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This thesis examines the implementation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 within the local context of Columbus, Ohio. It compares suburban Upper Arlington High School with urban East High School and argues that race and social class factored heavily into determining the disparate way both high schools implemented Title IX. Because of the high cost of desegregating Columbus public schools after 1978, poor African-American students and later poor white students at East High School saw a limited expansion of their girls' athletic program because of the school district's financial problems. At Upper Arlington High School, female students were not hindered by lack of funding but by their gender. More specifically, a gendered ideal still existed in this community that meant girls were just as likely to join pep clubs in order to support boys' sports teams as they were to be athletes themselves. Yet, these girls had far more opportunities to participate in sports than did students at East High School. Ultimately this study argues that Title IX contributed to the disparity between urban and suburban public schools because its authors did not address issues of race and social class within their writing.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sitting in a board room in Columbus, Ohio, on June 17, 1980, members of the Columbus School Board began to plan how they would finance the upcoming 1980-1981 school year with what looked to be a very paltry budget. Just two years earlier, the city school district had cut back its budget to state minimum levels, and this was beginning to have widespread repercussions. One consequence was that the athletic programs within the district's schools were hardly a top priority. Yet board members had just learned that volleyball equipment in thirteen of the district's high schools did not meet the standards set forth by the Ohio High School Athletic Association. The district would have to pay roughly $18,000 to improve the equipment by fall or cancel the volleyball season. Faced with other financial concerns but unwilling to cut one of the few sports offered to high school girls, board members resolved to set aside the required amount of money so that the teams would still be able to play.¹

Only three months later about two dozen high school girls from Upper Arlington, an affluent suburb on the edge of Columbus, became the founders of their high school's newest sport for girls—soccer. Their interest in soccer reflected a national trend that

¹ School Board Meeting Minutes (Columbus, OH: Columbus School District, 10 June 1980), 664, and (17 June 1980), 790.
caused the New York Times to report one year later “for the last ten years girls’ soccer in the area has prospered for a variety of reasons—from Title IX to the decline in field hockey.” Despite the national popularity girls’ soccer had achieved, Upper Arlington High School’s inchoate team got off to an inauspicious start. When the girls began practicing two weeks before the school year started, the team had no coach; left with no other options, the girls had to practice with the soccer team at a local junior high school. Few of the other students at the high school realized that a girls’ team even existed, so the team did not receive the strong support given many other sports. The team played its first game without stadium lights or an announcer, and this overshadowed the thrill of being the first girls’ team to play in the new high school stadium. Yet, despite its rocky start, members of the new team did not have to worry about funding. Respect might have been difficult for this team to gain, but money was not.

This comparison of high school girls’ athletics in Columbus and Upper Arlington, Ohio, illustrates the disparate opportunities available to female high school athletes after the passage of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Although this story details only how the law was received within central Ohio and only within the framework of athletics, it makes a compelling argument for the many inadequacies of Title IX’s implementation. For example, the law had little power to challenge long held gender norms entrenched in the athletic program at UAHS. While it provided for the creation of more girls’ athletic teams, it could not change the dominant position boys’ sports already

held. Furthermore, the law was unable to mandate equity within the sports program of
the Columbus public schools when the pressures of desegregation and financial shortages
forced the district into a position of compromise. Consequently, the district often had to
finance its athletic programs "on the cheap," so to speak. Because the authors of Title IX
did not acknowledge economic disparity, urban schools often found themselves
financially unable to meet the mandates of the law. Finally, Title IX was not able to
improve the disparity of funding between urban and suburban schools in general because
it never addressed this issue. There was already a strong economic gap between our
nation's urban and suburban schools in 1972, and in some ways the changes brought
forth by Title IX exaggerated this gap. Wealthy school districts like Upper Arlington had
more resources to expand girls' athletic programs than did urban school districts like
Columbus.

The crucial role that race played in this story must also be acknowledged. There
is all too often a strong link between stigmatized minority groups and poor urban school
districts, and this case is no exception. East High School was a predominantly African-
American high school until court-ordered desegregation drastically changed its
demographics in the late 1970s. After it underwent this process of desegregation, the
school remained about forty percent black. Whereas both middle and working-class
black students had attended East before desegregation, busing caused the school's
population to become both whiter and poorer between 1980 and 1990. Middle class
white families increasingly moved to suburban areas to avoid Columbus's newly-
integrated schools. Consequently, desegregation did little to ameliorate the
socioeconomic status of students at East High School. What it did seem to do was reinforce traditional stereotypes about the sports African Americans were most suited to play. There is no evidence that administrators or coaches at EHS separated students into different activities based on their race, but it is obvious that there was a connection between a student’s skin color and the activity in which he or she chose to participate.

Upper Arlington High School began and ended the years of this study as a predominantly white school, so desegregation never affected girls’ athletic programs there like it did at East High School. Moreover, because the school district did not face the large expense of desegregation, it could more easily finance the expansion of its girls’ sports program. Yet, race must still be acknowledged as a key factor in the implementation of Title IX at UAHS. Elsa Barkley Brown has noted “middle class white women live the lives they do precisely because working-class (minority) women live the lives they do.” In other words, when one group succeeds professionally and financially in our society, the result is that another group will not.⁴ Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham has also argued our society fails to recognize “white women’s own investment and complicity in the oppression of other groups of men and women.”⁵ In this respect, race played a very important role at UAHS. It ultimately determined who would benefit from the opportunities Title IX created. The deeper significance of the link between affluent white communities and the sports their youth are likely to play will be discussed later in this paper.

Upper Arlington High School did struggle with creating an equitable athletic program for its students. By this I mean that the school district was perfectly willing to expand opportunities available for girls throughout the 1980s, but it would not sacrifice the traditional pedestal reserved for key male sports like football and basketball. Thus, it was not at all uncommon during the 1980s to see a yearbook picture of the basketball team on one page and the girls’ basketball team on the next page. Yet, the difference between the boys’ and girls’ sports programs did not lie only in subtle semantics. The large number of girls involved in gender-idealized pep clubs, which were made up only of female members and devoted their time only to supporting boys’ teams, also suggests that girls’ athletics held an inferior position at the school, despite the amount of money spent on them.

Yet another player that cannot be ignored in this discussion is the Ohio High School Athletic Association, which still acts as the official governing body for high school sports within the state. As this study will demonstrate, the OHSAA often did not provide clear guidance for how local school districts should enforce Title IX during the 1970s and 1980s. For instance, the organization did not publish a handbook for athletic directors to understand gender equity within their programs until 1995. Thus, athletic directors and administrators at both schools had regulations from the federal government but lacked leadership at the state level.

---

6 In 1995, the Ohio High School Athletic Association recommended not referring “to ‘the team’ and the ‘girls’ team’ when addressing the same sport,” since athletic directors should make sure they use comparable language for both teams. From Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics, Columbus, OH: Ohio High School Athletic Association, 1995, 6.
The attention this study gives to Title IX's consequences for athletics rather than for academics can be justified on several levels. First, Title IX has in recent years become synonymous with equal opportunity in athletics, so it makes sense to explore the most commonly understood significance of this law. Second, colleges have lately placed emphasis on expanding the number of scholarships they offer to female athletes in order to increase women's athletic participation in college. Thus, opportunities offered at the secondary level affect girls' opportunities once in college. Finally, recent studies have shown the correlation between girls' participation on athletic teams and reduced risks of drug and alcohol use and teenage pregnancy. For all of these reasons, high school athletic programs are of critical importance to their female students. My focus on female, rather than male, high school athletes should also be justified. This study recognizes that women have long been excluded from the male-dominated sports establishment and that this establishment worked to limit the scope of Title IX throughout the years of this study. Therefore, it is important to discuss the impact this has had for female high school athletes.

There is an expansive body of scholarship on Title IX, despite its relatively recent enactment, and this work approaches the law from several different angles. Some studies have focused solely on athletics. Others have explored Title IX's nondiscrimination

---

7 Jessica Gavora, Tilting the Playing Field: Schools, Sports, Sex and Title IX (San Francisco: Encounter Books, 2002), 65-6.
10 See Carpenter and Acosta, Blumenthal, and Gavora.
policies in the broader scope of education.\textsuperscript{11} Some authors have written about the negative ramifications of Title IX for men's sports while others have concentrated on the positive consequences it has had for women's sports teams.\textsuperscript{12} Almost all of these studies focus on the impact Title IX has had within colleges and universities, thus giving little attention to high schools.

Despite all of this scholarship, there is little actual historiography on Title IX. Linda Jean Carpenter and R. Vivian Acosta's \textit{Title IX} contains both current policy interpretations and a very detailed history of how the law has affected athletics programs in this country. Its focus is on how the law has evolved in reaction to court decisions, and it mainly examines colleges. Welch Suggs's \textit{A Place on the Team} is another history of Title IX that describes the impetus behind the passage of the law and both the positive and negative effects it has had on women's sports. It, too, focuses mainly on college athletics, although it includes a chapter on how the law has been implemented differently in high schools.\textsuperscript{13}

A more useful area of the historiography on Title IX is that which explains the disparate effect it has had for women of color. Many authors of these studies argue, as

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Roger Dale Reeves, "An examination of Title IX factors in Kershaw County Schools, 2000" (Ph.D. diss., United States Sports Academy, 2004) and Maureen Cathryn Pritchard, "Title IX: Intent versus action. Compliance and equity in Allegheny County public high schools" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2001).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
does Alfred Dennis Mathewson, that Title IX has had some benefits for black women but its “efficacy...to remedy the historical station of Black women in sports is limited” and more narrowly that “the ‘essential’ girls and women contemplated by gender equity laws are white.”¹⁴ A more sophisticated argument is that of Angela P. Harris, who has asserted a theory of “intersectionality” that suggests African-American women have life experiences unique from those of white women or African-American men. Because Title IX operates only within a ‘single axis framework’ based solely on gender it fails to “address the discrimination felt by Black women as a result of multiple axes of influence.”¹⁵ Yet, historian Nancy A. Hewitt has criticized the intersection model because it falsely suggests that “women have more gender than other groups, that Blacks have more race, and that men have more class.” Instead, she argues in scientific language that race, class, and gender have compound identities, which forces us to see “the impossibility of studying any element in isolation without distorting the whole.”¹⁶ I find her theory of compound identities to be the most useful for interpreting the complexity of Title IX implementation in these two school districts. Stated more clearly, female students at both of these high schools were affected strongly by their race, class, and gender; it would be impossible to extricate these three factors to determine the effect of only one within a given historical moment. It would also be impossible to argue that race

and class did not affect students at Upper Arlington High School simply because they were middle class and white.

