Sports Science 3-1_final 10/3/08 10:07 am Page 55

Collegiate Athletes' Perceptions of the Coaching Profession

Cindra Kamphoff[1] and Diane Gill[2]
[1]Department of Human Performance, 1400 Highland Center,
Minnesota State University, Mankato, Mankato, MN 56001, USA
cindra.kamphoff@mnsu.edu
[2]Department of Exercise and Sport Science, University of North Carolina
at Greensboro, 226 HHP Building, Greensboro, NC 27402, USA

ABSTRACT
In this study, we examined college athletes' interest in and perceptions of
the coaching profession. A total of 201 U.S. Division I athletes (100 males,
101 females; 119 White, 81 minority, 1 race unknown) completed measures
of a) their intention of entering the coaching profession, b) reasons they
would want to enter the coaching profession, c) perceived barriers that
would prohibit them from considering the coaching profession, and d) their
perception of discrimination in the coaching profession. Results indicated
that men were more likely than women to intend to enter coaching at the
Division I and professional levels. Gender and racial differences were found
in reasons for entering the coaching profession and barriers that prohibit
athletes from entering the profession. Women were more likely than men
to agree that male and female coaches were treated differently, and
minority athletes were more likely than White athletes to agree that
coaches are treated differently in sport based on their race/ethnicity.
These results may partly explain the lack of women and minority coaches.

Key words: Coaching, Gender, Profession, Race, Women

INTRODUCTION
Although a large number of athletes are women and racial minorities, the coaching
profession remains largely a White, male domain. According to Howard and Gillis [1], the
number of girls participating in high-school sport increased from 294,015 in 1971 to an all-
time high of 2.8 million in 2002. A similar trend is evident in college athletics, with the
number of women participating in college athletics increasing from 74,239 in 1981 to
160,650 in 2002 [2]. Regarding minority athletes, DeHass [3] reported that Black athletes
comprised 23.3% of all college athletes and 51% of all athletes in revenue-producing sports
(football, and men and women's basketball). Yet, as Lapchick [4] documented in the *Racial
and Gender Report Card*, few racial minorities other than Black athletes participate in
college athletics; and both women and minorities are greatly underrepresented in coaching
and administrative positions.

Despite the number of women participating in sport, only a small percentage of coaches
are women. Acosta and Carpenter [5] reported that the proportion of women head coaches

Reviewer: Carole Oglesby (California State University, Northridge, USA)

has decreased since the passage of Title IX from over 90% in 1972 to 42.4% in 2006. This recent statistic of 42.4% is the lowest representation of females as head coaches in history. In fact, between 2000-2002 men received 9 out of 10 new head coaching jobs in women's athletics (326 out of 361) [6]. This trend (an increase in female participants, but a decrease in female coaches) has been well documented beyond Acosta and Carpenter's widely cited work (see Pastore [7] for a discussion). Research also suggests that females intend to leave the coaching profession sooner than their male counterparts. Knoppers et al. [8] found that 12.3% of female coaches, compared to 50.3% of male coaches, planned to stay in the coaching profession until they were 65. Similarly, Sagas et al. [9] found that 68% of women assistant coaches, compared to 15% male assistant coaches, anticipated leaving the coaching profession by the time they turned 45.

Like women, few racial minorities are represented in the coaching profession. In a report for the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), DeHass [3] indicated that only 8.8% of men's head coaches and 8.2% of female head coaches were Black during the 2001-2002 academic year (including Historically Black Colleges and Universities or HBCUs). Excluding the HBCUs, Black men represent only 5.1% of all head coaches, whereas Black women represent 5.2% of all female head coaches. The highest percentages of Black coaches are in Division I men's revenue-generating sports (i.e., football and basketball) representing 20.2% of all head coaching positions. Lapchick [4] in the *Racial and Gender Report Card* reported that Blacks are so underrepresented as head coaches that the percentage of women coaching men actually exceeds Black head coaches in Division III. Much like the trend of college athletes, other racial minority coaches (i.e., Asian, Hispanic, Native Americans) are almost completely absent from the coaching profession (2.9% of head coaches of men's teams and 3.1% of head coaches of women's teams excluding HBCUs) [3].

REASONS FOR THE LACK OF FEMALE COACHES

Hart et al. [10] provided two paths explaining the proportional decline of female coaches: i) females coaches are dropping out of their coaching roles; and ii) female coaches are not being replaced by other females. Several reasons have been offered to explain the decline in percentage of female coaches including: the change in structure of sport since the passage of Title IX [10, 11], gender bias and preference for a male coach [12-14], homogeneous reproduction and the bias of the 'good old boys' network [15, 16], gender discrimination in hiring practices [17], lower salary earned by females compared to their male counterparts [8, 18], likelihood of women to apply for head coaching positions [9] and a higher rate of burnout among women [19-21].

Pastore [7, 22] investigated both paths proposed by Hart et al. [10], which included the trend of female coaches dropping out of coaching, and the lack of females entering the coaching profession. The findings of Pastore's [22] study with Division I coaches suggested that both male and female coaches enter the profession to remain in competitive athletics and would leave the profession to spend more time with their family and friends. Women, however, were more likely to have entered the coaching profession for an "opportunity to work with advanced and motivated athletes," "to become a role model for young, aspiring athletes," and "to help female athletes reach their athletic potential." Both men and women coaches were consistent in their response to the reasons they would leave the coaching profession. In a study with two-year college coaches of women's teams, Pastore [7] reported that females were significantly more likely than males to cite "helping female athletes reach their athletic potential" as a reason for entering the coaching profession. Among the reasons to leave the coaching profession, females were significantly more likely to cite a "burden of

administrative duties" and "an increased intensity in recruiting student-athletes."

Everhart and Chelladurai [23] explained the second process proposed by Hart et al. [10] by investigating gender differences in preferences to coaching as an occupation. Specifically, the authors found that Big-Ten men and women basketball players did not differ in their coaching self-efficacy, preferred occupational valence, and perceived barriers to enter the coaching profession. The authors added, however, that it is important to replicate this study with larger and more representative samples. Specifically, basketball is a popular sport in college athletics with "greater recognition and prestige by the university community and media….[this] could have contributed to their [athletes'] high expectations for their future jobs" [23, p. 195].

Cooper et al. [24] explored female university students' beliefs about coaching as a career since university students make up current and future coaches as well as parents of athletes and may be responsible for hiring coaches some day. They found that although women were generally interested in entering the coaching profession (78.7% of their sample indicated they would like to coach), the women named several barriers to entering the profession. A lack of administrative support was the most common barrier mentioned followed by family conflicts, inadequate salaries, negative attitudes of co-workers, a lack of professional role models, a lack of professional connections/networks, negative attitudes of athletes, lack of self-confidence, and homophobia. In general, it was found that the women were concerned about institutionalized and individual sexism and the authors recommended more research in this area.

