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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the long history of sport, women have never been as involved as participants as they have been in the past two decades. The emergence of Title IX in 1972 marked the beginning of a new era of sport participation for girls and women. As a result of the legislation, girls and women have an increased opportunity to participate on developmental youth league teams, interscholastic and intercollegiate athletic teams, and on international teams such as the Pan American and Olympic teams. As the acceptance and popularity of sport participation for women has increased, the number of women choosing to participate in sport has escalated. This new emphasis in sport for women has made it more accessible for females to become involved at all levels in the vast sport arena. At the interscholastic level, during the seventies, girls’ athletics grew almost 700 percent (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985). On the intercollegiate level about 11,000 women participated in athletics and a decade later the number had grown to over 64,000 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986).

However, concomitant with the increase in the number of female participants, there has been a decline in the number of women in the coaching ranks. For example, Acosta and Carpenter (1985) reported that while more than 90 percent of women’s intercollegiate programs were coached by females in 1972, the figure dropped to 52.2 percent in 1978. In 1988, only 48.3
percent of the women’s teams in intercollegiate programs were coached by women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992).

This disproportionately lower rate of females in coaching also has been reported in the context of high school athletics. For instance, Mathes (1982) reported that females constituted only 12 percent of the basketball coaches of girls’ teams in Iowa, the state which has the nation’s largest high school basketball program for girls. Pastore and Whidden (1983) found that during a six year period from 1976 to 1982, the percentage of female coaches for female high school teams dropped from approximately 60 percent to 47.5 percent in Florida. In the state of Colorado, during the 1983-84 season, women held only 38 percent of girls high school team coaching positions (Schafer, 1987).

The same type of underrepresentation was also found in the context of administration of athletics in educational institutions. In 1985 Farrell (1985) reported that 38 percent (30 percent in 1980) of women’s intercollegiate athletic programs had no female at all involved in their administration. Three years later, Acosta and Carpenter (1986) reported that less than one percent of the athletic directors in men’s programs were women and only 16 percent of the athletic directors of women’s program were women. Division I institutions more frequently have four administrators and are less likely to exclude female participation in the administration of their own programs. However, in 1992, 27.8 percent of Division I schools had no females involved in administration (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). Male athletic directors in 1992 held 83.2 percent of all administrative positions for women’s programs at NCAA schools (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992).
The low representation of women in the administrative ranks is particularly disturbing since decisions about what sports will be offered, who will coach these sports, and how much money will be allocated to each sport are in the domain of athletic administrators. So, the structure and gender make-up of the administration may ultimately influence the advancement or decline of athletic programs for girls and women.

**Explanations for Female Underrepresentation in Coaching**

Several reasons have been advanced for this decline in the number of female coaches. For example, Acosta and Carpenter (1985) reported that the perceived reasons for the decline included (a) success of the old boys’ club network, (b) lack of support systems for females, (c) failure of the old girls’ club network, and (d) females leaving coaching/administrative positions sooner than males. Another reason may be the preferences of male and female athletes for a male coach. Weinberg, Reveles and Jackson (1984) surveyed the attitudes of male and female college, high school and junior high school varsity basketball players toward having a female or male basketball coach. The result of the study showed that the male and female students preferred a male coach to a female coach. Also, the results indicated that the males had a more negative attitude toward female coaches than did the female players. In a different study, Parkhouse and Williams (1986) studied female and male high school basketball athletes who showed a sex bias favoring male basketball coaches. Both males (89%) and females (71%) preferred a male coach. This study, unlike the Weinberg et al. (1984) study,
revealed that females were more biased against women than males.

Caccese and Mayerberg (1984) surveyed head coaches and attributed burnout to be one of the reasons for the decline of female coaches on the Division I level. Female coaches, in these studies, experienced a significantly higher level of emotional exhaustion and lower levels of personal accomplishment than did their male counterparts. One reason for this was that female coaches were younger and less experienced in knowing how to cope with stress. The women tried harder to prove themselves and had been less well prepared for coaching than men. Also, the women were rarely rewarded for their work and therefore, experienced burnout more frequently than men. The researchers also suggested that the women in the study might have been more willing to admit burn-out than their male counterparts.

It has been suggested also that the falling rate of women in coaching may be due to the increased attraction coaching women's teams has for male coaches (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; George, 1989; True, 1983). The argument is that since Title IX coaches of women's teams are compensated at higher salaries. With this increase in compensation, qualified male coaches seek and secure coaching positions with women's programs. There are two viewpoints on why men are able to secure jobs of coaching women's teams. The first view holds that men are better qualified than female applicants and, therefore, they get these jobs on legitimate grounds (Parkhouse & Williams, 1986). The second viewpoint is that males get these jobs because of preferential treatment through the old boys' network or outright discrimination (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; Parkhouse & Williams, 1986).

An equally possible reason could be that women, for many and varied reasons, may not aspire and apply for these jobs. In fact, this particular reason
has been advanced by several scholars for the severe underrepresentation of women in the coaching ranks (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985; Hart, Hasbrook & Mathes, 1986; Pease & Drable, 1988; True, 1983). This is a critical issue if, in fact, women do not aspire to be coaches, the other reasons alluded to earlier become irrelevant. Therefore, it is necessary to look at the extent to which women are eager to choose coaching as an occupation, and the efforts they put forth to secure such jobs prior to turning to other reasons to explain the declining rate of women in coaching.

Coaching as an Occupational Choice

This study of women's occupational preferences for coaching is based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Krumboltz, Mitchell, & Jones, 1976; Mitchell, 1979). Social learning theory postulates that one's personal attributes, significant others, and environmental conditions are the bases for the formulation of the focal person's attitudes, beliefs, values and behavior with respect to any other person or object. Krumboltz et al. (1976) extended the social learning theory to career choice and development. Their theory identifies the interactions of genetic factors, environmental conditions, learning experiences, cognitive, and emotional responses, and performance skills that produce movement along one career path or another. Combinations of these factors interact in different ways to produce different decisions (Krumboltz et al. (1976).

Since the focus of this study is on the decision making process relating to coaching as a career option, the Social Learning Theory of Career Selection (Krumboltz, et al., 1976) is most suitable as the theoretical basis for the study. The important constructs of the social learning approach are skills
and attitudes. The outcome of the process is specific aspirations and the development of the means to implement these aspirations.

Within the broader social learning approach to career choice, an individual may be conceived of making judgments about (a) ones' own abilities and competencies to be successful in a given occupation, (b) the opportunities afforded by the focal occupation to fulfill one's needs and aspirations, and (c) the barriers for entry into that occupation.

The first set of judgments about ones' capacity to perform adequately has been the central interest of the approach known as the self-efficacy theory of career choice (Bandura, 1977; Betz & Hackett, 1981; Hackett & Betz, 1981). The second area of judgments about the attraction of a specific occupation has been the focus of what can be classified as valence theories of career choice (Feather, 1988; Masaywki, 1988). Finally, perceived barriers to occupational entry and/or need fulfillment have been the focus of many studies that have examined the underrepresentation of women in specific occupations (e.g., Eccles, 1988; Feather, 1975; Heilman, 1983; Rosen & Jerdee, 1974). These three perspectives on occupational choice are elaborated in the following sections.

**Self-efficacy Model of Career Choice**

The theory of self-efficacy. Following the general direction provided by the social learning approach, Bandura (1977, 1982) suggested that the tendency for a person to engage in a specific behavior is largely dependent on that individuals' expectation that he/she has the ability to perform that behavior. "Efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes" (Bandura, 1977, p. 193). The theory posits a central processor of efficacy information. That is, people process, weigh, and integrate diverse sources of information concerning their
capabilities, and they regulate their choice behavior and effort expenditure accordingly (p. 212).

This efficacy expectation is learned from past experiences, observations, and from input from others. Self-efficacy theory has been examined in the context of different behavior domains including specific phobias (Bandura, 1977), academic achievement (Hackett & Betz, 1981; Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1986), and sport performance (Lee, 1984).

The theory of career self-efficacy. Professors Betz and Hackett (Betz & Hackett, 1981,1986; Hackett & Betz, 1981) applied the self-efficacy theory to the career area in general, and to the study of occupational self-efficacy, mathematics self-efficacy, career decision-making self-efficacy, task-specific self-efficacy, and career adjustment. Hackett and Betz (1981) first proposed that self-efficacy might be an important variable to include in models of career adjustment of both men and women. As an extension of Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy, Hackett & Betz (1981) developed a model which outlined how personal efficacy expectations differ between men and women due to socialization experiences. They stressed that career related self-efficacy was of particular importance in understanding women's career development. Hackett and Betz (1981) suggested that "women fail to fully realize their capabilities and talents in career pursuits". (p. 326) They argued that this is due to gender differences in access to the primary sources of efficacy information, such as the availability of vocational role models, performance opportunities, and encouragement by others to pursue nontraditional endeavors. The model is the basis for a growing number of studies in career choice (Layton, 1984; Post-Kammer & Smith, 1986; Wheeler, 1983).
Of special interest to this research is the area of occupational self-efficacy wherein it is postulated that individuals estimate their own talents/skills and personality in terms of job requirements. Given a specific occupation, a person is purported to evaluate if he/she possesses the necessary skills and talents to be successful in that occupation. If such an evaluation is negative, that person is not likely to choose that occupation. For instance, Hackett and Betz (1981), in examining gender differences in occupational self-efficacy, found that women’s self-efficacy expectations were significantly higher than men’s for occupations traditionally considered to be female occupations, and significantly lower than men’s for nontraditional occupations. Further, these gender differences in self-efficacy expectations were reflected in the range of traditional and nontraditional occupations considered by their subjects. Similar relationships between occupational self-efficacy and occupational choice have been found by other scholars (Ayres, 1980; Layton, 1984; Lent, Brown & Larkin, 1984, 1986; Post-Kammer & Smith, 1986; Taylor & Betz, 1983; Wheeler, 1983).