Many of the studies on how Title IX has been ineffective for minority athletes focus only on college athletics, so, again, it seems important to examine this inequity within secondary schools.\(^\text{17}\) While mine is a local and therefore not a conclusive national study of white and African-American high school girls and their experience with Title IX, it nevertheless serves to highlight discrepancies between the way white and minority students have benefited from this law. At the same time, as I have just mentioned, this study suggests that it was not merely race, but rather a combination of race and social class that ultimately affected Title IX’s implementation at these schools.

This paper expands the scope of previous studies of the law because of its multifaceted nature. Some educational studies have discussed the implementation of Title IX within high school athletic programs, but these generally limit their scope to the past few years, thus leaving the reader without a clear historical understanding of the law.\(^\text{18}\) This study also introduces the dichotomy between urban and suburban athletic programs to the history on Title IX. While much has been written on funding discrepancies between public schools, these studies generally focus on differences in curriculum, teacher training, per pupil expenditure and the physical plant of schools; they rarely focus on


\(^{18}\) Many Ed.D. dissertations have focused on the more recent impact of Title IX on high school athletics. Among them are: Charles Vernon Braddock, “Title IX compliance and Georgia high school athletic programs” (Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 2000). Michael Francis Condon, “Title IX High School Athletic Compliance, Implementation and Change in the State of New Jersey” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University Teachers College, 1992).
athletics. Berliner and Biddle’s *The Manufactured Crisis* and Jonathan Kozol’s *Savage Inequalities* are two examples of this literature that provides a detailed analysis of school district funding differences but does not encompass the area of athletics.  

Sarah K. Field’s chapter “Title IX and African American Female Athletes” in the forthcoming *Race and Sport in America* does briefly examine a case study of an urban and suburban high school athletic program in St. Louis to discuss the discrepancy between the two; but this case study is a current one that examines the years 2000-2003.

My study will draw on this great body of literature on women’s participation in sports, the ramifications of Title IX, the disparity between urban and suburban school districts, and the experiences of African Americans in sports; but it ultimately seeks to expand the scope of this scholarship by studying the interplay of all of these factors within the historical context of 1975 to 1990.

I begin my study with a concise history of Title IX and an examination of how it was at first understood on both the state and national levels. I then discuss the differences between the two communities in which these high schools were located to suggest that the founding of Upper Arlington and Columbus played a major role in how their schools would develop. From there I examine in depth how race, social class, and gender were interwoven at these two schools. Next, I turn to an analysis of how desegregation played out within the Columbus schools. Finally, I examine the unique problems each school faced.

---


encountered as it implemented Title IX. I conclude by looking at the law in its present state and suggesting similarities between it and the No Child Left Behind Act currently being debated among educators in this country.

A Brief History of Title IX

Signed into law by President Nixon on June 23, 1972, as part of the Education Amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IX stated rather vaguely that “no person in the United States shall on the basis of sex be excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving federal aid.” The law applied not only to women’s participation in athletics—although it would soon become synonymous with that idea—but also to the textbooks and classes offered to students, the treatment of female teachers, the career advice guidance counselors gave students, and the sexual harassment policies required of schools. In fact, less than 10 percent of the regulations made by Title IX dealt directly with sports.

The law gained a reputation for its application to female participation in sports because of the wave of controversy it caused in American athletic programs, especially at colleges and universities. Fearful of the implications that instituting equality would have for revenue-producing sports like football and basketball, coaches and university officials consistently protested the initiation of the law. Administrators at elite colleges and

---

21 Linda Jean Carpenter and R. Vivian Acosta, Title IX (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2005), 3.
23 Carpenter and Acosta, 6.
universities such as Harvard first believed their institutions to be exempt because they were private, and many refused to comply with government rulings.\textsuperscript{24} The voice for most public universities during this time was the National Collegiate Athletic Association, which strongly protested the law on the grounds that its member schools could not possibly take on the financial burden of making women's athletics programs equal to those of men.\textsuperscript{25} 

This controversy forced the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the government body responsible for regulating the law, to continually revise the regulations regarding Title IX. This meant seven years of uncertainty during which administrators had difficulty determining whether their schools were in compliance with the law. In 1979, HEW revised its regulations and introduced a three-pronged test for schools to measure their compliance. According to this test, a school needed to prove it had sports participation opportunities that were proportionate to the ratio of male to female students; it could show a history of increasing girls' athletic opportunities; or it could meet the athletic interests of its female students.\textsuperscript{26} 

In 1979, enforcement of Title IX became the business of the Office for Civil Rights, a branch of the newly-created U.S. Department of Education. It remains that way today. In addition to the responsibilities of the OCR, individual districts are responsible for appointing an employee to serve as a Title IX coordinator to ensure their district is following the law in every area—including the curriculum used by its schools, its practices for hiring employees, and the way it administers athletics. Both the OCR and

\textsuperscript{24} Blumenthal, 35, 37.  
\textsuperscript{26} Carpenter and Acosta, 13-5.
the OHSAA encourage individual districts to conduct a self-audit of their schools. Unfortunately for this study, neither organization requires the schools to submit these self-evaluations, so there are no such records available.

The OCR maintains responsibility both for investigating complaints alleging discrimination within school districts and for initiating its own audits of individual school districts. Unfortunately, neither the regional OCR office in Cleveland nor the national office in Washington, D.C. has records of either kind of audit being performed within the Columbus or Upper Arlington school districts. The lack of documentation alleging complaints suggests that none were filed with the OCR against either school district during this time. That the regional OCR office in Cleveland did not conduct a random audit of either the Columbus or Upper Arlington school districts between 1975 and 1990 is somewhat surprising. Perhaps the reason lies in an explanation offered by Carpenter and Acosta that the “OCR has the power but often neither the will nor the budget to initiate investigative enforcement procedures on its own accord.” These authors attribute the effectiveness of this government body to “the administrative climate of a particular regional OCR office or the commitment of the specific OCR employees assigned.”

Given this explanation, the reader can discern that either the OCR could not afford to do such a massive audit of these school districts or that it was not interested in conducting such an audit. Had the Cleveland office conducted its own examination of these school districts, there would naturally be more official information concerning how each district had responded to Title IX. Because such information does not exist, this study must

---

28 Carpenter and Acosta, 22.
undertake a deeper examination of how each district implemented the law with the resources available to it.

As we have seen, the Ohio High School Athletic Association also had a responsibility to help athletic directors understand and interpret the law within their schools. This not-for-profit organization of public and private junior and senior high schools began in 1906 as a body to oversee interscholastic athletics within the state. The OHSAA divided the state into six regional districts: East, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, Southwest, and finally Central, of which Columbus and Upper Arlington were (and still are) members.²⁹

The first strong statement the OHSAA made concerning gender equity in sports came in 1995 when it published *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics: A Manual to Assist Ohio Schools in Developing and Conducting Fair and Equitable Athletic Programs*. In order to research Title IX and gender equity issues for this manual, the association had formed an Interscholastic Athletics Equity Committee in 1994. This group had the task of recommending strategies “to assist member schools in providing programs that are gender equitable, multicultural and disability aware” in order to comply with federal and state laws relating to sex discrimination.³⁰ The language this manual used is at times striking. For instance, the manual stated at one point that “having as many young women involved in sports activities (in Ohio schools) is the right thing to do.” That the OHSAA described this as a moral responsibility seems an about-face given its initial reaction to the law, which will be discussed in more detail later in this study.

³⁰ *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics*, i-iii.
Finally, although it may seem surprising that the association waited until 1995 to publish its first manual on gender equity in sports, this did not make it at all unusual in relation to the rest of the country. The Minnesota State High School League was a forerunner in publishing a manual of this kind, and it did not do so until 1993.\textsuperscript{31} Consider also that the Office for Civil Rights did not issue its \textit{Title IX Athletics Investigator’s Manual}, by which athletic directors could determine how well their school complied with the law, until 1990.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31} \textit{Gender Equity in Athletics}, Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota State High School League, 1993.
\textsuperscript{32} Reeves, 32.
CHAPTER 2
TWO VERY DIFFERENT COMMUNITIES

One obvious difference between East High School and Upper Arlington High School lay in the physical setting of the communities in which they were located. A 1986 Columbus Monthly article rating the best Columbus suburbs in which to live humorously referred to Upper Arlington as “a Ronald Reagan campaign commercial with a cast of 35,000.” To explain this statement, the author alluded to the town’s reputation for snobbishness, to its requirements that residents maintain their lawns and property, and to the community’s desire to hermetically seal itself off from surrounding areas. He wrote, “most Upper Arlington residents will tell you they get a bum rap, that they are not snobs. But they all know the perception exists.”

