

4-30-2018

Salary Disparities Between Male and Female Head Coaches: An Investigation of the NCAA Power Five Conferences

Alex Traugutt

University of Northern Colorado, alex.traugutt@unco.edu

Nicole Sellars

University of Northern Colorado

Alan L. Morse

University of Northern Colorado

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.kent.edu/sport>

Part of the [Sports Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Traugutt, Alex; Sellars, Nicole; and Morse, Alan L. (2018) "Salary Disparities Between Male and Female Head Coaches: An Investigation of the NCAA Power Five Conferences," *The Journal of SPORT*: Vol. 6 : Iss. 1 , Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.kent.edu/sport/vol6/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ Kent State University Libraries. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of SPORT by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Kent State University Libraries. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@kent.edu.

**Salary Disparities Between Male and Female Head Coaches: An
Investigation of the NCAA Power Five Conferences**

Alex Traugutt

University of Northern Colorado

Nicole Sellars

University of Northern Colorado

Alan L. Morse

University of Northern Colorado

Abstract

Coaching salaries within intercollegiate athletics have increased tremendously over the past decade. This has led to continued and increased criticisms of current gender constructs within the NCAA and specifically the way in which coaches are compensated. The primary purpose of this study was to determine whether gender was a significant predictor of compensation for basketball coaches of men's and women's programs at the Division I level, while also assessing a variety of revenue and productivity variables. Results indicated that gender was not a statistically significant predictor of compensation. Rather, a host of revenue-specific variables were found to be the primary drivers of compensation for both male and female coaches.

Salary Disparities Between Male and Female Head Coaches: An Investigation of the NCAA Power Five Conferences

Disparities in the wages paid to males and females have been well documented and publicized throughout history. These differentials have resulted in continued and increased criticisms of gender-based societal constructs. In the sport setting, while the earnings gap between men's and women's head coaches at the collegiate level is far from unique, little research focused on college basketball has been done to determine what influences these disparities. Consider the salaries paid to the University of Florida head basketball coaches Amanda Butler and Mike White. Despite similar win percentages (.603 for Butler and .696 for White) which are commonly used as a barometer for compensation (Grant, Leadley, & Zygmunt, 2013), White's base salary of \$3,967,385 is roughly nine times that of Butler (\$429,006) (University of Florida, 2016). Some suggest that the differences can be attributed to the masculine culture of sport organizations, where women receive less compensation for their work, and are not provided equal returns for human capital investments (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008; Judge & Livingston, 1994; Tam, 1997). Thus, women become marginalized in the work place and are paid lower wages (Acosta & Carpenter, 2006). Others rationalize that women are underrepresented in leadership and coaching roles, and underpaid in intercollegiate athletics specifically, because of overt institutional discrimination associated with access and treatment (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008).

The purpose of this study was to examine how a variety of economic and coach-specific productivity variables impacted the salaries paid to both male and female coaches of Division I collegiate basketball programs. Since the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) head coaching labor market is homogeneous, meaning that men and women are hired to perform comparable work, gender discrimination will be discernable when revenue and productivity are addressed (Brook & Foster, 2010). It is imperative to note however, that while this study assumed that coaches were hired to perform similar duties, the contexts in which women's and men's college basketball programs operate are different. From financial resources to administrative support, men's programs and their coaches receive a greater amount of assistance and attention than their female counterparts. Nevertheless, by investigating financial, program, and coach specific variables, this research sought to determine the primary influencers of coaches' salaries to provide a framework for understanding current pay disparities.

Literature Review

Previous research has generally concluded that females earn lower wages than males despite performing comparable work. More specifically, in 2016, women who worked full-time jobs in the United States were paid just 80 percent of what their male counterparts were paid (Semega, Fontenote, & Kollar, 2017). While the pay gap has certainly narrowed, at the current rate women will not reach wage quality with males until 2059 (American Association of University Women, 2017). Studies have sought to determine the reasons for this discrepancy, often centered, whether directly or indirectly, around three prevalent theories; human capital (Becker; 1975; Schultz, 1960), gender role (Bem, 1981), and devaluation (England, 1992; Kilbourne, England, Farkas, Beron, & Weir, 1994). These theories, in conjunction with previous literature focused on the collegiate basketball setting, formed the foundation of this research.