In extending this approach to the study of women’s preferences for coaching occupations, it can be argued that if in fact women do not prefer coaching occupations it may be because women may not perceive themselves to possess those necessary talents and skills to be successful in coaching. Therefore, it would be necessary to measure the self-efficacy expectations of women with regard to the specific occupation of coaching. Such a measurement should focus on the specific tasks associated with coaching and the necessary abilities, skills, and dispositions required to perform those tasks adequately. Fortunately, prior research in this regard provides a framework to develop a measure of self-efficacy expectations for coaching. For instance,
Ayres (1980) selected four occupations of physician, nurse, college professor, and elementary teacher and listed tasks and competencies required to successfully pursue each occupational area. The subjects’ self-efficacy with respect to these tasks and competencies was then assessed. Self-efficacy has also been examined with reference to assertiveness tasks (Lee, 1984); social skills (Moe & Zeiss, 1982), willingness to take risks (Douce & Hansen, 1990), and career development (Ayres, 1980). The variety of skills and competencies employed by these and other authors would provide a pool of items from which a scale of self-efficacy for coaching could be developed.

Valence Model of Occupational Choice

In addition to the use of self-efficacy expectations in deciding their occupational alternatives, individuals may also assess an occupation in terms of the extent to which that occupation is perceived to offer opportunities for the satisfaction of their needs and values. The valence or attractiveness of an occupation increases if the occupation is perceived to offer opportunities for need satisfaction. Obviously, the valence an occupation holds is moderated by the attraction of other occupations considered by the focal person.

The values one may seek in coaching may be traced from the categorization of work values contained in different scales including Manhardt’s (1972) scale of 25 work values; Nevill and Super’s (1985) Salience Inventory; Supers (1973) Work Values Inventory; and Weiss, Dawis and Lofquist’s (1973) Minnesota Importance Questionnaire.

Barriers Model of Occupational Choice

Ayres (1980) recognized the importance of the concept of barriers or constraints in the career development of women. Men and women may differ in the extent to which they perceive barriers for entering into specific
careers. These barriers may be due to self-concept (internal) barriers or environmental (external) barriers. Farmer (1976) identified the internal barriers as self-esteem, fear of success, vicarious achievement motivation, home-career conflict, sex role orientation, and fear of risk-taking behavior. Environmental barriers, those barriers outside the control of the individual, include discrimination, availability of resources, and family socialization.

Both the self-efficacy and valence models of occupational choice are based on factors internal to the individual (Masaykwi, 1988; Hackett & Betz, 1981). That is, self-efficacy refers to an individuals’ evaluation of personal talents and skills in relation to a specific task. Similarly, the valence model emphasizes the match between one’s needs and those perceived to be available in an occupation. In contrast to these two perspectives, individuals may also perceive numerous external barriers (such as discrimination) to their entry into an occupation and/or subsequent satisfaction of their needs. These barriers do not reside in either the individual or the focal occupation but are externally imposed.

These obstacles are identified in the literature as discrimination in the hiring process (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986; Fiorentine, 1988; Hasbrook, 1988; Heilman, 1983; Holman & Parkhouse, 1981); compensation discrimination (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987); and discrimination on the job and sexual harassment (Bridges, 1989; Hackett & Betz, 1987; Bridges & Bower, 1985; Farmer, 1976; NCAA, 1991). These perceived constraints, both internally and externally imposed, are thought to impede the career-related behaviors of both men and women.
Gender Comparisons

While the foregoing discussion of the three factors (career self-efficacy; career valence, and career barriers) influencing occupational choice is applicable to both males and females, the actual evaluation of them is more likely to be different for the genders. It has been argued that because of differential social learning men and women examine career options differently based on their source of efficacy information (Hackett & Betz, 1981).

Earlier studies that examined gender differences in occupational preferences have generally looked at classes of occupations. For instance, Hackett and Betz (1981) asked their subjects to indicate their preferences for 10 traditional and 10 nontraditional occupations. Wheeler (1983) presented a list of 17 traditional and nontraditional occupations and asked the subjects to indicate the perceived match of abilities with reference to each of the occupations. Ayres (1980) gave subjects a list of tasks and competencies required for the successful pursuit of four occupations. Two of the occupations were viewed as appropriate for males and two were viewed as appropriate for females. In contrast to the above approach, this study focused on one occupation, coaching. This approach is consistent with Pease and Drabelle’s (1988) argument that a more meaningful way of investigating the problem would be to gain a better understanding of the beliefs a person may have about the profession she or he is preparing to enter.

Significance of the Problem

The study emerged from the concern that fewer women coach basketball now than in the 1970’s when 80% of women’s collegiate basketball teams were coached by women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985). In an effort to address the
problem, occupational preferences of those who were in a position to consider a career coaching basketball, namely female and male collegiate basketball players, were examined.

Women tend to coach predominately in women's programs, however, men are channeled toward both men's and women's programs. Despite women comprising nearly half of all wage earners, women continue to be grossly underrepresented in organizational roles associated with power and status (Heriman, 1983). Consequently, in a sport like basketball, where women's programs are nearing parity with men's basketball programs, men are entering this job market and continuously displacing women.

Women constitute over half of the student population on college campuses. This emphasizes the need for female role models in higher education (Fitzgerald, 1990). This in combination with the low percentage of females in athletic coaching positions, in particular basketball, (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985) results in collegiate women who do not have a large number of female role models in this profession. Hackett and Betz (1981) surmised that

...women do not have role models representing the full range of options... women have a lack of encouragement, sometimes an active discouragement, for nontraditional roles and pursuits. (p.333)

Children can see into the future far enough to see themselves as players, as stars, and as teammates, but not as facilitators, as mentors, or as leaders (Ahmann, 1991). Therefore, speculation concerning who will coach basketball teams should be a predominant concern for athletic directors. The lack of female coaches suggests a real need for investigating the female basketball players' occupational preference.
As basketball moves into a new era of challenge, a study on the occupational preference of basketball players toward coaching provides an analysis of how these players make decisions about their future. This information provides the knowledge necessary to better facilitate the entry of women into the profession as basketball coaches.

Statement of the Problem

The attitudes of male and female basketball players in the Big Ten Conference toward coaching as a viable career option were studied. The outcome of the study focused on the decision making process of this group and their attitude toward the coaching profession.

Research Questions

The study explores the following questions prevalent to occupational choice in coaching.

1. Do basketball players have confidence in their ability to perform the tasks associated with coaching?
2. Is coaching basketball viewed as an attractive occupation?
3. Are there perceived barriers which hinder basketball players from entering coaching?

Delimitations

The study is delimited to:

1. Female and male basketball players in the Big Ten Conference.

Limitations

The following limitations of the study should be recognized:

1. The student-athletes' perception of coaching basketball is reflective of their individual and personal basketball playing experience.
2. There may have been those who aspired to become basketball coaches among the subjects. No attempt was made to identify their responses from the total sample.
Basic Assumptions

It should be understood that:

1. Each subject read and answered each question on the instrument honestly.
2. Each subject responded to the study voluntarily.
3. No control was influenced over the student-athletes' responses.
4. The survey instrument was administered to each team under similar conditions.

Definition of Terms

1. Occupational Choice. An occupation that one would choose.
2. Career Self-Efficacy. Subjects' confidence in their ability to carry out the task associated with an occupation.
3. Occupational Valence. The strength of the subjects' preference for several work values.
4. Valence of Coaching. Subjects' beliefs regarding the extent that the work values were prevalent in coaching.
5. Perceived Barriers. Perceived hindrances for entering into coaching.
7. Work Values. Occupational objectives that one seeks to satisfy a need.
8. Big Ten Conference. Eleven institutions with common athletic goals. These institutions are Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Michigan State, Minnesota, Northwestern, Ohio State, Penn State, Purdue and Wisconsin.
Choice of Sport

In a previous section it was suggested that it would be preferable to assess the subjects’ evaluation of one occupation instead of a collection of occupations (Pease & Drabelle, 1988). Unfortunately, coaching can not be deemed to be one occupation because every sport requires special talents, skills, and predispositions. Therefore, it is necessary to choose one sport as the focus of the study. Basketball appears to be the best choice because it is the most popular among women’s collegiate sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 1990).

Choice of Subjects

While coaching is open to numerous applicants, the most likely population from which coaches of a particular sport are drawn is the players of that sport. Sage (1989) reasoned that

the decision to become a coach was subjectively warranted by personal characteristics and experiences in sport, devotion to sport, and a desire to work with young people . . . because almost all of the coaches participated in organized youth and/or high school athletics, they had a first-hand opportunity to observe their own coaches and acquire some informal images and impressions about the coaching occupation from them. (p. 81)

The choice of university basketball players as subjects of the study was justified on the basis that coaches of intercollegiate basketball teams have been largely drawn from this pool of subjects (Bischoff, 1988; Hasbrook, Hart, Mathes & True, 1990; Knoppers, Meyer, Ewing & Forrest, 1989; Sage, 1989).

Summary

In summary, the present study examined one possible explanation for the severe underrepresentation of women coaching basketball teams, namely, the extent that female basketball players were eager to chose coaching as a
career. The study was based on the theories in career development and career counseling. More specifically, the direction for the study was drawn from Betz's (Betz & Hackett, 1986; Hackett & Betz, 1981) career self-efficacy theory which, in turn, was based on the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977; Mitchell, 1979; Krumboltz et al. 1976). The study assessed (a) players' self-efficacy relating to the coaching career, (b) occupational valences (c) players' valences for the rewards available in a coaching career, (d) player's perceptions of the barriers to entry into the coaching occupation, and to obtain the rewards of coaching, and (e) players' intentions to choose coaching as a career. Within the above focus, the study tested the differences between subgroups defined by (a) gender of the players, (b) race, (c) year of study and, (d) gender of the coach of the team. The relationships among the variables of the study are illustrated in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Model of Desire to Coach
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A prevailing attitude that sport participation was psychologically as well as physiologically harmful to the welfare of women suppressed women's participation in sport for decades. At the present time, women continue to be underrepresented in all facets of the sport experience including participation, coaching, and the administration of athletic programs. A review of related literature will lend to the understanding of the underrepresentation of women in sport. This chapter is divided into two major sections. First, the impact of women as participants, coaches, and administrators is explored at different sport levels. In addition, plausible explanations for the underrepresentation is discussed.

The second section of this chapter examines the Social Learning Theory of Career Selection (Krumblotz, et al, 1976) as it relates to self-efficacy, valence, and barriers and Super's (1963) developmental theory.

