

379
NBI
No. 7402

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE MEN TO COACH
WOMEN'S NCAA DIVISION II BASKETBALL

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

James C. Jackson, Jr., B.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

Jackson, James C., Jr., Factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA division II basketball. Master of Science (Kinesiology), August, 1997, 66 pp., 5 tables, references, 34 titles.

This study identified factors that influenced men to coach women's basketball. The CCFQ, designed to determine relative importance of each of nine factors in career selection, was completed by 78 male head coaches of women's NCAA II basketball. Data was analyzed using univariate analysis with repeated measures, t-tests, and ANOVA. These coaches indicated fulfill need for competition, help female athletes reach full potential, and serve as role model as significant influences. Moderate influences included personal attributes of athletes, job attributes, and career advancement. Job availability, belief in own success, and income were not considered influential in career selection. Few differences were indicated between demographic sub-groups on any factor. Factors associated with well being of athletes had the greatest influence.

379
NBI
No. 7402

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE MEN TO COACH
WOMEN'S NCAA DIVISION II BASKETBALL

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

James C. Jackson, Jr., B.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. Allen Jackson and Dr. Scott Martin, for their encouragement and participation throughout my experience.

A special appreciation is due to Dr. Roxanne Albertson, my major professor, for permission to do this study, as well as, her encouragement and guidance throughout my graduate studies. The inspiration I obtained through the confidence she expressed in me leaves me forever in her debt.

I am grateful to Dr. James Morrow, Chair of the Department of Kinesiology, Health Promotion, and Recreation, for his guidance and for allowing me to pursue my Master's degree at the University of North Texas. Also, to Mr. Ron Smith for his assistance in the collection of data for this study. This study would not have been possible without the participation of the male basketball coaches of NCAA Division II women's basketball teams and their athletic directors.

Finally, a special debt of gratitude is owed to my wife, Heather, for her interest, encouragement, and invaluable assistance throughout my graduate program, and my son, Jimmy, for giving me the inspiration when I needed it most.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | iii |
| LIST OF TABLES | vi |
| Chapter | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Statement of the Problem | |
| Purpose of the Study | |
| Research Questions | |
| Delimitations | |
| Limitations | |
| Definition of Terms | |
| Significance of the Study | |
| Chapter References | |
| 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 10 |
| Historical Background | |
| Reasons Men Choose Coaching as a Career | |
| Men in Traditionally Female Occupations | |
| Summary | |
| Chapter References | |
| 3. PROCEDURES | 23 |
| Selection of Subjects | |
| Selection of the Tool | |
| Data Collection | |
| Data Analysis | |
| Chapter References | |

| | |
|--|----|
| 4. RESULTS | 33 |
| <p style="text-align: center;"> Factors That Influence Men to Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball Relative Importance of the Factors to the Male Coaches Differences Between Demographic Groups as to the Relative Importance of Each Factor </p> | |
| 5. DISCUSSION | 40 |
| <p style="text-align: center;"> Factors That Influence Men to Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball Relative Importance of the Factors to the Male Coaches Differences Between Demographic Groups as to the Relative Importance of Each Factor Conclusions Recommendations Chapter References </p> | |
| APPENDIX | 48 |
| <p style="text-align: center;"> A) Questionnaire B) Athletic Director's Cover Letter C) Athletic Director's Approval Form D) Coach's Cover Letter E) Differences Between Demographic Sub-groups by Factor </p> | |
| REFERENCES | 64 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. CCFQ Factors by Category, Corresponding, and Reversed Statements | 25 |
| 2. Test-Retest Coefficients | 27 |
| 3. Descriptive Statistics for Factors | 35 |
| 4. Differences Between Group Factors | 37 |
| 5. Significant Differences Between Sub-groups for Factor 6: Personal Attributes of the Athletes | 39 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

During the last 26 years, women's intercollegiate athletics has gone through significant changes (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). Increases in participation and coaching positions are two of the changes that have significantly impacted women's intercollegiate athletics. As these changes have occurred, women's intercollegiate athletics has grown in popularity and acceptance by the American public (Cimmons, 1986).

Men coaching women athletes is only one aspect of women's intercollegiate athletics, but one that raises questions. A question that could be posed to male coaches of female athletes is why they choose to coach women. Though men have coached female athletes in AAU and non-school sports for decades, the rise in this career choice of intercollegiate athletics has been more recent. There may be an interest among supporters of women's intercollegiate athletics as to why these men chose to coach intercollegiate female athletes.

The implementation of Title IX, the 1972 Educational Amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964; affirmative action measures; and dramatic changes in societal attitudes toward women have brought about an increase in the opportunities for female athletes to participate in sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996; Campbell, 1994; Holman & Parkhouse, 1981). Approximately 16,000 females participated in intercollegiate athletics in 1970 (Knoppers, 1987), and by 1995, the NCAA was reporting that 110,524 females were participating in women's athletics (U. Walsh, personal communication, January 9, 1997). Coakley (1994) listed five major factors for recent increases in sports participation among girls and women in North America and other countries around the world: (a) new

opportunities; (b) government legislation demanding equal treatment for women in public programs; (c) the women's movement; (d) the health and fitness movement; and (e) increased media coverage of women in sports. As the number of female participants increased, so did the number of head coaching positions for women's intercollegiate athletic teams. An increase of 2,372 head coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics occurred between 1978 and 1996 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). During the same time period, the average number of women's athletic teams offered by NCAA universities increased from 5.61 to a record high, 7.53 per school (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996).

Title IX, affirmative action, and changes in societal attitudes were perceived to help female participants and female coaches. The statistics that show an increased number of men coaching women are evidence that these actions also benefited men who coach women athletes (Lehr, 1981). The number of women holding head coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics has increased since 1970. However, a closer examination reveals that the percentage of women holding head coaching positions has declined significantly (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996; Hart, Hasbrook & Mathes, 1986; Holmen & Parkhouse, 1981; Lehr, 1981). The percentage of men occupying head coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics has increased from 10% in 1970 to 52.3% in 1996 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). Of the 2,372 new head coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics, women have filled 689 (29%) of those positions and men the remaining 1,683 (71%) positions (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). In women's intercollegiate basketball, the most popular female intercollegiate sport (Lehr, 1981), the percentage of male head coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball teams has increased from 20.6% in 1977 to 35.7% in 1996 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). Although these figures are below the overall percentages for all women's intercollegiate sports, they do reflect an increase in the number of male head coaches in women's intercollegiate basketball.

Research has been conducted on many aspects of coaching including leadership behaviors (Campbell, 1994), gender (Den Boer, 1994; Knoppers, 1987; Medwechuk & Crossman, 1994; Theberge, 1993), personalities (Pinkston, 1983), preferences (George, 1989; Hastie, 1993; Weinberg, Reveles, & Jackson, 1984), reasons for entering and leaving the profession (Pastore, 1991, 1992), self-efficacy, valence and perceived barriers (Everhart, 1994), and socialization (Anderson & Gill, 1983). While these studies have revealed some information concerning a variety of subjects, they have not answered the question of why some men choose to coach women's intercollegiate basketball.

Researchers have examined why men chose traditionally female occupations such as child-care, home economics education, nursing, and social work (Boughn, 1994; Cummings, 1984; Dohner, Loyd, & Stenberg, 1990; Egeland & Brown, 1988; Fottler, 1976; Gettelson, 1986; Hanson & McCullagh, 1995; Hayes, 1986; Hesselbart, 1977; Kuecker, 1986; Perkins, Bennett, & Dorman, 1993). These studies revealed factors (e.g., job availability, job opportunities, positive work experiences, income, believe in own success, desire to help others, effecting social change, contributing to society) influencing men who chose to enter these occupations.

Since more women's intercollegiate head basketball coaching positions are available and are being filled by men, it is important to understand the factors that influence men to choose to coach women's intercollegiate basketball teams. Administrators could benefit from better understanding the dynamics involved when men choose to coach women's intercollegiate basketball.

Statement of the Problems

In this study there were three scientific problems. The first problem was to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II

basketball. The second problem was to determine the relative importance of each of those selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career. The third problem was to determine differences within selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to provide administrators and other people in hiring positions information regarding factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. This information could benefit administrators by giving them an understanding of why men apply for head athletic coaching positions on their staff. With this information, they will be better prepared to interview, evaluate, and select qualified coaches for their intercollegiate basketball programs.

Research Questions

This study was designed to assist in answering the following questions:

1. What are the factors that influence men to choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball?
2. What is the relative importance of each of these factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career?
3. Is there a difference between demographic groups as to the relative importance of each factor?

Delimitations

The following delimitations were established for this study:

1. Male head coaches of women's NCAA Division II basketball programs were selected to participate in this study.
2. Subjects were employed by an NCAA Division II university as identified by The 1996-97 National Directory of College Athletics, (women's edition).

Limitations

Limitations of the study are as follows:

1. Some subjects may not have fully completed or returned the questionnaire.
2. Although honesty was requested and confidentiality was stressed, some subjects may not have been completely honest when answering the questionnaire because of a fear of being identified.
3. The responses of male head basketball coaches of women's NCAA Division II basketball programs may not have reflected those responses of male head coaches of other intercollegiate basketball teams, assistant women's intercollegiate basketball coaches, or male coaches of other women's intercollegiate athletic teams or individual sports.

Definition of Terms

Selected demographic groups -- Groupings of subjects that have been divided by selected characteristics (i.e., age, education level, participation, years experience coaching intercollegiate athletics, years experience coaching women's intercollegiate basketball, and years experience coaching men's intercollegiate basketball).

Selected factors -- Factors that possibly influence men to choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball (i.e., income, job availability, career advancement, help

female athletes reach their full potential, job attributes, personal attributes of the athletes, serve as a role model, belief in one's own success, and fulfill the need for competition).

