their vision of women’s intercollegiate athletics and then making it a reality. Many forces impinged upon their goals, which is why the obstacles they encountered in regard to fostering and advancing their philosophy and principles are scrutinized in the next chapter that focuses on the AIAW enmeshed in constant crisis management. Aware of the arduous environment of college athletics in which they were forging their way, the

presidents stated the AIAW's student-centered philosophy of athletics at their 1980 gathering in Iowa City and articulated a variety of ways that they lived out their Association's significant principles.

Carole Mushier remarked that on her way to Iowa City she pondered who would want to attend the AIAW Presidential Review. She concluded that it would be "those who feel a part of the history" and those who were "seeking to contribute to its meaning."<sup>201</sup> Her remark about the audience was pertinent to both the way and the degree to which the presenters disclosed the AIAW philosophy. With the exception of a few reporters, the Presidential Review attendees included athletics administrators and coaches who were familiar with and dedicated to the Association.<sup>202</sup> Some of the participants were graduate students earning summer academic credits for attending the event. Graduate students studying at the University of Iowa had as mentors and professors a former AIAW president (Peg Burke), an interim executive director (Bonnie Slatton), and the current president (Christine Grant), so they were familiar with the Association and its philosophy. The presidents were speaking to a crowd of approximately 50 participants who were mostly well-versed in the AIAW's key principles, which perhaps explains why only a few of the presidents thoroughly laid out the key tenets of their Association's philosophy. The presidents spoke to an audience largely familiar and even dedicated to the AIAW.

### **The Context: 'Power, Money, and Sex' and the NCAA**

To open the 1980 Presidential Review, Carole Oglesby established the "essential context" for the AIAW's brief existence and its alternative governance model, explaining that it has evolved as a "saga of power, money, and sex."<sup>203</sup> This context framed the

presentations at the Review. At the end of the week, President-elect Lopiano referred to Oglesby's "well-said" description and asserted that the AIAW leaders had come to the realization "that intercollegiate athletics is a game of power, money, and sex, and we have learned how to play it."<sup>204</sup> These two presidents' analyses of this statement showed that the AIAW leaders were aware of their complex, patriarchal environment and the challenges an Association created by and for women faced in trying to establish itself in college sport governance. They were not merely finding their way into the already established male domain of intercollegiate athletics with the intent of furthering the status quo. Instead, they were bringing different ideas about athletics governance to the forefront, and the voices articulating these ideas were those of females. Before the AIAW era, these voices were absent from male-dominated college sports. Oglesby's explanation of the state of the real world in which the AIAW persevered over its first 10 years provided useful insights about the environment in which the Association's leaders were establishing their governance model based on their student-centered philosophy. Her assessment demonstrated why the AIAW's efforts to establish an alternative model of athletics were both a difficult endeavor and a challenge to mainstream college sports.

To establish the context of the AIAW as a "saga of power, money, and sex," Oglesby analyzed each of the phrase's key components. She clarified that "to a large extent, power in the sports world of today is to be found in voting blocks in important organizations and important committees."<sup>205</sup> According to Oglesby, votes on important national committees such as the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) were often tied to the scope and quality of the programs they offered. She noted that "even in our sexist society, the AIAW has managed to amass some votes and potentially could garner



more.” The men’s college athletics governance associations—both the NCAA and the NAIA—coveted these votes and the power that they brought, thus in terms of “power,” the AIAW was both a “threat and an enticing prize.” The AIAW was a “threat” as long as it possessed votes on important committees and was recognized by powerful organizations such as the USOC, but these votes also made the Association a “prize” because they would be available to whatever organization was overseeing women’s intercollegiate athletics programs in the U.S.<sup>206</sup>

In terms of “money,” Oglesby pointed to the financial advantages for men’s organizations if they had a monopoly in intercollegiate athletics. She contended that “currently, on a theoretical basis, the NCAA cannot sell its basketball championship as *the* basketball championship because it’s ‘only’ the men’s national collegiate championship.” The NCAA gained an economic advantage if it could extend its monopoly over both women’s and men’s intercollegiate athletics. Oglesby offered a synopsis of the relatively new financial reality for women’s sports: “the money and the potential money earned by AIAW championships is again both a threat and an enticing prize.”<sup>207</sup> The NCAA would benefit from ownership of both men’s and women’s championships as well from the AIAW’s current and potential earnings, which included a recently signed one million dollar contract with NBC.

Oglesby defined the reference to “sex” in her account of the AIAW’s saga as “gender-related issues.”<sup>208</sup> She explained that this part of the saga required some “background digression,” and she described her own university office as a “foxhole of feminism.” Her office was located in what feminist Wilma Heide designated as the “semi-university” because it “really only concerns itself with half of the population.” She

pointed out that “unliberated” visitors to her office were often concerned with her sign that reads: “A woman needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle.” Oglesby admitted being somewhat confounded by the fact that this statement was so unnerving to some, but declared that when she figured it out, there was an “inescapable” connection to the AIAW: “this verse bespeaks of an existential independence of woman as a class from men as a class. It says nothing at all about dependence/independence pattern that pairs of male/female individuals may agree upon in the pair, but it denies the basic presumption that women need men for their existential being.” Oglesby observed that when the “AIAW proclaims a doctrine of sport and athletics of, for, and by women, it denies the same presumption; thus, it is very threatening and frightening to those whose life rules are based on just such a presumption of female dependence.” The AIAW confounded the male-dominated sport domain, for it was an organization that featured the “existential independence of women from men.”<sup>209</sup>

Oglesby proposed a second reason why the AIAW was perceived as a threat in a gender-related way. She pointed out that the history of athletics has a “homo” tradition, meaning that it has been a “within sex” or homosocial activity that has come to be the norm in society.<sup>210</sup> Oglesby showed a slide to the audience that she described as featuring a male coach she respects very much celebrating a play in what one assumes is a very affectionate and hands-on manner with another male. After clarifying that the slide was not depicting the latest cover of a Village People album or an outtake from Al Pacino’s *Cruising*, Oglesby contemplated: “What has lifted athletics as a one-sex activity though the decades from the profane, which might be thought of as the New York City Combat Zone or leather bars, to the sacred Mt. Olympus?”<sup>211</sup> She suggested that

women's roles as spectators and admirers had brought about the transformation—had helped to “heterosexualize” athletics. Men were greatly threatened if the stands were suddenly empty, and there were no sideline cheerleaders because all the women were off to participate in their own athletic events.<sup>212</sup>

The terrain of “power, money, and sex” that the AIAW had to navigate in its first 10 years proved to be quite challenging. Oglesby reflected on the AIAW's struggles and accomplishments, concluding that “every day of its existence is a feminist miracle composed of one part vision and of three parts gut-wrenching labor.”<sup>213</sup> Beginning the 1980 Presidential Review, Oglesby defined the cultural reality in which she and her colleagues were working to provide sport participation opportunities for women at colleges and universities across the country. She exhibited an astute understanding of the power lines that the young AIAW had to traverse, particularly those connected to class and gender.

At the first Delegate Assembly in 1973, Oglesby and the rest of the AIAW leadership were clearly thinking about whether their alternative governance model fit in the intercollegiate athletics scene. This initial Delegate Assembly provided the forum in which the membership began to learn about Title IX and its ramifications, leading many to inquire about what a law that called for equality across the educational landscape meant for the AIAW and its philosophy. The AIAW, like most of the rest of the country, did not realize that Title IX applied to athletics until about a year after the law was passed. Lacking financial resources, the AIAW leaders brought in an attorney—“a friend of a friend”—to the first Delegate Assembly who volunteered to explain the “legal ramifications of Title IX to a naïve membership and a naïve executive board.”<sup>214</sup>

Carol Gordon explained that the membership was concerned with two fundamental questions: 1) “Must women follow that which is laid down for men by men?”, and 2) “Are there any protections in the law to ensure different philosophical roots in intercollegiate sports for men and women?”<sup>215</sup> Gordon acknowledged that the attorney was not an expert on the recently passed Title IX and was thus unable to answer many of the membership’s inquiries; however, “without committing himself,” the attorney did say that “women will have their chance to be heard on campuses.”<sup>216</sup> From its very first official membership-wide meeting, the AIAW was contemplating the way forward to establish and develop its principles in an athletics governance model.

The AIAW was evolving alongside the already well-established system of men’s intercollegiate athletics governed primarily by the NCAA. The NCAA was founded nearly 60 years prior to women physical education leaders’ first conversations about forming the Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW)—the precursor to the AIAW— to oversee competitive sport opportunities for college women. This context points to why those attending the first AIAW Delegate Assembly had at the forefront of their agenda whether or not Title IX—a law that mandated an end to sex discrimination and called for gender equity in education—would allow them to develop their own system of athletics with “different philosophical roots” than the men’s system.

Understanding the AIAW presidents’ developing philosophy necessitates attention to the overall intercollegiate athletics scene in the United States, particularly the NCAA’s model of governance. The NCAA, the most powerful organization in college athletics, dictated the status quo in college sports. The AIAW presidents sometimes articulated their philosophy and main principles by contrasting them with those of the

NCAA; furthermore, the NCAA was a prominent and controversial player in the AIAW's saga of "power, money, and sex."

Bonnie Slatton's essay, "AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics," thoroughly explains the AIAW philosophy and argues that it offers an alternative model of athletics governance.<sup>217</sup> It appeared in James H. Frey's 1982 collection of essays entitled *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, which also contained an essay by Ted Tow, the Assistant Executive Director of the NCAA, which lays out the history and key principles of the NCAA.<sup>218</sup> The juxtaposition of these two essays, which were written within months of the AIAW Presidential Review, sheds light on the purposes and foundational ideas of the AIAW and the NCAA.

Frey's Preface establishes that Slatton's and Tow's essays are included in a work intended to scrutinize intercollegiate athletics:

Once again intercollegiate athletics is a subject of controversy. Recent revelations of illegal recruiting practices, bogus transcripts from obscure two-year schools, questionable alumni/booster involvement in athletic administration, cash payments for extra rebounds or points scored, grade fixing and the pathetic graduation rates of athletes compared to non-athletes have raised two questions: one is very practical; the other is more [ideological] and philosophical. The glaring expose of college athletics excesses has stimulated the first question: 'Who is in control?' . . . The second facet of the recent controversy is also one which has been raised before . . . 'What is the relation of an athletic program to the educational function of an institution of higher learning?'<sup>219</sup>

Frey's statement suggests that the AIAW presidents were leading their relatively new Association into an arena replete with controversy and questions about the appropriate role for athletics in higher education.

Tow's explanation of the NCAA governance model shows the NCAA's significant principles. Tow states that the NCAA was founded in 1906 "as the direct result of problems in football."<sup>220</sup> The violent nature of the game "was causing serious

injuries and some deaths,” which compelled President Theodore Roosevelt to call college athletics leaders to meetings at the White House to demand reform. In its first 15 years of existence, the NCAA served mainly as a discussion group that focused on establishing playing rules. The organization did not hold its first national championship until the National Collegiate Track and Field Championships in 1921. Gradually, more national championships followed, and “it was not until just after World War II that the NCAA’s role in the governance of athletics moved significantly from the areas of discussions, championships, and playing rules to regulatory considerations.” In light of significant abuses in intercollegiate athletics in areas such as recruiting and financial aid, in 1947 the NCAA adopted what became known as the “Sanity Code.”<sup>221</sup> This featured a set of five “Principles for the Conduct of Intercollegiate Athletics” that focused specifically on amateurism, institutional control and responsibility, academic standards, financial aid, and recruiting. However, due to lack of enforcement, the Sanity Code guidelines proved to be “ineffective as abuses in those areas grew in both number and seriousness.” This reality provided “dramatic evidence” that the NCAA needed to move from volunteer leadership to full-time professional leadership.<sup>222</sup>

In 1951, the NCAA named Walter Byers as its first full-time executive director and established the Association’s national office in Kansas City, Missouri: the NCAA’s regulatory function, as it is known today, had begun.<sup>223</sup> Tow describes the NCAA enforcement program as “the most extensive and effective self-policing effort of any voluntary membership organization in any field.” Moreover, he asserts that the NCAA’s “role in the governance of intercollegiate athletics is perhaps best characterized, at least for comparative purposes, by three interrelated precepts: total accountability to its

member colleges and universities, the principle of institutional control, and adherence to an extensive and ongoing enforcement program.”<sup>224</sup>

In addition to these three central precepts, Tow outlines other key NCAA “purposes” that include recommending policy to membership organizations; establishing competitive standards; supervising regional and national collegiate athletic contests; and preserving collegiate athletic records.<sup>225</sup> It is noteworthy that these purposes lack any specific reference to student athletes. One can infer that a few of the purposes would directly affect student athletes, for example: “To encourage adoption by its constituent members of eligibility rules in compliance with satisfactory standards of scholarship, amateur standing, and good sportsmanship.”<sup>226</sup> Overall, though, the NCAA “purposes” were focused mostly on institutional compliance and the logistics of competitive programs. In sharp contrast, the AIAW “purposes” listed in the 1980-81 AIAW Directory that were primarily centered on the well-being and enrichment of the life of the student athlete.<sup>227</sup>

Tow’s essay provides an important context for understanding the most powerful organization in intercollegiate athletics: the NCAA was synonymous in most people’s minds with college sports. Consequently, when Frey begins his collection of essays on intercollegiate athletics with some simple but poignant questions--“Who is in control?” and “What is the relation of an athletic program to the educational function of an institution of higher learning?”—he is asking them in relation to the NCAA.<sup>228</sup> Tow asserts that each institution is in control of its own athletics program and emphasizes the development of an extensive rules system intended to end scandals and keep athletics programs under control.<sup>229</sup>

In contrast, Slatton explains that women’s intercollegiate athletics have been “carefully controlled by professional physical educators” and that those who formed the AIAW built the “basic philosophical foundations” of “an intercollegiate model which was educationally sound, financially prudent, and concerned primarily with the welfare and the enrichment of the student athlete.”<sup>230</sup> Slatton offers details about numerous AIAW policies that demonstrate her Association’s “commitment to educationally focused programs.” In bold print, she emphasizes that the AIAW regulations “have consistently **avored rights of students over the rights of institutions.**”<sup>231</sup>

Slatton’s and Tow’s essays appeared in a collection written and published in the early 1980s, and juxtaposed, their writings provide perspectives on intercollegiate athletics that are a good starting point for understanding the differences between the NCAA and AIAW philosophies. At the Presidential Review, Carole Oglesby articulated an essential context for such an evaluation when she described the cultural reality in which the AIAW found itself trying to govern women’s intercollegiate athletics: the AIAW leaders found themselves engulfed in a “saga of power, money, and sex” in which the NCAA played a key role.<sup>232</sup> With this saga as the backdrop, the AIAW presidents took the stage in Iowa City in 1980 to create a living history of their Association. As they did so, they explained their philosophy and how they lived it.

### **The Presidents’ Philosophy in Words**

Two of the AIAW presidents—Carole Oglesby and Christine Grant— provided clear explanations of their Association’s philosophy. As a member of the CIAW, Oglesby had been a key player in developing the philosophy, and Grant, as the president in 1980, was engaged with traveling around the country extolling the strengths of the



AIAW philosophy in order to garner support for the Association. It is likely that more of the presidents would have articulated the philosophy if the audience in Iowa City had not been already well-informed about it. As the presidents gave their individual presentations and participated on the panels to share the significant happenings during their terms in office, they called attention to specific principles and actions that supported the AIAW philosophy. Interestingly, the presidents most frequently discussed their philosophy in terms of how both internal and external constituents were unaware of it and how it was often misconstrued, challenging circumstances that will be explored in the next chapter.

Oglesby's key leadership role in the CIAW positioned her to comment on the philosophy that guided the formation of the AIAW. She declared that the fundamental AIAW principle was a focus on student-athlete welfare, and the Association's goal was to establish a model of athletics that enriched the life of the participant.<sup>233</sup> She warned her audience that they would hear this mantra about athletics enriching lives a "million times" during the week of the Presidential Review; indeed, the repetitive focus on student athletes emphasized just how central their development and well-being were to the AIAW leaders.

Oglesby explained the formation of the AIAW through description of its foremothers' "Genesis Vision" that was most remarkable for its "simplicity."<sup>234</sup> The Genesis Vision was made up of three parts that existed under a basic theme: "the enrichment of the life of the participant. That was the heart of the vision." Oglesby described the three components of the vision which laid out that women's athletics would be supported by 1) expanding opportunities for girls and women athletes, especially those

who were highly skilled; 2) establishing athletics programs that were in perspective and in balance with the overall lives of the participants; and 3) accomplishing the enrichment of participants through the guidance and control of professional women conducting the sports programs with the establishment and enforcement of standards.<sup>235</sup>

Referring to official CIAW and DGWS documents from the mid-1960s to the early 1970s, Oglesby clarified the actual language that supported the three parts of the Genesis Vision.<sup>236</sup> A main idea featured in these documents was that those organizing women's athletics had over-focused on students with average or substandard ability to the detriment of those who were more talented. Thus, leaders in women's intercollegiate athletics called for a more balanced approach that would support all students, including provisions for more competitive sport experiences for highly-skilled girls and women. Oglesby outlined the "essential characteristics" for this vision that kept the place of athletics in the participants' lives "in perspective." This meant "no scholarships or pay for play" and a "de-emphasis on awards," guidelines meant to keep the athletics programs in balance with the rest of the educational experience.<sup>237</sup> Oglesby explained that there was also a "de-emphasis on profit-taking;" selling tickets and encouraging spectators to attend were fine, but the CIAW foremothers were adamant that making money should not be the primary motivation for sponsoring the sport experience. The policies and procedures were laid out in detail since many women were new to institutional involvement in competitive intercollegiate athletics, and they covered a variety of areas—the "meat and potatoes"—of sport programs: "facilities, equipment, the conduct of events, finances, insurance, medicine and first aid, officials, awards, rules, eligibility, the social relationships between competitors, . . ." Not only were these early guidelines

carefully worded and circulated, but they were enforced. Oglesby pointed out that there were “painful teeth” in the policies, and that the planners wanted “professional women” implementing and enforcing them.<sup>238</sup>

Oglesby’s summary of the CIAW years revealed that not all was smooth sailing as female professional educators worked to establish women’s intercollegiate athletics on a national level. Early leaders had to navigate some rough waters as policies were tried and tested. Oglesby described the CIAW awards system and its “god-awful certificates,” noting that few in women’s college athletics were satisfied with early efforts to recognize team and student-athlete accomplishments.<sup>239</sup> Some institutions were angry about being disqualified from championships because of a failure to register properly. Others had “heated” disagreements about how the country should be divided into competitive regions. Leaders in women’s intercollegiate athletics debated issues and made changes as their original ideas proved at times to be problematic in the “real world.” Despite these early difficulties, Oglesby concluded that from a 1980 vantage point, the CIAW’s policies and procedures were “basically sound.” She had “the greatest respect 10 years later” for the persons who were the early planners, and she did not think that the policies were “outrageous” or, for the most part, “anachronistic.” Oglesby encouraged women in athletics to review the CIAW documents and to appreciate the enormity of the task of organizing women’s intercollegiate athletics with a “top-down governance approach.”<sup>240</sup> Carol Gordon echoed these sentiments when she contended that many “tend to overlook the contributions that those original people made.” Gordon asserted that “it’s easy to judge . . . and not realize how much went into the development of these standards and how concerned these women were about the establishment of quality programs.”<sup>241</sup>

Oglesby explained the foundational elements of the AIAW philosophy at the start of the Review; at the end of the week, Christine Grant reinforced the AIAW's mission of enriching the life of the student athlete. In light of the context of her 1980 leadership year, it was not surprising that Grant was working diligently to spread the word about the AIAW's attributes. At the Presidential Review, the AIAW leaders stated frequently and emphatically that they were in a constant state of crisis management. Grant faced the strongest threat of an NCAA takeover when she steered the AIAW into the decade of the 1980s. Understandably, these events weighed heavily on Grant's mind as well as those of the other AIAW leaders. They recognized that it was critical to widely disseminate the value of their alternative model of athletics governance to decision-makers in higher education, the general public, and even their own membership in order for it to receive the support needed to survive the NCAA's movement into women's athletics.

