WestVirginiaUniversity
THE RESEARCH REPOSITORY @ WVU

Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports

2010

Exploring factors contributing to current versus former coaching status of women coaches: A social exchange theory perspective.

Justine Vosloo

Follow this and additional works at: https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd

Recommended Citation

Vosloo, Justine, "Exploring factors contributing to current versus former coaching status of women coaches: A social exchange theory perspective." (2010). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 9955.
https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/9955

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Exploring Factors Contributing to Current versus Former Coaching Status of Women Coaches: A Social Exchange Theory Perspective.

Justine Vosloo

Dissertation submitted to the
College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Kinesiology
With a major in
Sport and Exercise Psychology

Jack Watson II, Ph.D., Chair
Kristen Dieffenbach, Ph.D.
T.Anne Hawkins, Ph.D.
Vanessa Shannon, Ph.D.
Sam Zizzi, Ed.D.

Morgantown, WV
2010

Keywords: Social Exchange Theory, Mentoring, Work-life balance

UMI Number: 3428787

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®
Dissertation Publishing

UMI 3428787
Copyright 2010 by ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This edition of the work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest®

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

ABSTRACT

Exploring Factors Contributing to Current versus Former Coaching Status of Women Coaches:

A Social Exchange Perspective

Justine Vosloo

The percentage of women coaches at the helm of women's sports teams has dropped from 90% in 1972, to 42.6% in 2010 (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). Previous research has found that women coaches experience discrimination (Greenhaus et al., 1990) social stigma, and homophobia (Griffin, 1998). Difficulties with work-life balance have been identified as a barrier to coaching. Mentoring has been positive for the development of career satisfaction, commitment and positive job attitudes (Ragins et al., 2000), however, the role of mentoring in retaining women coaches needs exploration. This study used social exchange theory to determine if perceived costs/benefits of coaching, mentoring, work-life balance and coaching experiences could predict coaching career outcomes (current/non-coaching status). Current (n=442) and former (n=171) NCAA Division I head and assistant coaches completed an online survey. Five former coaches participated in phone interviews. Logistic regression analysis was conducted to predict coaching status (former/current) using demographic, costs/benefits to coaching, mentoring and work-life balance factors. The model correctly classified 81.3% of cases and the model accounted for 25.1-37.3% of the variance. Informal and formal mentoring significantly decreased the odds of being a former coach compared to no mentoring; however, mentoring satisfaction increased the odds of being a former coach. Work-life support decreased the odds of being a former coach. Qualitative results revealed the importance of mentoring, networking, personal balance and the impact of coaching on interpersonal relationships. Participants discussed experiences with structural barriers in athletics, homophobia and their decision to leave coaching.

Acknowledgements

A sincere thank you to my dissertation committee. Dr. Vanessa Shannon, Dr. Sam Zizzi, Dr. T.Anne Hawkins, Dr. Kristen Dieffenbach and Dr. Jack Watson for sharing your knowledge and insights with me on this project. Your guidance on this and other opportunities has been very much appreciated! Thanks to my chair, Dr. Jack Watson for your willingness to support me in this topic and all your time reviewing drafts. Special thanks to Dr. Kristen Dieffenbach who opened my eyes to this important topic area three years ago. Without you, I think I might still be aimlessly searching for a topic. Thank you for mentoring me through this project and I hope this leads to a long career of collaboration on this subject area and multiple publications.

A very special thank you to Jessica Peacock, Dr. Dieffenbach and Dr. Shannon for your help with the coding. I owe you one!

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to the Women's Studies Program for providing partial funding for this project via the Judy Mossburg fund for student, faculty and staff development.

My sincerest thanks to Dr. Cindra Kamphoff and Celia Slater at NCAA Winstar Foundation and the various Senior Woman's Administrators who helped me identify former women coaches and who were willing to forward the survey to these women. I would also like to thank the participants who agreed to participate in the phone interviews (who shall remain anonymous to protect confidentiality of the data). Their time and honesty made this a very enjoyable process.

I would also like to thank my trusty research assistants Andrea Bucher, Ashley Zultanky and Paul Listman-Ward for all their hard work identifying participants and transcribing interviews.

Thank you to Katie Cowan, Jessica Peacock, Alessandro Quartiroli for all your support through the years. You are great friends and colleagues and I appreciate all that you have done to support me in this process. Amanda Metcalf and Susan Ross, thanks for being in the same boat with me this year. I am glad that I had you two to laugh with through this process of "dissertating" and job hunting. Next challenge: Tenure?

A very special thank you to my mom who has always pushed me to do more than I thought I could…

Last but not least to Beth, thank you for all the support these last few years! You have been my rock and inspiration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction **1**

Social Exchange Theory 5

Methods **9**

Instrumentation 9

Costs/Benefits to coaching survey 10

Procedures 12

Results **14**

Quantitative Data Analysis 14

Post-hoc Analysis 18

Discussion **20**

Demographic Variables 20

Work-Life Balance 24

Social Exchange Theory 26

Mentoring 28

Post-hoc Analysis 30

Limitations and Future Directions 32

Practical Implications 35

References **37**

Appendix A Literature Review.....50

Appendix B Qualitative section 105

Appendix C Survey for Current Coaches.....135

Appendix D Survey for Former Coaches.....139

Appendix E Phone Interview Script.....143

Appendix F Pilot Study Questionnaire 144

Appendix G Cost/Benefit to Coaching Survey 149

Appendix H Sample of Draft Summary.....151

Appendix I Email Recruitment letter 154

Appendix J Bracketing Interview.....155

List of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Summary…….46

Table 2. Coaching and Mentoring Characteristics……...47

Table 3. Binary Logistic Regressions for Coaching Status……..48

Table 4. Intercorrelations between selected variables……..49

Introduction

The number of women's collegiate athletic teams has increased from 2.5 teams per school in 1970 to 8.64 teams per school in 2010 since the passage of Title IX (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). During a similar time period, the percentage of women head coaches of women's teams decreased from 90% in 1972, to 42.6% in 2010 (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010), and the number of women in coaching positions of women's teams has remained the same or has risen. These discrepancies have occurred because the number of women's teams has increased and consequently the number of opportunities to coach women's teams has increased as well (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). Given the significant increase in women's participation in collegiate sports over the past 30+ years, it would be logical to assume that the number of former women athletes interested in coaching might be on the rise. Though, Carpenter and Acosta's (2010) report does not appear to provide conclusive evidence to support this, there is no data on the number of female applicants for women's coaching positions to identify if interest has changed. Furthermore, the demand for head coaches for these women's teams has not been filled by women coaches. For example, during the time period of 2000 and 2002, the majority (over 90%) of new head coaching positions for women's intercollegiate teams were filled by men and this trend does not appear to be changing (Cunningham & Sagas, 2003). Previous research has suggested that there may be multiple factors that contribute to the lack of growth associated with former female athletes' interest in the coaching profession, in addition to experiential and structural barriers that may be influencing women's decisions to leave coaching, or not be hired.

This decline is concerning as young athletes, especially young girls, may be less likely to have access to female role models in the sporting context (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008; Lavoi, 2009). Messner (2009) suggests female role models are important even for boys as they continue

to experience women as colleagues and in leadership positions in their careers and, therefore, would benefit from experiencing women as leaders early in life. Additionally, girls may experience decreased self-efficacy, internalize and accept negative gender stereotypes, and devalue their own abilities; which might ultimately impact their ability to meet their full potential without female coaches as role models (Lavoi, 2009). Additionally, Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) have found that female athletes are more likely to enter coaching when coached by women when compared to female athletes coached by men. Lastly, women are more likely to reach self-fulfillment, particularly in a lifetime commitment to physical activity when viewing women coaches as role models (Marshall, Demers & Sharp, 2010).Therefore, the experiences of women coaches have been of much interest and examined from many different perspectives.

Research suggests that women may experience structural constraints in the form of the culture of intercollegiate sport, resources available and the leadership/administration of women's sports; as well as ideological constraints such as the gender roles of women in sport, when in the role of coach (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). Other researchers have also identified factors such as access (difficulties associated with the recruitment and hiring of women coaches) and treatment discrimination (difficulties encountered while in a coaching position; Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990), homologous reproduction (Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991), and social stigma associated with the historical use of the "lesbian label" to deter women from participating in sport (Griffin, 1998; Lenskyj, 1991). The social stigma associated with sport has also been used to justify hiring and firing practices by administrators (Thorngren, 1990; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a). Additionally, the gender of the coach may be a limiting factor in career development when the beliefs of the athlete and parents are considered. Female athletes have been found to hold stereotypical beliefs regarding perceptions of women coaches' competency,

suggesting a gender bias toward male coaches which may discourage them from becoming coaches themselves (Sisley, Weiss, Barber & Ebbeck, 1990). These factors may also play a role in the recruiting process, with opposing male coaches using this gender bias of female athletes to suggest that playing for a woman is "different" and questioning a woman's competency solely based on her gender (Drago et al., 2005).These experiences may influence women coaches' intentions to exit the profession sooner than men.

Another issue that may impact coaches' careers and specifically women coaches is work-life balance due to the gender role expectations placed on women to be care-givers, nurturers and house-keepers (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). The time demand associated with coaching has been identified as a barrier to coaching by women coaches at multiple levels (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). The decreased time available to spend on interpersonal relationships, lack of financial incentives, increased stress, and the presence of alternative professional opportunities have often been cited as the primary reasons for leaving coaching by former women coaches (Lowry & Lovett, 1997; Pastore, 1991; Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Bruening and Dixon (2008) suggest that this may be due to the trying organizational culture of collegiate sport, with those working long hours, and continually traveling for competition and recruiting representing the "ideal worker" (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). Women with children are not only faced with negotiating child care, but also domestic help in order to manage their daily life demands (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). These women coaches report feeling pressure to prevent disruption to their work schedule due to their children, they experience stress at work and home (Bruening & Dixon, 2008), and identify the need for support from their family and employer as vital factors in determining whether to remain at their current university and within athletics, or to leave coaching altogether (Bruening & Dixon, 2008; Dixon & Bruening, 2007). Therefore, developing and maintaining work-life

balance may be an important factor in the career development of women coaches and needs further examination to confirm that this is a critical factor in their retirement from the coaching profession (Drago, et al., 2005). Additionally, to better understand this issue, it would be helpful to compare women who have left the coaching profession to those who are still coaching to identify differences in work-life balance experiences (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). Factors such as mentoring that could improve coaches' work-life balance may also need further examination.

Mentoring has been identified as an important factor in career development across many vocations such as education, business and medicine (Ehrich, Hansford & Tennant, 2004). Research within the business and education literature has shown that professionals without mentors report lower career commitment, and satisfaction than those with informal mentors (Ragins, Cotton & Miller, 2000; see also Fagenson, 1989 and Scandura, 1992). Bower and colleagues also suggest that protégés may be protected from explicit and implicit inequity and prejudice by the presence of a mentor (Bower, Hums & Keedy, 2006) and that the presence of this support may assist the protégés in the advancement of their careers (Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). Salmela (1996), suggests that mentoring should be implemented and used for the specific purpose of coach development, indicating that the advice and actions of the mentor are most valuable. This point was echoed by Bloom and colleagues (1998), who suggested that is especially true for young coaches. This advice and support may often exist in the form of the networking systems between head coach and assistant coaches (Gogol, 2002). Furthermore, as highlighted earlier female athletes with women as coaches were found to be more interested in coaching careers than female athletes with male coaches (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). This finding emphasizes the importance of positive role modeling and mentorship in the career development of female athletes and young female coaches. Therefore, having a female mentor

may be an important variable in the development and upward career progression of the woman coach and may also play a role in career termination. The issue of mentoring may also be related to power. Kanter (1977) defined power as "having access to and the ability to mobilize resources" and support (or access to mentors who possess power; as cited in Knoppers, 1992, p. 215). Therefore, women with less access to these powerful resources may experience less satisfaction and feel less supported in their roles; and as a result have less access to resources due to the perceived or actual shortage of mentoring in coaching. Therefore it can be hypothesized that these coaches may view athletics as an unsupportive environment that is not appealing as a long-term career choice, making them more likely to exit the profession (Bruening & Dixon, 2008).

Social Exchange Theory

Placing all of the aforementioned factors into a larger context requires careful examination. Social exchange theory may provide an effective framework through which to examine these factors. Social exchange theory suggests that behavior is driven by an internal drive to capitalize on positive experiences and diminish negative experiences through social interactions, which in themselves, elicit costs (e.g., time invested, failure, anxiety) and rewards (e.g., satisfaction, success, and money; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Weiss and Stevens (1993) added that when making the decision to remain involved in an activity, the perceived satisfaction of the activity (coaching) and the perceived satisfaction of alternative activities outside of coaching will be compared (see also Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Therefore, coaches may decide to remain in coaching if they perceive that there are more rewards than costs to their profession and they believe that satisfaction with coaching is greater than the potential satisfaction that may come with alternative activities or occupations. Social exchange theory (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959)

has been used in the past to examine the attrition of female high school coaches (see Hart, Hasbrook & Mathes, 1986; Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Social exchange theory has also been used by Smith when examining burnout and he developed the cognitive affective model of burnout from this work (Smith, 1986). Smith (1986) also proposes that social exchange theory may serve as a practical method of studying behavior in sport. Additionally, Smith suggested that social exchange theory may be useful in isolating reasons for leaving coaching by identifying reasons other than burnout that may be influencing withdrawal from the profession. Based on this application of social exchange theory, the structure of social exchange theory and its' predictions may be a useful, practical tool through which to examine the departure of women from the coaching profession. Social exchange theory has also been used to compare former and current coaching status of high school coaches (Weiss & Stevens, 1993), the attrition of female competitive gymnasts (Lindner & Wolko, 1990), and used to predict persistence or withdrawal in youth and adult female handball players (Guiller et al., 2002). This theory was only examined once within the coaching population and the lack of replication with the intercollegiate population was the main reason for the use of social exchange theory as a framework in this study. Furthermore, social exchange theory resembles the decisional balance that is realistic of the process when considering withdrawal from an activity as it weighs multiple salient components: satisfaction and perceived satisfaction with alternative activities, as well as costs and benefits of the activity. Lastly, the social exchange theory could easily be used in conjunction with other variables to predict coaching outcome.

Social exchange theory has only been evaluated once in a coaching population to examine the decline of female coaches at the high school level. Current and former coaches of high school teams completed self-report questionnaires that measured costs, benefits, and levels

of satisfaction with overall coaching experiences and alternative experiences as defined by social exchange theory (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Results indicated that when compared to former coaches, current coaches assigned increased importance to the benefits of coaching relating to program success and the continuation of their athletic experiences, but also described greater importance to the costs concerning the time demands with coaching and decreased perceived competence (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Current coaches also reported higher overall satisfaction with coaching when compared to former coaches (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Social exchange theory has predicted the membership of coaches in the current versus former coaching ranks based on benefits, costs, and satisfaction levels after a discriminant function analysis was run. However, there were no differences between current and former coaches on satisfaction level with alternative activities (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). A major limitation of this study was the use of only quantitative analysis. Further examination of this topic using mixed methodology is necessary as it will provide more depth to the understanding of this issue. Furthermore, social exchange theory predictions for continuance and withdrawal from activities need to be further investigated in the sport domain, especially with intercollegiate coaches. The current study will replicate portions of the Weiss and Stevens (1993) study, and expand upon it through the use of a mixed methodological approach.

In summary, based on the literature examined above, limited conclusions can be drawn with regard to the reasons why women leave the coaching profession. The work-life balance literature has found that this variable impacts the coaches' work experiences and may influence their commitment to the profession. Furthermore, mentoring has been mentioned as a positive career development tool that could improve women coaches' experiences and prevent coach dropout and perhaps mediate the experience of coaching stressors. However, the relationship

between the impact of mentoring, work-life balance and experiences in coaching with career outcomes (former/current coaches) has not been examined in the literature thus far. The social exchange framework has also not been examined with intercollegiate coaches. This theoretical perspective provides a framework that can be used to examine the impact of these aforementioned variables on career outcomes in intercollegiate coaches. Additionally, these relationships also need further examination qualitatively as scholars in sport and exercise psychology have suggested that behavior should be examined in different ways (Dewar & Horn, 1992) and qualitative inquiry is one such tool that could improve the knowledge base in this area (Krane, 1994).

The current study will examine the experiences of current and former collegiate women coaches using a social exchange theory framework to determine if the perceived costs/benefits of coaching, satisfaction with career, and satisfaction of career alternatives effect their decisions to remain as a female coach of women's division I university team. The impact of this social exchange theory framework, mentorship and perceptions of the coaching experience/climate will be examined to predict the impact of these variables on career outcomes (current coaching/non coaching status). This study is intended to facilitate a deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to the motivation to leave the coaching profession and highlight the strategies that current women coaches employ to remain in the field. The research questions for this study include 1. Do the factors of mentoring, work-life balance, costs/benefits to coaching and perceptions of career advancement predict coaching status (former/current coach)? 2. Does the presence of mentoring and perceived impact of mentoring demonstrate a relationship to the costs/benefits or work-life balance variables? 3. Will current coaches experience costs and benefits to coaching differently depending on the length of time spent in the profession? 4. Does

social exchange theory adequately describe the experiences of intercollegiate coaches? 5. How do former coaches describe their coaching experiences?

Methods

This study employed a mixed-methods research design. Convenience sampling procedures were used to recruit current NCAA Division I head coaches (*n*=422) and snowball sampling procedures were used to recruit former NCAA Division I head and assistant collegiate coaches (*n*=171). Seventy current coaches were removed from the sample for being involved in coaching for less than five years and another 16 were removed for providing incomplete data. Sixty-four former coaches were removed from the sample for being involved in coaching for less than five years and/or having left coaching more than 10 years ago. After these participants were removed the final sample consisted of *n*=336 current coaches and *n*=107 former coaches.

Instrumentation

A demographic questionnaire (see Appendices C & D) inquired about participants' age, ethnicity, education, coaching certifications, relationship status, number of children, primary sport(s) coached, status of sport coached in athletic department (e.g. priority sport (Tier I etc.)), competitive history, number of years coaching and level of coaching experience, current coaching position, current yearly coaching salary, number of months or years coaching current team, or years since last coaching position (if a former coach). Additional questions inquiring about perceived career mobility, mentorship, work-life balance and social support were based on an extensive literature review and theoretical concepts (Ehrich, Hansford & Packer, 1995; Ragins et al., 2000; Tharenou, 2005; Weiss & Stevens, 1993; Dixon & Bruening, 2007). The mentoring questions were all based upon an extensive literature review of mentoring in education and business. These questions assessed the presence of mentoring, the type of relationship (formal vs.

informal), the perceived quality and satisfaction of the mentoring relationship, and career and professional development through the mentoring relationship, psychosocial support (Ehrich et al., 2004), and knowledge/skill development (Ballantyne, Hansford & Packer, 1995; Ehrich et al., 2004). Lastly, participants were asked if problems existed with the mentoring relationship (Ehrich et al.,2004).

Cost/Benefits to coaching survey. The costs/benefits analysis questionnaire (Weiss & Stevens, 1993) was used to identify the positive and negative aspects of coaching, the resulting satisfaction or dissatisfaction associated with the coaching experience, and the costs, benefits and satisfaction levels with potential alternative professional options as described by social exchange theory. The costs/benefits analysis questionnaire initially consisted of 28 benefit items and 24 cost items, one item to assess satisfaction with coaching (CL), and one item to assess satisfaction with alternative activities to coaching (CLalt). Participants responded on a Likert-type response scale, ranging from 1 = "not at all important" to 5 = "extremely important" to the cost/benefits questions. The CL and CLalt questions were responded to on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = "very dissatisfied" to 5 = "very satisfied."

Weiss and Stevens created the instrument by adopting the definitions of benefits, costs, satisfaction and dissatisfaction from Thibaut and Kelley (1959) in relation to social exchange theory. Content validity of the instrument was obtained through a pilot study with 20 coaches and administrators with youth, high school and/or collegiate sport coaching experience. Weiss and Stevens (1993) developed five categories related to the costs of coaching and five categories for the benefits of coaching from the responses given during their pilot research and previous research by Hart and colleagues (1986) who examined the reduction of female interscholastic coaches. Factor analysis for the costs/benefits analysis questionnaire revealed six interpretable

factors, accounting for 49.5% of the variance of the items for the benefits subscale (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). The factor scale reliabilities were calculated using coefficient alpha: positive team atmosphere (α=.72), program success (α=.75), feelings of competence (α=.76), continued athletic experiences (α=.72), external rewards (α=.72) and financial gains (α=.56). Factor analysis for the costs subscale produced six interpretable factors accounting for 59.8% of the variance. The factor scale reliabilities were calculated using coefficient alpha: time demands (α=.86), low perceived competence (α=.84), stress (α=.88), external pressures (α=.78), lack of support (α=.79) and inadequate professional compensation (α=.62).

Although there was weak reliability on the last factor for both the benefits (financial gains) and costs (inadequate professional compensation) subscales, the existing structure of the instrument was retained for this study. However, additional questions were added to the costs/benefits questionnaire in the current study based on recent findings in the related literature. The question "increase in occupational mobility for promotion" was added to the benefits subscale due to literature showing that individuals with mentors tend to have a greater opportunity for occupational mobility than individuals without mentors (Ragins, et al. 2000). To this end, a coach may perceive occupational mobility as a benefit to coaching if mentors are present. A series of questions were also added to the costs subscale based on a review of recent key components in the literature. Due to strong evidence in the literature suggesting that work-life balance difficulty and pressure from administration may contribute to coach drop out (Bruening & Dixon, 2008; Dixon & Bruening, 2008; Drago, et al., 2005; Theberge, 1992), the questions "inability to balance coaching and family demands" and "pressure from administration" were added. The items "discrimination due to my gender", "discrimination due to my race", "conflict with preconceived notions and stereotypes related to my gender", and

"conflict with perceptions of my sexual orientation" were also added to the costs subscale based on previous findings related to the issues of discrimination (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006; Kilty, 2006; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a) and stereotyping (Drago, et al., 2005; Kamphoff & Gill, 2008; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a) that women in coaching have experienced. Finally, the satisfaction level questions were modified and two questions were added based on the questions used by Petlichkoff (1993) in her study of interscholastic sport participants with the words "your sport" modified to the word "coaching." The two additional questions examined 'comparison level of satisfaction': "How would you rate your satisfaction in this sport right now?" and "How dissatisfied could you be in coaching and still remain in the coaching profession." Responses to all four satisfaction level questions were modified to a 9-point Likert type scale anchored by 1 = "very dissatisfied" and 9 = "very satisfied", with the number 5 representing "neutral". This was done to increase the variability in responses to satisfaction and to gather additional satisfaction level information. Therefore, the revised costs/benefits assessment (R-CBAQ; see Appendix G) consisted of 29 benefit items and 30 cost items and four satisfaction level questions, three to assess overall satisfaction with coaching (CL), and one item to assess satisfaction with alternative activities (CLalt).

Procedures

The researcher recruited participants for the current study through convenience and snowball sampling procedures. Prior to data collection, written approval was obtained from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. Current and former women coaches were identified through web searches of the NCAA website and communication with national sporting organizations (e.g. National Collegiate Swim Coaches Association, National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA)), and by contacting Senior Women's Administrators at

Division I schools. Former coaches were also identified through snowball sampling procedures by asking participants to identify any former coaches they may be familiar with. Identified individuals were contacted via email or phone and informed about the purpose of the study and asked to complete the survey.

The email recruitment message (see Appendix I) was sent out a total of three times during a four month period. This recruitment message contained the introduction to the survey followed by a link to the web-based survey. The first recruitment email was sent to the active e-mail addresses of current women coaches (*N* = 1140) current women coaches identified through web searches of the NCAA website. A follow-up email was sent 3-4 weeks after the initial email and then the last follow up email was sent another 3-4 weeks after the second email to the entire group of current coaches. These follow-up emails reminded participants about the survey and encouraged them to forward the email to any former coaches they were aware of if they had already completed the survey. Emails were also sent to Senior Woman's Administrators of each athletic department (*N* = 240) who were asked to forward the recruitment email to any former coaches they were aware of. These procedures were based on Dillman's (2000) recommendations for common and efficacious internet survey practices.

The first page of the survey informed participants of their rights as participants. Upon completion of the survey, data was sent to a secure, password protected web services account. Subsequently, participants were directed to a separate and unconnected form asking them to participate in a qualitative follow-up interview if they completed the former coach survey (Appendix D; see Appendix B for qualitative analyses). Those participants who consented to this were asked to submit their name and contact information (phone number and email address) in this page. This information was sent to the researcher separately and not linked to the

participant's initial survey information in any way. In addition to the description of survey methods described above, an attempt was made to add to the quantitative data to be discussed below using qualitative methodologies. For further information regarding the qualitative methods, procedures, results and discussion, see Appendix B.

Results

Demographic profiles of the current and former coaches were similar (see Table 1). Both consisted of mostly head coaches. The majority of the sample was over the age of thirty five and the majority of both groups were living with a partner/married (61.7% former coaches, and 53.6% current coaches). The educational data showed that over 50% of the total sample of coaches held a master's degree; 62.5% and 8.7% of the former coaches possessed a master's degree or doctoral degree respectively (51.6% and 2.8% respectively for current coaches), and 25.8% of the current coaches possessed some college or bachelor's degree and 19.9% of the current coaches completed some graduate work (14.4% and 14.4% respectively for former coaches). More than 85% of the overall sample self identified as Caucasian, 5.2% African American, 1.4% Asian, 1.1% Hispanic, .9% Native American, and 1.1% Bi-racial and 5.3% did not respond to the question. The average length of coaching careers for the total sample was 15.38 years (SD=7.75), but differed between the two samples (M=15.315 years for former coaches (SD=8.25), M=28 years for current coaches (SD=7.58); Table 2). Over 68.5% of the current coaches indicated that they had considered leaving coaching in the past or had in the past left coaching. Over 75% of the total sample reported receiving mentoring of some kind (60.3% indicating an informal mentoring relationship, 15.5% a formal mentoring relationship) and 24.1% reported receiving no mentoring. The majority of both samples indicated that their

primary mentor was female (over 60%) and approximately 10% of both samples indicated experiencing problems with their mentor (see Table 2).

Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients were calculated for the Costs/Benefits to Coaching scales and revealed acceptable reliability for each scale ($\alpha = .894$ for Costs of Coaching; $\alpha = .859$ for Benefits of Coaching). The six items related to work-life balance and support were also analyzed for reliability using Cronbach alpha = .664. Lastly, the five items related to mentoring impact and satisfaction also revealed high reliability ($\alpha = .839$). Factor scores were generated for each subject on both benefits and costs of coaching as well as mentoring impact and work-life support for the purpose of using these variables in the subsequent binary logistic regression analysis.

In an attempt to answer the first (*Do the factors of mentoring, work-life balance, and cost/benefits to coaching predict coaching status (former/current coach?*) and fourth (*Can Social exchange theory be used to describe the experiences of intercollegiate coaches?*) research questions, logistic regression analyses were used to explore the demographic and psychosocial factors that independently predicted discrete group membership (i.e. current or former coaching status). Independent variables in the regression model (as seen in Table 3) included length of coaching career in years, age group (5 levels), presence of children in family (Y/N), relationship status (2 levels), education level (4 levels), sport tier in athletic department (3 levels), mentoring status (3 levels), mentoring satisfaction/impact (ordinal), work-life support (ordinal), costs to coaching (ordinal), benefits to coaching (ordinal) and satisfaction items (4 ordinal items). The forced entry method was employed in the regression model. The odds ratio, significance value, confidence intervals and Wald's χ^2 were reported (see Table 3).

The Alpha level was set at $p<.05$. Overall, 81.3% of cases were correctly classified. The Hosmer and Lemeshow test (1989) was non-significant (χ^2 (8) = 9.759, p = .282), indicating adequate model fit. The model accounted for 25.1 – 37.3% of the variance, as indicated by the "Cox and Snell", and "Nagelkerke" approximate R-square values respectively. The demographic variables of having children and relationship status did not contribute significantly to the model. However, age and education level were significant components to the model (see Table 3). Participants aged 36-40 were more than 7 times (OR = 7.116), participants aged 41-50 were more than 11 times (OR = 11.790), and participants 51+ were more than 64 times (OR = 64.916) more likely to be former coaches compared to those in the 21-30 age group. The likelihood of being a former coach also increased when participants held a post graduate degree (master's degree OR = 2.480, doctoral degree OR = 10.860) when compared to participants with some college work and only a bachelor's degree. Univariate analysis indicated that there was a non-significant association between coaching status and age category $\chi^2(4)=8.870$, $p=.064$. A significant association was found between coaching status and education level $\chi^2(3)=13.788$, $p=.003$, with current coaches more likely to have a bachelors degree (25.8%) and some graduate work (19.9%) than former coaches (14.4% and 14.4% respectively); and former coaches significantly more likely to have a master's degree (62.5%) or a doctoral degree (8.7%) than current coaches (51.6% and 2.8% respectively). The odds of being a former coach also significantly increased by a factor of 3.189 when the participant's primary sport coached was perceived to be Tier I in the athletic department when compared to Tier III.

The presence of mentoring and perceived satisfaction with mentoring also contributed significantly to the model. Specifically, the odds of being a former coach decreased by a factor of .057 for those coaches who had either formal or informal mentors when compared to those who

did not have a mentor. Further, an increase in mentoring satisfaction of one unit was associated with an increase in the odds of being a former coach by about 1.130 times. A post-hoc t-test was conducted to determine if coaches who reported informal and formal mentoring differed in their mentoring satisfaction/impact scores. The t-test was non-significant ($t(315)=-.330$, $p=.742$), with participants with informal mentors reporting mean mentoring impact/satisfaction scores of 19.94 (SE=.217) and participants with formal mentors reporting mean mentoring impact/satisfaction scores of 20.11 (SE=.439). For work-life support the logistic regression analysis revealed that for a one point increase on the sum of the work-life support items there was a decrease in the odds of being a former coach by a factor of .906. An increase in the length of coaching career by one year, decreased the likelihood of being a former coach by a factor of .911.

Lastly, three of the social exchange theory factors were shown to be significant in the model but did not necessarily support the theory. A one point increase of the benefits to coaching scale was associated with an increase in the odds of being a former coach by about 1.038 times. While the costs to coaching scale demonstrated that for a one point increase in the total score of the scale, there was a decrease in the odds of being a former coach by a factor of .983, though this factor was not significant to the model. These findings do not support the theory as social exchange theory would suggest that a one point increase of the benefits to coaching scale would be associated with a decrease in the odds of being a former coach, as former coaches would be expected to experience greater costs and decreased benefits, while current coaches would be expected to experience greater benefits and decreased costs, according to the theory. Two of the four satisfaction items were significant predictors of coaching status. The current satisfaction with coaching item revealed that for a one point increase on the 9-point satisfaction scale there was a decrease in the odds of being a former coach by a factor of .660. While the satisfaction of

an alternative situation demonstrated that for a one point increase on the 9-point satisfaction scale there was a decrease in the odds of being a former coach by a factor of .782. These satisfaction items did support social exchange theory as current coaches would be expected to perceive high current satisfaction and report that an alternative situation would have to be very satisfying to consider leaving coaching.