Traditionally female occupations -- Positions of employment where females occupy the majority of those positions.

Significance of the Study

Since the implementation of Title IX, females have experienced significant increases in the opportunities for participation in intercollegiate athletics (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996; Holmen & Parkhouse, 1981; Lehr, 1981). This increase was followed by an increase in coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics. Men occupied 52.3% of all coaching positions in NCAA women's intercollegiate athletics in 1996 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). A review of the literature indicated a lack of studies to determine factors that influence men to choose to coach women's intercollegiate basketball teams. This study examined selected factors and their relative importance to the men that have chosen to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career. With an understanding of these factors, administrators and other people in hiring positions will be better prepared to interview, evaluate, and select coaches for their particular basketball programs.

CHAPTER REFERENCES

- Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L.J. (1996). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - nineteen year update 1977-1996. Unpublished report. Brooklyn College, New York.
- Anderson, D.F., & Gill, K.S. (1983). Occupational socialization patterns of men and women's interscholastic basketball coaches. Journal of Sport Behavior, 6 (3), 105-116.
- Boughn, S. (1994). Why do men choose nursing? Nursing and Health Care, 15, 404-411.
- Campbell, H.W. (1994). Comparison of male collegiate tennis coaches who coach male tennis players and male coaches who coach female tennis players (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 02, 211.
- Cimmons, M. (1986). Commanding performance: Are men coaching women into a state of dependence? Runner 8 (6), 42-48.
- Cleary, K. (Ed.). (1996). The 1996-97 national directory of college athletics (women's ed.). Fostoria, OH: Gray Printing.
- Coakley, J.J. (1994). Sport in society: Issues and controversies (5th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby-Yearbook.
- Cummings, P.H. (1985). Men in nursing: The development of a theoretical construct for delayed occupational choice (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 02, 473.
- Den Boer, T.J. (1994). High school coaches of women's basketball teams: Gender differences in the coaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 09, 3368.
- Dohner, R.E., Loyd, C.M., & Stenberg, L. (1990). Men: The other professionals in home economics education. Journal of Home Economics, 82 (4), 32-36.
- Egeland, J.W., & Brown, J.S. (1988). Sex role stereotyping and role strain of male registered nurses. Research in Nursing and Health, 11, 257-267.

Everhart, C.B. (1994). Gender differences in the choice of coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence and perceived barriers (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 03, 504.

Fottler, M.D. (1976). Attitudes of female nurses toward the male nurse: A study of occupational segregation. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 17, 98-110.

George, J.J. (1989). Finding solutions to the problem of fewer female coaches. The Physical Educator, 46 (1), 2-8.

Gettelson, S. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 03, 795.

Hanson, J.G., & McCullagh, J.G. (1995). Career choice factors for bsw students: A 10-year perspective. Journal of Social Work Education, 31, 1, 28-37.

Hart, B.A., Hasbrook, C.A., & Mathes, S.A. (1986). An examination of the reduction in the number of female interscholastic coaches. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57, 68-77.

Hastie, P.A. (1993). Coaching preferences of high school girl volleyball players. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 77, 1309-1310.

Hayes, R. (1986). Men's decisions to enter or avoid nontraditional occupations. The Career Development Quarterly, 35, 89-101.

Hesselbart, S. (1977). Women doctors win and male doctors lose: A study of sex role and occupational stereotypes. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 4 (1), 49-62.

Holmen, M.G., & Parkhouse, B.L. (1981). Trends in the selection of coaches for female athletes: A demographic inquiry. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 52, (1), 9-18.

Knoppers, A. (1987). Gender and the coaching profession. Quest, 39, 9-22.

Kuecker, L.L. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 01, 318.

Lehr, C.A. (1981). Sex of coaches in women's intercollegiate athletics from 1973 to 1980. Unpublished manuscript. University of Georgia, Athens.

Medwechuk, N., & Crossman, J. (1994). Effects of gender bias on the evaluation of male and female swim coaches. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 78, 163-169.

Pastore, D.L. (1991). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Journal of Sport Management, 5, 128-143.

Pastore, D.L. (1992). Two-year college coaches of women's teams: Gender differences in coaching career selections. Journal of Sport Management, 6, 179-190.

Perkins, J.L., Bennett, D.N., & Dorman, R.E. (1993). Why men choose nursing. Nursing and Health Care, 14 (1), 34-38.

Pinkston, G.C. (1983). Personality traits of coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 08, 2609.

Theberge, N. (1993). The construction of gender in sport: Women, coaching, and the naturalization of difference. Social Problems, 40, 301-313.

Weinberg, R., Reveles, M., & Jackson, A. (1984). Attitudes of male and female athletes toward male and female coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, 6, 448-453.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this study there were three scientific problems. The first problem was to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. The second problem was to determine the relative importance of each of those selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career. The third problem was to determine the differences between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor. This chapter presents a review of literature and research related to this study. The chapter is divided into four sections: (a) historical background, (b) reasons men choose coaching as a career, (c) men in traditionally female occupations, and (d) summary.

Historical Background

A review of literature revealed that in the last 26 years there have been some significant changes in the number of participants, coaching positions, and the people occupying coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics. There were approximately 16,000 female participants in women's intercollegiate athletics in 1970 and approximately 10% of all intercollegiate women's athletic teams were coached by men (Knoppers, 1987). The NCAA reported 110,524 females participated in women's athletics during 1995 (U. Walsh, personal communication, January 9, 1997) and men coaching women's intercollegiate athletic teams increased to approximately 46% (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996).

Acosta and Carpenter (1996) conducted a 19 year, longitudinal study, from 1978 to 1996, on women's intercollegiate athletics. No other study has been done on women's intercollegiate athletics for as long a period. During a telephone conversation with the NCAA (U. Walsh, personal communication, October 18, 1996), it was learned that the statistics on women's intercollegiate athletics submitted by Acosta and Carpenter are the official statistics of the NCAA.

Acosta and Carpenter (1996) reported, during this 19 year period, that the number of sports being offered in women's intercollegiate athletic programs, by all NCAA institutions, increased from 5.61 to 7.53. As the number of sports being offered to women increased, the number of women's intercollegiate athletic head coaching positions increased as well. According to Acosta and Carpenter (1996), the number of women's intercollegiate athletic head coaching positions grew from 4,208 to 6,580 during this time.

With the increase of coaching positions came an increase in the number of men coaching women's intercollegiate athletic teams. Numbers of both, men and women, filling these new positions increased, but a larger percentage of these positions were filled by men. Men held 10% of all women's intercollegiate head coaching positions in 1972. The majority, 51.2%, of all women's intercollegiate athletic head coaching positions were held by men by 1987. The percentage of men coaching women's intercollegiate athletic teams had increased another 1.1% since that time, to 52.3% by 1996 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996).

During the 1996 season, 98.3% of NCAA institutions reported offering women's intercollegiate basketball, which indicates that women's basketball is the most popular women's intercollegiate sport. Men held 35.7% of those NCAA women's basketball head coaching positions. Acosta and Carpenter (1996) offered no explanation as to why the percentage of men in NCAA women's basketball head coaching positions were less than

the overall percentage for all NCAA women's sports, but Lehr (1981) reasoned that basketball was the highest visible sport of all NCAA women's sports. This visibility factor of NCAA women's basketball programs tended to influence hiring practices of administrators in NCAA women's athletic programs. Even at that, 328 (35.7%) males held head coaching positions in NCAA women's basketball programs. Of all NCAA women's athletic teams, the highest number of males in head coaching positions were in basketball (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996).

Lehr (1981) collected data on women's intercollegiate athletics in a longitudinal study from 1973 to 1980. Lehr used The National Directory of College Athletics (women's edition, 1973-1980) to determine the sports offered by each institution and the gender of each coach listed in the directory. The data revealed four statistics pertinent to this study: (a) the number of institutions offering women's intercollegiate athletics increased 56.1%, (b) the number of coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics increased 43%, (c) the number of men coaching women's intercollegiate athletics increased 27%, and (d) male coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball increased 22%. It was not determined if Lehr's (1981) data corresponded with Acosta and Carpenter's (1996) because Acosta and Carpenter did not start collecting data until 1978, the final two years of Lehr's study.

A study by Holmen and Parkhouse (1981), from 1974 to 1979, surveyed 335 intercollegiate female athletic directors. Three statistics relevant to this study were revealed: (a) a 37% increase in the number of coaches for female intercollegiate athletes, (b) a 21% increase in the number of male coaches in women's intercollegiate athletics, and (c) a 22% increase in the number of men coaching women's intercollegiate basketball teams. Holmen and Parkhouse's (1981) data corresponded with data found by

Lehr (1981), but it was not determined if Holmen and Parkhouse's data agree with Acosta and Carpenter's (1996) data because of the different time periods examined.

A review of literature showed that since 1970, the number of female intercollegiate athletes, coaching positions for women's intercollegiate athletic teams, men occupying women's intercollegiate head coaching positions, and the number of male head coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball programs have increased significantly. All three of the studies indicated a continuing rapid increase in the percentage of women's intercollegiate basketball positions held by male coaches. Although these studies reported increases, they did not provide evidence as to the reasons why these men chose to become head coaches of NCAA women's basketball programs.