The AIAW was barely a decade old, and its leaders acknowledged that most outside the Association and even a large number coaching and participating in athletics within it did not understand what the AIAW stood for and what it was trying to accomplish. Thus, one of the goals Grant articulated for her 1980 year as president was "to gain publicity and support for the AIAW, for its model of intercollegiate athletics."<sup>242</sup> Grant contended that there was a "need to gain that support both internally within our own organization and certainly externally, which means that we have to be able to articulate to voting representatives, to coaches, to student-athletes, the values of supporting AIAW." Grant and her executive committee were working diligently to explain what the Association stood for by giving "as many speeches as humanly possible."<sup>243</sup> One of the presidents' key strategies for preserving the AIAW was to

inform all of those invested in college athletics—from student athletes to university presidents—about their approach and then to convince them that this alternative model of educational sport needed to remain viable for the benefit of all college athletics.

To state her understanding of the AIAW philosophy, Grant referred to segments from her 1979 Delegate Assembly presidential candidate’s address, noting that it was “almost exclusively philosophically oriented. I pulled no punches, and I really tried to be up front. I really didn’t care if I sounded like the ‘Old Guard,’ for it was necessary for the membership to know my basic philosophical beliefs.”<sup>244</sup> Grant communicated her view of the AIAW philosophy: “To me, our cornerstone is our stated belief that the existence and reason for any athletic program is the enrichment of the life of the participant. It is the belief that athletics is for athletes—not the coach, not the athletic director, the institution, or the public although the achievement of excellence by the participants may reflect well on these people.”<sup>245</sup>

Towards the end of her presentation at the Review, Grant restated her commitment to educational sport with an intensity fixed on rallying her peers to unite again to take on another crisis faced by their Association. Grant claimed resolutely that the AIAW was an “educationally oriented model” of athletics, and then explained what exactly that entailed:

I think it means we’ve made a commitment not to exploit students. I think it means that student rights are equally important as institutional rights—that student needs should be considered at least as important as institutional needs. I think it means that where possible athletes ought to be treated like other undergraduate students. I think it means that an athlete’s life ought to permit her to attain her academic goals as well as her athletic goals.<sup>246</sup>

While Grant articulated the AIAW philosophy multiple times, she also strived for her peers at the Review to understand how the Association’s mission extended beyond

establishing an alternative governance approach that was good for student athletes. She also viewed the AIAW as a key player in achieving the goal of using the power of Title IX and collective efforts of women sport leaders to work towards equal opportunity:

What we must be clear about is 1) we are trying to create an alternate approach to the structure and governance of intercollegiate athletics for the benefit of student athletes and individual institutions; 2) we are trying to ensure that equal opportunity exists for the female student athletes. In addition, personally, I believe that we are trying to create for women behind us the opportunities that did not exist and still are not equitable for women in professional avenues.<sup>247</sup>

Oglesby and Grant were the two presidents who most directly stated the AIAW's student-centered philosophy. As Oglesby explained the philosophy's Genesis Vision, she clarified the context of "power, money, and sex" in which it continued to function. Grant acknowledged the immediate value of how the philosophy was facilitating quality sport experiences for college athletes all over the country, but she called for a wider influence: the AIAW's student-centered focus transcended any particular sport program to support equitable opportunities for female sport participants and leaders as well as for girls and women in all avenues of life.

### **The Presidents' Philosophy in Action**

Christine Grant took the lead in explaining the essential rules and principles that supported the AIAW philosophy and guided the Association's every day decisions, seizing the opportunity to point out differences between the AIAW and NCAA. Grant's colleagues also described specific actions that brought their philosophy to life. Moreover, the presidents called attention to features of the Association's democratic governance approach which were most fully and dramatically lived out through the Delegate Assembly, the AIAW's annual meeting for its leaders and membership. With

emphasis on inclusiveness, balance, and fairness, the presidents fostered a governance model that focused on the enrichment of participants' lives.

Grant asserted that the AIAW's greatest strength was its ability to live by its principles:

I have such respect for this organization which has become in the short space of eight years the largest athletic governing organization in the nation. I have respect not because we have on paper several idealistic principles; I have respect because there are so many people in this organization who constantly try to live by these principles. And, in the continued adherence to these basic philosophical tenets lies the greatest strength of our Association.<sup>248</sup>

Recognizing that the AIAW philosophy could be respected for its substance only if its principles guided its daily actions, Grant explained how the AIAW strived to live out its philosophy that was focused on student athlete welfare.

Grant focused on the AIAW's "dual obligation to protect the rights of institutions and individual student athletes alike" and emphasized that the AIAW accomplished these goals through the way it offered due process, an appeals system, and student athlete representation in its government system.<sup>249</sup> She contended that these measures were "in tune" with society's increased emphasis on human rights and ahead of their time in athletics. Grant was concerned about the AIAW membership's tendency to "feel defensive" about these aspects of their Association as well as surprised at the AIAW's "shyness to boast about them." Further clarifying her perspective on this matter, Grant pointed out the NCAA's documented inadequacies in the area of due process: "Last year when the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the House [of Representatives] Governance Operations Committee analyzed the NCAA procedures, over 150 changes were suggested to the NCAA to ensure due process and fairness. In comparison, we should be proud of our structure." In the AIAW, every student athlete

had the right to appeal any Association decision all the way to the executive board. Grant concluded that the AIAW's "concern for the participant is well-demonstrated by the fact that we are the only athletic organization which guarantees the individual student's right to due process."<sup>250</sup>

A natural outgrowth of due process was the AIAW's "commitment to student representation on policy making groups from the campus to the national level."<sup>251</sup>

The AIAW provided a valuable forum for professional educators to discuss the significant issues in women's intercollegiate athletics, and from the Association's early days, student athletes were given a voice in the ongoing debates. Carole Oglesby noted that student representation was "always a part of the philosophical statement" as it was being formed during the CIAW years and that female student athletes were members of the various sport committees that were working on sponsoring the first national championships.<sup>252</sup> Carol Gordon recalled that student representatives were present for the second AIAW Delegate Assembly in Houston.<sup>253</sup> At her first board meeting as president, Peg Burke proposed that a Student Leadership Conference be held in conjunction with the Delegate Assembly; this proposal passed and the Student Leadership Conference was held annually. Burke captured the significance of this gathering of students: "I think that conference was and is one of the most exciting parts of the Delegate Assembly. It is exciting to see the political savvy the students develop and utilize in the subsequent days of an Assembly. They lobby like crazy for their issues, and I love to see it."<sup>254</sup>

The presidents endorsed student representation in the AIAW and the opportunities for student athletes to develop their leadership skills; simultaneously, they recognized



that more could be done in this area. Lee Morrison reflected disappointment “in the real extent to which we have involved students” and argued that the AIAW needed a Bill of Rights for student athletes.<sup>255</sup> While Grant acknowledged that students’ involvement in governance was important to “help to ensure that we do indeed make the welfare of the student our primary concern,” she also agreed with Morrison’s criticism of the extent of student involvement in the AIAW. Grant called on her Association to consider having more than one student on the national board since only one position reminded her of “tokenism.”<sup>256</sup>

Working to redress Morrison and Grant’s criticisms of the extent of student involvement, Carole Mushier described how she was collaborating with AIAW student representatives to draft a Student Athlete Bill of Rights and had “high hopes” that the group would submit it to the Executive Committee in October, 1980. She was pleased to chair a committee that was investigating “increased student involvement in the AIAW.” Mushier asserted that the student athletes often “bring sanity to chaos” and that no one had “articulated an educational philosophy more eloquently than our student athletes.”<sup>257</sup>

Another way that the AIAW tried to serve the best interests of student athletes and coaches was by establishing reasonable recruiting rules. The Association’s approach to recruiting emphasized potential student athletes’ on-campus visits and try-outs instead of a system that required coaches to frequently travel off campus to win over recruits. Grant questioned how many persons in higher education understood the rationale behind the AIAW’s recruiting rules: “Certainly, we are concerned about finances, but do many know we are equally concerned with protecting the high school student athlete from undue harassment? Do many know that we are also protecting the coaches from what often has

been termed as the exhaustive and degrading process of wooing a seventeen year-old?”<sup>258</sup> Grant observed that male coaches had become increasingly critical of their own recruiting system. For instance, she cited Johnny Major, head football coach at the University of Tennessee, who had been outspoken about the need to “drastically cut back on recruiting.” Grant voiced concern that the dominant narrative about college athletics recruiting often demanded for the AIAW to change its rules to fit better with the men’s system, and she cautioned against following this model just because it was more familiar and established. On the recruiting issue, Grant concluded that “though I do not think we have found a perfect way, at least at the moment, it seems to be an improved method. And for that we deserve to give ourselves some credit.”<sup>259</sup>

In addition to sensible recruiting rules that served the best interests of all involved in the process, Grant contended that the AIAW’s transfer rules emphasized student athlete welfare. The Association avoided the NCAA’s rigid transfer policies that often forced student athletes to request and be granted a release from teams and then required them to sit out for a year before being allowed to participate at their new institution. The AIAW transfer rules, which gave student athletes much more freedom to move from school to school without penalty, placed a premium on students’ autonomy and right to choose the college or university that best fit their needs.<sup>260</sup>

Considering the AIAW’s overall approach to rules, Grant asserted that the AIAW “commands respect for its different approach to rules making and rules enforcement.” She acknowledged that a few people would always abuse rules no matter how a system was structured, but she viewed the AIAW approach to rules as something exciting and different: “a system which reflects a belief in the integrity of a vast majority of

people.”<sup>261</sup> The AIAW resisted the temptation to try to make a rule to cover every situation and depended on individuals and institutions to self-report violations.

As Grant articulated the tenets of the AIAW philosophy, she also stated the Association’s “belief in the development of broad athletic programs, so that we may fulfill the varied needs and interests of our student population.” This emphasis on broad programs supported the AIAW’s efforts to avoid the “major” and “minor” sport distinction that existed in the men’s model of collegiate sport. These descriptors were primarily based on designating the money-making sports as the “major” ones. Grant “believes strongly in providing comparable opportunities and benefits to all athletes” and “cannot justify preferential treatment to students in a few selected sports.”<sup>262</sup>

Charlotte West and Carole Mushier described specific actions that demonstrated the AIAW’s commitment to treating student athletes in comparable ways. West explained that various companies had offered to provide sport equipment for national championships. The AIAW’s approach to these proposals was “to ensure that we have it in all divisions” even though some companies preferred to sponsor the higher profile Division I sports.<sup>263</sup> Mushier adopted a stance on television contracts in line with West’s views on sport sponsorship opportunities. One of her personal goals was realized when she negotiated a deal with ESPN to televise Division II and DIII championships.<sup>264</sup> Mushier stated that “it was difficult enough to sell Division I championships, but I was adamant that DII and DIII would get this coverage even if we had to give it away.” AIAW legal counsel Margot Polivy cautioned Mushier against agreeing to a lower dollar deal that would make it harder to negotiate down the road as the interest in women’s

televised sports would hopefully increase. However, Mushier felt that the value of the television coverage to DII and DIII student athletes “could not be measured in dollars.”<sup>265</sup>

The AIAW leaders also lived out their philosophy of supporting student athletes beyond the boundaries of their own organization. In the mid-1970s, when the United States Congress intervened in the ongoing battle between the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU), the United States Olympic Committee (USOC), and the NCAA over the control and the direction of amateur sport in the U.S., the AIAW strategically joined the conversations as strong advocates for athletes’ rights and welfare. Peg Burke described how the President’s Commission on Olympic Sport released a preliminary report without having heard testimony from groups such as the AIAW and the NAIA: “we felt it had a number of inadequacies in it . . . They were suggesting . . . restructuring for international competition and governance, and we felt it was a very important time to get in the concerns of women, a very important time to support the concept of a Bill of Rights for athletes.”<sup>266</sup> Lee Morrison explained that the Amateur Sport Act (1978) that was passed as the result of these organizations coming together “provides the enabling legislation for a whole new era in amateur sport in this country if it is implemented to the extent that is should be implemented. And, incidentally AIAW, had a great deal to do with this.”<sup>267</sup>

Carole Mushier expanded on the consequences of the Amateur Sport Act and her Association’s role in this process, noting that since the first testimony by Peg Burke in front of the President’s Commission on Amateur Sport, the AIAW had been increasingly involved in the total picture of amateur sport governance in this country.<sup>268</sup> Mushier stated that the Amateur Sport Act required that all member organizations within a specific sport’s NGB—National Governing Body—had “direct representation and

decision-making power in relation to the level, type, and size of the programs they sponsor within a specific sport. Also, women are to have decision-making power based on the same type of concept.” Mushier gave credit to Judie Holland and Carole Oglesby for restructuring the “old AIAW International Commission” to better serve the AIAW’s needs on the international sport scene. In November, 1979, “for the first time, all AIAW representatives to all the various amateur governing bodies were brought together to coordinate their actions.”<sup>269</sup>

The AIAW representatives were advocating for athletes’ rights and women’s representation on each sport’s National Governing Body. In contrast, Morrison described how the “NCAA were the ones in essence who were very, very resistant to some of the things that had to do with athletes’ rights. It’s a well-known fact that they have not been noted for their due process procedures, nor have they been noted for their involvement of athletes.”<sup>270</sup> The Presidents clearly understood that there was a distance to travel before the measures aimed at student rights and equitable representation for women were realized. Mushier observed that “at the current time . . . it’s fair to say that not one NGB meets the requirements from our perspective—not one. While it may seem unfair that AIAW act as sole guardian of the Act, it appears that AIAW and women in general have the most to gain if we do continue this large task.”<sup>271</sup> Grant echoed Mushier’s opinion about the AIAW’s role in the full implementation of the Amateur Sport Act, recognizing that “it is very seldom that power is given away. You tend to have to win power. And that is an element in this whole restructuring of all the NGBs . . . So you can guess who is going to have to primarily wrestle with this if we are to ensure that the spirit and letter of that law are achieved. It is going to have to be AIAW.”<sup>272</sup>

Throughout its brief existence, the AIAW established student athlete welfare and the enrichment of the life of the participant as paramount. The presidents supported these central precepts through their Association's rules and actions in areas such as due process, an appeals system, student athlete representation, and recruiting and transfer rules. Moreover, they worked to support broad-based athletics programs that treated athletes across each of the divisions equitably—no matter the size of her school or whether a scholarship athlete or not, each participant's experience was valued. The presidents also expanded their dedication to athletes beyond the AIAW, working diligently to make certain that athlete rights and equal representation for women were part of the 1978 Amateur Sport Act. In tandem with an unwavering focus on the student athlete, the AIAW presidents also strived to create an Association that consistently fostered inclusiveness and fairness in athletics programs that were in balance with the primary academic mission of higher learning institutions.

The AIAW's efforts to treat all members fairly were exemplified by each institution having input and a vote on all matters across three divisions. The AIAW's single legislative structure was comprised of voting representatives from all member institutions.<sup>273</sup> In contrast, the three NCAA divisions existed as distinct entities with voting power that only directly influenced their own particular division. Grant commented that the AIAW governance structure ensured meaningful input from both the small and the large colleges and universities on all decisions: "That structure, which was not accidental, reflects a belief that we should be concerned with the needs and the opportunities of the student athletes in all women's intercollegiate programs throughout the nation."<sup>274</sup>

Lee Morrison referred to the importance of the one-vote for each institution on all issues: “There is no way, in my estimation, that something that happened in Division III can’t effect Division I, and we have a vote on all those issues.”<sup>275</sup> Grant was concerned—as she had already voiced in regard to recruiting—about “rumblings of support” to move towards the NCAA model, which in the case of legislative structure would mean each division existing and voting independently. She stated: “I am concerned because I cannot help but think that such a move would encourage the development of a narrow self-interest of the wealthy and/or dominant institutions. Such a change would in turn almost assure the exact duplication of the men’s model.”<sup>276</sup> Grant acknowledged that she is “further convinced of this threat” when she reads books like John Underwood’s *The Death of an American Game: The Crisis in American Football*. She noted that Underwood “strongly criticizes the rich get richer, the poor get poorer syndrome, which has been set up by the NCAA. Moreover, he lauds the equitable TV sharing plan of the Big Eight. Actually, that plan for television is the AIAW plan also. I hope we are wise enough to keep learning from history.”<sup>277</sup> The AIAW placed importance on all institutions having a voice in governance and on sharing resources equitably.

Grant also focused on the AIAW’s efforts to keep athletics in balance with colleges’ and universities’ educational missions. She suggested that one of the ways to achieve better harmony between the two was to keep athletics expenditures in check. Grant reminded her audience that the AIAW was committed “to developing programs which are of reasonable cost to our individual institutions,” and that in an era of “economic hardship, this becomes not only a philosophical responsibility, but a moral

one.” As women’s programs developed and received more resources as mandated by Title IX, Grant warned that “this nation simply can not afford a duplication of programs characterized by excesses,” particularly at Division I institutions. While acknowledging that the “path leading simultaneously to sanity and equality is not easily defined” in terms of finances, Grant was concerned that “some are inclined to take the expedient route: the duplication of the commercialized and more expensive men’s model.”<sup>278</sup>

As an example of the AIAW’s awareness of the financial challenges in intercollegiate athletics and how the organization put forth ideas to curtail the problems, Grant cited the AIAW proposal to limit all athletics scholarships to tuition only. She told her peers that “we must never allow the presidents [of colleges and universities] to forget that we in women’s athletics recognized the financial problems five years ago when we challenged the NCAA to adopt tuition only scholarships. That was a financially prudent move that was ahead of its time since it could have quickly created a financially reasonable model which simultaneously would have allowed the attainment of equal opportunity.”<sup>279</sup> Peg Burke also described this proposed AIAW policy, pointing out that near the close of the Delegate Assembly during her presidency, “Chris Grant introduced a resolution that called upon the other governing organizations to join us in offering tuition and fees only. That was a rousing end to that Delegate Assembly, and I think people left there with the feeling that we could influence athletics in a new direction.”<sup>280</sup> In a very close vote, the NCAA membership defeated the idea of tuition and fees only scholarships. Many NCAA members did not trust that their competitors would abide by the rule and would then gain advantages in the recruiting process. Despite an unsuccessful attempt to bring a sane spending approach to athletic scholarships, the



AIAW leaders' actions demonstrated that they were not just living out their key principles in an insular manner; instead, they were working to effectuate positive change that would impact all of intercollegiate athletics.

In terms of finances and staffing resources, Grant pointed to the AIAW's efficiency by contrasting it with the two major men's organizations: "The NAIA with 520 members has a full time staff of 12 and a budget of 1 million dollars. The NCAA with 730 members has a full-time staff of 56 and a budget of approximately 15 million. AIAW, the largest organization, with 1000 members, currently has staff of 7, and excluding our recent multi-year 1 million dollar contract with NBC, we have a budget of around \$700,000."<sup>281</sup> Grant used these "mind-boggling" facts to illustrate that the AIAW was functioning with a minimal staff and resources, relying on volunteers whose dedication to the cause would sustain and further the Association. The AIAW showed that it was possible to run a national championship sport program for college women that featured reasonable spending more in line with other extracurricular programs on campuses.

The AIAW further exhibited its fundamental characteristics by carrying out a fair nomination and election process for president followed by the presidents' inclusive approach to leadership. During one of the panel discussions, audience members raised the issues of the election process for the president and the subsequent role that person fulfilled. Laurie Mabry explained that the nominating process for president involved the nine elected AIAW Regional representatives. Mabry saw it as an "advantage of the nominating process" that there was no internal nominating committee that created the situation where someone in that small group had to know a candidate in order for them to

have a chance to become president. Any member institution could submit a name of a person for president as long as that person was willing to be considered: “900 member institutions have the potential to send in a name as do the nine freely elected regional representatives.”<sup>282</sup> The nominating committee comprised of the regional representatives then decided on candidates for the office of president and submitted them to the membership for a vote at the Delegate Assembly. Lee Morrison pointed out that there was a “write-in provision” in the event that a member wanted to add a candidate.<sup>283</sup> Charlotte West explained that she was able to use this option to continue her bid for president. Although she turned in the required materials for the application for president on time, her name did not make it to the ballot at the Delegate Assembly. West ran from the floor and was elected AIAW president by means of the write-in provision.<sup>284</sup>

When an audience member asked why the presidency lasted for only one year, the AIAW leaders exhibited their sense of humor when the overall response from the panel was that one year was all someone could possibly survive in that position. But, then the conversation took a more serious turn as Mabry clarified that the presidency really is a three year term: “You really have three years involved at that level. You come in as president-elect for a year, serve as president the next year, and then serve as past-president. So, you are really giving three years of service. It is a very demanding job.”<sup>285</sup> Morrison emphasized that the three leaders in the roles of president-elect, president, and past president in a particular year worked closely with the executive director and met frequently, particularly when significant issues arose that require monitoring and/or action.<sup>286</sup>

The AIAW presidents' descriptions of the way their executive committees functioned during their terms revealed how much they respected and utilized an inclusive leadership approach. Judie Holland recognized Peg Burke and Charlotte West as members of her executive committee and asserted that they “were the reason we were able to accomplish what we did during my term. They were both exceptionally supportive people, and as you know we’re very diverse people, yet we had the ability to argue at length for what we thought was right, but when we walked out of the room, we spoke as one person. And we upheld that throughout the years that I worked with those two people.”<sup>287</sup> Carole Mushier called the AIAW presidency “an awesome thing” that required a group effort:

No one, even if she tried, could do it alone. The three presidents—elect, current, and past—develop a type of unity and support system that is vital for the organization. That is not to say that they always agree—far from it. But, I have never been on an executive committee where we took a vote on an issue if one person disagrees. If this occurs, then it is talked out, reworked, and revised until all can live with the result. No wonder after the hours—and I should really say days and nights—of constant deliberation, it could appear to someone outside the committee that we are of one mind.<sup>288</sup>

Christine Grant referred to how much she had to learn during her year as president-elect, pointing out how important the executive committee was to her in the way that it provided the opportunity to work with “really supportive women” whom you can “rely on 100%.”<sup>289</sup> This positive relationship with the executive committee continued when Grant moved into the presidency. The goals for her presidency were formed through a team effort: “And when I say ‘our goals,’ I mean ‘our.’ Last year’s executive committee from my perspective really worked as a team, and I really liked that, really enjoyed it; and I have continued the same format.”<sup>290</sup> The AIAW established a process that allowed for Association-wide involvement in the nomination and election of its president;

subsequently, those elected president adopted an inclusive approach to leadership that integrated the talents of the president-elect, past president, and executive director.