Post-hoc Analysis

Due to confusion regarding the results associated with the age and years of experience variables, the logistic regression analysis was run again, with the lowest and highest age categories (21-30 & 51 and over) excluded. The alpha level was again set at $p<.05$. Overall, 81.7% of the cases were correctly classified. The Hosmer and Lemeshow test (1989) was non-significant (χ^2 (8) = 11.080, p = .197) indicating adequate model fit. The model accounted for 25.0 – 36.9% of the variance, as indicated by the "Cox and Snell", and "Nagelkerke" approximate R-square values respectively. In this model, the benefits of coaching and costs of coaching were non-significant. Two of the four satisfaction items were still significant. A one point increase on the 9-point satisfaction scales, current satisfaction and satisfaction of an alternative situation decreased the odds of being a former coach by factors of .674 and .795 respectively

The work-life items were non-significant and the presence of an informal mentor decreased the odds of being a former coach by a factor of .059. Formal mentoring was not significant for the revised model. Education was significant again and the likelihood of being a former coach was increased when participants held a post graduate degree (master's OR=2.639, doctoral degree 8.123). Age was again significant, but to a smaller extent. Participants aged 41-

50 were 6 times (OR=6.018; previously 11.790) more likely to be former coaches compared to those in the 31-35 age group.

Relationship status was significant in this model and being married or in a long term relationship increased the odds of being a former coach by a factor of 2.437 compared to being single. Sporting status was also significant with participants in Tier I being 2.704 times more likely to be a former coach than participants in Tier III. The number of years in the coaching profession also decreased the likelihood of being a former coach by a factor of .837. To answer the second (*Does the presence of mentoring and the perceived impact of mentoring demonstrate a relationship to the costs/benefits or work-life balance variables?*) and third (*Will current coaches experience costs and benefits to coaching differently depending on the length of time spent in the profession?*) research questions, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated between the mentoring impact/satisfaction scale, the work-life balance scale, the cost/benefits to coaching analysis survey and length of time spent in the profession for current coaches (See table 4). Statistically significant relationships were found between length of coaching and overall satisfaction with coaching; benefits to coaching scores were positively related to costs of coaching and satisfaction in the sport right now; while costs to coaching scores were negatively related to work-life support ($r(434)=-.474$, $p<.001$) and overall satisfaction with coaching; and work-life support was positively related to the mentoring impact/satisfaction scale, overall satisfaction with coaching and satisfaction in the sport right now. All of these correlations, while statistically significant, the correlations were weak ranging in size from .205-.474 and may only be significant due to the size of the sample. To further answer the third research question, correlations were run for the current coaches' sample to determine if the length of coaching career was significantly related to the costs and benefits of coaching. No

statistically significant relationships were found between these variables (Benefits = r(335)=-.088, *p*=.105; Costs = r(335)=-.089, *p*=.103).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the experiences of current and former collegiate women coaches using a social exchange theory framework to determine if the perceived costs/benefits to coaching, satisfaction level with career and satisfaction of career alternatives affected their decisions to remain in coaching. This study also investigated the impact of mentoring, and work-life support on career outcomes (current coaching/non-coaching status). Of secondary importance, this study also utilized qualitative methodology to provide support to the quantitative data in terms of better understanding the experiences of the former coaches as the quantitative data in itself does not allow for a rich, in-depth understanding of the impact of these factors on women coaches. Therefore, an attempt was made to add to the quantitative data to be discussed below using qualitative methodologies. For further information regarding the qualitative methods, procedures, results and discussion, see Appendix B.

Demographic variables

In order to evaluate social exchange theory predictions and assess if mentoring and work-life support could predict coaching status, a binary logistic regression was conducted. Binary logistic regression successfully identified 81.3% of the former coaches. Age and education status both significantly predicted former coaching status. This finding suggested that older and more educated coaches were more likely to leave coaching. However, when a post-hoc chi-square analysis was conducted, education was significant and post graduate educational attainment was significantly associated with former coaching status. This suggests that education level does significantly impact the prediction of coaching status. Previous research has suggested that

higher educational attainment is more common among female coaches than male coaches due to the perception of needing to prove their capabilities as a coach (Anderson & Gill, 1983). However, female coaches with advanced degrees may also be more likely to perceive and experience increased alternative career opportunities available to them than coaches with bachelor's degrees. Previous research has suggested that an awareness of alternative professional opportunities may serve as a mechanism for female coaches to leave the sport (Lowry & Lovett, 1997).

It is possible that the age variable may be a natural artifact of the data that is impacting the results as coaches who get older are less likely to be working. Also, as people get older, more opportunities become available and perhaps older coaches may be leaving coaching for reasons that do not reflect having a negative coaching experience. A post-hoc chi-square analysis was conducted and revealed a non-significant association between coaching status and age category. This seems to support the notion that the significance of age in the logistic regression is a natural artifact in the data. This suggests that although age was significant in the logistic regression, the differences between groups were not significant in the chi-square analysis. Therefore, the finding that being over the age of 51 increases odds of being a former coach may not be completely accurate. The presence of age as a statistically significant predictor of former coaching status may also be due to the difficulty associated with determining if former coaches over the age of 51 left coaching for a reason other than retirement. Findings by Kamphoff and Gill (2006) suggest that there are "positive reasons" why women may leave coaching, which include: interest in other areas, opportunities for promotion (entering administrative ranks), pursuit of further education, retiring or "going out on top". The researchers found that 27 of the 121 participants in their study left for these positive reasons, while one of the negative reasons reported by

participants also included being fired (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). The current study did not ask former coaches to report their reasons for leaving coaching (e.g., poor experiences, not having one's contract extended, alternative career positions in athletics administration or retirement). However, of the five coaches interviewed for the qualitative portion of the study, all five left involuntarily due to non-renewal of contracts and terminations. The lack of inquiry about reasons for leaving sport is a limitation of the current study due to the possibility for high association between the age, education and coaching experience variables. An older coach (40s or older) is more likely, by virtue of age and opportunity to have a post graduate degree as well as having more coaching experience that a coach in their 20s or early 30s. Therefore, identifying the actual reason for leaving coaching would have clarified the inconsistency between the post-hoc analyses. For example, the post-hoc chi square analysis of age was not significant but education level was, Similarly, when the over 51 and 21-30 year age groups were removed from the revised logistic regression model, age and education was significant again but to a far lesser degree. In summary, age and education appear to be connected from the various statistical analyses conducted, and also appear to be statistically significant predictors of coaching status. However, the actual impact of these variables are unknown as the results are inconsistent and do not present a clear or interpretable model.

Length of coaching was also significant and, for each additional year of coaching experience, the chances of being a former coach was decreased by .911. This suggests that the longer coaches remain in their careers, the more likely they are to remain in coaching. Intuitively, this finding makes sense because a coach who invests more time into her career may be less likely to pursue alternative career options. Due to the study participation requirement of being involved in coaching for at least five years, all participants invested a significant amount of

time into their coaching careers. Nevertheless, this result has limited impact because it does not represent the experiences of all coaches. As Cunningham and Sagas (2003) discovered, the average coaching career for women is five years; therefore, this study represented the experiences of women coaches maintaining longer-than-average careers. This created a limitation in the study because the result is not generalizable to all women coaches. Future research should further examine the relationship between length of coaching and career outcomes.

The status of the participants' sport was also a significant factor in predicting coaching status. Coaches whose sport was viewed as a Tier I sport in the athletic department (i.e. as a priority sport for the institution) were three times more likely to be former coaches. This suggests that perhaps the demanding organizational culture associated with being a Tier I sport (i.e. emphasis on winning, long hours, excessive travel, recruiting, and perhaps decreased time for work-life balance) could play a role in influencing career outcome, due to increased scrutiny from administrators. Coaches within these Tier I sports may feel more pressure to succeed and have less time for their personal lives compared to participants in Tier II and Tier III sports, a finding supported in previous research by Pastore (1991), who found that coaches tended to leave the profession due to work-life balance issues and increased intensity required in the recruitment of athletes. The qualitative results from Appendix B provide more elaboration on this issue as many of the participants indicated that the "unwritten culture of athletics" that includes increased pressure to continually work, recruit, succeed, and travel contributed to their negative experiences in coaching. Further, Frey (2007) suggested that coaches experience stressors in the form of demands based on the expectations of their coaching position (e.g. time demands,

recruiting, pressure to win). The findings of this study seem to support the results of Frey (2007) and Pastore (1991).

Work-Life Balance

Work-life support also demonstrated a positive effect on career outcome, as an increase in the work-life support score was significantly related to a decreased chance of being a former coach. This suggests that believing that one has the ability to balance coaching and personal responsibilities, not feeling overwhelmed by coaching, feeling support from administrators and family members, and perceiving an opportunity for career advancement is associated with staying in coaching. Based upon this finding, it seems as if the perception of work-life support and balance is vital in the retention of coaches at the Division I level and supports similar findings by Thorngren, (1990; see also Dixon & Bruening, 2007; Kilty, 2006). The qualitative results provided support for this finding as most of the five former coaches described struggling with achieving personal balance as sport became their lives and often experienced negative health outcomes as a result. Participants also referred to prioritizing their own health, and identified social support as specific tools that helped them maintain balance. The qualitative theme that sport over takes the coaches life and the impact on health outcomes supports findings by Bruening and Dixon (2008), which suggests that the collegiate coaching lifestyle is taxing on coaches and their personal lives.

The coaches also discussed this in this context of their interpersonal relationships, specifically romantic relationships. Three of the coaches cited their lack of work-life balance as playing a key role in the loss of romantic relationships, while three coaches also discussed having a partner in athletics as a strategy to achieve interpersonal balance. Based on the five coaches interviewed, is appears as though the lack of work-life balance created a vicious cycle

for these coaches as the lack of balance resulted in a loss of spousal relationship and support, however previous research has suggested that spousal support is a key factor in creating effective work-life balance (Bruening & Dixon, 2008, Kilty, 2006). Consequently the loss of spousal support may have impacted these coaches' abilities to develop improved work-life balance, however further investigation may be necessary to examine this concept further. This finding supports the quantitative data and does appear to further illustrate exactly how coaching impacts the personal life of a coach. Three of the coaches also referenced their new found work-life balance since leaving coaching as one of their primary motivations to remain in non-coaching vocations. Further qualitative examination of the impact of work-life balance and interpersonal stressors on coaches' decisions to leave coaching may be necessary.

The work-life support scores were also negatively related to the costs to coaching scale which is defined as potential negative consequences from involvement in coaching, from the costs/benefits to coaching scale. This finding demonstrates that an increase in perceived work-life balance is associated with a decrease in the costs to coaching scores which includes items inquiring about pressure, time demands, and lack of support (see Appendix G). This finding supports previous research which suggests that women, who report increased work-life balance, to have a more positive coaching experience (Breuning & Dixon, 2008; Kilty, 2006). However, it is interesting to note that there was no positive correlation between the benefits to coaching scale and work-life balance, which would also be expected considering this finding. It may be that the benefits to coaching are not associated with work-life balance in any way, but that work-life balance impacts the perceived costs to coaching more. Further investigation of this relationship may be necessary to gain a more in-depth understanding of this relationship.

Social Exchange Theory

Some of the results of this study supported social exchange theory (SET), while other results did not. The satisfaction items were significant predictors of coaching status and fit with the social exchange theory tenets. Specifically, higher levels of satisfaction on the "satisfaction with coaching" scale was associated with a decrease in the odds of being a former coach, while higher levels of satisfaction reported when responding to the question "How satisfying would an alternative situation have to be to leave coaching?" was associated with a decrease in the odds of being a former coach. These findings suggest that coaches who were more satisfied with coaching and rationalize that another career must be even more satisfying than coaching were more likely to be current coaches, therefore they remain in coaching. This is an important factor for social exchange theory which suggests that the alternative situation should be more satisfying than the current situation for an individual to decide to leave (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). Therefore, satisfaction with the current situation is very important in predicting coaching status.

The benefits to coaching scale and two of the four satisfaction items were significant predictors of coaching status. Similarly to the relationship between work-life balance and the costs scale, the results for the costs and benefits scales were surprising. There was an increase in the odds of being a former coach associated with an increase in one's score on the benefits to coaching scale and an increase in one's score on the costs scale decreased the odds of being a former coach. The findings of the current study do not support SET which suggests that the former coach would experience greater costs and fewer benefits than a current coach, therefore an increase in one's score on the costs scale and a decrease in one's score on the benefits scale should, according to SET increase the odds of being a former coach. However, the lack of support for social exchange theory may have been due to the timing of the survey. Current

coaches may have been completing the survey while their season was in progress and as a result, may have perceived to experience more costs and fewer benefits to coaching, while former coaches were relying on hindsight to answer the questions. Therefore, former coaches may have recalled a rosier experience of their coaching career (consequently reporting increased benefits) than if the survey was completed during the last season they were coaching, while current coaches may have answered more negatively (consequently reporting increased costs) Weiss and Stevens (1993) found that current coaches rated the costs of coaching higher than former coaches. However, Weiss and Stevens also found that current coaches assigned greater importance to the benefits of coaching. This finding suggests that perhaps the costs/benefits to coaching survey needs further psychometric validation.

Another possible reason for the limited support for SET may be due to the differences in the sample used by Weiss and Stevens (1993). In this study, the sample consisted of former coaches who had left coaching no more than two years prior to completing the survey. These coaches may have had a slightly more accurate recollection of their coaching experiences than coaches who may be completing the survey up to ten years after leaving coaching. This also highlights the difficulty associated with survey administration and future research should examine if there is an ideal time period during which to administer this survey. Also, it may be necessary to revise the description of the survey to be clearer on what time period and experiences the coaches should be recalling when answering the survey. Additionally, both the costs scales were initially based on literature and developed with coaches over sixteen years ago. As a result, the items on the scales may not be accurately representing the experiences of coaches today and may be in need of updating.

Results also revealed small but significant correlations between overall satisfaction with coaching, satisfaction in the sport right now and work-life balance. This finding suggests that the social exchange theory components may indeed demonstrate some relationship to the work-life balance scale and that these factors are indeed interrelated. Although this correlation was weak and further investigation may be necessary to examine the extent that work-life balance and social exchange theory components are related. Based on the framework of social exchange theory and the partial support received for the satisfaction items in this study, social exchange theory may still be a legitimate means of studying coaching retention, however, further investigation may be necessary with the intercollegiate population and additional survey validation should be conducted to ensure that participants clearly understand the directions and that the survey items are representative of the current or recent experiences of coaches.

Mentoring

It is apparent from the current data that a large proportion (75%) of the participants received some form of mentoring. Having a mentor (formal or informal) significantly decreased the likelihood of being a former coach compared to participants having no mentor at all. This finding supports previous research which suggests that mentoring can be a vital part of the career development and retention of coaches (Singh, Ragins & Tharenou, 2009). However, further investigation is necessary as the mentoring impact and satisfaction scores were positively related to the odds of being a former coach. In other words, the more impact mentoring was perceived to have on the coaches' opportunities to build a network, develop professionally, increase knowledge and growth and provide social support, the higher the odds of being a former coach. It is difficult to determine the reason for such contradictory results and post-hoc tests did not reveal a significant difference in the mean score of participants with informal versus formal

mentors on the mentoring impact/satisfaction scale. One reasonfor these confusing results may be that the protégé feels added pressure from the mentor due to the increased opportunities associated with the presence of mentoring which undermines the positive effects of having support and guidance from the mentor's presence. Kram (1985) suggested that the mentoring relationship is a dynamic and ever changing system, and suggested that the relationship "can become less satisfying and even destructive" (p13). Kram also suggested a developmental model to mentoring, which might involve young career professionals using mentoring as a developmental tool, while more experienced coaches relying on the psychosocial support they receive from the mentor (1985). While informal and formal mentoring was defined to the participants in the survey, the participants were of various developmental stages based on Kram's (1985) mentoring model. Therefore, it is possible that even though the coaches' perceived that they were satisfied with their mentoring relationship, the informal or formal relationship may not have been developmentally appropriate, ultimately impacting the quality of the mentoring relationship and its' effectiveness.

Other studies have found that regardless of the type of mentoring, increased satisfaction with the mentoring relationship is related to a stronger impact on career and job attitudes than just the mere presence of a mentoring relationship alone (Ragins et al., 2000). Additionally, a more positive work and career attitude was also reported by individuals with highly satisfying mentoring relationships, while those reporting relationships that were dissatisfactory were equivalent in their work and career attitudes to those with no mentoring (Ragins et al., 2000). These findings suggest that perhaps bad mentoring can be as destructive as no mentoring at all, whereas good mentoring may lead to more positive outcomes for the mentee.

While the quantitative results demonstrate the degree to which the presence of mentoring impacts former and current coaching status, the results of the impact of mentoring scale was less clear and contradictory. The qualitative results provide more insight into the former coaches' experiences with mentoring. The former coaches indicated that formal mentoring, when present, was helpful to their careers. Additionally, the mentoring impact/advice theme suggests that coaches received support from their mentors, professional advice about dealing with day to day issues on their team (e.g. dealing with parents, running a program), and an emphasis on the big-picture of their sport/coaching career. Participants underscored the importance of support related to issues with administration and career development, while those who did not have a mentor, indicated that having a mentor could have increased their success as coaches.

The discussion of mentoring also included discussion of professional networking. All participants indicated the presence of a professional network as a form of social support for finding coaching positions as well as developing mentoring relationships. Therefore, the qualitative themes provide basic support for the logistic regression finding that informal and formal mentoring relationships may impact the career outcomes of coaches. This finding is also supported by previous research suggesting that women gain from having supportive mentors and from connections with networks (Eagly & Carli, 2007), and that the result of feeling increased connectivity and motivation may increase coach retention and also increase the talent pool of future female coaches (Desvaux et al, 2007).

Post-hoc analysis

Due to the conflicting findings between the significant role of age in the logistic regression results and the chi-square analysis that was non-significant, a second post-hoc analysis was conducted. A second logistic regression was conducted, this time with a revised age

variable. The results of the revised logistic regression suggests that participants in these middle age groups (age 31- 50) were more likely to be former coaches if over the age of 41, married or in a relationship, possess a post graduate degree and coaching a Tier I sport in the athletic department. However, the longer the coach has been in the coaching career and the presence of informal mentoring decreased the likelihood of being a former coach. These findings were interesting as they provided a more in-depth view of the factors that contribute to former coaching status for coaches who are deemed to be in the peak of their career according to age. As stated earlier, this finding may be due to the natural career development opportunities (such as advanced education) that exist as an individual ages, as well as, the increased opportunities for career advancement associated with increased experience (positive reasons for career termination as found by Kamphoff & Gill, 2003). Therefore, predicting former coaching status is a challenging task, and future researchers should continue to investigate the relationship between these variables in an effort to identify what the risk factors are for former coaching status.

Although work-life balance items did not contribute to the model, it is interesting to note that relationship status was significant which did not occur with the initial model. Based on the qualitative results, former coaches did identify that work-life balance, or the lack thereof, contributed to the loss of romantic relationships. While neither the qualitative or the quantitative data provides more detailed information regarding the nature of the impact of being in a serious, long term relationship on coaching, it appears as a relationship does exist between these factors. Previous research has suggested that spousal support is important in the development of work-life balance (Bruening & Dixon, 2008, Kilty, 2006), though it would be interesting to examine the progression of spousal support, work-life balance and career outcomes over time. In the future, longitudinal research should be conducted on this topic.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study allowed for an in-depth analysis of former and current Division I women coaches' experiences in the areas of work-life balance, mentoring, and costs/benefits to coaching. This study filled a void in the literature by examining these variables together and by comparing current and former coaches. Furthermore, this study also examined the multitude of major factors that might lead to a woman's decision to leave coaching, including the impact of mentoring. While this research provides great insight into the various factors that contribute to women leaving coaching, a number of limitations impacted this study. First, generalizations about the results of this study should be done cautiously regarding all women's experiences in the coaching profession and their reasons for leaving. The reasons for leaving identified by this sample were based upon a group of former coaches who were assembled using snowball sampling. Therefore, there is no way to know if their experiences are generalizable to the experiences of others. Additionally, the interviews were very structured and while attempts were made to limit bias and influence on the participants, the script could have reflected a more phenomological approach. Therefore, future qualitative research should be more phenomenological in the approach to this topic. Specifically, phenomenological research allows for study of the phenomena with the absence of any preconceived notions and attempts to gain a better understanding of the nature of the phenomenon in question (Hatch, 2002). The qualitative investigation in this study contained specific questions that assessed the presence of specific factors (such as mentoring, work-life balance, barriers etc.) which limited the ability of this study to study the phenomenon without undue influence. However, true phenomenological research asks a limited number of questions (2-3) and includes numerous probes to increase the depth of the interview. This type of qualitative research also attempts to limit the potential impact of

interviewer bias during the interview by asking open ended questions such as, “Tell me about your experiences as a head coach?”

Another limitation of this study is the lack of information regarding the number of former coaches who may have left non-voluntarily, and for positive and negative reasons. Future studies should investigate the various reasons why former coaches decide to leave coaching in great detail as this might provide greater insight into the number of women who may be leaving coaching to take administrative positions. It appears as though this happens frequently, but this phenomenon has not been studied extensively in the literature.

Another limitation to this study is related to the costs/benefits to coaching survey. As stated during the discussion section, the instrument may need further exploration to determine if it is a valid instrument for the division I collegiate coaching population since Weiss and Stevens (1993) developed this instrument for a high school coaching sample. Additionally, it is possible that social exchange theory is not the best framework for determining the career paths of division I collegiate coaches as those coaches may still remain in coaching positions, even when experiencing significant costs and limited benefits. Conversely, coaches may also choose to leave (or not return to coaching) after being terminated, while experiencing greater benefits and less costs to coaching. Therefore, this instrument may not be sensitive enough to measure all salient issues the coaches are experiencing or social exchange theory may not accurately assess the factors influencing these coaches’ decisions.

Future research should also examine and compare the experiences of former and current male coaches to determine if any similarities exist in male and female coaches’ experiences. It would be interesting to examine if male coaches describe the same experiences and opportunities with mentoring. Additionally, it would be useful to know exactly who the mentors are for both

female coaches and perhaps compare this with male coaches' experiences to determine if there is a difference in the type of mentors male and female coaches encounter in their careers. Future research should gather more information on the mentors to determine who these informal and formal mentors may be (e.g. administrators, coaches, rival coaches, same sport, gender matching etc.) and the effect these factors may have on the mentoring relationship and the impact of the relationship.

Future research should also examine the effectiveness of mentor training programs in coaching. Business, medicine and education fields have extensively studies mentor training programs, but coaching literature and sport psychology literature is lacking in this area. Research on mentor training programs in other fields have found that women are sensitive to the risks of mentoring and the potential reflection of failure if the mentee is unsuccessful (Marshall & Sharp, 2010), and therefore may shy away from the role of mentor. Therefore, these training programs might be useful for current women coaches to become more skilled and effective as mentors. This may help to increase the willingness of experienced women coaches to mentor young women coaches. Researchers should also investigate the benefits of mentoring for the mentor in addition to the benefits for the mentee.

Further there is a need for researchers to develop a psychometrically sound mentoring satisfaction/impact measure to be used for coaches as this will allow for a better understanding of the impact mentoring relationships have on the mentor and mentee. Lastly, more research is also necessary to examine the impact of mentoring on career development, specifically retention of women coaches in athletics. This should include the examination of women coaches who may leave coaching to pursue careers in athletics administration as may be one reason why women

leave the coaching profession. The findings regarding mentoring from the current study is promising, however, further examination is necessary.

Additional future directions for this study include further investigation of work-life balance experiences, specifically examining the experiences of male coaches. Additionally, the work-life balance experiences of coaches should be compared across divisions I, II and III. It would also be useful to examine the impact of sport type (or the emphasis placed on the sport within the athletic department i.e. Tier of the sport), on coaches experiences of stress. Fletcher and Scott (2010) suggested that coaches experience various significant stressors that impact not only coaches' performance but also the performance of their athletes. The stressors also impact the coach's health and well-being, which may be related to their ability to balance work and life demands. Therefore, future research should also examine the impact of coping skill development (e.g. leadership skills, stress management skills, conflict management) on work-life balance.

Practical Implications

Clearly the issues impacting the retention of division I intercollegiate coaches are not simplistic. The role of limited mentoring opportunities and work-life balance difficulties as a barrier experienced by women coaches in the current study have also been identified by others (Kilty, 2006; Theberge, 1993). Sport psychology practitioners may potentially be able to play a role in assisting coaches with the development of networking skills, the establishment of informal and formal mentoring programs and networks, identifying potential mentors and establish effective mentoring relationships. Additionally, sport psychology practitioners could also assist coaches with developing coping skills for their own physical and mental well-being (Allen & Shaw, 2009), and help them cope more effectively with the demands of coaching (Fletcher & Scott, 2010; Olusoga et al., 2009). Organizations and administrators should also be

made aware of the experiences of women coaches, and encourage athletes, as well as assistant and head coaches to participate in programs such as the NCAA Women Coaches Academy sponsored by the WinStar Foundation. The WinStar Foundation is a non-profit educational organization that provides leadership and skills training for coaches and athletes to support, train and retain women coaches. Programs such as the Women Coaches Academy may present the perfect framework to examine the impact of coping skills and mentoring programs on coach retention. The NCAA has also acknowledged the impact of work-life balance and coaching education on women coaches' career development through the NCAA work-life resources section of its website ("NCAA Work-Life Balance Resources," n.d.). Sport psychology practitioners may also play a role in the development of work-life balance skills when working with athletes who may be interested in a coaching career, but also with assistant and head coaches. Leadership development, assertive communication skills, conflict management and stress management skills would all be useful tools that SEP practitioners could teach to coaches to help them cope with the psychosocial demands associated with coaching (Fletcher & Scott, 2010)..

Kilty (2006) also recommends coaching education programs and conferences for women only, suggesting that these events should occur regularly, as they provide women with opportunities for reflection within their social context. Inglis and colleagues (2000) also found that female coaches who felt more in control over their career and work situation reported feeling more satisfied in their jobs. Sport psychology practitioners and researchers can play a vital role in coach development, education and perhaps even impact career outcomes.

References

Allen, J. B., & Shaw, S. (2009). Women coaches' perceptions of their sport organizations' social environment: Supporting coaches' psychological needs? *The Sport Psychologist, 23*, 346-366. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

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

Ballantyne, R., Hansford, B., & Packer, J. (1995). Mentoring beginning teachers: A qualitative analysis of process and outcomes. *Educational Review, 47*, 297-307. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Birrell, S. & Theberge, N. (1994). Feminist resistance and transformation in sport. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 361-376). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 29*, 267-281. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Bower, G. G. (2009). Effective mentoring relationships with women in sport: Results of a meta-ethnography. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 27*, 1-18. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., & Keedy, J. L. (2006). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor females in leadership positions within campus recreation: A historical perspective. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, *2*, Retrieved from http://www.advancingwomen.comawl/spring2006/Bower_Hums_Keedy.html

Brady, L. (1993). Peer assistance in the professional development of principals. *Curriculum and Teaching, 8,* 91-98.

Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2008). Situation work-family negotiations within a life course perspective: Insights on the gendered experiences of NCAA Division I head coaching mothers. *Sex Roles, 58*, 10-23. doi: 10.1007/s11199-007-9350-x

Caffarella, R. S., & Olson, S. K. (1993). Psychosocial development of women: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 43*(3), 125-151.

Carpenter, L. J., & Acosta, R. V. (2010). Women in Intercollegiate Sport. A longitudinal, National study, Thirty One Year update, 1977-2010. West Brookfield, MA. Electronically retrieved from http://www.acostacarpenter.org/

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2003). Occupational turnover intent among assistant coachces of women's teams: The role of organizational work experiences. *Sex Roles, 49*, 185-190. doi: 0360-0025/03/0800-0185

Demers, G. (2004). Why female athletes decide to become coaches – or not. *Canadian Journal for Women in Coaching, 4*(5), 1-9. Retrieved from http://www.caoch.ca/e/journal/july2004/index.htm.

Demers, G. (2010). Homophobia in sport – Fact of life, taboo subject. In S. Robertson (Ed), *Taking the lead: Strategies and solutions from female coaches.* (pp. 73–96). Alberta, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.

Desvaux, G., Devillard-Hoellinger, S., & Baumgarter, P. (2007). *Women matter. Gender diversity, a corporate performance driver*. McKinsey and Company: Paris

Dieffenbach, K. & Vosloo, J. (2008). Women coaching developmental club sport: Shaping the future for the next generation. *Lecture presented at Association for Applied Sport Psychology,* St. Louis, MO.

Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377-406. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Drago, R., Henninghause, L., Rogers, J., Vescio, T., & Stauffer, K. D. (2005). Final Report for Cage: The coaching and gender equity project (pp. 1-64): Pennsylvania State University.

Eagly, A., & Carli, L. (2007). *Through the Labyrinth*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & Dubois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 254-267. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B. & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 518-540. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267118

Ethnograph 6.0 (n.d.). Qualis Research, Colorado Springs, CO.

Everhart, C. B. & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 69*(2), 188-200.

Fagenson, E. A. (1989). The mentor advantage: Perceived career/job experiences of protégés versus non-protégés. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 10*, 309-320.

Frey, M. (2007). College coaches' experiences with stress- "problem solvers" have problems, too. *The Sport Psychologists, 21* (1), 38-57. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Gearing, R. E. (2004). Bracketing in research: A typology. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*, 1429-1452.

Gogol, S. (2002). *Hard Fought Victories: Women Coaches Making a Difference.* Wish Publishing, Terre Haute: IN.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Race effects on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 64-86.

Griffin, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sport.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

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.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Hewlett, S., Buck Luce, C., & Schiller, P. (2005). The hidden brain drain – Off ramps and on ramps in women's career. *HBR Report, Harvard Business Review, 83*, 31-57.

Inglis, S. Danylchuk, K.E. & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 9,* 1-14

Jenner, L. & Ferguson, R., (2009). *2008 Catalyst census of women corporate officers and top earners of the FP500.* Catalyst.

Kamphoff, C. S. & Gill, D. L. (2006). Bargaining with patriarchy: Former women coaches experiences and their decision to leave collegiate coaching. *Dissertation Abstract International, 67*(11), 853A. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (ATT 3242413).

Kilty, K. (2006). Women in Coaching. *Sport Psychologist, 20*(2), 222-234. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Knoppers, A. (1992). Explaining male dominance and sex segregation in coaching: Three approaches. *Quest*, 44, 210-227. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 608-625.