During the 1920's a national philosophy of a sport for every girl and a girl for every sport was adopted (Acosta & Carpenter, 1985). Predominate forms of early women's university sport were playdays and sportsdays. Playdays were experiences that incorporated teams traveling to other campuses to play a round robin format of competition. Teams were chosen at random, resulting in women from various universities participating on each
team. It was not uncommon for women to play different sports on these
days. Playdays and sportsdays continued until the 1960's. The philosophy of
the 1920's and 1930's emphasized the educational values and enhancement
of the individual's potential in sport. This philosophy remained with
women in sport until the early 1970's. During the 1940's and 1950's a concept
unique to women's athletics was established. Students began to get involved
in the establishment of policies and guidelines which determined the path of
women in athletics. On the high school level Girls' Athletic Associations
(GAA) were formed, while on the college level Women's Athletic
Associations (WAA) and Women's Recreation Associations (WRA) were
established (Uhlir, 1987).

Women physical educators held a tight rein on the development and
guidance of women's programs. This occurred basically through various
organizations that were established by women for women's sports. The
primary emphasis of these organizations was sport or intramural
participation. The American Association for Health, Physical Education and
Recreation (AAHPER) played a significant role in the formation of specific
organizations for women's sport. It was not until 1950 that the Division of
Girls and Women's Sport (DGWS) of AAHPER expressed support for
women's involvement in competitive sport. In 1967 the Commission on
Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (CIAW) was created (Uhlir, 1987). No
governance organization for women similar to the National Collegiate
Athletic Association (NCAA the governing body for men's athletics) existed
before this time. The purpose of CIAW was to encourage intercollegiate
athletic programs for enriching of the lives of the participants (Uhler, 1987). The Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW) was an outgrowth of CIAW. Initiated in 1971, the AIAW provided an organized structure for a governing body of intercollegiate athletics for women. AIAW membership extended to over 970 institutional members (Hult, 1980). In 1979, AIAW officially separated from AAHPER/DGWS to become a separate governance structure. AAHPER, DGWS, CIAW and AIAW were the prominent associations which encouraged women's participation in sport until the 1970's and 1980's.

There were two reasons which motivated women leaders to create associations to govern college athletics. First, it was believed that women had been seriously deprived of the most highly regarded extracurricular learning experience within higher education. Second, it was believed that there were approaches to providing competitive experiences other than those that had become institutionalized throughout higher education in men's athletics (Uhler, 1987). Before the early 1970's higher education had known but one version of athletics. Women leaders attempted to enrich the lives of college women through sport and to offer an alternative option for delivering programs of sport.

The Impact of Title IX on Participation

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from making employment decisions based on race, color, religion or sex. This act, along with Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972, which became effective in 1978, prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in educational
programs receiving federal assistance. Both have had a profound impact on athletics for girls and women. The key provision of Title IX is the following:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. (Wong, 1988, p. 418)

The enactment of Title IX covered virtually all areas of student life in institutions of higher education including admissions, financial aid, academic programs, health services, testing and counseling, and extracurricular activities to include sports and competitive athletics.

In 1977, the number of sports offered for women was 5.61 per school; in 1980 the number had grown to 6.48; in 1990 to 7.24 and in 1992 the number dropped to 7.09 (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). Basketball has been the most popular sport in the women's intercollegiate program since 1977, followed by volleyball, tennis and cross-country (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986). Soccer participation increased from 2.8 percent to 41.3 percent and cross-country increased from 29.4 percent to 82.1 percent between 1977 and 1990, respectively. The influence of Title IX was apparent.

Grove City College v. Bell

The most significant case in restricting the scope of Title IX involved the 1984 decision in Grove City College v. Bell. In the case the United States Supreme Court severely limited the scope and effectiveness of Title IX by narrowly construing the 'program-specific' language of the statute (Wong, 1988). The decision jeopardized the ability of Title IX to protect the civil rights of all individuals at educational institutions.
Grove City College wanted to maintain its independence from the government by refusing any form of government financial assistance. However, at the time of the trial, 140 of Grove City’s 2200 students were eligible to receive Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG). In addition, 342 of Grove City’s students had received Guaranteed Students Loans (GSL) (Wong, 1988).

In July, 1977, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) requested that the College execute an “assurance of compliance” based upon its students’ BEOG’s and GSL’s. Grove City College refused to do so on the ground that any aid its students received constituted federal financial assistance only to those students and not to the College. HEW initiated administrative proceedings to terminate the grants and loans to Grove City students. Concluding that Grove City College was a recipient of federal financial assistance and was therefore subject to regulation under Title IX, the Judge ordered the termination of the students’ BEOG’s and GSL’s. Grove City College and four of its students whose aid had been terminated filed a suit. The district court ruled that Grove City was a recipient of federal financial assistance within the meaning of Title IX. On appeal, the Court of Appeals affirmed the district courts ruling, relying on the fact that some of the College’s students financed their education with BEOG’s. Because BEOG’s ultimately became part of the school’s general operational budget, the court of appeals reasoned, "it is apparent...that the institution itself must be the program (receiving federal financial assistance)". (Wong, 1988, p. 436)
The Supreme Court unanimously adopted the court of appeals' broad interpretation of the statutory phase "receiving federal financial assistance", holding that the receipt of BEOG's by some students of the College rendered it a recipient of federal financial assistance within the meaning of Title IX. However, a 6-3 majority narrowly interpreted the phrase "program or activity" as used in the statute, holding that the BEOG's represented federal financial assistance only to the College's financial aid program, therefore, only the College's financial aid program was subject to regulation under Title IX. The immediate effect of the Grove City College decision on intercollegiate athletics was the dropping of 23 Title IX investigations (Wong, 1988).

Before the Grove City College case, between October 1979 and June 1981, over 300 complaints alleging discrimination in athletics were filed (Wong, 1988). The most common issues raised on the college level were equipment, supplies, facilities, assignments and compensation for coaches. On the secondary level was scheduling, matching interests and abilities, and denial of participation. This was only one indication of the increased attention being given to girls' and women's athletics. In general the response to Title IX was encouraging. More college and athletic departments recognized their responsibilities to female students. Athletic opportunities for women began to increase.

In 1987, the Civil Rights Restoration Act overturned the Supreme Court's 1984 decision in the Grove City v. Bell case, and restored the effectiveness of Title IX. The purpose of the Civil Rights Restoration Act was to affirm pre-Grove City judicial and executive branch interpretations and
enforcement practices. These practices provided a broad coverage of the anti-discrimination provision of the civil rights statutes.

The Impact of Women in Sports at Different Levels

Amateur Sports. Over the past decade youth sports have grown tremendously in this country. Approximately 20 million children participate in various sport programs including park and recreation programs, YMCAs, after school programs and amateur sports leagues throughout the United States (Brown & Branta, 1988). The growth of youth sports demands more coaches and qualified coaches to lead these programs. With the increased demands of youth sports programs, there has been a decline in the number of coaches who are willing to volunteer their time to these organizations (Marten and Gould, 1984; Weiss and Sisley, 1984).

The typical youth coach was male, in his mid-30's, coaches his own children in the program for about 5.5 years and spent 18 weeks and 11 hours per week coaching children (Marten & Gould, 1984). When surveyed in regard to reasons for their leaving youth programs, ninety-seven coaches polled by Weiss and Sisley (1984) listed multiple reasons: (a) time involvement (b) conflicts with jobs (c) child no longer participating (d) loss of motivation (e) problems with unqualified officiating, and (f) dissatisfaction with program philosophy. Little attention has been focused on the youth sport coach despite the fact that youth sport participation, along with physical education is the foundation of the socialization of children into the competitive arena. Interestingly, the majority of youth sports coaches studied were male (eighty-seven percent) (Martens & Gould, 1979). Women are seemingly inhibited from entering the youth sport coaching ranks. The
sports that are designed to attract girls as well as boys, including basketball and soccer are in fact 75% male (Pearl, 1993). Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board identified gymnastics as the only sport with high female participation. The absence of women coaches in youth sport programs deprives little girls of female role models at this critical stage of socialization.

**High Schools Programs** The continuing problem of providing enough qualified coaches for high school athletic programs climaxed with the increase of girls programs at the interscholastic level. Unlike most boys' programs, many girl programs were not administered by state activities associations. The most common sports for girls were track and field, cross-country, and swimming and diving (Sisley & Capel, 1986). As a result of the increased interest in girls' participation, the scarcity of qualified coaches became even more apparent. In Ohio and Virginia women held 96.6% and 92% of the girls' team coaching positions in 1972. But by 1982-83 the percentage declined to 43.8% and 54.6%, respectively. And, in Florida, between 1976-1982, female coaches of girls' teams declined from 59.8 % to 47.5% (Pastore & Whidden, 1983). Between 1978-79 and 1982-83, the number of female coaches for 12 Illinois High School Association Sports decreased by seventeen percent (Chesbro, 1985). This trend was repeated nationwide as several states reported a decline in the number of available qualified coaches (Chesbro, 1985; Cox & Noble, 1989; Hasbrook, Hart, Mathes, & True, 1990; Odenkirk, 1986; Pastore & Whidden, 1983; Schafer, 1987; True, 1983).

Previously, female coaches were hired from college and university physical education teachers programs. Noble and Sigle (1980) noted the importance attached to preparation in physical education for the aspiring
coach. Their study revealed that physical education students and graduates expected coaching to be a primary factor in their occupational lives. Additionally, teachers in other academic disciplines completed coaching courses in order to qualify for coaching responsibilities. However, with the growth of interscholastic athletic programs for girls, the number of teams to be coached, far exceeded the number of qualified coaches. In response to this situation AAHPERD initiated coaching certification programs on the high school level in 1976. Since AAHPERD was a voluntary organization, it was not in a position to require coaching standards. The organization, therefore, proposed minimum certification standards and developed research materials for those who were interested in becoming a coach.

Between 1972-76 the Kansas Association for Physical Education and Recreation viewed the insufficient number of coaches to be directly correlated with little or no preparation related to coaching responsibilities. Their discussions lead toward efforts to rectify the problem in the state of Kansas. This action prompted a nationwide study by two professors at Kansas State University. Noble and Corbin (1978) surveyed all 50 states, along with Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia seeking answers to questions concerning coaching certification programs and specific coaching requirements. The results revealed that 45 states, including Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia had no specific certification requirements for coaches. However, most states required that the coach be a certified teacher. Two states (Indiana and Wisconsin) had coaching certification programs available, but did not require coaches to be certified. Five states had minimum requirements for coaches in addition to teacher certification requirements.
A critical issue which was overlooked in the Noble and Corbin's 1978 study, was addressed in an 1980 nationwide study when Corbin & Sigle, 1980, inquired which states, if any, allowed nonteachers to coach. The results showed that 34 states allowed nonteachers to coach either on a regular basis or as an emergency procedure. Thirty-two of those required the head coach to be employed with the school system where they coached.