Reasons Men Choose Coaching as a Career

Few studies have examined reasons why men choose coaching as a career. Pastore (1991) conducted a study of male coaches of NCAA Division I women's athletic teams. Ninety men, representing women's intercollegiate athletic teams from the Big East, Big Ten, Pac Ten, and Southeastern conferences, were surveyed to find the reasons men chose to enter the coaching profession. These men served as head coaches of women's basketball, golf, gymnastics, softball, swimming, tennis, track and field, and volleyball teams. Each participant was instructed to indicate their extent of agreement with seven reasons that may have influenced their decision to enter the coaching profession. The seven reasons were (a) the desire to follow in the footsteps of a former coach, (b) the opportunity to stay involved in competitive athletics, (c) an increase in the number of head coaching positions that became available with the implementation of Title IX, (d) a mandate of equal pay for coaching women's teams with the implementation of Title IX, (e) the opportunity to work with advanced and motivated athletes, (f) the opportunity to

become a role model for young and aspiring athletes, and (g) the opportunity to help female athletes reach their potential. The participants were instructed to select the most important reason for entering the coaching profession and to list other pertinent reasons that did not appear on the questionnaire.

Pastore (1991) used a 5-point Likert Scale with values ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree to measure the coaches agreement of each of the seven reasons listed for entering the coaching profession. Factors receiving a favorable response (i.e., strongly agree and agree) at least 50% of the time were (a) stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) work with advanced and motivated athletes, (c) help females reach their athletic potential, and (d) become a role model.

Pastore's (1992) expanded her study by surveying 2-year college coaches of women's athletic teams. Participating in this study were 44 male coaches of women's athletic teams representing five athletic conferences: Garden State Athletic Conference, Maryland JUCO Conference, Massachusetts Community College Athletic Conference, Mountain Valley Collegiate Conference, and Pennsylvania Collegiate Athletic Association Conference. The findings of this study agreed with the 1991 study.

Basketball coaches at the interscholastic level have been studied to identify the reasons they entered the coaching profession. Den Boer (1993) conducted a study of 112 male high school basketball head coaches of women's teams in the state of Colorado. The top four reasons for entering coaching indicated by the participants were (a) the opportunity to stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) coaching gives me a feeling of self-satisfaction, (c) to help athletes reach their athletic potential, and (d) to become a role model for young, aspiring athletes.

Den Boer (1993) reported that Robert G. Hoehn had indicated in 1983 that people entered the coaching profession for five major reasons: (a) self-satisfaction; (b) to build a

strong rapport with kids, especially outside the classroom environment; (c) to enjoy socializing with fellow coaches; (d) to take pride in watching athletes improve; and (e) for the money.

A review of literature revealed that the consistent reasons cited for men to choose coaching as a career were (a) stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) help the athletes they are coaching to reach their full athletic potential, (c) become a role model (d) work with advanced and motivated athletes, and (e) coaching gives me a feeling of self-satisfaction.

Men in Traditionally Female Occupations

Men coaching women's intercollegiate athletes presents a unique work environment. No other occupation is quite like coaching women's intercollegiate athletics, yet there are some occupations that are similar. Similar occupations such as child-care, home economics education, nursing, and social work may be classified as traditionally female occupations and are reviewed in this section. Traditionally female occupations are those occupations where females occupy the majority of the positions (Fottler, 1976). Coaching women's intercollegiate basketball is traditionally a female occupation with only 35.7% of all women's intercollegiate basketball head coaching positions being occupied by men (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). Examining why men choose to enter other traditionally female occupations may benefit in the understanding of why men may choose to coach women's intercollegiate basketball. The occupations that have been identified as traditionally female with males comprising a minority portion of the labor force include: (a) nursing, (b) child-care, (c) home economics education, and (d) social work.

The nursing profession has a number of similarities to coaching women's intercollegiate basketball in that nursing in America was a male occupation until the 19th

century. The occupation underwent the process of "feminization" beginning with Florence Nightingale and the development of the first nursing school in 1873 (Kuecker, 1986). Currently there is a real effort by nursing administrators to attract males to the profession (Kuecker, 1986). Coaching, on the other hand, started as an all male profession until the advent of women's athletics. Ninety percent of all women's intercollegiate athletic teams were coached by women until 1972 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996), virtually shutting men out of this sector of sports in America. Since 1987, men have been occupying a majority of head coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996).

Boughn (1994) asked why men chose to enter nursing, an occupation, where in 1994 only 5.7% of the positions were occupied by males. Twelve male nursing students, ranging from freshmen to senior at a state college, were selected to participate in her qualitative study. She examined the characteristics, motivations, and desires of the participants. The most common themes reported as to why these men had chosen nursing were (a) psycho-social motivation, the desire to care for others; (b) practical motivation, specifically related to job security and salary; and (c) feelings of power and empowerment.

A study by Perkins, Bennett, and Dorman (1993) examined 146 male nursing students in a large southeastern state. The most frequently cited factor the male nursing students gave for choosing nursing as a career was career attributes. Career attributes included: (a) job opportunity and availability, (b) financial incentives, (c) job security, and (d) career flexibility and options.

A qualitative study by Kuecker (1986) was conducted of 30 male nurses in the state of Oregon. Kuecker cited economic factors and characteristics of the occupation for reasons as why men enter nursing. The top three influences of the economic factors were (a) the realization of the "tight" male labor market; (b) the perception of nursing as an

occupation in which traditional supply for the labor force, women, are not meeting that demand; and (c) nursing was among the highest paid of traditional female occupations. Therefore, nursing may become the best occupational choice for some men. The top three occupational characteristics were (a) I enjoyed taking care of people, (b) provided a variety of experiences, and (c) technical-scientific aspects appealed to me.

Gettelson (1986) conducted a study, using 14 male nurses employed in the New York Metropolitan area, looking for reasons the participants decided to study nursing. Findings from her qualitative study indicated that the most common sources of occupational motivation is parental, family, or community influences. Some of the men were provided experience through the medical corps and for others, experience was provided by hospital-type situations. All of the participants had the desire to do good work; hold a valued position; earn a decent, comparable wage; and succeed. These results suggest that people, rather than the work experience itself, or the mass media proved to be the most important factor that influenced men toward a nursing career. Gettelson (1986), quoting Levinson's (1978) *The Seasons of a Man's Life*, about men:

a man's occupation is one of the primary factors determining his income, his prestige and his place in society... a man's occupation places him within a particular socioeconomic level and work world. It exerts a powerful influence upon the options available to him, the choices he makes among them, and his possibilities for advancement and satisfaction. His work world also influences the choices he makes in other spheres. Occupation has important sources within the self and important consequences for the self.

A study was conducted by Cummings (1985) of 200 male registered nurses licensed to practice nursing in the state of North Carolina. All of the subjects had

graduated from a nursing program between the years 1978-1981. Cummings (1985) was trying to determine why men enter the nursing profession. Factor's most influential in respondent's decisions to enter nursing were (a) desire to help people (i.e., altruism), (b) career mobility, (c) job security, and (d) job availability.

A review of literature of why men choose nursing as their career revealed the top reasons to be (a) salary, (b) job availability, (c) job opportunities, and (d) desire to help others. The reason, desire to help others, corresponds to the reason, to help the athletes they are coaching to reach their full athletic potential cited earlier as why men choose to enter coaching. However, the other three reasons do not represent any similar responses as to why men choose to enter coaching.

Nontraditional career choice may be interpreted in terms of giving up a higher place in the existing caste system or "moving down the ladder" by choosing a career with lower status (Stenberg & Dohner, 1992). Stenberg and Dohner (1992) conducted a qualitative study using 10 male home economics educators as their participants to find the influence of a mentor on career choice. They found that a mentor positively influenced their choice of careers and career goals (Stenberg & Dohner, 1992).

Dohner, Loyd, and Stenberg (1990) examined 24 males that held home economics education degrees and were currently working in home economics education. Influences on nontraditional career choice showed: (a) positive experiences in high school home economic classes, (b) positive work experiences in home economic related careers, and (c) the availability of financial assistance to study home economics education. Included in the findings was that a mentoring relationship played a significant role for these men in their selection of a nontraditional career (Dohner, Loyd, & Stenberg, 1990).

In Hayes' (1986) review of studies conducted on men's decisions to enter nontraditional occupations, he quoted Kadushin (1976),

a man in a woman's profession has selected or has been forced to select that position because he could not qualify for a man's profession....female concentrated occupations may attract men who are interested or talented in the job characteristics and requirements of a specific job.

Hayes (1986) reported that male child-care workers, male nursing students, and male nurses reported entering these areas because they believed that they were providing a special contribution, loved and enjoyed the work, and wanted an opportunity to help people. Hayes (1986) also reported that men from lower socioeconomic backgrounds may perceive that although traditional female occupations may not always pay as much as traditional male occupations, they do offer stability as well as other fringe benefits such as a more pleasant work environment and interaction with the opposite sex. Male nurses indicated that they were more interested in obtaining security through limited upward mobility than in achieving higher level success and that nursing represented to them a secure job with more status than the normal semi-skilled work they probably would have performed otherwise. Male nurses also tend to come from working class backgrounds and often viewed nursing as a "stepping stone" career.

Hanson and McCullagh (1995) conducted a longitudinal study of 126 male social work students at a midwestern college over a 10-year period from 1983 to 1993. A questionnaire was designed to gather information on students' decision to choose social work as their career. The top four most important factors that the male students cited were (a) contributing to society, (b) believing in own success, (c) effecting social change, and (d) good job opportunities. These factors tend to concur with those reported by men in nursing and home economics education.

Summary

The number of participants and coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics have increased significantly since 1970 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). The number of men occupying coaching positions in women's intercollegiate athletics also has increased (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996). An examination of why men choose traditionally female occupations, as well as why men choose coaching as a career, may lead to a better understanding of why men choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball.

A review of literature addressing why men choose coaching as a career revealed three reasons that were consistent throughout the studies: (a) stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) help athletes reach their full potential, and (c) serve as a role model. A review of literature of nursing, home economics education, child-care, and social work revealed six consistent reasons why men choose to enter traditionally female occupations: (a) salary, (b) job availability, (c) career advancement, (d) job attributes, (e) personal attributes of the workers and people in that field, and (f) belief in one's own success.