Lavoi, N. M (2009). Occupational sex segregation in youth soccer organization: Females in positions of power. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 18* (2), 25-38. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Lenskyj, H. (1991). Combatting homophobia in sport and physical education. *Sociology of Sport Journal,8*, 61-69.

Lopiano, D. (2001). Recruiting, retention and advancement of women in athletics. Retrieved from: http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/cgi-bin/iowa/issues/coach/article.html?record=878

Lowry, C.D., & Lovett, D. J. (1997). Women coaches: Does when dictate why they leave? *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, *12*, 35-53.

Lovett, D. J., & Lowry, C. D. (1994). “Good old boys” and “good old girls” clubs: Myth or reality. *Journal of Sport Management, 8*, 27-35.

Marshall, D. (2001). Understanding mentoring as a development tool for women coaches. *Canadian Journal for Women in Coaching, 2*(2), 1-11.

Marshall, D., & Sharp, D. (2010). Understanding mentoring as a developmental tool for female coaches. In S. Robertson (Ed), *Taking the lead: Strategies and solutions from female coaches.* (pp. 117–145). Alberta, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.

Marshall, D., Demers, G., & Sharp, D (2010). Developing the next generation of female coaches. In S. Robertson (Ed), *Taking the lead: Strategies and solutions from female coaches.* (pp. 181–201). Alberta, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.

Messner, M. (2009). *Including more women coaches in youth sports: Why it matters.* Retrieved from http://www.momsteam.com/getting-more-women-coaches-in-youth-sports-why-it-matters#1xzzoI9yPrCLr&D

NCAA Work-Life Balance Resources (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?key/ncaa/ncaa/academics+and+athletes/personal+welfare/life+and+work+balance

Olusoga, P., Butt, J., Hays, K., & Maynard, I. (2009). Stress in elite sports coaching: Identifying stressors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*, 442-459. doi: 10.1080/10413200903222921.

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. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Petlichkoff, L. M. (1993). Group differences on achievement goal orientations, perceived ability and level of satisfaction during an athletic season. *Pediatric Exercise Science, 5*, 12-24.

Raggins, B. R., Cotton, J., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1177-94. Retrieved from Business Source Premier database.

Roed, B. (1999). *Mentoring: A strategy for faculty growth*. University of Alberta: University Teaching Services.

Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G. (2004). The impact of supervisor support on perceived career outcomes of the senior woman administrator. *International Journal of Sport Management, 5,* 229-242. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Salmela, J. H. (1996). *Great job coach*! Ottawa: Potentium.

Scandura, T. A. (1992). Mentorship and career mobility: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Organizaztional Behavior, 20*, 493-509.

Singh, R., Ragins, B. R., & Tharenou, P. (2009). What matters most? The relative role of mentoring and career capital in career success. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 75*, 56-67. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2009.03.003

Sisley, B.L., Weiss, M.R., Barber, H., & Ebbeck, V. (1990). Developing competence and confidence in novice women coaches: A study of attitudes, motives and perceptions of ability. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 61*(1), 60-64.

SPSS for Windows, 16.0.0. 2008. SPSS Chicago: SPSS Inc

Stangl, J. M. & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 8*, 47-60. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tharenou, P. (2005). Does mentor support increase women's career advancement more than men's? The differential effects of career and psychosocial support. *Australian Journal of Management, 30*(1), 77-109.

Theberge, N. (1993). Managing domestic work and careers: The experiences of women in coaching. *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal, 17*(2), 11-21.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thorngren, C. M. (1990) A time to reach out – Keeping the female coach in coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 61*, 57-60.

Tucker Center for Research on Girls and Women in Sport. (2009, Spring). *Wanted: Female coaches at all levels of sport*. Tucker Center, University of Minnesota newsletter.

Weiss, M. R., & Stevens, C. (1993). Motivation and attrition of female coaches: An application of social exchange theory. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7*,* 244-261. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Wellman, S., & Blinde, E. (1997a). Homophobia in women's intercollegiate basketball: Views of women coaches regarding coaching careers and recruitment of athletes. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 6*(2), 63-82. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Wellman, S., & Blinde, E. (1997b). Impact of homophobia on women intercollegiate basketball. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 68(1)*, A-116.

Werthner, P. (2005). Making the case: Coaching as a viable career path for women. *Canadian Journal for Women in Coaching, 5*(3). Retrieved from: http://www.coach.ca/WOMEN/e/journal/may2005.index.htm

WinStar Foundation (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.winstarfoundation.org/

Tables

Table 1 – Demographics

	Former (n = 107)	Current (n = 336)	Total (N = 443)
Head Coach	68.2% (N = 73)	96.7% (N=325)	89.8% (N = 398)
Assistant Coach	31.8% (N = 34)	3.3% (n = 11)	10.2 % (N = 45)
Age			
21-30	4.9% (N=5)	13.4% (N=43)	11.3% (N=48)
31-35	18.4% (N=19)	22.1% (N=71)	21.2% (N=90)
36-40	20.4% (N=21)	20.2% (N=65)	20.3% (N=86)
41-50	35.9% (N=37)	31.2% (N=42)	32.3% (N=137)
51 and above	20.4% (N=21)	13.1% (N=42)	14.9% (N=63)
Relationship Status			
Single	30.8% (N=33)	34.2 % (N=115)	33.4% (N=148)
Married/Long term partner	61.7 (N=66)	53.6% (N=180)	55.5% (N=246)
Divorced	4.7% (N=5)	6% (N=20)	5.6% (N=25)
Widowed	0% (N=0)	.3% (N=1)	.2% (N=1)
Children			
Yes	33.6% (N=36)	35.1% (N=118)	34.8% (N=154)
No	63.6% (N=68)	60.4% (N=203)	61.2% (N=271)
Partner/Spouse in Sport			
Yes	44.5% (N=37)	42.9% (N=98)	30.5% (N=135)
No	55.4% (N=46)	57.0% (N=130)	39.7% (N=176)
Education level			
Bachelor/some college	14.4% (N=15)	25.8% (N=83)	23% (N=98)
Some graduate	14.4% (N=15)	19.9% (N=64)	18.5% (N=79)
Master degree	62.5% (N=65)	51.6% (N=166)	54.2% (N=231)
Doctoral degree	8.7% (N=9)	2.8% (N=9)	4.2% (N=18)
Ethnicity			
Caucasian	83.3% (N=89)	86.0% (N=289)	85.3% (N=378)
African American	9.3% (N=10)	3.9% (N=13)	5.2% (N=23)
Asian	0%	1.8% (N=6)	1.4% (N=6)
Hispanic	0%	1.5% (N=5)	1.1% (N=5)
Native American	0%	1.2% (N=4)	.9% (N=4)
Other	1.9% (N=2)	.9% (N=3)	1.1% (N=5)
Salary			
<$10,000	5% (N=5)	.3% (N=1)	1.4% (N=6)
$10,001-24,999	4% (N=4)	2.8% (N=9)	3.1% (N=13)
$25,000-39,999	22.8% (N=23)	11.7% (N=37)	14.4% (N=60)
$40,000-54,999	31.7% (N=32)	30.6% (N=97)	30.9% (N=129)
$55,000-69,999	20.8% (N=21)	19.6% (N=62)	19.9% (N=83)
$70,000-84,999	10.9% (N=11)	16.1% (N=51)	14.8% (N=62)
$85,000-99,999	3.0% (N=3)	8.2% (N=26)	6.9% (N=29)
$100,000+	2% (N=2)	10.7% (N=34)	8.6% (N=36)

Table 2 – Coaching and mentoring characteristics

	Former (n = 107)	Current (n = 336)	Total (N = 443)
Tier of Sport Coached			
Tier I	38.8% (N=40)	24.1% (N=76)	27.7% (N=116)
Tier II	40.8% (N=42)	49.7% (N=157)	47.5% (N=199)
Tier III	20.4% (N=21)	26.3% (N=83)	24.8% (N=104)
Consider leaving in past?	(Consider leaving previously?)		
Yes	48.1% (N=50)	68.5% (N=222)	63.6% (N=272)
No	51.9% (N=54)	31.5% (N=102)	36.4% (N=156)
Mentor			
Informal	56.2% (N=59)	61.7% (N=201)	60.3% (N=260)
Formal	13.3% (N=14)	16.3% (N=53)	15.5% (N=67)
None	30.5% (N=32)	22.1% (N=72)	24.1% (N=104)
Gender of Primary Mentor			
Female	68.1% (N=47)	62.6% (N=149)	63.8% (N=196)
Male	31.9% (N=22)	37.4% (N=89)	36.2% (N=111)
Problems with mentor?			
Yes	7% (N=5)	10.3% (N=26)	9.6% (N=31)
No	93% (N=66)	89.7% (N=226)	90.4% (N=292)
Length of coaching career in months	M=183.79	M=336	M=184.60
Time since leaving coaching in months	M=50.10	.	.

Table 3. Binary Logistic Regressions for Coaching Status.

	Former Coaching Status			
	Odds	(95% CI)	*p*	Wald χ^2
Age				
21-30	1.00			23.322
31-35	3.973	(.954 – 16.543)	.058	3.593
36-40	7.116	(1.632 – 31.023)	.009	6.823
41-50	11.790	(2.638 – 52.699)	.001	10.431
51 +	64.916	(10.582 – 398.21)	<.001	20.332
Children				
Yes	1.00			
No	1.241	(.652 – 2.362)	.511	.432
Relationship Status				
Single	1.00			
Married/Partner	1.831	(.966 – 3.472)	.064	3.438
Education				
BA/some college	1.00			12.541
Some graduate work	1.654	(.641 – 4.269)	.298	1.084
Master's degree	2.480	(1.154 – 5.326)	.020	5.420
Doctoral degree	10.860	(2.645 – 44.591)	.001	10.954
Length of Coaching Career (in years)	.911	(.861 - .963)	.001	10.828
Sport Tier				
Tier I	3.189	(1.355 – 7.509)	.008	7.050
Tier II	1.374	(.629 – 3.003)	.426	.635
Tier III	1.00			8.997
Mentoring				
Informal Mentor	.057	(.006 - .513)	.011	6.517
Formal Mentor	.057	(.006 - .592)	.016	5.756
No Mentor	1.00			6.517
Mentoring satisfaction/impact[1]	1.130	(1.130 – 1.616)	.044	5.035
Work Life Support[2]	.906	(.823 - .997)	.044	4.052
Costs to Coaching[3]	.983	(.963 - 1.003)	.094	2.800
Benefits to Coaching[4]	1.038	(1.008 – 1.068)	.011	6.419
Satisfaction Items[5]				
Overall Satisfaction	1.066	(.814 – 1.395)	.644	.214
Current Satisfaction	.660	(.554 - .787)	<.001	21.539
Dissatisfaction to remain	1.016	(.847 – 1.219)	.865	.029
Satisfaction of alternative	.782	(.679 - .901)	.001	11.577

1. Total score of five ordinal items. Ordinal score ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree), 3 (Neither Agree or Disagree), to 5 (Strongly Agree).
2. Total score of six ordinal items. Ordinal score ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree), 3 (Neither Agree or Disagree), to 5 (Strongly Agree).
3. Total score of Costs to Coaching Scale. Ordinal score for each item ranged from 1 (Not at all important) to 5 (Extremely important).
4. Total score of Benefits to Coaching Scale. Ordinal score for each item ranged from 1 (Not at all important) to 5 (Extremely important).
5. Ordinal score ranged from 1 (Very Dissatisfied), 5 (Neutral), to 9 (Very Satisfied).

Table 4. Intercorrelations between selected Demographics to Cost, Benefit Scales, Satisfaction items, Work-life balance and Mentoring Satisfaction scales.

		Length of Coaching career in months	Benefits of Coaching Scale	Costs of Coaching Scale	Work-Life Support Scale	Mentoring Impact and Satisfaction Scale	Satisfaction Items			
							Overall Satisfaction with Coaching	Satisfaction in the sport right now	Dissatisfaction with coaching and still remain	Satisfying alternative situation to leave coaching
Length of Coaching career in months		1.00								
Benefits of Coaching Scale		-.065	1.00							
Costs of Coaching Scale		-.079	.241**	1.00						
Work-Life Support Scale		-.095*	.142**	-.474**	1.00					
Mentoring Impact and Satisfaction Scale		-.063	.139**	-.042	.265**	1.00				
Satisfaction Items	Overall Satisfaction with Coaching	.226**	.127**	-.285**	.359**	.084	1.00			
	Satisfaction in the sport right now	.120*	.205**	-.193**	.341**	.075	.594**	1.00		
	Dissatisfaction with coaching and still remain	.173**	.074	-.039	.152**	.023	.269**	.224**	1.00	
	Satisfying alternative situation to leave coaching	-.012	.072	-.079	.178**	.090	.336**	.291**	.086	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Appendix A: Literature Review

This chapter will provide a review of literature related to women coaches in U.S. Title IX of the Educational Amendment Act of 1972 has been recognized as an integral piece of legislation that has contributed to the rise in participation rates for female athletes since the 1970's. Participation rates among women athletes, especially college student athletes, have increased 10 fold since the passage of Title IX, which also increases the pool of prospective women coaches (Drago, et al., 2005). These basic statistics indicate the impact that Title IX has had on women's sport participation.

Although progress has been made with regard to women's involvement in sport, the representation of gender equality in sport has not yet been achieved. Ironically, although the participation rates for women in sport has increased, women represented in leadership positions such as head coach and athletic director (AD) have declined in percentage since the passage of Title IX (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). Therefore, women lack decision-making power within the sport domain.

This literature review will highlight the decline of women in leadership positions, specifically coaching, and seek to understand the factors contributing to the loss of women in the coaching profession. First, the changes in post-Title IX women's sports will be reviewed and some of the suggested explanations of the decline in numbers of female coaches will be discussed. Further, causes for the continuing decline, consisting of barriers and challenges within the climate of sport will be discussed. The specific experiences of women coaches will be examined both from the coach's perspective and the athletes they coach, to determine unique factors that may be contributing to this trend. Next, professional career development for women will be discussed to examine factors in career commitment and specifically, the role of

mentoring in the career development of female coaches. Finally, the limited research that has explored coach burnout/drop out will be discussed and a specific framework for identifying factors that may predict female coaches' intentions to leave coaching career will be examined.

Participation Rates

It is argued that the increased participation of girls and women in sport has been one of the most significant and dramatic changes in the recent world of sport (Coakley, 2004). In 1972, there was an average of two women's teams per school (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). In 2008, on average, National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) schools maintained 8.65 women's teams per school (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). Additionally, according to 2008 data, the number of women's teams was reported to be 9101, the highest number ever (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). It would be easy to assume that as a result of this increase in participation rates and opportunities for women to participate in sport that the percentage of women coaches and administrators would have also increased. However, this has not been the case. In fact, the percentage of women in leadership positions has decreased significantly since the passing for Title IX. In 1972, more than 90% of the head coaches of women's teams were women. However, in 2008 women comprised only 42.8% of head coaching positions for women's teams, the lowest total in reported history (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). On the positive side, of the 11,058 paid assistant coaching positions for women's teams, 57.1% were female.

This decline is concerning as young athletes, especially young girls, may be less likely to have access to female role models in the sporting context (Acosta & Carpenter, 2008; Lavoi, 2009). Messner (2009) suggests female role models are important even for boys as they continue to experience women as colleagues and bosses in their careers and, therefore, need to experience women as leaders (Messner, 2009). Additionally, girls may experience decreased self-efficacy,

internalize and accept negative gender stereotypes, and devalue their own abilities; which might ultimately impact their ability to meet their full potential without female coaches as role models (Lavoi, 2009). Additionally, Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) have found that female athletes are more likely to enter coaching when coached by women when compared to female athletes coached by men. Lastly, women are more likely to reach self-fulfillment, particularly in a lifetime commitment to physical activity when viewing women coaches as role models (Marshal, Demers & Sharp, 2010).Therefore, the experiences of women coaches have been of much interest and examined from many different perspectives.

Researchers have been interested in examining women coaches' experiences since Title IX due to the work of Carpenter and Acosta (2008; Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; 1988; 1985). Kamphoff and Gill (2006) identified that research in this area examines two larger barriers faced by women: "structural" and "ideological". Structural issues include the administration and leadership of women's sport, the culture of the organization, and resources available to women's sport (coaches and athletes). Ideological issues include the gender roles of women in sport, homophobia, and the social factors such as media images of women (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). These factors will be explored in the following section.

Barriers and Obstacles

Culture and old boys' network. Sage (1998) suggests there is a very clear socially constructed and complex network of gender relations in the US that provides a configuration for relations between males and females. This structure for interaction allows us to understand the issue of gender, race and class as it relates to norms, rules, roles and statuses in life and sport (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). The work of Acosta and Carpenter has suggested that there are many structural and environmental factors that influence the career successes of female coaches (1985;

1988). For example, the NCAA, which control's women's sport programs, is governed almost entirely by white men (NCAA, 2005). This development occurred to due a combination of factors, one being the dissolution of the AIAW (Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women) in 1982, which resulted in women's sport being governed by the NCAA which has always governed men's sport and consisted of men as a result (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006). As recently as 2010, 80.9% of NCAA ADs were found to be male, with 19.1% females (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). In 1972 when Title IX was enacted, females served of athletic directors of over 90% of programs for women and this historical figure can be contributed to the AIAW's governance of collegiate sport (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). However, Division I universities still reported the fewest number of women ADs at 30 compared to 1128 in Division III, and 13.2% of athletics program reported no women anywhere in their administration (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). This is a significant finding considering that administrative staff grew by 11% in 2007 and 2008 (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). The increase in administrative staff but stagnation of rates of women in athletics administration indicates that women are not necessarily being hired in these new administration posts.

Lapchick (2009) highlights that most women's athletic departments are overseen by caucasian men (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). These white men then have a significant impact on the careers of women coaches as well as minority coaches. Additionally, minorities (including women) are underrepresented in the upper levels of administration; specially, white women hold 6.2% of Division I administrative positions compared to 0% Asian women, .3% Native American and Latina women, and 1% African American women (Lapchick, 2009). Interestingly, the only examples of women nationwide who head a women's athletic department do not oversee football (i.e., University of Tennessee, Knoxville and University of Texas at Austin). This

suggests that even when women reach the highest levels of athletics administration, inequality exists in the sports she is able to govern (i.e. male revenue sports).

The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions has even more significant consequences when considering the perceptions of administrators. When the attitudes of male ADs of intercollegiate athletics are examined, it has been revealed that they attribute the decline of women coaches to the individual woman (e.g. women need more preparation), while women in this study were more likely to attribute the decline to structural variables such as discrimination (Knoppers, 1992). Furthermore, some research in the interscholastic realm has suggested that women have left positions of coaching more rapidly than male colleagues, and these positions were eventually filled more frequently by men (Hart, Hasbrook, & Mathes, 1986). These findings lead researchers to believe that male ADs may exhibit a bias against women coaches with the belief that women are not as prepared as men to be coaches, thereby replacing these vacant positions with men. In intercollegiate sport, similar findings have been supported (Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2001). To increase the number of women in coaching, many programs have been designed around the country to address issues that have been considered areas of weakness for women in coaching, as an attempt to increase the pool of qualified women coaches. However, some researchers believe that these programs may also harm female coaches in that they provide a rationale or justification for assuming that the decline in the number of women coaches ultimately lies with the women (Stangl & Kane, 1991) by implicitly stating that women are less qualified than men and need additional training. However, research has demonstrated that female coaches are often more qualified than male coaches and tend to have higher educational degrees (e.g. master's or Ph.D's) than male coaches (Anderson

& Gill, 1983). Perhaps the focus should be more on external barriers limiting women coaches' access to sport rather than their internal weaknesses as coaches.

Between 2000-2002, Acosta and Carpenter (2002) found that women were hired for less than 10% of head coaching positions for women's athletic teams. Out of 361 head coaching jobs for women's teams, only 35 women were hired). This data does not address whether women applied for these positions, but does demonstrate that most of the open coaching positions continue to be filled by men as women leave. Furthermore, representation of women in head coaching positions for men's teams remains between two and three percent, where it has been since prior to Title IX. The male sports typically coached by women are 'individual sports' such as tennis, swimming and track' (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). If head coaching as an overall career in intercollegiate sport was considered, across genders (both men's and women's teams) then only one out of five head coaches is female (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010). Therefore, intercollegiate sport, as a whole, is still very much a male domain and suggests that this may contribute to the low numbers of females in coaching and leadership positions.

Interestingly, the percentage of female coaches at institutions where there is a male AD and no females in administrative roles decreased during the period of 2002 to 2008 across divisions I and II, but division III remained relatively consistent (Division I: 45.1% in 2002; 30.6% in 2008; Division II: 38.9% in 2002; 29.7% in 2008; Division III: 45.6% in 2002; 45.8% in 2008) (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). The authors of this research found that the percentage of female coaches in 2008 was higher when the AD was male but there were females in the administration (Division I: 43.9%; Division II: 32.2%; Division III: 45.2%) and these numbers were relatively unchanged between the period of 2002 to 2008 (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). The highest percentages of female coaches were found when the AD was female (Division I: 50%;

Division II: 38.9%; Division III: 49.2%) (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008). These findings suggest that the presence of women in administrative roles has a significant influence on the number of women coaches. Perhaps this is due to the leadership of the athletics administration, but may also be due to other structural factors such as discrimination, homologous reproduction and social stigma.

Discrimination and stereotypes. Discrimination may be affecting the number of women in the coaching profession. Two types of discrimination have been identified: 1) access discrimination, which prevents members of a particular group from entering a job, organization or profession; and 2) treatment discrimination which occurs when 'subgroup' members receive fewer resources, rewards and opportunities than they legitimately deserve on the basis of job related criteria (Greenhaus, Parasuraman, & Wormley, 1990). Access discrimination often occurs during the recruitment and hiring process. The hiring process can be vastly different for women's versus men's sports. Most ADs report that the process of searching for a coach of a women's team may include the circulation of the job posting, a review of resumes, interviews and then an offer is made (Fazioli, 2004). However, this is different from the hiring process for more prominent men's teams. ADs may engage in active recruiting, pursuing specific candidates, seeking them out, and offering competitive propositions rather than passively posting an announcement and waiting for qualified applicants to apply (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002; Fazioli, 2004). Acosta and Carpenter (2002) recall that when a head coach is sought for a men's team, the best coach is identified and paid whatever is needed to get him on campus. However, the AD may bemoan the nonexistence of female candidates for a coach of a women's team but will not seek out the most qualified person by offering a competitive salary to have a top female coach come to campus (Acosta & Carpenter, 2002). These different hiring strategies may result in male

coaches receiving higher salaries and athletic departments using the results of these vastly different recruiting strategies (i.e. recruiting the best male coaches to campus using networking and the lack of "highly qualified and lucrative" female coaches applying) as a justification for the deficiency in female coaches of women's sports.

This bias toward seeking out "more qualified" male coaches may also be internalized by female coaches and indirectly affect the attitudes and beliefs of these coaches. Thorngren (1990), found that current and former women coaches believed that gender bias existed in intercollegiate athletics, which resulted in the majority of the women exhibiting perfectionistic attitudes, striving constantly to prove themselves worthy, competent and better than average. The researcher found that these women believed that males were assumed by administrators, students and the community to be more knowledgeable in athletics than females and therefore, women must be extremely competent to be considered successful (Thorngren, 1990). The ADs interviewed in this study also stated that when hiring female coaches for women's programs, if a male candidate was perceived by the public to be even slightly better qualified than the female candidate, the AD would be subject to criticism for hiring the female candidate (Thorngren, 1990). This finding is significant as many researchers have suggested that female athletes and parents associate greater coaching competency with men regardless of whether or not there was factual evidence to prove this (Drago et al., 2005). This suggests the public may possess a gender bias against female coaches; a finding which impacts AD's and this has the potential to influence their hiring decisions.

Similarly, the women coaches interviewed by Thorngren (1990) revealed a fear of failure and perceived males to have a "safety net" when moving to new positions due to networking and perceived competence that male coaches have due to gender bias (Thorngren, 1990). This fear of

failure is also related to the women's perceptions that very few coaching opportunities were available to them, especially head coaching positions. The author speculates these factors may result in women not being able to remain in the entry levels for long period to gain experience and be considered for head coaching positions because assistants in female sports often receive limited financial support in the form of salaries or are volunteers. It is worth examining if these attitudes and beliefs still exist almost 20 years later.

Another source of discrimination may occur as a result of the homologous reproduction in hiring practices. Many researchers have noted that persons in authority positions (i.e. white men) are more prone to hiring individuals who are similar to them (i.e. men) as coaches (Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991). Homologous reproduction is the process whereby persons in a dominant position reproduce themselves based on physical and/or social characteristics (Stangl & Kane, 1991). The researchers examined 937 public high schools over three time periods (1974-75, 1981-82, and 1988-1989) and coded the gender of both the AD and head coaches as variables. It was found that in every time period, the percentage of female head coaches was significantly greater under a female athletic director than under a male athletic director (Stangl & Kane, 1991). Similarly, when the proportion of female to male head coaches in women's intercollegiate athletics was examined, there were fewer female head coaches under male athletic directors (Stahura & Greenwood, 2001).

Treatment discrimination may occur through the lack of possibilities for advancement, which has been found to affect gender differences in coaches' intentions to exit the profession and their career satisfaction (Knoppers et al., 1992). Weiss and Stevens (1993) also highlighted that time load and low perceived competence served as "costs" of the coaching profession for women which may be another reason why women coaches consider leaving the coaching.. In

considering this possibility, one may need to consider if there is a relationship between perceptions of opportunities for advancement and perceived competence. One can speculate that if female coach does not perceive future possibilities for advancement she may view her abilities less favorably, as well.

Discrimination has also been suggested to affect areas such as the individual's work in the non-sporting workplace, job assignment, development opportunities and support from supervisors or superiors, and the ability to perform job activities (Burke, 1991; James, 2000; Button, 2001). This suggests that the individual's ability to develop as a professional may be impacted by treatment discrimination received in the workplace. Furthermore, social support in the workplace may also be affected. This may also influence perceived competence, perceptions of opportunities for advancement and subsequently desire to remain in the profession/organization.

Inglis and colleagues (1996) examined treatment discrimination in relation to the experiences of coaches in college athletics and determined factors that impact retention. The factors examined were: 1) work-life balance and conditions – the individual's personal time demands including, emotional comfort and stress at home, and work stress influence how work is internalized by the individual (e.g. supervisor and staff support at work and good communication); 2) credit and collegial support – status and acknowledgement at work and the roles of the individual's colleagues (e.g. acknowledgment of the coach's contribution as well as support and similarity to the coach); 3) Inclusivity – a work environment that is free from harassment both sexual and racial, accepting of all sexual orientations, support of differences and gender equity (Inglis et al., 1996). The authors note that inclusivity is a factor that has far reaching impact on the work environment and acceptance of diversity in the workplace. Inglis

and colleagues (1996), development an instrument using the above factors that can be useful to human resource professionals and administrators in understanding factors contributing to retention, however, the instrument may not account for other variables such as networking, and mentoring.

Other studies have noted that discrimination in athletics plays a significant role in women's decisions to leave coaching. Inglis and colleagues (2000) interviewed four American and seven Canadian women who have left careers in intercollegiate athletics as either coaches or administrators. Participants left sports completely or were still involved in higher education as scholars or administrators outside of athletics. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and focused on areas such as "experiences in administrative and coaching work environments, aspects of work supportive of women's experiences, aspects of work non-supportive of women's experiences and changes or improvements that could be made" to address these aspects (Inglis, et al., 2000, p. 6). Overall, of the women interviewed in this study, four of the women sexual harassment as a problem in their work setting (Inglis, et al, 2000). The participants recalled that the harassing actions came from the staff and male athletes within the department and was directed towards these women coaches and their female athletes. The coaches recalled that in some cases a "gag order" was placed on the female athletes who were harassed and in another, the issue was "brushed under the carper" by higher administrative staff at the university (Inglis, et al., 2000).

Similarly, Kamphoff and Gill (2006), found that the patriarchal structure of college athletics contributes to the experiences of former coaches and their decisions to end their coaching careers. The study describes gender discrimination and the position of male coaches in intercollegiate athletics as one of the main influences in career termination. Furthermore, all of

the participants interviewed by Kamphoff and Gill (2006), discussed the use of negative recruiting athletes and reported that heterosexual female caoches use male coaches strategies to negatively recruit athletes (i.e. insinuation that another coach may be homosexual such to persuade an athlete to attend their college). Kamphoff and Gill (2006), speculates that many of the women interviewed almost felt that men were responsible for the changes in women's athletes and some believed that this led to women leaving coaching.

Overcoming Stigma

Women's involvement in sport has also been affected by issues such as homophobia and the labeling of participants as lesbians (Griffin, 1987). Due to the traditional definition of sport as a male activity, women who enter competitive sport have been assumed to violate gender norms established for women. This assumption of violating gender norms is based on the presumed dissonance between athleticism and femininity which results in questions about the sexuality of women in sport (Griffin, 1987; Lenskyj, 1991). Many have speculated that accusations and innuendos directed at women in sport have successfully been used to discourage women from entry into sport (Lenskyj, 1990; Griffin, 1992; Birrell & Theberge, 1994). Team sports and activities that require aggressive and physical skills are more likely to be labeled as "lesbian sports" than individual sports or physical activities that are less strenuous (Lenskyj, 1986). Women who seriously pursue athletics or coaching at higher competitive levels also experience greater scrutiny in terms of the "lesbian label" (Boutilier & SanGiovanni, 1983).

Much evidence exists to support growing concern about homophobia's influence on the hiring and firing of coaches and the recruitment of college athletes (Thorngren,1990; Wellman & Blinde, 1997b). In this study, many of the coaches interviewed indicated that their sexual preference was inquired about during the hiring process either directly or through questioning

regarding marriage. Coaches' report shying away from coaching due to homophobia present in sport (Wellman & Blinde 1997b). Additionally, male administrators may be resistant to lesbian coaches (Wellman & Blinde, 1997b). These findings all suggest that homophobia and heterosexism exist within sport and the effects can be significant.

Blinde and Taub (1992) explored how homophobia disempowered women athletes and led athletes to engage in stigma management strategies (or "heteronorming" as described by Kamphoff, 2006), in an attempt to conceal and control the impact of the "lesbian" label; which included concealing athletic identities or accentuating feminine qualities to avoid the lesbian label (see also, Thorngren, 1990; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a). Other management strategies included: hiring males to provide a "balanced" atmosphere, single coaches living alone and selecting casual companions carefully and sending male assistant coaches for recruiting (Thorngren, 1990; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a).