Many high school state organizations opposed coaching certification requirements because the states realized how difficult it was to get certified coaches for all their athletic teams. Kentucky, Texas, Ohio, Kansas, and California wanted to hire only qualified teacher-coaches for coaching responsibilities, but failed repeatedly in implementing coaching certificate programs (Odenkirk, 1986). While efforts were attempted toward implementing certification programs, an increasing number of teacher-coaches were giving up their coaching responsibilities and retaining their teaching assignments. New teachers hired to teach were not qualified to coach. On many college and university campuses, physical education departments were placing greater emphasis on the exercise sciences. As a result, the interest in teacher-education programs and coaching minors diminished (Odenkirk, 1986).

The perceived lack of qualified coaches on the high school level was not solely the basis for the declining numbers of female coaches. Hasbrook et al. (1990) cited sex bias attitudes in the hiring of athletic coaches as a reason for the declining numbers at the high school level in a statewide and nationwide study. Hasbrook et al (1990) questioned the validity of the perceived lack of qualifications of women coaches by examining qualifications in the hiring of
athletics coaches. Three areas were examined, (a) playing experience (b) coaching experience, and (c) win/loss records. First, male coaches in the study possessed more playing experience than their female counterparts. This finding was in contrast to the earlier findings of Anderson and Gill (1983) who reported that female coaches of Iowa interscholastic basketball teams possessed significantly more college basketball playing experience than their male counterparts. Despite this, approximately 90% of the women's teams in the study were coached by men.

On the intercollegiate level, the analysis showed that females had significantly more playing experience than their male counterparts. Similarly, Bischoff (1988) reported that 94% of the female coaches versus 54.7% of the male coaches of Division I basketball teams played basketball at the intercollegiate level. Additionally, Knoppers et al. (1989) found that significantly more female than male coaches had intercollegiate playing experience among NCAA Division I coaches. These nationwide findings are consistent with the statewide findings of Anderson and Gill (1983).

In the area of formal training, on both the state and national level, females had obtained significantly more professional preparation to teach and assess physical skills than males. This finding coincided with the findings four years earlier of Sisley and Capel (1986). Sisley and Capel's (1986) study showed that women who coached at the high school level were more professionally trained than their male counterparts, when professional experience in the organization, delivery, and evaluation of sports and strategies were considered. In a study of NCAA Division I male and female head coaches (Knoppers et al. 1989) of counter sports such as baseball/softball,
basketball, golf, cross-country, track and field, swimming and diving, tennis and volleyball, there was not a significant difference between the win/loss records of male and female head coaches. The implication that women lack qualifications, when considering playing experience, coaching experience and win/loss records was not substantiated in these findings. And, Hart et al. (1986) contended that present and former coaches showed different value orientations toward coaching which may have contributed to the declining numbers. Former coaches left coaching for reasons unrelated to a sporting experience orientation (conflict with their personal lives). Present coaches indicated that they would leave coaching if they saw themselves as being no longer effective coaches or got tired of losing basketball games.

Two-Year Colleges  Information concerning the number of women in coaching at two-year colleges is lean. In 1979, more than one fourth of all two year colleges offered no sports to women (Urlir, 1984). Between 1979 and 1987 the number of sports offered women in two-year colleges more than tripled. However, as participation opportunities for women grew, the number of women coaching at this level declined.

Recently, a national study of gender trends in coaching at two-year colleges was completed by Pastore (1991). During a seven year span of the study (1983-1990), the percentage of female coaches at two-year colleges decreased from 49 percent to 43 percent, while the percentage of males coaching women's athletics teams increased from 51 percent to 57 percent. Volleyball recorded the highest number of female coaches over the seven year interval. Volleyball coaches were a great contrast to the percentage of female gymnastic coaches which decreased from 100 to 0 percent. Males were
the consistent coaches of women's teams. The percentage of male coaches increased in women's basketball from 56% to 69% between 1983 to 1990, while the percentage of female coaches of women's basketball teams decreased from 44% to 31%. No females were reported to coach male basketball teams during this seven year span. Female coaches of male sports were seen most often in golf, swimming, tennis and track and field.

Four Year College/University Programs Perceptions of previous studies have indicated that one of the causes for the decline in the number of women in athletics at four year colleges/universities is that females fail to apply for jobs. NCAA Senior Women Administrators (SWA) at four year institutions, who had held their current positions for at least ten years or more, were asked "why they have stayed" and "what would it take to induce them to leave?" (Carpenter & Acosta, 1992). The women who responded had witnessed the birth and death of the AIAW and remembered the frustration of the Grove City College v. Bell decision. Sixty-eight percent of the SWAs careers began in teaching physical education, and seventy-one percent were participants in varsity athletic programs.

The five most frequently cited reasons for why they stayed in their current jobs were: (a) I feel comfortable on campus, (b) my job is challenging, (c) my job is rewarding, (d) my job is interesting, and (e) my salary meets my needs. In regard to the last reason, it can be extrapolated that in the absence of sufficient or adequate salaries, the women reduced their wish list to fit their needs and then became accustomed to the fit. This point will be better understood with the aid of the second question. Although over 78% thought seriously about leaving, only 57% had ever applied for another job.
In regard to the second question, "what would it take to induce them to leave" the most frequent responses were (a) more money, (b) increased budget, (c) match authority with responsibility, (d) more support staff report directly to me and, (e) comply with Title IX (sex equity). Over 54% of these administrators had been offered jobs elsewhere, but chose to stay. Fitzgerald (1990) indicated that even movement between divisions was uncommon for female coaches and administrators.

The significance of females in administrative positions at four year institutions is reflected in over half of the coaches of women's teams being female under female leadership (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). However, the sobering point is that only a small percentage, 16.8, of women's programs were headed by a female, and in 27.8% of all athletic programs in 1992, there were no females involved in athletic administration. At Division I schools, which average 4.08 administrators, only 1.1 were likely to be women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992).

In 1977, only 58.2 percent of all women's sports teams were coached by women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986). By 1984, the number had dropped to 53.8 percent, in 1990 to 47.3 and in 1992, 48.3 percent of women's intercollegiate teams (the 24 most popular sports) were coached by women. Among the two most popular sports, in 1992, women coached 63.5 percent of collegiate basketball teams and 68.7 percent of college volleyball teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). In 1992, an American Basketball Council Survey showed that 12.2 million females played basketball which was an increase from 11% in 1987. Of the 12.2 million participants, almost 75% were under 17 years of
age. It is apparent that the growth in participation for women in basketball is concentrated among younger players.

The largest percent of female coaches in basketball coached at the Division I level (72.2%) with 51.4% and 63.9% at Division II and III, respectively. The greatest decline in the number of women coaches was noted in the most popular sport, basketball. As the popularity to participate in basketball increased in 1978 from 90.3 percent of schools offering a program to 96.2 percent in 1990, and 97.2 percent in 1992, the number of women coaching these teams has declined precipitously. Twenty of 24 sports offered to women experienced a decline in female coaches from 1977 to 1992. The impact of coaching change on other sports, however, has varied. For sports such as field hockey, lacrosse, and synchronized swimming, where participants and coaches are predominantly female, coaching staffs have remained predominantly female. In crew, riding, and sailing, there was an increase of female coaches.

Within the past ten years the number of head coaching jobs for women increased. However, women now hold only 181 more of these jobs as compared to men who hold 631 more jobs as coaches of women’s teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). Only two percent of the head coaches of men’s teams within the NCAA are females, and almost half of these are coaches of combined teams. The combined teams which practice together are swimming, cross-country and tennis. There is a higher percentage of female assistant coaches than head coaches in both paid (58.7%) and unpaid (53.1%) positions at NCAA member institutions (Acosta & Carpenter, 1992). Parkhouse and Williams (1986) findings were consistent with the
forementioned results. During a five year period from 1974-79 they found a trend toward hiring male coaches. The number of male coaches almost tripled in comparison to a three percent increase in female coaches during this time period. These configurations showed male dominance in head coaching positions in women’s programs at the collegiate level. Acosta and Carpenter (1986) addressed the importance of the female coach for female teams when they wrote:

The importance of the same-sex role models for the full development of the individual is well established . . . female sports participants very often are forced to develop without the presence of female role models in leadership positions, directing their own future, expressing competence, possessing self-assurance, and making thoughtful decisions. (p.33)

There are 1223 senior colleges in the country that have women's varsity basketball teams (NCAA News, 1993). This includes 894 NCAA members (294 in Division I). During the 1992-93 season 4.7 million spectators saw women play basketball (NCAA News, 1993). The number of people attending women’s basketball games has nearly doubled since 1982 when women began playing basketball under the NCAA structure. The Big Ten women netted the Division I attendance list during the 1992-93 season, by setting national records for both attendance (379,418) and per game average attendance (2599). However, despite the success of women programs in Division I basketball, rewards are neither reflected in female coaches’ salaries or contracts in the same manner as their male counterparts. A 1993 Women’s Basketball Coaches Association (WBCA) survey showed that base salaries for head coaches of women’s basketball averaged only 59% of the base
salaries of head coaches of men's basketball. Ninety-two percent of Division I head coaches of men's programs hold employment contracts as compared to 75% of head coaches for women teams. On an average males hold contracts for approximately four years or more while women hold contracts for approximately three years or less. These findings reveal the minimal security that female have as coaches of basketball.

Although not the primary focus of this study, minority group representation in administrative and coaching positions at NCAA member schools is staggering. In 1987, there were only 164 minority group members (Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, Indian Americans, Near Easterners) at over 800 NCAA institutions (Acosta & Carpenter, 1987). In other words, there was a minority group member in only one of five of the athletic administrative structures. The number of coaches in minority groups fared only slightly better, attaining 564 head coaching positions. In 1987, at one of three colleges and universities, there were no minority group persons in either women's or men's athletic programs serving as head coach (Acosta & Carpenter, 1987). The number of representatives of minority groups who hold positions as administrators, coaches or assistant coaches in all of NCAA sports is about 1979, or in other words, approximately 2.5 per school. Clearly, more attention needs to be devoted to this area in future occupational choice inquiries involving student-athletes.