REASONS FOR THE LACK OF RACIAL MINORITY COACHES

Although there is less research on racial minority coaches than on female coaches, the literature does suggest reasons for the lower numbers of racial minority coaches. These reasons include: the clustering of racial minority athletes into certain sports [25-27]; racial minority coaches may intend to leave the coaching profession sooner [28]; homogeneous reproduction and the success of the 'good old boys' network [3, 29]; racism and stacking in sport [30]; lack of role models [25, 31-32]; and both gender and racial discrimination, or "double jeopardy," for racial minority women [33].

The clustering of minority athletes into certain sports directly affects the possibility of hiring a racial minority coach. As stated earlier, DeHass [3] reported that Black athletes constitute 23.3% of all student-athletes, but 51% of all revenue-producing sports such as football and basketball. Furthermore, Suggs [27] reported that the majority of Black female athletes compete in basketball and track and field. With the growth of White, upper-class suburban sports such as soccer, lacrosse, rowing, and golf, Suggs [27] suggested the percentage of minority women might remain low in college sport. As both Smith [26] and Suggs [27] suggested, the resources and opportunities (i.e., equipment, green space, available coaches) to play sports such as lacrosse, golf and soccer may not be available to minority athletes. Similarly, the stacking research summarized by Brooks and Althouse [30] indicated that Black athletes are excluded from central positions (i.e., quarterback in football and guard position in basketball). Given that a high percentage of college coaches and administrators are recruited from central positions, few Black men and women have the opportunity to be hired as coaches. One consequence of positional segregation, they suggested, is less subsequent coaching mobility for minority coaches.

In their study with male assistant basketball coaches, Cunningham et al. [28] found that Black coaches intended to leave the profession at a greater rate than White coaches. Yet, they also found that Black assistant coaches were more socialized into the profession and had

similar feelings of affective commitment compared to White assistant coaches. They suggested, therefore, that "Black coaches either do not view coaching as a principal vocational interest, and/or experience discrimination in and peripheral to the workplace" [28, p. 143].

The extremely low number of racial minority men and women in leadership positions in sport leads to a lack of role models and support groups for racial minorities. Abney and Richey [25] found that a lack of support was apparent in their interviews with Black female athletic administrators and coaches. Specifically, the authors stated "there is a desperate need for support groups, career mentors, and role models for Black women in athletics" [25, p. 20]. In addition, Abney [31] found that the majority of Black female administrators and sports leaders sampled did not have role models or mentors. Abney [33] suggested that Black women face both gender and racial discrimination. This "double jeopardy" adds to the difficulty that Black women face in seeking positions within sport and athletics because Black women do not see coaching as a 'visible' goal (p. 123).

Numerous reasons have been provided to explain the lack of women and racial minority coaches. Research studies provide strong evidence for the low representation, but only limited support for proposed explanations. In this study, we explored one explanation for this decline. Specifically, we investigated whether women and racial minority athletes differ from White, male athletes in intention to enter the coaching profession, reasons and barriers when considering the coaching profession, and perceived discrimination in the coaching profession. The purpose of this study, therefore, was fourfold. First, the study was designed to examine college athletes' intention of entering various levels of the coaching profession (youth sport/community recreational league; high school; college, other than Division I institutions; Division I institutions; and professional level). Second, we examined reasons athletes would want to enter the coaching profession. Third, we investigated perceived barriers to entering the coaching profession. Finally, we examined athletes' perception of discrimination in the coaching profession. We hypothesized that gender and racial differences would be found in intention to enter the coaching profession, reasons to enter the coaching profession, perceived barriers, and perception of discrimination in the coaching profession. Following a pilot study used to refine the survey measures, we surveyed a sample of college athletes to address these hypotheses.

METHOD
PILOT STUDY
A sample of 70 undergraduate students completed a packet of questionnaires including the Coaching Intention Survey, the Coaching Interest Survey, the Perceived Hindrance Scale, a demographics questionnaire, and items related to racial/gender discrimination in coaching. The purpose of the pilot study was to finalize the measures as well as pilot the survey administration procedures. The participants were enrolled in an undergraduate Sociocultural Analyses of Sport and Exercise course at a university in southeastern U.S. This course enrolls a large number of both Exercise and Sport Science majors and non-majors, including students completing their coaching certification. The pilot sample included 38 females (54.3%) and 32 males (45.7%), and 50 (71.4%) White/non-minority students, 16 (22.9%) Black students, 1 (1.4%) Hispanic student, and 3 (4.3%) students that indicated their race as "other."

The students (M = 19.0, SD =1.2, age range = 17-22) completed the questionnaires and were asked to comment on the clarity and understandability of the questions. Based on their feedback, four questions were added to the Perceived Hindrance Scale: 1) Difficult to obtain

entry coaching position, 2) Other professions are more attractive, 3) Difficulties with parents/spectators, and 4) Time spent traveling to competitions. Each of the questions was added because at least six (8.5%) of the students included the item after the statement, "Please list any other barriers, or reasons you would not go into coaching that are not listed above." The wording on the other items and questionnaires appeared to be clear, and no other changes were made.

PARTICIPANTS IN THE MAIN SAMPLE
A total of 201 Division I athletes from two universities in southeastern U.S. participated in this study. In order to recruit similar numbers of minority and White/non-minority athletes, participants were recruited from two state universities with similar Division I athletics programs. One of the universities was a HBCU (a Historically Black College or University) and the other a predominantly White institution. The sample was equally distributed by gender, including 100 males (49.8%) and 101 females (50.2%). The sample also included 119 White/non-minority and 81 minority athletes (68 Black/African-Americans, 6 Hispanics, 2 Native Americans, and 5 who identified their race/ethnicity as "other")[1]. The participants competed in soccer ($n = 40$), tennis, ($n = 31$), basketball ($n = 22$), softball ($n = 25$), baseball ($n = 24$), wrestling ($n = 22$), track and field/cross country ($n = 22$), volleyball ($n = 8$), and golf ($n = 7$); and ranged in age from 17-23 ($M = 19.4$, $SD = 1.23$)

MEASURES
The athletes completed a demographics questionnaire (age, gender, race/ethnicity, citizenship, sport they participated in, year in school, athletic honors, and athletic scholarship status), the Coaching Intention Survey, the Coaching Interest Survey, the Perceived Hindrance Scale, and specific questions about perceived race/gender discrimination in coaching.

Coaching Intention Survey. The Coaching Intention Survey included questions about the participants' intent to enter the coaching profession. Specifically, the survey items included how much the participants want to coach at each of 5 levels (youth sport/community recreational league; high school; college, other than Division I institutions; Division I institutions; and professional level), with a response format of 1 = not at all to 5 = very much.