The AIAW presidents' inclusive style of leadership embraced a concern for diversity. Grant listed as one of the major goals for her presidency to "increase minority representation on all AIAW committees." As Grant identified specific responsibilities for the AIAW's tripartite leadership structure, she emphasized that "all three of us are concerned with minority representation:" Carole Mushier would keep an eye on international committees, Donna Lopiano would focus on minority representation on national committees, and she would keep watch over all other committees.<sup>291</sup> During Grant's term, the AIAW passed legislation mandating that 20 percent of each committee be comprised of minority representatives. Immediately after the Presidential Review, some of the AIAW presidents were involved with leading another symposium on the Iowa campus titled Black Women in Sport.

Another notable aspect of the AIAW's inclusiveness was the extent to which the Association invited all of its members to engage in debate on issues and to express dissenting viewpoints. Rather than avoiding challenges to their philosophical construct, the presidents welcomed them from the perspective that constantly questioning their key principles provided assurance that they were doing their best to serve student athletes. This outlook fostered open-minded leaders. Lee Morrison reinforced this when she discussed the value of being flexible; her intense reflection on whether or not national championship tournaments were a good idea for student athletes placed her in the position of initially arguing against them in field hockey but then later leading the AIAW as it sponsored national championships in multiple sports.<sup>292</sup> Carole Oglesby had an

experience similar to Morrison as her views evolved on athletic scholarships for female student athletes. She explained that she was for them, against them, and then, ultimately, supported them. Oglesby's analysis was that this was not a sign of a weak philosophy; rather, it was an attempt to thoroughly think through the issue and to do what was best for student athletes.<sup>293</sup>

Other presidents commented on how important it was that the AIAW provided a forum for open debate and opposing viewpoints. Peg Burke was appointed to AIAW leadership positions after vehemently criticizing the Association at its first Delegate Assembly. Burke celebrated the AIAW leadership's tendency to welcome those with dissenting opinions, a reality that had made her a "convert" to the Association and "zealous" in her support of it.<sup>294</sup> Donna Lopiano predicted that the future of the AIAW would be no different than its first decade: the Association's members would continue to argue about its rules and principles. She proposed that this "process of constantly testing the original philosophical premises of the Association is a conflict and embroilment that is very positive in terms of producing a healthy organization."<sup>295</sup>

The AIAW's annual Delegate Assembly was the important inclusive forum in which the membership deliberated the Association's policies and positions. The first AIAW Delegate Assembly was held in 1973 during Carol Gordon's term as president. Gordon explained that a main goal of her presidency was to "provide a climate of trust where views could be freely expressed to a responsive executive board."<sup>296</sup> Her hope was that this environment would allow for the development of a more educationally-sound sport model. The Delegate Assembly was the means to achieve this goal, and Gordon offered a detailed description of the first one and what it accomplished. Her

assessment of the event highlighted its emphasis on a democratic and inclusive process as well as the degree to which the AIAW membership debated and argued important matters in order to reach the most desirable outcomes for student athletes.

Gordon identified the Delegate Assembly as the “high point” of the year, stating that “it really personified everything. Here is a two-year old organization and with everything else that needed to be done, yet setting as its first priority the organizing of a Delegate Assembly. Everyone told us it couldn’t be done.”<sup>297</sup> Despite the fact that planning did not begin until May, the AIAW Executive Board was able to organize and hold the Association’s first Delegate Assembly in early November, 1973, in Overland Park, Kansas. A majority of the membership—260 delegates representing 200 institutions—attended the event. Most of these delegates came to Kansas at their own expense and with little lead time since the official notice for the Delegate Assembly came out in August. Gordon commented on the Delegate Assembly’s significance for the membership:

What this Delegate Assembly action did, I think, is that it established once and for all that the membership was going to have a direct say on what went on in the organization. And, that there was going to be a vehicle in which these members could get to the executive board to influence decisions. It removed the isolation of the executive board, and it gave everyone an opportunity to react to what were then working documents: a constitution, by-laws, and rules and regulations governing financial aid.<sup>298</sup>

During the early stages of the development of the Association, the AIAW’s leadership strived to involve the membership in the deliberations over and subsequent approval of foundational and guiding principles.

Past-president Carole Oglesby organized the Delegate Assembly with support from Region 6 representatives. Gordon paid tribute to them for being willing to

undertake such a momentous task. It became clear that their efforts were worthwhile when Gordon referred to the letters she received after the meeting from enthusiastic women sport leaders. With great emotion, Gordon captured the significance of this moment for women who were gaining their first opportunities to be involved in intercollegiate sport governance:

There was no question that the women who were present felt that they had taken their place in history. It was really . . . well, I get teary even thinking about it, and you know, I'm the 'Old Guard.' It was just an exhilarating, exhausting experience. I still have arthritic knees as a result of the hours spent at the podium. But, think, at this Delegate Assembly, it was literally the first time . . . that the majority of the women had even thought about Title IX and what the implications for women's programs might be. Unbelievable!<sup>299</sup>

This historic gathering was the first time a national intercollegiate athletics governance organization brought together women interested in shaping college athletics, and it fortuitously occurred just as the newly passed federal law Title IX mandated an end to sex discrimination in educational settings. Gordon explained that the Delegate Assembly was the mechanism for alerting the membership about Title IX.

The other major emphasis was on reviewing and discussing the proposed constitution and by-laws, and the business meeting was spent on the rules and regulations that would determine eligibility. The membership discussed key issues until 3 a.m., and then a quorum was present to pick up at 8 a.m. the next day. This long, productive meeting made an impression on Gordon:

Talk about dedication. Talk about a kind of loyalty. Talk about a concern for issues. Whatever you want . . . we know people were still there because ash trays kept dropping on the floor as someone would fall asleep. I'm not sure that everyone heard all the debate about the issues because their friends kept waking them up to have them vote. But, for sure everyone was heard. Everyone wanted to talk, and everyone did!<sup>300</sup>

Gordon described a rather chaotic scene of long lines in front of microphones, and the licensed parliamentarian hired by the Association trying, mostly unsuccessfully, to dictate the order of speakers. Perhaps the frantic nature of the scene was best illustrated by the fact that the parliamentarian eventually just disappeared, and later the AIAW leaders determined that she had deserted the meeting. Moreover, as evening approached, AAHPERD pulled its clerical staff off of the stage, which was alarming because everyone viewed this as an historic occasion and wanted every word down verbatim. Chaos ensued as the AIAW leadership scrambled to set up a tape recorder, but they were able to accomplish the feat of recording every word. Gordon reflected on this series of events: “Perhaps it was this kind of fiasco that left us with the feeling that we all had a part in this. We all sure had a part in it, believe me!”<sup>301</sup>

Peg Burke also shared her perspective on the value of the Delegate Assembly, emphasizing the way it provided a forum in which all attendees’ voices were heard. Dr. M. Gladys Scott, the chair of the University of Iowa’s Department of Physical Education for Women (the Department of Physical Education and Dance at the time of the 1980 Review), sent both Peg Burke and Christine Grant to the first Delegate Assembly in 1973. Burke noted that Scott named Grant the voting representative, “which meant that I arrived at the Delegate Assembly with all this fiery rhetoric, and the only way I could get to a microphone was if the body yielded the floor because I did not have speaking privileges unless they were specially granted to me.”<sup>302</sup> The issue of athletics scholarships was a controversial topic that had persons flocking to the microphone for their opportunity to speak on the matter. Burke recalled that microphones were set up to



the left and right of the stage, and that the contingencies for and against scholarships each gathered at a particular microphone. Burke definitely had her turn to speak:

So all night long, Chris Grant, Linda Estes, and I proceeded to go to the right hand microphone and generally lace AIAW for its anti-scholarship position and for many other issues involving students. Laurie [Mabry], as she has said before, was very much against scholarships at that time; she . . . and a few others were taking turns at the left hand microphone, trying to counter what we were saying . . . and I'm quite sure Carol [Gordon] is right; we probably each took our turn. Each time I had to get the will of the body in order to speak, and they kept giving it to me, which impressed me in a kind of way because they would keep letting me come up and say evil things about them.<sup>303</sup>

Burke agreed with Gordon's assessment of the first Delegate Assembly: "Regardless of what position you had, you had a sense that history was being made." The possibility that the AIAW membership was merely being polite to Burke on one occasion in letting her express her views proved untrue when soon after the Delegate Assembly, President Morrison invited Burke to serve on the Association's Ethics and Eligibility Committee as well as to attend a "Think Tank" on Title IX. Burke was "surprised and pleased that here was this organization that obviously I had been an outspoken critic of, and I was being included in it. And that kind of flexibility, that kind of acceptance did impress me."<sup>304</sup>

Just over two years after berating the AIAW at the microphone at the first Delegate Assembly, Burke was the newly-elected president of the Association: one of the most "outspoken critics" was elected to the "top leadership role." Again, Burke was impressed by this: repeatedly, she has seen "other presidents take critics of a particular policy and place them on committees for their ideas to be heard and frequently implemented. I believe this is a commendable trait, and it has made me a deep admirer of AIAW as an organization and of those who have assumed various leadership roles in it.

In short, I am a convert to AIAW, and like many converts, I am zealous in my defense of it.<sup>305</sup>

Christine Grant also articulated the value and the significance of the Delegate Assembly:

As president of AIAW, I have been told by some that the Association tolerates no dissention. When I hear that, I sigh, for who in our midst could come to that conclusion, knowing that at all Delegate Assemblies major issues are debated for hours and even days. Ours is a unique organization whose definition of permanent policy is for one year. To my knowledge, no other organization has invited the vigorous debate on major issues to the same extent as AIAW. It is imperative that we understand that our Association is receptive to change, and our short history has proven this to be true. It is crucial that individual voting representatives realize that any topic is open for debate on the Delegate Assembly floor where pro and con statements can honestly be made.<sup>306</sup>

The Delegate Assembly was an inclusive forum that provided the opportunity for open debate and divergent viewpoints. This significant annual meeting was where the AIAW carefully and consistently scrutinized its philosophy and passed legislation to set in motion the various ways that members would live out the Association's key principles. From specific rules to protect students and coaches in the recruiting process to requirements for student athlete and minority representation on all committees to efforts to positively affect the national amateur sport scene, the AIAW membership's actions ardently championed student athletes' rights and the welfare of those involved in women's intercollegiate athletics.

As previously noted, Carole Oglesby contended that as the AIAW developed it became both a "threat" and an "enticing prize" to the male college sport governance establishment. While navigating the difficult terrain of the power struggle with the NCAA, the AIAW managed to create an alternative model of sport governance centered on the enrichment of student athletes' lives. However, this was no easy task. The AIAW

presidents drew attention repeatedly to how much of their time and energy was dedicated to overcoming the various ways their philosophy was misunderstood, misconstrued, and constantly challenged.

## CHAPTER 5 THE AIAW PRESIDENTS: LEADING IN CONSTANT CRISIS MANAGEMENT

In their individual presentations and panel discussions at the Review, the presidents brought to light numerous challenges they faced during their terms in office. A dominant theme emerged as the week progressed: the presidents were leading an Association that was often in a state of crisis management. Considering an AIAW president's multi-faceted responsibilities, Carole Mushier pointed out the difficulty of naming a unifying theme for the AIAW presidency, but she concluded that crisis management was the most appropriate choice.<sup>307</sup> Carol Gordon conveyed a similar assessment of leading the AIAW: "It was crisis management on a day to day basis," which often meant "no luxury of time to establish a real philosophical base for some decisions" and that "decisions had to be right the first time."<sup>308</sup>

Interestingly, the AIAW presidents encountered crises that were most often connected to something other than administering national intercollegiate sport championships for women, the primary purpose for which the Association was created. Lee Morrison remarked that the AIAW took on so much more than administering national championships and had essentially "become the quasi-labor union for women's athletics."<sup>309</sup> Peg Burke remembered fondly the great joy of attending the volleyball championships at the University of Texas during her year as president, noting that she was otherwise so caught up in crisis management that there was no time to relish the competitive events on the national stage.<sup>310</sup> Burke commented on how crisis management dominated the presidency:

To me, it's amazing that the AIAW accomplishes as much program-wise as it does because the leadership—the president—does not have time to focus on the program. And we have just been so lucky to have the Ethics and Eligibility

Committee people, to have the Championship Commissioners, to have the Regional Representatives, to have the others who can focus on the day to day aspects of what we are supposed to be about. The president is invariably off fighting either the brush fires or the forest fires. And often they are forest fires.”<sup>311</sup>

Lee Morrison worried about the toll of all of these crises on the AIAW leadership as well as the “depression of women who have been fighting the long battle” to gain opportunities and equity in athletics. She shared a perspective similar to Gordon’s: “Every decision we made during the first years . . . was so critical because it was the first decision. And, you know, we women have been very good about feeling responsible for never making a mistake. Society has done that to us, I think.” Morrison called attention to the “heavy burden” the AIAW leaders frequently shouldered back home on campuses due to the fact that they were not only representing women’s athletics but also physical education and women’s issues in general.<sup>312</sup>

The frequency and magnitude of the presidents’ crisis management duties were perhaps most visibly exemplified during Christine Grant’s first week of office in January 1980. At Carole Oglesby’s suggestion, Grant attempted to keep a daily diary during her year in office. The Presidential Review provided Grant with the opportunity to reflect on the week of January 14—18, 1980. On her first day as president, “the phone rang nonstop with calls from the media regarding the NCAA’s proposal to initiate championships [for women], and that was true not only for me but for the entire executive staff.”<sup>313</sup> Grant’s diary indicated her high level of frustration due to the NCAA officially starting women’s championships this instigated a seemingly endless barrage of questions about how the AIAW would address the situation. And, Monday was not over yet. Grant also learned on that day that there might be a USOC boycott of the 1980

Olympic Games. The AIAW's constituents as well as the media repeatedly requested the Association's position on the possible boycott. Grant had to answer, "I don't know," and hurriedly scheduled an Executive Committee conference call for the next day to discuss the NCAA actions and the potential Olympic boycott. The Tuesday conference call not only featured the NCAA and Olympics dilemmas, but also a request from the People's Republic of China to host their basketball team for a tour in February or March as well as a conversation about how the AIAW was going to push the USOC to get the specific sport National Governing Bodies to comply with the Amateur Sport Act.<sup>314</sup>

Grant's week continued its hectic pace as another crisis emerged. On Wednesday, AIAW legal counsel Margot Polivy contacted her to inform her that both the AIAW and NCAA had been named as third party defendants in a court case filed by the University of Alaska. The university was arguing that if it was acting in an illegal, discriminatory manner within its athletics programs, it was because "they were adhering to the differing AIAW and NCAA rules."<sup>315</sup> Grant oversaw another conference call on Thursday; this time it was a two hour discussion to develop "the question/answer approach that we were going to have on the NCAA action. And what we tried to do was to select the best possible questions in order to help out our membership." The AIAW membership was anxiously awaiting guidance on the most effective arguments to use to oppose the NCAA's entry into women's athletics. Grant's first week in office ended with a meeting on her own campus to review the December Title IX interpretations, the "first time that week that I had been reminded that I still worked at the University of Iowa."

During the month prior to assuming the presidency, Grant had reason to believe that the near future might offer a somewhat easier pathway for the AIAW. On Dec. 11,

1979, the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare released Title IX interpretations for athletics programs. Grant viewed this as a major

AIAW victory:

I and probably all other members of the Association were elated with our success. We had fought a machine [NCAA] with an enormous war chest, and we had won . . . That period of time between the release of the Title IX interpretations and the Delegate Assembly was for me the high for the entire year . . . For seven years, we had fought an extraordinarily difficult battle to retain a strong Title IX document. We had won, but the toll had been very heavy. Never have I worked with any group who more deserved a respite than AIAW at that point in our history. What we had accomplished in less than a decade is really unbelievable. And a small reprieve from the great pressures of a revolution seemed very little to ask in December of 1979.<sup>316</sup>

Encouraged by the Title IX victory, Grant chose a theme for her year in office: The Year of the Roses. She took this phrase from a song that commemorated the Bread and Roses Strike of 1912 in Massachusetts: women and children working in dire conditions in New England's textile mills went on strike. When police brutally assaulted some of the women and children who had walked away from their jobs, the negative publicity brought about a Congressional investigation and led to much improved conditions for the workers. At the Presidential Review, Grant played the song "Bread and Roses," for the audience, so they heard its emphasis on the female protesters' need for bread for sustenance as well as roses to nurture their overall well-being: this strike was not just about horrible work conditions and unfair wages. This strike was about improving women's and children's overall quality of life. A particular line from the song—"The rising of the women means the rising of the race"—aligned with Grant's perspectives on how the AIAW was trying to elevate women's position not only in athletics but in society in general.

As Grant described her chaotic and crisis-filled first week in office, she reminded the audience at the Review to “remember, this is the Year of the Roses, right?!” After the NCAA decision in early January to start women’s championships, Grant knew that she had chosen an impossible theme for the year: “We deserved our Year of the Roses in 1980. But, it was not to be. We have a strong Title IX document, which is very shortly about to be enforced. However, our right to create a different model for intercollegiate athletics is being severely challenged. In my opinion, we are now fighting for our very survival. I do not believe that I exaggerate. But, I do believe that we can win.”<sup>317</sup> Based on the way Grant unfolded the major events affecting the AIAW in December 1979 and January 1980, one can conclude that the AIAW had about three weeks of peace in its first decade that began with the release of the Title IX interpretations mid-December and ended abruptly when the NCAA voted to sponsor women’s championships for Divisions II and III in early January. Grant’s first week as president endures as a microcosm of the AIAW presidents’ struggles with 10 years of crisis management.

At the Review, the presidents provided insights on numerous challenges that they encountered in their AIAW leadership roles, including their decision to change their scholarship policy, their move to separate from AAHPERD, and their constant efforts to support and protect Title IX. Two areas that stand out as major ongoing crises for the AIAW—their struggles to legitimize their philosophy and their battle with the NCAA—are analyzed in this chapter.



### **Understanding their Philosophy: Challenges and Misconceptions**

In 1980, the AIAW had existed for less than a decade but found itself with even more members than the NCAA. While the presidents recognized their Association's rapid growth and its location at the center of a women's sport revolution, they dealt with the ongoing challenges that most people were unaware of their Association or misunderstood its programs and principles. The presidents were reminded regularly that establishing their Association in the real-world was a formidable task. Many of them also realized that some NCAA executive staff members were working to create a divide among the AIAW leaders by suggesting that female sport leaders were having a major disagreement about the meaning of "educational sport" and the best approach to women's sport governance. And, as the AIAW began to gain more power and resources, some of the presidents concede that they had increasing concerns about their efforts to stay true to their central emphasis on student athlete welfare. During their presentations and discussions in Iowa City, the presidents frequently discussed the crises that inundated their Association; one such ongoing difficulty was the necessity to constantly legitimize their philosophy.