It could be argued that there was plenty to be snobbish about. Founded as a village in 1918, Upper Arlington was long referred to as the “Country Club District.” City planners intended it to be “an ideal residential community for Columbus” built on “a thousand acres of rolling, partly wooded Ohio farmland” found to be “the most beautiful district in the outlying regions surrounding the city.” A 1917 realty brochure for the community enthused, “Upper Arlington defined in a few words, is a place to live. It is a

\[33\text{ Ray Paprocki, “Rating the Suburbs.” Columbus Monthly, 1986, 6-8.}\]
place specially planned and platted as a site for those newer, more artistic and more comfortable homes everywhere demanded.\textsuperscript{34} Clearly this community had always been intended for affluent residents.

By 1960, it had attracted one of the wealthiest populations in Ohio. When compared that year with Ohio’s other 129 cities with 10,000 or more residents, Upper Arlington’s working population was 84.7% white collar—the highest in the state.\textsuperscript{35} When the census was taken twelve years later—the year Title IX became law—Upper Arlington ranked as the second richest community in Franklin County with a per capita income of \$7,660. In comparison, the per capita income for the city of Columbus, also located in Franklin County, in that year was a much smaller \$3,547.\textsuperscript{36}

This financial discrepancy between city and suburb had its beginnings in the founding of Columbus. The site for Ohio’s capital city was selected in 1812, more than a hundred years before the founding of Upper Arlington. The city’s central location kept it from becoming a thriving manufacturing center because it was not located near a major body of water; in fact, it remained an unimportant city. After the Civil War, the railroad did help to bring industrial growth to Columbus. While manufacturing never came to dominate the city, both its economy and population grew rapidly in the late nineteenth

\textsuperscript{34} History of Upper Arlington, A Suburb of Columbus, Ohio, ed. Marjorie Garvin Sayers (Columbus: Upper Arlington Historical Society, 1977), 3, 12.


century. By the time of the Great Depression, Columbus had a population of almost 300,000 people, making it the fourth largest city in Ohio.\textsuperscript{37}

Columbus’s African-American population increased profoundly due to the Great Migration, the movement of southern blacks to northern industrial centers between 1910 and 1920. Although Columbus received fewer African-American migrants than did larger industrial cities like Cleveland and Cincinnati, its black population did increase markedly during those years. Most new migrants to Columbus encountered fierce discrimination from white, native Ohioans so the majority settled in portions of the city already inhabited primarily by blacks. One such area was the Long Street district, where the building for East High School was constructed in 1923. Areas like this one were known for their close location to the downtown factories and for their low-rent housing, said to be some of the worst in the city.\textsuperscript{38} According to a 1928 study conducted by the Ohio State University, African Americans settled in the Long Street district because of its proximity to the wealthy residences on nearby East Broad Street, where affluent families hired African Americans to work within their homes. According to the study, “the Long Street region was near enough for convenience and also far enough away to keep Broad Street exclusive.”\textsuperscript{39}

Although affluent Broad Street residents were glad to have hired help living nearby, there is evidence that white residents of the Long Street neighborhood “bitterly resisted the encroachment of [African Americans]” and “tried to keep them confined to

\textsuperscript{37} Gregory S. Jacobs, Getting around Brown: Desegregation, Development, and the Columbus Public Schools (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1998), 66-76.
\textsuperscript{38} Vinnie Vanessa Bryant, “Columbus, Ohio and the Great Migration,” (M.A. thesis, Ohio State University, 1953), 2-6, 19-20.
\textsuperscript{39} Mary Louise Mark, Negroes in Columbus (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1928), 16-18.
the streets on which they were already living.” This failed as blacks slowly found white real estate dealers willing to sell them housing surreptitiously, without white residents knowing. In one instance, the day after a black family moved onto a block in the Long Street section “seven ‘For Sale’ signs were put up within the block and many others followed immediately. Property values went down considerably.”

Columbus first integrated its schools in 1874, thus permitting African-American children to attend its previously all-white schools. However, Vinnie Bryant asserts that “by 1932 gerrymandering of the school districts and a policy permitting students to transfer at will had succeeded in segregating the city’s schools.”

This move for racial separatism by white students and the location of East High School in the middle of the Long Street District explain why it was known as “the flagship school of the black community,” by the time Congress passed Title IX.

After World War II many American cities experienced some form of “white flight,” characterized by whites leaving cities in favor of living in suburban areas, which usually resulted in the concentration of poor minority groups in inner cities. Most large cities experienced white flight, but author Gregory Jacobs suggests that was never the case in Ohio’s capital. Instead he argues that white, middle-class “avoidance” of both Columbus and its school system was at play. In other words, longtime residents of the city were not necessarily moving out to the suburbs, but middle class people who moved to the area for the first time avoided the city in favor of living outside of it. While Jacobs

---

40 Ibid, 18.
41 Bryant, 43.
42 Jacobs, 65.
43 Berliner and Biddle, 231-2.
may be correct in arguing that “avoidance” was a stronger factor than “white flight” after World War II, we have already seen that in the 1920s whites were perfectly willing to move to other sections of the city to avoid living near blacks. This makes his theory interesting but not necessarily absolute. Whether we call it “white flight” or just “avoidance,” the clear result was the large growth of Columbus’s suburbs. By 1975, three years after the passage of Title IX, Upper Arlington’s population had grown to 38,000 people while Columbus housed 540,000 residents.\textsuperscript{44} Although this influx of residents to suburban areas certainly strengthened their economic and educational systems, it served to weaken those within the city of Columbus.

\textit{Two Very Different School Districts}

Because of the disparate size of Upper Arlington and Columbus, their respective school boards had vastly different responsibilities. The numbers explain this well: Upper Arlington maintained only nine schools and oversaw the education of about 9,000 students in 1975, whereas Columbus maintained 170 schools and was responsible for 96,000 students.\textsuperscript{45} The two districts varied not only in size but also in the money they could spend on each student—known as per pupil expenditures. For example, Upper Arlington spent $3,356 per student in 1983 while Columbus spent $2,879 per student that


year.\textsuperscript{46} The gap between the per pupil expenditures within these two school districts would continue to widen throughout the years of this study.

Despite these financial differences, both Upper Arlington High School and East High School offered many academic and extracurricular activities for their students. For instance, in 1975 UAHS was home to a successful student magazine that won awards from Quill & Scroll, the national high school journalism society.\textsuperscript{47} Its students were known for their academic accomplishments; the class of 1976, for example, had twelve students tied for valedictorian.\textsuperscript{48} In addition, the district boasted sending 80-85\% of its graduates to college.\textsuperscript{49} East High School also offered a wide variety of activities to its students. The school's "In the Know" Team, which competed in area academic bowls, defeated Upper Arlington and several other area schools to win the Central Ohio Championship in 1976.\textsuperscript{50} The team remained competitive throughout the period of this study. EHS also had a reputation for its strong male and female basketball teams during the 1980s.

Strong parental support was an important factor within both districts. Before each UAHS football game, parents took turns opening up their homes and preparing huge potluck meals for band members.\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, parents at EHS were known for their

\textsuperscript{48} "12 Valedictorians Lead Class of 742 at Commencement," The Upper Arlington News, 4 September 1976.
\textsuperscript{49} "Guidance Officers Help Students with College Plans. Applications." Upper Arlington News 7 February 1974, 3A.
\textsuperscript{50} Annual Report, 1975-76 (Columbus, OH: Columbus Public School District, 1976), 30.
\textsuperscript{51} June Wells Dill, "Band Eats Like 'Bears' At 'Football Spreads,'" Columbus Dispatch, 11 October 1975.
efforts to raise money for new uniforms for band members. In 1982, East High School parents collected $12,000 to buy band uniforms for the following year.\(^\text{52}\)

Certainly there were success stories at EHS, but the school still had problems, commonly associated with urban schools, which never plagued UAHS. Lowering the high truancy rate was a constant headache for school officials. There is also evidence that EHS administrators had trouble getting some parents involved in their children's education. Twice during this time, administrators came up with new methods for distributing student report cards so they could be sure parents had seen them. One program in 1977 involved the school requiring parents to come to school to collect their children's report cards, while another in 1988 had administrators visiting parents at home to deliver report cards.\(^\text{53}\) This does not suggest parents were remiss in prioritizing their students' education, but it is possible that students at UAHS were more likely to live in a two-parent home where only one parent had to work to support the family. Therefore, they may have been able to play a stronger role in their children's education. East High School also did not send as many of its graduates to college. While its Annual Report boasted in 1976 that two of its students would be attending Ivy League schools, only about 50% of its students actually matriculated. This percentage shrunk down further to 38% by 1986, whereas Upper Arlington High School's percentage had increased to 90%.\(^\text{54}\)


Another major area of divergence for these two school districts involved the issue of desegregation. Upper Arlington never dealt with this issue that had such a dramatic effect on the Columbus city schools. As previously stated, East High School was known until the late 1970s to be one of the predominantly African-American high schools in Columbus. This longstanding pattern of segregation began to unravel on March 8, 1977, when Judge Robert M. Duncan ruled in the case of *Penick v. Columbus Board of Education*, which had been filed by thirteen-year-old Gary Penick and three Columbus civil rights organizations in 1973. Their lawsuit alleged that the Columbus Public School District was guilty of segregation because some Columbus schools were predominantly African-American, although the district as a whole was predominantly white. That public schools were strongly segregated by race was common knowledge in Columbus, but the school district had managed for years to avoid the expense of a full-scale desegregation plan.