These management strategies suggest that this label puts strain on the lives of women coaches. Research suggests that this is a significant source of stress for many women athletes and has also affected female coaches. The research on the impact of the lesbian label on women coaches in sport is limited, however, the National Collegiate Athletic Association (Women's Athletic Survey, 1991) found that three quarters of women coaches and administrators felt that stereotyping such as the "lesbian label" of women in sport can act as a barrier to attracting and retaining women in athletic careers regardless of the coach's sexual orientation. Homophobia has been identified as a significant source of stress for women coaches and can impact several domains of their lives and careers, including the hiring process, recruitment of athletes and their social lives (Thorngren, 1990). Research suggests that "negative recruiting," or the use of suggesting or questioning the presence of lesbians on opposing teams, the sexual orientation or

marital status of the coaching staff of rival recruiting schools as a recruiting tactic, is prevalent and a major concern for women in coaching (Wellman & Blinde, 1997b).

Perceptions of parents and female athletes The discrimination women coaches experience may not just be limited to administrators. As stated earlier, women coaches must overcome perceptions of incompetence related to their gender. This phenomenon is not just limited to other coaches or administrators, but can also be found in the perceptions of the athletes and their parents. Parkhouse and Williams (1986) asked high school basketball players to rate hypothetical male and female coaches on their sport knowledge, their own preference about playing for a man or woman and future success of the coach. Male and female basketball players preferred male coaches in all three areas. Williams and Parkhouse (1988), found equal ratings by female basketball players for both male and female coaches but these ratings occurred when these athletes played for a female coach with a winning record and a male coach with a losing team. These findings suggest that female athletes may hold stereotypical beliefs regarding perceptions of women coaches' competency, suggesting a gender bias toward male coaches which may discourage them from becoming coaches themselves (Sisley, Weiss, Barber & Ebbeck, 1990). These factors may also play a role in the recruiting process, with opposing male coaches using this gender bias in female athletes to suggest that playing for a woman is "different" and questioning a woman's competency solely based on her gender (Drago et al., 2005).

More recently, Drago and colleagues (2005) held focus groups with collegiate female student athletes to determine their coaching preferences and beliefs. The researchers found that the most female athletes reported desiring a coach who lead with authority and required respect from their athletes. Overall, the student athletes felt that male coaches were more effective at this

skill. The authors speculate that perhaps they gain this authority by their male status (Drago et al., 2005).

Athletes also identified a need for clear and professional boundaries between the athlete and the coach (Drago et al., 2005).The authors speculated that this desire for boundaries between the coach and athletes may be due to the perception of women coaches' gender roles (i.e. more sensitive, nurturing, child-rearing) which may fuel the misconception that women coaches would not be able to separate their roles as mother/nurturer from coach to be authoritative, and thereby, be less effective and unable to demand respect.

A unique finding from the Cage report by Drago and colleagues was that the most of the female athletes interviewed favored male coaches over female coaches, with the most common reason being they perceived that men were more successful in commanding respect (Drago, et al., 2005). The authors note that most of these student athletes had minimal to no exposure to female coaches, and therefore, developed these ideals for a coach primarily from their early experiences with male coaches (Drago, et al., 2005). These early experiences may include limited exposure to women coaches in their sport during developmental and elite levels of the sport or discussion of the competency of women by male coaches. Other areas these female athletes expressed concern for concerned the perceptions that women coaches would be emotional and create "drama" on the team. Contradictory to this belief was the desire to feel emotionally supported by a coach, but the athletes did not desire this from the head coach since this could affect the athletes' ability to accept feedback from the coach (Drago, et al., 2005).

These findings suggest that perceptions of gender roles and athletes' schema of the 'ideal coach' may in fact hinder positive coach athlete relationships between the female athlete and the female coach. This finding warrants further examination to determine exactly how this may

affect the female coach's work experiences. A limitation of this study is the size of these focus groups which involved only forty one student athletes in total and therefore may not be generalizable beyond this sample. However as the authors note, these findings are troubling since athletes may select male coaches over female coaches as a result of the schema they have developed, therefore, universities who hire women coaches may be at a competitive disadvantage in the recruitment process (Drago, et al., 2005).

Possible explanations for these negative perceptions of female coaches can be found in the work by Heilman and Haynes (2005). These authors found that working together with men in traditionally male domains can be detrimental for women in terms of the perceptions of their contributions and abilities. Specifically, it was found that women were perceived more negatively unless there was specific information about the female team member's individual performance excellence, the female team member's contribution to the outcome was irrefutable because of the task structure or there was definitive information about the excellence of the woman's past performance effectiveness. When this was not the case, women were thought to be generally less competent, less influential in the outcome and less apt to have taken a leadership role than male counterparts (Heilman & Haynes, 2005). This suggests that women in coaching may be perceived as less competent, less influential and have less of a leadership role than male counterparts (i.e. assistant coaches) unless specific details regarding contributions are available. This highlights the difficulty that women coaches may have in establishing credibility with administrators, athletes and parents.

Work-life Balance

Time demands have also been found to be a legitimate concern for female coaches, especially at the high school level (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Women who leave coaching

positions often cite the primary reasons as declines in the amount of time they have to spend with family and friends, are deficient of financial incentives, stress, and the presence of alternative professional opportunities (Pastore, 1991; Weiss & Stevens, 1993; Lowry & Lovett, 1997).

In sport, a demanding organizational culture has been established as the norm, and includes increased demands on time such as long hours, excessive travel and "face time" (Bruening & Dixon, 2008; Dixon & Bruening, 2007). As a result, those who work long hours, and travel constantly for competition and recruiting are viewed as ideal workers. Women with full-time jobs and preschool aged children have been faced with not only negotiating child care but also domestic help in order to manage their daily demands (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). For women, working non-standard hours with preschool aged children has a significant effect on their ability to meet their work and family demands as established by society. However, this is not always the case for men as they are not perceived by society to be the primary care giver to the children in the family (Presser, 1995). As two employed parent families negotiate daytime and evening/weekend care, the quality time couples and families spend together can be greatly reduced in many cases (e.g. mother is responsible for day care and father evening/weekend care if the woman is a coach). This often leads to less satisfaction for the time spent away from employment than they would experience if that time was spent together with the family (Bruening & Dixon, 2007; 2008). This lack of satisfaction has been found to impact well-being characterized by negative health outcomes (e.g. stress-related heart, gastrointestinal and neurotic disorders; Bohley & Tilley, 1990; Coffey et al., 1988). This increase in stress and decrease in satisfaction may be one factor that influences a woman's decision to leave the coaching profession as it may contribute to feelings of staleness or burnout since the woman may not be experiencing quality or satisfactory time with her family and partner.

In terms of motherhood, Bruening and Dixon (2008), also note that the women they interviewed felt strongly that the collegiate athletic system was setup for men. Five of the fourteen NCAA division I intercollegiate coaches interviewed felt that although they were successful in this male-model, they also felt that they were successful due to their work during their "childless" years when they spent more time building their program and working extensive hours (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). Spousal support was also listed as integral to their success with thirteen coaches noting that their spouse/partner's support was extensive and at times included sacrificing part or all of their own careers in the process (Bruening & Dixon, 2008).

Bruening and Dixon (2008), noted that Division I head coaches who were also mothers, reported that after the birth of their first child, they typically found continued support from their spouse/partner but that administrator support varied. Some of the difficulties with administration occurred in regard to handling the work responsibilities concerning the birth of the child. A few women reported feeling pressure to prevent any disruption to their work schedule and pace due to the birth of their children, leading to work and family stress (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). All of the women reported not considering the sacrifices associated with coaching until after the birth of their first child at which time the need for support from their families and employers became vital (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). The researchers found that those women who were supported by the administration remained at their current university and within athletics, however, those who lacked this type of support chose to either leave the university for a more supportive environment or leave coaching altogether (Bruening & Dixon, 2008; Dixon, & Bruening, 2007). These findings regarding career alteration suggest that support of family roles as care giver and mother is important to female coaches and needs further examination to confirm that this is a critical factor in their retirement from the coaching profession as suggested by Drago and colleagues

(2005). However, the researchers recommend comparing women who have left the coaching profession to those who are still coaching, to identify differences in work-life balance experiences (Bruening & Dixon, 2008).

Research suggests that work-life balance issues also resulted in adjustments to the coaches' staff and other responsibilities (Bruening & Dixon, 2007). Participants in this study revealed the various strategies employed to manage their responsibilities as a mother and head coach including: incorporating coworkers such as assistant coaches and directors of operation into their support network in emergency situations, hiring family-oriented assistant coaches, and developing more balanced relationships with athletes (Bruening & Dixon, 2007). However, even with these modifications, the coaches still felt increased pressure to manage their dual roles within the confines of the existing athletic culture and not to ask for accommodations to their roles as wife or mother (Bruening & Dixon, 2007). This rigid athletic culture may cause coaching mothers to develop strategies to manage the work-life conflict they experience but still face extra pressures that male coaches may not necessarily experience. Therefore, this is another factor that requires further investigation.

Pastore (1991) examined the reasons why NCAA Division I male and female coaches of women's athletics teams enter and leave the profession. A total of 192 surveys were completed and the sample consisted of 102 female coaches and 90 male coaches. The participants completed questionnaires requesting information in the following areas: demographics, reasons for entering and leaving the coaching profession. The majority of coaches (over 50% or higher) agreed or strongly agreed with the following reasons for leaving the profession: "decrease in time to spend with family and friends," "lack of financial incentive" and "increased intensity in recruiting student-athletes." Interestingly, there were no significant gender differences in any of

the responses to the 12 factors for leaving the profession. However, both males and females selected “decrease in the amount of time to spend with family and friends” as their main reason for leaving the profession and this reason was indicated at the highest frequency. The findings presented by Pastore (1991) provide a different perspective to other studies completed during this time period in which female coaches. These other authors cited the “old boys’ club” and “time constraints due to family duties” whereas male administrators stated time constraints as the reasons for the declining numbers of female coaches (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; 1988). The range of findings during this time period suggests that there is more than one reason for the decline of women coaches.

Other research has found similar themes with different coaching populations, for example family factors were statistically significant reasons for women leaving the coaching profession, while men reported “apathetic student-athletes as their main reason for leaving high school coaching (Fredell, 1987); and Pastore (1991) found that female coaches of women’s teams at two-year colleges rated the burden of administrative duties and recruiting as the main reasons for leaving the profession, but males, not females, chose decreased time with family and friends and lack of financial incentives. Although Pastore’s (1991) finding regarding family and time constraints is important, all the research stated above failed to examine the factors of marital status and parental status in their research.

Although appearing to be counter intuitive, the stress placed on single coaches to sacrifice work-life balance seems to be as high as for married coaches. Thorngren’s interviews with intercollegiate coaches found that single women often lacked personal support systems, and felt that coaching would be easier if there was someone to share personal tasks like laundry, cooking and home care (Thorngren, 1990). Additionally, these women felt that opportunities to

meet people were limited due to time constraints, whereas men typically found friends in the males in the athletic departments. Lastly, these women reported that a likely reason to leave coaching was due to being unable to find a comfortable balance between their personal and professional lives (Thorngren, 1990). This battle for work-life balance differs to the nature of issues experienced by married couples. For married coaches, the pressure to leave coaching came from social expectations outside of their marriage. One coach stated that she was asked when she was going to quit coaching and start a family, citing that there is an expectation that married female coaches, regardless of success level, should leave coaching and raise children. However, male coaches are rarely questioned about this (Thorngren, 1990).

In summary, the stress of maintaining a balance between work, family and/or personal demands may have a significant impact on women coaches' ability to negotiate demands. Furthermore, work-life stressors require significant negotiation of roles in both aspects, and the development of strategies to handle this struggle. However, the specific impact that the negotiation of these demands has on intentions to remain in coaching still needs further examination both quantitatively and qualitatively.

Drop out, Leaving or Switching Careers

The writing of Pastore and colleagues (1996) and Inglis and colleagues (1996) (as discussed in Bias and Stereotyping section), can also be used to sum up work experiences and a great deal of the turnover literature outside of the sporting context. The retention framework identified factors that may affect coach retention (work-life balance conditions; collegial support and recognition of accomplishments; and inclusivity based on individual differences). This model provided consistent and systematic theoretical description regarding the experiences that may impact the work experiences that influence coaches' desires to stay in a position. Pastore

and associates (1999) examined the importance of each factor in a confirmatory factor analyses, but only mediocre support was found for the Iglis et al. (1996), retention model. The retention model contains a conceptual framework, however, further examination is necessary to link the factors to actual relevant work outcomes.

Cunningham and Sagas (2003), examined these gaps by investigating the connection between experiences, and intentions to leave coaching in the assistant coaches of women's teams. These authors developed a framework based on the research by Inglis and colleagues (1996) who identified the factors that were found to be important in the retention of intercollegiate coaches. These dimensions are important as they may shed light on what aspects of commitment might influence coaches decisions to remain in, or to leave coaching. Questionnaires were distributed to 368 first assistant coaches of women's teams within universities in the seven Atlantic conferences selected. Ninety percent of the participants were employed as full-time assistant coaches and a total of 59.4% of the sample consisted of women (n=101). There were no significant differences between men and women in work experiences regarding the retentions factors measured (i.e. work-life balance conditions), suggesting that female coaches described work similarly to male coaches. Additionally, there were no gender differences in organizational turnover intentions (Cunningham & Sagas, 2003). The authors also found that women rated being in an accepting work environment as more important, however the authors also suggest that what is more important for women is the extent to which these women experience and accepting and inclusive work environment (Cunningham & Sagas, 2003). Thus the development of accommodating and proactive diversity management policies by athletic departments may be helpful in creating more inclusive work environments.

Parks and colleagues found that women tend to be content with the discrepancies in pay and work demands in vocations such as institutions of higher education or collegiate athletics where men are most often found, and in their study of ADs, where women received less salary than men (Parks, Russel, Wood, Roberton & Shewokis, 1995). In all of these areas, job satisfaction for men and women was comparable (Park, et al., 1995). This may be due to women viewing themselves as "pioneers" in a traditionally male domain or may be unaware of the inequity in salary (Park et al., 1995). Further research is needed to examine the "paradox of the contented working woman" perspective. It is possible that the experiences of women coaches may be different when contrasted to coaches of men's teams (Cunningham & Sagas, 2003). Lowry and Lovett (1997) also found that the existence of other work prospects may serve to be a major motivator for female coaches' decisions to leave the sport. Perhaps a profession where women's equality is easily accessible is more appealing? Further investigation may be warranted to examine the influence of available alternative professions on leaving coaching. One variable that will not be assessed in the proposed study but that influences women coaches career development is that of burnout.

Burnout. It has been speculated that coach burnout has significant implications for the development of experienced coaches and coaching expertise, since early losses of promising coaches affects the profession negatively (Kosa, 1990). The effects of burnout may result in talented young women coaches leaving coaching due to excessive work demands and difficulty maintaining work-life balance, and therefore, a loss in experience and expertise.

Burnout is defined as "a state of fatigue or frustration brought about by a devotion to a cause, way of life, or relationship that failed to produce the expected reward" (Freudenberger, 1980, p. 13). The multidimensional conceptualization of burnout includes "three dimensions:

emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced performance accomplishment" (Maslach & Jackson, 1984, as cited in Goodger, et al., 2007, p. 128;). Schaufeli and Buunk (2003), also identify five categories of symptoms that have been associated with burnout: emotional, physical, behavioral, motivational and cognitive.

The main models used to describe burnout within the coaching professionals has consisted of 1) Smith's cognitive affective model (Smith, 1986), and 2) a commitment based model of burnout (Schmidt & Stein, 1991). The cognitive affective model suggests that burnout results from chronic stress and parallels the stress process. Specifically, this model suggests that stress manifests through the relationship between situational factors, cognitive appraisal of the interaction between the person and situation, physiological responses and behavioral responses (Smith, 1986). These factors are then in turn influenced by motivation and personality factors. According to Smith, an individual may consider the rewards and costs of coaching and evaluate them with the expectations of the activity and attractiveness of other activities. The stress comes from the imbalance between the demands and coping resources as well as the perception of the demands as a threat. Thus, the individual's stress level is dependant on the perception of the situation as being negative (Smith, 1986). The greater the time period that stress is experienced, the more likely it is that the individual will experience burnout according to Smith (1986).

This stress-induced perspective is also central to the only coach-specific theory of burnout (Kelley, Eklund, & Ritter-Taylor, 1999). Kelley (1994) examined the stress model in NCAA division III and NAIA softball and baseball coaches who coach and serve in another capacity in the athletics department or university (e.g. sports information officer and head baseball coach) at the start and end of the season. A gender by time analysis of variance revealed that women scored higher on difficulty with coaching issues (such as managing dual roles of

coach and administrator), emotional exhaustion and perceived stress at the end of the season than at the beginning of the season when compared to men (Kelley, 1994). Additionally, all coaches scored higher in coaching issues and depersonalization at the end of the season than at the beginning of the season. These gender differences may have resulted from the decreased support, increased strain from work-life balance and perhaps even treatment discrimination experienced by women coaches. The authors suggest that the differences may lie in role socialization and the different demands and expectations placed on women coaches (Kelley, 1994; Vealey, Udry, Zimmerman, & Soliday, 1992).

Frey (2007), examined the cognitive affective model of burnout in NCAA division I collegiate head coaches. Results of the study suggest that the perceived appeal of an alternative activity, intrusion of coaching on work-life balance, a decrease in their passion for coaching, inconsistent and unsuccessful performances and negative affect were the sources of stress that increased the odds of coaches deciding to leave coaching (Frey, 2007). This finding was found to be similar and consistent with Smith's (1986) model which stated that coaches may consider leaving coaching if an imbalance existed between the costs and rewards of coaching (Frey, 2007). While this finding is significant, it is not clear if the other stressors such as bias, stereotyping, and the lack of mentoring also contributes to these sources of stress.

A systematic review of burnout in sport revealed that psychological correlates of coach burnout consisted of a positive association with perceived stress, and negative association with commitment (Schmidt & Stein, 1991; Goodger et al., 2007). The lack of depth in the psychological correlates of coach burnout suggests that more examination is needed in this area. However, when demographic variables were examined, the literature revealed six demographic correlates of coach burnout including gender, age, marital status, experience and type of sport.

These findings suggest that gender differences are significant in coach burnout, and specifically that women are more prone to burnout due to emotional exhaustion. However, other situational and psychological factors were not examined in these studies. Similarly, no literature has discussed the role that the potential barriers and challenges identified in the previous section may have on the burnout of female coaches. Therefore, further investigation is warranted. Additionally, in the coach burnout literature, there is a notable absence in the examination of elite coaches (i.e. professional/Olympic level coaches), however, there has been substantial work with collegiate and high school coaches (Goodger, et al., 2007).

The "healthy-worker effect" is another important factor as many studies in burnout may not actually consist of participants who are experiencing burnout or who have experienced burnout in the past (Goodger et al., 2009). Schaufeli and Enzmann (1998) suggest that this may be because individuals who are familiar with the symptoms and effects of burnout may have vacated the coaching profession already and therefore may not be recruited as a participant in a study. Therefore, future studies should include more purposeful sampling to enhance understanding and generalizability of findings in coach burnout, this could be accomplished by selecting coaches who are leaving the sport (after their recent season, e.g. summer) and assessing burnout with these coaches in addition to data points within the season.

In an examination of burnout in male coaches in the Premier league for women and male coaches in the Premier league for men in Sweden, it was found that approximately three quarters of the coaches in the Premier league for women, compared to a quarter of the coaches in the Premier league for men reported moderate to high levels of emotional exhaustion (Hjalm et al., 2007). However, 50% of these coaches of the women's league scored high on depersonalization compared to 38.5% of men's league coaches. Further, 30% of the women's league coaches

report problems related to personal accomplishment compared to 69% of the men's league coaches. Additionally, Hjalm and colleagues (2007) found that one of the possible explanations for this result may be that only 10% of the coaches of teams in the women's league held full time positions, contrasted the coaches of teams in the men's league. Additionally, the men's league also had an average of six support staff personnel, whereas the women's league averaged four (2007). Furthermore, the potential for leadership conflict occurring between the male coach and female athlete is speculated to be a factor that may contribute to interpersonal conflict and therefore emotional exhaustion by the authors (Hjalm, et al., 2007). While this study provides information regarding elite coaches which is lacking in the burnout literature, it only examined the experiences of male coaches coaching female athletes. Although these male coaches of female athletes experienced similar environmental obstacles (such as limited support staff) typical to the female coach's experiences, further examination using female coaches is warranted.

The Schmidt and Stein's (1991), commitment model is an alternative approach to understanding burnout which has proposed an investment and commitment paradigm. This model contains some similarities to the social exchange theory (Kelly & Thibaut, 1951). The sport commitment model was developed for use in predicting environments that may foster sport participation, dropout or burnout (Schmidt & Stein, 1991). The model suggests that individuals with high commitment remain in sport due to their perceived satisfaction as established by the cost and benefits of participating in the activity, the presence of attractive alternatives, and resources previously invested in the activity (Schmidt & Stein, 1991). Thus, individuals who experience a decrease in the cost and available alternative activities along with an increase in investment, satisfaction and rewards may remain in the activity for enjoyment reasons; however,

those with high commitment in the activity who remain for reasons excluding enjoyment may be more prone to burnout. These individuals may feel trapped and remain in the activity because they feel they have to (Raedeke, 1997). This model states that leaving the activity occurs when individuals experience a decrease in investment and an increase in attractive alternative activities (Schmidt & Stein, 1991). However, those in burnout may experience an increase in sport investment but a decrease in perceived alternatives to the activity. This model has been used extensively with athletes and has received much support from the literature (Raedeke, 1997; Schmidt & Stein, 1991; Weis & Weiss, 2003).

Career Development for Women

Research by Pastore (1991) has found that women may have different reasons for entering the coaching profession than men. Specifically, these NCAA division I female coaches in their study felt stronger than male coaches about "helping female athletes reach their athletic potential," "becoming a role model" and the "opportunity to work with advanced and motivated athletes." This finding suggests that identifying what motivates women to remain in coaching could be essential to developing programs to encourage female athletes to become coaches since these reasons vary across gender, and female athletes may not always view coaching as a possible career path. However, women coaches who enter the profession for these aspirational reasons may have the ability to motivate their own female athletes to become coaches as well. Drago and colleagues (2005), also examined career interests among NCAA division I female athletes and found that half of the student athletes in their study expressed an interest to coach in the future. However, many of these athletes were uncertain about the career path for attaining this goal, and were characterized by doubt and uncertainty about the field (Drago et al., 2005). Many of these athletes also expressed disinterest in coaching at the Division I level due to the

time demands and perceive sacrifices of the position. One such perceived sacrifice was the concern about combining coaching and family life (Drago et al., 2005). This suggests that the female athletes' intentions to enter the coaching profession involve complicated issues. One variable that could influence career development significantly is the presence of mentoring.

Mentoring. Mentoring is defined as helping, advising, teaching, counseling, instructing and guiding another person (Marshall, 2001, p. 1). A mentor is described as someone who is dedicated to providing mobility and support to the mentee through the use of their own advanced experience and knowledge (Kram, 1985). Caffarella and Olson (1993), add that mentoring involves an intense caring relationship that promotes both professional and personal development (Caffarella & Olson, 1993). Weaver and Chelladurai (1999), developed a mentoring model outlining four key elements of effective mentoring relationships: 1) mentor and protégé characteristics which lead to mentor-protégé compatibility; 2) career functions related to sponsorship, feedback, knowledge development and protection from too many responsibilities; 3) psychosocial roles including modeling, approval and affirmation, counsel and camaraderie, trust and support, and 4) outcomes of the mentoring relationship such as increased salary, job satisfaction and career mobility. For sports organizations, the use of informal mentoring can be a inexpensive way to provide professional growth opportunities for coaches (Marshall, 2001).

When mentoring is examined, it is revealed that those with informal mentors experience increased career commitment, mobility, satisfaction, and increased optimistic perspectives on their job than those without (Ragins, et al. 2000). It is suggested that mentors may cushion the coach from prejudice, and help the female mentee overcome and avoid barriers to progression in the organization (Bower, Hums & Keedy, 2006; Sagas & Cunningham, 2004). Possible reasons for these findings may be that mentors have access to a vast amount of professional experience to

provide to the mentee. Therefore, the protégé has access to this information through the mentor and may develop faster than if she did not have access to this knowledge through the mentor with the added support for her development (Roed, 1999). Some research suggests that women need legitimacy and authority to move forward in administration, which, when tied to a calculated mentor they are more able to obtain, while men already have legitimacy and authority because they are men (Burt, 1998). Furthermore, it is suggested that the best strategy for coach development is to encourage the protégé to use the advice and actions of a mentor (Salmela, 1996); young coaches have indicated that a formalized and structured mentoring program is believed to be the most important factor in coach development (Bloom, Salmela, & Schinke, 1995).

Reviews of mentoring in business organizations have established that mentoring programs help women and minorities in management to move up, while recognizing that women experience more personal, family, and organizational barriers to their upward progression when compared to their male counterparts (Blake-Beard, 2001). Mentoring is also thought to be vital to women's career progression and may increase women's career outcomes more so than for men (Tharenou, 2005). Some of these barriers in business organizations include: gender discrimination, male hierarchies, and lack of informal networks that assist advancement (Tharenou, 2005). Many of these same qualities seem to exist in sport.

Gender differences in mentoring have been examined in a study surveying public and private employees in Australia (Tharenou, 2005). A moderated hierarchical regression analysis was used and results revealed that male mentors did not provide increased career support than female mentors, and female mentors provided increased psychosocial support to female protégés (Tharenou, 2005). Furthermore, this study demonstrated that career support from mentoring can

help women move forward compared to men, while psychosocial support from mentoring does not facilitate women's upward progression more so than men and may in fact impede mobility (Tharenou, 2005). This study has obvious limitations due to the lack of generalizability beyond finance or business service industries. This is a curious finding since evidence suggests that psychosocial support is helpful in the mentoring relationship but may have limitations; however, in the sporting context this requires further examination. Additionally, the authors suggest that psychosocial support does not help the mentee's hierarchical advancement, this also requires further examination. Another limitation may be that women are more inclined to report receiving psychosocial support than men. Therefore the help men receive from their mentors is not necessarily tied to their progression as that reported by women (Tharenou, 2005).

Furthermore, it is suggested that the best way to grow as a coach is to use the support, actions and advice of mentoring relationship (Salmela, 1996); young coaches have indicated that a formalized and structured mentoring program is believed to be the most important factor in coach development (see Bloom, et al, 1995). Other sport specific research has examined the concepts of mentoring more implicitly. Previous coaches and athletic directors from both Canada and the US were interviewed about women's experiences in athletics, and the concept of multiple realities emerged (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000). Specifically, several women indicated that the empowerment emerged from various networks in athletics (i.e. mentors). Several women in this study discussed the need for role models and disparities associated with women's work. This highlights the question of how much power do women coaches have in intercollegiate athletics?

Knoppers (1992), suggested that power is described as being able to use resources and support (or access to mentors who possess this power) (Kanter, 1977, as cited by Knoppers,

1992). While those with decreased access to power experience decreased satisfaction and may leave the profession. In the context of coaching, women may feel less supported in their roles and have very little access to resources due to the shortage of mentoring in coaching; and may, therefore, view athletics as an unsupportive environment that does not appeal as a long-term career choice.

Weaver and Chelladurai (2002) suggested that women more than men perceived mentors as being less willing to engage in a mentoring relationship because women must often participate in cross-gender mentoring relationships if they wish to have a mentor in coaching. Research examining gender similarities in mentoring has demonstrated inconsistent results, and most of this research has not been in the sporting context. It has been suggested that gender dissimilar mentees receive significantly less psychosocial and career mentoring than those with same-gender mentors (Avery, Tonidandel, Phillips, 2008). However, the researchers also found that this correspondence of gender dissimilarity with lower levels of career mentoring did not occur when the mentor was a white man. Therefore, these results suggest that the power perspective (i.e. the observed power imbalance favoring white men in US corporations), makes white men more capable of providing career support to protégés than women or minorities since white men have more power in these settings (Ragins, 1997).

One finding suggests, tangentially, that having a positive mentor may also impact women's perceptions of their own ability to remain in the profession, thereby impacting intentions to remain in the profession. Kamphoff and Gill (2006), suggest that due to the lack of women in the coaching profession, female athletes may be less likely to envision themselves as coaches. Additionally, Sagas and colleagues have found that 15% of male assistant coaches compared to 68% of the female assistant coaches expected to exit coaching by age 45 (Sagas,

Cunningham & Ashley, 2000). These findings imply that female assistant coaches do not view coaching as a full time, long-term career option. The researchers in both of these studies speculated that the barriers and discrimination listed previously (e.g. hiring discrimination, lack of work-life balance, and a lack of financial incentives) may all contribute to these beliefs. However, very little research has been done to examine if a positive female mentor may assist in changing assistant coaches' beliefs about the coaching profession. It can be argued, that having a successful woman coach as a role model might help a young assistant coach navigate the discrimination and other life-balance difficulties.

Gogol (2002) suggested that head coaches empower their assistant coaches to use the networking systems of the head coach and their own networks to help find head coaching positions. Furthermore, when examining career interest in athletes, Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) found that female athletes on teams with female head coaches demonstrated a greater interest in coaching compared to female athletes with male coaches. This finding further emphasizes the importance of positive role modeling and mentorship in the career development of female athletes and young female coaches; however, much of this research is outdated and has not examined the impact of mentoring on all factors that may motivate a woman coach to leave the profession.

Recently, Bower (2009), conducted a meta-ethnography of the effective mentoring relationships with women in sport and analyzed fifteen articles within the Weaver and Chelladurai (1999) mentoring model framework as described earlier. Bower (2009) found support for the Weaver and Chelladurai mentoring model and also suggested that informal mentoring benefited the protégé's career progression and social emotional factors more than the female mentees of formal mentors. This study identified the need of female role models in upper

level, leadership positions in sport. The author suggested that women may fear mentoring due to a) a fear that the protégé may fail; b) the time required, and, c) concern about the protégés surpassing them. Although this article was the first of its' kind in the area of sport, many of the articles analyzed in the meta-analysis examined the fitness industry and sport sciences, and a limited number of the studies directly examined mentoring with coaches. Therefore, additional research is necessary to examine the impact of mentoring on coaches and it may be necessary to examine if mentoring may influence the retention of coaches.

Social Exchange Theory and Coaching

Social exchange theory suggests that behavior is driven by a desire to maximize positive experiences and minimize negative experiences through social interactions, which elicits costs and rewards (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959). These rewards may include self-satisfaction, success, money and trophies, while the costs may include time invested, anxiety, and failure. Additionally, the decision to remain involved in an activity may also be determined by the comparison between outcomes is compared with potential outcomes of alternative activities (; Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Therefore, coaches may decide to remain in coaching if they perceive that there are more rewards than costs to their profession and they believe that the outcomes of coaching are greater than the potential outcomes that may come with alternative activities.