Coaching Interest Survey. The Coaching Interest Survey was developed to examine reasons that athletes would want to enter into the coaching profession. The survey was developed by a team of two faculty members, three doctoral students, and one master's level student based on a review of the relevant coaching literature. Research by Pastore [7, 22] provided several of the reasons on the initial Coaching Interest Survey. The questionnaire went through several revisions, and was then given to the pilot sample.

The final version of the Coaching Interest Survey included 29 reasons why athletes would be interested in entering the coaching profession. The response format of the Perceived Hindrance Scale (1 = not at all to 9 = completely) was adopted for consistency. A Principal Component Analysis with varimax rotation revealed a six-factor structure, each factor with an eigenvalue over 1. Because the items of the Coaching Interest Survey are likely correlated, a second analysis was calculated with oblique rotation. Results from the varimax and oblique rotation were almost identical, therefore only the results from the oblique rotation are reported in Table 1. Only two items ("To promote and advance the sport" and "To give something back to the sport") loaded on factor six; because these items also loaded

---

[1]One athlete did not indicate their race on the survey.

(.44 and .51 respectively) on and were logically related to factor 5, these items were grouped with this factor. All items grouped into logical and meaningful factors which were labeled: 1) To develop young people, 2) Like the coaching role, 3) To stay in the sport, 4) Minority/women's issues, and 5) Love of the sport. See Table 1 for factor eigenvalues and percent variance as well as a list of items and loadings associated with that factor.

Table 1. Factor Analysis Results for the Coaching Interest Survey

Factor	Item Loading
1) To Develop Young People (Eigenvalue = 11.82, % of Variance = 40.76%)	
To enhance the skill development of young people.	.89
To enhance the character development of young people.	.88
To be a role model for young, aspiring athletes.	.75
To pass on my knowledge to others.	.73
I am interested in working with young people.	.73
To challenge athletes to improve and strive to be better.	.73
I like to work with people.	.72
To help male athletes reach their athletic potential.	.51
2) Like the Coaching Role (Eigenvalue = 3.18, % of Variance = 10.96%)	
To prove to myself that I could be a successful coach.	.85
To be in charge and direct people.	.85
The status and prestige associated with coaching.	.76
I would be the most qualified.	.71
The opportunity to travel.	.70
To follow in the footsteps of a former coach.	.68
To work with skilled and motivated athletes.	.58
3) To Stay in the Sport (Eigenvalue = 1.97, % of Variance = 6.79%)	
To make a living in sport.	.90
To pursue a career in athletics.	.90
I have a strong network in coaching.	.71
To continue in sport after I finish competing.	.62
To improve my knowledge of the sport.	.60
4) Minority/Women's Issues (Eigenvalue = 1.33, % of Variance = 4.59%)	
To work towards equal pay and opportunity for minority coaches.	.86
To work towards equal pay and opportunity for women coaches.	.80
To help minority athletes reach their athletic potential.	.79
To help female athletes reach their athletic potential.	.76
5) Love of the Sport (Eigenvalue = 1.03, % of Variance = 3.54%)	
I love the sport.	.87
I like the excitement of the sport.	.83
I like competition.	.73
To give something back to the sport.	.51
To promote and advance the sport.	.44

Perceived Hindrance Survey. The items comprising the Perceived Hindrance Survey were adapted from Everhart and Chelladurai's [23] study with collegiate basketball players. Everhart and Chelladurai selected 25 items from the NCAA's Perceived Barriers of Intercollegiate Athletics Survey that explored perceived discrimination and work hours as a barrier to enter the coaching profession. These 25 items were used with the language changed to be inclusive of all sports. Given the goal of the present study, several key items were added. The original scale included items related to the treatment of women coaches, but no items referred to racial/ethnic minority coaches. Therefore, five items related to the treatment of racial/ethnic minority coaches were added. Four additional items were added after suggestions from the pilot sample including: 1) Difficult to obtain an entry coaching position, 2) Time spent traveling to competitions, 3) Other professions may be more attractive, and 4) Difficulties with parents and spectators. At least six (8.5%) students in the pilot sample wrote these reasons following the prompt "Please list any other barriers, or reasons you would not go into coaching that are not listed above." The final version of the Perceived Hindrance Scale used in this study included 34 items with a response format of 1 = not at all to 9 = completely.

A six-factor structure emerged using Principal Components Analysis with oblique rotation. Only one item ("Female players prefer male coaches") loaded on factor six and because this item also loaded (.56) on factor 2, the item was grouped with this factor. Again, the item groupings were logical and include: 1) Minority/Gender Bias, 2) Gender Issues, 3) Nature of Coaching, 4) Conflicts with Others, and 5) Professional Issues. See Table 2 for factor eigenvalues, variance and item loadings.

Perceived Racial and Gender Discrimination. To examine athletes' perception of discrimination in the coaching profession, four items were included: 1) Do you think men and women coaches are treated differently *in sport in general*? 2) Do you think men and women coaches are treated differently in *your sport*? 3) Do you think coaches are treated differently *in sport in general* based on their race/ethnicity? and, 4) Do you think coaches are treated differently in *your sport* based on their race/ethnicity? Each question was answered with a yes or no response.

PROCEDURES
Fourteen coaches from two Division I universities were contacted to obtain permission to administer the questionnaires to the athletes. After obtaining permission, the first author met with the athletes before or following the team's practice. The researcher explained that the purpose of the study was to explore college athletes' perceptions of the coaching profession and reasons they would or would not want to enter the coaching profession; and that participation was voluntary, confidentiality was guaranteed, no names were requested, their coach had no access to the data, and only group statistics would be reported. The athletes completed and returned the questionnaires with the signed informed consent to the researcher.

DATA ANALYSIS
A series of 2 x 2 (Male/Female x White/Minority) Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVA) were used to explore gender and race influences on athletes' intent to coach at various levels, Coaching Interest Survey factors, and Perceived Hindrance Scale factors. Because multiple MANOVA and significance tests increase the likelihood of Type I errors, the level of significance was set at $p = .01$. Also, as suggested by most research methods texts (e.g., Thomas et al. [34]), we have reported effect sizes to more accurately describe the meaningfulness of significant effects. Black athletes made up the majority of the minority athletes in this study (68 of 81), therefore, each MANOVA was ran twice - first with Black

athletes only, and second with all minority athletes (Hispanic, Native Americans, Black, and "other"). There were virtually no differences in the results of these two analyses; therefore, the results using *all* minority athletes are reported here.