Based on previous studies, the dominant reasons indicated for entering coaching were different than those given for entering other traditionally female occupations. This researcher combined the nine reasons predominately cited by men for selecting to pursue a career in coaching and traditionally female occupations to the current study as possible selected factors why men choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball.

CHAPTER REFERENCES

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L.J. (1996). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - nineteen year update 1977-1996. Unpublished report. Brooklyn College, New York.

Boughn, S. (1994). Why do men choose nursing? Nursing and Health Care, 15, 404-411.

Cummings, P.H. (1985). Men in nursing: The development of a theoretical construct for delayed occupational choice (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 02, 473.

Den Boer, T.J. (1994). High school coaches of women's basketball teams: Gender differences in the coaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 09, 3368.

Dohner, R.E., Loyd, C.M., & Stenberg, L. (1990). Men: The other professionals in home economics education. Journal of Home Economics, 82 (4), 32-36.

Fottler, M.D. (1976). Attitudes of female nurses toward the male nurse: A study of occupational segregation. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 17, 98-110.

Gettelson, S. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 03, 795.

Hanson, J.G., & McCullagh, J.G. (1995). Career choice factors for bsw students: A 10-year perspective. Journal of Social Work Education, 31, 1, 28-37.

Hayes, R. (1986). Men's decisions to enter or avoid nontraditional occupations. The Career Development Quarterly, 35, 89-101.

Holmen, M.G., & Parkhouse, B.L. (1981). Trends in the selection of coaches for female athletes: A demographic inquiry. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 52, 9-18.

Knoppers, A. (1987). Gender and the coaching profession. Quest, 39, 9-22.

Kuecker, L.L. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 01, 318.

Lehr, C.A. (1981). Sex of coaches in women's intercollegiate athletics from 1973 to 1980. Unpublished manuscript. University of Georgia, at Athens.

Pastore, D.L. (1991). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Journal of Sport Management, 5, 128-143.

Pastore, D.L. (1992). Two-year college coaches of women's teams: Gender differences in coaching career selections. Journal of Sport Management, 6, 179-190.

Perkins, J.L., Bennett, D.N., & Dorman, R.E. (1993). Why men choose nursing. Nursing and Health Care, 14 (1), 34-38.

Stenberg, L.A., & Dohner, R.E. (1992). Men in home economics education. Journal of Vocational Home Economics, 10 (2), 28-37.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

In this study there were three scientific problems. The first problem was to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. The second problem was to determine the relative importance of each of these selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career. The third problem was to determine the differences between demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor.

Selection of Subjects

The population for this study was 114 male head coaches of women's NCAA Division II basketball teams as identified by The 1996-97 National Directory of College Athletics, (women's edition). NCAA Division II male head coaches of women's basketball teams were chosen for this study for two reasons: (a) NCAA Division II has a higher percentage (42%) of women's basketball teams being coached by men than either NCAA Division I or III (Acosta & Carpenter, 1996) and (b) it was assumed that the NCAA Division II level of women's basketball offered a cross-representation of male head coaches of collegiate women's athletic teams.

Selection of the Tool

Studies seeking reasons why male coaches of 4-year and 2-year intercollegiate and interscholastic women's athletic teams choose coaching as a career were examined (Den Boer, 1994; Pastore, 1991, 1992). Studies from nursing (Boughn, 1994; Cummings,

1985; Gettelson, 1986; Kuecker, 1986; Perkins, Bennett, & Dorman, 1993), home economics education (Dohner, Loyd, & Stenberg, 1990), child-care (Hayes, 1986), and social work (Hanson & McCullagh, 1995) also were examined to determine reasons why men selected traditionally female occupations as their career choice. While each study used an instrument designed to identify the reasons that men chose to enter their particular profession, they did not address or identify the factors that influenced men to choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. The instruments however, offered a guide to the construction of a questionnaire, the Career Coaching Factors Questionnaire (CCFQ) (Appendix A), that addressed nine factors, selected from three categories, found by other researchers as most dominant. The CCFQ specifically was designed to ascertain: (a) factors selected from three categories, economic, occupational, and personal, that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball; (b) the relative importance of each of those selected factors to the men that chose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career; and (c) the differences between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor. The CCFQ consisted of two parts: (a) Part 1 was a demographic background section and (b) Part 2 contained 12 statements which addressed nine factors selected from three influencing categories.

For this study, the demographic background section identified six independent variables divided in the following manner: (a) age (i.e., 20 to 35 years, 36 to 50 years, and 51+ years); (b) education level (i.e., bachelor's degree, master's degree, and doctorate degree); (c) participation (i.e., college varsity basketball playing experience or no college varsity basketball playing experience); (d) years experience coaching intercollegiate athletics; (e) years experience coaching intercollegiate women's basketball; and (f) years experience coaching intercollegiate men's basketball.

In Part 2 of the CCFQ, the nine factors were organized under three categories: (a) economic; (b) occupational; and (c) personal. Each category consisted of three factors

Table 1

CCFQ Factors by Category, Corresponding, and Reversed Statements

| Category | Factor | Corresponding | Reversed |
|---------------------|---|---------------|------------|
| Factor # | | Statements | Statements |
| <u>Economic</u> | | | |
| 1 | income | 2, 12 | 2 |
| 2 | job availability | 5 | |
| 3 | career advancement | 6 | 6 |
| <u>Occupational</u> | | | |
| 4 | help female athletes reach full potential | 1 | |
| 5 | job attributes | 3, 11 | 11 |
| 6 | personal attributes of the athletes | 9 | |
| <u>Personal</u> | | | |
| 7 | serve as a role model | 4 | |
| 8 | belief in one's own success | 8, 10 | 10 |
| 9 | fulfill the need for competition | 7 | 7 |

which served as the dependent variables for this study. Table 1 reflects the nine selected factors which were adopted from previous studies of careers discussed in the review of

literature. Factor 1, income; Factor 2, job availability; Factor 3, career advancement; Factor 5, job attributes; Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes; and Factor 8, belief in one's own success were selected from studies on reasons men choose nontraditional occupations. Factor 4, help female athletes reach their full potential; Factor 7, serve as a role model; and Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition were selected from studies on reasons men choose to enter coaching.

The CCFQ was constructed after each factor was randomly assigned a statement number. Twelve statements were written which addressed the nine factors. Seven statements, 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, and 12, were written in a positive direction. Five statements, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 11, were written in a negative or reversed direction. Statements 2 and 12 addressed Factor 1, statements 3 and 11 addressed Factor 5, and statements 8 and 10 addressed Factor 8. Table 1 reflects the statements, their corresponding factors, reversed statements, and the three factors that had two statements addressing those factors. Reversing the statements and adding an additional statement to three of the selected factors allowed for reliability reference points in the responses of the subjects. Those responses were combined and the mean score was taken for analysis purposes for those factors.

The CCFQ was assessed for content validity by a panel of three experts. Each of the experts' experience spanned 20 or more years in intercollegiate basketball coaching, athletic administration, and scientific research. Each expert edited and critiqued the CCFQ's format and content for clarity, length, order, and relevance. The CCFQ was then revised to reflect the panel's recommendations.

A reliability analysis was conducted on the CCFQ by calculation of correlations on the nine selected factors using a test-retest method. Two weeks after the CCFQs were returned, 30 subjects were randomly selected to be retested. Phone calls to the 30

subjects were made in order to obtain their approval. Thirty CCFQs were mailed and returned useable.

The correlation coefficients reflect the reliability of each of the statements addressing the nine selected factors on the CCFQ. Table 2 shows that statement 9 (.793), statements 8 and 10 (.756), statement 6 (.739), and statement 1 (.709) had high reliability estimates. Statement 4 (.565), statements 2 and 12 (.445), statement 5 (.394), statements 3 and 11 (.379), and statement 7 (.075) had low reliability estimates. One reason for these low reliability estimates could be the result of administering the survey at two different times of the season. The first survey was given in the latter part of the basketball season

Table 2

Test-Retest Coefficients

| Factor | Statement | Correlation Coefficient |
|--------|-----------|-------------------------|
| 1 | 2 & 12 | .445 |
| 2 | 5 | .394 |
| 3 | 6 | .739 * |
| 4 | 1 | .709 * |
| 5 | 3 & 11 | .379 |
| 6 | 9 | .793 * |
| 7 | 4 | .565 |
| 8 | 8 & 10 | .756 * |
| 9 | 7 | .075 |

* Indicates high reliability.

while hopes for post season success were still high and the second survey was given after the season had ended. Another reason could be simply the coaches did not fully understand the statements.

The CCFQ used a 5-point Likert Scale to assess the degree of agreement with each of the statements concerning the influencing factors. Thomas and Nelson (1990) suggested that a 5-point scale was sufficiently discriminate for this type of investigation. The principal advantage of a 5-point scale was that it permitted a wider choice of expression than responses with only two choices, such as "yes" or "no", or three choices, and it narrowed the selection of the responses down to a manageable and more definitive scale than one that offers 7 choices. The values used on the Likert Scale were 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = undecided, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree. A copy of the revised CCFQ is in Appendix A.

Data Collection

Letters (Appendix B) expressing the importance of this study and approval forms (Appendix C) asking for permission to request participation of their women's basketball coaches were sent to the 114 athletic directors of NCAA Division II universities that employ males as head women's basketball coaches as identified by The 1996-97 National Directory of College Athletics, (women's edition). Eighty-five percent ($n = 97$) of the athletic directors completed and returned approval forms indicating their agreement to have their women's basketball coaches surveyed. One athletic director returned the approval form indicating non-approval. Eight athletic directors returned approval forms indicating that women had been hired as the head coach. Eight athletic directors failed to respond to the request for approval.

