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Abstract
Throughout history gender discrimination has created barriers that have prevented women from achieving their desired career goals no matter what the work setting is. One way that steps were made towards the elimination of gender discrimination was the enactment of Title IX in 1972. Pervious research has examined barriers that women head coaches coaching men's teams have had to overcome in order to acquire their position. The coaches who were used in that research either coached NCAA Division I men's teams or all three divisions combined. The barriers these women experienced were both externally and internally barriers. The external barriers include: 1) unequal assumption of competence, 2) hiring from a principal of similarity, 3) homophobia, 4) lack of female mentors, and 5) difficulty recruiting male athletes (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010, Kilty, 2006). The internal factors that exist are 1) perfectionism, 2) lack of assertiveness, 3) inhibition in promotion of accomplishments, and 4) high stress of balance work and lie (Kilty, 2006). The purpose of this research was to see if these same barriers exist at just the Division III level. Two women who coach NCAA Division III men's teams were interviewed about their experiences coaching men. The purpose of this study was to better understand the experiences and barriers that Division III female head coaches of men's teams go through.
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Abstract

Throughout history gender discrimination has created barriers that have prevented women from achieving their desired career goals no matter what the work setting is. One way that steps were made towards the elimination of gender discrimination was the enactment of Title IX in 1972. Previous research has examined barriers that women head coaches coaching men’s teams have had to overcome in order to acquire their position. The coaches who were used in that research either coached NCAA Division I men’s teams or all three divisions combined. The barriers these women experienced were both externally and internally barriers. The external barriers include: 1) unequal assumption of competence, 2) hiring from a principal of similarity, 3) homophobia, 4) lack of female mentors, and 5) difficulty recruiting male athletes (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010, Kilty, 2006). The internal factors that exist are 1) perfectionism, 2) lack of assertiveness, 3) inhibition in promotion of accomplishments, and 4) high stress of balance work and lie (Kilty, 2006). The purpose of this research was to see if these same barriers exist at just the Division III level. Two women who coach NCAA Division III men’s teams were interviewed about their experiences coaching men. The purpose of this study was to better understand the experiences and barriers that Division III female head coaches of men’s teams go through.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the challenges that female head coaches must overcome within the NCAA. At the Division III level these barriers were both externally as well as internally and after conducting surveys they were four main themes that emerged. Externally the theme that emerged was 1) Obtainment of their position coaching men. Internally the themes that emerged were 1) the ability to establish
credibility and relate to their colleagues and players. 2) Balancing a work-life relationship 3) emotion and intensity when coaching.

Introduction

The perception and opportunities for women in sport prior to 1972 is very different compared to how they are today. Prior to 1870 all forms of physical activity for women were informal and recreational rather than being competitive and with rules (Bell, 2007). The first women’s collegiate sports team to be formed was a basketball program at Smith College in 1892 (Bell, 2007). With progressive growth for women in sports one of the most well-known landmarks was the enactment of Title IX in 1972. This law has and continues to create greater opportunities for women not only to compete in sports but also offers the opportunity to become a head coach (Wilson, 2007).

The same year Title IX was enacted the number of women who were coaching women’s sport teams was roughly 90 percent (Wilson, 2007). However, as there has been a progression through time the number of female coaches in the coaching field has begun to diminish. Reasons for why these numbers are beginning to decrease have to do with either internal or external restrictions/barriers (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Even though there is a great deal of opportunities for males to coach women’s sports the same cannot be said for women who wish to coach male sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Title IX was designed to prevent any sort of discrimination based on sex. However, even after 40 years there are still numerous barriers that a woman must overcome in order to obtain a coaching position with a male sports team.
The goal of this study is to determine what coaching barriers exist for females coaching men’s sports teams at the Division III level. The research question to be answered through this study is:

What perceived barriers did female head coaches feel they overcame in order to become the head coach of a male team?

This study is valuable to the academic community because all literature that has examined this issue thus far has either examined all three levels of the NCAA at once or just at the Division I level. There has yet to be a study that examines female head coaches at just the Division III level. Furthermore, this provides further evidence as to whether or not the barriers are the same for each level of the NCAA or if they vary depending on the level of competition.

**Literature Review**

**Gender Discrimination in the Workplace**

Gender stereotypes are very much alive and well, producing workplace discrimination between males and females. In 1950 the percentage of women who held some form of managerial position was 13.8 percent (Latu et.al, 2011). That number increased to 26.1 percent in 1980 and as of 2007 that number is up to 50.6 percent (Latu, et. al, 2011).

When either a man or a woman is applying for a job he or she will go through a personnel selection process that involves two important steps. The first step is the initial screening of the applicants (Bosak & Sczensy, 2011). This process allows there to be the formation of a short list of selections from the normally large pool of candidates (Bosak & Sczensy, 2011). The second step is when the decision will be made as to whom the
company will hire from the previously created short list (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011). When one is being selected from the short list the applicant is compared to a minimum set of requirements that the job demands (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001). It was found that women who made it short list were normally held to a lower minimum standard than that of men (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001). However, during the final selection process they were held to higher confirmatory standards, which consist of the idea that stronger evidence is needed to prove that they, have the necessary capabilities for the job (Biernat, 2003, 2005). In two studies conducted by Biernat and colleagues the results showed that women are more likely to make it onto the short list for the job. However, those same women were less likely to meet that final hiring standards compared to men (Biernat & Fuegen, 2001; Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997)

Although women have made tremendous strides to be accepted in the workplace they remain to be underrepresented in traditionally male dominated occupations and there still remain cultural stereotypes about the roles that each gender should play. Gender stereotypes are defined as “generalizations about groups that are applied to individual group members simply because they belong to the group (Heilman, 2012, Chapter 1).” Gender stereotypes are made up of two different properties, descriptive and perspective (Eagly & Karua, 2002). Descriptive properties define what women and men are like and perspective properties define what women and men should be like (Heilman, 2012). Many tend to share similar beliefs about men in leadership positions but have dissimilar beliefs about women in those exact same positions. Men are seen in employment roles and display characteristics such as independent and assertive (Bosak, & Sczesny, 2011). On the other hand women are seen as taking on the caretaking role with characteristics
such as sympathetic and kind (Bosak, & Sczesny, 2011). In what Eagly and Karau (2002) refer to as role incongruity theory, they argue the role prescriptive stereotype that is assigned to women is not the same as those associated with leadership. Eagly and Karau (2002) suggest that when women do enter into leadership positions they in fact violate their stereotypically prescribed roles. Also, when women end up in leadership positions they tend to be evaluated in a less favorable manner than that of men (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Furthermore research has shown that individuals will apply lower standards when they are evaluating a male’s leadership ability than that of a woman (Biernat & Kobrynowicz, 1997).