Perceived Causes for the Declining Representation

Structural Changes  From a historical perspective, men's and women's athletic departments at colleges and universities operated autonomously before 1980 (Uhlir, 1987). Athletic facilities were initially built for men and
because remodeling or additions were both time consuming and expensive, countless women's programs still struggle to reach a balance. The greatest advantage of the separate department for men's and women's athletics was that it was an excellent way to accommodate two work forces. The two separate departments included the combined areas of athletics and physical education. Under this system women held ninety percent of the leadership positions in women's athletic programs (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986).

The separate department structure in men's and women's athletic programs provided the entry level leadership experience for women who aspired to pursue a career in athletics. Women had a source of power and gender solidarity. The structure provided the female athlete with role models in almost every leadership position in athletics. Athletes saw women in positions of authority having a direct impact on the future development of athletics for women. The structure provided an avenue for women leaders to network and to develop the type of intercollegiate athletic programs which would allow the female student-athlete the optimal academic-athletic experience.

In 1972, virtually all athletic programs for women were directed by women, with only six percent of Division I programs being merged into single athletic departments (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986). By the late 1970's, many men's and women's athletic programs around the country had combined. The two separate work forces were now one. In light of this trend, in 1980, the NCAA initiated a proposal to provide some championships for women's teams along with a plan whereby women administrators and student-athletes would be admitted into the all-male
operated organization. The AIAW responded with efforts to maintain autonomous control over intercollegiate athletics for women. However, the AIAW could not match the financial incentives of the NCAA. The result had a significant impact on the future of women in intercollegiate athletics. More importantly, it marked the demise of the AIAW. By 1980, over 80 percent of all collegiate athletic administrations were merged and 80 percent of the administrations had males at the top (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986). Frequently, the women who were displaced were more qualified, had more experience, higher degrees, academic rank, and tenure than the males who displaced them (Uhlir, 1987).

In 1990 the chances of a women's program being supervised by a women was less than one percent in over 800 NCAA institutions (Acosta & Carpenter, 1990). Division III institutions represent the largest group of athletic programs (over 300 in 1990) and these institutions averaged only one administrator per program. Yet, Division I programs, where entry level jobs should be more obtainable, have the least number of females represented. Under Division I NCAA regulations, coaching staffs for basketball are restricted to three full-time coaches and one restrictive earnings coach. At Division II and III institutions there may be any number of restrictive earnings coaches. Coaching jobs are more obtainable at the lower levels than administrative jobs.

Knoppers (1987, 1989) has argued that the structural changes in the management of athletic departments may be an underlying explanation for the reduction in the number of women in coaching positions as well. Following Knoppers lead, Stangl and Kane (1991) suggested that Kanter's
(1977) model of structural determinants of organizational behavior, opportunity, power, and proportion, work together to influence the ratio of coaches by gender. In other words, it is at the administrative level in athletics that individuals have the power and opportunity to determine who is hired or terminated. The findings of Stangl and Kane’s work, which expanded over three Title IX time periods, 1981-82, 1988-89, and 1974-75, pointed to a direct relationship between the gender of the administrator and the gender of the head coach.

This point was further illuminated when Acosta and Carpenter (1990) surveyed male and female athletic administrators throughout the country in an attempt to identify the factors perceived as causing the diminishing role of women in athletics. There were two causes agreed on by all respondents, the most important being the success of the old boys’ club network. Obviously, the feeling among both men and women in athletic administrative positions was that men, who account for the majority of leadership positions, gave preferential treatment to men in the hiring process.

When the respondents were asked to rank their responses in order of importance, male athletic administrators perceived the four most important causes as (a) the lack of qualified women coaches, (b) failure of women to apply for job openings, (c) lack of qualified female administrators, and (d) time constraints due to family duties. It is also interesting to note that male respondents did not list "the success of the old boys’ network' in their ranked order. These reasons reflect gender-role connotations about men and women such as women are less competent than men, women are less committed to careers than men, and the employment of women interferes with family life.
Perceived Barriers. Women, because of the low gender ratio, face pressures within the profession unfamiliar to male coaches. According to Acosta and Carpenter (1986) seventy-seven percent of females in athletics experience discrimination in the form of sexual discrimination or harassment on the job, ranging from salary, budget, prestige, media coverage, and 'dirty work' assignments. Knoppers et al., (1989) studied NCAA Division I coaches and found that ninety-two percent of those surveyed said they experienced some form of sex discrimination in coaching. In a national study on the reduction of the number of female interscholastic coaches Hart et al. (1986) suggested that female coaches of female teams have more trouble than male coaches of male teams in getting equipment, facilities, and administrative support to do their job. There is speculation of gender differentiated treatment of women coaches in the hiring process (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987; Gerdes & Garber, 1983; Hart et al., 1986; Hasbrook, 1988; Heilmen, 1983).

Budgetary restrictions in athletic programs have been the reason for many disparities in the women's programs and more recently a number of lawsuits. Discrimination has occurred both intentionally and unintentionally as women's programs compete for the finances and status to ensure the most meaningful athletic experiences for student-athletes. At Colorado State University the women's softball team was eliminated and later reinstated, and at Colgate University, after four attempts in nine years, women's ice hockey was elevated to varsity status. Brown University dropped women's gymnastics and volleyball from varsity status to club status. After two years of deliberations, the courts ordered Brown to reinstate both
teams to varsity status (NCAA News, 1993a). The University of Texas increased the percentage of athletic scholarships for women, raised the proportion of women's athletic participation from 32 to 44 percent, and added soccer and softball to the women's sports programs to avoid a Title IX litigation (NCAA News, 1993a).

The Florida Educational Equity Act has been strengthened by including gender equity in athletics at all levels of public education. The law also demands that each institution develop its own gender equity plan and holds the institution accountable for that plan. If a state university is found not in compliance with both Title IX and the Florida Educational Equity Act, educational institutions risk being eligible for competitive state grants and are subjected to the withholding of state funds. Florida is probably a forerunner among states with this type of progress toward equity (NCAA News, 1993b).

Perhaps one of the largest commitments to increase the quality of their women's sports programs was a move by the nineteen campuses of the California State University system to change athletic participation for women in the future. A lawsuit settled out of court requires that the proportion of women athletes will come within five percent of the proportion of women students on campus, funding for women's sports will be within ten percent of the women enrolled, and athletic scholarships will be within five percent of the women undergraduate student population on campus (NCAA News, 1993c). The underlying reasons for these lawsuits and proposed changes have been a lack of financial support in accommodating the abilities of female student-athletes. The actions of the courts have made it clear that financial concerns do not justify gender discrimination.
Women's programs and coaches of women's teams operate daily under the forementioned pressures. These types of pressures are known to lead to occupational burnout. Maslack and Jackson (1981) suggested that occupational burnout has contributed to individuals leaving employment, so it is reasonable to assume that women may leave coaching due to burnout. Parkhouse & Williams (1984) suggested that the general devaluation of coaches may provide some explanation for the increasing drop-out rates. Holmen & Parkhouse (1981) purported that men have more access to the political system than their female counterparts. Therefore, males are more successful in attaining head coaching jobs. Other writers (Caccese & Mayerberg, 1984; Hart, et al., 1986) have reported that women are unable to cope with the stress of coaching and that the lack of role models to mentor women for experiences in athletics have interrupted the athletic careers of women. Douvan (1976) supports these issues and states that

... modelling is important to learning ... the career development of women would be limited by the lack of adult women representing strong career orientation and varied career pursuits. (p. 10)

**Female Athletes' Desire to Coach**

Few studies have examined the intentions of the female athlete toward entering the coaching profession. A national study conducted by the NCAA (1991) on the "Perceived Barriers of Women in Intercollegiate Athletic Careers" found that only five percent of the female student-athletes at NCAA institutions showed an interest in seeking positions in athletics. Seventy-five percent of those surveyed indicated that a 9 to 5 job was more appealing. The female coaches surveyed in this study showed concern over the attractiveness
of athletic careers to female athletes. Seventy-seven percent of the coaches indicated awareness of stereotyping and misconceptions that might be perceived as barriers to attracting young women to athletic careers. While the results of this national study leave little hope for the female athletes' pursuit of athletic endeavors, results of other studies shed a different light on this dilemma.

George (1988) surveyed 516 female athletes attending eleven colleges and universities in Indiana and explored the female athletes' interest in coaching as a vocation. The authors predicted a disinterest among the athletes in regard to entering the coaching profession. However, this theory was disproved when it was found that 55 percent of the athletes indicated an interest in coaching. The largest group of athletes represented in the study were basketball (20%), volleyball (16%) and softball players (15%).

In a different study, Pease and Drabelle (1988) found similar results among female athletes' coaching interests. Male and female college students, who were enrolled in coaching oriented classes at four institutions were surveyed. Forty-six percent of the women responded positively to coaching as a primary career goal. However, it should be noted that the women in the study preferred a coaching position on the junior high school level as compared to 90 percent of the men who wanted high school coaching positions. The women also were less willing to serve long apprenticeships in coaching. These two findings indicate that however interested in coaching, women may prefer coaching at lower levels than males and are not willing to wait as long as males for head coaching positions.
Strategies to Increase the Number of Female Coaches

Several strategies have been introduced to reverse the decline of women in coaching positions in athletics. These strategies include, but are not limited to, sensitizing athletic directors and educational leaders awareness of the needs such, as increasing contracts and the length of contracts for women, marketing programs, equal base pay scales, active affirmative action programs, more publicity for women's programs, increasing the amount of grass root programs, having large and unbiased search committees, intern and graduate assistant programs in both coaching and administration, assertiveness training, encouragement to women to enter into coaching, institutional preparation of students to enter the coaching profession, recruiting and hiring a larger number of women for head coaching positions, and hiring more women to coach male athletic teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986; Farmer, 1976; George, 1988; Noble & Sigle, 1980; Obenkirk, 1986).

Role modelling, as vicarious learning, is a major contention in increasing the number of women in coaching. Krumboltz et al. (1976) contends that not only is modelling important, but the greater effectiveness is the same-sex models. Tidball (1980) supports this argument and concludes that

\[ \ldots \text{ as the proportion of women (in leadership positions), relative to the number of women students increase, so does the proportion of women high achievers in professional life. (p.515)} \]

Occupational Choice Theories

An impressive amount of empirical data describing how career decisions are made and implemented has accumulated in the literature. One of the main approaches to career choice and development has been
reinforcement and development based theories. The Social Learning Theory (Krumboitz, et al. 1976) and Super's (1963) developmental theory are of particular interest to this study.