At the start of the Review, Carole Oglesby described how female leaders in the Division of Girls and Women in Sport (DGWS) experienced a change in mindset and moved to supporting competition for girls and women.<sup>318</sup> A core group of these leaders decided that it was time to focus more on the gifted student athletes and provide high-level competitive opportunities. As noted in Chapter 1, this change to an outlook that valued competition for women fueled the founding of the CIAW, the precursor to the AIAW. Some of the experiences the presidents shared at the 1980 Presidential Review

indicated that many outside the circle of DGWS and AIAW were not fully aware of some female sport leaders' shift to more positive thinking about competition. Oglesby highlighted this kind of misconception when she referred to an article in the Western Michigan University student newspaper from January 1979 in which a quotation from the women's athletic director declares that from the beginning of the AIAW's existence, its leaders have done everything possible to "play down competitive athletics."<sup>319</sup> Oglesby responded emphatically to this assertion, saying that she "goes up the wall" when she reads something like this because "this is not true, and it really makes me angry."<sup>320</sup> After all the work by Oglesby and her peers to establish the AIAW's national championship program for college women, she was irate about the misconception that the Association was against competition.

Judie Holland recounted a similar incident when she served on a panel of speakers at an AAHPERD event that had drawn over 600 students.<sup>321</sup> The female speaker who preceded Holland made derogatory remarks about the DGWS and the AIAW, alleging that DGWS stood for "Don't Give Women Sports" and defining AIAW as the "Association for Interfering with Athletics for Women." The speaker asserted that the AIAW would rather women pimp on the streets than receive athletic scholarships. Holland grew increasingly nervous as she listened to this stinging criticism and knew that she was going to have to speak up for AIAW. Throwing out the speech she had prepared, Holland "spoke from her heart" about what she believed about women in athletics. She recalled receiving a standing ovation for the speech, a rousing start to her career in the AIAW and another example of how the Association's leaders had to confront misunderstandings.<sup>322</sup>

Some of the AIAW leaders also found that other athletics governance organizations were still in the dark about the AIAW's purpose. Second President Carol Gordon described a meeting with the Amateur Athletics Union (AAU) at which AAU officials expressed great excitement about the AIAW national championship programs. The AAU was interested in extending "their full support, including television coverage on CBS Sports Spectacular." The "high" that Gordon experienced when she thought of the recognition this could bring to student athletes and the publicity this could give to the AIAW quickly dissipated when she asked what sports the AAU would like to feature first, and the AAU representative exclaimed, "Cheerleading!"<sup>323</sup> Despite the fact that girls and women across the country were competing in athletics and had expanded their involvement in the sport scene beyond the singular role of leading cheers on the sideline for their male peers, many of the AIAW's constituents had a misconstrued perception of the Association's sport program. Several people were still struggling to move beyond the norm of girls and women as cheerleaders and spectators to acceptance of them as full-fledged participants.

The AIAW leaders not only had to deal with misconceptions about their Association, but also the reality that some were completely unaware of its purpose and potential value to intercollegiate athletics. For this reason, Christine Grant made it one of the goals for her presidential year to increase both internal and external understanding of the AIAW. She set out in 1980 to join her colleagues on the executive committee to give as many speeches about the Association as "humanly possible."<sup>324</sup> The central message of Grant's oft-given speech was simple and clear: we exist to serve the best interests of students and are worthy of support for our alternative model of sport governance.<sup>325</sup>

These efforts to inform constituents about the AIAW's purpose and value were directed most keenly at leaders in higher education.

On multiple occasions during the Presidential Review, the speakers referenced and described efforts to inform university presidents and chancellors about the AIAW as well as to involve them in the Association. Carol Gordon explained that during her term in office the Association formulated a philosophical statement on financial aid and recruiting and sent it to the presidents/chancellors of all member institutions as well as to some additional presidents who might be supportive of their position. According to Gordon, the AIAW leaders had "long debates over the wording in this philosophical statement," and she felt that they "were really going to be able to reach those presidents because we were offering them an alternative."<sup>326</sup> A disappointed Gordon noted that the AIAW received very few responses to their philosophical statement on financial aid and recruiting. She also pointed out that Executive Committee actions during her term included sending "another letter to university presidents extolling the virtues of the AIAW and portraying it as a way out for them if they would just listen to us. They didn't listen."<sup>327</sup>

Peg Burke also worked to initiate discussions about critical issues in intercollegiate athletics and to inform university presidents and chancellors of her Association's value. Burke's first board meeting as president resulted in acceptance of her proposal for the AIAW to hold a Summit Conference for Chief Executive Officers of Colleges and Universities with Donna Lopiano designated as the conference leader.<sup>328</sup> The AIAW held the Summit in Denver in December 1976 and featured George Hanford as the keynote speaker. Just prior to this address, Hanford authored the report, "The

Need For and the Feasibility of a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics,” for the American Council on Education (ACE) in which he argued that “intercollegiate sports were suffering from presidential inattention.”<sup>329</sup>

According to Burke, the AIAW Summit offered the presidents and chancellors a variety of sessions on topics such as recruiting, financial aid, rules comparisons between intercollegiate governance associations, Title IX, and even a “speak out” session for the leaders in attendance.<sup>330</sup> A group of presidents representing land-grant colleges passed a resolution proclaiming strong support for the AIAW as a governing institution. However, not as many Chief Executive Officers attended the Summit as the AIAW had hoped since some institutions sent vice-presidents, deans of students, or other college personnel. Burke accorded the AIAW credit for at least attempting “to address the problems in athletics” and for giving “the presidents an opportunity to hear all viewpoints.” She pointed out that the AIAW invited the men’s organizations—NCAA, NAIA, and NJCAA—to attend and present at the conference. The NAIA “in their usual supportive fashion at that time sent both their president and their executive director” as well as “several other members.” In sharp contrast, “the NCAA indicated that financially they were just called on to attend too many things,” so they sent a “local person.”<sup>331</sup> The AIAW expended considerable time and energy trying to involve leaders in higher education in discussions about intercollegiate athletics, hoping to enlighten them about the merits of their Association. As they did so, they made the effort to include the perspectives of the other college athletics governance associations.

When the AIAW presidents gathered in Iowa City in 1980, they were just weeks removed from an attempt to bring together higher education leaders and those directing

the country's major intercollegiate sport associations. Christine Grant explained that in February and June, 1980, the AIAW Executive Committee met with a newly established group—the Presidents' Committee on Athletics—formed by the American Council on Education (ACE).<sup>332</sup> This group was founded in part because the AIAW had asked ACE to assemble representatives from men's and women's college sport organizations in order to discuss athletics governance issues. The NCAA and NAIA declined the invitation to attend, citing inadequate lead time. Grant reflected on how the AIAW approached these meetings and what they tried to accomplish:

We were very disappointed that we were the only organization there, but we were warmly received. We told them the situation from our perspective. What we really basically tried to do was to explain the alternate governance structure that we had developed because it is not really understood by anybody outside the AIAW. We tried to solicit support for the chance to test our model, and we tried to solicit opposition to the proposed NAIA and NCAA championships . . . We urged that a forum be created for all three organizations to discuss and debate all of the possible solutions to our current problems in intercollegiate athletics. And at the second meeting, which was in June as I mentioned, we again stated our opposition to the unilateral actions by the NCAA and NAIA, and again we appealed for the creation of a neutral forum to debate the issues at an organizational level.<sup>333</sup>

The AIAW presidents diligently sought opportunities to inform college sport organizations and higher education leaders about the positive features of their Association, hoping for support for their alternative model. This was often an uphill battle due to disinterest and lack of engagement exhibited by those with whom they were trying to communicate.

Another perpetual challenge was informing student athletes—those the AIAW was designed to serve—about the Association's strengths. During a panel session that included Presidents Gordon, Morrison, Mabry, and Burke, a question from the audience led to a discussion about whether or not female student athletes currently competing in

AIAW tournaments and championships would willingly attend NCAA women's championships.<sup>334</sup> Another audience member observed that two former AIAW student representatives were in the room and asked for feedback from them on this issue. Their responses affirmed strong support for the AIAW amongst young women athletes who had direct exposure and involvement in the Association. But, they were concerned that many female college athletes had not been directly engaged with the AIAW or educated by their athletics directors about its philosophy. One of the former student representatives reported that the students she had spoken to at the previous two Delegate Assemblies expressed strong support for the AIAW philosophy and recognized that they had a voice in the AIAW that they would not have had in the NCAA.<sup>335</sup> She believed these students would refuse to attend NCAA Championships and would maintain support for the AIAW. A second former student representative offered her insights on the issue of student awareness of and support for AIAW:

Students who have been made aware of AIAW's philosophy—whose athletics directors have tried to include them in decision making on their campuses and made them aware—I think would support the AIAW. I still think there is a large number of the membership where many of the student athletes aren't aware of AIAW . . . and, therefore, look to the things that the male athletes have, the exposure that they get—things like that through the NCAA . . . I think that the athletes who have been educated support the AIAW, but I think that unfortunately a large number of the institutions have not made the effort to increase the representation, and therefore, we might not get the support that we need.<sup>336</sup>

Following this concern about lack of student awareness, another audience member lamented that the AIAW lacked the resources to more fully engage student athletes in the Association:

I have always felt that if there would have been a way, or if there were a way in the future, to finance these students to state level meetings, regional level meetings, and national level meetings, our problems would be almost all solved in this area. I find that once these gals have a chance to attend, and they get an

appreciation for what really goes on in decision-making, it doesn't anymore become just a game but they understand the background. And, I think that in of itself is one of the most valuable experiences that we can offer. I am just sorry that we haven't been able to do it more. That would have solved a lot.<sup>337</sup>

Another audience member proposed that the same could be said for university presidents and chancellors—they would also have had a much clearer and deeper understanding of the AIAW philosophy and principles if they were attending significant AIAW meetings.<sup>338</sup>

Christine Grant addressed students' and also some coaches' lack of understanding about the AIAW when she described her contrasting experiences attending the 1980 Division III and Division I AIAW women's basketball championships.<sup>339</sup> Grant "can't begin to describe the difference between the two championships" and remarked that the "attitudinal differences" of the student athletes and coaches between the two divisions were "extraordinarily obvious." She depicted the Division III championship as a "warm, cooperative, appreciative atmosphere" that she "thoroughly enjoyed." In contrast, the Division I championship featured a "business-like approach," leaving "little time or space for any human relationships." In her opinion, "the coaches' attitudes left a great deal to be desired." Grant was clearly discouraged by some of the students' and coaches' views that she encountered at the Division I tournament:

There was a complete, almost complete, lack of understanding on why the AIAW wasn't doing this and wasn't doing that and wasn't doing the next thing, as if in a way, the Association was hoarding up millions of dollars and putting it in the bank and denying it to the membership when it could have been used. All in all, I found it a very frustrating experience. I tried, and I do try, to understand the pressure on some Division I coaches, but I think despite that pressure there has to be some understanding of the philosophical and the financial basis of the AIAW. I don't necessarily put all the blame on the coaches. As an athletic director, I came home thinking: I wonder to what extent I personally have done a good education of our coaches here at the University of Iowa. Do they understand the strengths of the Association, and do they understand the limitations of the



Association, particularly financial limitations? Are they ready to trade the intangible values of the AIAW for the tangible or monetary values of a business model? So, I did quite a bit of soul searching after I returned from that particular championship. And, as I said, I think the blame must fall equally on us as athletic directors. And that remains our challenge, and perhaps one of our biggest challenges—to educate our coaches and our student athletes of our different approach, which honestly tries to protect their welfare in so many instances.<sup>340</sup>

Grant's observations serve as a compelling reminder that female athletes and their coaches were exposed daily to the men's programs on their campuses, which received much more funding and exposure. These benefits included NCAA funding to support championship play. One of the panel discussions at the 1980 Review established that the AIAW had begun to partially reimburse teams' travel expenses to national championships, and the feeling was that this practice could be expanded in the future.<sup>341</sup>

Grant's observations revealed that the AIAW leaders were contending with making students and coaches aware of their Association's "intangible values."

Charlotte West described an encounter with a male coach of a high-level women's team at a national championship that demonstrated once more the limited awareness of the governance structure of women's intercollegiate athletics.<sup>342</sup> She referred this male coach to the National Association of Girls and Women in Sport (NAGWS) rule book to clarify an issue, and he responded with "What's that?" even though he was at an AIAW championship. As she conveyed this brief but telling interaction with the coach, West emphasized that most of what coaches and athletes knew about the AIAW came from their experiences at national championships. She asserted the importance of the championship commissioner and others involved in overseeing Association championships taking on the role of ambassador and doing all they could to teach the participants and coaches, increasing their knowledge about the AIAW as well as

informing them about new legislation affecting their sports.<sup>343</sup> West's insistence about the importance of this role as educator showed that AIAW's leaders faced the ongoing task of instructing those they served about the intricacies of their Association.

Carol Gordon, who was dismayed with the lack of understanding about AIAW's programs and the AAU's request for featuring cheerleading on CBS Sports Spectacular, was thankful by the end of her term for just some basic awareness about the Association. She expressed thanks for the "dedicated support of a tremendous executive board, and through the work of so many, at least twice at the end of the year, I did not have to explain what AIAW stood for."<sup>344</sup> Beyond the need to clarify their Association's acronym, the AIAW presidents dealt with the even greater hurdle of disseminating their philosophy and guiding principles to constituents at all levels—from chancellors to students. In fact, at the very time the AIAW leaders were actively participating in the Presidential Review, they were spending every extra minute behind the scenes working on a document to send to the American Council on Education (ACE) that requested support for their alternative athletics governance model. At the end of the week in Iowa, Lee Morrison explained the presidents' activities away from their individual and panel presentations: "You might be interested in knowing . . . that this week has been no different from any other AIAW experience that I have had in terms of the fact that if you all were looking for us at lunch and at odd times, you didn't see us very much. We have been working . . . and I think we are all going through the same kinds of things that we've gone through in crises before, but we are united as a group. There is a plan, and we feel very comfortable with it."<sup>345</sup>

On the last day of the Presidential Review, Grant read the document that the AIAW presidents had prepared for the ACE. In it, they strived to convince some of the most powerful figures in academia that the AIAW offered the governance system that best served the female college athlete; furthermore, they emphatically called attention to the tremendous injustice of a men's athletic governance system being "forcibly imposed upon women." The AIAW leaders argued that a "carefully negotiated merger is one thing: a blatant takeover is another," and they requested support for a five-year moratorium on the NCAA starting national championships to allow for fair and meaningful conversations about governance options.<sup>346</sup>

The AIAW presidents spent much time and effort working to make others aware of their Association and what its alternative approach to athletics had to offer. They also had to contend with misconceptions about the AIAW's sports programs and philosophy. Analysis of the 1980 Presidential Review reaffirmed Burns' 1987 dissertation, which uses interviews with AIAW leaders to construct a feminist theory of leadership. As noted in this project's literature review, Burns develops the theoretical concept of legitimization.<sup>347</sup> She concludes that because the AIAW had an alternative philosophy of athletics that was different from and in many ways challenged the dominant ideology as represented by the NCAA, its leaders had to dedicate extensive efforts to legitimizing themselves and their Association.<sup>348</sup> Considering the toll of this constant need to legitimize their organization and its philosophy within the college sport world, it is not surprising that the AIAW presidents had moments of doubt about their ability to establish and expand their different vision for intercollegiate athletics and its female participants.

In addition to dealing with misunderstandings about their Association and some people's lack of awareness of its mission and purpose, some of the AIAW presidents also had concerns about maintaining their alternative athletics model. During the first panel discussion at the Presidential Review, Carol Gordon was asked about concerns for the future of AIAW. Gordon expressed distress about the erosion of women's leadership positions in both athletics and physical education departments and worried about whether or not the AIAW was really offering an alternative model of sport. She wondered if this alternative model was "ever possible" and if it was "just a dream."<sup>349</sup> Lee Morrison held strong to her belief in the value of the AIAW model, but identified one of the AIAW's unsolved problems to be its continued efforts to cope with success without becoming part of the system.<sup>350</sup> And, Laurie Mabry explained that she voted for the AIAW to retain its relationship with AAHPERD because she was concerned over the AIAW's ability to keep its continued "educational approach to athletics."<sup>351</sup>

In response to Mabry's concern, Peg Burke acknowledged that the AIAW's decision to separate from AAHPERD was "not an easy thing to see happen" because AAHPERD was the main professional organization for the women involved in AIAW.<sup>352</sup> Moreover, Burke expressed disappointment about the manner in which AAHPERD "actually pushed AIAW to the position they did." Even though the separation was difficult, she did not believe that the move demonstrated an AIAW departure from its philosophy. Burke was confident the AIAW could stand on its own with its strong principles: "If AIAW's commitment to an educational approach is so shallow that we can only retain it living in the house of AAHPERD, then I think that there is something

wrong with the depth of our philosophy. And, I don't think it is shallow. I think we have retained that focus."<sup>353</sup>

Mabry was bothered by the ramifications of the changing on-campus roles for women in intercollegiate sport leadership: "I have resigned from my position. Peg, how long are you going to last? This is what worries me. We had a professional educational background and birth, but others will come after us."<sup>354</sup> Mabry revealed that her concerns were rooted in the possibility that future women's sport leaders would not be connected to academic departments on their campuses. At the time of the Presidential Review, Mabry no longer held the dual position of athletics administrator and professor at Illinois State University as she did when she was AIAW president in 1975. She had moved to solely a faculty position. The AIAW presidents each completed a Ph.D. and served in various capacities as both professors and athletic administrators during their presidencies. Mabry's move out of athletics was indicative of a national trend. Separate men's and women's intercollegiate athletics programs were consolidating beginning in the mid-1970s, resulting almost always in a male being put in charge of both departments. It was challenging for female athletic administrators to further the educational sport model when a growing number were no longer in positions of power in athletics on their campuses.

At the end of the Presidential Review week, Christine Grant offered a comprehensive view of the scope of challenges and great pressures that the AIAW leaders faced as they work to maintain their philosophy of athletics:

As budgets explode, will we be strong enough to maintain educational athletic programs? As external and internal pressures increase, will we be strong enough to continue to place the welfare of the student athlete above that of the institution? As we and the coaches are drawn into the limelight, will we be strong enough to

continue to resist the temptation to use athletics for a personal ego trip or as a vehicle for increased personal prestige and status? As we press for full compliance with Title IX, will we be strong enough and creative enough to provide opportunities without duplicating the status quo? Personally, I am currently learning a strange truth. It was so much easier to be principled when I was poor, for at that time there was little choice. Perhaps that is our most crucial question for our organization today: can we and do we wish to remain principled now that we have a choice?<sup>355</sup>

Grant's remarks along with those of her peers called to the forefront the magnitude and complexity of the difficulties that the AIAW would have to overcome to continue to foster the growth of educational support. As she answered her own question about remaining principled in spite of these many obstacles, Grant reaffirmed the AIAW's alternate approach to sport governance as well as her deep commitment to it:

Obviously, I think we should because our principles are worth fighting for. Obviously, I think we should because we have the seeds of something different to offer the American sports world, a prototype for a new era of intercollegiate athletics. Obviously, I think we can, or I would not be here today. But, we can only if we collectively have the courage of our convictions, and only if we can retain the right to chart our own course through the AIAW. Perhaps to some these ideas are too idealistic or too radical; however, I would remind you in 1776 a much more radical and idealistic concept was sold to this nation. And, when I periodically remind myself of the magnitude of the change from autocracy to democracy in 1776, I can't help but wonder why we, in 1979, would doubt our ability to simply create a somewhat different model for intercollegiate athletics. In addition, there is another lesson that we can learn from history, and that is rights are never granted—they are only won. By the same token, I believe that we in AIAW must continue to fight for our rights—the rights of our students and faculty to be afforded equal opportunity and the right to have the time and the freedom to develop our own AIAW model for athletics.<sup>356</sup>

Grant appealed fervently to her colleagues to support their somewhat radical and idealistic convictions with the kind of courage exhibited by the founding fathers of the United States' democracy.

The AIAW Presidential Review provided the leaders with a forum for stating their philosophy of athletics and acknowledging the various challenges that had to be

overcome in order to advance it. The presidents confronted obstacles such as others' lack of knowledge about and misconceptions of their Association. Working through doubts about the reality of sustaining their educational model, they supported the AIAW philosophy as a personal cause that had the potential for far-reaching impact on athletics and on women's advancement in society in general. For the presidents, the AIAW philosophy was an alternative model of athletics that warranted an ardent defense; consequently, they dedicated much time and resources to the difficult endeavor of establishing their philosophy in the male-dominated environment of intercollegiate athletics.