Cover letters (Appendix D) and the CCFQ were mailed to the 97 head coaches of the NCAA Division II women's basketball programs who athletic directors granted approval of participation. Each coach was asked to follow directions, complete, then return the CCFQ in the enclosed dual envelope. Follow-up phone calls were made two weeks after each mailing to enhance the number of returned responses. Seventy-eight ($n=78$) of the 97 approved coaches completed and returned useable CCFQs, a useable return rate of 80%. One CCFQ was returned unusable. Tabulation of the CCFQ was completed after the coaches returned the CCFQs.

Data Analysis

The subject's responses on the CCFQ were analyzed utilizing the Statistical Package of the Social Sciences (SPSS) to determine mean scores for each factor (SPSS Inc., 1997). Items stated in a negative manner were reversed for scoring purposes. In order to answer research question 1, those factors with a mean value greater than 3.0 on the 5 point scale were considered influential on those men at the time of their response as to why they chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. Mean scores 3.0 and lower were considered to have less influence on those male coaches as to why they chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball.

Research question 2 was answered by conducting a univariate analysis of variance with repeated measures and analyzing differences between factor means for the total population. The nine selected factors were reorganized into three new groups according to similar mean scores and labeled (a) High-Mean, (b) Mid-Mean, and (c) Low-Mean. The three new groups were analyzed using dependent t-tests, with an alpha level pre-set at $< .05$, in order to identify any significant differences between the new groups.

Research question 3 was answered by conducting an analysis of variance (ANOVA) with a pre-set alpha level at $< .05$. Each demographic variable was divided into sub-groups. ANOVAs were done to determine if differences occurred between sub-groups on their mean responses to each of the factors.

Analyses of the data revealed the selected factors that influenced the male coaches to choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, the relative importance of each of those selected factors to those men that chose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career, and the differences between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor. The results of these analyses should assist administrators and other people in hiring positions to interview, evaluate, and select qualified coaches for their particular basketball program by giving them more understanding of why the men apply for the women's basketball head coaching positions.

CHAPTER REFERENCES

- Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L.J. (1996). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - nineteen year update 1977-1996. Unpublished report. Brooklyn College, New York.
- Boughn, S. (1994). Why do men choose nursing? Nursing and Health Care, 15, 404-411.
- Cleary, K. (Ed.). (1996). The 1996-97 national directory of college athletics (women's ed.). Fostoria, OH: Gray Printing.
- Cummings, P.H. (1985). Men in nursing: The development of a theoretical construct for delayed occupational choice (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 02, 473.
- Den Boer, T.J. (1994). High school coaches of women's basketball teams: Gender differences in the coaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 09, 3368.
- Dohner, R.E., Loyd, C.M., & Stenberg, L. (1990). Men: The other professionals in home economics education. Journal of Home Economics, 82 (4), 32-36.
- Gettelson, S. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 03, 795.
- Hanson, J.G., & McCullagh, J.G. (1995). Career choice factors for bsw students: A 10-year perspective. Journal of Social Work Education, 31, 1, 28-37.
- Hayes, R. (1986). Men's decisions to enter or avoid nontraditional occupations. The Career Development Quarterly, 35, 89-101.
- Kuecker, L.L. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 01, 318.
- Pastore, D.L. (1991). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Journal of Sport Management, 5, 128-143.

Pastore, D.L. (1992). Two-year college coaches of women's teams: Gender differences in coaching career selections. Journal of Sport Management, 6, 179-190.

Perkins, J.L., Bennett, D.N., & Dorman, R.E. (1993). Why men choose nursing. Nursing and Health Care, 14 (1), 34-38.

Statistical package of the social sciences (Version 6.1) [Computer software]. (1997). Chicago: SPSS.

Thomas, J.R., & Nelson, J.K. (1990). Research methods in physical activity (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this study there were three scientific problems. The first problem was to identify selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. The second problem was to determine the relative importance of each of those selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career. The third problem was to ascertain differences between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor. The Career Coaching Factors Questionnaire (CCFQ) was sent to 97 male head coaches of women's NCAA Division II basketball teams, with a return rate of 80% ($N = 78$). The CCFQ was divided into two parts: (a) Part 1 was a demographic background section and (b) Part 2 contained 12 statements addressing nine factors selected from three influencing categories. The purpose of this study was to provide administrators and other people in hiring positions information regarding selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball.

The data for this study is presented in this chapter in three sections: (a) factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, (b) relative importance of the factors to the male coaches, and (c) differences between selected demographic sub-groups as to the relative importance of each factor. The three research questions of this study were tested by using mean scores, univariate analysis with repeated measures, t-tests, and ANOVA, with pre-set alpha levels at $< .05$.

Factors That Influence Men To Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball

The participants responded to 12 statements, addressing nine possible factors, arranged in the economic, occupational, and personal categories, to determine which factors influenced their decision to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. A 5-point Likert Scale ranging from "strongly agree" (value = 5) to "strongly disagree" (value = 1) was used (Appendix A). The coaches indicated their level of concurrence with each statement by circling the applicable scale value. Means for each factor were computed to determine the perceived importance of that factor's influence on their decision.

Factors with means greater than 3.0 were identified as those that had the most influence on those male coaches, at the time of their response, regarding why they chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. Factors with means of 3.0 or lower were considered to have less influence on those male coaches, at the time of their response, regarding why they chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. In relation to research question one, what are the selected factors that influence men to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball, the findings shown in Table 3 indicate that Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition; Factor 4, help female athletes reach their full potential; Factor 7, serve as a role model; Factor 5, job attributes; and Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes; (mean range from 4.7 to 3.1) were those factors indicated as most influential to the male coaches of this study in their decision to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball. Table 3 reflects the means, medians, and standard deviations of the coaches' responses to those factors. Table 3 also reflects the factors that had less influence on the male coaches surveyed as to why they chose to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball. Those included Factor 3, career advancement; Factor 8, belief in

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Factors

| Factor | M | Mdn | SD |
|---------------------|-------|-----|------|
| <u>Economic</u> | | | |
| 1 | 1.6 | 1.0 | .81 |
| 2 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.04 |
| 3 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 1.42 |
| <u>Occupational</u> | | | |
| 4 | 4.7 * | 5.0 | .64 |
| 5 | 3.6 * | 3.5 | .70 |
| 6 | 3.1 * | 3.0 | 1.34 |
| <u>Personal</u> | | | |
| 7 | 4.1 * | 4.0 | .88 |
| 8 | 1.8 | 1.0 | .90 |
| 9 | 4.7 * | 5.0 | .81 |

* Factors indicated to have influence.

one's own success; Factor 2, job availability ; and Factor 1, income; (mean range of 2.9 to 1.6). Medians were similar to the means for the factors that were of high influence and the factors with less influence. Standard deviations however, indicated a wide range of the responses on Factor 2, job availability; Factor 3, career advancement; and Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes. Responses which appeared to have consistent

agreement with the means and medians and were also of high influence included: Factor 4, help female athletes reach full potential; Factor 5, job attributes; Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition; and Factor 7, serve as a role model. Those responses in which the means and medians indicated that the factor had high influence, but had a variable influence response was Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes. This may indicate that there was not agreement as to the specific influence level of Factor 6. However, it appeared that the majority of responses were grouped around the mean score for the total population. The findings also indicated that three factors from the occupational category; Factor 4, help female athletes reach full potential; Factor 5, job attributes; and Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes; and two factors from the personal category; Factor 7, serve as a role model; and Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition; showed a high influence to the men that chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. Factors from the economic category showed less influence on the male coaches' decision.

Relative Importance of the Factors to the Male Coaches

In order to answer research question 2, what is the relative importance of the selected factors to the men who choose to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball, an univariate analysis with repeated measures was used to detect any differences among factor means for the total population. Univariate analysis of variance with repeated measures and a pre-set alpha level of $< .05$, indicated there were differences among the factors ($p < .001$).

Although factor means varied as indicated in Table 3, there was not any one obvious category in which all the influences indicated the dominant on choosing to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. Therefore, the nine factors were reorganized into

three different groups according to similar mean values. The new groups will be referred to as High-Mean, Mid-Mean, and Low-Mean. The High-Mean group consisted of: Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition; Factor 4, help female athletes reach their full potential; and Factor 7, serve as a role model; which were the three factors with the highest mean scores from the total population. The Mid-Mean group consisted of: Factor 5, job attributes; Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes; and Factor 3, career advancement; which represented the three factors with the middle highest mean scores for the total population. The Low-Mean group consisted of: Factor 8, belief in one's own success; Factor 2, job availability; and Factor 1, income; which were the three factors with the lowest mean scores for the total population. Dependent *t*-tests with pre-set alpha levels of $< .05$ were run on the three new groups in order to determine if there were any reliable differences between the mean scores of the new groupings. Table 4 reflects the

Table 4

Differences Between Group Factors

| Group (M) vs. Group (M) | <i>t</i> | <i>p</i> |
|------------------------------------|----------|----------|
| High-Mean (4.5) vs. Mid-Mean (3.2) | 14.41 | .001 |
| High-Mean (4.5) vs. Low-Mean (1.7) | 26.73 | .001 |
| Mid-Mean (3.2) vs. Low-Mean (1.7) | 13.45 | .001 |

High-Mean, Mid-Mean, and Low-Mean factor groups, group's mean scores, *t*-ratios, and *p*-values. The High-Mean group showed a significant difference from the Mid-Mean group with a *t*-ratio of 14.41 and $p < .001$. The High-Mean group, also showed a significant difference from the Low-Mean group with a *t*-ratio of 26.73 and $p < .001$.

Also a significant difference was reported between the Mid-Mean group and the Low-Mean group as the t-ratio was 13.45 and $p < .001$. Although there was not a significant difference between categories of factors, there were differences between High-Mean and Mid-Mean, High-Mean and Low-Mean, and Mid-Mean and Low-Mean groups. This indicated that High-Mean factors had the greatest influence, Mid-Mean factors were of moderate influence, and Low-Mean factors were of less influence, to the decision of the men to choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball.