Table 2. Factor Analysis Results for the Perceived Hindrance Scale

Factor	Item Loading
1) Minority/Gender Bias (Eigenvalue = 15.1, % of Variance = 44.31%)	
Racial/ethnic minority coaches are treated unfairly.	.95
Racial/ethnic minority coaches are discriminated against.	.93
Lack of support for racial/ethnic minority coaches.	.93
Lack of role models for racial/ethnic minority coaches.	.92
Women coaches are treated unfairly.	.83
Male coaches do not accept female coaches.	.76
Biases of "old boys" network (men hiring only men).	.72
Affirmative action has created extra hassles.	.71
Female players prefer male coaches.	.56
2) Gender Issues (Eigenvalue = 3.82, % of Variance = 11.24%)	
Women coaches are discriminated against.	.91
Lack of training programs for women coaches.	.90
Lack of support systems for women players.	.90
Lack of support for women coaches from superiors.	.88
Perception of homosexuality among women coaches.	.87
Women coaches are perceived to be unattractive.	.84
Perceptions of women coaches as unfeminine.	.74
Lack of role models among women coaches.	.63
3) Nature of Coaching (Eigenvalue = 1.75, % of Variance = 5.14%)	
Coaching takes too much time.	.83
Having to do a lot of training.	.78
Unfavorable work hours.	.72
Pressures to win.	.70
Public scrutiny of life.	.67
Lack of opportunities for promotion.	.65
Difficulties with alumni.	.60
4) Conflicts with Others (Eigenvalue = 1.20, % of Variance = 3.53%)	
Difficulties with parents/spectators.	.76
Coaching interferes with social life.	.76
Hassles with the media.	.76
Time spent traveling to competitions.	.64
Coaching means working evenings and weekends	.63
Coaching conflicts with family commitments.	.48
5) Professional Issues (Eigenvalue = 1.15, % of Variance = 3.38%)	
Low salary.	.78
Lack of job security.	.75
Other professions are more attractive.	.68
Difficult to obtain an entry coaching position.	.48

A series of 2 x 2 Chi-square tests were used to explore differences in athletes' perceived discrimination in the coaching profession by gender and by race. Again, the level of significance was set at $p = .01$ for all Chi-square statistics.

RESULTS

ATHLETES' INTENTION OF ENTERING THE COACHING PROFESSION

A 2 x 2 MANOVA on the 5 coaching intention items indicated a significant main effect for gender, Wilks lambda = .88, $F (5, 188) = 5.18$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$, but no race main effect or interaction. The univariate results indicated men were more likely than women to indicate interest in entering the coaching profession at the Division I level, $F (1, 192) = 15.20$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$, and the professional level, $F (1, 192) = 22.19$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$. Men also indicated a stronger (but non-significant) interest in coaching at both the high-school level and the non-Division I college level compared to women. However, women indicated more interest in coaching at the youth sport/community/recreational league level compared to men.

Although non-significant, racial differences paralleled gender differences. Minority athletes were more likely to indicate interest in coaching at the youth sport/community/recreational league level compared to White athletes, but White athletes were more likely to indicate interest in all other levels of the coaching profession (high school; college, non Division I; Division I; and professional levels) compared to minority athletes. See Table 3 for complete results.

REASONS TO ENTER THE COACHING PROFESSION

A 2 x 2 MANOVA on the items of Factor 1 on the Coaching Interest Survey ("To Develop Young People") indicated a significant main effect for gender, Wilks lambda = .88, $F (8, 181) = 3.11$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$, but not for race, and there was no interaction. The univariate results for gender indicated females were significantly more likely than males to specify that the following reasons would influence their decision in entering the coaching profession: "To enhance the character development of young people," $F (1, 159) = 8.67$, $p = < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, "I like to work with people," $F (1, 159) = 8.71$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$, and "I am interested in working with young people," $F (1, 159) = 9.54$, $p = < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$.

MANOVA on Factor 2 ("Like the Coaching Role"), Factor 3 ("To Stay in the Sport") and Factor 5 ("Love of the Sport") of the Coaching Interest Survey indicated no significant main effects or interaction.

However, for MANOVA on Factor 4 (Minority / Women's Issues) items indicated a significant interaction between race and gender, Wilks lambda = .93, $F (4, 193) = 3.68$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$; as well as significant main effects for gender, Wilks lambda = .67, $F (4, 193) = 24.06$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .33$; and race, Wilks lambda = .81, $F (4, 193) = 11.63$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .19$. The univariate results for race indicated that minority athletes were significantly more likely than White athletes to indicate they would want to enter the coaching profession "To work toward equal pay and opportunity for minority coaches," $F (1, 196) = 25.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$; and "To help minority athletes reach their athletic potential," $F (1, 196) = 13.58$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$.

Univariate gender differences were evident for three items; women were significantly more likely than men to indicate they would want to enter the coaching profession "To work toward equal pay and opportunity for women," $F (1, 196) = 17.64$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .08$; "To help minority athletes reach their athletic potential," $F (1, 196) = 14.70$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; and "To help female athletes reach their athletic potential," $F (1, 196) = 67.97$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .26$.

Table 3. Athletes Interest in Entering the Coaching Profession by Gender and Race

	Males		Females		Gender		Race	
	Minority	White	Minority	White	Males	Females	Minority	White
Level of Coaching	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Youth sport/community/ Recreational league	3.0 (1.43)	2.7 (1.31)	2.9 (1.23)	3.1 (1.33)	2.8 (1.35)	3.0 (1.28)	3.0 (1.30)	2.9 (1.33)
High school	2.8 (1.48)	3.2 (1.36)	2.8 (1.29)	2.9 (1.21)	3.0 (1.41)	2.8 (1.24)	2.8 (1.36)	3.0 (1.30)
College, but not Division I	2.4 (1.48)	2.3 (1.22)	2.0 (1.12)	2.2 (1.26)	2.3 (1.30)	2.1 (1.19)	2.2 (1.29)	2.3 (1.23)
Division I	3.4 (1.58)	3.1 (1.46)	2.1 (1.21)	2.7 (1.62)	3.2 (1.50) *	2.4 (1.46) *	2.6 (1.50)	2.9 (1.54)
Professional level	3.0 (1.83)	2.9 (1.56)	1.8 (1.17)	2.1 (1.43)	2.9 (1.65)*	1.9 (1.32) *	2.3 (1.58)	2.6 (1.56)

Response format for the above items was 1 = not at all, to 5 = very much.
*Univariate gender difference significant at the p < .001 level.