### **The Constant Crisis: The AIAW's Battle with the NCAA**

Over the course of the Presidential Review, every president addressed the AIAW's ongoing struggle with the NCAA. The core of the conflict was essentially twofold: first, the NCAA repeatedly attempted to initiate its own women's championships with little to no regard for the AIAW's already established program and women's rights to self-governance; and, second, the NCAA directed abundant resources throughout the 1970s to fight Title IX's application to athletics, sending the message that they were in opposition to the government's mandate for women to have equitable opportunities and resources in educational sport programs. In Iowa City, the presidents highlighted the NCAA words and actions they found most exasperating. They also shared accounts of how they were able to unite and successfully fend off NCAA efforts to govern women's intercollegiate athletics. At the Review, the presidents offered the "inside story" on how they wanted to handle their major NCAA problem in the summer of 1980: the NCAA had already voted to hold Division II and III championships and would most certainly

vote to do the same for Division I in early 1981 at their annual convention. The NCAA's initiation of women's championships threatened the AIAW's existence, situating the presidents in the middle of their most significant NCAA crisis when they gathered for the Review.

First president Carole Oglesby reviewed the material on the NCAA in her files from the early 1970s and commented that it could have been just as easily written in 1980.<sup>357</sup> The problems with the NCAA started in the AIAW's first year and both persisted and escalated during the decade. While Oglesby's reflection confirmed the longevity of the AIAW and NCAA saga, Peg Burke's observations show the intensity of the conflict between the two organizations. Many of the difficulties the AIAW had to deal with were a direct result of NCAA executives' viewpoints and actions. Burke described being invited by AIAW President Morrison to attend a Think Tank on Title IX at which there was much discussion about how the AIAW would bankrupt college athletics if it did not support excluding the men's revenue sports from the law's jurisdiction. An NCAA representative threatened that if "you girls don't agree to exempting the revenue producing sports, the NCAA will throw a million dollars into the war chest and defeat the whole thing." Burke remembered responding in her "characteristically low key style" that such a statement by the NCAA "smacked of blackmail."<sup>358</sup>

In addition to the war chest comment, Burke outlined several other instances involving the NCAA that exemplified "the arrogance of men in athletics."<sup>359</sup> These situations "stirred an anger" in her that "eats at her guts" to this day. Burke pointed to the NCAA administrators holding a vote to begin women's championships at their annual



convention in 1975 without informing anyone in the AIAW or even their own membership beforehand. Due to these types of underhanded moves, she asked why any woman should trust the NCAA's intentions in regard to women's athletics. Burke provided more evidence pointing to why women in athletics should be weary of trusting the NCAA. When the NCAA Executive Director, Walter Byers, was told that women were receiving at the median 2% of overall athletics budgets at colleges and universities across the country, he commented that this was "not inadequate." Burke also referred to a quotation from Byers that was featured in an Omaha, Nebraska, newspaper in 1975. Byers stated that when the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) worked to implement Title IX it was "trying to correct the mistake that God made when he didn't create the sexes equal."<sup>360</sup>

Burke stated in 1980 that she had strong words for these types of NCAA actions that posed a constant challenge to the AIAW's progress:

To have male dominated organizations take over the control of women's athletics is more than the reorganization of intercollegiate athletics. It is the rape of women's minds. Compromise if you must on strategy, but do not compromise on principles. And, the consent of the governed is a rather important principle. A new and struggling country, against all odds and with great sacrifice, fought a war in 1776 to defend that principle. Can we in women's athletics afford to do less? I think not.<sup>361</sup>

Burke recognized that the AIAW's struggles with the NCAA that began in earnest during her presidency in the mid-1970s had intensified. She acknowledged that it was the current leaders of AIAW—Presidents Mushier, Grant, and Lopiano—who had to bear the "burden of the load" as the Association persevered to uphold its right to self-governance and its alternate model of athletics. Burke also called out by name all of the other

presidents and addressed many in the audience to point out that they continued to be key AIAW stakeholders:

Years of your sweat and ideas are also in this organization and an assault on it is an assault on your thinking and years of effort. Whatever you think may need to be changed in women's athletics can be more readily changed by AIAW than it can by an organization that tries to even resist an act of Congress . . . Why should any woman trust an organization that has fought and continues to fight Title IX?<sup>362</sup>

For Burke, the AIAW was a significant “product of women's thinking” that had already shown that it could make a positive difference in college athletics. In order to continue to do so, the Association had to battle NCAA attitudes and actions that clearly opposed a law meant to even the playing field for girls and women in the sports world.

Burke's outline of some of the more provocative NCAA comments briefly referenced the NCAA's 1975 vote at its annual convention to initiate women's championships. This surprise vote took place at the very same time the AIAW membership was gathered in Houston at its Delegate Assembly. Lee Morrison was serving as president at that time, and she provided an extensive explanation of how this was an example of both NCAA executives' scheming behind the scenes and of AIAW members' realization that they were capable of countering an NCAA initiative that threatened their Association.

In the months prior to the 1975 Delegate Assembly, Morrison explained that the AIAW had been in regular communication with the NCAA's Committee on Women's Athletics.<sup>363</sup> The two groups were discussing numerous issues, particularly the problems that arose from having different sets of rules for men's and women's athletics programs on individual campuses. The plan was to form a joint committee of representatives from both groups to continue dialogue, and the AIAW “went into the Delegate Assembly in

Houston with the clear understanding with the NCAA . . . that they would not start championships for women and would give us time to develop.”

At their 1975 gathering in Houston, the AIAW in their “usual way” invited “all kinds of groups to come to the Delegate Assembly.”<sup>364</sup> Morrison explained that the AIAW set up an evening program that included representatives from all of the men’s athletic organizations. Just hours before this program, Morrison received a call from a friendly reporter who was in Washington, D.C. at the NCAA Convention. The reporter divulged that the NCAA Executive Council was planning to introduce and vote on a resolution to start women’s championships. Morrison described the NCAA maneuver as a “breach of faith” and “a slap in the face to AIAW.” She recalled that the AIAW Executive Committee came together: “We told ourselves to keep cool. We decided to go ahead with the meeting that evening, and we announced what had happened at the Delegate Assembly. I don’t know what Tom Jernstadt’s [NCAA representative] salary was at that time, but he deserved every penny of it because he came to that meeting, and it was a very difficult position for him to be in.”<sup>365</sup>

Following an intense debate about the NCAA’s actions, the AIAW dismissed its evening meeting “and told people to go get on the phones. We tied up the switchboard!” The AIAW members flocked to every phone available and stood in long lines waiting to call their institutions’ athletic directors who were attending the NCAA Convention in Washington, D.C. and denounce the NCAA’s proposed move into women’s athletics. The staff at the hotel front desk where the NCAA Convention was being held paged each of the male delegates as the phone calls came in from Houston, summoning them from the floor of the convention and disrupting the ongoing proceedings. One of the women in

the audience at the Review recalled that journalist Candice Hogan reported in *Women's Sports* that this “guerilla warfare” was what one woman involved described as “the best planned political action since the suffragettes.” The AIAW also issued a press release “calling the whole situation piracy, which was a quotable quote” that was picked up by the national media.<sup>366</sup>

The political action in the form of a flood of phone calls that presented the AIAW's side of the story on the issue had its desired effect: the NCAA resolution to start women's championships did not pass the next day. Morrison named the “NCAA fiasco” in Houston as one of the most significant AIAW events in the last 10 years: “not from the standpoint of the fact that it was an NCAA crisis, but from the standpoint that we won. We found out that night and the next day . . . what political power can do. It was a success story. It did something that the first Delegate Assembly had started; it pulled those women together.”<sup>367</sup> While the AIAW won this round from Houston, the NCAA established a pattern that would taint future interactions with women sport leaders: the NCAA would send a committee to meet with the AIAW, but then the real power in the NCAA—the Executive Council—would undermine the word of its committee talking directly to women sport leaders and stun the AIAW with unexpected actions.

The NCAA carried out one of these actions near the time of the Presidential Review when it insinuated that the AIAW membership was deeply divided over the meaning of educational sport. The NCAA's suggestion of such a split in the AIAW was a “divide and conquer” strategy intended to sway women sport leaders to support the NCAA's entry into women's intercollegiate athletics. Carole Mushier addressed this NCAA tactic, taking the opportunity to clarify what educational sport meant to AIAW

leaders. Christine Grant and Charlotte West further analyzed the NCAA's attempt to "divide and conquer," establishing the degree to which the AIAW membership was united in its conviction for its educational sport philosophy.

As a result of the NCAA's assertion of a state of discord in the AIAW, Carole Mushier attempted to set the record straight on the AIAW membership's understanding of educational sport. She referred to a recent NCAA document that implied a split in the AIAW between those who were "basically physical educators" and those who wanted a "true varsity intercollegiate program."<sup>368</sup> The implication was that the "physical educators" preferred a version of athletics that was anti-competition and that shied away from making money while those seeking a "true varsity model" desired the highest possible levels of competition and revenue production. Mushier stated that the idea of this divide would be "laughable" if she did not know that some truly believed it to be factual. She used the NCAA's assertion of a philosophical division in the AIAW to elaborate on the meaning of educational sport, introducing her remarks by establishing that there is a "great, and perhaps contrived, confusion about the commitment of an individual to an educational sport position."<sup>369</sup>

According to Mushier, an AIAW leader "seeks excellence, winning, money, good coaches, equipment, facilities, travel arrangements, and all of the other goods, but not at the expense of the . . . human integrity, sense of individual value, and educational experience of the student athlete in particular and anyone associated with the program in general."<sup>370</sup> She established that the AIAW philosophy featured a primary emphasis on the welfare of student athletes but also supported secondary goals such as achieving winning records and revenue production. By suggesting that some AIAW leaders were

anti-competition and anti-profits, the NCAA aimed to entice some female administrators who wanted the “true varsity model” to support the NCAA’s approach to athletics and then efforts to initiate women’s national championships. Mushier refuted the suggestion of a philosophical divide in her Association, suggesting as evidence the AIAW membership’s recent vote on its desire to continue to oppose the NCAA’s efforts to initiate women’s championships and to exist as an autonomous entity with its own particular philosophy and governance model.<sup>371</sup>

Following her presentation, Mushier joined Presidents Burke, West, and Grant for a panel discussion and was asked again about this controversy over the educational sport philosophy.<sup>372</sup> In response, Mushier emphasized that she has not heard this idea within the AIAW, clarifying that it was suggested in the minutes of an NCAA governance committee meeting. Mushier offered further interpretation of the alleged division in AIAW when she addressed the NCAA’s assertion that “there are the old guard physical educators who are hanging on to the educational model fighting and scratching all the way, and there is this other new breed . . . that there’s the other side of the coin of the people who truly know what intercollegiate athletics is all about.”<sup>373</sup> Again, Mushier rejected the notion that the AIAW was divided over the concept of educational sport:

My notion was simply that if what these two models meant was what I said, then I do not see this great division. Granted, yes, there can be differences. I have said this in almost every speech that I have said in AIAW: money does not mean that something is non-educational, and there is some hang up with that as soon as money is in it. And, yes, the temptations are greater, and it may be tougher . . . but do not make that assumption. And, I think Judie Holland said that rather well. Everybody assumes that it cannot be educational sport at UCLA because they have had one of the biggest money programs since they first got their initial thrust in the country. So . . . fundraising . . . is going to kill the educational model? It’s about the way in which you relate to and feel about what your program is for, number one. And, that it’s for student athletes rather than for coaches and all the other people who get the perks from it.<sup>374</sup>

Mushier argued that the AIAW philosophy and profitable athletics could co-exist as long as the Association's primary focus remained on student athletes. Moreover, she disputed the NCAA's insinuation that the AIAW leaders had divergent perspectives on educational sport that were creating major conflict within the Association.

Presidents Grant and West also shared thoughts on the NCAA's intimation of a divisive split in the AIAW membership. They addressed the difficulties faced by the NCAA when this men's organization attempted to identify and communicate with women who were supportive of their efforts to start women's championships. Grant explained that according to NCAA meeting minutes, two AIAW members, Linda Estes and Mary Alice Hill, "supplied the NCAA Special Governance Committee with the names of women in the AIAW who might be likely to support NCAA initiation of championships, and from that list, the NCAA committee phoned 15 women."<sup>375</sup> Grant noted that a majority of these 15 women indicated support for the NCAA and that she viewed that as "a classic example of the divide and conquer theory in practice." Charlotte West was quick to interject: "It's interesting that there were 900 some women they could call, and they could only contact 15, and then only had a majority."<sup>376</sup> Only around eight out of 900 women in the AIAW were willing to step forward to support the NCAA's entry into women's athletics.

The discussion over the meaning of educational sport at the Presidential Review resulted in President Mushier clarifying and affirming the AIAW's student-centered philosophy. Additionally, Presidents Grant and West offered testimony to support the notion that the AIAW leaders and membership were much more united than divided in regard to their Association's direction and actions. This educational sport debate

suggested that it would be erroneous to conclude that because the AIAW leaders supported profit-taking and achieving excellence that they had abandoned their focus on the well-being of student athletes.

When the AIAW leaders gathered in Iowa City in 1980, they knew that their Association's future was tenuous. Not only were they confronting the NCAA's allegation of a philosophical division in the AIAW ranks, but they also were very concerned about the NCAA's entry into women's sport governance and the reality that this was likely to expand. Presidents Burke, Holland, Mabry, and West end the third day of the Review with a panel discussion that featured the week's most in-depth analysis of the NCAA crisis.<sup>377</sup> Overall, this dialogue revealed that the presidents were in agreement that it was time to once again present a united and strong front to fight the NCAA. One of the presidents had a position on the NCAA issue that was slightly distinct from her peers. In concert with the other AIAW leaders, Laurie Mabry was adamant about her support for the AIAW; however, she repeatedly implored her colleagues to prepare for the possibility of the NCAA takeover and to negotiate for representation in the NCAA structure. Judie Holland's outlook on the NCAA's entry into women's intercollegiate athletics governance conflicted with the other presidents' positions: she was amenable to the NCAA's efforts and contended that colleges and universities would be able to choose what was best for them: either AIAW or NCAA governance.

Early in the panel discussion, audience member Sharon Taylor, a coach and faculty member at Lock Haven University, asked the presidents if there were any conditions under which they would accept the NCAA governance plan for women's athletics. Peg Burke acknowledged that she had not studied the plan in detail due to no



direct responsibilities for athletics on her campus. Burke did have strong feelings about women being essentially forced to join any men's organization:

I don't care what you have in terms of voting strength, or whatever agreements you might have. If women are taken into the NCAA, they are still being taken in. They are still being accommodated, and if you look back through the records, that word is used time and time again: 'We [the NCAA] are going to accommodate the women's programs.' I don't think women in this world, and especially those of us in athletics, want to be accommodated. I think that we have shown from almost nothing that we could forge a new organization and a strong one and a worthy one and one that is going in the right direction.<sup>378</sup>

This was not the first time at the Review that Burke expressed concern about the AIAW being accommodated by existing sport governance organizations that were dominated by men. In an earlier panel discussion, she asserted that there was "a great deal of difference between having equal voice and having equal power" in an organization. From Burke's perspective, the AIAW already had secondary status in terms of power if it joined a previously established men's organization such as the USOC or the NCAA. Burke cited testimony she gave in 1976 to the President's Commission on Olympic Sports in regard to whether or not the USOC should be the superstructure for intercollegiate athletics to illustrate the inferior role women would likely have in either the USOC or NCAA:

Voting strength is not the only influence that operates in a governance situation. Being involved in the building of that structure also lends strength. Many groups were not involved when USOC poured the foundation—and I think we could insert here NCAA. Some were invited in to help construct the framework. Others came along to help nail on the roof. But, one group, a group that constitutes 51% of the population of this country has only, and then in small numbers, been invited in after the structure was built. If this Commission decides to recommend any of the existing structures, it will likely find that those who poured the foundation will retain the actual if not the voting power. And, most assuredly, those who poured the foundation, built the frame, and hammered on the roof will retain more power than those who were invited in to hang the curtains. And, I think that is where we are with the NCAA.<sup>379</sup>

After Burke addressed Sharon Taylor's question in regard to willingness to accept the NCAA model, Judie Holland joined the conversation, but found Taylor's inquiry to be somewhat perplexing:

I am not sure that I really know what you want to get at Sharon. I don't have a ready answer for you. As I said, I think I have thought very differently on the subject. And, I believe that I am at odds with most of the other presidents of AIAW. And, I don't think I really want to start a major war here. That is not the purpose of this group, and it would be totally inappropriate for me to do so. I do not fear the NCAA. I never have. I have always felt that if we really believed in our educational focus, and if we really believed in what we were doing, once we got going, and we are going now, no question in my mind, we ought to extend that into men's athletics. I think schools have the freedom of choice here to do what they want to do, and I believe that people will make that choice based on what they think is best for their school. I don't see the demise of AIAW under any circumstances. I think it is too strong. I think it stands for too many good things. I do think we have to find some ways to talk to the men. I don't think we have been exceptionally good at that. I try not to be critical of other people; it's just the way I saw it. I don't think that I was exceptionally good at it either. But, I did try to open doors.<sup>380</sup>

Holland viewed the NCAA's entry into women's athletics as a much more innocuous venture than did her peers who predicted that the AIAW would not survive if the NCAA initiated women's championships for all divisions.

An emotional Laurie Mabry entered the discussion to clarify that in her individual presentation the previous day, she had not, as Taylor suggested in the preface to her question to the panel, commented on her acceptance of the NCAA plan: "I spoke to the point that I think in AIAW, we've got to get our heads out of the sand. Decisions in athletics are not made on logic and what's fair. So, in no way did I answer your question yesterday, nor would I ever voluntarily go with [the NCAA]. I am just saying, 'Watch out,' that's all."<sup>381</sup> Mabry was clearly worried that the AIAW's fate was more in the NCAA's hands than some of her fellow presidents wanted to concede.

From the audience, Carole Oglesby refocused the attention on Holland's comments. Oglesby asserted that Holland had been inconsistent in a newspaper article when she stated that current student athletes in her program and around the country were "educationally sound" but that they would go to any national championship no matter what organization sponsored it. Holland clarified her remarks:

He [the reporter] felt that our student athletes at UCLA . . . would much prefer to go to an AIAW championship. Well, I have to be honest with you and tell you that I don't think that is correct. I think our student athletes know that we belong to AIAW, and they know that they go to AIAW championships. But if we took the same philosophy of AIAW and moved it over to the NCAA and just called it something different, and the NCAA did it, what would be the difference?<sup>382</sup>

Oglesby was quick to state why she found Holland's comments to be problematic. While she agreed that too much could be made of labels or titles, Oglesby contended that "Women" in the title of AIAW was important. Moreover, Oglesby questioned how practical it was to believe that the positive features of the AIAW philosophy could be easily transferred to the "preexisting structure of the NCAA," an organization many during the week had exposed as unethical. Oglesby had a "hard time accepting" this possibility "except in a very long term view." Holland responded that she usually took a long term view of things, and also suggested some other reasons to collaborate with the NCAA. First, "the men in athletics have an awful lot of problems," and she had "a lot of confidence" in her ability to resolve the men's issues. Holland declared her personal ambitions:

I have to be real selfish about some things . . . I am very ambitious, and I don't think that I have ever hidden that. People in my region often talk of me as power hungry and use some other terms that I find to be extremely complimentary, and when they say them, I want to tape record them and play them back in my sleep so that I can get better. The thing that I wanted to do most at UCLA was to be the director of intercollegiate athletics for men and women, and we just had a recent retirement. The reason that I wasn't hired was because I had no experience in

football, and I had not dealt with problems in men's athletics. I have to get that experience someplace. And, I am going to spend the next couple of years to get it because I am going to tell you that my ultimate goal is to direct the whole program.<sup>383</sup>

The audience responded with laughter as the other presidents on the panel all tried to speak at once to respond to Holland. Mabry explained that Holland might be shocked to learn that the two of them actually agreed that the AIAW's different approach to athletics would inevitably change men's athletics. However, Mabry disagreed with Holland on the point "that athletes who come from a different setting than we have will be sound educationally. And, that is why I say if an equal voice structure [in the NCAA] were forced, I think we have a better chance to affect what we really want to bring about. I also have great fear that no logic will be utilized as the decisions are made. And, if we fight our separatism too long, we may end up with only nothing or only what the NCAA proposes which is close to nothing."<sup>384</sup>

Charlotte West affirmed that Holland was one of the most talented athletics administrators in the country but emphasized that in terms of power positions in intercollegiate athletics that "the game isn't played both ways." While men who had no experience in sports like women's volleyball and field hockey were administering women's sports all over the country, women were not getting even minimal opportunities to work with men's sport programs. Burke more directly addressed Holland, saying that she would be there to cheer for her if and when she was offered the overall athletics director job at UCLA because "women in these positions are very much needed. But, I hope that after a few years of preparation when you apply for another job of a similar nature that you don't find that the real reason you weren't hired was because you are a woman."<sup>385</sup> Holland's disclosure of a personal agenda that involved collaborating with

the NCAA in order to get the experience she needed for advancement in administration differed markedly from the other presidents' approaches to the NCAA crisis.