Theoretical Framework

Human capital theory postulates that personal incomes will vary based on the amount of investment in human capital, which should be understood to be the education and training that is undertaken by an individual or group of individuals (Becker, 1975). Therefore, gender should have no direct effect on wages. However, research has found that penalties against females in the workplace have proven to be a product of occupational differences in specialized training, that is, a lack of skill specialization (Tam, 1997). If we apply this theory to the collegiate basketball setting, one could consider the current tenure and career winning percentage of a coach to be the equivalent of education and specialized training measures used as benchmarks in the corporate setting (Cunningham & Sagas, 2000; Wicker, Orłowski, & Breuer, 2016). Moreover, many would agree that it takes a unique skill set to be a Division I head basketball coach, regardless of program. The question therefore becomes whether similar metrics in training, education, and specialized human capital result in comparable wages for both males and females.

Gender role theory is “grounded in the supposition that individuals socially identified as males and females tend to occupy different ascribed roles within social structures and tend to be judged against divergent expectations for how they ought to behave” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009, p. 433). Traditional gender roles have created predetermined earnings structures that oftentimes feature higher earnings for men and lower earnings for women (Judge & Livingston, 1994). For example, women still account for large majority of the workforce in waitress, retail, administrative assistant and nursing positions (Carnevale & Smith, 2014). These occupations are culturally thought to be female-oriented and thus are ascribed with certain gender stereotypes. Collegiate sports are no different. The coaching landscape at the Division I

level is riddled with preconceived notions of earning structures, which generally favor male coaches, regardless of program. Based on this theory, male coaches, simply due to their social identification, will garner a greater wage even when relevant control variables are accounted for (Judge & Livingston, 1994). Simply stated, when men attempt to preserve the traditional social order in the workplace, they are rewarded financially, while women are largely trivialized for acting in a similar manner (Judge & Livingston, 1994).

Lastly, the devaluation theory or hypothesis, with roots in sociology, argues that male-dominated occupations are more highly compensated and rewarded than female-dominated occupations due to societal structures that devalue “women’s work” (Perales, 2013). This construct suggests that if a specific occupational position, such as women’s basketball coach, is predominately held by women, then all the workers in that occupation will be subject to the devaluation effect (Tam, 1997). Under the principal of this hypothesis, no economic factors can completely explain the effects of gender composition on compensation packages because “women’s labor, to a substantial extent, modifies or overrides market considerations” (Tam, 1997, p. 1654).

Empirical Framework

Coaching salaries and athletic department revenues across Division I college athletics have increased tremendously over the past decade (Hobson, 2017; McKenna, 2016). The beneficiaries of these significant growth patterns have historically been male head coaches of men’s sport programs (Brook & Foster, 2010; Hoffer & Pincin, 2016; Terry, Pjensky & Patterson, 2011). While a variety of explanations can be given for the evolving earnings gap, Carroll and Humphreys (1999) concluded that the prestige associated with men’s sports persuades athletic directors to overinvest in the men’s salaries and programs in relation to women’s salaries and programs. However, the possibility of overt gender discrimination should not be dismissed.

When analyzing NCAA Division I athletic department revenue, Hoffer and Pincin (2016) found that although strict compensation regulations exist for student-athletes, coaching salaries are virtually unregulated. Between 2004 and 2015, inflation-adjusted revenue grew by roughly \$35 million for the median NCAA Division I athletic department (Fulks, 2016). Due in large part to the general financial growth of NCAA Division I athletics, an increasing number of educational institutions have and continue to offer larger contracts and benefit packages to their various coaches. Moreover, to compete on a national level, colleges and universities are forced to pay millions of dollars in an effort to secure top-level staff members, which further inflates coaches’ salaries.

In 2016, 39 male basketball or football coaches were the highest paid employees in their respective states (Gibson, Keller, & Chandan, 2017). At the University of North Carolina, Roy William’s 2016 contract earned him a base

salary of just over \$2 million dollars. At the same university, women's head basketball coach Sylvia Hatchell earned a base salary of roughly \$650,000 dollars (University of North Carolina, 2016). While both coaches have comparable career win percentages and NCAA tournament appearances (.732 and 22 for Hatchell and .790 and 26 for Williams), Hatchell has been a head coach at North Carolina for nearly twice as long as Williams. It might be argued that conventional wisdom would suggest that Hatchell should be earning more, or at least a comparable wage, to her male counterpart. While this is not to suggest that coaches of women's programs have not earned increases in pay, these increases have clearly occurred to a much lesser degree than the coaches of men's programs. This example illuminates the point that while head coaches' salaries continue to increase, both genders are not benefiting equally from the influx of dollars pouring into these athletic departments.