Table 4. Reasons to Enter the Coaching Profession by Gender and Race

	Gender		Race	
	Males	Females	Minority	White
Factors/Items	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
1) To Develop Young People				
To enhance the skill development of young people.	7.4 (1.86)	8.0 (1.14)	7.7 (1.81)	7.7 (1.37)
To enhance the character development of young people.	7.2 (1.92)*	8.0 (1.43)*	7.6 (2.00)	7.6 (1.52)
To be a role model for young, aspiring athletes.	7.6 (1.62)	8.1 (1.27)	7.9 (1.74)	7.8 (1.27)
To pass on my knowledge to others.	7.8 (1.61)	8.0 (1.28)	7.9 (1.69)	7.9 (1.23)
I am interested in working with young people.	7.0 (1.91)*	7.8 (1.57)*	7.4 (1.87)	7.4 (1.87)
To challenge athletes to improve and strive to be better.	7.6 (1.70)	8.0 (1.18)	7.8 (1.77)	7.8 (1.22)
I like to work with people.	7.2 (1.69)*	7.9 (1.23)*	7.5 (1.63)	7.6 (1.51)
To help male athletes reach their athletic potential.	6.9 (2.13)	6.7 (1.97)	6.8 (2.05)	6.7 (2.05)

65

Factors/Items	Gender		Race	
	Males Mean (SD)	Females Mean (SD)	Minority Mean (SD)	White Mean (SD)
2) Like the Coaching Role				
To prove to myself that I could be a successful coach.	6.0 (2.47)	5.6 (2.54)	5.7 (2.50)	5.9 (2.52)
To be in charge and direct people.	5.0 (2.50)	4.4 (2.47)	4.6 (2.50)	4.8 (2.50)
The status and prestige associated with coaching.	5.9 (2.30)	5.3 (2.46)	5.7 (2.40)	5.5 (2.40)
I would be the most qualified.	6.1 (2.27)	5.5 (2.36)	5.9 (2.30)	5.5 (2.60)
The opportunity to travel.	5.6 (2.74)	5.5 (2.54)	5.5 (2.73)	5.6 (2.54)
To follow in the footsteps of a former coach.	5.8 (2.54)	5.0 (2.61)	4.8 (2.67)*	5.9 (2.47)*
To work with skilled and motivated athletes.	7.2 (1.66)	7.2 (1.80)	7.2 (1.77)	7.2 (1.71)
3) To Stay in the Sport				
To make a living in sport.	6.1 (2.74)	5.2 (2.79)	5.5 (2.81)	5.8 (2.80)
To pursue a career in athletics.	6.4 (2.34)	5.6 (2.68)	5.8 (2.64)	6.1 (2.47)
I have a strong network in coaching.	5.5 (2.17)	4.8 (2.64)	4.8 (2.44)	5.4 (2.43)
To continue in sport after I finish competing.	7.3 (2.05)	7.0 (2.17)	6.8 (2.29)	7.4 (2.00)
To improve my knowledge of the sport.	6.9 (2.03)	7.1 (2.05)	7.1 (2.28)	7.0 (1.86)
4) Minority/Women's Issues				
To work towards equal pay and opportunity for minority coaches.	5.2 (2.76)	5.7 (2.66)	6.6 (2.56)**	4.7 (2.55)**
To work towards equal pay and opportunity for women coaches.	4.3 (2.62)**	6.0 (2.63)**	5.6 (2.81)	4.9 (2.68)
To help minority athletes reach their athletic potential.	6.3 (2.39)**	7.7 (1.73)**	7.7 (1.87)**	6.5 (2.26)**
To help female athletes reach their athletic potential.	5.3 (2.59)**	8.0 (1.42)**	7.3 (2.10)	6.2 (2.64)
5) Love of the Sport				
I love the sport.	8.3 (1.36)	7.9 (1.69)	7.8 (1.92)	8.3 (1.18)
I like the excitement of the sport.	8.1 (1.37)	8.0 (1.31)	7.9 (1.62)	8.2 (1.10)
I like competition.	8.3 (1.19)	7.8 (1.66)	7.7 (1.84)	8.3 (1.10)
To give something back to the sport.	7.4 (1.81)	7.2 (1.98)	7.5 (1.87)	7.2 (1.92)
To promote and advance the sport.	7.1 (1.87)	6.8 (2.14)	6.8 (2.31)	7.1 (1.78)

Response format for the above items was 1 = not at all, to 9 = completely.
* Univariate difference significant at the $p < .01$ level.
** Univariate difference significant at the $p < .001$ level.

The univariate gender and race interaction was significant for the item "To help female athletes reach their athletic potential," F (1, 196) = 9.34, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$. As the means in Table 4 indicate, the gender difference was stronger for White athletes than for minority athletes. Table 4 provides descriptive information by race and gender for each item on the Coaching Interest Survey.

BARRIERS TO ENTERING THE COACHING PROFESSION
A 2 x 2 MANOVA on Factor 1 (Minority/Gender Bias) items of the Perceived Hindrance Scale indicated a significant main effect for race, Wilks Lambda = .76, F (9, 183) = 6.35, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .24$, but not gender; and there was no interaction. The univariate results for race indicated that minority athletes were significantly more likely than White athletes to indicate the following barriers: "Racial/ethnic minority coaches are discriminated against," F (1, 191) = 45.78, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .19$; "Racial/ethnic minority coaches are treated unfairly," F (1, 191) = 38.73, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .17$; "Lack of support for racial/ethnic minority coaches," F (1, 191) = 36.62, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$; "Lack of role models for racial/ethnic minority coaches," F (1, 191) = 32.19, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$; "Women coaches are treated unfairly," F (1, 191) = 14.34, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$; "Biases of the 'old boys' network," F (1, 191) = 10.71, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .05$; and "Male coaches do not accept female coaches," F (1, 191) = 9.80, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$.

A similar trend appeared with Factor 2 (Gender Issues) items, with the 2 x 2 MANOVA indicating a significant main effect for race, Wilks Lambda = .89, F (8, 183) = 2.77, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$, but not gender; and there was no interaction. The univariate results indicated that minority athletes were significantly more likely than White athletes to indicate the following barriers: "Women coaches are discriminated against," F (1, 190) = 7.31, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$; "Lack of support system for women coaches from superiors," F (1, 190) = 13.56, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$, and "Lack of support system for women players," F (1, 190) = 7.36, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$.

The 2 x 2 MANOVA on Factor 3 (Nature of Coaching) items indicated a significant main effect for gender, Wilks Lambda = .88, F (7, 179) = 3.46, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$, but not race; and there was no interaction. The univariate results indicated that women were significantly more likely than men to cite "Pressures to win," F (1, 185) = 11.07, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$, as a barrier in entering the coaching profession. The 2 x 2 MANOVA on Factor 4 (Conflicts with Others) and Factor 5 (Professional Issues) indicated no significant interaction or main effects for gender and race. Descriptive results for barriers by gender and race can be found in Table 5.

PERCEIVED DISCRIMINATION
A series of 2 x 2 Pearson Chi-square analyses indicated that athletes' perceived discrimination in the coaching profession differed by gender and race. When asked if male and female coaches were treated differently *in sport in general*, women were more likely to agree than were men, $\chi2$ (1, n = 193) = 13.45, $p < .001$, but there were no significant differences by race. As a follow-up, gender differences were examined separately for minority and White athletes. Significantly more White women than White men indicated that male and female coaches were treated differently *in sport in general*, $\chi2$ (1, n = 114) = 15.07, $p < .001$. The trend was similar for minority athletes, but the gender difference was weaker and non-significant, $\chi2$ (1, N = 78) = .82, $p = .25$. There were no significant gender differences or racial differences when asked if male and female coaches were treated differently *in their sport*.