In most work settings women are seen as nicer and kinder are also seen in a more positive light than that of men (Heilman & Eagly, 2008). Although, women are more often seen in a more positive light they remain to be the victims of prejudice (Heilman & Eagly, 2008). A reason for why there are these gender biases has to do with the fact that when it comes to women holding leadership positions there are negative performance expectations associated with them (Heilman & Eagly, 2008). Because of these beliefs it leads to a biased performance evaluation (Heilman & Eagly, 2008).

Although these perceived stereotypes have been around for decades organizational scholars believe that a shift in consensual models of leadership is playing a major factor is women’s growth to leadership positions. This leadership style puts a greater emphasize on the importance of person-oriented activities. These types of activities include “participatory decision making, democratic relationships and teamwork for success in an increasingly diverse and competitive economic environment (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011, p. 256).” An example of this form of leadership would be
transformational leadership. This is a more genderless leadership style incorporating the “typical” feminine characteristics with “typical” masculine characteristics as well (Bosak & Sczesny, 2011).

One’s own voice signals may even play a factor into how a leader is viewed. Non-human animals are known for responding to information that is encoded in voice signals; the same can now be said for humans (Klofstad, Anderson, Peters, 2012). No matter the leadership position you hold the tone of your voice can either have a positive or a negative impact on someone else. This can, many times, impact whether or not they will take you seriously or not. Recent studies have shown that one’s voice pitch can influence the perception of leadership when it comes to both men and women (Klofstad et. Al, 2012). Researchers Klofstad, Anderson, and Peters (2012) recorded both men and women saying, “I urge you to vote for me this November.” They then manipulated their statements into higher and lower pitched versions of the original recording (Klofstad et. Al, 2012). They took the recordings and played them to both men and women and had the participant’s vote as to which one sounded more powerful. The results showed that both men and women selected the men and women with lower voices as being more powerful (Klofstad et. Al, 2012). This suggests that both men and women with lower pitched voices have a better chance at successfully obtaining positions of leadership. It may also suggest that due to the fact that a woman on average has a higher pitched voice it could act as another factor as to why they have difficulty obtaining these leadership positions (Klofstad et. al, 2012).

In 2004 Catalyst, a leading research and advisory organization, conducted a study examining women and men in U.S. corporate leadership (Catalyst, 2004). For the study
they surveyed 705 senior-level women and 243 senior-level men who shared similar backgrounds and characteristics (Catalyst, 2004). In the study both men and women cited similar views of their strategies for success. Which included: hard work, managerial skills, performing on high visibility assignments and demonstrating expertise (Catalyst, 2004). Women also noted an extra step that they take in order to ensure that they advance within the organization. This is that most women come up with a managerial style that males are comfortable with (Catalyst, 2004). Although men and women have similar strategies for trying to advance there are significant differences between men and women. Women are more likely to seek high-visibility assignments and try to network within the organization whereas men are more likely to gain line management and international experiences (Catalyst, 2004).

Within the sport organization these forms of stereotypes are also very well known. In almost every aspect of sport men hold almost exclusively every form of organizational responsibility, authoritative position and public voice (Whiteside & Hardin, 2012). For a woman who tries to work her way into the industry she faces numerous forms of resistance. For many these forms of resistance include sexual harassment and discrimination. For these women they are faced with a “glass ceiling” a term popularized by the Wall Street Journal in the mid-1980’s (Whiteside & Hardin, 2012). The glass ceiling refers to the “artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevents qualified individuals from advancing upward in the organization into management-level positions (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991, p. 1).” The only way that the glass ceiling could be eliminated is when women reach one third of
the entire leadership in any given organization. Until then they are considered to not be able to make decisions with the majority (Whiteside & Hardin, 2012).

**Title IX**

If one were to look at all of the legislation ever signed into law measuring them on potential impact there would be great argument to say that Title IX has had a lasting impact on not only sex stereotypes but also how those stereotypes have been inappropriately used (Staurowsky & Weight, 2011). Arguments may also be made that this law is the most significant piece of civil rights legislation to ever be brought up within the United States. With the signing of Title IX it not only opened up opportunities in male dominated professions but it also offered chances for women in athletics that were at one time never possible (Staurowsky & Weight, 2011). The law states:

“No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefit of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance (Office, 1998).”

This 37-word document, which is most commonly referred to as Title IX, was a part of the Education Amendments Act, was signed into law on June 23, 1972 by President Richard Nixon (Kwak, 2012). The purpose of this law is to ensure that there is no longer the discrimination based on sex for all educational programs or activities that are receiving any form of federal funding (Kwak, 2012). One of the purposes of this law was to create a greater number of opportunities for women. A three-prong test has been established to ensure that schools are in compliance with Title IX. The three parts are, “a female sports participant should be proportional to female enrollment in schools, the school shows a recent history of expanding sport offerings for women, and the interests
and abilities of female athletes have been fully and effectively accommodated (Warrick, 2012, 1).”

Oppression grew surrounding this law and there was fear that Title IX would in fact impact the opportunities for male sports in a negative manner. It took only a few short years before the law faced a great deal of oppression from the NCAA. On February 17, 1976 the NCAA filed a lawsuit that challenged Title IX, claiming that no athletic departments received any sort of direct federal funding (Kwak, 2012). However, that case ended up being dismissed (Kwak, 2012). It took nearly six years for there to be greater enforcement of the law. It was not until 1978 a mandatory compliance date was set and it was then decided that these organizations need to get organized. (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). In order to oversee compliance the Department of Education through the Office of Civil Rights is established and given oversight of Title IX in 1980 (Women’s, 2011).