The 1977 *Penick* decision fell within a national context of court-ordered busing as a remedy for school segregation. In *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenberg Board of Education* in 1971, the Supreme Court ruled that having students attend their “neighborhood schools” preserved de facto segregation and recommended the busing of students to different schools as a solution for integration. In its 1973 *Keyes v. Denver School District #1* ruling, the Court found that northern cities were also responsible for segregated school districts. A third case, *Miliken v. Bradley*, also had a strong impact on the practice of busing. In this 1974 decision, the Court ruled against a plan to transport students between mostly black urban Detroit and its white suburbs. This decision
effectively limited the extent of busing as a solution to segregation because it allowed for “white flight” into the suburbs for parents who did not want their children bused to a city school outside of their neighborhood.\textsuperscript{55} Five years later in Columbus, despite district protests that it did not have enough money to do it, Judge Duncan ordered the school board to immediately implement a plan for desegregating Columbus schools. The school board complied in the fall of 1979.\textsuperscript{56}

Desegregating a school district that included nearly 100,000 students was no small expense, and it served to further aggravate the already existing financial discrepancies between Columbus and the schools in its neighboring suburban areas. The costs of massive planning, busing, and reconstruction of the operations of all of the public schools—not to mention the money spent in defense of the allegations brought forth by \textit{Penick}—absolutely crippled the Columbus school district. In 1976 the school board reported having to cut $5.8 million dollars from its budget in the areas of “building maintenance, equipment purchases and textbooks.”\textsuperscript{57} The situation was much worse three years later when the district accepted an $8.6 million dollar emergency loan from the state in order to keep the schools open and to continue to pay its employees. Although Superintendent Joseph L. Davis concluded in an annual report that “while we still face an uncertain financial future...we do have reason to be proud of our school system and optimistic about its future,” this message could not have been less


\textsuperscript{56} Jacobs, 45, 51-64.

\textsuperscript{57} \textit{Annual Report, 1975-76} (Columbus, OH: Columbus Public School District, 1976), 1.
convincing.\textsuperscript{58} Columbus school district finances reached their nadir two years later in 1981 when Davis had to admit to the board that "we are on the brink of the most perilous financial times the Columbus Public Schools have faced since the depths of the Depression."\textsuperscript{59}

This study is certainly complicated by the desegregation of East High School in 1979. There is an obvious shift in the racial makeup of the student body at EHS and in the kind of students who attended it between the first four years of this study (1975-1979) and the final eleven years until 1990. The racial and socioeconomic shift that took place there had a profound and very interesting effect on the school's athletic program, which will later be discussed in more detail. For now, it is important to note the change in numbers; the school's percentage of "nonwhite" students fell from almost 100% to 49.8%.\textsuperscript{60} In comparison, the Upper Arlington High School's student body remained almost exclusively white during this time. In fact, nonwhite students generally accounted for less than one percent of the high school's population.\textsuperscript{61}

\textit{Before Title IX: The Girls Athletic Association}

Boys' athletics had begun within the Columbus Public Schools as early as 1898, when the first high school basketball league was formed. As the years progressed, basketball, football, baseball, track, and wrestling became mainstays of the boys'
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athletics program. At UAHS, boys' interscholastic sports were concurrent with the building of the first high school in 1919, which housed a gymnasium. Boys competed as part of the Central Buckeye League against area suburban schools like Bexley, Grandview, Delaware, and Mount Vernon. Just as in the Columbus public schools, basketball, football, baseball, and track were the most popular sports.

Girls' sports within both districts understandably had very different beginnings. Prior to the passage of Title IX, both high schools had athletic opportunities for female students, although they were limited to the Girls Athletic Association. Through participation in this nationally-known club, "physically fit" high school girls competed in a variety of sports. At UAHS in 1965, there were fourteen GAA officers including a president, treasurer, and a "chairman" for each of the sports offered. There girls could compete in field hockey, basketball, volleyball, track, tennis, bowling, archery, and golf.

At East High School in the same year, female students participating in the GAA were described as playing a variety of sports, but only two, basketball and track, were specifically mentioned. Twenty-three female students appeared in a yearbook photograph of the group. Although the GAA had a large membership and a wide variety of sports in which girls could compete, it offered no opportunities for interscholastic competition. Girls at both schools were able to get physical exercise and
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learn teamwork from their participation in GAA, but they missed out on the attention paid to boys’ sports. While schools invested heavily in football and basketball teams for boys, girls were encouraged to be either cheerleaders for male teams or to play more docile non-competitive club sports.

This kind of high school sports program might have pleased the majority of the female students, but there is evidence that other female athletes had the potential to excel within a more competitive program. One female athlete who graduated from East High School in 1964 serves as a good example. Estelle Baskerville became the first female Olympian from Columbus when she competed in the 1964 Tokyo Olympics on the women’s track team. Throughout her junior high and high school years, Baskerville had competed on national teams and in such events as the Junior Olympics and the Pan-American Games. She had been in the Girls Athletic Association and had run as a member of a private track club.

In the 1965 *Crucible*, the yearbook of East High School, Baskerville was lauded for much more than her athletic talent. The yearbook focused a good deal of attention on her femininity. It described her as having “charm, grace, patience” and then went on to mention her “warm and friendly personality.” In the pictures of Baskerville that surround this article, she is seen not just competing on the track but also wearing a dress on the campus of her new college and wearing a kimono given to her during her time in Japan.\(^\text{67}\)

Clearly her femininity was viewed as being just as important as her athletic prowess. Even though the *Crucible* article did praise Baskerville’s femininity along with

\(^\text{67}\) Ibid, 2-3.
her athletic accomplishments, at least it did not disparage her for being a strong female athlete. It is unclear whether a female athlete at UAHS would have received as much support for being a competitive runner, since the only sports offered to girls there came through the Girls Athletic Association and did not involve the kind of intense competition Baskerville expected from an athletic program.

Until the 1970s, the GAA remained the predominant avenue for girls at both high schools to participate in sports. However, around this time girls’ interest in sports increased dramatically. Within the state of Ohio, this caused the OHSAA to respond with more competitive opportunities for female athletes. By 1975 it began to create state athletics tournaments for girls, in addition to the ones that already existed for boys.68 It is clear that female participation in competitive sports was quickly losing its stigma. In short, the 1970s witnessed the birth of a very different kind of female athlete.

68 Ohio High School Athlete 34, no.5 (April 1975): 182.
CHAPTER 3
EARLY LIMITATIONS OF THE LAW

Although 1972 is typically understood as the year Title IX became law, this is not exactly accurate. Congress passed the law in that year, but it was not until December 1979 that a final set of policy interpretations became effective to help federally-funded institutions understand how to implement the law.\textsuperscript{69} In other words, about seven years passed before school districts were actually held accountable for demonstrating that their athletic programs were Title IX compliant.

This information is complicated given that the rise in high school girls' participation in sports came before 1979. Author Jessica Gavora argues that because policy interpretations were not published until 1979, "for most of the decade of the 1970s...the law was unenforced and unenforceable in sporting programs in the nation's schools." According to her, "the momentum with which young female athletes were entering high school sports between 1971 and 1972 tells us that this was a trend that did not originate with the passage of Title IX but began years earlier."\textsuperscript{70} Author Brian L.
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Porto agrees that Title IX "reflected, more than it created" girls increasing interest in playing sports.\(^71\)

In addition, successful lawsuits on behalf of equity in girls' sports were waged before the passage of Title IX and were instead based either on claims under the Fourteenth Amendment or state equal rights amendments. In *Brendon v. Independent School District* in 1971, a federal court ruled that two Minnesota high school girls were eligible to compete on a boys' sports team since their school did not sponsor a similar girls' team, basing this ruling on the Fourteenth Amendment.\(^72\) All of this suggests that high school girls across the country were showing an increased interest in sports even before Title IX became so strongly associated with athletics.

The Ohio High School Athletic Association would maintain for two decades that Title IX had not provided the impetus for the expansion of girls' athletic programs. In an article that appeared in its magazine for athletic directors, "The Ohio High School Athlete," the association suggested "it is...a myth that Title IX has been responsible for the rapidly expanding opportunities for girls in interscholastic athletics" since the largest growth in girls' athletics had predated the passage of the law. "Title IX has had little or nothing to do with the growth of girls interscholastic athletics...the statistics prove Title IX was a johnny-come-lately."\(^73\) Even though this article and the authors mentioned

---


above have argued correctly that the growth in girls’ sports had come by 1975, they have missed other important points.

First, girls did begin to participate on sports teams in larger numbers, but schools had no incentive to make sure their teams were equitable before Title IX took effect. In other words, girl’s sports teams often had volunteer coaches, practiced and played in inferior facilities, and received less attention than male sports. OHSAA board members missed the point of the law when they looked only at the number of girls playing interscholastic sports within state high schools.

Second, there is evidence that the OHSAA acted slowly in its initial response to the expansion of girls’ athletics within the state. When it did engage in such a discussion, it turned to Dolores Billhardt, the assistant commissioner of the association and also the sole member responsible for all aspects of Ohio’s girls’ sports programs. Thus, the association relied on her for several years to be the only expert on such matters. Billhardt formed a Girls’ Advisory Committee in 1972 and led an initial discussion entitled “Standards for Girls’ and Women’s Sports—are they necessary?” It seems an understatement to suggest this discussion was elementary. Despite the large number of girls flocking to interscholastic athletics at this time, the OHSAA did not yet have any idea what to do with them.
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74 Certainly the law’s actual ability to ensure equality within sports programs is continuously debated (as it is within this paper), but I think most scholars would acquiesce that Title IX was at least being considered by school boards when planning their athletic programs.

75 “All District Board Meeting, 15 April 1978,” Ohio High School Athlete 37, no. 6 (May 1978): 335.

Finally, as we have just seen, the association did not begin scheduling comparable state athletic tournaments for girls until 1975. This was obviously after the passage of Title IX, so it also suggests that the organization could have begun to recognize the importance of holding equitable tournaments because of Title IX. In all of these scenarios, Title IX acted as a powerful incentive to hold the OHSAA accountable for its actions on behalf of girls’ athletics programs. It seems likely that OHSAA board members did not want to give credit to Title IX for pushing them to expand girls’ athletic opportunities. Instead these officials wanted to maintain they had the foresight to offer girls more athletic opportunities when they first showed interest in them.