Minority athletes were more likely than White athletes to agree that coaches are treated differently *in sport in general* based on their race/ethnicity (χ^2 (1, n = 194) = 14.26, $p < .001$),

Table 5. Perceived Barriers/Hindrances to Entering the Coaching Profession by Gender and Race

	Gender		Race	
	Males	**Females**	**Minority**	**White**
Factors/Items	**Mean (SD)**	**Mean (SD)**	**Mean (SD)**	**Mean (SD)**
1) Minority/Gender Bias				
Racial/ethnic minority coaches are treated unfairly.	3.4 (2.36)	3.8 (2.44)	4.8 (2.62)**	2.8 (1.84)**
Racial/ethnic minority coaches are discriminated against.	3.5 (2.39)	3.9 (2.44)	5.0 (2.50)**	2.8 (1.91)**
Lack of support for racial/ethnic minority coaches.	3.5 (2.46)	3.9 (2.57)	5.0 (2.67)**	2.9 (2.00)**
Lack of role models for racial/ethnic minority coaches.	3.4 (2.43)	3.5 (2.32)	4.3 (2.50)**	3.0 (1.87)**
Women coaches are treated unfairly.	3.2 (2.18)	3.8 (2.27)	4.3 (2.50)**	3.0 (1.90)**
Male coaches do not accept female coaches.	3.2 (2.06)	3.8 (2.21)	4.0 (2.30)*	3.1 (1.96)*
Biases of "old boys" network (men hiring only men).	3.0 (2.09)	4.0 (2.30)	4.2 (2.46)*	3.0 (1.98)*
Affirmative action has created extra hassles.	3.7 (2.41)	3.4 (2.14)	4.0 (2.32)	3.2 (2.20)
Female players prefer male coaches.	2.8 (1.99)	3.1 (1.91)	3.2 (2.08)	2.8 (1.84)
2) Gender Issues				
Women coaches are discriminated against.	3.3 (2.32)	3.9 (2.51)	4.2 (2.57)*	3.2 (2.26)*
Lack of training programs for women coaches.	3.2 (2.12)	3.7 (2.35)	3.8 (2.42)	3.2 (2.10)
Lack of support systems for women players.	3.1 (2.19)	3.9 (2.51)	4.1 (2.64)*	3.1 (2.10)*
Lack of support for women coaches from superiors.	3.3 (2.28)	4.0 (2.44)	4.3 (2.66)*	3.1 (2.02)*
Perception of homosexuality among women coaches.	3.1 (2.20)	3.7 (2.74)	3.7 (2.76)	3.2 (2.30)
Women coaches are perceived to be unattractive.	2.9 (2.13)	3.0 (2.22)	3.1 (2.24)	2.8 (2.13)
Perceptions of women coaches as unfeminine.	3.1 (2.05)	3.5 (2.46)	3.7 (2.49)	3.0 (2.07)
Lack of role models among women coaches.	3.0 (2.06)	3.1 (2.20)	3.4 (2.27)	2.8 (2.01)
3) Nature of Coaching				
Coaching takes too much time.	4.0 (2.11)	4.2 (2.14)	4.1 (2.06)	4.0 (2.17)
Having to do a lot of training.	2.9 (2.05)	3.3 (1.96)	3.4 (1.97)	2.9 (2.02)
Unfavorable work hours.	3.7 (2.31)	4.4 (2.34)	4.5 (2.18)	3.8 (2.41)
Pressures to win.	3.2 (2.17)*	4.4 (2.33)*	4.2 (2.33)	3.6 (2.30)
Public scrutiny of life.	3.6 (1.95)	3.8 (1.99)	3.7 (2.00)	3.7 (1.96)
Lack of opportunities for promotion.	4.0 (2.02)	4.3 (2.07)	4.2 (1.97)	4.1 (2.11)
Difficulties with alumni.	3.5 (2.17)	3.2 (1.99)	3.7 (2.10)	3.1 (2.04)
4) Conflicts with Others				
Difficulties with parents/spectators.	3.8 (2.25)	4.4 (2.26)	4.3 (2.14)	4.0 (2.35)
Coaching interferes with social life.	4.2 (2.04)	4.0 (2.36)	4.2 (2.34)	4.0 (2.11)
Hassles with the media.	3.3 (2.20)	3.7 (2.25)	3.8 (2.24)	3.3 (2.20)
Time spent traveling to competitions.	3.3 (2.05)	3.8 (2.45)	3.5 (2.21)	3.6 (2.32)
Coaching means working evenings and weekends.	3.8 (2.23)	4.1 (2.47)	4.0 (2.42)	4.0 (2.32)
Coaching conflicts with family commitments.	5.1 (2.28)	5.4 (2.20)	5.5 (2.20)	5.0 (2.26)
5) Professional Issues				
Low salary.	5.3 (2.37)	5.1 (2.60)	5.7 (2.44)	4.8 (2.47)
Lack of job security.	4.1 (2.26)	4.8 (2.35)	4.7 (2.35)	4.3 (2.31)
Other professions are more attractive.	5.0 (2.50)	5.4 (2.73)	5.2 (2.79)	5.2 (2.52)
Difficult to obtain an entry coaching position.	4.2 (2.18)	4.7 (2.27)	4.8 (2.29)	4.2 (2.17)

Response format for the above items was 1 = would not hinder at all, to 9 = completely hinder.

* Univariate difference significant at the p < .01 level.

**Univariate difference significant at the p < .001 level.

but there were no significant gender differences. This race difference held when examining race differences separately by gender. Minority males were significantly more likely than White males to agree that coaches are treated differently *in sport in general* based on their race/ethnicity, χ^2 (1, n = 95) = 7.37, *p* < .01, and minority females were significantly more likely to agree than White females, χ^2 (1, n = 99) = 7.23, *p* < .01.

Minority athletes were also more likely than White athletes to agree that coaches are treated differently *in their sport* based on their race and ethnicity (χ2 (1, n = 193) = 12.91, *p* < .001). In follow-up analyses, this race difference was stronger for males as minority males were significantly more likely to agree that coaches are treated differently *in their sport* based on their race/ethnicity compared to White males, χ2 (1, n = 94) = 11.43, *p* < .001. For females, minorities were more likely to agree than were Whites, but not significantly, χ2 (1, *n* = 99) = 4.15, *p* = .04. Table 6 provides descriptive information by gender and race on athletes' perceived discrimination in the coaching profession.

DISCUSSION

This study explored athletes' interest in the coaching profession. We hypothesized that gender and racial differences would be found in intent to enter the coaching profession, reasons to enter the coaching profession, perceived barriers that would prohibit athletes from entering the coaching profession, and perception of discrimination in the coaching profession. Gender and racial differences were found to support each of these hypotheses.