The use of social exchange theory has been limited in the sporting context. Johns, Lindner and Wolko (1990) examined attrition in female competitive gymnastics using social exchange theory. The authors examined the constructs that weighed the costs and returns of personal effort, which may account for adolescents' involvement and withdrawal from sport. The mixed-methodology provided data from a survey and interviews that partially supported social

exchange theory (Johns, Lindner, & Wolko, 1990). First, the gymnasts reported appreciating their experience in sport, had a positive opinion of themselves and considered other's opinions to be positive as well. Secondly, gymnasts withdrew from gymnastics to spend more time on things like being with friends, hobbies, and shopping; and, finally, the data suggested that injury was not a primary cause for drop out but may have been associated with the decision. The authors suggested that initially, the benefits and costs of participation are equitable, but as the participant gets older, an imbalance is often perceived (Johns, et al., 1990). Johns and colleagues suggested that it is this imbalance that encourages social efforts to be made to gain new social rewards as alternative status and sport cultures draw the young athletes away from the demands of competitive gymnastics.

More recently social exchange theory was used to predict persistence or withdrawal in youth and adult French female handballers (n=488) (Guiller, Sarrazin, Carpenter, Touilloud, Cury, 2002). The study aimed to examine the antecedents of pleasure by highlighting the key factors in the costs/benefits analysis, and to test the sport commitment model based on social exchange theory hypotheses, using structural equation modeling analysis to predict actual dropout behavior. The commitment model is hypothesized to consist of four previous circumstances: 1) athlete's costs/benefits analysis, 2) perceived attractiveness of the best accessible alternative to sport participation, 3) investment, and 4) social constraints (Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993). The results of this study revealed that female handball players who left the sport experienced less commitment to the sport, in addition to higher perceptions of costs by perceiving decreased competentency, autonomy, decreased relations to their team, and decreased in progress and support from their coach (Guillet, et al., 2002). The generalizability of the findings in this study to male or elite athletes needs further

investigation. This study does support the idea that when psychological needs (e.g. being around friends, skill) are not met, the costs exceed the benefits to involvement and athletes leave the sport. This finding is useful in youth sport settings, and although it has applicability to the coaching population, limited research exists in this area.

The only known study to use social exchange theory with a coaching population examined the decline of female coaches at the high school level (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Current and former coaches of high school teams completed a self-report measure that assessed benefits, costs and satisfaction levels with overall coaching experiences and alternative experiences as defined by the social exchange theory (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). It was determined that current coaches assigned greater importance with regard to achievement and maintenance of their own sporting experiences, and described costs involving the time burdens with coaching, low perceived competence and general satisfaction with coaching (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). A discriminant function analysis examined the degree to which social exchange theory predicted membership of coaches in current versus former coaching status based on the predictor variables: benefits, costs, and satisfaction levels. It was determined that these factors significantly predicted coaching group membership. However, there were no differences between current and former coaches on satisfaction level with alternative activities (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). This study was limited by the use of only quantitative analyses and may have benefited from qualitative examination. The findings from the Weiss and Stevens (1993) study suggests that social exchange theory predictions for continuance and withdrawal from activities need to be further investigated in the sport domain. Therefore, this study will be replicated for this proposed study and mixed methodology will be used with a sample of collegiate coaches. This extension is important as it provides a framework through which collegiate coach drop out can be

investigated using social exchange theory. Understanding coach drop out using this theoretical framework may provide practical strategies for administrators and coaching educators to prepare coaches for long term success and career development.

Potential Interventions

Providing workshops to facilitate stress and time management techniques as well as increasing perceived competence would also be helpful to future coaches (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). It has been recommended by Weiss and Stevens that administrators at the high school level incorporate time in coaches schedules for professional development activities such as coaching clinics, workshops and teambuilding so that female coaches can increase their levels of competence in areas such as self-confidence, self-control of stress and anxiety, and communication skills. Unfortunately, research on the interventions to prevent burnout remain largely unexplored (Goodger, et al., 2007).

Some coaching organizations have acknowledged the importance of mentoring in coach development and have implemented formal mentoring programs (e.g. Swim coaches association; personal communication, March 2009). Programs such as women in coaching long-term apprenticeship program, and other programs that match candidates with coaching mentors in their sport could be helpful in women coaches' career development (Marshall, 2001). However these mentoring programs have not been evaluated for effectiveness and additional exploration of potential interventions needs to be considered.

Practical Implications

Based on the topics discussed in the above sections, many suggestions can be made to increase the number of women in the coaching field. Thorngren (1990) suggests that more effective networks should be developed among women to increase the availability of support

systems and career development. Additionally, it is recommended that athletic directors should avoid buying into the societal devaluation of female sport, recognize gender biases and homophobia in themselves, actively challenging these biases in students, coaches, colleagues and the general public, in addition to increasing the strong influence they have in hiring and retaining women coaches (Thorngren). Furthermore, ADs should provide encouragement and support to women coaches since they are more likely than men to retire prematurely from coaching. Another suggestion has been to teach coaches to seek out social support, avoid isolation and judgment of each other, and decrease perfectionism during coaching education and mentoring programs (Inglis and colleagues). However, very little support exists for these types of programs.

Based on the research presented above, future research and interventions should focus on the impact of mentoring relationships on coaches. Additional research is needed to understand the role of mentoring on the environmental (access discrimination), personal (work-life balance, burnout) and experiential (mentoring, treatment discrimination, gender stereotyping) factors that may increase retention rates. Specifically, coaching education degree programs and national coaching organizations should focus on teaching current, experienced coaches, mentoring skills and should establish formal mentoring programs to develop mentoring relationships with young head coaches and assistant coaches. This should also be combined with informal or formal mentoring programs within athletic departments which pair assistant coaches with cross-gender and same-gender mentors. The NCAA has already acknowledged the impact of work-life balance and coaching education on women coaches' career development through the NCAA Work-Life resources available on its' website ("NCAA Work-Life Balance Resources," n.d.) and the Winstar Foundation ("WinStar Foundation," n.d). The Winstar foundation recognizes the importance of mentoring and career networking for young women coaches and has attempted to

develop this type of support for women through its programs. However, the program is less than five years old and the outcomes of this program are yet to be evaluated. Furthermore, the impact of these types of programs may not be known for some time.

Another practical implication for this area of study is the development of an instrument that could examine the impact of mentoring on intentions to remain in the coaching profession. Social exchange theory provides an excellent framework for the development of such as an instrument. This instrument could then be used as a tool to examine the experiences of coaches and to identify potential psychological and social interventions to navigate challenging experiences.

Summary

The number of women coaches in intercollegiate athletics has declined dramatically during the past 30 years, and many potential reasons for this decline have been examined. It has been found that women coaches experience and perceive discrimination in hiring based on perceptions of competency and skill (Thorngren, 1990) as well as homologous reproduction in the hiring process (e.g. male ADs are more likely to hire similar others, i.e. male coaches, over female coaches) (Stangl & Kane, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stahura & Greenwood, 2001). Additionally, women coaches also experience treatment discrimination (Button, 2001) in the form of stereotyping regarding perceived incompetence based on their gender, lack of possibilities of advancement, sexual and racial harassment, and negative recruiting. Another common experience of women coaches that has been used to discourage women's entry into sport includes stereotyping and stigmatization based on gender roles, race or sexual orientation (Lenskyj, 1990; Griffin, 1992; Birrel & Theberge, 1994), which also puts strain on women coaches' abilities to recruit and function in the work environment (Wellman & Blinde, 1997;

Drago et al., 2005), and serves to discourage female athletes from becoming coaches themselves (Sisley, Weiss, Barber & Ebbeck, 1990). A significant number of studies have examined the impact of these factors in current coaches. However, few studies have directly examined the impact of these aforementioned variables on women coaches' decisions to leave coaching (Kamphoff & Gill, 2006).

A newer issue in the coaching literature is the idea of work-life balance difficulties which described the conflict that coaches experience between their work role as coach and personal, social and family responsibilities. Work-life balance has been demonstrated to be a concern for high school coaches (Weiss & Stevens, 1993), collegiate coaches (Dixon & Bruening, 2005), and female collegiate coaches who have children (Bruening & Dixon, 2007; 2008). Further, support from administration has been identified as a key to women remaining at their current institution and within intercollegiate athletics (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). These findings suggests that support from family is important to women coaches' career commitment, but further examination has been recommended by researchers to determine the difference exist in work-life balance experiences between women who have left the field and current coaches (Bruening & Dixon, 2008).

Mentoring has been shown to improve career satisfaction, commitment, career mobility and positive job attitudes (Ragins et al., 2000). However, very little research has been done to examine the impact of mentoring on women coaches' career development. The few studies in this area have suggested that there is a lack of role models for women coaches (Carpenter & Acosta, 2008) which may impact women coaches ability to find mentors in their field. Additionally, Knoppers (1992) suggested that women who have little access to resources and support tend to be less satisfied. Although this study did not directly address the role of

mentoring, it did identify the potential systems that mentoring gives them access to. However, significant research needs to be done in this area. Additionally, very little research has been done to examine if having a positive female mentor would assist in changing female assistant coaches' beliefs about the coaching profession and assist them in navigating any discrimination and other work-life balance difficulties through the mentoring relationship.

Therefore, the reasons why coaches leave coaching are complicated to explain and predict. Social exchange theory has been suggested to be a valid framework through which coach intentions to remain in coaching can be examined due to their desire to maximize benefits and minimize costs of coaching. These costs have been identified to include issues related to work-life balance, difficulties related to coaching tasks, stress, lack of support, and external pressures, while benefits may include items such as positive team atmosphere, program success, athletic experiences, and external rewards (Weiss & Stevens, 1993). Social exchange theory has not been examined in many athletics contexts and has only been used to compare current and former high school women coaches satisfaction levels. Further examination is necessary using the social exchange theory framework in other coaching samples (such as intercollegiate women coaches) and further validation of the instrument used to identify costs and benefits to coaching is necessary. Therefore, the current proposed study will examine work-life balance and mentoring within the social exchange theory framework.

References

Acosta, R. V. & Carpenter, L. J. (1985). Status of women in athletics: Changes and causes. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 11,* 61-71.

Acosta, R. V. & Carpenter, L. J. (1988). *Perceived Causes of Declining Representation of Women Leaders in Intercollegiate Sports- 1988 update.* Unpublished manuscript, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, NY.

Acosta, R. V., & Carpenter, L. J. (2002). *Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal study – Twenty-five year old update – 1977-2002*. Unpublished manuscript. Brooklyn College. Brooklyn, NY.

Allen, T.D., Eby, L.T., Poteet, M.L., Lentz, E. & Lima, L. (2004). Career benefits associated with mentoring for protégés: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 127–136. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Altheide, D., & Johnson, J. (1994). Criterai for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Ed.s), *Handbook of Qualitative Reserch* (pp. 485-499). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

Avery, D., Tonidandel, S., & Phillips, M. (2008). Similarity on sports sidelines: How mentor-protégé sex similarity affects mentoring. *Sex Roles*, *58(1/2),* 72-80.

Ballantyne, R., Hansford, B., & Packer, J. (1995). Mentoring beginning teachers: A qualitative analysis of process and outcomes. *Educational Review, 47*, 297-307. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Birrell, S. & Theberge, N. (1994). Feminist resistance and transformation in sport. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 361-376). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Blake-Beard, S. (2001). Taking a hard look at formal mentoring programs. *Journal of Management Development, 20,* 331-345.

Blinde, E. M., & Taub, D. E. (1992). Homophobia and women's sport: The disempowerment of athletes. *Sociological Focus, 25*, 151-166.

Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 29*, 267-281. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Bloom, G. A., Salmela, J. H., & Schinke, R. J. (1995). Expert coaches' views on the training of developing coaches. In R. Vanfraechem-Raway & Y. Vanden Auweele (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ninth European Congress on Sport Psychology* (pp. 401-408). Brussels, Belgium: Free University of Brussels.

Bohley, P., & Tilley, A. J. (1990). The impact of night work on psychological well-being. *Ergonomics, 32*, 1089-1099.

Boutilier, M. A. & SanGiovanni, L. (1983). *The Sporting Woman*. Champaign, IL : Human Kinetics.

Bower, G. G. (2009). Effective mentoring relationships with women in sport: Results of a meta-ethnography. *Advancing Women in Leadership, 27*, 1-18. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

Bower, G. G., Hums, M. A., & Keedy, J. L. (2006). Factors influencing the willingness to mentor females in leadership positions within campus recreation: A historical perspective. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, *2*, Retrieved from http://www.advancingwomen.comawl/spring2006/Bower_Hums_Keedy.html

Brady, L. (1993). Peer assistance in the professional development of principals. *Curriculum and Teaching, 8,* 91-98.

Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2007). Work- family conflict in coaching II: Managing role conflict. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 471-496. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Bruening, J. E., & Dixon, M. A. (2008). Situation work-family negotiations within a life course perspective: Insights on the gendered experiences of NCAA Division I head coaching mothers. *Sex Roles, 58*, 10-23. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Burke, R. J. (1991) Work experiences of minority managers and professionals: Individual and organizational costs of perceived bias. *Psychological Reports, 69*, 1011-1023.

Burt, R.S. (1998) The gender of social capital, *Rationality and Society*, *10*, 5–46.

Button, S. B. (2001) Organizational efforts to affirm sexual diversity: A cross-level examination. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 17-28.

Caffarella, R. S., & Olson, S. K. (1993). Psychosocial development of women: A critical review of the literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 43*(3), 125-151.

Carpenter, L. J., & Acosta, R. V. (2008). Women in Intercollegiate Sport. A longitudinal, National study, Thirty One Year update, 1977-2008. West Brookfield, MA. Electronically retrieved from http://www.acostacarpenter.org/

Carpenter, L. J., & Acosta, R. V. (2010). Women in Intercollegiate Sport. A longitudinal, National study, Thirty One Year update, 1977-2010. West Brookfield, MA. Electronically retrieved from http://www.acostacarpenter.org/

Clutterbuck, D. & Ragins, B. R. (2002). *Mentoring and Diversity*. Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford.

Coakley, J. (2004) *Sport in society: Issues and controversies* (8th ed.). Boston MA: McGraw-Hill.

Coffey, L. C., Skipper, J. K., & Jung, F. D. (1988). Nurses and shift work: Effects of job performance and job-related stress. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 13, 245-254.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16*, 297-334.

Cunningham, G. B., & Sagas, M. (2003). Occupational turnover intent among assistant coachces of women's teams: The role of organizational work experiences. *Sex Roles, 49*, 185-190. doi: 0360-0025/03/0800-0185

Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Ashley, F. B. (2001). Occupational commitment and intent to leave the coaching profession. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 36*(2), 131-148

Demers, G. (2010). Homophobia in sport – Fact of life, taboo subject. In S. Robertson (Ed), *Taking the lead: Strategies and solutions from female coaches.* (pp. 73–96). Alberta, Canada: The University of Alberta Press.

Desvaux, G., Devillard-Hoellinger, S., & Baumgarter, P. (2007). *Women matter. Gender diversity, a corporate performance driver*. McKinsey and Company: Paris

Dieffenbach, K. & Vosloo, J. (2008). Women coaching developmental club sport: Shaping the future for the next generation. *Lecture presented at Association for Applied Sport Psychology,* St. Louis, MO.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and Internet Survey: The Tailored Design Method* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, John & Sons.

Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2005). Perspectives on work-family conflict in sport: An integrated approach. *Sport Management Review, 8*(3), 227-253. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Dixon, M. A., & Bruening, J. E. (2007). Work-family conflict in coaching I: A top-down perspective. *Journal of Sport Management, 21*, 377-406. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Drago, R., Henninghause, L., Rogers, J., Vescio, T., & Stauffer, K. D. (2005). Final Report for Cage: The coaching and gender equity project (pp. 1-64): Pennsylvania State University.

Dreher, G. H., & Ash, R. A. (1990). A comparative study of mentoring among men and women in managerial, professional, and technical positions. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 539-546.

Eby, L. T., Allen, T. D., Evans, S. C., Ng, T., & Dubois, D. L. (2008). Does mentoring matter? A multidisciplinary meta-analysis comparing mentored and non-mentored individuals. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 72*, 254-267. doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.04.005

Ehrich, L. C., Hansford, B. & Tennent, L. (2004). Formal mentoring programs in education and other professions: A review of the literature. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*, 518-540. doi: 10.1177/0013161X04267118

Ethnograph 6.0 (n.d.). Qualis Research, Colorado Springs, CO.

Everhard, C. B. & Chelladurai, P. (1998). Gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation: The role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers.

Fazioli, J.K. (2004). *The Advancement of female coaches in intercollegiate athletics. Background paper for the Coaching and Gender Equity Project*. Retrieved from http://lser.la.psu.edu/workfam/CAGE.htm.

Fredell, E.S. (1987). A study of former head coaches of selected sport in public high schools of Colorado and their reasons for leaving coaching. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 47*, 3256A.

Freudenberger, H. J. (1980). *Burnout*. New York: Doubleday.

Frey, M. (2007). College coaches' experiences with stress- "problem solvers" have problems, too. *The Sport Psychologists, 21* (1), 38-57. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Gearing, R. E. (2004). Bracketing in research: A typology. *Qualitative Health Research, 14*, 1429-1452.

Gogol, S. (2002). *Hard Fought Victories: Women Coaches Making a Difference.* Wish Publishing, Terre Haute: IN.

Goodger, K., Gorely, T., Lavallee, D., & Harwood, C. (2007). Burnout in Sport: A Systematic Review. *Sport Psychologist, 21*(2), 125-151.

Greenhaus, J. H., Parasuraman, S., & Wormley, W. M. (1990). Race effects on organizational experiences, job performance evaluations, and career outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 64-86.

Griffen, P. (1998). *Strong women, deep closets: Lesbians and homophobia in sport.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Guillet, E., Sarrazin, P., Carpenter, P. J., Touilloud, D., & Cury, F. (2002). Predicting persistence or withdrawal in female handballers with social exchange theory. *International Journal of Psychology, 37*(2), 92-104.

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. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Heilman, M. E., & Haynes, M. C. (2005). No credit where credit is due: Attributional rationalization of women's success in male-female teams. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(5), 905-916.

Hewlett, S., Buck Luce, C., & Schiller, P. (2005). The hidden brain drain – Off ramps and on ramps in women's career. *HBR Report, Harvard Business Review, 83*, 31-57.

Hjalm, S., Kentta, G., Hassmenan, P., & Gustafsson, H. (2007). Burnout among elite soccer coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 30*(4), 415-427.

Ilgen, D. R., & Youtz, M. A. (1986). Factors Affecting the Evaluation and Development of Minorities in Organizations. In K. Rowland & G. Ferris (Eds). *Research in personnel and human resource management: A research annual* (pp. 307-377). Greenwhich, CT: JAI Press.

Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. L. (1996). Understanding retention factors in coaching and athletic management positions. *Journal of Sport Management, 10*, 237-274.

Inglis, S. Danylchuk, K.E. & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 9,* 1-14

James, E. H. (2000). Race-related differences in promotions and support: Underlying effects of human and social capital. *Organization Science, 11,* 493-508.

Johns, D. P., Lindner, K. J. & Wolko, K. (1990) Understanding attrition in female competitive gymnastics: Applying social exchange theory. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 7*(2), 154-171.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Kamphoff, C. S. & Gill, D. L. (2006). Bargaining with patriarchy: Former women coaches experiences and their decision to leave collegiate coaching. *Dissertation Abstract International, 67*(11), 853A. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (ATT 3242413).

Kamphoff, C. S. & Gill, D. L. (2008). Collegiate athletes' perception of the coaching profession. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 3(1),* 55-73.

Kelley, B. C. (1994). A model of stress and burnout in collegiate coaches: Effects of gender and time of season. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 65*(1), 48-59.

Kelley, B. C., Eklund, R. C., & Ritter-Taylor, M. (1999). Stress and burnout among collegiate tennis coaches. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 21*(2), 280-294.

Kilty, K. (2006). Women in Coaching. *Sport Psychologist, 20*(2), 222-234. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Knoppers, A. (1992). Explaining male dominance and sex segregation in coaching: Three approaches. *Quest*, 44, 210-227. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Knoppers, A., Myers, B.B. Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1991). Opportunity and work behavior in college coaching. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 15, 1-20.

Kosa, B. (1990). Teacher-coach burnout and coping strategies. *Physical Educator, 47* (3), 153-158.

Kram, K. E. (1983). Phases of the mentor relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 608-625.

Lapchick, R. (2005). *The 2004 racial and gender report card: College sports*. Retrieved on April 10, 2009 from http://www.bus.ucf.edu/sport

Lapchick, R. (2009). *The 2008 racial and gender report card: College sports*. Retrieved on April 10, 2009 from http://www.bus.ucf.edu/sport

Lavoi, N. M (2009). Occupational sex segregation in youth soccer organization: Females in positions of power. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal, 18* (2), 25-38. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Lenskyj, H. (1991). Combatting homophobia in sport and physical education. *Sociology of Sport Journal,8*, 61-69.

Lowry, C.D., & Lovett, D. J. (1997). Women coaches: Does when dictate why they leave? *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, *12*, 35-53.

Marshall, D. (2001). Understanding mentoring as a development tool for women coaches. *Canadian Journal for Women in Coaching, 2* (2). 1-11. Retrieved from http://www.coach.ca/WOMEN/e/journal/nov2001/journal_nov2001.pdf

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1984). Burnout in organizational settings. *Applied Social Psychology Annual, 5.* 133-153.

Messner, M. (2009). *Including more women coaches in youth sports: Why it matters.* Retrieved from http://www.momsteam.com/getting-more-women-coaches-in-youth-sports-why-it-matters#1xzzoI9yPrCLr&D

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace: Theory, research and application.* Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.

NCAA Leadership Advisory Board Members (2005).Retrieved from http:// www.ncaa.org/leadership_advisory_board/officers.html

NCAA Work-Life Balance Resources (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.ncaa.org/wps/ncaa?key/ncaa/ncaa/academics+and+athletes/personal+welfare/life+and+work+balance

Nueman, W. (2000). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Parkhouse, B. L., & Williams, J. M. (1986). Differential effects of sex and status on evaluation of coaching ability. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 57*, 53-59.

Parks, J. B., Russell, R. L., Wood, P. H., Roberton, M. A., & Shewokis, P. A. (1995). The paradox of the contented woman in intercollegiate athletics administration. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *66,* 73-79.

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. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Patton, M. Q. (2001). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Petlichkoff, L. M. (1993). Group differences on achievement goal orientations, perceived ability and level of satisfaction during an athletic season. *Pediatric Exercise Science, 5*, 12-24.

Presser, H. (1995). Job, family, and gender: Determinants of nonstandard work schedules among employed Americans in 1991. *Demography, 32*, 577-598.

Raggins, B. R., Cotton, J., & Miller, J. S. (2000). Marginal mentoring. *Academy of Management Journal, 43*, 1177-1194. Retrieved from Business Source Premier database.

Raedeke, T. D. (1997). Is athlete burnout more than just stress? A sport commitment perspective. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *19*, 396-417.

Roed, B. (1999). *Mentoring: A strategy for faculty growth*. University of Alberta: University Teaching Services.

Sagas, M., & Cunningham, G. (2004). The impact of supervisor support on perceived career outcomes of the senior woman administrator. *International Journal of Sport Management, 5,* 229-242.

Sagas, M., Cunningham, G.B., & Ashley, F. B. (2000). Examining the women's coaching deficit through the perspective of assistant coaches. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 267-282. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Sage, G. H. (1998). *Power and ideology in American sport: A critical perspective* (2nd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Salmela, J. H. (1996). *Great job coach*! Ottawa: Potentium.

Scanlan, T. K., Carpenter, P. J., Schmidt, G. W., Simons, J. P., & Keeler, B. (1993). An introduction to the sport commitment model. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 15*, 1-15.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (2003). *Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research and theorizing*. (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schaufeli, W. B., & Enzmann, D. (1998). *The burnout companion to study and practice: A critical analysis*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Schmidt, G. W., & Stein, G. L. (1991). Sport commitment: A model integrating enjoyment, dropout and burnout. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 65*, 344-348.

Sisley, B.L., Weiss, M.R., Barber, H., & Ebbeck, V. (1990). Developing competence and confidence in novice women coaches: A study of attitudes, motives and perceptions of ability. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 61*(1), 60-64.

Smith, R. E. (1986). Toward a cognitive-affective model of athletic burnout. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 8*, 36-50.

SPSS for Windows, 16.0.0. 2008. SPSS Chicago: SPSS Inc

Stahura, K. A., & Greenwoord, M. (2001). Patterns within women's intercollegiate athletics: Revisiting homologous reproduction. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, *72(*Supplement), A-110.

Stangl, J. M. & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 8*, 47-60. Retrieved from Education Research Complete database.

Stevens, J. P. (2002). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences* (4th ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. NewYork: Cambridge University Press.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tharenou, P. (2005). Does mentor support increase women's career advancement more than men's? The differential effects of career and psychosocial support. *Australian Journal of Management, 30*(1), 77-109.

Theberge, N. (1992). Managing domestic work and careers: The experiences of women in coaching. *Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal, 17*(2), 11-21.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The Social Psychology of Groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thorngren, C. M. (1990) A time to reach out – Keeping the female coach in coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 61*, 57-60.

Turner, B. A., & Chelladurai, P. (2005). Organizational and occupational commitment, intention to leave and perceived performance of intercollegiate coaches. *Journal of Sport Management, 19*, 193-211.

Vealey, R. S., Udry, E. M., Zimmerman, V., & Soliday, J. (1992). Intrepersonal and situational predictors of coaching burnout. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 14*, 40-58.

Weaver, M. A., & Chelladurai, P. (1999). A mentoring model for management in sport and physical education. *Quest*, *51*, 24-28.

Weiss, M. R., & Stevens, C. (1993). Motivation and attrition of female coaches: An application of social exchange theory. *The Sport Psychologist*, 7*,* 244-261. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Weiss, M. W., & Weiss, M. R. (2003). Attraction- and entrapment-based commitment among competitive female gymnasts. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 25*, 229-247. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Wellman, S., & Blinde, E. (1997a). Homophobia in women's intercollegiate basketball: Views of women coaches regarding coaching careers and recruitment of athletes. *Women in Sport*

& Physical Activity Journal, 6(2), 63-82. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

Wellman, S., & Blinde, E. (1997b). Impact of homophobia on women intercollegiate basketball. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 68(1)*, A-116.

Williams, J. M. & Parkhouse, B. L. (1988). Social learning theory as a foundation for examining sex bias in evaluation of coaches. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*, 322-330. Retrieved from SPORTDiscus with Full Text database.

WinStar Foundation (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.winstarfoundation.org/

Women's athletics survey published (1991, June 12). *The NCAA News, 28*(24), 1-2.

Appendix B

Qualitative Section

Methods

A mixed-method approach was used to allow for an in-depth and detailed understanding of the coaches' experiences. The quantitative approach was used to reach a large population of current and former coaches, allowing for a larger sample size and to gather as much information as possible about these women's experiences. The quantitative approach also helped identify possible interview participants to help qualitatively support the quantitative data. Although the sample of women interviewed (seven former coaches) was much smaller, the interviews added depth and facilitated greater understanding of the quantitative results. Of the seven coaches interviewed, the transcripts of only five coaches were analyzed as it was determined that saturation was achieved, therefore, the last two interviews were not analyzed.

Qualitative interview script. Qualitative interviews were conducted with former coaches who left the profession in the past 5 years for a reason other than retirement from work. Therefore, these women were first screened using a series of questions during a phone call prior to the start of the interview. These questions inquired about career status (former coach), former coaching status (head coach), age, relationship status, primary sport played and the presence of a mentoring relationship. Qualitative data were collected using semi-structured interviews. The eight interview questions were developed from reviews of previous literature (Carpenter & Acosta, 2010; Drago, et al., 2005; Inglis, Danylchuk & Pastore, 2000; Kamphoff & Gill, 2006; Wellman & Blinde, 1997a) and based on the qualitative questions developed in the pilot study conducted by Dieffenbach and Vosloo (2008).

The interview questions addressed the areas of work-life balance (Drago et al., 2005), mentorship (Drago, et al., 2005; Inglis et al., 2000; Dieffenbach & Vosloo, 2008), and coaching

beliefs and experiences related to discrimination (Wellman & Blinde, 1997a; Kamphoff et al., 2006; Drago et al., 2005), barriers to career mobility (Inglis et al., 2000; Dieffenbach & Vosloo, 2008), and impact of experiences on intent to remain in the field (Dieffenbach & Vosloo, 2008; Drago et al., 2005; see Appendix E for phone interview script).

The questions addressing areas such as intentions to leave coaching, barriers to career mobility, coaching beliefs and experiences related to discrimination, and work-life balance assessed the costs and benefits to coaching as part of social exchange theory in the qualitative interviews. Questions that were more neutral or positive in nature were also included to avoid biasing the participants' responses and to explore experiences that may have facilitated personal and professional growth through coaching. All questions were asked in a semi-structured style with probes and follow-up questions such as, "How did you feel about that?" or "Tell me more about that?" This was used to elicit rich information from the participants as recommended by Patton (2001).

Procedures

Following completion of the non-coaches' survey, participants were asked to assist in further identifying other former coaches, and also asked to participate in a phone interview. If participants were interested in participating in these interviews they were asked to click on anther link that directed them to a separate page that allowed them to and enter their contact information. This data was saved separately from the participants survey responses to protect confidentiality. Seventy five participants provided contact information to participate in phone interviews and were first contacted to and asked to answer a series of screening questions. Fifty-two coaches responded to these screening questions of which nineteen met the basic requirements for the phone interviews (e.g. a head coach, and left coaching no more than five years ago), the rest were removed from the

potential participant pool. The researcher randomly selected seven participants from this pool to participate in the phone interviews.

The researcher contacted via telephone the randomly selected participants who had agreed to participate in the qualitative research, and inquired about their continued willingness to participate in the follow-up interview. Interested participants were sent an email containing the consent form with information about the study to read prior to the phone interview. During the call, participants were again informed of their rights as participants, informed that anonymity and confidentiality would be protected as best as possible and that pseudonyms would be assigned to each participant; that the phone call would be digitally recorded and that the content of the call would be transcribed and analyzed by the researcher. Participants were asked to give verbal consent prior to beginning the interviews.

Prior to conducting the phone interviews, the researcher participated in a bracketing interview (see Appendix J). The purpose of this bracketing interview was to recognize the personal theories of the researcher (e.g. personal knowledge, history, experiences and values) and assumptions based on academic ideas related to this topic (e.g. theories; Gearing, 2004). Additionally, the researcher engaged in bracketing throughout the phone interviews by recording and noting any thoughts that came to mind that were relevant to what the participant was speaking about to increase the researcher's awareness of potential bias during the interviews and to ensure validity and reliability. The bracketing interview was coded and important themes were noted for reference and discussion.