On February 28, 1984 the scope of Title IX was limited due to the outcome of Grove City v. Bell. The Supreme Court decided that Title IX would only apply to athletes who were under athletic scholarship (Women’s, 2011). However, that outcome was reversed on March 22, 1988 (Women’s, 2011). This is because of the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, which was enacted into law, even over the veto of President Ronald Regan, reversed the Grove City findings and restored Title IX’s institution wide coverage (Women’s, 2011). On January 16, 1996, the Office of Civil Rights issued a clarification when it comes to the three-part “Effective Accommodation Test.” It reiterated the requirements for compliance and that institutions must choose any one of the three tests in order to demonstrate that they are effectively accommodating the
underrepresented gender (Women’s, 2011). On June 27, 2002 the U.S. Secretary of Education Rod Paige announced the establishment of a Commission on Opportunities in Athletics. The purpose of this commission is to “collect information, analyze issues, and obtain broad public input directed at improving the application of current Federal standards for measuring equal opportunity for men and women and boys and girls to participate in athletics under Title IX (Women’s, 2011).”

In 2005 there was a landmark case that had an impact on gender equality for both interscholastic and intercollegiate athletic departments (Porto, 2012). Roderick Jackson was the head coach for the girl high school team in Birmingham, Alabama (Porto, 2012). His team was forced to hold practice in a gymnasium that was old and run down compared to the new gym their male counterparts practiced in (Porto, 2012). Coach Jackson complained to the school’s athletic director and the principal, however, the only change that was made was the fact that Jackson was relieved from his coaching duties (Porto, 2012). The case was brought in front of the United States Supreme Court. After hearing the *Jackson v. Birmingham* case the United States Supreme Court determined “the private right of action implied by Title IX encompasses claims of retaliation… [when] the funding recipient [i.e., school or college] retaliates against an individual because he [or she] complained about sex discrimination” (Porto, 2012, p. 554). The outcome of this case now provided individuals with a legal recourse that prior to 2005 did not exist (Porto, 2012). Even though Jackson empowered whistleblowers to come forward it did not end the retaliation that many coaches faced (Porto, 2012).

Recently, a California University was in the spotlight for firing coaches due to the fact that they stood up for gender quality. Fresno State University fired both the women’s
volleyball coach Lindy Vivas in 2004 and the women’s basketball coach Stacy Johnson-Klien in 2005. Both of these women had complained about the equality of their female athletes. In the Vivas case, Vivas was quoted referring to the athletic department, as “they did not like women who supported equity It always came down to that (Porto, 2012, 555).

Since Title IX has increased the level of equality for female sports it too has increased the budget that each of these teams is allowed to spend each year. This now allows athletic departments the ability to pay a high salary, which is attracting many more male candidates (Richman, 2011). Similarly salary discrepancies have been known to exist between a woman and man’s salary as a coach. Although this may sound like sex discrimination the courts have generally found that it is not based on sex but on other factors and therefore has been allowed to happen (Richman, 2011). Men are also considered to have a competitive edge when it comes to coaching experience. The reason being is that men have been coaching much longer and before Title IX was even enacted (Richman, 2011). Females also believe that a lack of a female role model has actually discouraged them from getting into a position like coaching. Since there are such few female coaches out there it has been noted that successful female coaches are those who establish a network with other female coaches with in the industry (Richman, 2011).

There are some philosophers and political theorists that have argued that in order to achieve a just society there must be the elimination of gender roles (Simson, 2011). There would also need to be the elimination of disadvantages that stem from sex which include race, ethnicity, class, age, religion, and sexual orientation (Simson, 2011). A gender-free society would provide males and females with an equal opportunity to
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engage in a range of activities (Simson, 2011). Not only does this require the elimination of sex-based discrimination but it also requires that both males and females have equal access to any societal resources that are needed in order to be successful (Simson, 2011). Examples of these societal resources would be access to information, equipment and facilities, and people who are in a position of influence (Simson, 2011).

The rules that Title IX implied on athletics allow one to conceptualize a gender-free society and how feasible and desirable it is (Simson, 2011). In many ways Title IX clearly promotes this idea of gender-free society and in other ways it points out various challenges that this ideal faces. Title IX has created a shift away from females being primarily viewed for they sexual attractiveness and submissiveness and instead has created a focus on physical strength, their assertiveness, and their ability to lead (Simson, 2011).

Dr. Erianne Weight from the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and Ellen Staurowsky from Drexel University looked at the largest study conducted regarding Title IX literacy among college coaches (Staurowsky, & Weight, 2011). From more than a thousand coaches that responded to the survey the findings could be broken down into different statistics (Staurowsky, & Weight, 2011). When looking over the results, Dr. Weight and Staurowsky found that 30 percent of those coaches felt that they were not familiar with or did not know how the three-part test under Title IX controlled participation opportunities. A potential reason for why this number is so low can be contributed to the fact that 80 percent of the coaches in this survey stated that they do not remember Title IX being a part of their formal job training (Staurowsky, & Weight, 2011). Another reason for this could be due to the fact that nearly 60 percent of the
coaches who responded stated that the place where they received the most information regarding Title IX were through mainstream news outlets (Staurowsky, & Weight, 2011). With little formal teaching about Title IX the level of knowledge regarding this law would only vary from person to person.

After 40 years it should certainly not be unreasonable to expect athletic department personnel to have an elementary understanding of Title IX. Even with all of the progress that has been made within an athletic department regarding equality there remains a lack of consistency among athletic departments teaching Title IX. One’s knowledge of Title IX is very much based on their own interpretations, many times from third-party sources. However, this educational process does not just end within the athletic department. There needs to be an understanding and agreement both within and outside of the athletic department about the importance to knowing the facts and importance of Title IX (Staurowsky & Weight, 2011).

Female Coaches by the Numbers

In 1972, the same year Title IX was enacted, more than 90 percent of all women’s teams were coached by women (Wilson, 2007). However, that number decreased significantly just six years after it being enacted. In 1978 the year that Title IX became mandatory for compliance that percentage decreased to 58.2 percent (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). This large change came primarily due to the increase in the number of sports teams offered to women. In 1972 there were just 2.5 sports teams offered whereas; in 1978 there were 5.61 teams per school offered (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Prior to Title IX almost all coaches coaching women’s sport teams were unpaid. Thus with the signing of Title IX coaches began to get paid for their services which made these jobs
more inviting. From 1995-96 to 2010 the representation of women head coaches has increased in men’s teams and decreased in women’s teams. In men’s team the increase was by 0.6 percent and for women’s teams the decrease was by 4 percent (Brown, 2010). Out of the 8,600 coaches of men’s teams there are only 328 women who hold that position. Whereas, there are 3,862 women head coaches compared to the 5,880 male head coaches for women’s teams (Brown, 2010). In 2012 the percentage of female coaches was 42.9 percent or 3,974 total head coaches, which is the highest ever (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). The representation of female head coaches for male sport teams remains at roughly 2 percent, which has been consistent since the passing of Title IX (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). Overall, for female coaches roughly 43 out of 100 coach women’s sport teams, 20 out of 100 coach both men and women’s sport teams and only 2 out of 100 coach men’s sport teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012).