Humphreys (2000) was one of the first to explore the salary differences between men's and women's head basketball coaches. In his study of 238 Division I NCAA institutions in 1990-91, he found that regardless of gender, head coaches of women's programs earned a significantly lower salary than coaches of men's programs. He concluded that the large gap between the salaries of men's and women's basketball coaches may be attributed to a variety of factors that included the prestige of men's sports and the impact that such prestige had on an athletic director's funding decisions. Brook and Foster (2010) paralleled the findings of Humphreys (2000), concluding that although men's basketball programs pay their coaches more, the variations in salary were not indicative of employer discrimination. Further, Brooks and Foster (2010) suggest that revenue and labor variables are better indicators of salary than gender and employer discrimination.

This study built on the previous research in two primary areas. First, it analyzed more recent publicly available information from the fiscal year 2015 (FY15) as reported by the individual institutions. Given the drastic rise in salary figures since previous publications, especially within men's programs, this topic warranted further exploration and analysis. Second, the study included a more comprehensive set of revenue-specific variables that could influence compensation. This permitted a more thorough analysis of factors that drive compensation and created a robust model for determining whether gender of the coach had a significant influence on compensation.

Methods

Variables

To determine the primary drivers of compensation of both men's and women's basketball programs, a host of variables that relate to compensation were analyzed. The measured variables took two different forms: those that pertained to athletic department revenues and those that measured a head coach's performance and productivity. Athletic department revenues were obtained through written requests by the researchers to each public university in the Power Five conferences (Big Ten, Big 12, Atlantic Coast Conference [ACC], Southeastern Conference [SEC], Pacific-12 [Pac-12]) in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). Correspondence through written mail, email, and phone conversations occurred to varying frequencies by the researchers in an attempt to acquire reports from each institution. On average, institutions that provided their financial reports only required one exchange, generally via written mail. Those institutions who did not respond immediately, were then contacted via email and then by phone. Any institution that did not respond after the third attempt was not contacted again. Private schools are not required to disclose revenue and expense information and thus were not contacted. Their omission is important to note in the greater context, however, since their designation does not permit them to lobby for additional funding in the same manner as public institutions. Thus, these schools are generally more reliant on revenues from, for example, ticket sales and student fees which could limit the salaries afforded to their coaches.

In total, 36 out of a possible 53 reports were obtained for the FY2015. The revenue variables utilized in this analysis were: ticket sales, institutional support, guarantees (input revenue received from participation in away games), contributions, in-kind contributions, media rights, NCAA distributions, conference distributions (non-media), program/novelty/parking/concession sales, royalties/licensing/advertising/sponsorships, sports camp revenues, athletic restricted endowment and investments income, and other operating revenue (any operating revenues received by athletics in the report year which cannot be classified into one of the stated categories). In addition, variables which included tenure at current institution, career win percentage, and career NCAA tournament appearances were also utilized to control for each coach's on-court prestige and productivity. The latter variables were obtained directly from the NCAA's website to maintain accuracy and consistency. Lastly, gender was coded both for the coach and the program and took a binary form of one for male and zero for female in both instances. In total, eighteen variables were included in the analysis.

Methodology

This study employed a standard multiple linear regression model to identify those variables, which significantly impacted compensation.

$$Salary_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_1 + \beta_2x_2 \dots \varepsilon_i$$

Where the salary of head coach i at institution j is determined by the values of the various parameters, x , of the variables β , with a standard error term, ε .

This analysis is a commonly accepted methodology for studying wage disparities (Chalikia & Hinsz, 2013; Conway & Roberts, 1986), and permitted the examination of variance in salaries among males and females in the context of predictor variables that have been determined to affect coaches' compensation.