Near the end of the panel discussion, Donna Lopiano addressed the presidents on the stage, calling attention to specific challenges they faced during their presidencies and the strong positions they took to overcome these obstacles. She reminded the audience that under Laurie Mabry's leadership the AIAW refused to even consider exempting revenue producing men's sports from Title IX and that Judie Holland took a firm stand on the necessity to separate from AAHPERD during her term as president. Lopiano evoked these examples to bolster her colleagues' resolve because she sensed from some "a refusal to believe that we can once again rise up and conquer."<sup>386</sup>

Mabry acknowledged that the AIAW succeeded in defeating the NCAA in the past, but she saw a different intercollegiate sport landscape in 1980:

This is five years later, and they're back. And, two-thirds of one organization [NCAA] has already voted it [women's championships] in, and the other [NAIA] has totally voted it in . . . I'm saying its progressive, and I believe that it is going to happen. And, I believe that we've got to push also for the best that can happen to us when it does happen. And, that doesn't mean I want to join the group voluntarily. I would prefer still to stay separate and be strong about wanting to be separate. I'm just saying that we may not have a choice.<sup>387</sup>

Burke wanted to make certain that her colleagues did not doubt her desire to engage the NCAA full force: "If you sense a wavering in me, you have misread me. Just because the wolf has been at the door five times doesn't mean that I am going to put down the welcome mat." Mabry responded that she hoped that Burke was not implying that she was laying out the welcome mat for the NCAA.

Sharon Taylor entered the discussion again after having posed the initial question that opened the debate about the AIAW leaders' views on the NCAA's recent actions.

Taylor inquired if the AIAW could fight for its right for self-governance and its alternative model of athletics even though Title IX or any other law might not empower the cause: “Is it necessary to have a clear cut statute behind us, or can we take the position that we simply feel is morally right? Do we have to have legislation for us to make a decision, or can we take the position just because it is the right thing to do?” Immediately after Taylor uttered her final question, Holland asked, “What is the right thing to do, Sharon?” For Holland, the discussion about the NCAA was not a moral issue; in fact, she proceeded to turn the discussion about morals on the AIAW, criticizing the AIAW for initially denying women athletic scholarships.

For Charlotte West, Taylor’s plea for her peers to consider the AIAW’s position on the NCAA on moral grounds struck a chord:

Regardless of the end product, and we can define the end product as two separate organizations, and of course, I have already offended some people because we keep talking about the NCAA and just as important to some people is the NAIA, but separate governing organizations for men and women. If that is the end product that so many people want, fine. And, of course, our membership has told us that this is what they want, so as leaders, I think that is important to keep foremost in our minds. But, if there are others in the group who really believe that for the best of student athletes and the easiest, which I hate to hear, and efficient way of conducting athletics activities on campuses is one organization for men and women, I would like to set that end product aside and say that I think that anyone who is a person of integrity would have to admit that the process that we are witnessing is very, very faulty. You know, the history of the NCAA is just a continuance of what I think a really ethical person would judge unethical. And, I don’t care who it is—if you were to go over to your philosophy department on your campus or you talked to your clergyman—whoever you want to talk to that you have high respect for their integrity, they have to be offended at the process. I think it is a time where we all have to speak out on the process regardless of what the end product would be . . . I think we should take every avenue possible to avoid that type of process or object to it. I know that I am going to give 110%, and I think most of the people I have talked to are going to give 110% too. I think the frustration is the realism of how successful those attempts might be. And, I guess maybe we have to help each other not to go into the game with a defeatist attitude.<sup>388</sup>

West's intense prompting to focus on the process by which the women's intercollegiate governance issue was worked out rather than the final product shows that the AIAW leaders were keenly aware of the NCAA's frequent unscrupulous moves to gain power over women's athletics. Her comments also reflected that the AIAW leaders were not refusing to consider various outcomes for national college sport governance, but they were demanding a fair and equitable process for such deliberations.

Mabry was concerned that West's warning of being a "defeatist" was aimed at her. Rather than giving up on the cause, Mabry viewed herself as instead giving "an accurate projection of what is going to happen to us. And we are not ready for the other."<sup>389</sup> This panel discussion that thoroughly explored the NCAA's entry into women's athletics closed with presidents Grant and Oglesby contributing their perspectives on the debate. Grant identified with Mabry's worries when she recognized that the "onslaught has started once again." However, she saw a way forward to get the results the AIAW desired. For Grant, this current battle with the NCAA was "very similar to the Title IX picture from last year. And, we did it last year . . . I think we did it because we acted collectively in a unified fashion . . . and I am still very optimistic that we can win even with no law supporting us. I think this is a moral issue and reasonable people who are not even in athletics are as offended as we are with the process . . . What have we got to lose by trying?" Oglesby echoed Grant's rally to once again rise to the occasion in this struggle with the NCAA and stated the importance of the AIAW being a strong presence on the college athletics sport scene. If the AIAW ceased to exist, Oglesby predicted that it would be very destructive to women's opportunities.<sup>390</sup>

The panel discussion that featured Presidents Burke, Holland, Mabry, and West as well as much dynamic interaction with the audience offered an in-depth perspective on the AIAW's debate over how to deal with its newest and most challenging NCAA crisis. The intense discussions on the NCAA topic confirmed that the presidents were generally in agreement that they needed to forge ahead in a unified front to halt the NCAA's entry into women's intercollegiate athletics governance. Two of the presidents present offered alternative viewpoints. Laurie Mabry warned her peers that even their most dedicated efforts were unlikely to prevent the men's organizations from completing their pursuit of overseeing women's athletics. Mabry advocated that the leaders should not only concentrate on the AIAW remaining separate, but also that they should work on negotiating equal representation—the best deal possible—in the NCAA structure. In striking contrast to her peers, Judie Holland viewed the NCAA's entry into women's athletics as an opportunity to give the male leaders assistance with their problems and to subsequently gain the experience and contacts required to achieve advancement to an athletics director position at a major university such as UCLA, her current workplace.

In light of Holland's admission of her intention to collaborate with the NCAA, then current AIAW President Christine Grant could not have been too surprised when Holland contacted her a few days after the 1980 Presidential Review and asked to have her name removed from the document the presidents drafted during the week to send to the American Council on Education (ACE).<sup>391</sup> Holland had no interest in her name being associated with a plea to ACE to support the AIAW in fending off the NCAA's advances into women's athletics.



University of Iowa graduate student Pat Rosenbrock's 1987 dissertation that explored women sport leaders' persistence in and assimilation into NCAA Division I athletics following the demise of the AIAW offers insights into what was occurring when in 1980 a very small minority of AIAW leaders such as Judie Holland had a divergent view about the NCAA's role in women's intercollegiate athletics as compared to the other presidents.<sup>392</sup> After thorough interviews with female Division I athletics administrators in the mid-1980s, Rosenbrock developed "A Theoretical Model of Dealing with Assimilation" that explains how women were dealing with moving into the dominant NCAA culture.<sup>393</sup> Her theory "rests on the relationship of two disparate continua: 1) level of feminist consciousness and 2) level of perceived power, autonomy, and control on the job."<sup>394</sup> Rosenbrock created a visual image of two intersecting axes: a horizontal axis that showed a continuum of high and low levels of feminist consciousness and a vertical axis that indicated high and low levels of power, autonomy, and control on the job. Within the model's various quadrants, she placed and then defined various types of female sport administrators dependent on their location along the two continua: Boat-Rockers, Soloists, Burn-Outs, Nurturers, Victims, and Drop-Outs.<sup>395</sup>

Rosenbrock's description of Boat-Rockers and Soloists are most germane to the end of the 1980 Review when Judie Holland spoke about her willingness to work with the NCAA in order to reach her personal ambitions and then later communicated her subsequent request to remove her name from the AIAW's document asking for support from the ACE. According to Rosenbrock, Soloists "tend to be male-identified, disavow feminism, and blame women's condition on women's own weakness and fear. Their agenda is much more individualistic. Their assumption is one of meritocracy . . . They

are determined to make it in a man's world, on man's turf, playing by man's rules."<sup>396</sup> In contrast, Boat-Rockers "are woman-identified, declare themselves to be feminists, and have a high level of consciousness regarding women's oppression. As a result they are committed to social change, are social activists, and utilize their autonomy and power in the workplace to push a change-oriented, egalitarian agenda."<sup>397</sup>

The presentations and dialogue at the Review indicated that in 1980 many of the presidents fit the role of Boat-Rocker, meaning that they had high levels of feminist consciousness and power in their leadership roles. This put them in the position to believe in the value of preserving the AIAW's autonomy and philosophy and to be ready rise up again to deal with another NCAA threat. The very small minority of leaders such as Holland who departed from the mainstream AIAW viewpoint and joined with the NCAA displayed perceptions of power similar to the Boat-Rockers, but unlike them, seemed to possess a low level of feminist consciousness, thus positioning them as Soloists. Rosenbrock explains that "women with power but without feminist consciousness are likely to support the status quo, fail to support the advancement of other women, and direct their efforts towards individualistic needs."<sup>398</sup> Rosenbrock's theoretical model provides the means to analyze opposing perspectives within the AIAW leadership during a critical time for the Association. Clearly, the degree to which the presidents had developed a feminist consciousness shaped their positions on the NCAA issue and the best way forward for the AIAW.

The AIAW leaders' dialogue about the NCAA's efforts to sponsor women's championships demonstrated that it was a major external crisis that was also affected by nominal internal dissent. The overwhelming majority of the presidents and the

membership were in harmony: the AIAW—dedicated first and foremost to serving female student athletes—was the best organization to govern women’s college sports. The presidents’ criticism of the NCAA’s actions, such as West’s assertion that the NCAA consistently engaged in an unfair process to gain control of women’s athletics, indicated that most of them were well aware that the patriarchal male sport domain was not reaching out to them to seek their expertise or their philosophical perspectives. Rather, the NCAA coveted power over women’s athletics, particularly in light of Title IX’s mandate to share opportunities and resources with the underrepresented sex. Holland’s alliance with the NCAA never propelled her to the athletics director position at UCLA that she desired. Unfortunately for the AIAW, Mabry’s prediction that the NCAA would take over women’s athletics despite a valiant effort by her Association’s members proved to be true.

### **Lopiano’s AIAW Prophecy**

On the last day of the Presidential Review, president-elect Donna Lopiano delivered a “five minute prophecy” about the AIAW that focused profoundly on the NCAA crisis. She proposed that the model of athletics that women had created would triumph over the older and more established men’s version because “men’s athletics had set the proponents of educational sport against them.”<sup>399</sup> In contrast to the AIAW, the men’s governance organizations had “avoided academia” and had “lived in fear of testing their philosophical construct against that of an educational model.” In unison with all but a few of her colleagues, Lopiano called for an all-out battle against an NCAA takeover. She did not demand that the AIAW remain a separate organization, but she did declare that any future version of athletics governance that involved her Association’s leadership

and members would have to feature an “educational conscience.” As she predicted a tough battle ahead for the young AIAW, Lopiano asserted that the knowledge the Association had gained during its first decade and its firmly established philosophy would allow it to triumph over the NCAA:

We will be embroiled in conflict for the next ten years and probably the next twenty, externally. But the difference will be that the AIAW will knowingly, consciously, eagerly, and vigorously act to produce that external conflict. We have learned that intercollegiate athletics is a game—as Carole [Oglesby] so well said—of power, money, and sex. And, we have learned how to play it. We have a far stronger sword than money. We have knowledge: knowledge of what educational sport is, knowledge of why we exist, of why sport is good for student-athletes. And, we have knowledge of power and politics and how to use both of those things.<sup>400</sup>

Lopiano emphasized the significance of the educational sport model and its positive influences on student athletes as she sought to instill confidence in her counterparts and to lead the charge for the AIAW’s survival.

Lopiano rallied her colleagues by arguing forcefully that “all of the conditions for massive and irreversible change are present.”<sup>401</sup> She outlined a number of reasons why this change in intercollegiate athletics was inevitable with the most important one being that “women have become political animals with a vested interest in the sport system.” In just a decade, the AIAW leaders had learned how to navigate the difficult political landscape of intercollegiate sports, and Lopiano predicted that she and her colleagues would use their newly developed skills to rise up to challenge the NCAA’s efforts to govern women’s athletics: “We can and we will produce . . . a massive amount of political pressure. And you have to be part of that just once to realize how good it feels, and how easy it is if you are willing to work for it and to use people outside of athletics to

take the place of women in athletics who cannot operate on their campuses for fear of retribution.”<sup>402</sup>

The AIAW had already used political pressure to defend against the NCAA’s efforts to fight Title IX. The NCAA was unsuccessful in its lobbying efforts in Congress to eliminate Title IX as it applied to athletics or to alter the law by exempting men’s revenue producing sports from its jurisdiction. The NCAA’s next move was to gain power over women’s intercollegiate athletics. Lopiano knew that the NCAA administrators would push forward with their goal to offer women’s championships in all divisions, and she set the stage for how this fight would unfold:

This will be a telling year. The NCAA by all accounts, and there is no doubt in my mind, is pulling out all the stops. They are throwing every gun into the fray; they are pulling all the boards out of the woodwork, and they are attempting to take care of and take over women—to eliminate the bothersome conscience in the person of women. Most of you know that. Few of you, however, I think, in looking at the NCAA, this massive, wonderful construct, few of you have looked beside you. Few of you have looked at the people standing next to you. Academic women and men, let me assure you that the AIAW is pulling our own boards out of our own woodwork, moving now and into the next decade to take care of and take over all of athletics. And to put in place an educational conscience that will change the face of athletics for men and women for evermore.<sup>403</sup>

Women’s ways of thinking about and leading athletics had brought a much needed moral compass to intercollegiate sport. According to Lopiano, this “educational conscience” that was so fundamental to the AIAW and its student-centered philosophy had the potential to substantially change all of college athletics.

Lopiano’s predictions shed light on the fact that women in athletics had evolved to become “political animals,” the majority of whom were prepared to navigate the sexist terrain of intercollegiate athletics and to fight to maintain their principles. She ended her prophecy with a reminder that engaging in the struggle and continuing to persevere were

for the benefit of student athletes: “AIAW’s future is very clear to me. It is sheer determination; it’s sheer effort and hard work. But, it’s also that really neat feeling that has made this doable, all of this: the feeling good, the self-esteem from knowing how good we are for student athletes, the smiles on our kids’ faces.”<sup>404</sup>

After Lopiano’s “five-minute prophecy” for the AIAW, the presidents dedicated the remaining minutes of the Review to informing the audience of some of the details about their strategies for battling the NCAA. Part of the leaders’ plan was to empower AIAW members and supporters on individual campuses with extensive information so that these persons could articulate persuasive arguments for why their institutions should vote against an NCAA proposal to sponsor women’s championships for Division I—an initiative the presidents were certain would be forthcoming at the 1981 NCAA Convention. As pointed out previously, the AIAW leaders’ other major strategy was to continue an aggressive appeal to higher education leaders to ask for support for their educational model. The presidents ended the week in Iowa City by drafting and signing a document that urged the American Council on Education (ACE) to intervene in the conflict between the AIAW and the men’s governance organizations. The document was accompanied with a press release that included a statement from current President Grant:

There is absolutely no question that the leadership of women’s athletics is strongly united in the opinion that the time has come for a neutral body of chief executive officers to step into the intercollegiate athletics picture. The fundamental issue at stake in the men’s unilateral decisions to initiate women’s championships is whether those directly involved in women’s athletic have the right as did those involved in men’s athletics to develop an athletics program and system of governance designed to meet the interests and abilities of female student athletes or whether a system designed to serve men’s athletic programs should be forcibly imposed upon women. When the many smoke screens are blown away, this emerges as the basic issue, an issue with which neither the men’s organizations will deal. They either do not understand or do not choose to understand. A carefully negotiated merger is one thing; a blatant takeover is

another. We are witnessing the latter. This is not equality, and it is equality for which we must strive.<sup>405</sup>

Grant ended the AIAW Presidential Review by reading aloud the document to be sent to ACE and her accompanying statement—an invigorating send-off for the audience and presidents as they left Iowa City and returned to the challenges of the real world.

The months following the Review brought the major conflict that Lopiano forecasted but not the outcome she and her peers worked so hard to achieve. At its annual convention in January, 1981, the NCAA membership first defeated the proposal to start women's championships for Divisions II and III. However, the AIAW's victory was short-lived. NCAA senior officials lobbied vigorously to change voters' minds, and when the measure was reconsidered, it narrowly passed. Soon after, the AIAW began losing members as well as financial resources, including the television contract with NBC. In October, 1981 the AIAW filed an antitrust lawsuit against the NCAA as a last attempt to prevent the NCAA from taking over women's athletics governance. The lawsuit eventually failed, and the AIAW made the difficult decision to close its doors at the end of the 1981-82 academic year.<sup>406</sup> The AIAW may have been able to survive for a few more years, but the AIAW leadership realized that conflicting AIAW and NCAA rules simultaneously governing women's intercollegiate athletics would create chaos that was not in the best interest of female student athletes.<sup>407</sup>

The powerful and established NCAA proved to be too much for the AIAW to overcome. This battle over athletics governance was the culminating event in a decade of constant crisis management. The presidents managed a variety of challenges, most of which had little to do with their primary function of administering sport programs. The AIAW leaders worked tirelessly to correct misconceptions about their philosophy and for

their constituents to understand the many ways it benefitted student athletes. Repeatedly and with varying degrees of success, they rose to the occasion to stave off the male college sport establishment's threats and divisive strategies. It is remarkable that with a larger membership than any of the men's athletics governance associations and far less resources they were able to persevere in a contentious environment and a state of constant crises to administer a successful, broad-based, national women's sport program that focused intently on the welfare of the student athlete.



## CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

The presidents created a “living history” of the AIAW at the Presidential Review that displayed the vital leadership roles they undertook during a critical period for women in intercollegiate athletics. The Review provided the presidents with a forum for extensive and thoughtful reflections. They were intentional about preserving their Association’s story, leaving for posterity a primary source that is a valuable addition to the AIAW historical narrative and that allows for significant contribution to feminist sport historiography. At the Review, the presidents offered insights on their pathways to sport leadership, explained how they understood and lived out their philosophy and key principles, and described the challenges of leading a national association that was in a constant state of crisis.

The presidents’ pathways to sport leadership depicted how they overcame obstacles to their own sport participation and dealt with the growing pains associated with trying to play, coach, and administer athletics during a time when girls and women were striving to establish a place in competitive sports. They started as novices with limited funds and resources and forged ahead to provide opportunities in the sport realm long-dominated by men. When the presidents took office, some had limited sport experiences—one president had never run a mile—while a few had enjoyed the thrill of winning national sport championships. They emerged to sport leadership from a continuum of experiences in athletics and education: blatant discrimination on one end and transformative opportunities on the other. And, they did so with an unyielding commitment to provide quality educational sport programs for college women.

Some of the presidents indicated that along their journeys to sport leadership they developed an understanding of sexism in society that motivated them to work for change in the patriarchal environments of education and sport. Only a few of the presidents identified themselves as feminists, but as a whole, they knew that they were in the midst of changing times—a women’s sport revolution. In the center of this revolution, they relished the chance to play a part in creating sport programs that gave female student athletes the opportunity to reach their potentials. Recognizing the value of athletics in their own lives, the presidents viewed their leadership roles as more than a professional duty; the AIAW was a personal cause.

One of the significant outcomes of the Presidential Review is that most of the presidents shared aspects of their autobiographies, offering meaningful narratives about what it was like to play, coach, and administer intercollegiate athletics in the AIAW era and decades leading up to it. Their histories bring to life the ways that views about appropriate gender roles infused through a patriarchal society often made it very difficult for girls and women to play competitive sports and serve as reminders of the many struggles that had to be undertaken to break down barriers and open doors for females in athletics and academics. Current generations can benefit from knowing these stories. As feminist historians Jane Sherron De Hart and Linda K. Kerber contend, one of the most effective ways to keep a group of people oppressed is to keep them from knowing their own history.<sup>408</sup> The presidents’ descriptions of their pathways to leadership impart an essential message about how girls and women have had to overcome numerous obstacles just to get to play. These narratives can function as impetus for feminist interventions in athletics.