There is also a slight difference when it comes to the percentage of female coaches depending on the level of competition. At the Division I level in 2012 female coaches comprised 42.3 percent of total coaches (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). This is compared to 46.3 percent of female coaches at the Division III level (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). As a female head coach there is also some disparity when it comes to the gender of the athletic director depending at your university. At all three levels of the NCAA there is a gap in the number of female coaches whether it is a female athletic director compared to a male athletic director. At the Division I level with a female athletic director the percentage of female coaches is 45.9 percent compared to the 41.9 percent when the athletic director is male (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012). A similar gap exists at the Division III level. The percent of female coaches that have a female athletic
director is 51.1 percent. That number decreases to 44.3 percent when there is a male athletic director (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012).

**Barriers that affect women to get into coaching**

Since the enactment of Title IX in 1972 the United States has made strides towards the inclusion of certain groups prohibiting discriminatory actions. However, even with all of the laws that have been passed sport organizations remain to be one of the most notable areas for discrimination (Cunningham & Sartore, 2007). Fink and Pastore (1999) suggest that “perhaps nowhere is discrimination and oppression more evident than in Division IA intercollegiate athletics” (p. 311). In our society the stereotypical beliefs that exist toward women are typically communal. In that they are seen as service or social oriented which includes being helpful, warm, kind and gentle (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, & Tamkins, 2004, Ridgeway & Smith-Lovin, 1999). Although these types of stereotypes may be perceived as a positive in content they undoubtedly can possess negative consequences. This is due to the fact they are not seen as competent nor have the ability to hold power (Eagly & Mladinic, 1989, 1993, Jost & Kay, 2005). For men they are commonly stereotyped as being agentic or achievement-oriented. They are seen as being confident, strong, assertive, and independent (Cunningham & Sartore, 2007).

With the enactment of Title IX there has been without question a shift in the number of women’s sports team in a positive way. However, what remains to be missing is there is still a small percent of female coaches industry (Gregory, 2007). A reason for this is that for many the job is not seen as glamorous. Take for example Dena Evans who was the coach at Stanford’s women’s cross-country team. Due to the fact that her
her husband traveled so much she was forced to bring her kids too many of the team’s meets (Gregory, 2007). Requiring her to breast-feed her children in-between races and worry if her child’s crying was disruptive to her players (Gregory, 2007). Another thing that is driving this decline in women coaching has to do with the fact that women are now expected to win just as much as their male counterpart (Gregory, 2007). Because of this a work-life dilemma is being formed. Female coaches are required to put in the crippling hours which include both nights and long weekend spent recruiting (Gregory, 2007). In order to remain within the coaching field some coaches have had to take desperate measures similar to Evans. Another example comes from Karen Tessmer, the women’s basketball head coach at Massachusetts’s Worcester State College, a Division III program. She held all of her practices while her infant daughter was strapped to her back. This acted as a limitation to what Tessmer could do while she was coaching (Gregory, 2007).

The United States Olympic Committee Department of Coaching and Sport Sciences has setup an annual conference for women who hold coaching positions since 2002 (Kilty, 2006). While at the conference the attendees identified both internal and external barriers that limit their ability to get into coaching. The external barriers that have been identified as interfering with their coaching abilities can be broken down into four subcategories. These four subcategories are: (1) unequal assumption of competence, (2) hiring from a principal of similarity, (3) homophobia, and (4) lack of female mentors (Kilty, 2006). Those who participated at the conference felt that the unequal assumption of competence stemmed from the fact that men were automatically assumed as being more competent than female head coaches. A secondary characteristic was that women
were required to “prove themselves” as being capable, whereas, a male head coach was believed to be accepted on credentials alone (Kilty, 2006).

These participants also felt that they were being discriminated when it came to the hiring process (Kilty, 2006). Many times when someone is being hired for a position they have a better chance of obtaining the position if the person doing the hiring is of the same gender. The reason for this is the homologous reproduction that goes into employment discrimination. Hiring managers will many times hire someone who is similar to themselves, because it is the easiest and most comfortable thing to do (Kanter, 1977, Stangl & Kane, 1991). The participants felt that they were being excluded from leadership positions for two reasons: they were women in a male dominated society and they demonstrated leadership styles that were not viewed as the norm. This belief of homologous reproduction was supported by Stahura and Greenwood (2001) when they evaluated the number of female to male head coaches within women’s intercollegiate athletics comparing the gender of the athletic director and how prestigious the institution is.

Coaches participating in the conference also discussed the issues that come along with homophobia as a barrier that is limiting their professional opportunities (Kilty, 2006). Women who work in a male dominated atmosphere are constantly perceived as “not really being women” or are perceived to be lesbians (Krane & Barber, 2005). A female who is a good coach is many times labeled with the term “lesbian”. There is the assumption that her performance has less merit because she is seen as “male-like” (Kilty, 2006).
Lastly coaches discussed the lack of a female mentor as a barrier that prevents other women from getting into the coaching field (Kilty, 2006). Mentors can have a significant impact on one professional career and without a mentor young coaches may end up becoming discouraged and attempt to pursue another career path. The participants felt that a female mentor provided both guidance and was able to help facilitate both networking and contacts (Kilty, 2006).

These participants at the conference also identified internal barriers that affected their professional opportunities. These internal barriers can be broken down into four subcategories: (1) perfectionism, (2) lack of assertiveness, (3) inhibition in promotion of accomplishments, and (4) high stress of balancing work and life (Kilty, 2006). Many of the coaches who participate in these conferences are highly trained, competent, and knowledgeable, however, they were also very self-critical. The participants were quick to state the areas that they needed to improve in and often would reference to perfection as their standard (Kilty, 2006). On the other hand these coaches found difficulty in identifying any of their individual strengths. The coaches who felt that perfection was the standard, could find no area of strength to be strong enough thus forcing them to always improve on something (Kilty, 2006).