Empirical Results

All Coaches/Programs

First, the primary influencers of compensation for all head coaches in the sample were examined by regressing all variables against their FY15 salaries. With gender as an indicator variable, it was of primary interest to determine if compensation, regardless of program, was influenced by the gender of the head coach. Of the 72 coaches in the sample, 47 were male and 25 were female. Descriptive statistics for each program can be found in Table 1. Of interest is the average tenure of coaches of women's programs compared to the average salaries. As is the case in most occupations, the longer an individual is employed by a certain company or program the higher their salary should theoretically be. Despite this notion, it appears that the opposite is true in Division I college basketball, especially for the women's programs. For example, Charli Turner Thorne, the head coach of the women's program at Arizona State University earned a base salary of \$590,770 for the 2015-16 season in her twentieth year of coaching at the institution (Arizona State University, 2016). Compare Thorne's salary to that of Joni Taylor, the women's coach at the University of Georgia, who entering her first season at the school in 2015-16 earned a base salary of \$857,130 (University of Georgia, 2016). It is with this understanding that we sought to deduce which variables significantly influenced compensation, as it appeared that conventional norms surrounding compensation were not applicable in this setting.

Salary Disparities Between Male and Female Head Coaches

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics – Men’s/Women’s Programs

| Variable | Women’s Programs | | Men’s Programs | |
|--|------------------|--------|----------------|---------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Tenure (Years) | 8.0 | 6.3 | 6.25 | 4.5 |
| Career Win % | .618 | .106 | .664 | .077 |
| Tournament Appearances | 6.3 | 6.1 | 8 | 6.8 |
| Ticket Sales | 229315 | 226970 | 4813325 | 4239316 |
| Institutional Support | 52242 | 109219 | 96747 | 338246 |
| Guaranteed Revenue | 1931 | 8123 | 153489 | 239074 |
| Contributions | 317910 | 393448 | 1840160 | 3680323 |
| In-Kind Contributions | 14501 | 28372 | 46356 | 77547 |
| Media Rights | 32461 | 147016 | 3144917 | 2016942 |
| NCAA Distributions | 30064 | 55747 | 1473338 | 1494852 |
| Conference Distributions | 30116 | 76909 | 955387 | 1637886 |
| Program/Novelty/ Parking/Concession | 33640 | 37055 | 286371 | 313044 |
| Royalties/Licensing/ Advertising/Sponsorships | 100138 | 162916 | 446301 | 888035 |
| Camp Revenue | 39859 | 61409 | 1112184 | 170471 |
| Restricted Endowments | 17924 | 29391 | 49636 | 92188 |
| Other | 22586 | 61112 | 87513 | 395886 |
| Head Coach Salary | 689879 | 287091 | 2716191 | 1460545 |
| | <i>n</i> = 25 | | <i>n</i> = 47 | |

Table 2 reports the results of the regression model, which featured a robust R² value of .940. Based on the results, head coach’s gender was not found to be a significant predictor of compensation. Rather, revenue producing potential, including ticket sales, contributions, media rights, and camp revenue, were found to be the primary drivers of compensation. It should be noted that the negative beta coefficient associated with Program/Novelty/Parking/Concession may be attributable to extraneous variables not contained within the model.

Table 2

Regression Results for All Coaches & Programs

| Variable | β Coefficient | p-value |
|--|---------------------|---------|
| Constant | -440107.2 | .465 |
| Tenure | -6790.2 | .746 |
| Career Win % | 1527354.7 | .141 |
| Tournament Appearances | 10185.8 | .642 |
| Program | 136331.9 | .703 |
| Gender | 54412.1 | .807 |
| Ticket Sales | .279 | .000*** |
| Institutional Support | .119 | .688 |
| Guaranteed Revenue | -.540 | .490 |
| Contributions | .118 | .082* |
| In-Kind Contributions | .687 | .623 |
| Media Rights | .125 | .089* |
| NCAA Distributions | .128 | .162 |
| Conference Distributions | .105 | .166 |
| Program/Novelty/Parking/Concession | -2.027 | .001*** |
| Royalties/Licensing/Advertising/Sponsorships | .196 | .153 |
| Camp Revenue | 2.8 | .000*** |
| Restricted Endowments | -.976 | .427 |
| Other | -.637 | .287 |
| R Squared | .940 | |
| Adjusted R Squared | .884 | |
| <i>n</i> = 72 | | |

* statistically significant at the .10 level; ** at the .05 level; *** at the .01 level