Forty years after Title IX there are many more opportunities for girls and women in sport, which is certainly something to celebrate. However, this progress can lead to complacency—a sense that girls and women have now “made it” in sport and the struggles are over. In reality, female college students still have considerably less athletics participation opportunities than their male peers. The data about leadership positions in intercollegiate athletics are troubling as well: around 80 percent of athletics directors and coaches in college sports are men.<sup>409</sup> The AIAW presidents’ journeys to sport leadership invite us to know and appreciate their efforts that expanded opportunities for girls and women in athletics and education, and most importantly, they call us to engage in feminist interventions that can lead to more equitable participation and representative leadership in sport.

Another important aspect of the Presidential Review is the forum it provided for the presidents to explain their philosophy and to show how they lived it. Carole Oglesby and Christine Grant articulated that the AIAW’s central focus was on the enrichment of the life of the student athlete. The AIAW vision also included expanding participation opportunities for girls and women athletes and establishing athletic programs that were in perspective and in balance with the overall lives of the participants. The AIAW philosophy has been documented thoroughly in other sources; however, the Presidential Review offers some distinctive perspectives on it. The Review marks the only time in the AIAW’s existence when all of the presidents gathered in one location for an extended period with the specific purpose of documenting the history of their Association. At this gathering, the presidents collectively affirmed the AIAW philosophy; even Judie

Holland, who was in favor of the NCAA's move into women's athletics, supported the philosophy with the belief that it could be extended to men's athletics for its benefit.

Most intriguing, though, is how the Presidential Review establishes that the AIAW philosophy developed and persisted in a "saga of power, money, and sex." A phrase not previously associated with the AIAW philosophy in other studies, it points to issues of power, particularly along the lines of class and gender. Presidents Oglesby and Lopiano frame the Presidential Review with this phrase, and a critical feminist cultural studies approach is a useful lens through which to explore the power issues the Association's leaders contended with as they worked to establish and advance their alternative vision of intercollegiate athletics. The AIAW was both a "threat" and an "enticing prize" to the men's athletics governance organizations for many reasons: the AIAW was acquiring votes in powerful sport organizations, supporting Title IX, expanding women's presence in and influence on the male sport domain, and proving women's athletics could be profitable. In this complex and challenging context, the AIAW leaders established a student-centered philosophy, and the Presidential Review portrays how they persevered to accomplish this goal.

The week in Iowa City also afforded the presidents the opportunity to explain how they lived out their philosophy. To make certain that student athlete welfare was paramount, they established principles and rules that provided students with due process, with representation in the AIAW governance structure, and with recruiting and transfer rules that both protected and empowered individuals. The AIAW leaders further emphasized their strong belief in initiatives that focused on student athletes' rights when they worked with the federal government and other sport organizations on the 1978

Amateur Sport Act. The AIAW also emphasized broad-based sport programs in which all student athletes were treated as equally as possible and each membership institution had a vote on every piece of legislation. Concerned with the lack of diversity in their governance structure, the AIAW members voted to require 20 percent minority representation on their committees. The annual Delegate Assembly was the means by which these laws and principles were debated and enacted. The Presidential Review elicited multiple passionate statements about how significant the Delegate Assembly was to the entire AIAW membership: it allowed for extensive deliberations and encouraged dissenting opinions, resulting in an inclusive governance model in which all participants could offer meaningful input.

As the presidents provided examples of how they put their rules and principles into action, they showed that the AIAW brought a more student-centered focus to athletics governance as compared to the well-established men's model. During the AIAW era, the NCAA was routinely criticized for a number of reasons—even by the U.S. Congress for its lack of due process for student athletes. The presentations and discussions at the Presidential Review firmly established that the AIAW leaders and members were concerned with student athletes' welfare and dedicated to advancing student athletes' rights. To hold each other accountable and ensure decisions were in the best interest of student athletes, the presidents used their democratic and inclusive Delegate Assembly.

The AIAW presidents were fortunate to have a firmly established philosophy because it was needed to guide an Association that was in a constant state of crisis management. While the AIAW leaders clearly understood their philosophy and its value,

most outside their Association and even some within it did not entirely comprehend the AIAW's mission or had misconceptions about its purpose. This posed a formidable challenge for the AIAW because it was trying to survive as a largely unwelcome newcomer in the patriarchal domain of college athletics. The AIAW leaders needed both internal and external constituents to recognize and value their alternative model of athletics in order for it to remain viable. In particular, the AIAW presidents were counting on higher education leaders to realize their Association's worth and to speak out against the NCAA's unilateral takeover.

As the AIAW presidents worked to solidify their position on the national sport scene, they were losing power within their own Association. Charlotte West explained that at the first AIAW Delegate Assembly, virtually every voting representative was the person (almost always female) overseeing the athletics program for women.<sup>410</sup> During the 1970s, colleges and universities were merging their men's and women's athletics departments, and in most every case, the male administrator was given power over the entire department. West estimated that by the 1978 Delegate Assembly, female voting representatives who were in control of the women's athletics programs on their campuses were down to 70 percent. West experienced this on her own campus when she was "blindsided" by a letter that took away her status as the AIAW voting representative and gave power over women's athletics to a Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics. This loss of voting rights and power was "one of the first manifestations of the lack of opportunity for women in athletics to try anything different than what was the practice in men's athletics."<sup>411</sup>

The ongoing crisis that was the greatest challenge to the AIAW involved the NCAA. The Presidential Review is replete with examples of NCAA actions that threatened the AIAW and consumed its leaders' resources and time. In Iowa City, the presidents established both the longevity and the intensity of the conflict with the NCAA. They chronicled how the NCAA executives implemented a variety of tactics to gain power over women's athletics. Some of the NCAA's top leaders insinuated that the AIAW membership had differing views over the meaning of educational sport in order to garner support from female leaders in athletics—a divide and conquer strategy. Moreover, they brought proposals to start women's championships to their convention floor without effectively communicating with the AIAW leadership or showing concern for the possible negative effects on the women's Association. On the national stage, the NCAA hired a lobbying firm—put a million dollars in the war chest—to fight the application of Title IX to athletics. This assault on Title IX meant that the AIAW had to constantly rise up to defend the law that was so integral to its goal of expanding participation opportunities and providing more equitable resources for girls and women in athletics. The tragic irony for the AIAW leaders is that once they succeeded in protecting Title IX and shaping the interpretations for compliance in athletics that were released in December, 1979, the NCAA pursued its objective of governing women's intercollegiate even more vigorously. Within a month, the NCAA had passed legislation to start women's national sport championships for Divisions II and III.

The key events of the NCAA and AIAW confrontation have been documented in a variety of sources; however, at the Review, the presidents revealed intricate details and their personal thoughts about the crisis. It was in these intense and often controversial

interactions with the NCAA that the AIAW lived its “saga of power, money, and sex,” encountering sexist attitudes and a persistent unwillingness to accept women in the power structure of college athletics. The presidents thoroughly debated how they would deal with the NCAA’s attempted takeover. With the exception of one president who supported the NCAA, they vowed to fight for their right to chart their own course and to carry out their primary purpose of serving student athletes. The presidents’ commentary at the Review on the NCAA crisis and many other challenges faced by their Association offers insiders’ perspectives and the opportunity to create a fuller and more dynamic history of the AIAW.

The fact that the AIAW had to shut down after just eleven years points to why many have never heard of the Association or have any idea that a female governance organization administered women’s college athletics during the sport revolution of the 1970s. In analyses of Title IX and the progress in women’s athletics over the past fifty years, the AIAW is often relegated to footnote status. The AIAW may often be left out of the major attention given to Title IX, but the Association’s leaders deserve extensive credit for battling the patriarchal male sport establishment and preserving the law as it applies to athletics. While the AIAW as a physical institution did not survive, its philosophy lives on through many of the Association’s leaders who have persisted in their roles in sport administration and academia and have remained dedicated to improving college athletics for both women and men. Their willingness to become involved in the NCAA governance system even after the ordeal they had experienced meant that over time they could help to bring some of the key AIAW principles to mainstream college sports. By the 1990s, some of the former presidents had even gained



enough power in the NCAA to begin moving the organization towards giving attention to gender equity and some support for Title IX. In recent years, I have joined former AIAW Presidents Grant and West to work on gender equity and Title IX projects for the NCAA. Moreover, I have heard President Lopiano speak on reform issues in intercollegiate athletics at several NCAA sponsored events.

As noted in Chapter 2, the AIAW has been the central subject of only one published book: Ying Wushanley's *Playing Nice and Losing, The Struggle for Control of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000*. While this research project did not set out to directly address Wushanley assertions, it does problematize some of his findings. Because I was able to acquire first access to the entire collection of Presidential Review tapes as well as to study with and to have as mentors former AIAW leaders, I have had the rather unique opportunity to explore a significant AIAW event from close range and to construct a "history from within" the Association. My examination of the tapes has yielded evidence supporting the presidents' conviction for and adherence to their philosophy of educational sport. In contrast, Wushanley contends that the AIAW leaders cared more about having power over intercollegiate athletics than "about the welfare of those they controlled."<sup>412</sup> Furthermore, he frequently uses the term hypocrisy when he refers to the AIAW and its educational sport model.<sup>413</sup> Wushanley concludes that the Association kept up a "noble appearance of its philosophy" to maintain its separate organization and that in reality, it had adopted the men's traditional model of athletics.<sup>414</sup>

The Presidential Review highlighted the AIAW rules and principles that supported an educational sport model. Legislation requiring due process and student representation in the governance structure was passed not in order to control student

athletes but to protect their rights and give them a meaningful voice in an Association that was created to serve them. Rules such as these—crafted with student welfare in mind—were nowhere to be found in the NCAA’s governance structure during the AIAW era. While the AIAW did implement some NCAA practices such as offering scholarships and seeking profit through sponsorships and national championships, it did so while maintaining its student-centered focus.

Another way evidence from the Presidential Review confounds Wushanley’s claims is through consideration of the presidents’ narratives about their pathways to sport leadership. As established in Chapter 3, a dominant theme from these narratives is the extent to which the AIAW leaders valued athletics in their own lives and wanted to provide meaningful sport experiences for other girls and women. Some of the presidents identified as their crowning achievements those moments when sport programs they coached or administered transformed young women’s lives. These genuine revelations make it difficult to accept the charge that they persisted in sport leadership more for the purpose of gaining power than for concern for student athlete welfare. Evidence from the Presidential Review problematizes Wushanley’s notions about hypocrisy and the AIAW educational sport model because from the first introduction to the closing remarks, the Review confirms that the presidents’ foremost purpose for involvement in developing and leading women’s intercollegiate athletics was to enrich the lives of student athletes.

As the AIAW presidents gathered in Iowa City in the summer of 1980, they knew that the future of their Association was tenuous. Christine Grant indicated that they were also aware of what they had achieved in less than a decade:

Looking back over the past eight years, I am astounded by what the AIAW has accomplished, and I think we ourselves do not fully appreciate what we have

done. In 1971, who would have believed that today we would have a membership of almost 1000 strong? In fact, who would have believed that we have survived this long? But, not only have we survived, we have created an organization which is credible, which is strong when attacked, which is thoughtful under stress, which has already had an impact on the American sports scene, which is strong to respond to changing times, and where necessary, revise and restructure, and which most importantly has the audacity, the courage, and the creativity to try different approaches. All of this done while living through a revolution.<sup>415</sup>

Although the AIAW survived its “saga of power, money, and sex” for only two more years after the Presidential Review, the Association left a legacy of an educational sport model that reformers in college athletics continue to pursue for the benefit of student athletes as well as a strong Title IX that ensures girls’ and women’s rights to worthwhile experiences in athletics and education.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Martha H. Verbrugge, *Active Bodies: A History of Women's Physical Education in Twentieth-Century America*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 10.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 109-152.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 150.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 13.

<sup>7</sup> Virginia Hunt, "Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: An Historical Perspective," (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976), 186.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 187.

<sup>9</sup> Welch Suggs, *A Place on the Team: The Triumph and Tragedy of Title IX* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005), 13.

<sup>10</sup> Hunt, "Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," 58, 60.

<sup>11</sup> L. Leotus Morrison, "The AIAW: Governance by Women for Women," in *Women in Sport: Issues and Controversies*, edited by Greta L. Cohen (Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993), 62.

<sup>12</sup> Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, *AIAW Directory 1980-1981*, (Washington, DC: AIAW, 1980), 3-4.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 1.

<sup>15</sup> Karen Blumenthal, *Let Me Play: The Story of Title IX* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005), 42.

<sup>16</sup> Table 1 shows that seven of the presidents have professional titles indicating they were overseeing women's athletics on their campuses. The wording of these titles is inconsistent. Historically, female physical education professors oversaw women's athletics on their campuses as an additional duty in their academic departments. As women's college athletics expanded in the CIAW/AIAW era, colleges and universities

established specific roles and titles for a female administrator in charge of women's sports in the athletics department. The AIAW presidents' varied professional titles show that there was no established way on a national level to name these positions. There would not be time to develop one either because by the late 1970s, many colleges and universities merged their separate men's and women's athletics departments. Many women were relegated to associate or assistant positions or in some cases moved out of athletics altogether. It is interesting that Presidents Grant and Lopiano, who held the title of Women's Athletic Director, evaded the merger movement and remained in charge of a separate department for women.

<sup>17</sup> Peg Burke, *AIAW . . . A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review* (Iowa City, IA: Department of Physical Education and Dance, 1980)

<sup>18</sup> Peg Burke, Christine Grant, and Bonnie Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid.

<sup>22</sup> Suggs, *A Place on the Team*, 57.

<sup>23</sup> Burke, Grant, and Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Bonnie Slatton, Personal Papers. "Appendix D, Women as Leaders Conference Speakers and Topics, 1978-1988," *Women as Leaders Conferences*. Department of Physical Education and Dance, University of Iowa.

<sup>26</sup> L. Leotus Morrison, "The AIAW: Governance by Women for Women," 65.

<sup>27</sup> Jennifer Hargreaves, "Querying Sport Feminism," in *Sport and Modern Social Theorists*, ed. Richard Giulianotti, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 187, 202.

<sup>28</sup> For recent information on gender equity and Title IX in intercollegiate athletics that shows that women continue to lag behind men in participation opportunities and resources see: Amy Wilson, *The Status of Women in Intercollegiate Athletics as Title IX Turns 40*, (Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2012), <http://www.ncaapublications.com/productdownloads/TITLEIX.pdf>.

<sup>29</sup> Suggs, *A Place on the Team: The Triumph and Tragedy of Title IX*, 2. Additionally, a number of books were published to coincide with Title IX's 35<sup>th</sup> anniversary and point to the legislation's importance: Blumenthal, *Let Me Play: The Story of Title IX*, 2005; Nancy Hogshead-Makar and Andrew Zimbalist, *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2007); Linda Jean Carpenter and R. Vivian Acosta, *Title IX* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2005); *Sporting Equality: Title IX Thirty Years Later*, edited by Rita Simon (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2005); Suggs, *A Place on the Team: The Triumph and Tragedy of Title IX*; Susan Ware, *Title IX: A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 2007).

<sup>30</sup> Carole Oglesby, "Individual Presentation." DVD 1. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD; Donna Lopiano, "Presidential Review." DVD 24. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980), DVD.

<sup>31</sup> Susan Birrell, "Feminist Theories for Sport," in *Handbook of Sport Studies*, ed. Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000), 61-76.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 61.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 67-68.

<sup>37</sup> Jennifer Hargreaves and Ian McDonald, "Cultural Studies and the Sociology of Sport," in *Handbook of Sport Studies*, ed. Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000), 55.

<sup>38</sup> Jennifer Hargreaves, "Querying Sport Feminism," in *Sport and Modern Social Theorists*, edited by Richard Giulianotti (New York: Palgrave, 2004), 198.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 199.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 200.

<sup>41</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>42</sup> Slatton, Personal Papers. "Appendix D, Women as Leaders Conference Speakers and Topics, 1978-1988."

<sup>43</sup> Examples of collections of essays on women and sport from the AIAW era include: Barbara J. Hoepner, ed. *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy* (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974); Ellen W. Gerber, et al. eds. *The American Woman in Sport* (Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1974); Carole A. Oglesby, ed. *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality* (Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, 1978); Stephanie L. Twin, ed. *Out of the Bleachers: Writings on Women and Sport* (Old Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press, 1979); Reet Howell, ed. *Her Story in Sport: A Historical Anthology of Women in Sports* (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982); Mary A. Boutilier and Lucinda SanGiovanni, eds. *The Sporting Woman* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1983).

<sup>44</sup> Edward J. Sims, "Introduction." *Development of Human Values through Sports* (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1974), 7.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> John W. Loy, "Foreword," in *The American Woman in Sport*, ed. Ellen W. Gerber, et al., (Reading, MA; Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1974), iv.

<sup>47</sup> George H. Sage, "Fertile Field: Humanism in Sport," presentation to Central Association for Physical Education of College Women, Lincoln, Nebraska, October 3, 1975.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Barbara J. Hoepner, "Preface," in *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974), 2.

<sup>52</sup> Margaret C. Dunkle, "Equal Opportunity for Women in Sports," in *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974), 9.

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>54</sup> Carole A. Oglesby, ed., *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978)

<sup>55</sup> Ibid., vii.

<sup>56</sup> Wilma Scott Heide, "Feminism for a Sporting Future," in *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, ed. Carole A. Oglesby (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978), 195-202.

<sup>57</sup> Carole A. Oglesby, epilogue to *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, (Philadelphia: Lea & Febiger, 1978), 255.

<sup>58</sup> Patricia L. Geadelmann, "Introduction," in *Equality in Sport for Women*, (Washington D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1977)

<sup>59</sup> Christine Grant, "Effectuating Change" in *Equality in Sport for Women* (Washington D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1977), 104-114.

<sup>60</sup> Examples of writings on women and sport by Burke, Grant, and Slatton that followed their contribution to *Equality in Sport for Women*: Peggy Burke, "The Effect of Current Sports Legislation on Women in Canada and the U.S.A—Title IX," in *Her Story in Sport: A Historical Anthology of Women in Sports*, ed. Reet Howell (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982), 330-342.; Christine Grant, "Institutional Autonomy and Women's Athletics," *Educational Record* 60, (1979), 409-19.; Bonnie Slatton, "AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics," in *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, ed. James H. Frey (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982), 144-154.

<sup>61</sup> Virginia Hunt, "Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: An Historical Perspective," (PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976).

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 1.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 270.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 252-253.

<sup>66</sup> Bonnie Slatton, "AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics," 144-154.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 153.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 154.

<sup>70</sup> Hunt, "Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," 252-253.



<sup>71</sup> Carole Oglesby, "Future Directions and Issues," in *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, ed. Barbara J. Hoepner (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974), 64.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>73</sup> Bonnie Slatton and Susan Birrell, eds. *Arena Review* 8, no. 2 (July, 1984).

<sup>74</sup> The contributors to this edition of *Arena Review* include: Athletics Administrators: Christine Grant and Donna Lopiano; and Sport Academics: Susan Birrell, Ann Hall, Bonnie Slatton, and Nancy Theberge.

<sup>75</sup> Bonnie Slatton and Susan Birrell, "Introduction," *Arena Review* 8, no. 2 (July, 1984): i.

<sup>76</sup> Kristin Burns, "Reconstructing Leadership Experiences: Toward a Feminist Theory of Leadership," (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1987), 4-5.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 71, 91-92.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 147.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 148.

<sup>80</sup> Burke, Grant, and Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>81</sup> Joan S. Hult, "The Legacy of AIAW," in *A Century of Women's Basketball: From Frailty to Final*, eds. Joan S. Hult and Marianna Trekell (Reston, VA: AAHPERD Publications, 1991), 281-307.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 297-302.

<sup>83</sup> Joan S. Hult, "NAGWS and AIAW: The Strange and Wondrous Journey to the Athletic Summit, 1950-1990," *JOPERD* (April 1, 1999) <http://media-server.amazon.com/exec/drm/amzproxy.cgi./Mzg0IEL0/caxMKbPqwNldElb>.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 7.

<sup>85</sup> Joan S. Hult, conversation with author, March 30, 2007.