**Social Learning Theory.** A number of attempts has been made to understand why people make the choices they do in occupational and educational endeavors. Decision making theories use assumptions about the availability of information and the ability of individuals to handle it. One such decision making theory is the Social Learning Theory of Career Selection (Krumboitz et al. 1976). The social learning theory recognizes humans as intelligent, problem-solving individuals who want to understand the reinforcement contingencies which act on the environment to suit environmental and personal needs. The foundation of this theory is associated with the work of Albert Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory.

Bandura's (1977) Social Learning Theory (renamed Social Cognitive Theory) postulates that cognitive processes mediate change, but that cognitive events are induced and altered most readily by experience of mastery arising from effective performance. Therefore, the social learning theory holds that learning takes place through observation, as well as through direct experiences. Expectations are formed through activities of positively and negatively reinforcing events and covert behavior becomes an initiator for overt action. The theory signifies that in humans creativity occurs as various cognitive concepts are manipulated to form new conceptual patterns. Human behavior, then, can be under the control of the individual as well as the environment and the individual can exercise some control over the available alternatives and the consequences of her or his actions.
The theory consists of four categories which influence career decision making. The first category is genetic endowment and special abilities, which are inherited qualities that may set limits on educational and occupational skills. Included are race, sex, physical appearance and characteristics, including defects of handicaps that cannot be changed.

The second category of influences in career decision making is environmental conditions and events. These influences include factors which are outside the control of any one individual and include social, cultural, political and economic forces, as well as natural forces such as disasters and location of natural resources. The result of these factors may be planned or unplanned occurrences which influence the career preferences, skills and plans of the individual. Some factors include the number and nature of job opportunities, number and nature of training opportunities, social policies and procedures for selecting trainees and workers, labor laws, technological developments, and educational systems.

The selection of a career may be influenced by an individual’s past learning experiences. The theory posits two major types of learning experiences. Both are considered to have an impact on career decision making. Instrumental learning experiences act on the environment in such a way that they produce certain consequences. Three components identified with instrumental learning experiences in decision making are antecedents, covert and overt behavioral responses, and consequences. Behavioral responses of instrumental learning consist of both cognitive and emotional responses as well as observable behaviors. Associative learning experiences occur when the individual perceives a connection between stimuli and the
environment. These learning experiences also include observational learning of real or fictitious models, also.

The fourth category of influences includes task approach skills. The interactions between genetic characteristics, environmental influences and special abilities, result in task approach skills. These skills include performance standards and values, work habits, and emotional responses. These task approach skills affect the outcome of each task or problem. The nature of the interactions of the task are not fully understood. However, task approach skills are factors which influence outcomes such as value clarifying, goal setting, predicting future events, information seeking, estimating, planning and generalizing.

The social learning theory is not only concerned with how the individual affects the environment but how the environment influences the individual. The theory suggests that self-observation generalizations or covert self-statement evaluating one's performance or preferences are a major component of the process of career decision making (Krumboltz et al., 1976). While the application of this belief is not fully understood, one category of cognitive behavior which has been viewed to have relevance for the understanding of women's career development is that of self-efficacy expectations (Bandura, 1977).

Theory of Self-Efficacy. Hackett and Betz (1981) were the first to use an extension of Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy to explain female under-representation in male dominated careers. Efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes (Bandura, 1977). Efficacy expectations, according to Bandura
(1977), determine how much effort people will expend and how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and adverse experiences.

To examine the elements of this theory, Hackett & Betz (1981) presented a model which postulated that because of socialization experiences, "women failed to fully utilize their capabilities and talents in career pursuits". (p.236) They attributed this action among women to be a lack of strong expectations of personal efficacy. Socialization experiences of females were incorporated in the model to better understand sex differences from four sources of efficacy information which include (a) performance accomplishments (successful accomplishments of a task), (b) vicarious learning (observation of others), (c) emotional arousal (state of physiological arousal in judging anxiety and vulnerability to stress), and (d) verbal persuasion (verbal suggestions of others). The model describes elements which are characteristic of the socialization of a majority of girls and women.

For example, in the area of performance accomplishments the model postulates that females tend to have greater involvement in domestic and nurturing activities, however less involvement in sports and other traditionally "masculine" domains. These experiences would lead to high self-efficacy with regard to domestic activities and lower self-efficacy in most other behavioral domains. A lack of female role models in non-traditional roles and occupations would lead to low self-efficacy in non-traditional occupations and high self-efficacy with regard to traditionally female roles and occupations. The model suggests that a lack of experience seeing other women (as role models) obtain jobs in non-traditional occupations would lead to the continuance of females seeking stereotypical occupations. Further,
the model postulates that a lack of verbal persuasion or encouragement toward non-traditional activities would lead to low self-efficacy expectations in relation to a variety of career options. The model has set the stage for this study of gender differences with respect to coaching as an occupational choice.

The concept of the model was used to investigate the treatment and understanding of career indecision. Taylor & Betz (1983) measured the self-efficacy expectations of 346 students with regard to 50 tasks or behaviors required in career decision making and the examination of the relationships of career decision making self-efficacy to several components of vocational indecision. The results showed that male and female college students reported strong self-efficacy expectations with regard to career decision making tasks. Further, the strength of the students' career decision making self-efficacy expectations were strongly and negatively related to overall levels of career indecision and were related to the component of indecision described as a lack of structure and confidence with respect to career decision. The study suggested that the concept of career related self-efficacy expectations provides a useful framework for the understanding, assessment, and treatment of at least some of the antecedents to vocational careers (Taylor & Betz, 1983).

Further use of the model involved a study by Betz and Hackett (1983), investigating the extension of the theory to the domain of mathematics behavior. The purpose of the study was to test two hypotheses derived from the Hackett and Betz (1981) model. The study hypothesized that (a) the mathematics self-efficacy expectations of college males were stronger than those of college females; and (b) that mathematics self-efficacy expectations
were importantly related to career decision making and, in particular, to the extent that college students select science-based majors.

The results indicated that mathematics self-efficacy expectations were significantly related to the extent that students selected science-based college majors. This finding supported the self-efficacy theory which postulates that behavior and behavioral change are mediated primarily by expectations of personal efficacy. Additionally, the math-related self-efficacy expectations of college males were significantly stronger than those of college females (Betz & Hackett, 1983).

The results of the previous studies in the use of the self-efficacy model to examine the career development of women was an attempt to break down some of the barriers which may hinder women from examining certain job opportunities. Strengthening expectations through the sources of efficacy information may provide significant information to breaking down the avoidance of pursuing nontraditional careers. Low efficacy expectations decrease the probability that women will seek to change from traditional social expectations. The model seeks to widen the career related options for women by strengthening efficacy information which would lead to more effective use of career related behaviors.

**Occupational Valence.** Occupational valence describes the individual in terms of personal differences in the importance of obtaining desired rewards (outcomes) in different occupations to occupational preference. Feather's (1988) work within the expectancy-valence framework has centered around the role of valence and the effect of values on behavior. Similar to Betz and Hackett (1983), Feather (1988) linked students course enrollments to
measures of the perceived attractiveness/aversiveness of mathematics and English. As in self-efficacy, the concern of the study was with

... one's perceived likelihood of meeting successful levels of performance at mathematics and English rather than as outcome expectations concerned with the consequences of successful performance. (p.382)

The major difference of the two studies was the incorporation of personal values. The findings showed that the valence or subjective value of mathematics and English was a function of the personal values held by the student. Personal values influenced course enrollment though their effects were mediated by the subjective value of mathematics and English.

Contrary to Betz and Hackett (1983), Feather (1988) found no reliable gender differences in regard to self-concepts of ability for either mathematics or English. The finding implied that for girls, interventions may require undermining gender-related stereotypes that girls are less proficient at mathematics than boys. And, that girls should disregard course options and occupations dependent on mathematics.

Wheeler (1983) compared a self-efficacy model to an expectancy-valence model of occupational choice. According to the expectancy model, valence, or job attractiveness, increases if the work values of the individual match the perceived work values of the occupation. First the subjects were asked to identify the occupations in which they would like to be in, then those they would not like. Then, Wheeler selected 17 occupations, representing approximately 68% of the total United States labour force, on a continuum ranging from low to high in terms of the percentage of women employed in the occupation. He then assessed the subjects' perception of their ability,
matched with their perceived ease of success in each occupation. The results of the comparison indicated that both occupational self-efficacy and occupational valence were related to occupational preference. However, Wheeler (1983) concluded that

the self-efficacy model as perceived match of personal abilities in relation to occupational requirements is more highly related than occupational valence to occupational preference. (p. 78)

Occupational Hindrances Hindrances or barriers have been sparsely addressed in the literature. Although women are a significant proportion of the labor force, constituting 44% of all workers (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987), a relatively small amount of literature has examined the concerns and needs women may have as they confront hindrances prior to entering into occupations.

As related to the self-efficacy theory, in a review of over 58 studies on achievement motivation in women, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) noted a series of studies in which gender differences in self-efficacy appeared first in college, and not at the elementary or high school level. Lipman-Blumen (1972) found vicarious achievement motivation to contribute to women's contentment with traditional career roles, such as being a secretary, an elementary school teacher and a nurse. In the area of career management, university women of varying ages were asked to share what would completely hinder a managerial career (Kanter, 1977). In this study, women over 34 expressed interest and less favorable attitudes toward a management career than younger women. The 22 to 34 year-old women studied were more concerned with possible
resistance from subordinates, while younger women also voiced more concerns about family/social issues as inhibiting promotion information, internships, and decision-making training. While women share many similar opinions concerning a management career, women also differ with respect to their concerns and needs.

Willingness to take physical and social risks has some implications for women and occupational preference as well. Douce and Hansen (1988) studied the Adventure scale in terms of certain expected personality correlations such as willingness to take physical risk, willingness to take social risks and need for independence in college women. The study indicated that women who scored high on the Adventure scale also may be more willing to consider nontraditional occupations than will women who score low on the scale.