Results

Qualitative data analysis. To gain further insight into the experiences and perceptions of former coaches', five women were selected from the survey sample to participate in phone interviews about their experiences in coaching and the factors contributing to their decision to leave

the coaching profession. After the first five interviews were transcribed and coded, it was determined that a saturation point had been achieved. As Hatch (2002) suggests, the saturation point identifies when the from the interviews have provided a thorough understanding of the phenomena. All the participants interviewed were former head coaches at Division I schools and left collegiate coaching in the last five years. One of these coaches left coaching after serving as the director of basketball operations following a long career as a head coach. A modified interpretive analysis was used to examine the data and extract meaning from the responses (Hatch, 2002). Interpretive analysis allowed for themes to emerge from the text. Each transcript was reviewed repeatedly by the researcher and initial findings were compiled with possible themes and subthemes. Three independent researchers familiar with qualitative data analysis examined and coded the transcripts as recommended by Patton (2002). These independent interpretations were compared to the lead researcher's coding of transcripts and reanalyzed to depict the most accurate representation of the coaches' experiences. These findings were compiled into a draft summary for each participant and participants were given the opportunity to review the draft summary to ensure an accurate representation of their experiences. Participants were sent the draft summary and asked to contact the researcher within one week if changes were needed. Participants were informed that if they did not contact the researcher during this time it would be assumed that the draft summary was an accurate representation of their experiences. Two participants responded to this request and reported that the draft summary was correct and one was also concerned about protection of confidentiality. She was reassured by the use of a pseudonym. Each individual draft summary was then reviewed and cross-case analysis was conducted to compare possible themes and develop support for interpretations across participants.

The five coaches who participated in the interview are described as follows: Kate: age 61, sport: basketball, left 5 years ago; #2: age 46, volleyball, left 4 years ago; #3 age: 32, sport: field

hockey and lacrosse, left 2 years ago; #4: age 39, sport rowing, left 3 years ago, and #5, age 42, sport: softball, left 9 months ago. The coaches were specifically asked about their experiences with mentoring, work-life balance and barriers in their coaching careers (see Appendix C for interview script). The participants were also asked about their experience as a woman in sports, any experiences that empowered them as a woman in sport, their greatest achievement as a coach, experiences with mentors and networks that helped with their career progression, any mentoring relationships they may have had, perceptions of their career progression, obstacles confronted while coaching, experiences with sexual harassment, discrimination and stereotyping in terms of gender or sexual orientation, experiences with work-life balance, and what led to considering leaving coaching. Since very specific and somewhat leading questions were asked about specific topics, a phenomenological approach was not used. Therefore, the emergent themes identified from the qualitative data analysis are organized using the categories as inquired about through the interview script and are not necessarily identified as themes since they were specifically inquired about. The categories discussed below include: 1) Mentoring, 2) Work-Life balance, 3) Negative experiences as a coach, and 4) Career reflections and achievements.

Mentoring. Coaches were asked to describe their experiences with mentoring in their coaching careers. For the purpose of this document, mentoring was defined as "helping, advising, teaching, counseling, instructing and guiding another person" (Marshall, 2001, p.2), and mentoring involves an "intense caring relationship" that promotes both personal and professional development (Cafarella & Olson, 1993). The main themes in this area consisted of a) lack of formal mentoring, b) mentoring impact/advice, and c) importance of networking.

Lack of formal mentoring. Two coaches indicated they developed formal mentoring relationships, one indicated she did not have any formal mentoring relationships, while two coaches indicated that they had no mentoring relationships during their coaching careers. The

theme of *lack of formal mentoring* consists of coaches' descriptions of their limited experiences with formal mentoring. Two of the coaches indicated they did not have any formal or informal mentoring relationships during their coaching careers. One of these coaches suggested that she was unaware of the concept of having a coaching mentor but thought she could seek out advice from friends if needed. Another participant indicated she only experienced what she would classify as informal mentoring but described that she desired more formal mentoring.

> I think I personally wish there was a mentoring system there and in my later years, I tried to orchestrate one, and it didn't really happen. But I think it's… I think for me, for some of the lack of success that I found, I think my road, I would've loved to experience my road again with a mentor… because there was definitely a lot of trial by error….aside from just having a lot of friends that were coaches and aside from just kind of talking with them, there was nothing really formal. (Liz)

The coach who identified only having an informal mentor suggested that the lack of a formal mentor led to problems in her mentoring relationship:

> […] we were also competitors so, I don't know if she saw herself as a mentor to me so you know, it's kind of, I'm sure there were times it was awkward when I was asking her things and she was gonna be racing me that weekend […] probably would have been more effective in a formal way. (Linda)

Another coach acknowledged the role that joining a professional organization played in developing her first female formal mentoring relationship from networking at the WBCA.

> I think back on the first women mentors that I had… when I became involved really heavily with the WBCA. I was a charter member. So when the organization first started I was in the WBCA, but when I got elected to the board, [name] who was the women's athletic director at [school name] was also on the board as our NCAA advisor type person. […] and that was the first female athletic director who I really had a lot of contact with. All the other female coaches were men and there were no assistant women. Other than that AD's, the associates everybody, there was no… I'd go to meetings and be the only woman in the room. (Kate)

Mentoring impact/advice. In the discussion of the presence of formal and informal mentors, coaches discussed the advice they gained regardless of the type of mentoring received. Four coaches discussed the advice and knowledge they gained from their mentoring relationships or what they believe they could have been gained from the presence of a mentoring

relationship in their career. One participant suggested that not having a mentor could have helped her learn to be more balanced. Two coaches (one without a formal mentor and one with a formal mentor respectively) identified that having a mentor could have or did provide more guidance on the administrative side of coaching:

> I was constantly just kind of… testing the waters on doing things, and it wasn't so much from the softball side, I was very comfortable there. It was more from the administrative side. It was more from the recruiting and how you go about, what's the best way to go about recruiting? What's the best way to go about offering and handling the scholarship aspects, budgets, … things like that. And even though I was good at handling the budget, again, knowing how to prioritize, knowing when to push and ask for more versus … just sort of settling for you're getting. (Nancy)

> […] I would go to her and say, "what do you go and do with your parents?" […] we would often have the same philosophy about that aspect… she shared a letter that she sent her parents every year and that kind of thing. […] I think were also very helpful […] getting information and sharing with fellow staff members. […] more like the subtle substances in running a program than strategy and that kind of thing. (Dorothy)

> When I took over the head coach and especially when I moved up to Division 1 and I was about 4 or 5 years into being a head coach, I thought to myself, I really wish I had been somebody's right hand person because I literally felt like I was learning on the fly. (Nancy)

Three of the five coaches interviewed also indicated that having a mentor was perceived as providing increased support for coaches and also the perspective they gained on their coaching careers and career development:

> I don't know if I would've left sooner when I felt, felt like she was somewhat of a safety net… that was there because of lack of one provided by the university…(Liz)

> […] she was somebody that … I could share, I felt I trusted, I could share stories… and ask for advice and yet, you know, I was also able to ask for what we needed and I think it was overall a pretty good relationship. (Dorothy)

> The mentoring relationship with the AD was just sort of a natural check and balance relationship…. I was always pretty fortunate… and unfortunate at the same time. She was one of those very hands on and very meddling types… I think it was there, is a good reason why she is successful with the program. […] I was fine being accountable and fine telling her what was going on and how things were. I also felt when she challenged me that was good for me. (Dorothy)

> I would go in and ask them different things about how something would work or how do you go about obtaining this or things like that. […] they had sort of… opened that door to say hey, if you need anything just let me know. (Nancy)

> I think [name], from a perspective of understanding the big picture of athletics and relating to how everything you do affects the big picture, you know what I mean? […] one of the things she tried to instill is do what is good for the game. It may not be what is good for you today, but it's what's good for the game. […] You know, think about the big picture, think a out where you want to be in 3 years, 5 years, 10 years. I think [name of other mentor] taught me that you know, don't take losing personal[ly]. It's a game. You're going to win, you're going to lose. Try to contain your composure either way. (Kate)

In summary, these coaches identified important lessons they learned from their mentor and the reception of advice in administrative areas if a mentor was present. The one coach not represented here indicated that she had no formal mentors but that she sought advice from previous coaches during her career.

> […] the coaches I had in college are then looked to as kind of mentors. The head coach I had, it was probably a love hate relationship. So there were things that she did that I've like, I would never do that. And then there were things she did that were incredibly successful and s I couldn't mirror those. … my professional coach, we had a really good relationship and she was the closest coach to me geographically when I started coaching. So, she really gave me advice and helped me figure out you know, decision and that kind of stuff. It wasn't formal at all, I would just call and talk to her and you know… I just see her as competition. (Linda)

Importance of networking. Another theme was the presence of a professional network. Most of the coaches discussed their network and this seemed to be influential in the development of the mentoring relationships, as one participant illustrates:

> I became very good friends with the field hockey coach at [university name]. She's also younger, but just a few years older than I and it was her first head coaching position but she had coached elsewhere as an assistant at several other places. […] I kind of appointed her my mentor … I definitely went to her with a lot of things. (Liz)

One coach described having a professional network as "… empowering and sort of a sense of mentoring…" and others discussed how their professional network encouraged and supported them

> […] we had this sort of fraternity if you will and everybody really did support each other (Dorothy)

> There was one instance where… my good friend… but we never called her a mentor… where she had an athlete that was in her area, where she coached that she was trying to recruit and they didn't have the academic program at her school, so they sent her to me. And the girl ended up being an All-American… So I guess that is a true sharing that was helpful. (Dorothy)

> […] my college coach, who was also coaching at the time and competed against her… but it was still sharing she would be encouraging, she'd follow the career and whatever… (Linda)

> […] we would be talking about different kids we were recruiting and knowing we were different types of schools. If we were both recruiting same time the same kid and we were very different kinds of programs, we would talk about whether or not we could get that kid …. And maybe one of use would back off, or I had another coach in our conference who knew I was looking for specific positions and called me up and said hey there's a kid out on this team and you know we're all done recruiting… I think you should go … look at her. It was in order to make this sport better… (Nancy)

Three coaches also identified having a professional network as important in terms of getting recommendations and experience for the next position.

> What got me to [school name] was through someone I knew playing field hockey, played against her, was there as another assistant and under the same head coach… and a position had opened. So that's kind of what got me there, through another athlete. (Liz)

> The sport is not very big anyway, so there was only like 85 division 1 schools, so knowing the other coaches and having other well respected coaches as recommenders… if I would apply somewhere… would probably help. (Linda)

> One of my teammates that we started the club together in [name]… she also went into college coaching and she actually recommended me for and pushed me sort of… to apply for my first head coaching position. (Dorothy)

In summary, all coaches suggested that having a professional network as a resource helped them find coaching positions and develop informal mentoring relationships. Also, coaches alluded to the advice and support their professional network contributed.

Work-life balance. Coaches were asked to describe their experiences with work-life balance in their coaching careers. Work-life balance is the expansive notion that describes the balance between prioritizing career and ambition on one hand, with leisure, family responsibilities and pleasure, on the other (Dixon & Bruening, 2007). All of the coaches agreed that personal balance was difficult to maintain and four of the five participants specifically discussed the impact

of coaching on their interpersonal relationships. Therefore, in the discussion of this topic two themes emerged: a) sport was my life, and b) impact of coaching on interpersonal relationships.

Sport was my life. The theme sport was my life is operationally defined as any discussion of the challenges the coaches had with balancing work and life responsibilities. All coaches identified that balancing coaching with their personal lives was a challenge. Many coaches suggested that coaching was their life.

> When I got the head division I head coaching position… and then discovered how much work there was going to be and not having a full time assistant… the amount of work I put in was just ridiculous and it actually became my life. (Nancy)
>
> I consider myself a workaholic to a degree and I think that to be a successful coach you really have to make it your life. That's how I've seen and that's how I have experienced it and I don't know how you know, women have families and babies, I don't know how they do it. (Liz)
>
> I sucked at it [work-life balance], rowing was my life. So … looking back I'm glad I'm not coaching anymore because I have a life outside of my employment. […] at that time rowing was my life, that's what I loved. It was my passion and I sacrificed everything for it. (Linda)
>
> Early in my career especially… There was hardly any balance, mostly because I didn't have anybody to delegate anything to and if it was to be done, it was gonna be me. (Dorothy)

Most of the coaches also discussed the specific consequences of not maintaining personal balance. Three of the five coaches also discussed the impact on this lifestyle on their health as this quote illustrates:

> I think that I got sicker because of the lack of balance, but I didn't eat as well, I didn't believe it or get as much exercise as I should have, which I always think is an irony. (Nancy)
>
> There were years where I sacrificed my health for it [rowing] and then I learned how to juggle that and make sure I was taking care of me physically. (Linda)
>
> […] I was required to get my master's degree as part of the position. So at [school name] I was also taking graduate classes… there was no balance anywhere… so on top of everything else… I had to get my master's degree and also … teach everything else. I finished [master's degree] but I ended up getting mono in one of my first years … (Dorothy)

The coaches were also asked to discuss their main strategies for maintaining personal balance while coaching. Various strategies for maintaining personal balance were discussed:

> I made it a point to go out with people that who were not into, like hangout with that were not in the coaching arena. You know to give me a different perspective, but at the same time you want to be around coaches because they understand what you are going through. … I made a commitment to take care of myself physically and then I, I guess, by prioritizing that and I encouraged my staff to prioritize that, it became a lot more effective tool. […] took time to work out and eat right and that kind of stuff because the whole staff was doing it. (Liz)

> I think that once I got thing settled down after a couple of years of having staff members I was a little better but not much at creating more time for myself and that kind of thing. (Dorothy)

> I've come to learn that you can work, you can work better and smarter and fewer hours than just being somewhere and doing busywork all the time so that you could sometimes… produce more work … get more out of yourself sometimes by working less. … understand that you have to have the different things in your life going on or else you're not going to be as good at the primary job in itself. (Nancy)

Impact of coaching on romantic relationships. This theme is defined as discussion of personal relationships and the *impact of coaching on their romantic relationships*. All of the coaches discussed their personal relationships when asked about their experiences with work-life balance. Three of the five coaches indicated that their partnership suffered from the demands of their coaching careers.

> […] it wasn't the reason but it was definitely a contributing factor as to why the relationship broke up. […] there was one year, January through May you're working seven days a week and then you take a couple days off and then you're on the road three to four weeks out of the first five weeks of summer and etc […] like I said there's definitely not a balance there at all. (Nancy)

> […] in the end […] my partnership suffered for it […] because I wasn't able to separate work from my home life. That was probably the biggest reason for my break up and I definitely didn't, you know, spend the time and prioritize my family like I should have when I was coaching. (Linda)

> […] I just didn't go there. So it was just, I had balance at home, but it wasn't a true balance that could be considered healthy. (Dorothy)

Three of the five coaches also discussed their partner's career as a strategy to maintain balance:

> […] the only way I managed a relationship is that I worked with my partner, we were together all the time. Otherwise I never would have seen her. […] I think it is a big challenge for women gay or straight to have a life outside of coaching. (Linda)

> I think that being with the coach, I was really nice to be, to have them know exactly what you're experiencing when you're frustrated or… and be able to kind of help each other work through but then you never get to leave it. … then… you being with someone outside, it's nice to just be able to remember that there is life beyond coaching and give you that kind of recharge when you need it. (Liz)

> She was director of facility operations at [school name]… so she was at every sporting event. (Kate)

In summary, the work-life balance themes highlight two important experiences for women coaches. Primarily, four of the five women interviewed described experiencing difficulty with their work-life balance and specifically noted a lack of personal balance. These women also noted the impact that their lack of balance had on their romantic relationships. Specifically, three of the coaches cited their lack of balance as playing a key role in the loss of their personal relationships, while three coaches discussed having a partner in athletics as a strategy to achieve interpersonal balance.

Negative experiences. Coaches were asked to discuss any barriers or negative experiences they encountered while coaching. Previous researchers have identified that women coaches face structural (leadership of women's sport, the culture of the organization and resources available to women's sport) and ideological (gender roles of women in sport, homophobia and social factors such as media images of women) constraints (Kamphoff & Gill, 2008). Similarly, the themes that emerged from coaches' responses to the questions regarding barriers/obstacles encountered as well as knowledge or experience with sexual harassment, and discrimination. The emergent themes from these questions consisted of: a) discrimination related to sexual orientation, b) gender marginalization, c) structural barriers, and the d) unwritten culture of athletics.

Discrimination related to sexual orientation. Coaches were asked about their

specific experiences with discrimination based on sexual orientation during the interview. One coach (Linda) identified discrimination based on sexual orientation before this question was asked and discussed her own experiences as a lesbian coach in the context of discussing her career progression. Overall, four of the five coaches identified themselves as lesbians during the interview and three coaches discussed their experiences with discrimination when asked about discrimination they encountered while coaching.

> […] I heard outright administrators at my school, when we were hiring a head coach from another school, you know three candidates came in they were getting interviewed and I went to one of the administrators and asked, how you know, the interviews was going and she said, she was like… Well we are not going to hire so and so…yeah she is a great coach but she is a lesbian. And I mean, my job, I wasn't out… my jaw like hit the table.! (Linda)

> There were numerous times where things were said by fellow staff members … even from one of my primary mentors. That you know, "she doesn't look like a [school name] type player" or "I don't know if she would fit into our type of program". Meaning, she was concerned … about orientation. She would also just talk about sexual orientation, different stories just kind of made it clear that it wasn't really acceptable. … at the same time, I wasn't really willing to go there. It was just kind of kept to myself. (Dorothy)

> […] If you are a single female, and you were starting to get successful and by that I mean winning games and say become good… people took shots at you, you know in recruiting. […] You know people would say, 'Oh she's forty years old. She must be gay. She's not married.' You know, so we're going to say that. We're gonna send that in a visit. She [an athlete] would come to campus, you know, now coaches would say 'you don't want to go there' and they way 'what do you mean?' 'Well you just don't want to go there' And they'd start making, you know, like comments along those lines. […] (Kate)

This last coach also discussed the prevailing stigma attached to being a lesbian coach:

> But coaches would use that [sexuality] a great deal against the women and it was very difficult, you know what do you say to somebody? Whether you were gay or not. Why would you come out? Are you kidding me? What parent would send their kid to you if they knew you were out and they knew you were gay? […] I mean there are more male coaches who have married their former or married former players than any woman [coach]. (Kate)

These experiences seem to indicate that a stigma attached to being a lesbian in sport and this is reflected in the hiring bias described by participants.

Gender marginalization. An experience of marginalization due to gender was a

common theme discussed by the coaches when asked about experiences of discrimination while coaching. Gender marginalization included discussion of issues related to not being respected by male colleagues or a description of being marginalized due to the lack of women represented in the department. Three coaches discussed their experiences with gender marginalization.

> […] when I approached the head coach… who was older and had been there a while and he just kinda laughed and took it very lightly and he just kinda like laughed and took it very lightly and was like 'come on sweetie' … as if I was his grandchild and actually took his practice plans and bopped me on the head. Like 'you're not really going to do this to me, are you?' … pulled the whole respect card and I just had to walk away. I told my supervisor right away and kind of just faded away. […] there were two female head coaches… so it was very much a boys club … so, just kind of lack of number, kind of just felt, definitely made me feel like more of a minority but no other communication or action besides that one coach, never ever made me feel like a minority but just definitely just the lack of visibility… the rest of our women's sports were coached by men. (Liz)

> […] some people would probably say it was to my advantage. But I disagree with that because over 50% of coaches right now of female sports are male. So, but yeah, I do feel like I wasn't respected, I wasn't sought out for, you know, to be on a committee for the … or be involved in the hiring process because, I wasn't a good ol' boy. (Linda)

> […] work that still has to be done with the perception of girls coached by women, or women coached by women. You know a lot of the club environment out there is male dominated, whether its basketball, volleyball, whatever sport and these kids growing up, being coached by men. And then when they get to the collegiate experience they haven't had a lot of women coaches… the whole thing where I'm tough with you in a disciplined environment. I'm a woman, I'm a bitch, but a guy gets away with it because of a father figure that's been tougher than a wife or a male coach. (Dorothy)

Another coach also identified that she felt that women coaches were treated differently than men and this is reflected in how the administration interacted with coaches.

> My opinion is he manages through intimidation and fear and I think women respond differently to that in a sense that it's gonna be the "I'm not gonna, I don't want to shake things up" because there was a fear factor where I think men are wired a little bit differently and are a little more self-centered and will go in and make sure their personal needs get me. (Nancy)

Three coaches discussed their observations of gender marginalization in the hiring process. These coaches described the phenomenon as "coach recycling" in their interviews. It was suggested that female coaches were less likely to be hired again if terminated. However, it was suggested that male

coaches are "recycled" and rehired more easily. Another coach speculated that this may be due to the perceptions of female coaches and a hiring bias against women:

> I have heard administrators hire such and such female coach and it didn't work out.. so they will look for a male next time. Well if they hire a male coach and the male coach doesn't work out, they don't go hire a female next time, they just figure… oh he was just an idiot. We will go hire someone else. But if it is a female that screws up they never replace them with another female. It was because she was female and then they go hire another male. (Linda)

Another coach described her first hand experience with this hiring bias against women coaches after she left coaching:

> […] this upper level administrator who oversees athletics had made this statement that as long as … they would always do everything they could to have a woman coaching women sports upon my departure. I know … some of the people who applied for the position and the final three candidates were three men. There was not one woman who made the final cut, and the resources that have been provided to this new coach, I really believe a part of it is because he's a male. (Nancy)

> I felt that I didn't necessarily get the cooperation or response or you know respect at times, because of how young I was and I think to a degree, that's still how things are operating. You know, there's an unwillingness to raise the expectation level, so there is a cycle of hiring young, inexperienced coaches who won't be too demanding. (Liz)

The oldest coach also suggested that this lack of "coach recycling" for women coaches is also related to age.

> There's a bigger stigma of hiring women coaches, men get hired all the time! […] women coaches in their 40s and 50s are too old, where guys are just coming into their own. He doesn't get a job until he is in his 40s usually. You know… he is just coming into his own. Most women around 45 or 50s they think are too old. […] I think that the problem too… is the age discrimination in the game. (Kate)

Structural barriers. Another theme was that of structural barriers which included discussion of lack of support from administration and lack of resources and emerged when the coaches were asked about any obstacles they experienced during their coaching careers. Many coaches identified that they did not feel supported by their administration in the areas of financial support, facilities, and staff support. As the following statements illustrate:

> We had a beautiful field and then they decided to renovate it, and the renovation ran into problems and so the final two years I had nowhere to practice and nowhere to play. They found us alternative places to play, but they were… barely met the …field specs. So that was another major obstacle. Probably the last big one that I can sort of really sticks out is that I did not have a full time assistant. […] money, budgets that probably the greatest obstacle was… recruiting dollars both in order to be able to go out… and activity recruit in regards to travel and things like that.. and then in reference to scholarships. That was a really big obstacle because the expectation was to produce… just as other programs were that had many more scholarships and so that was a huge obstacle in the final years. (Nancy)

> […] there was a large percentage of my time that was spent on checking up that, checking up on what other departments or other people… the responsibilities of other and that. Can we practice on the field at that time? Is the field ready? … do I have to contact an outside coach? Are our hotels booked? … in talking with people that are at different universities… had people did those things for them. It felt as though no matter how much was planned, there had to be a plan B, C, D, E because something could fall through… which left athletes frustrated because they didn't… know where or what time we were gonna be able to practice the following day. […] there was not full support from the administrative staff… (Liz)

> […] I took a job at a salary with no, hardly any support… to improve their program and …. Hopefully get better supported and that kind of thing. (Dorothy)

> […] I talked to some of the other newly added women's sports coaches and … they definitely didn't feel a peer system […] I would say [one] of the top three obstacles were administrators lack of support. (Linda)

Interestingly, when discussing the issue of lack of support from administrators, many of the coaches described experiences with the lack of diversity in their department, and their interest in encouraging diversity training for their athletes. Three coaches discussed their attempts to facilitate diversity training for their athletes and the athletic department. All three women reported running into difficulty with their administrators and did not feel supported in their efforts. As the following quote illustrates:

> I asked the athletic director if they were going to do any kind of training… like there was absolutely nothing in terms of race discrimination, religious discrimination, sexual orientation… I said that I felt… there needs to be some diversity training and they were like … yeah we'll plan it. .. it just kind of keep getting pushed … and never done. So then I told my administrator that I am going to arrange to have diversity training for my sport team… if you want to invite any other women's sports to come… if she wanted to supervise…[The SWA] said yeah, it isn't a problem in our department and if you bring it up and talk about it you are opening up a can of words and it will become a department problem. And I was like you're kidding me… it's a problem! And she said no it's not a problem, I've talked to

> everyone else and no one else thinks it is a problem but you. So we don't want you to have it [diversity training]. (Linda)

Unwritten culture of athletics. Another issue was the culture of athletics which emerged as theme as discussed by three coaches. This theme specifically included the pressure to continually work, recruit, and succeed. These coaches cited feeling pressure to achieve a specific level of success early on in their positions.

> Part of the problem today, coaches are being paid an awful lot of money but that window to turn, to be successful is so small that, that you have, you think you have a 5 year contract. You have about 3 years to turn it around, if you don't […] chances are you're not gonna because the tides turn against you. […] There are some things that I wish I could do again, I could learn from. But I had the time to fix it. A lot of coaches don't have the time to make mistakes any more. They're just thrown into their role as head coach. (Kate)

Another coach noted that the lack of administrative support and the "unwritten rules" of athletics contributed to the pressure she felt to produce results with little support:

> […] it didn't seem to matter that you didn't have a full time assistant, maybe your recruiting dollars weren't sustained but the pressure was there to produce. So, even though it wasn't like, it was kind of like that unwritten rule of pressure. (Nancy)

The third coach described that as the pressure to succeed increased, the pressure to recruit became increased as well:

> We had to go to the national qualifiers instead of just the regional. And, you know, it required us to make, do a really intensive planning process while were still doing everything else. (Dorothy)

In summary, the discussion of barriers and negative experiences consisted of the discussion of discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender marginalization, and structural barriers such as lack of administrative support financially and for diversity. The last theme was related to the unwritten culture of athletics that created an atmosphere of pressure to succeed for the coaches.

Career reflections and achievements. During the interview, coaches were asked to discuss their career progression, the tipping point that led them to contemplate leaving the profession and their greatest achievements as a coach. During this discussion, the following themes emerged from

the participants' responses: a) support matters, b) tipping point, and c) student development and empowerment.

Support matters. The theme support matters, emerged in various forms throughout all five of the interviews. This theme was oriented around the belief that support from administration, colleagues and staff helped the coaches during their careers. Many of the coaches indicated that support from staff was vital to their success. One coach identified that when her administration was supportive, she felt more successful as a coach and this was centered on being provided with support staff. Another coach stated that the support of her athletic director was likely the reason she reported not experiencing discrimination or marginalization as a female coach:

> I think it was the athletic directors that were, they were actively involved in things, and you know they weren't just… someone sitting in an office, you know, so they knew what was happening within the department […] there was just a good sense […] of mutual respect amongst the coaches. (Nancy)

Another coach highlighted the fact that her university was inclusive in their diversity statement and felt that made a difference and helped her have a more positive experience.

> […] the university definitely used language, very inclusive language even though it was a catholic university. Very inclusive for sexual orientation and religion. (Liz).

Tipping point. Coaches were asked to describe the circumstances that led them to consider leaving coaching and to identify if there was a tipping point in that decision. Coaches' responses to these questions as well as general discussions of their career throughout the interview resulted in the development of the theme tipping point. Interestingly, none of the coaches initially chose to leave their position voluntarily. Instead they were all either terminated, or their contracts were not renewed. However, four of the five coaches indicated that they still wanted to continue coaching and would have, if their circumstances were different. One coach recalled her experiences with homophobia and felt that her athletic director was looking for a reason to terminate her:

> […] I believe that they wanted a reason to fire me because all the years, there have been all these issues with my sexuality and stuff and we started racing really well in our first few races, we had ranked so high. I honestly think they were afraid that if we finished the season really well, they would have to renew my contract. They'd postponed renewing my contract for pretty lame excuses. Like in January they were supposed to renew it for the following year and they just kept forgetting about it or cancelled the appointments […] (Nancy)

Another coaches' situation resulted in her not being hired at another school. She describes the reason why she left coaching:

> Well the biggest reason was that I didn't get hired anywhere. Because I had been blackballed […] I hadn't dealt with the whole issue that it was the end of my career to me, it was the end of that job. But I still had my career, but I wasn't, I think I really just decided not to coach because I didn't get that job. (Linda)

Another coach described the loss of identity that she experienced since leaving coaching, a common theme among all the coaches. This coach stated that she still likes being referred to as "coach" despite no longer being in the coaching profession and described the previous times she thought about leaving coaching:

> […] you're on the bus ready to go to a game and you think 'what would it be like to be home for dinner?' but then after the season is over, you have a chance to reflect on it, or you win a game you're not supposed to win. Oh my god, it's like … you birdie a hole, or hit a home run, you're back for more! […] So, I don't think I every really contemplated it. I don't think – I know had they hired me, I'd still be in women's [coaching], I'd still be doing it. (Kate)

Another coach identified that she would have liked to continue coaching as she feels very unsatisfied because her coaching career did not go as planned. A theme that she related back to not feeling supported, not having a mentor, but also due to the culture of athletics:

> I felt frustrated because I felt that if I would continue on the coaching path, then I needed to be successful where I was and I wasn't finding the success and I felt that, had the tools been different or sharpened or even more readily available, that we would've found success but I felt that there were a lot of obstacles. (Liz)

Similarly, another coach described that her reason for leaving coaching was related to the increased pressure on winning she experienced from her school:

> I started to feel and experience people cutting corners for that [winning]. And that academics and all of that stuff was preached really wasn't the priority. So, it really really started getting

> me questioning, 'is this where, is this what I wasn't to keep doing, at least as this level?' Because this isn't […] my philosophy. Because my philosophy always was no coach ever wakes up wanting to lose that day, but when you start to cut corners, just to try to win then you kind of cross over a line… (Nancy)

Three of the coaches are currently working in a career related to athletics. One is pursuing professional coaching outside of sports, while the other two are working for companies that specialize in working with athletic departments and universities to develop specific tools for recruiting.

Overall, these coaches' experiences varied but their decisions to leave coaching were not necessarily voluntary, but once they were no longer in a coaching position, they all decided not to return to coaching. Most of the coaches also stated that in hindsight they were happy with their decision to exit coaching due to the benefits of having more work-life balance and increased salary.