Differences Between Demographic Groups as to the Relative Importance of Each Factor

To answer research question 3, what are the differences between demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor, an ANOVA was utilized to find if differences occurred between demographic sub-groups on each factor (Appendix E). For Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes, responses indicated a significant difference ($p = .031$) between the coaches who had played intercollegiate basketball ($M = 2.8$) and those who had not played intercollegiate basketball ($M = 3.5$). Although there was a significant difference between these sub-groups for this factor, mean values indicate that this factor, personal attributes of the athletes, was only a significant influence to the men that had not played intercollegiate basketball. Also, for Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes, responses indicated a significant difference ($p = .014$) between the coaches that had experience coaching men's intercollegiate basketball ($M = 2.8$) and those who had no experience coaching men's intercollegiate basketball ($M = 3.3$). Although there was a significant difference between the sub-groups for this factor, mean values indicated that this factor, personal attributes of the athletes, was only a significant influence to the men that had never coached men's intercollegiate basketball. These two significant differences are reflected in Table 5.

Table 5
Significant Differences Between Sub-groups for Factor 6: Personal Attributes of the Athletes

| Demographic Variable | Sub-groups | M | p |
|--|------------------|-----|------|
| Participation in Intercollegiate Basketball | Played | 2.8 | .031 |
| | Did Not Play | 3.5 | |
| Experience Coaching Men's Intercollegiate Basketball | Coached | 2.8 | .014 |
| | Have Not Coached | 3.3 | |

No other significant differences occurred between the population divided by age, education level, years experience coaching intercollegiate athletics, and years experience coaching women's intercollegiate basketball. This indicated that differences in responses to the nine factors were not significantly influenced by age, education level, years experience coaching intercollegiate athletics, and years experience coaching women's intercollegiate basketball.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, the relative importance of each of those selected factors, and if relative importances occurred between selected demographic groups. To achieve this purpose, a questionnaire (CCFQ) on factors that might influence men to choose to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball was administered to 97 male coaches of NCAA Division II women's basketball teams. From the population of male coaches receiving the CCFQ, 78 were returned usable and one was returned unusable. Nine factors, (a) income, (b) job availability, (c) career advancement, (d) help female athletes reach their full potential, (e) job attributes, (f) personal attributes of the athletes, (g) serve as a role model, (h) belief in one's own success, and (i) fulfill the need for competition, were arranged into three categories (a) economic, (b) occupational, and (c) personal. These nine factors were found to be those most dominate in similar studies. The coaches' responses in this study were analyzed by the factor means to determine which factors influenced their decision. Univariate analysis with repeated measures was utilized to test for significant differences between the selected factors. An examination of the factor means showed that not any one category of factors was the most dominate in influencing coaches' decision, but that there were three distinct levels of the means. Therefore, the nine factors were regrouped into three different groupings, (a) High-Mean, (b) Mid-Mean, and (c) Low-Mean, according to similar means. To determine if there were any reliable differences between the means of the new groupings, t-tests were

t-tests were utilized. ANOVAs were done to determine if there were significant differences between mean influence levels of demographic sub-groups for each factor.

Factors That Influence Men to Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball

The findings indicate that the factors that had the greatest influence on the male coaches surveyed were (a) fulfill the need for competition, (b) help female athletes to reach their full potential, (c) serve as a role model, (d) job attributes, and (e) personal attributes of the athletes. The findings also indicated that the factors that had less influence on the male coaches decision were (a) career advancement, (b) belief in one's own success, (c) job availability, and (d) income.

The findings in this study concurred with Pastore (1991, 1992), who concluded that men choose to enter the coaching profession in order to: (a) stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) work with advanced and motivated athletes, (c) help females reach their full potential, and (d) become a role model. Den Boer's (1993) study on reasons why men enter coaching on the interscholastic level was also supported by the findings of this study. Three reasons stated regarding why men choose to enter coaching were (a) the opportunity to stay involved in competitive athletics, (b) to help athletes reach their full potential, and (c) to become a role model for young and aspiring athletes.

An examination of the findings in studies of nontraditional occupations did not seem to concur with the findings in this study. Studies by Boughn (1994); Cummings (1985); Gettelson (1986); Kuecker (1986); and Perkins, Bennett, and Dorman (1993) indicated the top reasons to enter the nursing profession were (a) salary, (b) job availability, (c) job opportunities, and (d) desire to help others. Desire to help others could be associated with the influencing factor of helping female athletes reach their full potential. However, (a) salary, (b) job availability, and (c) job opportunities were not

indicated by the coaches as dominant influences as reflected by low means regarding: (a) income ($M = 1.6$), (b) job availability ($M = 1.7$), and (c) career advancement ($M = 2.9$).

Dohner, Loyd, and Stenberg (1990) and Hanson and McCullagh (1995) finding which identified reasons men enter home economics education and social work, respectively, were partially supported in this study. Influencing factors reported in home economics education and social work: (a) job opportunities and (b) believing in one's own success were not indicated as dominant factors in this study. However, reasons cited by the home economics and social work studies: (a) positive work experiences, (b) contributing to society, and (c) effecting social change, could be associated with the influencing factors: (a) job attributes, (b) personal attributes of the athletes, and (c) help female athletes reach their full potential, indicated by the men to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball.

Relative Importance of the Factors to the Male Coaches

An univariate analysis with repeated measures indicated there were significant differences in influence levels among the nine factors selected regarding why men choose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. After an examination of the means of the nine factors, it was determined that three new groups of the nine factors should be formed according to similar means. High-Mean, the three highest means, contained: (a) Factor 9, fulfill the need for competition; (b) Factor 4, help female athletes to reach their full potential; and (c) Factor 7, serve as a role model. Mid-Mean, the three middle means, contained: (a) Factor 5, job attributes; (b) Factor 6, personal attributes of the athletes; and (c) Factor 3, career advancement. Low-Mean, the three lowest means, contained: (a) Factor 8, belief in one's own success; (b) Factor 2, job availability; and (c) Factor 1,

income. Dependent t-tests indicated significant differences between High-Mean and Mid-Mean groups, High-Mean and Low-Mean groups, and Mid-Mean and Low-Mean groups.

The results of the t-tests indicated men that chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball were influenced more by the factors that seem to relate directly to the well being of the female athletes. It appears that the men, while desiring to serve as a role model, wanted to convey to the female athletes their desires for competition and help them reach their full potential in a competitive arena. The coaches seemed to be moderately influenced in career selection by the job attributes, possible career advancement opportunities, and the athletes. Factors of less importance were influences of income, job availability, and belief in one's own success. The Mid- and Low-Mean influences were related to factors concerning one's own well being and believed to be reasons for career selection of nontraditional occupations, such as nursing, home economics, and social work.

Differences Between Demographic Groups as to the Relative Importance of Each Factor

ANOVAs to find if significant differences occurred between the demographic sub-groups on each factor indicated significant differences between only two of the sub-groups divided by: (a) participation in college varsity basketball and (b) experience coaching intercollegiate men's basketball, for the personal attributes of the athletes factor. Male coaches who did not play varsity college basketball responded to the statement concerning personal attributes of the athletes in as having more influence than male coaches played varsity college basketball. Male coaches who had no experience coaching intercollegiate men's basketball also responded higher on influence of the personal attributes of the athletes factor than male coaches who had experience coaching men's

intercollegiate basketball. Both, previous participation and coaching in men's intercollegiate basketball were not considered as positive pre-conditions for selecting coaching females in basketball. Quite possibly, these earlier experiences were not considered germane to working with female players. No other significant differences were found between demographic sub-groups on any of the other eight factors. This indicated that not any of the demographic sub-groups were more or less influenced than the other sub-groups in relation to any of the other eight factors.

Conclusions

The findings of this study indicate that at the particular time that this group of men were surveyed concerning why they chose to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, that the factors: (a) fulfill the need for competition, (b) help female athletes reach their full potential, (c) serve as a role model, (d) job attributes, and (e) personal attributes of the athletes had been very influential in their decision to coach NCAA Division II women's basketball. Factors that were most influencing seemed to relate to the needs and well being of the female athletes. Factors that were of less influence included: (a) career advancement, (b) belief in one's own success, (c) job availability, and (d) income. Factors less influential seemed to relate to the physical or external needs of the men. Therefore, the male coaches appeared to indicate their choice was based dominately by seeking internal gratifications derived from this occupational setting of helping female athletes than from external economic rewards associated with coaching female athletes. This suggests that the job, the athletes' attributes, and their own future careers were, for the respondents in this study, less important than helping female athletes, but more important than seeking their own external economic rewards.

An examination of the significant differences concerning personal attributes of the athletes revealed that the male coaches that had experience with male players, as either a player or coach, viewed women's basketball differently. The male coaches that neither had coached nor played intercollegiate basketball responded to personal attributes of the athletes as having a greater influencing effect on their decision to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball. It may be concluded that male coaches with no interaction with male players at the collegiate level based their opinions on observations of male athletes and compared those observations with those of their own female athletes. Thus, some men may choose to coach females solely on their observations of male players. If the male coaches of female basketball teams could experience coaching men's basketball, then they might change their opinions concerning coaching. This might lead to a change in the gender make-up of female basketball team's head coaching positions.

Recommendations

The findings of this study and resulting conclusions form the basis for the following recommendations:

1. The CCFQ should be further developed to assess the agreement of influencing factors regarding why coaches choose to coach a certain group of athletes (i.e., race, gender) in a particular sport (i.e., basketball, soccer, volleyball, track and field).
2. A similar study should be conducted on male coaches of NCAA Division II women's basketball teams during the pre-season and post-season to determine if any differences in perceptions occur over those time periods.
3. Studies should be conducted on NCAA Division I and III women's basketball team's head male coaches to compare them to the findings of NCAA Division II male coaches in this study.