The OHSAA later acknowledged that its initial view of the law was shortsighted when it published *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics* in 1995. This manual asserts that “one result of the adoption of this law was a tremendous increase in interscholastic participation opportunities for girls throughout the country and in Ohio.” It then cited statistics to show the increased number of girls playing sports between the years 1973 and 1981 and noted a correlation between this increase and the passage of Title IX.77 Again, this view stands in stark contrast to that the OHSAA espoused in the late 1970s.

Both the Columbus and Upper Arlington school districts did take notice in 1975 when HEW published initial regulations for how schools should implement the law. On November 17, 1975, the Upper Arlington school board passed a “Title IX—Affirmative Action Resolution.” It stated that the district intended to comply with Title IX and to

77 *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics*, 1.
conduct a "searching self-examination to identify any discriminatory policies or practices" within its schools.\textsuperscript{78} The Columbus School Board reacted to the law about six months later when it passed a similar resolution stating its intention to comply with the law. However, neither school district made any mention of girls' athletics.\textsuperscript{79}

That neither Columbus nor Upper Arlington at first envisioned the impact of Title IX on athletics is not that surprising, given the OHSAA's slow reaction to the law. As we have seen, the organization was considering how to expand its role in girls' sports at this time, but it usually did this without directly invoking Title IX. It gave short shrift to the law in its 1975 board meetings, stating only briefly in a February 1975 meeting that "guidelines for the implementation of Title IX have not been approved by HEW. The Board tabled any action until guidelines are received."\textsuperscript{80} Later in September 1975, the board noted it had received a "preliminary report on Title IX interpretations. Reprints from the National Federation (of high school athletic associations) were distributed."\textsuperscript{81} Clearly both the OHSAA and the two school districts did not begin worrying about equitable athletics programs until much later.

Even though the school boards and the OHSAA at first failed to understand Title IX's future implications for athletics, female athletic participation increased markedly at both high schools during this time (see Tables 1-6). For example, while track was the only sport available for girls at East High School during the 1974-75 school year, in the following year girls could compete in tennis, basketball, volleyball, softball and track.
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Consequently, the number of female athletes increased considerably, jumping from 18 to 49 in just one school year.\textsuperscript{82} While this increase from one to five sports was phenomenal for one year's time, the girls' athletic program at East High School would not see such drastic growth again. In subsequent years the school sometimes offered girls six sports, but this number decreased to only four from 1978-1987, probably due to the district's massive budget cuts. Nevertheless, girls' athletic participation at the school remained higher than it had been prior to 1975.

Upper Arlington High School saw a similar spike in girls' sports participation in 1975. Whereas girls could compete in six sports through the Girls Athletic Association in 1970, by 1975 there were eight regular sports in which girls could compete.\textsuperscript{83} Thus, both of these schools witnessed the largest increase in female athletic participation by 1975.

It is impressive that this addition of girls' sports at both high schools came despite financial complaints by both districts during the late 1970s and early 1980s. These economic problems had both local and national roots. On a national level, the post-World War II financial boom had come to a halt by 1970. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the American economy struggled with stagflation—the combination of high rates of inflation and unemployment. This national problem had a strong impact on local school districts because Americans became increasingly weary of taxation.\textsuperscript{84} Yet another problem, as we have seen, was the deep financial quandary in which the Columbus school district found itself after desegregation in 1979. It seems over-obvious to state
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that the resulting budget cuts placed Columbus schools severely behind those of Upper Arlington, but the Columbus School Board's "Proposed Goals and Tasks for 1980-1984" does illustrate this point quite well. Goal #6 of this plan proposed the allocation of funds for hiring classroom aides, certified (as opposed to uncertified) music and physical education teachers in elementary schools, and media aides in all of the middle and high schools. This plan stated that these services "will allow us to be competitive with the suburban school districts," noting that "we have been starved in these personnel areas that are taken for granted in the suburbs." Columbus School Board officials obviously recognized the city schools to be inferior to those in suburban areas like Upper Arlington.

There is evidence that the Upper Arlington school district also faced financial problems during these years. When a teacher wrote a letter in the fall of 1976 to notify the school board about his upcoming resignation he apologized for "leaving at a time of critical financial crisis." Five years later, the school district continued to struggle with its finances, demonstrated when the board passed a resolution to participate in a statewide "Schools Are Seeing Red Week." The resolution recognized that school districts in Ohio were spending less per pupil and were paying teachers less than the national average. Yet, as we have seen, the per pupil expenditure rate in Upper Arlington remained much higher than that of Columbus during this time. Thus, the district's complaints of being short-funded seem much less serious in comparison.

85 *Columbus School Board Meeting Minutes*, 10 June 1980, 672.
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CHAPTER 4
THE 1980s AT UPPER ARLINGTON HIGH SCHOOL

In 1982, the Upper Arlington school district faced what it defined as a huge problem. Because ninth graders had recently joined the high school population and because of the increased participation of girls in sports, coaches and athletes had been burdened with “a crowded gymnasium schedule with overflow into the auditorium lobby and cafeteria.” This concern would have probably been viewed as just one among several in the Columbus schools, but the Upper Arlington school board proposed a solution. Soon, construction began on a new multi-purpose gymnasium. The million-dollar facility housed basketball and volleyball courts, locker rooms, office and storage space, and bleachers. This new facility enabled the school to expand its athletic program by adding “two boys’ and two girls’ basketball teams, an additional volleyball team, an expanded gymnastics program, an additional wrestling squad and an additional swim program.” While the school district was not able to pay for this lavish new facility out of its current operating budget, it was able to use capital funds from the past sale of school property.89 Certainly Upper Arlington High School’s athletic program was not troubled by a lack of funding.

Female athletes attending the high school in the 1980s had it much better than any of the girls who had gone before them. This was the trend both locally and nationally; the New York Times reported in 1984 that “participation by girls on athletic teams has surged” and attributed this rise to parents’ pushing for girls’ athletic teams, the women’s rights movement, increased interest in physical fitness, and the passage of Title IX. It seemed that each year brought increased acceptance of girls’ participation in sports. In 1982, 212 girls at Upper Arlington High School competed in soccer, cross country, tennis, volleyball, basketball, swimming, gymnastics, track, and softball. In the 1981-82 school year and the one that preceded it, Upper Arlington girls took home state titles in both cross country and tennis. By the mid-1980s, girls were able to organize their own version of the popular boys’ lacrosse team. By 1989, two girls were allowed to compete on the boys’ water polo team and, according to a yearbook article about the team, they were “integral” members of the team who “fit in really well.”

Much of the stigma that had previously surrounded girls competing in high schools sports had disappeared by the 1980s, and there is evidence that this was the case at UAHS by the end of the decade. An article on the girls’ soccer team from the 1989 yearbook portrayed soccer players as being the perfect mix of feminine and athletic. The photos of the team showed girls with ponytails and make-up still looking tough on the field. The article praised their team spirit and hard work, as well as their pre-game cheer

of “Rip their faces off!” Similarly, in an article about the girls’ cross country team, one of the members of the team complained about having to run outside in the mud during practice. She explained, “We were not mudders…We were a team of little, cute girls who didn’t run well in muddy conditions.” The author of this article, nonetheless, felt the need to reassert the toughness, not the femininity, of the team by writing “The girls may have been ‘cute and little,’ but they were definitely tough.”

The increased participation of girls in sports as well as the decreasing stigma of female athletes are both said to be accomplishments of Title IX. But despite Upper Arlington’s affluence and the resulting ease with which it could improve its athletic program for girls, there is evidence that traditional gendered practices continued at the high school. Despite their growing reputation as capable and hardworking athletes, girls were either expected to or wanted to live up to older gender roles. This can be seen clearly at UAHS in the amount of attention given to male sports teams and the role girls filled as supporters, assistants, and pep club members for boys’ teams.

High school yearbooks reveal the changes in girls’ sports participation over the years as well as continuing disparate patterns for girls and boys. The 1965 volume of Upper Arlington High School’s Norwester contained a large athletic section, but all of the sports portrayed were those for boys, except for one small section devoted to the Girls’ Athletic Association. Moreover, the page introducing the sports section of the 1965 yearbook contained several pictures of athletes competing, yet none of the pictures
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showed a female face. By the 1980s, however, sports sections of the yearbook contained almost as many sports for girls as for boys; on the page introducing the sports section, photos displayed both girls and boys in athletic competition. Yet throughout this twenty-year time frame, one thing about these yearbooks stayed remarkably consistent: the dominance of male sports teams.

Football is the best example. Almost always the first sport pictured in the yearbook and always the sport with the most players, the football team dominated UAHS athletics, as it did in high school athletics programs across the country. During the 1980 school year, the high school's football team had 100 players—the same number as the boys' basketball, soccer, and cross country teams combined. Homecoming week always revolved around a football game, so this must have sent a clear message to girls that their sports were not appreciated in the same way. Also in the 1980 yearbook, the football team was the first sports team written about, in an article titled "U.A. Football is Pride." Throughout the period of this study, football was obviously viewed as the most important sport in the school.

The main problem with the dominance of football is that girls are generally not allowed to play. It follows that, despite the increased attention female athletes were able to gain for their sports, they would never be considered as important as the football team. Suggs argues that high school girls encounter more inequity in sports than do college women because they are faced with "second-class status" in high school sports,
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compared to the “first class status” of high school football players. According to his study, this disparity usually receives less attention in high schools than in colleges because colleges are more concerned about lawsuits or the difficulty of student recruitment if they do not appear Title IX compliant. He goes on to argue that many parents do not understand Title IX legislation; the Office for Civil Rights does not often enforce the three-pronged test within high schools to see if they are following Title IX; and most high schools have not dropped boys’ sports in order to have equal numbers of girls’ and boys’ sports teams.100 For all of these reasons, high school football is often not restricted in size, even though it might result in less money for girls’ sports teams or other boys’ teams.101 Because of this, female athletes at UAHS quite possibly entered sports programs with an understanding that their sport would never gain the attention paid to the massive boys’ football team. The actions of athletic directors sent a clear message to female athletes that football was widely regarded as the best sport within the school.