Women's Programs

The second analysis examined whether compensation within the same program is influenced by gender. Given there are no female coaches of men's programs, the analysis was limited to the women's programs. In a sample of 36 women's basketball programs, 25 employed a female head coach and 11 employed a male head coach, which permitted a test for employer gender discrimination within the same program. Descriptive statistics of women's basketball programs can be found in Table 3, segmented by the gender of the coach.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics – Women’s Basketball Programs by Gender

| Variable | Female Head Coach | | Male Head Coach | |
|--|-------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|
| | Mean | SD | Mean | SD |
| Tenure (Years) | 8.0 | 6.5 | 7.9 | 6.2 |
| Career Win % | .597 | .106 | .668 | .090 |
| Tournament Appearances | 6 | 5.5 | 7.9 | 7.3 |
| Ticket Sales | 178921 | 155488 | 343847 | 318593 |
| Institutional Support | 75177 | 124911 | 118 | 393 |
| Guaranteed Revenue | 1540 | 7702 | 2817 | 9343 |
| Contributions | 374996 | 447492 | 188170 | 185860 |
| In-Kind Contributions | 19015 | 32676 | 4243 | 9396 |
| Media Rights | 36429 | 170139 | 23443 | 77752 |
| NCAA Distributions | 34994 | 65320 | 18858 | 20932 |
| Conf. Distributions | 34057 | 91742 | 21160 | 19386 |
| Program/Novelty/ Parking/Concession | 31388 | 33082 | 38758 | 46234 |
| Royalties/Licensing/ Advertising/Sponsorships | 122996 | 190499 | 48190 | 39060 |
| Camp Revenue | 36623 | 52523 | 47213 | 80573 |
| Endowments | 19385 | 27942 | 14606 | 33647 |
| Other | 22262 | 60169 | 23323 | 66195 |
| Head Coach Salary | 631763 | 2339689 | 821959 | 359807 |
| | <i>n</i> = 25 | | <i>n</i> = 11 | |

The regression results concerned with coaches of women’s programs presented in Table 4 indicated that while coach’s gender was not a significant predictor, ticket sales, NCAA distributions, and other revenue were found to significantly influence compensation. These results, like those in Table 3, would indicate that athletic departments are more concerned with the coach’s ability to generate revenue, and specifically ticket revenue, than the coach’s gender.

Table 4

Regression Results for All Coaches of Women's Programs

| Variable | β Coefficient | p-value |
|--|---------------------|---------|
| Constant | 475375.0 | .301 |
| Tenure | 214.6 | .985 |
| Career Win % | 48737.3 | .943 |
| Tournament Appearances | 8333.3 | .589 |
| Gender | -17298.5 | .848 |
| Ticket Sales | .816 | .001*** |
| Institutional Support | -.624 | .320 |
| Guaranteed Revenue | -1.1 | .817 |
| Contributions | -.113 | .240 |
| In-Kind Contributions | -2.1 | .211 |
| Media Rights | -.253 | .578 |
| NCAA Distributions | 2.1 | .028** |
| Conference Distributions | .469 | .548 |
| Program/Novelty/Parking/Concession | 1.2 | .207 |
| Royalties/Licensing/Advertising/Sponsorships | .187 | .401 |
| Camp Revenue | -.432 | .475 |
| Restricted Endowments | -.531 | .695 |
| Other | -2.3 | .006** |
| R Squared | .902 | |
| Adjusted R Squared | .813 | |
| $n = 36$ | | |

* statistically significant at the .10 level; ** at the .05 level; *** at the .01 level

Men's Programs

Lastly, a regression model that included all coaches of men's programs was run to determine the significant predictors of compensation within this structure. Since there are no female coaches of men's programs, the gender variable was not included. Table 5 displays the results of the model, which lends support to the notion that coaches of men's programs are compensated based on their revenue producing potential, which mirrors previous results in this research. Once again, ticket sales were found to be a primary driver of compensation. In this case, however, the number of tournament appearances also impacted the pay of the head coach. This variable has a dual application as it highlights the importance of tournament appearances from both a productivity and revenue-producing standpoint. NCAA tournament appearances not only highlight the coach's ability to win games but also provide increased revenue to the conferences and schools since they receive monetary returns for making and advancing in the NCAA tournament.