> I've been out for a year, yeah, you couldn't pay me enough to go back to coaching now… I am a real estate investor…self-employed. And a lot more money! (Linda)

> I kind of had this desire to do some different things and you know… maybe pursue some of... I was never interested in business and you know other avenues (Dorothy)

> […] I think my experience and that I've heard from others who have left before… I think that was actually something else that contributed too… I just had several friends and colleagues who had left the profession and seeing… the change in them… I didn't know anybody that left coaching that regretted that decision… that was kind of an eye opener. (Liz)

Interestingly, three of the coaches did identify that they would return to coaching if "given the right situation":

> I would like to get back into athletics… I think…I don't know for sure. Given the right situation, working for the right person. I think I would… I just don't have to if I don't want to. (Kate)

> […] I've most definitely like to go back into what look to be at the Division III level. I considered doing Division I…maybe as an assistant at maybe a little bit bigger program… but as I, as I get further and further into creating more of a balanced life for myself, I think to myself I don't, …unless there was an opportunity that I just felt I could not pass up and sort of sit some things for myself that I would set up for myself and they look and they sit those fall into those factors, I would I would probably strictly look at Division III.. (Nancy)

> […] Yep. I probably, you know, I know I'd still be well [coaching division II], I don't know that, how do you know anything? But, I really barely sure I'd still be coaching there if we were still D-2. (Dorothy)

Student-athlete development and empowerment. When asked about their greatest achievements, most coaches identified and discussed student-athlete development and empowerment before discussing win-loss records or winning championships. It appears as though the coaches valued student-athletes development:

> […] it is really important to have, like, you know, the ability to motivate, the ability to […] act for the athlete, the ability to kinda remember what it's all about, you know, for the athlete. (Liz)

> I think my experience at [school name] of helping students graduate. Yeah I know we can talk about the wins and losses […] but I can tell you that in the whole time I was there, I only had two students athletes come through there play for four years that didn't graduate. Everybody else who played for four years graduated. […] I gave a lot of student, first year generation college from their family, an opportunity and I think that's what I'm really proud of. […] I had good wins. I had championships, I was in the NCAA, but to watch kids graduate, watch kids mature, that's a pretty neat experience. (Kate)

> […] it was a sense of… knowing you were helping with the development of student athletes, and helping them grow both personally, academically and athletically. So that felt very good to be a part of that process. […] I really made sure I focused on … the well rounded aspects of it. But from the academic side, really making sure that the kids came in, stayed and graduated and if they transferred […] still do my best to stay in contact with them to encourage them to continue their academics. (Nancy)

Three coaches also mentioned the value they placed on empowering their student athletes while coaching their respective teams.

> I really do think I was a good coach and I really impacted a lot of lives. And I think athletics is a great way for women to become empowered and to become leaders and to you know, to become positive members of society. I really valued my position that I had that opportunity to influence people like that… (Linda)

> […] that felt very good, to be part of that process. I think it was just the issue that overall… the confidence and everything you gain from participating, that kind of helps you feel empowered to be able to accomplish things. (Nancy)

> […] on an interpersonal player-coach relationship and how things are on the field and seeing when things click. Seeing that difference, you're making a difference in someone's life, even if it's, it starts out with … teaching them something technically and having it grow to

> helping them reach their goals and cultivate their attitude towards sport, towards team work and that always feels good… and that fuels the passion for me. (Liz)

In summary, the coaches emphasized student development and empowerment in their coaching philosophies and reported feeling a sense of achievement during their coaching careers as a result of this emphasis.

Discussion

The primary purpose of the qualitative section was to facilitate understanding of the quantitative data. The interview questions specifically inquired about mentoring, work-life balance, barriers/obstacles, and experiences with discrimination and career reflections.

Mentoring. The answers to the mentoring questions revealed three main themes in the participant's responses. While the presence of formal mentors theme is relatively week it does highlight a finding that could be examined further in future research. The presence of formal mentors was less common among the qualitative participants, with only two participants reporting a formal mentor, 2 reporting no mentor and one reporting the presence of an informal mentor only. Ragins and colleagues (2000; Bower, 2009), stress the importance of mentor selection for programs aimed at women and also suggest that informal mentoring may be more effective for women while formal mentoring programs may be less effective for women compared to men. While Kram (1983), acknowledged the importance of stages of development in the mentoring relationship and indicates that informal mentors were more likely to sponsor the young mentee into upwardly mobile positions and give them demanding assignments. It is unclear from the qualitative results if formal or informal mentors were more or less effective as judged by the participants, though participants without formal mentors did indicate that they would have liked a more formal relationship with their mentor. Therefore, this aspect of mentoring should be further evaluated in future research.

Those participants without mentors suggested that having a mentor would have assisted them with issues related to administrative tasks as a coach (e.g. recruiting, managing budgets,

scheduling etc.). These findings suggest that these coaches felt confident about the pure coaching aspects of their sport however, the other tasks associated with being a "coach" were more challenging. Business literature suggests that mentors often have access to a incredible amount of professional and personal experience to provide the young mentees (Kram, 1983), and protégés that have access to this knowledge through a mentor, may progress more quickly than if they were not provided access to the knowledge of the mentor or to the added support for their growth and development (Bloom et al., 1998). Other researchers have also suggested that the young protégé also have needs support, affirmation and career guidance, all of which can be met by the mentoring relationship (Eby et al., 2008).

Another issue may be that the need for mentoring is not being met due to the scarcity of female role models in leadership positions in sport (Bower, 2009) and the trend of hiring young women in the head coach role (coach re-cycling), also identified by participants. Therefore, it may be that young coaches with limited experience are placed in positions where they may have an opportunity to mentor assistant coaches, but are themselves still learning the head coaching role. This finding suggests that perhaps this issue needs further investigation as this might explain why women are more reluctant to enter into mentoring relationships (Marshall, 2001). Networking also appeared to be important in terms of career development. All participants cited the role of having a professional network as supporting them as coaches, assisting in the development of positions and providing support. Previous research has suggested that women gain from having supportive mentors and from connections with networks (Eagly & Carli, 2007), and that the result of feeling increased connectivity and motivation may increase coach retention and also increase the talent pool of future female coaches (Desvaux et al, 2007).

Work-life balance. Participants also discussed the unwritten culture of athletics, supporting the quantitative theme of the demanding organizational culture associated with being a Tier I sport

(i.e. emphasis on winning, long hours, excessive travel, recruiting, and perhaps decreased time for work-life balance) could play a role in career outcome, a finding supported by previous research (Bruening & Dixon, 2008). The coaches described the "unwritten culture of athletics" as one that expects increased pressure to continually work, recruit, succeed, and increased travel contributed to their negative experiences in coaching. Similar themes were supported by previous research by Pastore (1991) who described that coaches reported the main reason for leaving coaching as the lack of time for family and friends and the increase recruiting responsibilities. The qualitative results also provided evidence that participants struggled with achieving personal balance as sport became their lives and often experienced negative health outcomes as a result. Fletcher and Scott (2010) suggest that coaches experience various psychosocial pressures that impact their health and performance. One of these stressors is the work-life imbalance associated with coaching. Primarily, four of the five women interviewed described experiencing difficulty with their work-life balance and specifically noted prioritizing sport as their sole focus. These women also noted the impact that their lack of balance had on their romantic relationships.

Three of the coaches cited their lack of work-life balance as playing a key role in the loss of their personal relationships, while three coaches discussed having a partner in athletics as a strategy to achieve interpersonal balance. Previous research has identified spousal support as a key factor in creating effective work-life balance (Bruening & Dixon, 2008; Kilty, 2006). These findings suggest that these former coaches struggled with maintaining work-life balance and that this may have impacted their decision to leave coaching. Many coaches also referenced their new found work-life balance since leaving coaching as one of their primary motivations to remain in non-coaching vocations. Further qualitative examination of the impact of work-life balance and interpersonal stressors on coaches' decisions to leave coaching may be necessary.

Negative experiences. The results from this qualitative analysis suggests that coaching may did experience situations related to discrimination based on sexual orientation and four of the five coaches self-disclosed their sexual orientation when asked about this issue. Previous research has described the sport culture as homophobic (Demers, 2004). Homophobia has a significant influence on the hiring and firing of coaches and recruitment of college athletes (Thorngren, 1990; Wellman & Blinde, 1997b). Other researchers have found that female applicants are often scrutinized about their "homosexual inclinations" or "masculine" appearance when athletic directors check applicant's references (Lopiano, 2001). Heaton (1992) also found that single female coaches are less likely to be hired, which, according to Wellman and Blinde (1997b), may be due to some athletic directors' concerns about lesbians, so they may only hire males to avoid the issue entirely. Wellman and Blinde (1997b) also suggest that coaches may shy away from coaching due to the homophobia present in sport. Demers (2010) suggested that all women experience this pressure to engage in heteronorming, even heterosexual coaches, though she states that lesbian coaches often face different consequences on their coaching careers. Lesbian coaches are dramatically limited in career options and negatively affected in hiring opportunities at the assistant coach and head coach levels (Demers, 2010), a statement echoed by some of the participants in the phone interviews.

The result of four out of five former coaches self-identifying as lesbians was quite surprising and may support Kamphoff's (2006) findings which suggests that a significant number of women coaches leaving coaching may be lesbians. However, due to the sensitive nature of the topic, it is impossible to know exactly what percentage of coaches are lesbians and what percentage may be leaving coaching due to the perceptions of their sexual identity. Griffin (1996) suggests that this stigma affects all female coaches, straight or gay since the assumption of being a 'single' or non-heterosexual woman in sports is problematic; Griffin also suggests that heterosexual women may leave athletics to avoid the lesbian label. Therefore, this issue of heteronorming may be a significant

factor impacting the retention of all women coaches and previous research suggest that it may at least impact access discrimination (Greenhaus et al., 1990).

Another theme that was developed from the questions asked about barriers and negative experiences was related to the gender marginalization and structural barriers experienced by these women. Many of the women reported that they felt that women coaches were not treated the same way as men when fired and that it is more difficult for women to be "recycled". This resembles the access discrimination as identified by Greenhaus and colleagues (1990), which is defined as preventing members of a particular group from entering a job, organization or profession. The structural barriers of fewer resources, rewards and opportunities resemble treatment discrimination also identified by Greenhaus and colleagues (1990) as two types of discrimination faced by women in the coaching profession. One participant indicated that she was told she was too old to be a coach, while another felt that she was not respected by male peers due to her youth. Overall, a number of participants suggested that it is easier for male coaches to be re-hired after termination, and that women are held to a different standard. This finding supports previous research by Thorngren (1990) who found that women coaches perceived males to have a "safety net" due to networking and greater perceived competency as coaches by those in administrative positions compared to women coaches due to the gender bias that sport is a male domain. It is surprising that these beliefs still exist twenty years after initially written. This issue was not assessed by the surveys given to all participants, therefore it is impossible to determine to what extent current and other former coaches experience this phenomenon and further research is recommended. Access discrimination or the lack of hiring women coaches, appeared to be the most direct factor in limiting the continuation of the careers of the former coaches interviewed in this study.

Tipping point. Many of the former coaches interviewed did not choose to leave their last coaching position, but instead were terminated and chose not to return to coaching. Some

participants indicated that they would consider returning to coaching only if the perfect situation or time arose. However, none of the coaches indicated that they would return to a head coaching position at a division I school as a result of their reflections during their non-coaching careers, but would consider division II and division III coaching positions. It is unclear how many of the 171 former coaches who completed the survey left non-voluntarily or for positive vs/ negative reasons. It is also difficult to determine if some of these coaches may return to coaching in the future. Future research may be necessary to determine what percentage of women coaches leave the profession and return in the future, as well as what the common reasons for leaving or these career interruptions may be.

Student empowerment and development. Lastly, all coaches interviewed were asked about their greatest experience as a coach. All emphasized athlete empowerment, growth and development in their coaching philosophies. Specifically, all of the coaches identified that they valued their student-athletes' accomplishments in the classroom, some indicating that this was more important to them than athletic performance. It is important to note that these coaches identified the empowerment and growth of their athletes as some of their greatest achievements. This theme speaks to the impact that coaches can have as role models to student athletes. Hewlett and colleagues (2005) suggest that the presence of female role models sends a positive, empowering subliminal message to female athletes. Desvaux and colleagues (2007) go further and suggest that coaching, mentoring and networking all increase awareness and enable and empower women to make appropriate choices. Therefore, the emphasis on student development and empowerment may carry over to the philosophies of any future coaches that may emerge from their athlete pools or may impact these student-athletes in their non-athletic related careers. Future research may be necessary to explore the impact of coaches' emphasis on student-athlete development and empowerment on student-athlete psychosocial and career outcomes.

Bracketing interview. Prior to conducting the interviews, the researcher participated in a bracketing interview for two reasons, 1) to increase awareness of potential bias, and 2) to facilitate a basic understanding of the researcher's personal model for the qualitative data. The results of this bracketing interview consisted of themes associated with mentoring, work-life balance and discrimination. One hypothesis identified in this interview was that former coaches would experience work-life balance difficulty and that this would be one of the main stressors experienced. The researcher did not have any hypothesis regarding what type of mentoring the coaches would report (informal or formal) during their coaching careers and did not speculate about the type of advice likely received. Another theme from the bracketing interview was the impact of obstacles and experiences with discrimination. The researcher hypothesized that coaches may experience some obstacles during their coaching careers. Specifically, that coaches would report to be at least aware of the experiences other women coaches may have had with these issues. The researcher did not identify any specific themes associated with empowering or greatest achievements of the coaches, but felt that some coaches may report very positive experiences in this area. The researcher did expect that coaches would describe a tipping point in their decision to leave. This tipping point discussion may highlight a decision making process or a sequence of events that lead up to the final decision being made. It was expected that these coaches may have been contemplating leaving coaching for some time.

When the researchers' initial bracketing interview expectations were compared to the coded data, it was found that the initial bracketing model and the coded former coaching data were similar in only a few areas. The researcher expected to see increased work-life balance difficulty, and this was supported by the data, but differed as the researcher did not develop a hypothesis regarding the impact of work-life balance on personal health/balance and interpersonal relationships. The researcher's bracketing interview did not resemble the lack of formal mentoring theme as

participants were split on the presence of mentors and the researcher did not expect a specific result in this area. Additionally, a lack of formal mentoring, need for more administrative guidance and the usefulness of the coaching network emerged as themes from the discussion. Additionally, when asked about empowerment and greatest achievements these coaches experienced as a coach,, the coaches revealed the emphasis placed on their athletes empowerment and development. Lastly, the researcher did not hypothesize any themes resembling that of *support matters* or the circumstances that would lead to a *tippng point*. No specific hypotheses were developed surrounding sexual orientation, though the researcher did suspect, based on previous research that the impact of discrimination based on sexual orientation will exist. The researcher also noted that *gender marginalization* might occur in the form of the "old boys club" that the male players, administrators and coaches might devalue women coaches' contributions. The researcher also hypothesized that barriers would likely exist in the form of lack of support in general and lack of athletic department. No specific hypotheses were generated for the *culture of athletics* or *student development and empowerment* themes as they were not necessarily direct questions asked of the participant. The researcher did expect that coaches would describe a tipping point in their decision to leave, however, it was not expected that all five coaches would have left coaching non-voluntarily.

Based on the comparisons between the researchers bracketing interview and the results of the coding of the data, it may be that the researcher was biased in some areas of the interview even though every attempt was made to limit bias. The use of specific questions regarding specific topics may have been leading. Similarly, the researcher's hypotheses based on understanding of the literature may have impacted the type of probes the researcher used when questions were asked regarding experiences with discrimination, barriers and work-life balance. As a result this study would have benefited from a phenomenological approach.

Limitations and Future Directions

A major limitation of qualitative is the format and the content of the phone interview script. While the survey inquired about important factors that have been shown to impact coach retention, in hindsight the survey was likely leading and may have biased the participants unintentionally when asked about specific topic areas (e.g. mentoring, work-life balance). As a result future research should use phenomenological research to open up the participant's responses and get richer more emergent data as opposed to asking about very specific aspects of the coaches experience. Phenomenological research asks a limited number of questions (2-3) and includes numerous, specific probes to increase the depth of the interview. This type of qualitative research also approaches attempts to limit the potential impact of interviewer bias during the interview by asking open ended questions such as, "Tell me about your experiences as a head coach?"

Another limitation of the results would be the relatively small sample size, however, due to the purpose of the qualitative section being too help better understand the quantitative data, further interviews may not be necessary. Saturation had also been achieved. However, due to the small sample size, the analysis focused mainly on higher order themes under the category from which the high order theme was coded, and subthemes were only included in discussion with the higher order themes to illustrate the specific components that emerged with the high order themes.

Appendix C

Survey for Current Coaches

Screening question:
What is the primary sport that you currently coach? _____

Current coaching status: Head coach Assistant coach
Current job status: Full time Part time

Demographics
Age: Under 20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-50 51-60 Over 60

Ethnicity:

African American Asian/ Asian American
Caucasian Hispanic/ Hispanic American
Native American Other (please identify):_____

What is your highest level of formal education? *(pick one)*

High school/GED Bachelor's degree Doctoral degree
Some college Some graduate work Associated degree
Master's degree

Do you have a coaching, teaching or sport science related degree? Yes No
If yes, please list degree title (e.g., elementary education, kinesiology) and level (BS/BA, MS/MA, Ph.D.)

Please list any coaching certifications you currently hold and the certifying organization.

Relationship Status: Single Married/Long term partner Divorced

Is your partner/spouse also involved in sport? Yes No

If yes, please explain in what capacity they are involved (e.g. coaching, administration, participation etc.)

Do you have children? Yes No
If yes, please explain in what capacity they are involved in sport_____

List your primary sport played: _____
Highest level of participation in your primary sport: _____

Please describe how your primary sport is viewed within your athletic department (e.g. as a priority sport for the institution, i.e. Tier I?)

Tier I Tier II Tier III

Current yearly coaching salary:

Volunteer coach – no salary Less than $10,000 $10,001 - 24,999
$25,000 - 39,999 $40,000 – 54,999 $55,000 – 69,999
$70,000 - 84,999 $85,000 - 99,999 > $100,000

Section 2: Quantitative Data

Coaching Beliefs & Experiences

Read each of the following statements regarding coaching and indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. 1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree or disagree, 5 strongle agree.

In my coaching career, I believe that I have the opportunity for career advancement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

It is difficult to balance a coaching career and a family/or personal responsibilities successfully.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I am overwhelmed by my coaching duties and the demands of coaching.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I feel my family has been supportive of my coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I feel administrators have been supportive of my coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I feel administrators have been supportive of my personal life and/or family responsibilities?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Mentoring

Did you have a formal (the relationship is facilitated and supported by the an organization, the athletic department etc.) or informal mentor(s) (a relationship that is created spontaneously or informally without any assistance from the organization) in coaching?

Formal Informal None

Please tell us the gender of your primary mentor(s)

My coaching mentor(s) has provided opportunities for networking?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

My coaching mentor(s) has provided opportunities for my professional development

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

My coaching mentor(s) has given me social support

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Being in a mentoring relationship has allowed me to experience growth, advancement and increase my knowledge of coaching

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

When evaluating my relationship with my coaching mentor, I am satisfied with the quality of the mentoring received

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Have you experienced any problems with your mentoring relationship?

Yes No

If yes, please indicate all of the following problems you experienced with mentoring from the list below:

- Lack of time
- Lack of mentor time
- Personality mismatch
- Mentor was too critical
- Mentor was too defensive
- Mentor was untrusting
- Cultural bias
- Gender bias

Section 3: Open Ended Questions

What motivated you to enter coaching as a profession?

Where did you learn to coach?

What obstacles have you had to overcome related to pursuing your career in coaching?

What is mentorship as you understand it?

What is the nature of your relationship with your mentor?

How has/have the relationship(s) helped you in your coaching career?

Please describe your experiences balancing the demands of work and your personal life or other responsibilities.

Have you ever considered leaving the coaching profession or have you ever left the profession?

Yes No

Please explain

Please list the top three reasons why you would choose to leave the coaching profession?

Have you ever considered coaching at a lower level of sport (less skill or lower competition) or have you dropped to a lower level as a coach? Yes No

Please explain

Please list the top three reasons why you remain or continue to remain in the coaching profession?

If you have left the coaching profession in the past, was there a precipitating event that led you to leaving?

Do you know of anyone who has left coaching due to struggles with barriers or perceived barriers to being a female coach? Yes No
Please explain:

If you are aware of other coaches who have left coaching, who might be willing to participate in the study, please provide their name and contact information _____

Appendix D
Survey for Former Coaches

Screening question:

What was the primary sport that coached? _____

What was your coaching and job status at your last coaching position?

Coaching status: Head coach Assistant coach

Current job status: Full time Part time

Demographics

Age: Under 20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-50 51-60 Over 60

Ethnicity:

African American Asian/ Asian American

Caucasian Hispanic/ Hispanic American

Native American Other (please identify):_____

What is your highest level of formal education? *(pick one)*

High school/GED Bachelor's degree Doctoral degree

Some college Some graduate work Associated degree

Master's degree

Do you have a coaching, teaching or sport science related degree? Yes No

If yes, please list degree title (e.g., elementary education, kinesiology) and level (BS/BA, MS/MA, Ph.D.)

Please list any coaching certifications you currently hold and the certifying organization.

Relationship Status: Single Married/Long term partner Divorced

Is your partner/spouse also involved in sport? Yes No

If yes, please explain in what capacity they are involved (e.g. coaching, administration, participation etc.)

Do you have children? Yes No

If yes, please explain in what capacity they are involved in sport_____

List your primary sport played: _____

Highest level of participation in your primary sport: _____

Please describe how your primary sport was viewed within your athletic department at your last coaching position (e.g. as a priority sport for the institution, i.e. Tier I?)

Tier I Tier II Tier III

Please describe the yearly coaching salary you received at your last coaching position:

Volunteer coach – no salary Less than $10,000 $10,001 - 24,999

$25,000 - 39,999 $40,000 – 54,999 $55,000 – 69,999

$70,000 - 84,999 $85,000 - 99,999 > $100,000

Section 2: Quantitative Data

Coaching Beliefs & Experiences

Read each of the following statements regarding coaching and indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements. 1 = strongly disagree, 3 = neither agree or disagree, 5 strongle agree.

During my coaching career, I believed that I had the opportunity for career advancement.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

During my coaching career, it was difficult to balance a coaching career and a family/or personal responsibilities successfully.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

During my coaching career, I was overwhelmed by my coaching duties and the demands of coaching.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

During my coaching career, I feel my family was supportive of my coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

During my coaching career, I feel administrators were supportive of my coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

During my coaching career, I feel administrators were supportive of my personal life and/or family responsibilities?

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Mentoring

Did you have a formal (the relationship is facilitated and supported by the an organization, the athletic department etc.) or informal mentor(s) (a relationship that is created spontaneously or informally without any assistance from the organization) in coaching?

Formal Informal None

Please tell us the gender of your primary mentor(s)

My coaching mentor(s) provided opportunities for networking

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

My coaching mentor(s) provided opportunities for my professional development

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

My coaching mentor(s) gave me social support

1	2	3	4	5

Strongly disagree Disagree Neither agree or disagree Agree Strongly agree

Being in a mentoring relationship allowed me to experience growth, advancement and increase my knowledge of coaching while I was coaching

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

When evaluating my relationship with my coaching mentor, I am satisfied with the quality of the mentoring received while I was coaching

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

Did you experience any problems with your mentoring relationship while you were coaching?
Yes No
If yes, please indicate all of the following problems you experienced with mentoring from the list below:
- Lack of time
- Lack of mentor time
- Personality mismatch
- Mentor was too critical
- Mentor was too defensive
- Mentor was untrusting
- Cultural bias
- Gender bias

Section 3: Open Ended Questions

Please reflect on your experiences while coaching and answer the following questions.

What motivated you to enter coaching as a profession?

Where did you learn to coach?

What obstacles did you have to overcome related to pursuing your previous career in coaching?

What is mentorship as you understand it?
What was/is the nature of your relationship with your coaching mentor?
How did the relationship(s) help you in your coaching career?

Please describe your experiences balancing the demands of work and your personal life or other responsibilities while you were still in the coaching profession.

Prior to leaving the coaching profession, did you previously consider leaving the profession? Yes No
Please explain

Please list the top three reasons why you decided to leave the coaching profession?

Prior to leaving coaching, did you ever consider coaching at a lower level of sport (less skill or lower competition) or did you ever drop to a lower level as a coach? Yes No

Please explain

Please list the top three reasons why you would have remained in the coaching profession if you had not chosen to leave?

When you left the coaching profession, was there a precipitating event that led you to leaving?

Do you know of anyone else who has left coaching due to struggles with barriers or perceived barriers to being a female coach? Yes No
Please explain:

If you are aware of other coaches who have left coaching, who might be willing to participate in the study, please provide their name and contact information _____

Appendix E Phone Interview Script

1. *Prior to leaving coaching coaching, what was your sport experience as a woman in sports?As an athlete? As a coach?*

2. *Please tell me about any experiences that empowered you as a woman in sport.*

3. *Tell me about your greatest achievement while coaching and what you feel was most responsible for that achievement.*

4. *How did you reach your last coaching position? Were there certain experiences, training, previous positions, mentors, or networks that helped you get where you were at that time?)* .

5. *Describe any mentors you've had, the type of relationship you have, how this was developed and how they have helped you?*

6. *Prior to quitting coaching, how did you feel about your career progression? Did you feel you were advancing your coaching career as you planned? What is your current career or career path?*

7. *Tell me about some of the obstacles you confronted while you were coaching?*

8. *Tell me about any experiences you or your colleagues may have been subject to with regards to sexual harassment, discrimination or stereotyping in terms of gender or sexual orientation while you were still coaching? In what way did these experiences alter your career path? Describe any strategies you or other women have used effectively deal with these issues?*

9. *Tell me about your experiences balancing the demands of coaching and your commitments outside of work such as social relationships or other responsibilities when you were coaching? What strategies did you develop to make your social or personal life and professional life both work effectively?*

10. *What do you believe led to you quitting coaching? Please describe what led you to consider this?*

11. If necessary, based on previous responses: Do you feel as though any of the obstacles or challenges you faced were as a result of your gender?

Appendix F

Pilot study questionnaire

PART I: General Demographics

Age: Under 20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40 41-50 51-60 Over 60

Ethnicity:

African American Asian/ Asian American
Caucasian Hispanic/ Hispanic American
Native American Other (please identify):_____

Are you a US Citizen or resident? Citizen Resident
If you are a citizen or resident of another country, please list country:_____

What is your highest level of formal education? *(pick one)*

High school/GED Bachelor's degree Doctoral degree
Some college Some graduate work
Associated degree Master's degree

Do you have a coaching, teaching or sport science related degree? Yes No
If yes, please list degree title (e.g., elementary education, kinesiology) and level (BS/BA, MS/MA, Ph.D.)

Marital Status: Single Married/Long term partner Divorced

Is your partner/spouse also involved in sport? Yes No
If yes, please explain in what capacity they are involved (e.g. coaching, administration, participation etc.)

Do you have children? Yes No
If yes, please list ages and genders: _____

Please list any coaching certifications you currently hold and the certifying organization.

Part II: Sport Participation History

Primary sport played:
Highest level of participation in your primary sport:
Other sports played:
Have you ever played on a boys or coed team? Yes No
If so, at what level of play?

Did you play sport in college? Yes No
If yes, at what level? Division I II III NAIA

Have you ever coached and played for the same team at the same time? Yes No
If so, at what level of play?

During your athletic career, please indicate how many female and male head and assistant coaches have you had at each level of play: If you did not play at a certain level, please leave the response boxes blank.

For example, if you played youth sport and you had one female assistant coach one male assistant and 2 male head coaches, you would enter 0 for # of female head coach, 1for# of female assistant coach, 2 for # of male head coaches, and 1 for # of male assistant coaches.

Age and/or level of participation	# of **FEMALE head** coaches you played for at this level	# of **FEMALE assistant** coaches you played for at this level	# of **MALE head** coaches you had you played for at this level	# of **MALE assistant** coaches you played for at this level
Example: Youth sport	*0*	*1*	*2*	*1*
Youth sport (under 12 years old)				
Club sport (12-18 years old)				
High school sport				
Collegiate sport				
National team/ level				
Adult sport recreational /club				
Other:				

Part III: Coaching History

Using the following table, please indicate the number of years you have coached in each of the following situations. If you never coached in a given situation, you can leave the square blank.

For example, if you were the head coach of a youth level girl's team for 4 years; put a 4 in the box that corresponds to the youth sport and # of years as the head coach for a female team.

Level of play	# of years as the **head** coach for a **male** team	# of years as the **assistant** coach for a **male** team	# of years as the **head** coach for a **co-ed** team	# of years as the **assistant** coach for a **co-ed** team	# of years as the **head** coach for a **female** team	# of years as the **assistant** coach for a **female** team
Example: Youth sport (under 12 years old)	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*4*	*0*
Youth sport (under 12 years old)						
Club sport (12-18 years old)						
High school sport						
Collegiate sport						
National team						
Adult sport recreational /club						
Other level:						

During the times you worked as an assistant coach, please indicate how many times you coached

with a female head coach _____

with a male head coach _____

What is the primary sport that you currently coach? _____

Current coaching status: Head coach Assistant coach

Current job status: Full time Part time

Current yearly coaching salary:

Volunteer coach – no salary Less than $10,000 $10,001 - 24,999

$25,000 - 39,999 $40,000 – 54,999 $55,000 – 69,999

$70,000 - 84,999 $85,000 - 99,999 > $100,000

If you coach part time, please list your other career/jobs:
If you coach part time, how many hours per week do you currently devote to coaching? _____
Please estimate the number of female head coaches in your league? _____
Please estimate the number of female athletic administrators in your league? _____
If possible, please estimate the number of female athletic trainers in your league? _____

Part IV: Coaching Beliefs & Experiences

Read each of the following statements and indicate the number that best corresponds to your response.

I have occupational mobility as a coach (e.g, able to move up, be promoted)

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

In my coaching career, I have been asked to perform tasks that are more related to my gender than my job description.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I have to work harder than my male coaching colleagues to prove my abilities as a coach.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

My athletes are less accepting of my authority as a coach than they would be of a male coach.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

It is difficult to balance a coaching career and a family successfully.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I have experienced discrimination in my coaching career due to my gender.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I have experienced discrimination in my coaching career due to my race.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I have had to challenge preconceived notions and stereotypes related to my gender and abilities/competency to coach.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

I am overwhelmed by my coaching duties and the demands of coaching.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree or disagree	Agree	Strongly agree

How supportive has your family been of your coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5

Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely

How supportive have administrators been of your coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely

How supportive have other female coaches been of your coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely

How supportive have male coaches been of your coaching pursuits?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	Mostly	Completely

I believe the top 5 ideal coaching qualities for working with female athletes are: (rank your top 5 choices)

Assertive	Athletic	Competent	Competent
Competitive	Confident	Conscientious	Consistent
Credible	Decisive	Empathetic	Fair
Honest	Leader	Loyal	Objective
Self aware	Self controlled	Sensitive	Understanding

I believe the top 5 ideal coaching qualities for working with male athletes are: (rank your top 5 choices)

Assertive	Athletic	Competent	Competent
Competitive	Confident	Conscientious	Consistent
Credible	Decisive	Empathetic	Fair
Honest	Leader	Loyal	Objective
Self aware	Self controlled	Sensitive	Understanding

PART V: Open Ended Questions

What motivated you to enter the coaching as a profession?