Female coaches also have this strong need to be liked and may be even more relevant to younger coaches (Kilty, 2006). Having the need to be liked can actually act as an interference with one’s coaching. This is because it affects your ability to set limits, manage conflict, and negotiate effectively (Werthner, 2001). This can also result in coaches overextending themselves in their work, losing control of their teams or other coaches, and working under less than ideal contract conditions (Kilty, 2006).
Similar to the lack of being able to identify their strengths coaches also find it difficult to identify individual accomplishments (Kilty, 2006). There is a shift when talking about past success from “I” to “we” (Kilty, 2006). Also women are more than likely to not highlight on past success and when given praise for their accomplishments will many times deflect it rather quickly (Fletcher, 1999, Marback et al., 2005, Pastore & Kuga, 1993). Women believe that if they do a good job the results will speak for themselves and there is no need to inform others of their success as it is perceived to be inappropriate and self-serving behavior (Kilty, 2006).

Lastly the ability to maintain a work and personal life balance can become extremely stressful (Kilty, 2006). The participants at the conference noted two main areas: the decision to have a family and spending time either with their families or their significant others. Women discussed that there is added pressure as they attempt to establish a professional career while going through their childbearing years (Kilty, 2006). Many coaches stated that they would abandon their professional pursuits with the intent to resume later in life. A way to cope with this was instead of seeking head coaching positions remain an assistant coach (Kilty, 2006). The reason for why this is so difficult to balance stems from the North American society where work and family have be viewed as separate entities (Mercier, 2000). Traditionally work has been the man’s primary domain and family has been the women’s primary domain. This sort of belief does not allow for the possibility for someone to be loyal to both work and family (Mercier, 2000).

Continuing to look at the barriers, in 2009, the NCAA attempted to gain a better understanding as to why there is a lack of female head coaches. In order to do this they
surveyed 8,900 intercollegiate female athletes (NCAA, 2009). One of the possible reasons for the lack of head coaches is that only 10 percent of the female athletes surveyed intended to pursue a career in intercollegiate athletics (NCAA, 2009). What was also examined was that, of the women who currently coach men only 5 percent of them exclusively coach men’s teams (Yiamouyiannis, 2008). What this means is that most of these female coaches have coached a combination of men and women’s teams, which many times includes: cross-country, track, or swimming (Yiamouyiannis, 2008).

In a third study conducted by Kamphoff, Armentrout, and Driska (2010) they interviewed fifteen women head coaches of men’s sports teams at the Division I level. The sports that the women coached included: both cross country and track and field, cross country only, track and field only, tennis, golf, rowing, swimming and diving, squash, and equestrian (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). During their results they found that these women pointed to many gender barriers some of which have been already mentioned. However, an additional external barrier that these women encountered was the fact that they found it difficult to recruit male athletes to their programs (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Eleven of the fifteen women discussed this matter and many thought that there were males out there that solely did not come to their program because the head coach was female (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Ten of these women also described being a “token” status (Kanter, 1977). In that they were the only female coaching men either at their university, conference, or within their sport (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010).

All fifteen women that were interviewed also talked about how they obtained their position. Eight of them were first coaching the women’s team and both the men and
women’s team were being combined together (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Either the administrators or the former coach regarding the position approached four of them (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Finally only three of them actually set out and applied for the position to coach a men’s team (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Also the women interviewed without a prompt talked about how they were only coaching men’s minor sports teams. Many used the term “minor sports” whereas others used terms like “men’s individual sports” (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010). Each of them were quick to point out that it is rare to find a woman coaching a major sport program like basketball, football or baseball and if/when it does happen it usually makes the news (Kamphoff, Armentrout, & Driska, 2010).

Methodology

Research Tradition

The research tradition that I used for my study was an interpretivist approach (Gratton & Jones, 2010). The reason being is that the measurements that will be done were not numerical but instead are using words, statements, and other non-numerical data from the viewpoint of the participant (Gratton & Jones, 2010). The reason that this is so important is that I as the researcher interpreted the participant’s responses and determined whether or not there are themes between the responses. This research tradition also offers insight from an insider’s perspective and tries to understand the subjects from within (Gratton & Jones, 2010). I took an exploratory approach as I conducted research that had yet to be done.
Conceptual Framework

A head coach is a professional who is in charge of the direction, instruction, training and developing of the sports team or a specific individual. A head coach will also be determined based on the title that they are given on the athletic department’s website. The demographics that are important to mention among these head coaches will be both age as well as race. The reason being is that depending on the year they may have been born the coach may have a different perspective on gender discrimination. Gender discrimination will be defined as any attitudes, conditions, or behaviors that promote stereotyping of social roles based on gender. Gender equality, on the other hand, implies that men and women should be treated equally. This is because they were born either before or after Title IX was enacted. Title IX is defined as a law, passed by Congress in 1972, is intended to eliminate discrimination on the basis of sex for any educational program or activity that is receiving some form of federal assistance. Race is also important to factor in due to the fact that depending on one’s skin color she may be subjected to a greater number of barriers. For the purpose of this research a women who coach’s two teams (e.g. men and women’s track and field) will be factored into this research. This is because, within Rochester, all female coaches coaching a male team also coach the female team as well. A barrier will be defined as anything that restrains or obstructs progress or access, which can prevent a female head coach from achieving their desired career goals.

Theoretical Framework

The theory that I selected is role congruity theory. Role congruity theory states that men and women have specific social roles with associated stereotypes and
prescriptions (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Agentic stereotypes are normally associated with men, which consist of assertiveness, confidence, and being powerful (Reid, Palomares, Anderson, & Bondad-Brown, 2009). Women are stereotypically seen with communal attributes, which include being pleasant, likeable and trustworthy (Reid, Palomares, Anderson, & Bondad-Brown, 2009). Agentic attributes also define the leader role, which is why men, stereotypically, are seen as possessing more leadership traits than women (Reid, Palomares, Anderson, & Bondad-Brown, 2009). The reason for why I chose this theory is due to the fact that the disparity between these attributes suggests that some form of prejudice exists. With this theory it supports the fact that certain jobs are seen as more appropriate for one sex over the other which creates a bias in many male dominated industries such as sports.