Women collegiate athletes in our sample were less interested in entering all levels of the coaching profession except for youth/recreational levels, and differences were strongest for Division I and professional levels of coaching. This finding may reflect the absence of female coaches at these levels. There are fewer female coaches in Division I than in Division III [5] and only 38% of head coaches in the WNBA are women [4]. Female athletes may not see others like them in the Division I and professional level coaching positions. Furthermore, women's interest in coaching at the youth/recreational levels likely reflects a greater interest in developmental goals. Women in this sample were more likely to agree they want to enter the coaching profession to enhance the character development of young people than for other reasons. Levels of coaching such as youth, community/recreational league, or high school (in which women indicated more interest) may be perceived as more conducive to character development compared to the Division I and professional levels. Perhaps women are more interested in youth/recreational levels of coaching due to the impact they can have on the development of young athletes.

In addition, the women in our sample were more likely to agree that male and female coaches are treated differently in sport. Therefore, the women in this sample do recognize discrimination in the coaching profession and this may contribute to their interest in certain levels of coaching. Female athletes in this study were also significantly more likely than male athletes to indicate that the pressure to win was a barrier in entering the coaching profession.

As well as perceptions of gender discrimination, we also found evidence of racial bias/discrimination. Minority athletes were more likely to report that they believed coaches were treated differently based on their race/ethnicity. Furthermore, minority athletes were more likely to indicate unfair treatment, a lack of role models, and a lack of support for minority coaches as barriers to enter the coaching profession. Although racial discrimination and lack of role models for minority athletes have been discussed in the literature [25, 31-33], researchers have not examined the influence of racial discrimination on athletes' interest in entering the coaching profession. Our results indicate that racial minority athletes do

Table 6. Athletes' "Yes" Responses Regarding Perceived Discrimination in the Coaching Profession

Perceived Discrimination	Males		Females		Gender		Race	
	Minority f (%)	White f (%)	Minority f (%)	White f (%)	Males f (%)	Females f (%)	Minority f (%)	White f (%)
Men and women coaches are treated differently in sport in general	18 (58.1)	24 (38.7)[1]	32 (68.1)	39 (75.0)[1]	71 (71.7)[2]	43 (45.7)[2]	50 (64.1)	63 (55.3)
Men and women coaches are treated differently in my sport	9 (30.0)	21 (32.8)	16 (34.0)	19 (35.8)	35 (35.0)	30 (31.9)	25 (32.5)	40 (34.2)
Coaches are treated differently in sport in general based on their race/ethnicity	12 (38.7)[3]	9 (14.1)[3]	16 (34.0)[4]	6 (11.5)[4]	22 (22.2)	21 (21.1)	28 (35.9)[5]	15 (12.9)[5]
Coaches are treated differently in my sport based on their race/ethnicity	12 (38.7)[6]	6 (9.5)6	9 (19.1)	3 (5.8)	12 (12.1)	18 (19.1)	21 (26.9)[7]	9 (7.8)[7]

Response format for the above items was "Yes" or "No". The table indicates "Yes" responses.
[3,4] chi-square significant at the p < .01 level
[1,2,5,6,7] chi-square significant at the p < .001 level

indeed perceive racial discrimination and barriers to entering the coaching profession, and these barriers may contribute to minority athletes deciding not to enter the coaching profession.

We found additional gender and racial differences in reasons that athletes would want to enter the coaching profession. Women athletes were interested in entering the coaching profession to address women's issues such as equal pay and opportunity for women as well as to help female athletes reach their potential. Similarly, minority athletes were interested in entering the coaching profession to help other minority athletes reach their potential, but they were also very concerned about women's issues. In addition, minority athletes were more likely to indicate gender-related barriers such as the belief that women coaches are treated unfairly, that male coaches do not accept female coaches, and the bias of the 'old boys' network. Minority women suffer from what Abney [33] calls "double jeopardy" (gender and racial discrimination), hence they may be more likely to recognize barriers related to both gender and race. Also, male minority athletes, who experience racial bias, may relate to gender discrimination in and outside of sport.

It is also important to discuss the factors that were not significant in this study. For example, one long-held assumption about women coaches is that they are more likely to perceive and be affected by family constraints than their male counterparts [17]. In our study, both men and women had similar responses to coaching conflicts with family commitments. This finding is consistent with Pastore's [22] and Weiss and Sisley's [35] findings of a non-significant gender difference related to time constraints with family responsibility. It is also interesting that there was no gender difference on Factor 5 (Professional Issues) of the Coaching Interest Survey. This factor included the item "Low salary," which as been suggested to contribute to a lack of female coaches in the profession [8, 18]; yet women were no more likely than males to indicate a low salary in this study.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Few other studies have investigated athletes' interest in entering the coaching profession and certainly more research is needed to confirm our findings. Our results are contrary to Everhart and Chelladurai [23], who found no significant differences among men and women in barriers in the coaching profession. Further research might explain this inconsistency. Additional research in this area should explore other populations, including Division II and III athletes. Further research might also use other measures and approaches, particularly qualitative methods to obtain more in-depth information and rich data to provide insight into athletes' and coaches' perceptions.

Although Lapchick [4] reported that fewer than 15% of Division I athletes identify a race other than White or Black, a concerted effort should be made to include these groups. Many athletes in this study were from a Historically Black College or University (HBCU), and Black and minority athletes at HBCUs may have unique experiences in collegiate athletics. It is interesting to note that there are a higher percentage of Black coaches at HBCUs [3], but the minority athletes in our sample were still more likely to indicate that the lack of role models was a significant barrier that would prohibit them from entering the coaching profession.

Our results are in line with a socio-cultural perspective in which sport is a site where gender and racial ideologies are constructed, maintained and reproduced. Historically, collegiate athletics has been structured to benefit men (particularly White men). Women and minorities have fewer opportunities and support whether by design, or simply tradition. Results do not support the female or racial minority "deficit model," meaning that females

and minorities lack the skills to be coaches. Instead, females and racial minorities may recognize the exclusionary structure of sport, and may not want to put themselves through the discrimination and mistreatment.

CONCLUSION
Despite the gender and racial difference in interest and perceived discrimination, there *are* women who are interested in coaching, as well as women and racial minorities who accept the challenge and enter college coaching. Administrators can take steps to improve the support system and the likelihood that women and racial minorities will stay in the coaching profession. These steps might include establishing a mentor program for women and racial minority coaches, ensuring equitable salaries and resources, and establishing and enforcing clear non-discrimination policies that take proactive steps to ensure the sport environment is inclusive and inviting for all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES
1.   Howard, B. and Gillis, J., *Surveys Resources: Participation Sets Record for Fifth Straight Year*, National Federation of State High School Association, 2003, Retrieved March 8, 2005, http://www.nfhs.org.