What obstacles have you had to overcome related to pursuing your career in coaching?

Did/do you have a mentor who has helped you in your coaching career? Yes No

If yes-

Without using names, please tell us the gender of your mentor(s)

How did you connect with your mentor(s) initially?

How has/have the relationship(s) helped you?

Have you ever considered quitting the coaching profession or have you ever quit the profession?

Yes No

Please explain

What advice would you give to young women interested in getting into the coaching profession?

Pilot study - qualitative questions

1. What motivated you to enter the coaching as a profession?

2. Describe any role models you looked up to and aspired to be like with regards to your coaching career. What was it about them that inspired you?

3. Describe any mentors you've had or have that have helped you in your career. How have they helped you?

4. As an aspiring female coach or in the early years in your coaching career, please tell us about encouragement (e.g. positive statements, career advice, financial assistance) you received regarding your career aspirations?

5. As an aspiring female coach or in the early years in your coaching career, please tell us about the discouragement (e.g. negative comments) you received from others regarding your career aspirations?

6. Prior to entering the coaching profession, did you imagine you would confront any potential obstacles to your coaching career? Have you confronted any of those obstacles? Other obstacles?

7. What do you think is the source of the obstacles you've confronted? [Probe for gender]

8. Thinking about your life, list all the roles you play on a daily basis in addition to "coach." How do you balance all these roles?

9. Do you feel that your gender influences people's perceptions of you as a coach? Describe how. [Probe for athletes, parents, administrators]

10. Have you ever considered moving to coaching at a lower level or getting out of coaching? If so, please describe what led you to consider this.

11. Since the introduction of Title XI, although the opportunities for women to participate in sport have increased, the number of women coaching women's teams at the NCAA level of competition has declined from over 90% in the mid 70's to less than 43% currently. What advice or ideas would you like to share that would help to increase the number of women in the coaching profession? [probe: What advice would you give to young women considering a career in coaching today?]

Appendix G

Cost/Benefit to Coaching Survey

Benefits are defined as potential positive consequences of involvement in an activity. *Below are listed a variety of benefits related to coaching that have been identified by individuals within the coaching profession. Please indicate the degree of importance that each of these items has for* ***your own*** *coaching experience. There are no right or wrong answers, so answer as honestly as possible.*

Benefits to coaching	**1 Not at all important**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Extremely important**
Challenge of building a successful program	1	2	3	4	5
Challenge of competition	1	2	3	4	5
Challenge of encouraging athletes to work as a team	1	2	3	4	5
Challenge of turning a program around	1	2	3	4	5
Clinic attendance for professional development	1	2	3	4	5
Development of peer relations with other coaches	1	2	3	4	5
Enjoyment associated with working with athletes	1	2	3	4	5
Enjoyment of seeing athletes achieve goal	1	2	3	4	5
Enjoyment of teaching skills	1	2	3	4	5
Enjoyment of team atmosphere	1	2	3	4	5
Enjoyments seeing an athlete learn a new skill	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of competence	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of self-satisfaction	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of success	1	2	3	4	5
Fun	1	2	3	4	5
Increase in employment opportunities	1	2	3	4	5
Learning from athletes	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunity to continue athletic experiences	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunity to emulate a role model	1	2	3	4	5
Opportunity to share sport experiences with others	1	2	3	4	5
Personal awards for coaching	1	2	3	4	5
Prestige	1	2	3	4	5
Salary	1	2	3	4	5
Stepping stone to athletic administration	1	2	3	4	5
Strategic challenges	1	2	3	4	5
Travel	1	2	3	4	5
Trophies from competition	1	2	3	4	5
Winning	1	2	3	4	5
Increase in occupational mobility for promotion or move up in position*	1	2	3	4	5

Costs are defined as potential negative consequences of involvement in an activity

Below are listed a variety of costs related to coaching that have been identified by individuals within the coaching profession. Please indicate the degree of importance that each of these items has for ***your own*** *coaching experience. There are no right or wrong answers, so answer as honestly as possible.*

Costs to coaching	**1 Not at all important**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5 Extremely important**
Anxiety	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict with parents	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict with professional non coaching commitments	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict with social life	1	2	3	4	5
Conflicts with administration	1	2	3	4	5
Feelings of nonsupport	1	2	3	4	5
Frustration related to lack of program commitment by athletes	1	2	3	4	5
Inability to accomplish goals	1	2	3	4	5
Inability to establish discipline	1	2	3	4	5
Inability to motivate athletes	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate financial compensation	1	2	3	4	5
Inadequate program support	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of opportunity to advance technical knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of technical knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of time to engage in other activities	1	2	3	4	5
Lack of winning seasons	1	2	3	4	5
Less time for family	1	2	3	4	5
Long hours	1	2	3	4	5
Physical symptoms of stress	1	2	3	4	5
Pressure from community	1	2	3	4	5
Pressure to win	1	2	3	4	5
Sacrifice of personal time	1	2	3	4	5
Stress	1	2	3	4	5
Workload related to teaching/coaching responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
Inability to balance coaching and family demands*	1	2	3	4	5
Discrimination due to my gender*	1	2	3	4	5
Discrimination due to my race*	1	2	3	4	5
Conflict with preconceived notions and stereotypes related to my gender*	1	2	3	4	5
Pressure from administration*	1	2	3	4	5

Thinking back on your past coaching experiences, how would you rate your overall satisfaction with coaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very dissatisfied Neutral very satisfied.

How would you rate your satisfaction in this sport right now?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very dissatisfied Neutral very satisfied.

How dissatisfied could you be in coaching and still remain in the coaching profession?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very dissatisfied Neutral very satisfied.

How satisfying would an alternative situation have to be for you to leave coaching?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Very dissatisfied Neutral very satisfied.

Appendix H – Sample of Draft Summary

Initial Findings:

- Working with women coached [positive influence on athletes]
- "frustrating being in a male dominated field [good old boys]
- Credibility and validity not valued by male co-workers [not valued by male culture]
- Milestones, improvements in program, victory [empowerment, student development]
- NCAA women's coaches academy - very empowering [professional development]
- Achievement → good staff and good athletes [staff support]
- "previous positions" → experience, networking [exp = credibility, networking]
- D1 right out the gate [career progression]
- Exp building a program [exp = credibility]
- Small D1 community → being respected and networking important [networking]
- No formal mentors [lack of mentoring]
- Model previous coach → "love hate relationship" [mentoring difficulties]
- Rival coach/informal mentor → awkward [mentor problem - rival]
- Taking initiative to develop mentoring relationship
- Mentoring helped in first 2 years, then "sink or swim" [loss of mentor]
- Coaching six years without any informal mentoring
- Coached at 2 schools → developing programs [career progression]
- Success in D1 → limited in opportunity to move up to higher level of career success [lack of opportunity in pros]
- Seeking position that supported students and athletic program
- New position → lacking peer support network
- Lack of support from department → "totem pole and I'm at the bottom" [lack support]
- "real estate investor" – self-employed [more financially lucrative profession]
- Always wanted to coach "as long as I can make a difference, I'll coach forever" [career progression]
- High ranked team – carry large roster to balance Title IX issues [importance of sport, pressure to succeed]
- "split up with partner" [loss of relationship]
- Not out to department → discrimination from parents and administration [stigma]
- Allegations of "inappropriate relationships" → witch hunt [stereotyping, discrimination]
- Team lost coach before national championship --.negative impact on top athletes on team [impacting students]
- Postponing renewing contract for months → feel dept was looking for reason to terminate [set up to fail,
- "being single" → no proof [lack of support, discrimination]
- "didn't want to leave coaching at that time" [commitment to sport]
- Applying for positions → "black balled", no neutral recommendations [stigma, lack of support, discrimination, hiring/firing]
- Barriers – lack of administrators support [barriers], Overbearing parents [parenting issues], "just being a female, a lesbian" [sexual discrimination]
- Hiring lesbians not ok → administration [discrimination]
- Bias hiring women, hiring female coach → next time male if it doesn't work out [diff men vs. women]
- Culture of athletics → hide sexuality [sexuality as issue, closeted]
- "off-handed comments" from admin → "won't hire her bc she's a lesbian [stigma, discrimination]
- Inappropriate comments from athletes → lack of support from AD [lack of support]
- "diversity training in department' → not taken seriously [lack of support from AD]
- SWA/dept deny need for diversity training [culture of denial]
- "bring it up" "opening a can of worms" → become a problem [culture of denial]
- Organized own diversity training → positively received by athletes [student development, positive influence]
- Using stereotyping, discrimination as motivation → "ultimately" ended career "homophobia" [reason for leaving, discrimination, sexual orientation]
- Strategies for coping → "staying in the closet", [sexuality, discrimination, coping skill]
- Female coaches getting married to avoid stereotype [sexuality as issue, discrimination]
- No work-life balance → "sacrificed health for it" [W-L balance]
- "partnership suffered for it" → unable to balance work-life [loss or relationship, social life, need balance]
- "season is too long, recruiting too intense" → little time off [w-l balance, pressure]
- "worked seven days a week, fourteen hours a day" → little time for relationship, work with partner [w-l balance, support from partner]
- Length of season and being understaffed [stress]

- Initial reason for not returning to coaching → "blackballed" [reason for leaving, discrimination, coach recycling]
- After year, wouldn't return even though "good coach and I impacted a lot of lives" [costs/benefits to coaching, positive influence]
- "I worked with my partner" → conscious choice [support – W-L balance]
- "develop relationships with friends" →understood seasonal time constraints [W-L balance, coping skills]
- "commitment to take care of myself physically" [coping skill, prioritizing health, personal balance]
- Consider leaving before → student-athlete changing
- "partner leaving bc I wasn't prioritizing her over my sport" [loss of relationship, lack of w-l balance]
- "issues with parents" being over involved [parenting issues, dissatisfaction w/ coaching]
- "weigh pros and cons" of coaching [costs/benefits to coaching]
- "not sough out", "wasn't respective" → not a good ol' boy [barriers due to gender]
- "certainly the sexual orientation issue that was double-whammy" [discrimination]
- Perception of hire bc needed female [differences in men vs. women's sport]
- "love coaching" → making difference in athletes' lives [empowerment, student development]
- Sport → "such a difference in my life" [development, empowerment]
- Positive feedback from athletes → "belief in herself was huge", empower women that way [empowerment, student development, positive influence]

Draft Summary Continued

<u>Possible Themes and Sub-Themes</u>

THEME: Mentoring

Subtheme: Lack of formal mentoring relationship
- No formal mentors
- Model previous coach→ "love hate relationship"
- Rival coach/informal mentor → awkward [mentor problem]
- Taking initiative to develop mentoring relationship
- Coaching six years without any formal mentoring.

Subtheme: female network
- Previous positions → networking
- Small D1 community → respected coaches part of network

Subtheme: Mentoring advice
- Mentoring helped in first 2 years, then "sink or swim"

THEME: Work-life balance

Subtheme: Partner support
- "split up with partner" [loss of relationship]
- "I worked with my partner" → conscious choice seeking balance

Subtheme: personal balance
- Current job: real estate → more financially lucrative profession + balance
- Friendships w/ ppl understanding seasonal time constraints
- Commitment to self-care

Subtheme: sacrifice/stressors
- Sacrifice health for coaching
- Partnership suffer for coaching → 7 days a week, 14hrs a day
- Season length, "recruiting too intense" → little time off
- Being understaffed
- Loss of relationship "bc I wasn't prioritizing her over my sport"

THEME: Barriers/Negative Experiences

Subtheme: Discrimination
- Not out to department → experience discrimination from parents and administration [stigma]
- Allegations of "inappropriate relationships" → witch hunt [stereotyping, discrimination]
- Being single → no proof otherwise
- Postponing renewing contract for months → feel dept was looking for reason to terminate
- Blackballed, no neutral recommendations
- "being a female, a lesbian"
- Hiring lesbians not ok → administration
- Bias hiring women, if it doesn't work, hire male
- "homophobia"

- Pressure on women to marry to avoid stereotype

Subtheme: Marginalization

- Good ol' boys – "frustrating being in male dominated field.
- Credibility and unvalued by male colleagues
- Hide sexuality → culture of athletics
- "not sought out", "not respected"

Subtheme: structural barriers

- Success in D1 → limited opp to move up to higher level of career success. [lack of pro opportunities]
- Lack of administrative support
- Overbearing parents "over involved"
- Comments from athletes → lack of support from AD
- Culture of denial of problems related to need for diversity training
- Limited Coach recycling → "black balled"
- Perception of being hired bc needed a female coach

Subtheme: pressure for success

- High ranked team – pressure to support large roster due to Title IX issues

THEME: Development of support

Subtheme: Support matters

- Achievement → good staff and good athletes
- Last position → lack of peer support network

THEME: Student-Athlete Development

Subtheme: Empowerment

- Positive influence – working with women
- Milestones – improvement in program, victory
- Seek out positions that supported students and athletic program
- "love coaching", making differences in athletes' lives
- Personal empowerment → passing it on
- Feedback from athletes → "belief in self" empower women

THEME: Career Development

Subtheme: experience

- NCAA women's coaches academy – empowering
- "previous positions" → experience
- Experience building a program [credibility]
- "as long as I can make a difference, I'll coach forever" – always wanted to coach
- Commitment to sport – didn't want to leave coaching
- Using stereotyping, discrimination as motivation → ultimately stressor

Subtheme: coaching prep

- D1 right out the gate

Subtheme: cost/benefits to coaching

- Won't return to coaching even when considering positive influences on athletes
- "couldn't pay me enough"
- Consider leaving before → student's changing
- "weigh pros and cons" of coaching

Appendix I

Email recruitment letter

Greetings,

This letter is a request for you to take part in a research study that explores the experiences of *current and former women head coaches of intercollegiate teams.* Your email address was found by using an internet search. This project is being conducted by Justine Vosloo, M.S. to meet the requirements for a Ph.D. in Sport and Exercise Psychology, under the supervision of Dr. Jack Watson, an associate professor in the College of Physical Activity and Sport Sciences at WVU.

Your participation in this project is greatly appreciated and it will take approximately 10-20 minutes to fill out the online survey. For every participant who completes the "Former Head or Assistant Coach" survey, a charitable donation of $2 will be made to a charity that you select from the three options provided. Completing the "current coach" survey no longer not contains this charitable donation.

If you would like to participate in the survey please use the following links to enter the survey that best describes your current coaching status. Once you enter the survey link, additional information will be available regarding your rights as a research participant.

\If you a CURRENTLY coaching at the Division I level as a **Head Coach**, please select this link:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/QPQ2MPQ

If you are currently NOT coaching but were a FORMER **Head or Assistant coach** at the Division I level, please select this link:
http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/N2WPDD7

I hope that you will participate in this research project, as it could be beneficial in understanding the experiences of current and former women coaches. Should you have any questions about this letter or the research project, please feel free to contact Justine Vosloo by e-mail at Justine.vosloo@mail.wvu.edu or phone (304) 906-7426.
If you do not wish to receive our messages in the future, please reply to our email and we will remove you from our list.

Thank you for your time and help with this project.
Sincerely

Justine Vosloo and Jack Watson

Appendix J

Bracketing Interview

'I: umm prior to leaving coaching, what was your sport experience as a woman in sports, as an athlete and as a coach?
J: Well based on my understanding of the literature, I foresee the [..] um a positive [..] maybe some negative experiences uhh as an athlete and as a coach, maybe noticing some of the gender disparities in terms of financial um, resources allocated to certain sports and I think that could potentially be a positive or a negative experience that a coach might have as well
'I: How do you mean by a positive?
J: positive in terms within my benefit from some of those [...] women's basketball program [..] versus soccer or gymnastics um they might benefit from some of those disparities or they could benefit in terms of not having as much pressure placed on their on the outcome of their season.
I: So going back to the question about was your experiences as women in sport do you think just, is that going what the women actually say or talk about?
J: I think, um maybe not all of them I think some of them might just rate as both, this is what I did as an athlete this is what ive done as a coach, some of them might just stick to, basically stick to that and then others could potentially talk more about other experiences and I think that some of them maybe primed just based on answering the questions on the quantative survey and might pick up other things that we've assessed
'I: and then umm sort of along the lines of that, in asking them about their experiences as an athlete and as a coach, What do you think you might see since your asking it in two phases? Any differences or any…
J: I think that some might answer only based on what they pick up on but their not, versus some might be more focused on the coaching role, some might be more focused on the athlete role and I'm a prime them to answer the other aspect of the question cause I do foresee that that's a potential depending on how long its been since they've in the athlete role. [..] There are any [....] experiences that that might have...
I: That was going to be, that was going to be [….next] you know you've got the questions how you know, what's your age, how long have you left since you left, what would you expected to see just based on your knowledge of the literature for somebody who is five years out of versus twenty years out, or anyone that [continuum]
J: out of coaching or out of just...
'I: out of play because your, hopefully your people aren't going to be more than ten years out of coaching, correct? But they might be thirty years ago that they coached, it might be ten years ago that they coached; I mean that they were an athlete. I'm sorry.
J: Umm, I think that the longest, longer its been since they've actually been an athlete, I think I'll have a more positive view of what it was like for them as an athlete unless, unless there's something else that's priming them to remember more the negative experience then they have had as an athlete. So I think some of those experiences could come out too, in terms of as a coach, what they've observed there athletes going through and that could bring up some stuff from them and again it could be positive or negative, it kind of just depends on the situation.

'I: Ok [good] I think that is a good point that it's going to depend on what was most salient at that time. Umm, tell me about any experiences that have empowered you as a woman in sport.
'J: my own experiences or research[?] [..]
I: lets first […..]I have you on answering terms of bracketing this I think.
J: for me in terms of empowerment, so its given me a career, this so, that's what's nice] umm I think in empowerment you need self confidence and umm yea having skills transferable life skills that are definitely [..] so I think that those ways [..] empowering, umm I think for a lot of coaches that might be some what experienced in coaching or playing a sport is given the opportunities in the career that they've wouldn't have typically have seen or thought about um, I don't know what else to say to that really, in terms of my own empowerment
'I: what about from the literature then?
J: umm, from the literature obviously there is a lot of positive that comes out of playing sport, you know, prevention of teenage pregnancies and those types of things are a lot of positive benefits for girls and women specifically so I could at least foresee some you know, definitely some positive experiences in terms of confidence or instilling work ethics, leadership and some of those positive characteristics and values that we could see coming out of sport participation and I think definitely in terms of um coaching perhaps also some empowerment in terms of networking and support from peers and colleagues, um , depending on whatever that situation is that they find themselves in.
I: [..] just looking at that question, just even the term empowering you as a woman, you know, has sort of a connotation to it just in the phrasing, do you have any sort of concepts or thoughts on how that might be perceived just that that phrasing as you put it to a female athlete or coach?
J: I think some could see that it is kind of a feminist you know, [..] perspective on how they've been empowered through sport um I, I do think it could, it has potential being misunderstood as a question, so probably would have to clarify
'I: what might you see if you , what would you anticipate to see if someone was going the road of misinterpreting that?
J: maybe focusing more on the outcomes you know, what have they done, what are some of the accomplishments that they have had in sport or in that way and perhaps also maybe comparing themselves to other coaches or perhaps looking at it from that perspective, I couldn't think of anything else.
I: what other phrasing might you use to help make sure that the true meaning of what your looking for, or what is it that you are truly looking for, what might you, how else might you rephrase that to make sure you get at what you want?
J: I think how sport as benefitted you personally, might be another way to phrase it if they ask for clarification.
I: ok, or even if you hear them going kind of, empowerment, you know. Umm tell me about your greatest achievement while coaching and what you feel was most responsible for that achievement.
J: umm, well I cant answer that from a personal perspective, I think based on what the population, I think that there can be a whole range of responses, but there is no way predict what they might say. I think some might definitely be more outcome oriented and others might focus on the personal relationship side of what they have with their athletes.

'I: Tell me a little about it before we get to the other half here, what was your intent when you asked them what do you feel was most responsible for that achievement?
'J: well I think it is kind a pick up on what do they see as some of the positives things that have come out of their coaching experiences cause obviously these are coaches who have left and they might be thinking about a lot of the negatives that come from the result of leaving so its kind of a positive uh primer so that they wouldn't bias the rest of their responses to the questions.
I: ok, so if you start off with the, just tell me about your greatest achievement, they tell you and then you ask, well what was responsible for that achievement. Just curious was the wording of the questions, something that as your thinking about it, you're telling me why you put it in there. Does the wording, what makes, what, what you feel was most responsible for that achievement, does that take it away from, perhaps what they did as a coach or sort of their empowerment or does it and suggest that, what you know, what helped you, what was sort of or do you think that would be interpreted as just I worked really hard or I mean just sort of a thought on that.
J: I think that is a good point, I think maybe it could potentially be misinterpreted that way, and clarifying, well what do you personally think was responsible for you being able to accomplish that would be a good clarification. Take it away from the outside source that extrinsic source.
I: cause what you just said matched up with your questions, sorry or the way your were clarifying it.
J: ok that was a good point.
'I: umm how did you reach your last coaching position?
J: hmm, I think again that could potentially be misinterpreted by some coaches, I think clarifying you personally, what do you think were uhh some of the things, the experiences they had in priming them for experiences that lead to that coaching position in terms of accomplishments or networking or coaching development whatever it might be that, that helped them.
I: so really it is a question of tell me about your path to your last coaching position. Umm so your intent for this question is then to get at
J: the path that they've taken toward career development, those specific issues.
'I: and what, now your second part of that question is your probe more so than then the what, were there certain experiences training [pre….] mentors, networks, what do are you expecting to hear perhaps from the women?
J: I think some of them might talk about mentoring experiences and um, based on literature that's one thing that seems to be important but we don't know to what extent um, so there's a possibility that could be mentioned in some coaches they might talk about you know the progression from the assistant coach to head coach, its how that experience was. and then also any kind of training program would it be [...] or something else that they might have gone through, hopefully there might be some positive or maybe there was a lack thereof...
I: and just curious, just to be thinking about this, and this question fits into the framing of your script why?
J: In terms of framing of my script. Most because I want to get at some of that education career paths that may be helpful in career development.
I: So you are looking for models on how to do it right?
J: models of how to do it right, or better…
I: describe any mentors you have had and the type of relationship you have had.

J: that one I don't know what to expect. Based on the research there has been very little discussion… there are very few role models available for female coaches, so I am uncertain what should be expected. If someone answers that they did not have a mentor I would definitely follow up on why that may have been and what their experience was. If they answer yes I would definitely follow up and ask them to tell me more about that.
I: Ok, yeah I left off part of the question as I was asking it to you. Prior to leaving coaching how did you feel about your coaching career progression.

J: Again I don't know what to expect about that. In terms of the instruments used and the perceived satisfaction of their career and their career path that could be an interesting range of responses.
I: now refresh my memory you will not be reading their surveys.
J: Yes,
I: so you might want to make a note of this at the start as they may not know and therefore not answer completely, and be confused as to why you are asking them about the same issues. So you may want to remind them of that. Your follow up questions here, do you feel you were advancing as expected and what is your current career path. Two separate questions, what were your thoughts on that one, do you feel you were advancing as expected.
J: I think identifying any potential road blocks, if they encountered anything that may have impacted their career path and contributed to them leaving coaching. I think that may play into the satisfaction piece and perhaps coaches may leave because they are no longer satisfied. I think this group chose to leave for a reason. I'd like to get a sense of why.
I: having said that, why don't you ask why they are leaving? It just dawned on me that you are not asking this. You ask about other pre questions and probes…. You talk about your last coaching position…. And prior to leaving coaching, how did you feel about your career progression.
J: Is that the last question…
I: what do you believe led you to believe coaching is asked.. I think you may want to think about your order… you are setting yourself up to jump a little bit.. and just the flow as an interviewer may be a bit awkward.
J: maybe that could be a probe for that specific question… what caused you to leave.
I: and that could then lead to them discussing that they did feel like they were progressing but they still left…it could be a whole other set of ….
Then what is your current career or career path.
J: I think it would be interesting to know what they are doing. Some may have moved into another position within athletics and others may have left completely.
I: to see the disconnect… ok. Tell me about some of the obstacles you confronted while you were coaching.
J: based on the literature there are a whole host of issues that may be mentioned. For example, work-life balance, discrimination, perceived discrimination, gender role type stereotyping in terms of their career or job assignments. Discrimination based on sexual orientation could be coming out of that questions.

I: and you are interested based on that specific individuals experiences…. What types of probes might you use, if I were to tell you that the administrators, parents and team were a huge obstacle?
J: can you give me some specific examples…
I: also perhaps, how did you handle it… it seems to me that could be a long answer.
Tell me about any experiences you or your colleagues may have been subject to with regard to gender, sexual orientation and harassment while coaching.
J: this would be more specific probe to address that previous question as specifically mentioned in the literature.
I: I could see someone specifically address well I never have but my friend has… how would you handle it?

J: I think it would be important to identify how that individual was affected by knowing that other person's experience.
I: So you might collect heresy but you will decide what to do with it later.
What might you expect coaches to say in terms of how these issues affected their career path.
J: Honestly I am not sure in terms of what coaches might say, and what the literature suggests. Like we might see that those experiences are reported in the literature, potentially it may be a full range of responses… some coaching might say yes they experienced these situations but it did or did not impact them. Or some coaches may report that it did alter their career path…
I: the reason why I ask about career path, you ask about other women, because you say describe strategies you or other women have used to handle these experiences. In terms of consistency, it is the only place where you are asking about other women's experiences. So why did you put that in there as a probe?
J: I think in terms of depersonalizing it, it may make it easier for coaches to talk about it…
I: pretend it is somebody else…
J: right, putting that probe in there might… there is a potential problem with that… but there is also a potential benefit to it.
I: I don't think it is bad… I just think it is the fore thought you put into it. What type of strategies do you expect to see…
J: perhaps leaving, perhaps addressing it with that person, or reporting it. Perhaps finding some ways to navigating through it through mentoring or other outside counseling in some form. Beyond that I don't know what other strategies might be available to coaches or what they might come up with creatively.
I: as you listed to the next question, I want to know more about the set up for this. Tell me about your experiences with balancing the demands of coaching with other personal responsibilities.
So your thoughts about the way that question set somebody up…
J: I think in terms of the questions prior to it I think it may be necessary to prompt the participant that we are switching gears.
I: I wonder if you back it up and say, how you experienced work life balance and neutralize the demands… some may not see that as a big deal… perhaps neutralizing it a little bit. In terms of the literature, what might you expect to see from the literature.

J: I think they … whether they are single or married or have kids or not I think there may be some perceptions of demands and perhaps little time for personal time. At least some people might be more aware of that.. or if there was an issue with that. I would be interested to see just how many mention that as a demand in the first place. I suspect based on the literature that those with families might come up more.
I: how do you expect gender might play into it. Do you see females, or being female contributing to inequity of load or increased demands?
J: I think there may be more awareness placed on the additional family responsibilities that come with being female, compared to males. I think some coaches may comment on that. Based on the literature, they may also comment on the perceived support they felt they had from other coaches and administrators, based on gender roles.
I: Um you probe on the positive side… what strategies you developed to make your personal and professional life both work effectively. Any thoughts on.. .since you are dealing with coaches who have left coaching. What if you find that this was a miserable fiasco that contributed to why they left…
J: I would ask for specifics. Why they felt that was a fiasco for them and I would like to find out more about what they did to develop what strategies they tried to develop.
I: so try to probe what strategies they did develop.
J: or maybe even ask them what they would do differently if they were in that situation now. Maybe some perspective on it would be helpful.
I: and just as a thought, since you have asked them about their current career path… it might be an interesting thing to probe.. how is your career now different in this area? So I switched over to this and it's better or not? Is the grass greener on the other side?
Now we do have the question what do you believe led you to leave coaching? What led you to believe to consider this? Why is this at the end?
J: it was done in an attempt to limit the bias of their responses. I wouldn't want to put that at the beginning and if it was a really negative experience, have it impact their responses to the other questions.
I: tell me more about that thought process.. it just seems, it is an interesting… If you don't see them… if you don't bring it up but you are asking them if they left… how else do you see them bringing it up. I see the point of not firing up the emotions.
J: I think in terms of content, that it would bias it that much, but I do think that the emotion that comes with that investment in coaching and the difficulty with making that decision could take the entire interview down a negative path. So even asking about accomplishments for example, could be influenced in some way as a result. Just trying to control for that.
I: I think you need to think very carefully about those questions to probe certain questions deep enough because you don't want to stir up the emotion… and if it is a touchy reason why they left… you are going to be working very nimbly…
J: I also suspect that some may tell my why they left earlier on regardless so that was really a back up question in case they don't talk about it earlier.
I: I think if they left for an angry reason you will hear about it straight away. I think that is why they agreed to be in the study… more so than being interested.
Another interesting probe to add.. you think asking about perspective now if they would do things differently. What from your probe, the only time you ask for tipping point.
J: It was a probe that was suggested to me…

I: and Ed probe
J: a Sam probe, thinking specifically if there was another issue that may have brought them to contemplate leaving like a health issue but then another experience may have put them over the edge in terms of making the move.
I: another probe might be to ask how long did you consider the move? If it is a number of years of considering and then they make a move that will be interesting to know…. Do you feel as though any of the obstacles you faced are as a result of your gender?
So that would be sort of an end summary one.
J: Potentially, those type of issues might come up, when talking about barriers or obstacles faced before. Some might address that specifically. If they don't I might want to clarify if there is any perception of their gender playing a role as a negative factor.
I: just that question alone makes me wonder … you go out of your way to make sure you leave heavy emotional questions at the end with a concerted effort to keep some of the discussion positive… experiences of empowerment.. staying positive.. I am wondering then if to balance that out… do you feel there are any positives or advantages to being your gender in your sport? Might be something to consider to ask as a probe with that empowerment question.
J: I will keep that in mind.
I: as you went through the list of questions, what are your thoughts about the interview.
J: I feel pretty confident about it and it was good to go through this and know what the literature findings are that I am most aware of and to be aware of possible bias. Also to know what my specific probes might be for each question.

John H. Hagen
Digitally signed by John H. Hagen
DN: cn=John H. Hagen, o=West Virginia University Libraries, ou=Acquisitions Department, email=John.Hagen@mail.wvu.edu, c=US
Date: 2010.08.03 10:27:50 -04'00'