4. Researchers should identify other possible factors (e.g., recruitment, alumni, and pressure from administrators) and conduct studies to determine the level of influence these factors have on the men's decisions to coach women's intercollegiate basketball.

CHAPTER REFERENCES

- Boughn, S. (1994). Why do men choose nursing? Nursing and Health Care, *15*, 404-411.
- Cummings, P.H. (1985). Men in nursing: The development of a theoretical construct for delayed occupational choice (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, *46*, 02, 473.
- Den Boer, T.J. (1994). High school coaches of women's basketball teams: Gender differences in the coaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, *54*, 09, 3368.
- Dohner, R.E., Loyd, C.M., & Stenberg, L. (1990). Men: The other professionals in home economics education. Journal of Home Economics, *82* (4), 32-36.
- Gettelson, S. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, *47*, 03, 795.
- Hanson, J.G., & McCullagh, J.G. (1995). Career choice factors for bsw students: A 10-year perspective. Journal of Social Work Education, *31* (1), 28-37.
- Kuecker, L.L. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, *47*, 01, 318.
- Pastore, D.L. (1991). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Journal of Sport Management, *5*, 128-143.
- Pastore, D.L. (1992). Two-year college coaches of women's teams: Gender differences in coaching career selections. Journal of Sport Management, *6*, 179-190.
- Perkins, J.L., Bennett, D.N., & Dorman, R.E. (1993). Why men choose nursing. Nursing and Health Care, *14* (1), 34-38.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

CAREER COACHING FACTOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE (CCFQ)

Completion of the questionnaire indicates consent.

PART 1: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- * Please provide the appropriate background information on the by circling or filling in the most accurate response.
- * Please respond to all of the questions.

1. Age: 20-35 36-50 51+
2. Highest Degree Earned: Bachelor's Master's Doctorate
3. Did you participate in Varsity Basketball in college? yes no
4. Years experience coaching Intercollegiate Athletics: _____
5. Years experience coaching Intercollegiate Women's Basketball: _____
6. Years experience coaching Intercollegiate Men's Basketball: _____

PART 2:

- * The following statements are references to selected factors which might or might not have influenced your decision to coach women's intercollegiate basketball.
- * Please indicate your best response by circling the response with which you most agree.
- * Please respond to all of the statements. There are no right or wrong answers.
- * Spontaneous and honest response are important for the success of this study.

5 = strongly agree

4 = agree

3 = no opinion

2 = disagree

1 = strongly disagree

- 5 4 3 2 1 1. I want to help female athletes and women's athletics reach their full potential.
- 5 4 3 2 1 2. The recent salary increases in women's athletics did not affect my decision to coach female athletes.
- 5 4 3 2 1 3. The responsibilities associated with coaching women rather than men are more attractive to me.

CCFQ

PART 2: (Con't)

5 = strongly agree

4 = agree

3 = no opinion

2 = disagree

1 = strongly disagree

- 5 4 3 2 1 4. Serving as a role model to female athletes is self-satisfying.
- 5 4 3 2 1 5. I coach female athletes because the only available coaching positions were in women's athletics.
- 5 4 3 2 1 6. I find women's athletics lack job and career advancement opportunities.
- 5 4 3 2 1 7. Coaching female athletes does not fulfill my need for competition.
- 5 4 3 2 1 8. I am more confident of success coaching female athletes rather than male athletes.
- 5 4 3 2 1 9. The personal attributes of female athletes are more attractive to me than those of male athletes.
- 5 4 3 2 1 10. I would be just as successful coaching male athletes as I am coaching female athletes.
- 5 4 3 2 1 11. The responsibilities associated with coaching men rather than women is more attractive to me.
- 5 4 3 2 1 12. I coach female athletes because of the recent salary increases in women's athletics.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed dual envelope and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope prior to (designated date). Your responses will remain anonymous by using a third party and the data will be reported in aggregate to maintain individual confidentiality. If you are interested in the results of this study or have questions concerning the information asked on this questionnaire, please contact:

James C. Jackson
University of North Texas
Department of Kinesiology, Health Promotion, & Recreation
P.O. Box 13857
Denton, TX. 76203-6857
(214) 823-4280
e-mail address: jet@airmail.net

APPENDIX B
ATHLETIC DIRECTOR'S COVER LETTER

Date

Name

Athletic Director

University Name

University Address

Dear AD Name,

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I realize that this is a busy time of year for you and your staff. I'll get right to the point, I need your help.

As a graduate student in the Kinesiology, Health Promotion, and Recreation Department at the University of North Texas, I am currently working on a research project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Science degree. The topic of my study is "Factors That Influence Men to Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball". My three research problems are: 1) to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, 2) to determine the relative importance of each of these selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career, and 3) to determine the difference between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor.

I am seeking permission to send the enclosed questionnaire to your women's head basketball coach. Please return the enclosed permission form prior to (designated date) in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. The respondents will be kept anonymous by using a third party and the data will be reported in aggregate to maintain individual confidentiality. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of North Texas Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects. Participation in this project is voluntary and withdrawal is permitted at any time without penalty.

Your input is important to me as well as our administration and coaching professions. Thanks again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson
Graduate Student

Dr. Roxanne M. Albertson
Major Professor

APPENDIX C

ATHLETIC DIRECTOR'S APPROVAL FORM

Date

University Name

Athletic Director's Name

Please check one:

_____ I grant permission for you to send my head women's basketball coach the "Career Coaching Factors Questionnaire". I understand that all responses will be **anonymous and confidential**.

_____ I do not wish for my head women's basketball coach to participate in your study.

Please check one:

_____ Yes, our university's women's basketball program is classified as a NCAA Division II program.

_____ No, our university's women's basketball program is not classified as a NCAA Division II program.

Please check one:

_____ My head women's basketball coach is male.

_____ My head women's basketball coach is female.

Please return prior to (designated date). Thank you for your time and consideration.

APPENDIX D
COACH'S COVER LETTER

Name
Head Women's Basketball Coach
University Name
University Address

Dear Coach Name,

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration. I realize that this is a busy time for you and I hope you are experiencing great success with your team. I'll get right to the point, I need your help.

As a graduate student in the Kinesiology, Health Promotion, and Recreation department at the University of North Texas, I am currently working on a research project in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master of Science degree. The topic of my study is "Factors That Influence Men to Coach Women's NCAA Division II Basketball". My three research problems are: 1) to ascertain selected factors that influence men to coach women's NCAA Division II basketball, 2) to determine the relative importance of each of these selected factors to the men that choose coaching women's NCAA Division II basketball as their career, and 3) to determine the difference between selected demographic groups as to the relative importance of each selected factor. The enclosed questionnaire has been sent to you with the approval of your athletic director as well as the University of North Texas.

Please take the three to five minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it prior to (designated date) in the enclosed dual envelope. Rest assured that all responses will remain **anonymous** and **confidential**. Your input is very important to me as well as our coaching profession. Thanks again for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

James C. Jackson
Graduate Student

Dr. Roxanne M. Albertson
Major Professor

APPENDIX E

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC SUB-GROUPS BY FACTOR

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Age

| Factor | 20 - 35 yr. (n = 16) | | 36 - 50 yr. (n = 46) | | 51 + yr. (n = 16) | | p |
|--------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|----------------------|------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.6 | .85 | 1.5 | .76 | 1.8 | .93 | .653 |
| 2 | 2.1 | 1.24 | 1.7 | .94 | 1.5 | 1.10 | .513 |
| 3 | 3.1 | 1.41 | 2.9 | 1.42 | 2.7 | 1.49 | .626 |
| 4 | 4.7 | .60 | 4.6 | .72 | 4.9 | .34 | .825 |
| 5 | 3.5 | .91 | 3.5 | .60 | 3.9 | .69 | .195 |
| 6 | 3.1 | 1.06 | 3.2 | 1.42 | 3.1 | 1.44 | .263 |
| 7 | 3.8 | .91 | 4.2 | .87 | 4.1 | .85 | .667 |
| 8 | 2.0 | .81 | 1.8 | .87 | 1.6 | .65 | .725 |
| 9 | 4.69 | .60 | 4.7 | .94 | 4.8 | .58 | .988 |

p < .05

Age: Current age of the coaches.

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Level of Education

| Factor | Bachelor's (n = 23) | | Master's (n = 50) | | Doctorate (n = 5) | | p |
|--------|------------------------|------|----------------------|------|----------------------|------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.6 | .93 | 1.6 | .75 | 2.1 | .89 | .644 |
| 2 | 1.8 | 1.23 | 1.7 | .98 | 1.6 | .89 | .656 |
| 3 | 2.6 | 1.16 | 3.0 | 1.52 | 2.8 | 1.64 | .419 |
| 4 | 4.6 | .84 | 4.7 | .55 | 4.8 | .45 | .246 |
| 5 | 3.5 | .67 | 3.6 | .71 | 3.7 | .84 | .574 |
| 6 | 2.8 | 1.24 | 3.4 | 1.31 | 2.0 | 1.41 | .507 |
| 7 | 3.7 | 1.01 | 4.3 | .76 | 3.8 | .84 | .120 |
| 8 | 1.6 | .73 | 1.9 | .82 | 2.1 | 1.14 | .487 |
| 9 | 4.6 | .94 | 4.8 | .74 | 4.4 | .89 | .916 |

p < .05

Education Level: Highest degree earned by the coaches.