**Procedure**

The type of data that I have collected is primary data using a cross-sectional approach as I have interviewed female collegiate coaches within the Rochester area at one point in time. For my sampling size I used a key informant technique. The reason being is that a key informant is someone who is chosen on the basis of specific knowledge that she possesses (Gratton & Jones, 2010). The way that I accessed these women was by retrieving their email addresses off of the athletic department’s website. From there I made initial contact and setup a time to interview them. A reference request email that I sent out can be found in appendix B. There are a few things that could have acted as an obstacle for me to conduct this research. I first had to make sure that the head coach is okay talking to someone she has never met before about this issue. This is where it was important for me to establish a relationship so they feel that they can trust me with
the information. I also had to find a place where the interviews could be held if they did not want to have the conversation in their office. A neutral location was somewhere like a café where it is still a social setting but quiet enough that I can record our conversations. Prior to each interview I acquired the permission of each head coach in order to record the interview. Each head coach was asked to sign a consent form ensuring that I was able to use her responses (See Appendix C). The questions that I asked these coaches attempted to pull responses regarding the barriers they may or may not have had to overcome, both internally and externally, in order to become the head coach of a men’s team. Examples of internal questions are: in what way did you obtain your position as head coach? Have you found it difficult to recruit male athletes to your team? Internal factors include: what characteristics would you attribute to your success to coaching men? As a head coach in what ways does you balance your work and personal life? For a complete list of questions you may reference Appendix A.

**Analytic Strategy**

After conducting my research I used a descriptive analytic strategy to analyze and interpret the interview data (Creswell, 1998). I took each of the recorded interviews and typed them into a transcript. More specifically the content from each interview transcript was divided into individual statements. The process began with a thorough reading of the transcripts, then highlighting the key phrases and terms, and writing overlying conceptual labels in the margins. The labels were consistently compared with one another in order to reduce the number of labels, differentiate labels, and show a relationship between the labels. The passages were then placed into categories and labeled with the overlying theme of the passage. The themes were developed based on the frequency of comments
and significance of the comments that occurred during the interview process. This allowed me to figure out which themes are more or less frequently encountered.

Results

For the purpose of this research I interviewed two female head coaches at the Division III level in the Rochester area. Each of these coaches are head coaches of individual team sports and coach both the men’s and women’s team. I will refer to the coaches by the names of Ashley and Danielle. After a comprehensive and thorough analysis of the interview transcripts the participants demonstrated that there were both internal and external barriers when it comes to become a head coach. Externally the theme that emerged was 1) Obtainment of their position coaching men. Internally the themes that emerged were 1) the ability to establish credibility and relate to their colleagues and players 2) Balancing a work-life relationship 3) emotion and intensity when coaching.

Obtainment of their Position Coaching Men

Both of the women that were interviewed first referenced their experience while at college. Both of which were student-athletes who competed for at least one year. When it came to each of their hiring processes the opportunities were similar. Danielle was approached of the job opening and the school was looking for someone who had previous coaching experience. Danielle, who had already been a tennis coach at another university, was brought in for an interview was offered the position as the men’s and women’s tennis head coach. Ashley was initially offered an assistant head coach position due to the fact that she was working with the head coach at the tennis club. After being the assistant coach of the men’s and women’s team they decided to split the programs, where she
became the head coach of the women’s team. Once the head coach of the men’s team moved on she interviewed for the vacant position and subsequently became the head coach of both teams. Both of these coaches faced the barrier of establishing themselves as an instructor prior to being offered a coaching position at the university they are currently at. Although one had come from another university both were hired based on their previous experience as an instructor.

**The Ability to Establish Credibility and Relate to Administration and Players**

Both coaches discussed the importance of experience and credentials as being the easiest way for establishing their credibility, more specifically noted was their interaction with their student-athletes. Although Danielle did not go into great detail about the differences Ashley took a more direct approach and dived right into the topic. Ashley stated that “I am not fulltime… I’ve never received health insurance while coaching there, and I’ve asked them saying hey we went and had this great season I really would like to have this or can we raise my salary and I’ve never gotten anything. I don’t know if it’s because I’m a female. I don’t know if it’s tennis and since it’s a smaller sport and we don’t make money. But those are a few of things that I’ve come across.”

Both coaches emphasized that among their student-athletes they have always received respect. Both having very strong personalities and their ability to make sure that when it comes to on the court that everything is all business. When asked during the interview both coaches had almost shockingly similar answers when it came to the question as to what they believed to be their biggest strength as a head coach. Each stating that it was their ability to relate to the players. Danielle stated “I would say that I relate to the players really well. I’m very organized. I try to make sure they know all of
our trips and schedules. I would also say that I’m more cooperative I like to get their feedback… It’s also important to make sure each player is getting help with their specific needs.” Both coaches also talked about how their sport is a very individualized sport and each player may have a different need. So they turn to their players when it comes to adding new drills. They want their players to come to their office, feel comfortable doing so, and be able to voice their opinions on what they believe to be working or if they feel that something needs to be changed or tweaked in practice.

Although the ability to relate was definitely the coaches’ biggest strengths one coach did point out that she does not relate to the student-athletes 100 percent. The reason being is that she talked about her biggest weakness as not being very into social media. Danielle discusses that “I don’t text and I don’t tell my players to text me. I prefer more of a face-to-face interaction and I also use email and the phone. But if I really need to get a hold of a player I will get in touch with one of the captains and have them text that players such and such a message.” So although the biggest strength was the ability to relate there is definitely a communication barrier that exists when it comes to forms of social media.

This theme created the barrier that without being able to be seen as creditable among their peers they were given very little respect, which can create its own barrier when attempting to be seen as equal among the other coaches who are male. Another barrier that was noted that may become of greater concern is the ability to connect via social media. Since so many people are connected through social media it may be a growing priority that coaches are able to connect and relate to this new form media. If
they are not it may create for an additional barrier for anyone who wishes to get into the coaching field.

**Balancing a Work-Life Relationship**

When asked to talk about how they balance their work life and personal life both coaches gave a slight chuckle before they even gave their answers. Both coaches addressed the question first by explaining how long their season truly is, whether it is in season, pre-season practice or recruiting. Because of this work received the most of their attention followed by any additional time they had to focus on their personal life. However, both also did say that they don’t view what they do as work. Both being very goal oriented they seemed to truly love what they did and passionate about their work so to them it wasn’t as if they were working. But instead having fun and getting paid for it.

Ashley put it best by saying “I like to put a great emphasis on my work, but to me it’s not a job because I have fun with what I do. But now that I am married and found someone to spend time with I would like to spend more time with him. So in the aspect of coaching we travel a lot and every weekend during the season we are either traveling or we have matches so it can be a lot. But I have a good team and in the aspect of family everyone gets along and it just works.”