Table 5

Regression Results for Men's Programs

| Variable | β Coefficient | p-value |
|--|---------------------|---------|
| Constant | -1138240.3 | .641 |
| Tenure | -8153.1 | .884 |
| Career Win % | 2805207.5 | .485 |
| Tournament Appearances | 128873.4 | .030** |
| Conference | 16258.5 | .712 |
| Ticket Sales | .275 | .002** |
| Institutional Support | .124 | .800 |
| Guaranteed Revenue | -.872 | .517 |
| Contributions | .116 | .409 |
| In-Kind Contributions | .658 | .785 |
| Media Rights | .156 | .211 |
| NCAA Distributions | .112 | .497 |
| Conference Distributions | .133 | .286 |
| Program/Novelty/Parking/Concession | -2.2 | .026** |
| Royalties/Licensing/Advertising/Sponsorships | .217 | .350 |
| Camp Revenue | 3.2 | .007** |
| Restricted Endowments | -1.7 | .486 |
| Other | -.581 | .630 |
| R Squared | .797 | |
| Adjusted R Squared | .627 | |
| $n = 36$ | | |

* statistically significant at the .10 level; ** at the .05 level; *** at the .01 level

Discussion

Coaches' salaries in Division I college basketball have risen tremendously in recent years. Nevertheless, coaches of women's programs continue to garner significantly less pay than coaches of men's programs. To illustrate this point, consider that in 2010, the median salary for coaches of men's programs was \$329,000 compared to \$171,600 for women's programs (Gentry & Alexander, 2012). When comparing these figures to the data utilized for this study, the increases for both programs are substantial despite the earning gap increasing significantly. Based on the data compiled for this analysis, men's programs had a median salary of roughly \$2.7 million compared to women's programs at \$690,000. Given the unequal rise in salaries between head coaches of men's and women's programs, it was of primary interest to conclude whether universities, as employers, engage in compensation discrimination based on gender. This research was conducted under the assumption that the men's and women's basketball labor markets are homogenous, meaning that coaches of both programs, regardless of gender, are hired to do similar work and perform similar tasks. Results from

the various multiple linear regression analyses indicated that in no scenario was coach's gender found to be a statistically significant influencer of compensation. These results align with those of previous studies that examined the same market (Brook & Foster, 2010; Humphreys, 2000). Therefore, though compensation amounts for head coaches of men's and women's programs are dissimilar, our results indicated that they are not indicative of direct and overt gender discrimination but rather may be a byproduct of market factors and societal predispositions.

The secondary purpose of this study was to determine which variables significantly impacted and influenced compensation. If regression results for both men's and women's programs yielded significant variables that were similar in nature, then we could make a case that there may be some form of veiled gender compensation discrimination in the homogenous market. Indeed, when comparing the results of men's and women's programs independently, the outcomes suggest that the salary of head coaches of men's and women's programs are influenced by similar variables. Revenue producing potential, and specifically ticket sales, were found to be the primary reoccurring drivers of compensation. While this is not to suggest that coaches are solely responsible for revenue generation, they do have an influence on the product and the winning potential of their program which subsequently impacts attendance (Branvold, Pan, & Gabert, 1997; Scibetti, 2011). However, given the stark disparities between ticket sales of men's and women's programs, current compensation structures appear to align with the results. To illustrate this point, consider that during the FY15 women's programs averaged ticket sales revenue of \$233,146, compared to the \$4,812,325 average for men's programs. While we are not dismissing the fact that men's basketball games are more highly attended than women's games, this large disparity in revenue is likely being considered, at least in part, by administrators as a validator for current compensation packages.

While the data and results did not support the notion that gender was a significant influencer of compensation, we believe that there may be a degree of veiled bias among those in charge of determining compensation packages. As previously mentioned, societal predispositions may be at work in this market which could explain the disparities in compensation. From a theoretical standpoint, gender role theory has a clear application given the results as it proposes that individuals make assumptions about gender roles based on their observations of the "sexual division of labor and gender hierarchy of the society" (Eagly et al., 2000, p. 124). As such, certain behaviors and characteristics are ascribed to specific jobs. Based on this theory, female coaches are at a general disadvantage when placed in positions that have traditionally been reserved for men (Rosenthal, 2008). Unfortunately for female head coaches, this means that women's programs have had a difficult time garnering the same support and compensation packages as their male counterparts. Consequently, program prestige, ticket sales, and revenue producing potential for women's programs, which were found to significantly

influence compensation, have suffered at the hands of deeply rooted societal constructs regarding gender and work placement.