This local preoccupation with boys’ sports teams seems to have run parallel with an idea that, on a national level, men’s sports were more important than women’s. This can be seen in the 1980 Norwester’s special section on current events. This volume separated current events into different categories such as “Fads, Fashion and Fun,” “Movies, Music and More,” “People, Politics and Problems,” and finally “Goals, Games and Gold,” which showed seven pictures from national sporting events. Six of these pictures depicted male athletes; only one was of a woman playing tennis. An article that

100 At least in Upper Arlington and East High School, the Office for Civil Rights never conducted a random audit to verify that either was complying with Title IX. Given the large size of the Columbus School District, it would seem that Suggs is correct in charging this organization with negligence.
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accompanied the section then described happenings in the world of sports—from the World Series to the winning record of Ohio State’s football team to the U.S. hockey team’s defeat of the U.S.S.R.—but it made no mention of women’s sports or of any female athletes.\(^{102}\) It could be said that the attention the yearbook gave to men’s sports reflected the contemporary cultural attitude about who belonged in sports. This attitude was then reflected in the student body and affected the attention paid to certain sports within the high school.

Yet another indicator of gender disparities at UAHS during this time can be found in the organization of pep clubs and clubs who assisted at games for the male sports teams. In 1975, at the same time interscholastic competition became possible for female athletes, the high school formed an official pep club of about 100 members to support the football team. Its members participated in such activities as decorating players’ houses and lockers before the games and making scrapbooks for each of the senior players to remember the season. Not surprisingly, every member was female.\(^{103}\) In later years, as the high school’s athletic program expanded, so did the activities of the pep club. By 1990, it supported other boys’ sports—not just the football team—and its members were known to frequently bake cookies for male players.\(^{104}\) A similar club included girls who helped at the various boys’ athletic events. With such names as the soccer booties, racquettes, mat maids, and hockey honeys (although some were less gendered, e.g. the “track timers”), these girls both timed and kept statistics at athletic matches. Their
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similarity to the pep club is obvious; these groups, too, were exclusively female and supported only the male teams.

However, these girls who gave sexualized names to their groups and assisted directly with male athletic competition seem to have been part of a different trend. Even though their names were probably chosen in good fun, they implied both that members had to be female (certainly most male high school students would not wish to be called a “hockey honey,”) and some involved the physical appearance of women (e.g. soccer booties), seemingly in order to draw attention to the physical appearance of the girls involved. These girls chose to draw attention to their femininity and physical appearance in order to comfortably involve themselves with the male sports teams. In most years the membership of the pep club and these assistant groups combined was either equivalent to or higher than membership on the various girls’ sports teams. Thus, while new opportunities for female athletes arose, there was still a strong persistence of older gender norms at the high school.

No one ever made this an issue at Upper Arlington High School, but the question of whether girls should support only male teams was raised at other schools across the country.105 For example, in the 1970s high schools on Long Island began to debate the fairness of offering female cheerleaders for boys’ sports only. After they presented their case to the U.S. Board of Education, that body ruled that cheerleaders should be provided equally to both male and female sports teams. But one complication of this decision was that “female basketball players did not want cheerleaders at their games, and the female

105 In its 1995 manual, the OHSAA recommended athletic directors “ensure that female athletes have access to support services that are typically provided to boys’ squads, i.e. cheerleaders, pep bands, adult scorekeepers, announcers.” From *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics*, 7.
cheerleaders did not want to cheer at girls’ games.” According to the athletic director, “It all has to do with attitudes, and we’re trying to change that.” When this issue was raised in the late 1980s, Long Island school districts contacted the Office of Civil Rights, which also said it was discriminatory for female athletes not to have a cheerleading squad. When the *New York Times* reported on this story in 1991, school board officials were still unsure about how to solve the problem. Based on this evidence, it could be argued that if female athletes at Upper Arlington High School had wanted a pep club, a group of assistants to time and record stats at their sporting events, or even their own cheerleading squad, they would have asked for it. Nonetheless, in a time when girls were praised for their increasing athletic prowess, a girl was just as likely to identify herself as a “soccer bootie,” who baked cookies and attended the boys’ matches, as she was to consider herself a serious athlete who deserved to have people attend her own soccer matches.

Girls at UAHS also felt more pressure than their male peers to prove they had knowledge of sports. The 1980 *Norwester* described the formation of the boys’ intramural basketball team and noted, with some surprise, that it was the first year female students served as referees for their games. When asked by the yearbook staff if the basketball players respected them, “one referee replied, ‘They did not at first. There was some goofing around—just to see if we knew what we were doing. Once they realized that we were serious, they got serious also.’”

---

Further evidence that the athletic program of the 1970s and 1980s was not equitable can actually be found in the gender equity manual printed by the OHSAA in 1995. With an eye toward ameliorating problems of the past, the authors of this manual made many suggestions for how girls' sports could be treated more fairly within the high school setting. Their suggestions indicated areas where girls still lagged behind boys in athletic programs, so they shed light on the problems mentioned in this study. First, the authors suggested setting "standards for acceptable language" by not referring to "the team" and the 'girls' team' when addressing the same sport." As we have seen, the *Norwester* frequently used this language, which suggested that the girls' team was only auxiliary to the boys'. The 1995 manual also recommended giving equal focus to different sports during special school events by suggesting that the Homecoming game be played by a different team each year. Yet another recommendation was that schools should work with booster clubs "to ensure that financial and other support is distributed equitably amongst all teams within the school."\(^{108}\)

What this mention of football teams, pep clubs, and female referees illustrates is the continuing battle girls faced during this time period for "equity," even in affluent suburban school districts like Upper Arlington. Even though Upper Arlington certainly had more revenue than did Columbus to increase girls' access to sports programs, certain notions about a woman's place in an athletics program still held firm. In other words, women were still expected to be spectators, supporters, and helpers for male sports teams despite the progress brought by Title IX.

\(^{108}\) *Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics*, 5-6.
But this evidence stands in the shadow of other evidence indicating strong support for female athletes at Upper Arlington High School. Parents were quick to support their games and their participation in athletics. Their impressive record also speaks for itself; between the years 1975 and 1990, UAHS female athletes won eleven state titles—most of them in tennis and cross country.¹⁰⁹ Ultimately, female students in Upper Arlington had a good deal of options available to them. In general, they had the freedom to pursue almost any activity they chose.

¹⁰⁹ Information provided by Dan Donovan, Communications Director for the Upper Arlington School District.
CHAPTER 5

EAST HIGH SCHOOL: THE IMPACT OF DESEGREGATION ON GIRLS’ ATHLETICS

The official meeting minutes of the Columbus Board of Education during the late 1970s and early 1980s reveal a recurring theme—an almost obsessive preoccupation with locating additional financial aid for its schools. Given the dire financial strait the school district was in, this is certainly understandable. During this period, district officials applied for myriad grants and emergency funds from both the state and federal government. Consequently the board took a good deal of interest in legislation like Title VII of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1972, which provided funds to districts in the process of implementing a school desegregation plan, and in Title IV of the Civil Rights Act, which provided funds for “technical assistance and staff training” to aid school desegregation efforts.¹¹⁰ That the federal government did not offer schools funds for implementing Title IX explains why it educed little attention from board members.

The Columbus school district barely avoided a complete shutdown of all of its schools given the extreme financial problems it faced at the beginning of the 1980s. This makes it all the more remarkable that the athletics program at East High School continued after schools were desegregated. Despite the district’s financial woes, EHS always had

¹¹⁰ Columbus School Board Meeting Minutes, 5 August 1980, 921,925.
athletic opportunities for its students, and it was able to maintain the increased number of girls' sports begun in the mid-1970s. Middle schools within Columbus were not so fortunate. As the school district desegregated in 1979, it also changed from a system of three-year middle and three-year high schools to a more traditional plan of two-year middle schools and four-year high schools. Once the district implemented this system, there were neither freshmen teams available at the high schools for ninth-graders nor were there any athletics programs within the Columbus middle schools. School board officials finally ameliorated this deficiency in 1987, but for years Columbus students went without school-sponsored athletics until they reached tenth grade.\textsuperscript{111}

As was the case with Upper Arlington High School and most other Ohio schools, East High School's sports program for girls had experienced incredible growth by the mid-1970s. In 1973, the all-male tennis team expanded its membership to include female tennis players. For the next sixteen years, girls at EHS would be allowed to play as part of the boys' team.\textsuperscript{112} By 1976, girls had their own teams in volleyball, basketball, tennis, track, and softball. However, the girls' sports added at EHS were offered on a less consistent basis than were girls' sports at Upper Arlington (see Tables 4 and 6). Basketball, volleyball, softball, and track were offered most consistently. East High School was unable to afford the kind of lavish girls' athletic program offered at UAHS, but its female athletes still met with frequent success. For instance, the girls' basketball

\textsuperscript{111} Kathy Gray Foster. "Freshmen to Get Sports Program," Columbus Dispatch 17 June 1986, 1A and Foster, "Middle Schools Gearing up for Sports Rebirth," Columbus Dispatch 2 August 1987, 1B.