Work Values. Among the many theoretical approaches to career decision making is the developmental theory epitomized by Super (1963) and Super et al (1957). Super (1963) proposed the idea that an individual strives to implement their self-concept by choosing to enter the occupation one sees as most likely to permit self-expression. Further, Super (1963) suggests that the particular behavior a person engages in to implement their self-concept becomes stable as an individual matures. The manner in which self-concept is implemented vocationally depends upon conditions external to the individual. Therefore, decisions concerning vocational interest during adolescent years may be different than those made during middle age. The main ingredient of Super's theory, relative to this study, is life stages and their effect on human development.
Self-concept develops through identification with family members and friends in school. This initial stage of development is called the growth stage. From birth to age fourteen years, need, fantasy, and the capacity to become important within social participation begins to develop. Likes are major determinants of aspirations and activities, needs are dominant, abilities are given more weight, and job requirements are considered in this stage.

The exploration stage begins at age 15 through 24 years of age. In this stage of development, self-examination, role try-outs, and occupational exploration takes place in school, leisure activities, and part-time work. Tentative occupational and educational choice are discussed during this time. At this point, one enters the labor market or professional training and attempts to implement a self-concept. An individual will also obtain a first job on a trial basis during this time.

Age 25 through 44 years mark the establishment stage. After an appropriate field is found, an effort is made to establish a permanent place in that field. This stage, however, is not marked by concrete decisions of a career. As a career path commences an effort to stabilize and have a secure place to work becomes important.

The maintenance stage is the fourth stage and begins at age 45 through 64 years of age. After establishing a professional area, the concern, to the individual becomes how to hold a job. This concern leads to the final stage of development called the decline stage. Work activity changes and will, in time, cease as the physical and mental capacities of the individual begin to decline. At some point, official retirement will take place as the pace of work slackens, duties are shifted, or the nature of work is changed. Some
individuals will find part-time jobs to replace their full-time occupation during this stage. However, complete cessation of an occupation comes for all in due time. The individual's progress in mastering the task through these five stages describes vocational maturity.

The theory is a predictor of occupational preferences and choice. To operationalize this concept, Super followed the development theory with an instrument to assess the dimensions of the theory. The Work Values Inventory (WVI) was used to assess the goals that motivate individuals to work. Super's work marked the beginning of several scales measuring work values (Manhardt, 1972, Minnesota Importance Questionnaire, 1973; Work Values Inventories, 1973) which were used to develop the valence sections for the instrument for this study.

**Summary**

In summary, this review of literature is pertinent to the study of the occupational choice of men and women in athletic positions. The review provides a broader perspective from which to examine the decline in the number of women coaching. An understanding of the explanations for the underrepresentation is imperative to understanding the movement of women in and out of coaching. The area of collegiate coaching is unique to the exploration of self-efficacy, valence and hindrances. The study is an attempt to set a framework in which to assess the extent that women and men assess their efficacy expectations, occupational valence, valence for the reward in coaching, and hindrances or barriers in regard to entering into the chosen occupation of coaching.
CHAPTER III
METHOD

This chapter describes (a) the subjects, (b) instruments (c) data collection procedures, and (d) data analysis procedures.

Subjects

Male and female intercollegiate basketball players in the Big Ten Conference comprised the population. This Conference was selected because of the success of its basketball programs throughout the country and the association of The Ohio State University with the conference. This association supported the data collection process. All women’s and men’s basketball teams in the Big Ten Conference have Division I program status representing some of the most competitive basketball programs in the country. The number of women’s and men’s basketball teams surveyed included a total of 15 (7 men’s and 8 women’s) teams. Sixty-three percent (N=97) of the female basketball players and 61% (N=94) of the male players from the Big Ten Conference participated in the study.

The distribution of the 191 participating subjects by race, gender, and year of study is presented in Table 1.

Age. The mean age for all subjects, males and females, was 19 years. Together the 19 and 20 year old respondents comprised the largest number of subjects surveyed (N=93).
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Study</th>
<th>Whites Males</th>
<th>Whites Females</th>
<th>African-Americans Males</th>
<th>African-Americans Females</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55 (28.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42 (22.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52 (27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Whites = 107 (56.0%)  
All Males = 92 (48.2%)  
All African-Americans = 66 (34.6%)  
All Females = 94 (49.2%)  

Note: Discrepancies in numbers due to missing data and/or rounding.
Year in school. The number of males and females responding in each category for year in school was almost equal. The largest group of students participating in the study were first year students, (N=55). First year male and female respondents numbered 28 and 26; second year numbered 21 and 20; third year 30 and 21, and fourth year 15 and 24, respectively.

Gender Of those who indicated their gender, 92 (48.2%) were males and 94 (49.2% of the total sample) were females.

Race There was a total of 107 (56.0 %) white subjects and a total of 66 (34.6%) African-American subjects. Among the whites, there were 39 males and 66 females. Forty three of the African-Americans were males and 23 were females. The discrepancies in numbers are due to some of the subjects failing to indicate their race and/or gender.

Year on the Team. The largest group of respondents participating in the study were first year players (N=69), followed by third year players (N=48), second year players (N=40), and fourth year players (N=27). First year team participants numbered higher in this category than in the category year in school because some athletes most likely did not play basketball the first year they attended school.

Gender of the head coach. The largest percentage of head coaches (61%) reported by subjects were males. One-hundred percent of the coaches of male athletes were men. Females reported 77% female and 23% male head coaches of women’s teams.

Instrumentation

The instrument consisted of four major sections which measured (a) coaching self-efficacy, (b) occupational valence, (c) valence of coaching, and
(d) perceived barriers (hindrances), and (e) perceived discrimination (administered only to females).

**Self-Efficacy.**

Subjects' self-efficacy levels were measured by asking the subjects to rate their confidence in their ability to carry out the tasks associated with coaching basketball. The items (tasks) were largely modified from two previous studies (Ayres, 1980; Taylor & Betz’s, 1983). The subjects were asked to rate on a 9-point continuum (1 = no confidence to 9 = complete confidence) their confidence in their ability to accomplish each task. This section focused on the subjects' efficacy expectations in four distinct areas which were defined as (a) political (shrewdness in dealing with groups), (b) team management (skills to direct, supervise and control the activities of a basketball team), (c) personal management (personal skills used to cope with the demands of coaching a basketball team), and (d) decision making (firm determination used in resolving conflict, confrontation or in giving direction). The total number of questions (N=35) in Section I was distributed in the following manner: (a) political=9, (b) team management=11, (c) personal management=7, and (d) decision making=8.

**Valence.**

Second, in addition to self-efficacy expectations, individuals may make judgments about the opportunities offered by a specific occupation to fulfill their needs and values. Therefore, it was necessary to measure the job's valence or attractiveness to the individual. Manhardt’s (1972) scale of 25 work values and Weiss, Davis and Loquist’s (1973) Minnesota Importance Questionnaire were the sources for 28 items concerning work values. The items focused on five areas (a) achievement/recognition (a sense of achievement/to be acknowledged by others), (b) altruism/ the job itself (selfless regard or concern for the well-being
of others/coaching basketball), (c) autonomy/challenge (job independence/the energy and resourcefulness needed in the job), (d) growth/interpersonal (the process of maturing professionally/interaction with others), and (e) security/responsibility (stability of the job in terms of income and benefits/to direct and supervise others).

This part of the instrument was expanded into two sections of 28 identical questions. In Section II subjects were asked to rate, on a 9-point continuum (1=least desirable to 9=most desirable), the degree of desirability of each of the items listed. This variable was labelled preferred occupational valence. In Section III the subjects were asked to rate, on a 9-point continuum (1=least prevalent to 9=most prevalent), the extent to which they perceived the outcome to be prevalent in coaching basketball at a university (valence of coaching).

Barriers.

Third, in addition to self-efficacy and valence, an individual’s lack of preference for an occupation may be influenced by perceived barriers to entering into that occupation. Therefore, it was necessary to measure the occupational hindrances or barriers perceived by both men and women to their entry into the coaching occupation. The NCAA survey on Perceived Barriers of Women in Intercollegiate Athletics (1991) provided the framework for the selection of 25 questions for this section of the instrument. Subjects were asked to rate on a 9-point continuum (1=will not hinder at all to 9=completely hinder) the extent that the listed barriers would hinder them from entering a coaching career. This section of the instrument consist of 25 questions.

Barriers common to both men and women (N=13) were categorized into (a) family/social (concerns about family-job, time shortage, job and social life interference, lack of support and promotion) (b), work schedule (concerns about
inflexible work hours, long working hours and the amount of time spent to do
the job) (c), job opportunities (concerns referring to salary, promotion and
security), and (d) external pressures (refers to interactions or conflict with the
media, alumni, parents and high school coaches).

Perceived Discrimination

Females subjects were presented with 12 more statements relating to (a)
organization (concerns about the hiring process, status and treatment of female
coaches, support from supervisors, access to informal gathering and information
on opportunity), (b) femininity (fear of being unattractive and unfeminine to
males as well as having, in general, a negative image), (c) lack of acceptance
(resistance from basketball players and male coaches to accept female basketball
coaches), and (d) lack of support, (a lack of support from within the system, from
other female and male coaches, and lack of informal work groups for female
coaches). This sub-division of perceived barriers in coaching was referred to as
perceived discrimination.

Desire to Coach

The instrument contained items eliciting the respondents’ desire to be a
full-time basketball coach. Subjects were asked to rate on a 9-point continuum
(1=not at all to 9=very much) how much she/he would like to become a
basketball coach at the level of (a) high school, (b) two-year colleges, (c) Division
III colleges, (d) Division II colleges, and Division I universities.

Background

In addition to the above sections, the respondents were requested to
indicate their age, gender, race, year of study, number of years on the team and
the gender of their head coach.
Scale Development

Panel of Experts  As a fundamental preliminary step 20 experts (administrators, coaches, and professors) were requested to scrutinize the items in each scale for clarity and conciseness. The experts were asked to comment on the meaningfulness of the specified categories (sub-scales) under each scale, to add or delete items from the scale and to comment on the appropriateness of the items under each sub-scale (See Appendix A). Simultaneously, a group of 12 graduates students was presented with the definitions of the sub-scales along with the collection of all the items in those sub-scales (See Appendix B). The graduate students were requested to place each item in a category they deemed appropriate. Percentage of agreement of criteria-category fit was also calculated. Items had to be accepted by 50% of the graduate students to qualify for the category. Based on the feedback from the experts and graduate students, items were deleted, added, and/or modified for a draft instrument administered in the field test (see Appendix C). This process established the face validity (content validity) of the scales.