Danielle continued to emphasis the difficulty to balance a work life relationship by stating “when the season starts up my team becomes very busy. I just try to really focus on the job and then personal life comes second. Other things just than fall into place. Then when I have down time I can do other things. But for the most part I plan according and put my work ahead of any personal life.”
Balancing a work-life relationship was the most talked about barrier among the two coaches. Both of which emphasized that this relationship can be one barrier that may prevent many women from getting into the coaching. This is because it is extremely difficult to maintain a personal life while still being a successful head coach and because of this you may have to put your personal life second. This for some may be difficult to do and lead them to either stop being a head coach or never become one in the first place.

**Emotion and Intensity While Coaching**

Both coaches also discussed how their mentality and intensity differs whether they are coaching their men’s team compared to women’s team. Each talked about how their women’s team does not need to receive the same negative feedback that the male players can handle better. Danielle talked about how her female players “tend to be more emotional and they do not always need negative feedback all the time. I’ve learned that saying it positive and saying it negative can get different responses. Not everything needs to be said negative to them.” Because the level of competitiveness seemed to vary depending on the gender both coaches talked about how important it was to challenge the men more in an attempt to get as much out of them as possible. Ashley even talked about how she has realized it is necessary to schedule a break between the two practices. Ashley’s justification to the scheduling was that “if I have had the women first because I am hard on them, but I’m hard on them in a different way. The guys need a little more discipline and more sternness. Whereas the women don’t need that discipline but instead a little more optimism.”

Ashley also talked about how her emotions are easily picked up by the players. This is because she has been told that she gets caught up in the situation and can get very
emotion. “They say that I have like three levels of “emotionalness” that they can recognize. So I’ve been working on not necessarily calm because I can still be serious but making sure that I do not get too emotional.” Not to say that she does not believe she can still be intense and passionate because as she put it “I care about it and about them and I want them to succeed.” So ultimately it is making sure that she can remain in a sense calm while the matches are taking place.

These coach’s emotions and intensity can also act as a barrier for them. If they are seen as being too emotional while coaching or well as when they are critiquing their players it can be a negative thing. If they find their emotions getting in the way of them coaching men and women it may prevent them from putting forth their best effort at pushing the players to their limits allowing them to grow and succeed. It can also act as a barrier if someone else in the administration were to notice their level emotion and think that this coach were unable to perform her job at the highest level because of the emotion they have.

Further Findings

After going through an analyzing the information that was provided there was certain information that seemed to be of important and relevance regarding this topic. However, there was not a specific theme that this information would fit into. Ashley talked about, regarding the difficulty of recruiting men over women, that it was in fact easier to recruit men to her team due to the school itself. Being an engineering school that’s what many of the men come to school and major in. So anyone who is looking to continue playing the sport and wants to peruse a degree in engineering may see this as an added bonus when determining where to go to school. However, she did say that the
financial aid package that can be offered to these athletes may act as a deterrent. On top of not being able to receive scholarships for athletics at the Division III level this specific institution’s financial aid package seems to be a challenge as competing schools are able to offer more money. With the cost of a college/university being so expensive people are always weighing which school is able to provide them with the best financial aid package or scholarship.

Danielle gave great praise to Title IX and all of the change that it has been able to cause for the better. Although she did not know any of the percentages off of the top of her head she did believe that things have been getting a lot better, in regards to women head coaching. However, on the converse she did say that she does believe that there will always be men’s sports that we will never see females at the head coach. Such sports included football and baseball. One of her biggest justifications for it was the fact that the head coach is required to go into the locker room. Because of this there may be issues and controversies regarding that situation. Whereas, she pointed to the sport she coaches as being more individualized and there is not that need to go into the locker room and talk to the players. Also Danielle pointed to the fact that Title IX had a huge impact on the ability for women to get into the coaching world. This is important to note, because of Title IX, it has opened the doors for many women to acquire positions in sports in ways that were previously viewed as just being held by men.

Although these responses by both Ashley and Danielle do not point to specific barriers that prevent females from obtaining a head coach position they did provide information that seemed to be valuable to note. The first being that depending on the
university you are coaching at can impact how easy it is to recruit male athletes.

Something that in previous literature seemed very difficult to do.

**Discussion**

**Limitations**

After looking back on my research I encountered a few limitations that have impacted my findings. The first being is that within the Rochester area there are only four female head coaches of male sport teams. From that list only two of them responded to me when I reached out to them in an attempt to sit down and interview them, thus leaving my sample size to be very small. Another limitation of the research was time. Given that we only had a semester to conduct our research I was limited to who I would be able to reach out to conduct in-person interviews. I was also affected by other courses that I was taking during the semester. Since I could not devote all of my time to the research I had to budget time for all other courses as well as conducting the research.

**Obtainment of Their Position Coaching Men**

With this research it can now be added to the previous literature that has already been written regarding this topic. From the interviews that were conducted, at the Division III level each of the head coaches had some form of experience prior to acquiring the head coaching position that they currently hold. Although their previous experiences varied neither were hired without having that experience. Similarly authors Kamphoff, Armentrout, and Driska (2010) found in their surveys of Division I female coaches that each coach obtained their head coaching position in one of three ways: initially coaching the women’s team, approached to apply, and directly applied for the position. There noticeably similar trends among the two coaches interviewed at the
Division III level. Ashley was approached to be an assistant coach and was ultimately hired as the men’s coach after coaching the women’s team. Danielle who was also approached regarding the head coaching vacancy was in charge of coaching both the men’s and women’s team.

**The Ability to Establish Credibility and Relate to Administration and Players**

Both Ashley and Danielle were adamant that they did not find it difficult to establish respect or credibility among their players. They both talked about how they relied on their past experiences to speak for themselves. This is in contrast to the findings in the Kamphoff, Armentrout, and Driska (2010) article that found while interviewing Division I female head coaches that it was difficult to establish credibility and gain respect among their student-athletes. However, in support of the Kamphoff, Armentrout, and Driska (2010) both the coaches at the Division I and III level appeared to find it difficult to establish some sort of respect with the administration staff. As one coach pointed to, even great success did not guarantee that the team would see any benefits or that the coach would receive any sort of additional personal benefits.