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Playing Experience

| Factor | Played (n = 41) | | Did Not Play (n = 37) | | p |
|--------|--------------------|------|--------------------------|------|--------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.7 | .84 | 1.5 | .79 | .641 |
| 2 | 1.6 | .97 | 1.8 | 1.12 | .727 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 1.37 | 2.8 | 1.49 | .692 |
| 4 | 4.7 | .61 | 4.6 | .68 | .557 |
| 5 | 3.5 | .71 | 3.7 | .69 | .597 |
| 6 | 2.8 | 1.28 | 3.5 | 1.33 | .031 * |
| 7 | 4.1 | .87 | 4.1 | .89 | .994 |
| 8 | 1.7 | .75 | 1.9 | .88 | .577 |
| 9 | 4.8 | .62 | 4.6 | .98 | .503 |

p < .05

* significant difference

Participation: Whether or not the coaches had participated in intercollegiate varsity basketball.

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Years of Experience Coaching Intercollegiate

Athletics

| Factor | 2 - 8 yr. (n = 24) | | 9 - 12 yr. (n = 15) | | 13 - 16 yr. (n = 21) | | 17 - 24 yr. (n = 18) | | p |
|--------|-----------------------|------|------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.4 | .70 | 1.7 | .86 | 1.8 | .93 | 1.5 | .78 | .653 |
| 2 | 1.6 | .92 | 2.2 | 1.37 | 1.6 | .87 | 1.6 | 1.04 | .765 |
| 3 | 2.9 | 1.30 | 3.3 | 1.35 | 2.8 | 1.64 | 2.7 | 1.41 | .640 |
| 4 | 4.6 | .65 | 4.7 | .92 | 4.9 | .30 | 4.6 | .60 | .874 |
| 5 | 3.5 | .70 | 3.6 | .76 | 3.7 | .64 | 3.6 | .75 | .883 |
| 6 | 3.1 | 1.18 | 3.3 | 1.49 | 3.5 | 1.37 | 2.6 | 1.33 | .550 |
| 7 | 4.0 | .81 | 4.2 | 1.15 | 4.2 | .75 | 4.0 | .91 | .887 |
| 8 | 2.0 | .89 | 1.6 | .83 | 1.8 | .70 | 1.6 | .82 | .543 |
| 9 | 4.8 | .53 | 4.7 | 1.05 | 5.0 | .00 | 4.3 | 1.19 | .643 |

p < .05

Experience Coaching Intercollegiate Athletics: Years experience coaching intercollegiate athletics by the coaches.

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Years of Experience Coaching Women's
Intercollegiate Basketball

| Factor | 1 - 6 yr. (n = 21) | | 7 - 10 yr. (n = 22) | | 11 - 15 yr. (n = 21) | | 16 - 22 yr. (n = 14) | | p |
|--------|-----------------------|------|------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|-------------------------|------|------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.6 | .80 | 1.6 | .80 | 1.5 | .85 | 1.7 | .86 | .859 |
| 2 | 1.9 | 1.18 | 1.8 | 1.02 | 1.6 | .98 | 1.6 | 1.02 | .843 |
| 3 | 3.1 | 1.28 | 3.0 | 1.40 | 2.7 | 1.52 | 2.6 | 1.60 | .103 |
| 4 | 4.8 | .54 | 4.4 | .85 | 4.9 | .30 | 4.6 | .65 | .959 |
| 5 | 3.5 | .80 | 3.5 | .60 | 3.8 | .56 | 3.6 | .85 | .814 |
| 6 | 2.8 | 1.30 | 3.1 | 1.32 | 3.6 | 1.21 | 3.0 | 1.57 | .658 |
| 7 | 3.9 | .83 | 4.2 | 1.02 | 4.1 | .79 | 4.1 | .86 | .600 |
| 8 | 1.7 | .66 | 2.0 | 1.04 | 1.7 | .62 | 1.8 | .91 | .232 |
| 9 | 4.7 | .56 | 4.8 | .87 | 5.0 | .22 | 4.2 | 1.31 | .484 |

p < .05

Experience Coaching Women's Intercollegiate Basketball: Years experience coaching women's intercollegiate basketball by the coaches.

Differences Between Sub-Groups by Coaching Experience of Men's Intercollegiate Basketball

| Factor | Coached (n = 41) | | Have Not Coached (n = 37) | | p |
|--------|---------------------|------|------------------------------|------|--------|
| | M | SD | M | SD | |
| 1 | 1.7 | .87 | 1.5 | .77 | .587 |
| 2 | 2.0 | 1.17 | 1.5 | .91 | .076 |
| 3 | 2.8 | 1.28 | 3.0 | 1.52 | .397 |
| 4 | 4.6 | .61 | 4.7 | .66 | .760 |
| 5 | 3.4 | .68 | 3.7 | .68 | .121 |
| 6 | 2.8 | 1.09 | 3.3 | 1.42 | .014 * |
| 7 | 4.0 | .88 | 4.2 | .88 | .660 |
| 8 | 1.7 | .67 | 1.9 | .90 | .476 |
| 9 | 4.6 | .76 | 4.7 | .85 | .173 |

p < .05

* significant difference

Experience Coaching Men's Intercollegiate Basketball: Whether or not the coaches had coached men's intercollegiate basketball.

REFERENCES

Acosta, R.V., & Carpenter, L.J. (1996). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study - nineteen year update 1977-1996. Unpublished report. Brooklyn College, New York.

Anderson, D.F., & Gill, K.S. (1983). Occupational socialization patterns of men and women's interscholastic basketball coaches. Journal of Sport Behavior, 6 (3), 105-116.

Boughn, S. (1994). Why do men choose nursing? Nursing and Health Care, 15, 404-411.

Campbell, H.W. (1994). Comparison of male collegiate tennis coaches who coach male tennis players and male coaches who coach female tennis players (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Southern Mississippi, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55, 02, 211.

Cimmons, M. (1986). Commanding performance: Are men coaching women into a state of dependence? Runner 8 (6), 42-48.

Cleary, K. (Ed.). (1996). The 1996-97 national directory of college athletics (women's ed.). Fostoria, OH: Gray Printing.

Coakley, J.J. (1994). Sport in society: Issues and controversies (5th ed.). St. Louis: Mosby-Yearbook.

Cummings, P.H. (1985). Men in nursing: The development of a theoretical construct for delayed occupational choice (Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 02, 473.

Den Boer, T.J. (1994). High school coaches of women's basketball teams: Gender differences in the coaching profession (Doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, 09, 3368.

Dohner, R.E., Loyd, C.M., & Stenberg, L. (1990). Men: The other professionals in home economics education. Journal of Home Economics, 82 (4), 32-36.

- Egeland, J.W., & Brown, J.S. (1988). Sex role stereotyping and role strain of male registered nurses. Research in Nursing and Health, *11*, 257-267.
- Everhart, C.B. (1994). Gender differences in the choice of coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence and perceived barriers (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1994). Dissertation Abstracts International, *55*, 03, 504.
- Fottler, M.D. (1976). Attitudes of female nurses toward the male nurse: A study of occupational segregation. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, *17*, 98-110.
- George, J.J. (1989). Finding solutions to the problem of fewer female coaches. The Physical Educator, *46* (1), 2-8.
- Gettelson, S. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1986). Dissertation Abstracts International, *47*, 03, 795.
- Hanson, J.G. & McCullagh, J.G. (1995). Career choice factors for bsw students: A 10-year perspective. Journal of Social Work Education, *31*, 1, 28-37.
- Hart, B.A., Hasbrook, C.A., & Mathes, S.A. (1986). An examination of the reduction in the number of female interscholastic coaches. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, *57*, 68-77.
- Hastie, P.A. (1993). Coaching preferences of high school girl volleyball players. Perceptual and Motor Skills, *77*, 1309-1310.
- Hayes, R. (1986). Men's decisions to enter or avoid nontraditional occupations. The Career Development Quarterly, *35*, 89-101.
- Hesselbart, S. (1977). Women doctors win and male doctors lose: A study of sex role and occupational stereotypes. Sociology of Work and Occupations, *4* (1), 49-62.
- Holmen, M.G., & Parkhouse, B.L. (1981). Trends in the selection of coaches for female athletes: A demographic inquiry. Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, *52*, 9-18.
- Knoppers, A. (1987). Gender and the coaching profession. Quest, *39*, 9-22.
- Kuecker, L.L. (1986). Men in nursing (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1985). Dissertation Abstracts International, *47*, 01, 318.

Lehr, C.A. (1981). Sex of coaches in women's intercollegiate athletics from 1973 to 1980. Unpublished manuscript. University of Georgia, Athens.

Medwechuk, N., & Crossman, J. (1994). Effects of gender bias on the evaluation of male and female swim coaches. Perceptual and Motor Skills, *78*, 163-169.

Pastore, D.L. (1991). Male and female coaches of women's athletic teams: Reasons for entering and leaving the profession. Journal of Sport Management, *5*, 128-143.

Pastore, D.L. (1992). Two-year college coaches of women's teams: Gender differences in coaching career selections. Journal of Sport Management, *6*, 179-190.

Perkins, J.L., Bennett, D.N., & Dorman, R.E. (1993). Why men choose nursing. Nursing and Health Care, *14* (1), 34-38.

Pinkston, G.C. (1983). Personality traits of coaches of women's intercollegiate basketball (Doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, *43*, 08, 2609.

Statistical package of the social sciences (Version 6.1) [Computer software]. (1997). Chicago: SPSS.

Stenberg, L.A., & Dohner, R.E. (1992). Men in home economics education. Journal of Vocational Home Economics, *10*, (2), 28-37.

Theberge, N. (1993). The construction of gender in sport: Women, coaching, and the naturalization of difference. Social Problems, *40*, 301-313.

Thomas, J.R., & Nelson, J.K. (1990). Research methods in physical activity (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Weinberg, R., Reveles, M., & Jackson, A. (1984). Attitudes of male and female athletes toward male and female coaches. Journal of Sport Psychology, *6*, 448-453.