In the same context, we might suggest that devaluation theory also has an effect on the compensation of female head coaches. Devaluation theory states that occupations dominated by women are thought to be less valuable than occupations dominated by men (Perales, 2013). At the NCAA Division I level, two-thirds of all women's programs are coached by females. Such a high concentration of women in head coaching positions would imply that the occupation is largely considered to be "women's work." Thus, based on the devaluation theory, the domination of female head coaches within women's basketball programs means that both male and female head coaches will earn less. This is not to suggest that coaches of both programs are hired to perform different tasks, but rather that the valuations of such tasks appear to vary based on the program. Based on the results of this study, devaluation theory seems to be the most viable explanation for current salary disparities since both male and female coaches of women's programs earn substantially less than coaches of men's teams, a potential product of society's devaluation of "women's work".

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, coach's gender alone should not be considered a viable influencer of compensation within the realm of NCAA Division I basketball. Rather the program designation (men's or women's) and the ability for the coach to produce revenue, and specifically ticket revenue, should be considered as the primary drivers of compensation. Again, this is not to suggest that coaches are solely responsible for revenue generation, yet they are accountable for the talent level of their players and the subsequent product that is produced and consumed. These findings further support those of previous studies concerned with the same construct and provide a more current understanding of the salary disparities among and within basketball programs (Brook & Foster, 2010; Humphreys, 2000).

Unfortunately, the compensation gap among coaches of male and female programs has not narrowed from previous studies. In fact, the earnings gap has increased with no signs indicating that such a trend will cease. The large gap between salaries is likely attributable to additional factors not accounted for in this analysis. A better understanding of how individuals view the prestige of men's sports and the biases of athletic administrators and consumers could provide more clarity to the current wage gap. Future analysis concerned with such factors would provide added insight into the influencers of compensation in this market creating a possibility for critical discussion, accountability and a future reduction in the earnings gap.

While this study was effective in determining the influence of coach's gender and other variables on compensation, there are inherent limitations that should be addressed. First, the lack of data that was reported limited the

degree and scope of statistical analyses. It would have been beneficial to further segment coaches of women's programs by gender to compare results, however the small sample of male coaches of women's programs prohibited this analysis. Future studies should seek to obtain additional financial reports to provide more comprehensive results. Furthermore, there is a clear opportunity to craft a continuous longitudinal study using this type of data to identify compensation trends over time. The addition of variables may also be beneficial to account for an increased degree of variation in compensation. We surmise that the negative beta coefficients associated with some of the variables may be due, in part, to the lack of covariates included in the sample. Future studies may seek to add additional variables that could account for differences in compensation among and within programs. Lastly, the fact that no females are coaching men's basketball programs at the Division I level makes comparisons impossible. While there is no manner in which to address this limitation, it should be noted that a more thorough analysis could be completed if there were both male and female coaches present in both programs.

References

- Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2006). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study—twenty nine year update-1977–2006*. Unpublished manuscript, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY.
- American Association of University Women. (2017). *The simple truth about the gender pay gap*. Washington, DC: AAUW.
- Arizona State University. (2016). *NCAA Membership Financial Report*. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.
- Becker, G.S. (1975). *Human capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis, with special reference to education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88(4), 354–364.
- Branvold, S. E., Pan, D. W., & Gabert, T. E. (1997). Effects of winning percentage and market size on attendance in Minor League Baseball. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 6(4), 35-42.
- Berkowitz, S., Upton, J., Schnaars, S., Dougherty, S., Klein, S., Lattinville, R., & Zwart, D. (2016). *NCAA salaries*. Retrieved from <http://sports.usatoday.com/ncaa/salaries/mens-basketball/coach/>
- Brook, S., & Foster, S. (2013). Does gender affect compensation among NCAA basketball coaches? *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 5(2), 96-106.
- Carnevale, A. P., & Smith, N. (2014, May 9). Gender discrimination is at the heart of the wage gap. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/105292/gender-wage-gap/>
- Chalika, M.H., Hinsz, V.B. (2013). Sex-based salary disparity and the uses of multiple linear regression for definition and remediation. *Current Psychology*, 32(4), 374-387.
- Cunningham, G. B. & Saga, M. (2002). The differential effects of human capital for male and female Division I basketball coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73(4), 489-495.
- Cunningham, G.B. & Sagas, M. (2008). Gender and sex diversity in sport organizations: Introduction to a special issue. *Sex Roles*, 58(1), 3-9.
- Eagly, A. H., Wood, W., & Diekmann, A. B. (2000). Social role theory of sex differences and similarities: A current appraisal. In T. Eckes & H. M. Trautner (Eds.), *The developmental social psychology of gender* (123–174). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- England, P. (1992). *Comparable worth: Theories and evidence*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fulks, D. L. (2016). *Revenues and Expenses 2004-2015*. Indianapolis, IN: National Collegiate Athletic Association.
- Gentry, J. K., & Alexander, R. M. (2012, April 2). Pay for women’s basketball coaches lags far behind that of men’s coaches. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from