**Balancing a Work-Life Relationship**

Supporting previous literature would be the difficulty of maintaining a work-life relationship. This was something that both coaches stressed during the interviews conducted for the purpose of this research. This is an a testament to the dedication that coaches put into their job as well as the love and passion that they have when it comes to working and teaching these student athletes. In Kilty (2006), the researcher also found thanks to the United States Olympic Committee Department of Coaching and Sport Sciences that there is a high stress of balancing work and personal life. No matter what
division the coach is at it was certainly clear that work must come first then your personal
life follows second. Because of this it was emphasized that this was one of the bigger
barriers to overcome because some coaches do not want to give up so much of their
personal lives especially if they must dedicate time to their significant other or if they are
trying to raise a family.

Emotion and Intensity While Coaching

One theme that appeared during these surveys that did not appear during the
previous research conducted had to do with the emotion and intensity when it came to
coaching male athletes. Both of these female athletes talked about how there is this need
to push the men harder. This is because it is what they are looking for. If they feel as if
they are not be pushed and tested they are not truly enjoying themselves. Because both
coaches felt that their own emotions were coming out and one even said they has been
told by her players that she can be too emotional about situations from time to time. This
sort information was surprise that the same if not more emotion would be shown from
female head coaches at the Division I level due to the fact that the level of competition is
significantly greater.

Further Findings

There was other information that was provided by the coaches in there interviews
that although they did not fit into a specific theme they certainly supported other
information that was found in previous literature. What was found to be different from
the Kamphoff, Armentrout, and Driska (2010) article was the lack of difficultly that these
Division III female head coaches seemed to have when it came to recruiting male
athletes. On coach attributed the majors offered by the schools as a reason for why men
are easy to recruit. Another pointed to the fact that it merely depends on the year and there is not the same level of importance of the sport, as compared to Division I, in these student-athletes so they are not impacted as greatly by who the head coach of the team is.

**Future Research**

Based on the current finding of these interviews and previous literature, further research should attempt to reach out to a larger sample of Division III female head coaches of men’s sport teams. By doing so it will allow for the opportunity to determine whether or not the finding in these interviews is what coaches around the country or just in the Rochester area believe. Also as we progress in time and more and more females enter into the coaching ranks it would be interesting to determine if thoughts change even five to ten years from now. As of right now there remains to be very limited research conducted on female head coaches at the Division III so in order to understand any similarities and difference a more extensive analysis will need to be conducted in order to find further information.

**Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to better understand the experiences and barriers that Division III female head coaches of men’s teams go through. This topic is important to examine due to the fact that there remains to be a lack of women coaching men at all levels of collegiate athletics. When Title IX was enacted in 1972, women comprised 90 percent off all coaching positions for women’s teams. Women head coaches began to then move into coaching men sports as well. However, since 1972 the number of female head coaches has continuously decreased for both sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2012).
Because of this it is important to examine the reasons as to why exactly these numbers have been decreasing at such a drastic rate.

There have been changes in the representation of women when it comes to positions of leadership and more specifically being a head coach. Going even further there has been a shift towards females becoming the head coach of male sports teams. Something that previously viewed to be male dominated. However, although there has been this shift for the positive there remains to be these invisible barriers that exist that are preventing more females from becoming the head coach of a men’s sports team. At the Division III level these barriers were both externally as well as internally and after conducting surveys they were four main themes that emerged. Externally the theme that emerged was 1) Obtainment of their position coaching men. Internally the themes that emerged were 1) the ability to establish credibility and relate to their colleagues and players 2) Balancing a work-life relationship 3) emotion and intensity when coaching.
Appendix A

Interview Questions

External Factors:

1) Were you a student-athlete in college? If yes, what sports did you play?

2) In what way did you obtain your position as head coach?

3) Have you found it difficult to recruit male athletes to your team?

4) Do you believe there to be difficulty establishing credibility and respect among the student-athletes or among your colleagues?

Internal Factors:

5) What characteristics would you attribute to your success to coaching men?

6) As a head coach in what ways do you balance your work and personal life?

7) What do you believe to be your strengths and weaknesses as a head coach?

8) How important do you believe it is for female coaches to act as a model and provide guidance for other female head coaches?
   Do you believe male head coaches provide the same model and guidance?

External/Internal Factors:

9) Please provide your perception on why there is a lack of women coaching men.

10) What strategies would you implement in order to change and increase the number of women coaching a men’s team?
Appendix B

Sample Request Email to Participants

Dear Ms. ________________,

My name is James Troutman and I am currently a senior at St. John Fisher College. As a sport management major it is required of us to take on a research project and go out and conduct our own research. The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of the barriers that may or may not exist for female head coaches at the Division III level. As a participant in this research, you are being asked to be involved in an interview that addresses your current status as a head coach. For example, you will be asked questions regarding how you obtained your position and your views of coaching male athletes. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour to complete.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. You have the choice to not participate and if at any time during the interview you have the option to not answer a question or stop the interview completely. Any decisions that you make will be respected.

It would be greatly appreciated if we could set up a time at your earliest convenience to conduct the interview. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (518)-495-5175 or jgt07646@sjfc.edu

Sincerely,

James Troutman
Appendix C

Consent Form

Project Title: Head Coaching Gender Equality at the Division III Level
Researchers: James Troutman
Advisor: Professor Katharine Burakowski
Phone: (585)-385-7389

Email: kburakowski@sjfc.edu
Email: jgt07646@sjfc.edu

Purpose and Description: The purpose of this study is to gain an understanding of the barriers that may or may not exist for female head coaches at the Division III level. As a participant in this research, you are being asked to be involved in an interview that addresses your current status as a head coach. For example, you will be asked questions regarding how you obtained your position and your views of coaching male athletes. The interview will take approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour to complete.

The answers that you provide will give a better understanding as to whether or not barriers that exist are similar among the different levels of the NCAA. A risk associated to your participation in this interview is that your coworkers or supervisors may be aware of your participation through observation of you speaking with myself. However, all responses from this interview will be kept confidential along with all names and contact information will not be included in the results.

Participation in this survey is voluntary. You have the choice to not participate and if at any time during the interview you have the option to not answer a question or stop the interview completely. Any decisions that you make will be respected.

By participating in this interview you will give me permission for your participation. If you have any concerns about your selection or treatment as a research participants please contact my research advisor or me.

Please indicate your agreement to voluntarily participate in this interview:

(Agree)  (Disagree)

Signature:

________________________________________________________________________
Date:________________________________________________________________________
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