2.   Bray, C., *1981-1982 to 2002-2003 NCAA Sports Sponsorship and Participation Rates Report*, National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2004, Retrieved March 5, 2005, http://www.ncaa.org

3.   DeHass, D., *2001-2002 Race Demographics of NCAA Member Institutions' Athletic Personnel*, National Collegiate Athletic Association, 2003, Retrieved March 5, 2005, http://www.ncaa.org.

4.   Lapchick, R.E., *2005 Racial and Gender Report Card*, Institute for Ethics and Diversity in Sport, 2005, Retrieved July 31, 2007, http://www.bus.ucf.edu/sport.

5.   Acosta, V.R. and Carpenter, L.J., *Women in Intercollegiate Sport: A Longitudinal, National Study Twenty-Seven Year Update 1977-2006*, Unpublished Document, Brooklyn College, NY, 2006.

6.   Acosta, V.R., and Carpenter, L.J., *Women in Intercollegiate Sport: A Longitudinal Study - Twenty-Five Year Update 1977-2002*, Unpublished Document, Brooklyn College, 2002.

7.   Pastore, D. L., Two-year College Coaches of Women's Teams: Gender Difference in Coaching Career Selection, *Journal of Sport Management,* 1992, 6, 179-190.

8.   Knoppers, A., Meyer, B.B., Ewing, M. and Forrest, L., Opportunity and Work Behavior in College Coaching, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues,* 1991, 15(1), 1-20.

9.   Sagas, M., Cunningham, G.B. and Ashley, F.B., Examining the Women's Coaching Deficit Through the Perspective of Assistant Coaches, *International Journal of Sport Management,* 2000, 1, 267-282.

10. Hart, B.A., Hasbrook, C.A. and Mathes, S.A., An Examination of the Reduction in the Number of Female Interscholastic Coaches, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1986, 57(1), 68-77.

11. Hult, J., The Story of Women's Athletics: Manipulating a Dream 1890-1985, in: Costa, D.M. and Guthrie, S.R., eds., *Women and Sport: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Human Kinetics Publishers, Champaign, IL, 1994, 83-106.

12. Habif, S., Van Raalte, J.L. and Cornelius, A., Athletes' Attitudes Toward and Preferences for Male and Female Coaches, *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal,* 2001, 1(10), 73-88.

13. Parkhouse, B.L. and Williams, J. M., Differential Effects of Sex and Status on Evaluation of Coaching Ability, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1986, 57, 53-59.

14. Weinberg, R., Reveles, M. and Jackson, A., Attitudes of Male and Female Athletes Toward Male and Female Coaches, *Journal of Sport Psychology,* 1984, 6, 448-453.

15.   Lovett, D.J. and Lowry, C.D., "Good Old Boys" and "Good Old Girls" Clubs: Myth or Reality, *Journal of Sport Management,* 1994, 8, 27-35.

16.   Stangl, J.M. and Kane, M. J., Structural Variables that Offer Explanatory Power for the Underrepresentation of Women Coaches Since Title IX: The Case of Homologous Reproduction, *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 1991, 8, 47-60.

17.   Hasbrook, C.A., Hart, B.A., Mathes, S.A. and True, S., Sex Bias and the Validity of Believed Differences Between Male and Female Interscholastic Athletic Coaches, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1990, 61(3), 259-267.

18.   Humphreys, B.R., Equal Pay on the Hardwood: The Earnings Gap between Male and Female NCAA Division I Basketball Coaches, *Journal of Sport Economics,* 2000, 1(3), 299-307.

19.   Caccese, T.M. and Mayerberg, C.K., Gender Differences in Perceived Burnout of College Coaches, *Journal of Sport Psychology,* 1984, 6, 279-288.

20.   Kelley, B.C., A Model of Stress and Burnout in Collegiate Coaches: Effects of Gender and Time of Season, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1994, 65(1), 48-59.

21.   Kelley, B.C., Eklund, R.C. and Ritter-Taylor, M., Stress and Burnout Among Collegiate Tennis Coaches, *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology,* 1999, 21, 113-130.

22.   Pastore, D.L., Male and Female Coaches of Women's Athletic Teams: Reasons for Entering and Leaving the Profession, *Journal of Sport Management,* 1991, 5, 128-143.

23.   Everhart, C.B. and Chelladurai, P., Gender Differences in Preferences for Coaching as an Occupation: The Role of Self-efficacy, Valence, and Perceived Barriers, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport,* 1998, 69(2), 188-200.

24.   Cooper, M., Hunt, K. and O'Bryant, C.P., Women in Coaching: Exploring Female Athletes' Interest in the Profession, *Chronicle of Kinesiology and Physical Education in Higher Education,* 2007, 18(2), 8, 17-19.

25.   Abney, R. and Richey, D., Barriers Encountered by Black Female Athletic Administrators and Coaches, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance,* 1991, 62, 19-21.

26.   Smith, Y.R., Women of Color in Society and Sport, *Quest,* 1992, 44, *228*-250.

27.   Suggs, W., Title IX has Done Little for Minority Female Athletes Because of Socioeconomic and Cultural Factors, and Indifference, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2001, Retrieved November 30, 2001, http://www.chronicle.com.

28.   Cunningham, G.B., Sagas, M. and Ashley, F. B., Occupational Commitment and Intent to Leave the Coaching Profession: Differences According to Race, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport,* 2001, 36(2), 131-148.

29.   Lapchick, R., *The Buck Stops Here: Assessing Diversity Among Campus and Conference Leaders in Division IA Schools in 2007-08,* The Institute for Diversity and Ethics in Sport, 2007, Retrieved on January 15, 2008, http://www.nacwaa.org.

30.   Brooks, D. and Althouse, R., African American Head Coaches and Administrators: Progress But…?, in: Brooks, D. and Althouse, R., eds., *Racism in College Athletics: The African American Athlete's Experience*, 2nd edn., Fitness Information Technology Publishers, Morgantown, WV, 2000, 85-117.

31.   Abney, R., *The Effects of Role Models and Mentors on Career Patterns of Black Women Coaches and Athletic Administrators in Historically Black and Historically White Institutions of Higher Education*, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Iowa, 1988.

32.   Acosta, V.R., Minorities in Sport: Educational Opportunities Affect Representation, *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance,* 1986, 57(3), 52-55.

33.   Abney, R., The Glass-Ceiling Effect and African American Women Coaches and Athletic Administrators, in: Brooks, D. and Althouse, R., eds., *Racism in College Athletics: The African American Athlete's Experience*, 2nd edn., Fitness Information Technology Publishers, Morgantown, WV, 2000, 119-130.

34.   Thomas, J.R., Nelson, J.K. and Silverman, S.J., *Research Methods in Physical Activity*, 5th edn., Human Kinetics Publishers, Champaign, IL, 2005.

35.   Weiss, M.R. and Sisley, B.L., Where Have All the Coaches Gone? *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 1984, 1, 332-347.