\textsuperscript{112} It was not until 1989 that a separate girls' team was formed.
team was ranked as one of the top ten in the area between 1977 and 1980.\textsuperscript{113} In addition, its girls’ track team won the state track finals in both 1982 and 1983.\textsuperscript{114}

Whereas East High School’s female athletes were successful, they also experienced the second-class status faced by female athletes at Upper Arlington High School. Boys’ football and basketball were clearly the most popular sports at East High School; they received the greatest amount of attention and also had the largest number of athletes. Columbus’ African-American community had long provided ardent support to the male sports program at East High School. Attendance at these games was high because both sports were a strong source of community pride and tradition. Girls’ sports did experience incredible growth at EHS during this time, but they would never replace the position boys’ sports held within this community.\textsuperscript{115}

Girls at East High School also garnered less attention than their male teammates when they competed on coeducational teams. I have already mentioned the co-ed tennis team, but male and female students also competed together on the soccer team. Whereas UAHS began a boys’ soccer team in 1975 and a girls’ team in 1980, soccer did not premier at East High School until 1984. It was a boys’ team from 1984 to 1990, but a few female students who wanted to play soccer chose to join the team during the 1984 and 1988 school years. The East High School yearbook, the Crucible, described the 1988 team as having “a small but loyal group of fans” who “found out that Soccer-East High School is 80 minutes of fast-paced, exciting sports action.” This description indicates

\textsuperscript{113} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1980), 48.
\textsuperscript{114} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1983), 5.
soccer was not as popular as more established sports teams, since in four years it had
failed to draw a large fan base. The yearbook included a photo of the team, which
showcased both its male and female members. However, when the article noted the best
players on the team, none of the girls were mentioned. In the individual pictures of
athletes playing during specific matches, only boys were pictured.\textsuperscript{116}

Much like yearbook portrayals of female athletes at UAHS that highlighted their
femininity and athletic ability, the \textit{Crucible} described the school’s female athletes as
being both athletic and feminine. For example, an article about the 1980 girls’ basketball
team praised their “tenacious man-to-man defense” as well as their “speed, quickness,
scoring power, and pressure defense,” yet the girls’ team was known as the “Lady
Tigers.”\textsuperscript{117} Similarly, the yearbook lauded the 1982 girls’ track team for having “used
splendid sprinters, superb field events, and team depth to put together a memorable track
season.” These girls had proved themselves able to handle difficult athletic competition,
but members of this team were known as the “Tigerbelles,” and the runners were
frequently described as “ladies” within the article.\textsuperscript{118}

The girls’ teams at EHS were known by feminized versions of the name for the
male team (the Tigers), but this nomenclature seems a far cry from the gender stereotypes
that defined the girls’ pep clubs at Upper Arlington High School. There is no evidence
that girls at EHS engaged in the kind of pep club activity so prevalent at UAHS.
Although girls who ran and played basketball were known as “Tigerbelles” and “Lady
Tigers,” these names seem much different than the pep club members and sports

\textsuperscript{116} \textit{The Crucible} (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1988), 90-1.
\textsuperscript{117} \textit{The Crucible} (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1980), 48.
\textsuperscript{118} \textit{The Crucible} (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1982), 2.
assistants who referred to themselves as “soccer booties,” “hockey honey’s,” and “mat maids.”

In part, this difference can be explained by the way white society and African-American society dissimilarly viewed women’s sports participation. The traditional argument is that African Americans were historically more accepting of female athletes and were less likely to look down on women for being strong and athletic. Author Susan Cahn explains this different perception by arguing that “black women’s own conception of womanhood, while it may not actively have encouraged sport, did not preclude it—they created an ideal of womanhood rooted in the positive qualities they cultivated under adverse conditions: struggle, strength, family commitment, community involvement and moral integrity.” Because of these traits, Cahn asserts, African-American society has historically valued female athletics more than white society has. Marian Washington also observed that African-American women were historically celebrated for their achievement as athletes, especially as Olympic runners, because this was one of few realms in which they earned positive national attention and were celebrated as role models for young black women. Perhaps this best illustrates Higginbotham’s argument that “gender identity is inextricably linked to and even determined by racial identity.” In other words, these runners were not identified by either their race or their gender; they were recognized as being an inextricable combination of both.

121 Higginbotham, 253.
In addition to societal views of black female athletes, desegregation also affected student interactions within the sports program at EHS. Schools first desegregated in the fall of 1979, and school district officials had noticed by the next year that racial separation occurred within the district’s extracurricular activities. Officials did an audit of participation in extracurricular activities in all Columbus schools and found that some showed low percentages of black participation—for instance, African Americans made up only 2% of the golfers in the high schools and accounted for only 21% of female tennis players. However, in other sports black athletes were disproportionately represented. In football, reserve football, and cross country, they accounted for 40-60% of high school athletes. Overall, African Americans made up about 38% of Columbus students. 122

This district-wide tendency for some sports to be predominantly African-American while others had very few blacks was also reflected at East High School. For instance, after desegregation EHS saw a revival of the Girls Athletic Association, an organization which had not been present at the school since 1973. In the 1980 yearbook photo of the GAA, 24 of the 34 members were white. In the following year, the organization had 38 members, only one of whom was black. 123 This seems to suggest that white students had brought this organization with them from their previous school and that African-American students either were not interested in joining or did not feel

122 The committee examined eight sports and four activities—cross-country, varsity football, reserve football, golf, varsity cheerleaders, reserve cheerleaders, girl’s tennis, girl’s volleyball, band, drill team, vocal music and orchestra.
123 The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1980), 80 (1981), 98.
they would be included in the organization. The organization continued to be dominated by white members throughout the period of this study.\textsuperscript{124}

Gregory Jacobs noted that the tendency of African-Americans to be disproportionately involved in some activities was also apparent in cheerleading at certain Columbus high schools. Most African-American girls were unfamiliar with the style of cheerleading at the new schools to which they were bused because black and white schools had practiced two different forms of cheerleading; cheerleading at black schools had long focused on flips and dancing, whereas white schools focused on pyramid formations. This meant that black cheerleaders often felt uncomfortable joining the squads at their new schools, so many avoided it.\textsuperscript{125} There is some evidence that the cheerleading style at EHS changed after desegregation, due to the influence of its new white students. For instance, cheerleading photographs in the 1965 Crucible seemed to emphasize cheerleaders’ athletic ability. They were individually pictured doing different gymnastics moves like the “Chinese split” or the “Russian jump.” The 1979 squad even had four male tumblers who participated along with the cheerleaders. According to the yearbook, “the varsity tumblers worked hard to perfect their flips and jumps. The big thrill of the season was their appearance at St. John Arena at the state championship basketball game.” The pictures that accompanied this article suggest the male tumblers were very skilled gymnasts.\textsuperscript{126} Yet, in yearbook pictures of the more racially

\textsuperscript{124} It is unclear whether the activities of this new Girls Athletic Association were similar to the ones offered through East’s GAA before desegregation. The yearbooks do not go into any detail about the kinds of activities in which GAA members participated.

\textsuperscript{125} Jacobs, 147.

\textsuperscript{126} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1979), 73.
heterogeneous squads of the 1980s, athletic ability and strength seem much less strongly emphasized.\textsuperscript{127}

To some degree, the racial separation within the sports program at East High School continued throughout the years of this study—to the extent that some sports were heavily dominated by black athletes, whereas others were dominated by whites. For example, the 1983 girls’ track team that won first place at the state finals was 100% black (13 runners), when African-American students made up only 42% of the student body. The team was coached by three black male coaches. Even as late as 1988, yearbook pictures of the boys’ cross country team reveal that it was made up solely of black members. The girls’ cross country team had only one white runner.\textsuperscript{128} Similarly, the boys’ varsity basketball team had only one white player. But white students, who made up half of the student body at EHS, seem to have dominated sports like swimming and soccer. For example, two-thirds of the members of the girls’ swim team were white during this year. Other teams, such as men’s wrestling and women’s volleyball, actually seemed to achieve a racial balance during this year.\textsuperscript{129}

There are many possible reasons for why white and African-American athletes were disproportionately represented in some of the sports at East High School during the 1980s. First, black athletes might have chosen sports, whether consciously or subconsciously, because they considered them to be traditional African-American sports. Perhaps their schema for sports participation did not include sports like soccer or

\textsuperscript{127} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1965), 69-71 and (1980), 68-70.
\textsuperscript{128} It should be acknowledged that yearbook pictures are not entirely accurate for judging the racial makeup of a team since some players are not pictured in the yearbook team photo. Still, studying yearbook photos was the most accessible method for determining the racial composition of these teams.
\textsuperscript{129} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1988), 82, 84, 94.
swimming because they were influenced by the sports their older siblings had played or by the national sports in which they saw the largest percentage of black athletes. Marian Washington argued that black female athletes were more influenced by track stars because “people tend to choose those things which are familiar...for their own reservoir of experience is so limited.” She suggested black girls were not influenced by athletes like Billie Jean King, Mickie Wright, or Peggy Fleming (all popular white athletes) because they were “white and from a world apart.” Instead, they chose sports familiar to their experience where they saw the largest representation of black female athletes.¹³⁰

Another likely possibility is that Columbus students had been strongly affected by the long absence of sports within the city’s middle schools. As we have seen, between 1980 and 1987 the school district was unable to finance these athletic programs. As a result, students who entered EHS in these years would have had no athletic experience except that provided by area recreational leagues or by private lessons. Tina Sloan Green, director of the Women in Sport Foundation, has suggested that the costs of private sports lessons (for activities such as golf, tennis, swimming, or gymnastics) can be prohibitive for many urban parents. The result is that urban students often have no exposure to these sports, so they later choose not to compete in them on the high school or college level because they have no reason to believe they would be successful.¹³¹ This lack of exposure to a variety of sports at the middle school level might have solidified students’ desire to play traditionally African-American or white sports. Choosing to begin a new sport at the high school level—where competition is more intense—would

¹³¹ Suggs, A Place on the Team, 182.
have been riskier than it would have been in middle school. This explains why black students chose to compete in sports like track and basketball. Yet, it cannot explain why they participated so heavily in cross country, which is traditionally known as a white sport.