- <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/03/sports/ncaabasketball/pay-for-womens-basketball-coaches-lags-far-behind-mens-coaches.html>
- Gibson, C., Keller, J., & Chandan, S. C. (2017, March 30). Who's the highest-paid public employee in every state? *ESPN*. Retrieved from http://www.espn.com/espn/feature/story/_/id/19019077/highest-paid-us-employees-dominated-college-football-college-basketball-coaches
- Grant, R. R., Leadley, J. C., Zygmunt, Z. X. (2013). Just win baby? Determinant of NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision coaching compensation. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 8(1), 61-74.
- Hobson, W. (2017, March 13). As NCAA money trickles down, even tennis coaches are outearning professors. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/colleges/as-ncaa-money-trickles-down-even-tennis-coaches-are-outearning-professors/2017/03/13/d40d448e-043b-11e7-b9fa-ed727b644a0b_story.html?utm_term=.df1b30b6ddd4
- Hoffer, A., & Pincin, J. A. (2016). The effects of revenue changes on NCAA athletic department's expenditures. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 40(1), 802-102
- Humphreys, B. R. (2000). Equal pay on the hardwood: The earnings gap between male and female NCAA Division I basketball coaches. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 1(3), 299-307.
- Judge, T.A., & Livingston, B.A. (2008). Is the gap more than gender? A longitudinal analysis of gender, gender orientation, and earnings. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 994-1012.
- Kilbourne, B. S., England, P., Farkas, G., Beron, K., & Weir, D. (1994). Returns to skill, compensating differentials, and gender bias: Effects of occupational characteristics on the wages of white women and men. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100(3), 689-719.
- Littlejohn, S.W., & Foss, K.A. (2009). *Theories of human communication* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Mckenna, L. (2016, March 24). The madness of college basketball coaches' salaries. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/03/the-madness-of-college-basketball-coaches-salaries/475146/>
- Perales, F. (2013) Occupational sex-segregation, specialized human capital and wages: evidence from Britain. *Work, employment and society*, 27(4), 600-620.
- Rosenthal, C. S. (2008). Sports talk: How gender shapes discursive framing of title IX. *Politics & Gender*, 4(1), 65-92.
- Schultz, T. W. (1960). Capital formation by education. *Journal of Political Economy*, 68(6), 571-583.
- Scibetti, R. (2011, July 13). *Is winning everything?* Retrieved from <http://www.thebusinessofsports.com/2011/07/13/is-winning-everything/>

- Semega, J. L., Fontenot, K. R., and Kollar, M. A. (2017). *Income and poverty in the United States: 2016*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Tam, T. (1997) Sex segregation and occupational gender inequality in the United States: Devaluation or specialized training? *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6), 1652-1692.
- Terry, N., R., Pjensky, R. & Patterson, R. (2010). Determinants of women's college basketball profit. *Journal of Global Business Management*, 6(2), 1-7.
- Terry, N., R., Pjensky, R. & Patterson, R. (2011). Determinants of men's college basketball profit. *Research in Business and Economics Journal*, 4, 1-10.
- University of Florida. (2016). *NCAA Membership Financial Report*. Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.
- University of Georgia. (2016). *NCAA Membership Financial Report*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia.
- University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. (2016). *NCAA Membership Financial Report*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.
- Wicker, P., Orłowski, J., & Breuer, C. (2016). Human capital, formal qualifications, and income of elite sport coaches. *International Journal of Sport Finance*, 11(3), 204-220.