<sup>86</sup> Joan S. Hult, "Women's Struggle for Governance in U.S. Amateur Athletics," *International Review for Sociology of Sport*. 24, no. 3 (1989): 249.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 255-259.

<sup>88</sup> Hult, conversation with author, March 30, 2007.

<sup>89</sup> Suzanne C. Willey, "The Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women," (PhD diss., Indiana University, 1996), 1-38.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., vii.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 241.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., 238-241.

<sup>94</sup> Allen Guttman, *Women's Sports: A History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991), 212-214.

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 213.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid.

<sup>97</sup> Catriona M. Parratt, review of Allen Guttman's *Women's Sports: A History*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991) in *Journal of Sport History* 20, no.1 (Winter 1993), 302.

<sup>98</sup> Jennifer Hargreaves, *Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sports* (London: Routledge, 1994), 3.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 174, 179-180.

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 180.

<sup>102</sup> Susan K. Cahn, *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women's Sports* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994), viii.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 6.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., viii.

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 248-49

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Catriona Parratt, "About Turns: Reflecting on Sport History in the 1990s," *Sport History Review* 29 (1998), 10.

<sup>109</sup> Mary Jo Festle, *Playing Nice: Politics and Apologies in Women's Sports* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996) xxiii.

<sup>110</sup> *Ibid.*, xxii.

<sup>111</sup> *Ibid.*, xiv.

<sup>112</sup> *Ibid.*, 208.

<sup>113</sup> Wushanley, Ying. *Playing Nice and Losing: The Struggle for the Control of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2004) xiv.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 156-157.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, 72, 113, 124, 158-159.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 158-159.

<sup>118</sup> Sara M. Evans, *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (New York: Free Press, 2004), 193.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>120</sup> Peg Burke, *AIAW . . . A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review* (Iowa City, IA: Department of Physical Education and Dance, 1980)

<sup>121</sup> Peg Burke, "Individual Presentation." DVD 11. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 16, 1980), DVD.

<sup>122</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>125</sup> Carole Mushier, "Individual Presentation." DVD 18. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 17, 1980), DVD.

<sup>126</sup> Lee Morrison, "Individual Presentation." DVD 6. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 15, 1980), DVD.

<sup>127</sup> Ibid.

<sup>128</sup> Laurie Mabry, "Individual Presentation." DVD 8. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 15, 1980), DVD.

<sup>129</sup> Ibid.

<sup>130</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>131</sup> Donna Lopiano, "Individual Presentation." DVD 23. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980), DVD.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid.

<sup>133</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>134</sup> Ibid.

<sup>135</sup> Ibid.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> Ibid.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid.

<sup>140</sup> Carol Gordon, "Individual Presentation." DVD 3. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid.

<sup>142</sup> Ibid.

<sup>143</sup> Lee Morrison, "Panel Discussion." DVD 5. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD.

<sup>144</sup> Ibid.

<sup>145</sup> Ibid.

<sup>146</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>147</sup> Ibid.

<sup>148</sup> Ibid.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid.

<sup>150</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 18.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> Ibid.

<sup>154</sup> Ibid.

<sup>155</sup> Ibid.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid.

<sup>161</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 23.

<sup>162</sup> Ibid.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid.

<sup>165</sup> Ibid.

<sup>166</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>167</sup> Ibid.

<sup>168</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 23.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid.

<sup>170</sup> Ibid.

<sup>171</sup> Ibid.

<sup>172</sup> Ibid.

<sup>173</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 18.

<sup>174</sup> Ibid.

<sup>175</sup> Charlotte West, "Individual Presentation." DVD 17. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 17, 1980), DVD.

<sup>176</sup> Laurie Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 8.

<sup>177</sup> Ibid.

<sup>178</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 6.

<sup>179</sup> Ibid.

<sup>180</sup> Lee Morrison, "Individual Presentation." DVD 7. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 15, 1980), DVD.

<sup>181</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>182</sup> Ibid.

<sup>183</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid.

<sup>186</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>187</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 23.

<sup>188</sup> Burke, Grant, and Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>189</sup> Ibid.

<sup>190</sup> Charlotte West, "Individual Presentation." DVD 16. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 17, 1980), DVD.

<sup>191</sup> Ibid.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid.

<sup>193</sup> Judith Holland, "Individual Presentation." DVD 14. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 16, 1980), DVD.

<sup>194</sup> Christine Grant, "Individual Presentation." DVD 22. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980), DVD.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.

<sup>199</sup> Wushanley, *Playing Nice and Losing*, 156-157.

<sup>200</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>201</sup> Carole Mushier, "Individual Presentation." DVD 19. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 17, 1980), DVD.

- <sup>202</sup> Burke, Grant, and Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.
- <sup>203</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.
- <sup>204</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.
- <sup>205</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.
- <sup>206</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>207</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>208</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>209</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>210</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>211</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>212</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>213</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>214</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 3.
- <sup>215</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>216</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>217</sup> Bonnie Slatton, "AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics," 144-154.
- <sup>218</sup> Ted Tow, "The Governance Role of the NCAA," in *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, ed. James H. Frey (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982), 108-116.
- <sup>219</sup> James H. Frey, "Preface," in *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, ed. James H. Frey (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982), 7-8.
- <sup>220</sup> Tow, "The Governance Role of the NCAA," 109.
- <sup>221</sup> Ibid., 116.
- <sup>222</sup> Ibid., 109.



<sup>223</sup> Ibid.

<sup>224</sup> Ibid., 112.

<sup>225</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid.

<sup>227</sup> Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, *AIAW Directory 1980-1981*, 1-2.

<sup>228</sup> Frey, "Preface," in *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, 7-8.

<sup>229</sup> Tow, "The Governance Role of the NCAA," 108-116.

<sup>230</sup> Bonnie Slatton, "AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics," 144.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>232</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid.

<sup>237</sup> Ibid.

<sup>238</sup> Ibid.

<sup>239</sup> Ibid.

<sup>240</sup> Ibid.

<sup>241</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 3.

<sup>242</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>243</sup> Ibid.

<sup>244</sup> Christine Grant, “Individual Presentation.” DVD 21. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980), DVD.

<sup>245</sup> Ibid.

<sup>246</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>247</sup> Ibid.

<sup>248</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.

<sup>249</sup> Ibid.

<sup>250</sup> Ibid.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid.

<sup>252</sup> Carole Oglesby, “Panel Discussion.” DVD 5. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD.

<sup>253</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 5.

<sup>254</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>255</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 7.

<sup>256</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>257</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.

<sup>258</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>259</sup> Ibid.

<sup>260</sup> Ibid.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid.

<sup>263</sup> Charlotte West, "Panel Discussion." DVD 20. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 17, 1980), DVD.

<sup>264</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid.

<sup>266</sup> Peg Burke, "Individual Presentation." DVD 12. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 16, 1980), DVD.

<sup>267</sup> Lee Morrison, "Panel Presentation." DVD 10. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 15, 1980), DVD.

<sup>268</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.

<sup>269</sup> Ibid.

<sup>270</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.

<sup>271</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.

<sup>272</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.

<sup>273</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>274</sup> Ibid.

<sup>275</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 7.

<sup>276</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid.

<sup>278</sup> Ibid.

<sup>279</sup> Ibid.

<sup>280</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>281</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

- <sup>282</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.
- <sup>283</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.
- <sup>284</sup> West, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 16.
- <sup>285</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.
- <sup>286</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.
- <sup>287</sup> Judie Holland, "Individual Presentation." DVD 13. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 16, 1980), DVD.
- <sup>288</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.
- <sup>289</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.
- <sup>290</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.
- <sup>291</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>292</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 6.
- <sup>293</sup> Carole Oglesby, "Individual Presentation." DVD 2. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD.
- <sup>294</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.
- <sup>295</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.
- <sup>296</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 3.
- <sup>297</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>298</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>299</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>300</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>301</sup> Ibid.

- <sup>302</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.
- <sup>303</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>304</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>305</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>306</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.
- <sup>307</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 18.
- <sup>308</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 3.
- <sup>309</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 7.
- <sup>310</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 12.
- <sup>311</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.
- <sup>312</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 5.
- <sup>313</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.
- <sup>314</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>315</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.
- <sup>316</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>317</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>318</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 1.
- <sup>319</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 2.
- <sup>320</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>321</sup> Judith Holland, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 13.
- <sup>322</sup> Ibid.

<sup>323</sup> Carol Gordon, "Individual Presentation." DVD 4. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 14, 1980), DVD.

<sup>324</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.

<sup>325</sup> Ibid.

<sup>326</sup> Ibid.

<sup>327</sup> Ibid.

<sup>328</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>329</sup> George H. Hanford. "Intercollegiate Athletics Today and Tomorrow: The President's Challenge." In *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, ed. James H. Frey, (West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982), 45.

<sup>330</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.

<sup>331</sup> Ibid.

<sup>332</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>333</sup> Ibid.

<sup>334</sup> Gordon, Morrison, Mabry, Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.

<sup>335</sup> Ibid.

<sup>336</sup> Ibid.

<sup>337</sup> Ibid.

<sup>338</sup> Ibid.

<sup>339</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

<sup>340</sup> Ibid.

<sup>341</sup> Burke, Mushier, West, Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 20.

<sup>342</sup> Charlotte West, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 17

- <sup>343</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>344</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 4.
- <sup>345</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.
- <sup>346</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.
- <sup>347</sup> Burns, "Reconstructing Leadership Experiences: Toward a Feminist Theory of Leadership," 148.
- <sup>348</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>349</sup> Gordon, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 5.
- <sup>350</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 7.
- <sup>351</sup> Laurie Mabry, Peg Burke, Judie Holland, and Charlotte West, "Panel Discussion." DVD 15. *AIAW Presidential Review*, (Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 16, 1980), DVD.
- <sup>352</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>353</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>354</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>355</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 21.
- <sup>356</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>357</sup> Oglesby, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 2.
- <sup>358</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 11.
- <sup>359</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>360</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>361</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>362</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>363</sup> Morrison, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 7.

- <sup>364</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>365</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>366</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>367</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>368</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 19.
- <sup>369</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>370</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>371</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>372</sup> Mushier, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 20
- <sup>373</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>374</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>375</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 20.
- <sup>376</sup> West, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 20.
- <sup>377</sup> Panel Discussion, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>378</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>379</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 10.
- <sup>380</sup> Holland, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>381</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>382</sup> Holland, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>383</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>384</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.
- <sup>385</sup> Burke, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.



<sup>386</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.

<sup>387</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.

<sup>388</sup> West, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.

<sup>389</sup> Mabry, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.

<sup>390</sup> Oglesby and Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 15.

<sup>391</sup> Peg Burke, Christine Grant, and Bonnie Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>392</sup> Patricia Ann Rosenbrock, "Persistence and Accommodation in a Decade of Struggle and Change: The Case of Women Administrators in Division IA Intercollegiate Athletics Programs," (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1978).

<sup>393</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

<sup>394</sup> *Ibid.*, 228.

<sup>395</sup> *Ibid.*, 229.

<sup>396</sup> *Ibid.*, 234, 235.

<sup>397</sup> *Ibid.*, 234.

<sup>398</sup> *Ibid.*, 235, 236.

<sup>399</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>400</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>401</sup> Lopiano, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>402</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>403</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>404</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>405</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 24.

<sup>406</sup> Willey, "The Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics," 169, 197-98.

<sup>407</sup> Burke, Grant, and Slatton, interview by Amy Wilson, April 25, 2008.

<sup>408</sup> Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sherron De Hart, "Introduction," in *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed, ed. Linda K. Kerber and Sherron De Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 3.

<sup>409</sup> Wilson, "The Status of Women in Intercollegiate Athletics as Title IX Turns 40," 26.

<sup>410</sup> West, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 16.

<sup>411</sup> Ibid.

<sup>412</sup> Wushanley, *Playing Nice and Losing*, 156-157.

<sup>413</sup> Ibid., 72, 113, 124, 158-159.

<sup>414</sup> Ibid., 158-159.

<sup>415</sup> Grant, *AIAW Presidential Review*, DVD 22.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, AIAW Directory 1980-1981.*  
Washington, D.C., 1980.
- Birrell, Susan. "Feminist Theories for Sport." *Handbook of Sport Studies*, edited by Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning, (2000): 61-76.
- Blumenthal, Karen. *Let Me Play: The Story of Title IX*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2005.
- Boutilier, Mary A. and Lucinda SanGiovanni. *The Sporting Woman*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1983.
- Burke, Peg, Christine Grant, and Bonnie Slatton. Interview by Amy Wilson. April 25, 2008.
- Burke, Peg. "The Effect of Current Sports Legislation on Women in Canada and the U.S.A—Title IX." In *Her Story in Sport: A Historical Anthology of Women in Sports*, edited by Reet Howell, 330-343. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.
- Burke, Peg, Carol Gordon, Laurie Mabry, and Lee Morrison. "Panel Discussion." DVD 15. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Burke, Peg, Christine Grant, Carole Mushier, and Charlotte West. "Panel Discussion." DVD 20. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Burke, Peg. "Individual Presentation." DVD 11. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Burke, Peg. *AIAW . . . A Decade of Progress: Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: Department of Physical Education and Dance, 1980.
- Burke, Peg. "Individual Presentation." DVD 12. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Burns, Kristin. "Reconstructing Leadership Experiences: Toward a Feminist Theory of Leadership." PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1987.
- Cahn, Susan K. *Coming on Strong: Gender and Sexuality in Twentieth-Century Women's Sports*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1994.

- Carpenter, Linda Jean and R. Vivian Acosta. *Title IX*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2005.
- Dunkle, Margaret C. "Equal Opportunity for Women in Sports." In *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, edited by Barbara J. Hoepner, 9-19. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974.
- Evans, Sara M. *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End*. New York: Free Press, 2004.
- Festle, Mary Jo. *Playing Nice: Politics and Apologies in Women's Sports*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Frey, James H. Preface to *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, edited by James H. Frey, 7-8. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.
- Geadelmann, Patricia A. Introduction to *Equality in Sport for Women*. Washington D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1977.
- Gerber, Ellen W, et al. *The American Woman in Sport*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1974.
- Gordon, Carol, Laurie Mabry, Lee Morrison, and Carole Oglesby. "Panel Discussion." DVD 10. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Gordon, Carol, Lee Morrison, and Carole Oglesby. "Panel Discussion." DVD 5. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Gordon, Carol. "Individual Presentation." DVD 3. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Gordon, Carol. "Individual Presentation." DVD 4. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Grant, Christine. "Institutional Autonomy and Women's Athletics." *Educational Record*, 60, (1979): 409-19.
- Grant, Christine. "Effectuating Change." In *Equality in Sport for Women*, 104-114. Washington D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1977.

- Grant, Christine. "Individual Presentation." DVD 21. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Grant, Christine. "Individual Presentation." DVD 22. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Guttman, Allen. *Women's Sports: A History*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Hanford, George H. "Intercollegiate Athletics Today and Tomorrow: The President's Challenge." In *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, edited by James H. Frey, 44-48. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.
- Hargreaves, Jennifer and Ian McDonald. "Cultural Studies and the Sociology of Sport." In *Handbook of Sport Studies*, edited by Jay Coakley and Eric Dunning, 48-60. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2000.
- Hargreaves, Jennifer. "Querying Sport Feminism." In *Sport and Modern Social Theorists*, edited by Richard Giulianotti, 87 - 205. New York: Palgrave, 2004.
- Hargreaves, Jennifer. *Sporting Females: Critical Issues in the History and Sociology of Women's Sports*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Heide, Wilma Scott. "Feminism for a Sporting Future." In *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, edited by Carole A. Oglesby, 195-202. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, 1978.
- Hoepner, Barbara J. Preface to *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, edited by Barbara J. Hoepner. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974.
- Hogshead-Makar, Nancy and Andrew Zimbalist. *Equal Play: Title IX and Social Change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2007.
- Holland, Judith. "Individual Presentation." DVD 13. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Holland, Judith. "Individual Presentation." DVD 14. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.

- Howell, Reet, ed. *Her Story in Sport: A Historical Anthology of Women in Sports*. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.
- Hult, Joan S. "Women's Struggle for Governance in U.S. Amateur Athletics." *International Review for Sociology of Sport*, 24, no. 3 (1989): 249-261.
- Hult, Joan S. Conversation with Amy Wilson. March 30, 2007.
- Hult, Joan S. "NAGWS and AIAW: The Strange and Wondrous Journey to the Athletic Summit, 1950-1990." *JOPERD* (April 1, 1999) <http://media-server.amazon.com/exec/drm/amzproxy.cgi./Mzg0IEL0/caxMKbPqwNldElb>.
- Hult, Joan S. "The Legacy of AIAW," In *A Century of Women's Basketball: From Frailty to Final*, edited by. Joan S. Hult and Marianna Trekell, 281-307. Reston, VA: AAHPERD Publications, 1991.
- Hunt, Virginia. "Governance of Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: An Historical Perspective." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976.
- Kerber, Linda K. and Jane Sherron De Hart, "Introduction," In *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed, ed. Linda K. Kerber and Sherron De Hart. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995, 3-27.
- Lopiano, Donna. "Individual Presentation." DVD 23. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Lopiano, Donna and All Presidents. "Individual Presentation and Panel Discussion." DVD 24. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Loy, John W. Foreword to *The American Woman in Sport*, edited by Ellen W. Gerber, iii-iv. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1974.
- Mabry, Laurie. "Individual Presentation." DVD 8. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Morrison, L. Leotus. "The AIAW: Governance by Women for Women." In *Women in Sport: Issues and Controversies*, edited by Greta L. Cohen, 59-66. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Morrison, Lee. "Individual Presentation." DVD 6. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.

- Morrison, Lee. "Individual Presentation." DVD 7. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Mushier, Carole. "Individual Presentation." DVD 18. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Mushier, Carole. "Individual Presentation." DVD 19. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Oglesby, Carole A., ed. *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, 1978.
- Oglesby, Carole A. Epilogue to *Women and Sport: From Myth to Reality*, 255-256. Philadelphia, PA: Lea & Febiger, 1978.
- Oglesby, Carole A. "Future Directions and Issues." In *Women's Athletics: Coping with Controversy*, edited by Barbara J. Hoepner, 64-68. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER Publications, 1974.
- Oglesby, Carole. "Individual Presentation." DVD 1. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Oglesby, Carole. "Individual Presentation." DVD 2. *AIAW Presidential Review*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Dept. of Physical Education and Dance, July 18, 1980.
- Parratt, Catriona M. "Review of Allen Guttman's *Women's Sports: A History*." *Journal of Sport History*, 20, no.1 (Winter 1993), 300-302.
- Parratt, Catriona M. "About Turns: Reflecting on Sport History in the 1990s." *Sport History Review*, no. 29 (1998): 4-17.
- Sage, George H. "Fertile Field: Humanism in Sport." Presentation to the Central Association for Physical Education of College Women, Lincoln, NE, October 3, 1975.
- Sims, Edward J. Introduction to *Development of Human Values through Sports*, 7-8. Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1974.
- Rosenbrock, Patricia Ann. "Persistence and Accommodation in a Decade of Struggle and

Change: The Case of Women Administrators in Division IA Intercollegiate Athletics Programs.” PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1987.

Slatton, Bonnie. “AIAW: The Greening of American Athletics.” In *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, edited by James H. Frey, 144-154. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.

Slatton, Bonnie. Personal Papers. “Appendix D, Women as Leaders Conference Speakers and Topics, 1978-1988,” *Women’s as Leaders Conferences*. University of Iowa, Department of Physical Education and Dance.

Slatton, Bonnie and Susan Burrell, eds. *Arena Review*, 8, no. 2 (1984).

Slatton, Bonnie and Susan Birrell. Introduction to *Arena Review*, 8, no. 2 (1984): i-iii.

*Sporting Equality: Title IX Thirty Years Later*, edited by Rita Simon. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2005.

Suggs, Welch. *A Place on the Team: The Triumph and Tragedy of Title IX*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2005.

Tow, Ted. “The Governance Role of the NCAA.” In *The Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics*, edited by James H. Frey, 108-116. West Point, NY: Leisure Press, 1982.

Twin, Stephanie L., ed. *Out of the Bleachers: Writings on Women and Sport*. Old Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press, 1979.

Verbrugge, Martha H. *Active Bodies: A History of Women’s Physical Education in Twentieth-Century America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Willey, Suzanne C. “The Governance of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics: Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women.” PhD diss., Indiana University, 1996.

Wushanley, Ying. *Playing Nice and Losing: The Struggle for the Control of Women’s Intercollegiate Athletics, 1960-2000*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2004.