Another possible reason for why students chose the sports they did was their opinion of the person coaching the sport. In a 1985 interview of various high school principals from Columbus schools, Principal Willis said a problem faced at East High School was "getting white athletes to have confidence in black coaches." So, there is a possibility that athletes chose a sport based on the skin color of its coach.

This segregation of students in extra-curricular activities after desegregation paralleled an increasing percentage of white students within the student body. The percentage of white students at East High School went from less than one percent in the 1970s to almost sixty percent by 1990. By 1987, the school’s white population was higher than that of the Columbus school district as a whole (see charts E and F, p. 64). At this time, the city saw a major decline in its student population due to the decrease in the birth rate; this would mean a student population that stood at 110,000 in 1971 dropped to 68,367 by 1983. Simultaneously, the student body at EHS was whiter but also poorer than the rest of the school district during the 1980s (see Tables 7-9). In comparison,

---

132 Rapp, Burkley, and Lyttle, 16A.
134 The author of a 1984 Citizen-Journal article interviewed a school district official who noted that most school districts in the country were losing students because of the declining birth rate; he said the major losses were in middle and high schools as students "born in years with low birthrates" reached those grade levels. See Paul Sussman, "Pupil Exodus Down to a Mere Trickle City Schools Find," Columbus Citizen-Journal, 16 November 1984, 19.
during the 1990-91 school year, there were no students at Upper Arlington High School who received a free or reduced price lunch.\textsuperscript{135}

As we have seen, three consequences of desegregation for the Columbus Public Schools were the segregation of students within athletics programs, the long-time absence of sports at the middle-school level, and the limiting of funds for high school athletics. Yet another pejorative effect of desegregation was the impact busing had on sports participation. Consider the percentage of East High School students who participated in sports. In 1985, 10\% of the high school’s female students were athletes; by 1988, this figure had risen to 19\%.\textsuperscript{136} These percentages seem quite low when compared to girls’ athletic participation at Upper Arlington High School.\textsuperscript{137} There, 29\% of girls were athletes in 1985, and this figure rose to 43\% in 1988.\textsuperscript{138} The low turnout of female athletes at East High School can be explained both by the limited number of sports available to girls and also by busing. In an interview with several Columbus coaches after schools desegregated, many mentioned the difficulty of recruiting bused students to join athletics teams. As one basketball coach explained, “It’s difficult to get bused athletes to the school, and it’s a hardship on the kids because they’re never home... they


\textsuperscript{136} The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1985), 41-68; The Crucible (Columbus, OH: East High School, 1988), 77-115; Annual Report, 1984-85 (Columbus, OH: Columbus Public School District, 1985), 41; Annual Report, 1987-88 (Columbus, OH: Columbus Public School District, 1988), 45.

\textsuperscript{137} Statistics for both East High School and Upper Arlington High School were estimated based on the number of female students reported at each high school and the number of athletes pictured in yearbook photographs and captions.

have to stay here sometimes from early in the morning till eight or nine at night.”

Thus, busing served as another factor that limited the impact of Title IX for female athletes at East High School but had no effect on girls at Upper Arlington High School.

As we have seen, the financial difficulties associated with administering a large urban school district were often hurdles that kept Columbus school board members from addressing key Title IX concerns. The court-ordered desegregation and resulting financial crisis of the late 1970s and early 1980s, as well as the socioeconomic decline of families who kept their students within the districts’ public schools by the late 1980s compounded during the years of this study. Students’ reaction to desegregation and the resulting multi-ethnic athletic programs also challenged the effect the law could have on mandating equity within East High School athletics. In the end, these difficulties meant Title IX had quite a different impact on East High School than it had on Upper Arlington High School. Whereas female athletes at both schools dealt with a second-class status because of their gender, EHS students took on these additional burdens that would not have been understood by Upper Arlington High School students.

---

139 Rapp, Burkley, and Lytle, 16A.
CONCLUSION

This case study of urban and suburban central Ohio high schools has illustrated the widely different landscape upon which Title IX fell after its passage in 1972. Specifically within Columbus and Upper Arlington, this law was limited by the race, gender, and socioeconomic status of each district's students. Within a larger national context, the impact of this law was shaped by broader issues in the political economy such as the women's liberation movement, court-ordered desegregation and busing, the civil rights movement, and the economic downturns of the 1970s and 1980s. These historical factors also trickled down to impact each of these communities differently.

At East High School in Columbus, Title IX had the positive effect of further eradicating the stigma surrounding female athletic participation. Yet, for African-American female athletes, Title IX could not change either society's or their own construct concerning the athletic activities in which they could participate. Consider also that racial tensions between students after desegregation often led to a curious new segregation of the school's sports teams for reasons that ranged from students' understanding of the kind of sports they were supposed to play to prejudice concerning the skin color of coaches. Because most Columbus parents could not afford private sports lessons for their children, the consequential lack of exposure to such sports may
have led African-American students to believe they would not be competitive in sports to which they had no previous exposure.

At the same time, economic problems on a national level compounded with the cost of desegregation on a local level to limit the effect Title IX could have at East High School. Although the law seemed to promise an auspicious future for female athletes, it often had more power to change mindsets than to actually change school spending. Because legislators had allotted no funding for local school districts to make girls’ athletic programs equitable, East High School students were limited by their social class. Unlike in Upper Arlington, EHS students did not have parents who could make up the financial difference between the athletics program female students wanted and the one the Columbus school district could afford to finance.

At Upper Arlington High School, Title IX combined with female students’ newfound interest in sports to greatly increase the athletic opportunities available to them. Girls quickly made leaps and bounds within the athletics program because the wealthy school district could easily finance their progress.

Yet, long-held notions about gender roles held strong in Upper Arlington, and these served to limit the impact of the law within this suburban community. As we have seen, Upper Arlington High School began a popular girls’ pep club in the same year female athletics experienced a meteoric increase within the school. The influence of the women’s liberation movement meant that high school girls received two different messages about how to succeed within society. New images of sexually-liberated women, educated career women, and strong athletes infiltrated the media, but these were
contradicted by the message of their middle- to upper-class suburban mothers, who may have seemed happy fitting into a traditional gender role. The resulting dichotomy of what they would have understood a “successful” woman to be can explain why some chose to participate in the expanding girls’ athletic program while others were content to fill the traditional gendered role of pep club members. Nevertheless, this study has illustrated that they attended a school where both images were celebrated.

This research provides evidence for the disparate way Upper Arlington and Columbus school districts interpreted Title IX. It demonstrates that such an expansive piece of educational legislation cannot act as a panacea to solve the inequity within our public schools, especially if it does not address issues of funding. Much like the No Child Left Behind Act signed into law by President Bush in 2002, Title IX was written as a broad law that had a disparate impact both on different types of schools and on different types of students. As this study has illustrated, Upper Arlington High School was in a stronger financial position than East High School, so it was able to quickly expand its girls’ athletic program once the law mandated and female students showed interest in this expansion. With the No Child Left Behind Act, schools have scrambled to show they are all meeting the same standards, but this is problematic since urban and suburban school districts are inherently different. The implementation of Title IX was also made difficult by standards because urban and suburban schools often seem to interpret these standards differently. Without clear guidance from the Office for Civil Rights it is easy for school districts to either ignore or misunderstand how Title IX should be implemented within their schools. This case study of Title IX best serves as a caveat for legislators and
educational policy makers to understand it is problematic to approach all schools as if they are equal.
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APPENDIX

TABLES

Note: The following information involving girls’ and boys’ participation in interscholastic athletics at East and Upper Arlington high schools was taken from their respective yearbooks, the Crucible and the Norwester. When possible, it was verified by comparing it with the lists of teams that competed in a given sport for a given year published annually in the “Ohio High School Athlete.” Furthermore, pursuant to current OHSAA instructions for athletic directors, female athletes were counted more than once if they participated in more than one sport. According to their manual, “a girl who participates in all of the sports is counted as 3 participants” instead of just as one athlete.\(^{140}\) Using this method, it was easier to ascertain the total number of spaces available for female athletes on a given school’s sports teams.

\(^{140}\) Gender Equity in Interscholastic Athletics, 34.
Abbreviations for Tables 3-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Baseball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BKB</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Cross Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>Football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>Field Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Gymnastics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IH</td>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>Lacrosse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Softball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCR</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Volleyball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>Wrestling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Number of Male Sports Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1: East High School Athletic Teams, 1965-1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Male Sports Teams</th>
<th>Number of Female Sports Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Upper Arlington High School Athletic Teams, 1965-1990**
### Table 3: Male Athletic Teams at East High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>SCR</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>BKB</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>WR</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4: Female Athletic Teams at East High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VB</th>
<th>SCR</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>BKB</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>TR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>FB</th>
<th>SCR</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>BKB</th>
<th>IH</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>WR</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>BB</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Male Athletic Teams at Upper Arlington High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>VB</th>
<th>SCR</th>
<th>CC</th>
<th>BKB</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>TN</th>
<th>FH</th>
<th>SW</th>
<th>SB</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>LS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Female Athletic Teams at Upper Arlington High School
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>White Students</th>
<th>Nonwhite Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>.8%</td>
<td>99.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>41.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Ratio of White to Nonwhite Students at East High School, 1978-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>White Students</th>
<th>Nonwhite Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-91</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Ratio of White to Nonwhite Students in Columbus Public Schools, 1978-90
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th><em>East High School</em></th>
<th><em>City of Columbus</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Percentage of Students Receiving Free and Reduced Price Meals, 1978-90