Field Test

Field testing of the instrument was carried on by submitting the questionnaire to 15 intercollegiate basketball players (male and female) outside the frame of the study. The field test was designed to monitor the time taken for completion, provide suggestions for improvement, and evaluate the overall appearance of the instrument. The criticisms and recommendations of the basketball players were used to revise the instrument. The final survey instrument appears in Appendix D.
Data Collection Procedures

The Academic Services Unit at each Big Ten Institution was requested to assist in the data collection procedures of the study (See Appendix E). Academic Counselors (N=11) at the Big Ten universities were sent a letter and survey instrument describing the purpose and data collection procedures of the study (followed by telephone contact). Athletic directors and coaches were informed of the purpose and nature of the study via the Academic Services Unit at each institution asking for their endorsement of the study.

The Academic Counselors arranged for the teams to meet as one group during a time before or after basketball practice for data collection. The researcher traveled to the campuses of the Big Ten Conference schools (N=8) to collect data from the teams who consented to participate in the study. The researcher gave verbal instructions to each team preceding the administration of the instrument. The data collection process was facilitated by the researcher answering questions which arose during the process of completing the questionnaire.

At that time, the Academic Counselors were given instructions on how the instrument should be administered to athletes who wanted to participate but were unable to respond to the questionnaire when the researcher was on campus.

Data Analysis Procedures

The first set of analyses were focused on the psychometric properties of the scales used in the study. The second set dealt with differences among subgroups defined by gender, race, year of study, and gender of the head coach.

Psychometric Properties of the Scales

The questionnaire, in addition to background information, consisted of (a) the Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale, (b) the Occupational Valence Scale, (c) the
Coaching Valence Scale, (d) the Perceived Barriers Scale, (e) and the Desire to Coach Scale. It was noted that each of the scales are divided into sub-scales.

After the data were collected, the responses were subjected to item analyses including item-to-total correlations and internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha). In item-to total correlations, each item of a scale was correlated with totals of the other items in its own sub-scale and with the totals of the other sub-scales. An item was expected to correlate higher with its own sub-scale than with other items. The sub-scale structure of the scale would be verified if all or most of the items behaved as expected. In addition, the internal consistency estimate for each sub-scale was also computed to verify if the items in a sub-scale measure the same construct.

**Sub-group Differences**

Sub-group differences were tested through multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) procedures. In each MANOVA, the set of scales was the dependent variables and gender, race, year of study of the respondent, and gender of the coach of the team were the grouping variables. Following each MANOVA, univariate analyses were carried out to identify the specific scales in which the groups differed.

**Occupational Preference for Coaching**

The relationships of the antecedent variables of coaching self-efficacy, valence of coaching, and perceived barriers with occupational preference for coaching were assessed through bivariate correlation's. In order to identify the cumulative effects of the antecedent variables and the unique effects of each of the scales, separate multiple regression analyses were carried out wherein the dependent variable was the occupational preference for coaching at one of the five levels of educational institutions.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The results of the analyses are presented in three sections (a) development of the scales; (b) sub-group differences in self-efficacy, occupational valence, coaching valence, perceived barriers, discrimination, and desire to coach; and (c) relationships between hypothesized antecedents and desire to coach.

Development of the Scales of the Study

The results relating to the development of the six scales used in the study are explained below.

Coaching Self-Efficacy

As noted in the third chapter, this scale was purported to consist of four sub-scales to measure self-efficacy in (a) political aspects, (b) team management, (c) personal management, and (d) decision making. In order to verify if this hypothesized sub-scale structure was supported by the present data, item-to-total correlations were computed. This process was repeated with the data of females, males, and the total sample. The item-to-total correlations pertaining to the total sample are presented in Table 2.

As can be seen, all the items tended to correlate highly with every total (i.e. every sub-scale). This was also the case when males and females were analyzed separately. Thus, the hypothesized sub-scale structure was not
## Table 2

**Item-to-Total Correlation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>TM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>DM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 be politically shrewd in dealing with interest groups</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 effectively manage the recruiting process</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 decide on what you most value in coaching</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 make intelligent decisions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 become part of networks</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 plan and conduct effective practices</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 manage stress arising out of coaching</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 make decisions under conditions of control players and assistant coaches in</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 be effective in negotiating</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 appraise your own effectiveness</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 maintain strict discipline within the team</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 stick to your plans under conditions of uncertainty</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 have a good relationship with faculty</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 determine your coaching strengths</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 be tactful in dealing with media</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 be confident in your decisions</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 be firm in dealing with your players</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 keep your composure at all times</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 make sure that athletes work to capacity</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 sacrifice other needs and pleasures for the sake of coaching</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 establish reasonable goals and objectives for the team</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 make quick decisions under pressure</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 develop tactics and strategies to suit the skills and talents of players</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 resist the interference by parents, alumni and other groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 accurately assess the ability of your players</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 select an effective staff</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 change coaching strategies if they do not work</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 select the players best suited for your strategies</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 identify groups and individuals who could</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>attend to the details of eligibility, team travel, etc.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>be self-assured in dealing with problems</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>modify your strategies according to the strength and weakness of your opponent</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>take the responsibility for the team</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>communicate your thoughts effectively</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimals Omitted
PL- Political
TM- Team Management
PM- Personal Management
DM- Decision Making
supported in any of the data sets. Therefore, it was necessary to subject the items in this scale to factor analysis to identify any other meaningful sub-scale structure. As before, these analyses were carried out with data of females, males, and the total sample. These factor analyses revealed that there was only one strong factor in each data set accounting for 54.3% of the explained variance in the data of females, 58.7% in the data of males, and 55.4% in the total sample. Therefore, it was decided to extract only one factor and select only those items that had a factor loadings of .5 or more in at least two of the three data sets. The selected ten items and their factor loading in the data of the total sample are shown in Table 3. The internal consistency estimate (Cronbach’s alpha) for these items was .96.

As in the case of Coaching Self-Efficacy Scale, the results of item-to-total correlations did not support the hypothesized sub-scale structure in any of the other scales. Therefore, as before, factor analyses were carried out with the data of the females, males and total sample with reference to every scale. In every scale, only one underlying factor could be identified. Selection of the items in each scale was contingent upon the items loading of .5 or higher in at least two of the three data sets. The results are presented below scale by scale.

Preferred Occupational Valence

Twenty items became eligible for inclusion on the criterion of a loading of .5 or higher in at least two data sets. Their factor loading in the total sample are presented in Table 4. The internal consistency estimate (Cronbach’s alpha) for these items was .85.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 resist the interference by parents, alumni and other groups</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 accurately assess the ability of your players</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 select and effective staff</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 change coaching strategies if they do not work</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 select the players best suited for you strategies</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 identify groups and individuals who could help your program/team</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 be self-assured in dealing with problems</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 modify your strategies according to the strength and weakness of your opponent</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 determine your coaching strengths</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 make intelligent choices</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**
Decimal Omitted
Alpha=96
### Table 4

**Factor Loadings of Selected Items in the Occupational Valence Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 advancement to higher possibilities</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 respect from others</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 setting goals yourself</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 using your ingenuity and inventiveness</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 making the best of available talent</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 overcoming odds</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 personal growth and development</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 a sense of achievement</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 making athletes attain their potential</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 helping others</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 recognition from the profession</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 prestige among peers</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 being able to work alone</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 being important in the organization</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 job security</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 being independent in thought and action</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 directing others</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 supervision others</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 being honest</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 good fringe benefits</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**  Decimals Omitted  
Alpha=85
Valence of Coaching

The selected 20 items and their factor loading in the data of the total sample for valence of coaching are provided in Table 5. The internal consistency estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for these items was .93.

Perceived Barriers

Six items were selected for this scale. Their factor loading in the data of the total sample are shown in Table 6. The internal consistency estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for these items was .87.

Perceived Discrimination

As noted before, only females were asked to respond to this scale. As in the previous cases, only one factor could be supported empirically. The selected items and their factor loadings are shown in Table 7. The internal consistency estimate (Cronbach's alpha) for these items was .94.

Desire to Coach

The five items eliciting subjects' desire to coach at (a) high school, (b) two year schools, (c) Division III colleges, (d) Division II colleges, and (e) Division I universities were treated as individual scales.

Sub-Group Differences

The means and standard deviations for the total sample and sub-group defined by gender, race, year in school, and gender of the head coach are provided in Table 8. It must be noted that the mean of the scores on the items in a scale was used to represent that scale. The results of the MANOVA are presented in Table 9. The multivariate effects of gender ($F(4,169) = 7.10$, $p<.001$), year in school ($F(12,447) = 1.99$, $p<.05$), and gender of the head coach
Table 5

**Factor Loadings in the Valence of Coaching Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>advancement to higher possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>respect from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>setting goals yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>using your ingenuity and inventiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>making the best of available talent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>overcoming odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>personal growth and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>making athletes attain their potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>helping others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>recognition from the profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>prestige among peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>being able to work alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>being important in the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>being independent in thought and action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>directing others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>supervising others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>being honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>good fringe benefits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**
Decimals Omitted
Alpha= 93
Table 6

Factor Loadings in the Perceived Barriers Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 coaching basketball takes too much time</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 having to do a lot of traveling</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 coaching basketball means working evening and weekends</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 coaching basketball interferes with social life</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 unfavorable work hours</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 coaching basketball conflicts with family commitments</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimals Omitted
Alpha = 87
Table 7

Factor Loadings of Selected Items in the Perceived Discrimination Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 women basketball coaches are discriminated against</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 women basketball coaches are perceived to be unattractive</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 lack of support systems for female basketball coaches</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 lack of support for women basketball coaches from superiors</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 perception of homosexuality among basketball coaches</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 lack of training programs for women basketball coaches</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 prestige among peers</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 biases of old boys network</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 male coaches do not accept female coaches</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 perceptions of women basketball coaches as unfeminine</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 lack of role models among female basketball coaches</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 women basketball coaches are treated unfairly</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Decimals Omitted
Alpha = 94
Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Total Sample and Sub-Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SE M (SD)</th>
<th>OV M (SD)</th>
<th>CV M (SD)</th>
<th>PB M (SD)</th>
<th>*PD M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.91 (1.43)</td>
<td>7.39 (0.94)</td>
<td>6.58 (1.34)</td>
<td>4.69 (1.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.09 (1.10)</td>
<td>7.57 (0.76)</td>
<td>7.33 (0.84)</td>
<td>5.24 (1.98)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td>7.22 (1.21)</td>
<td>7.51 (1.07)</td>
<td>6.86 (1.48)</td>
<td>4.85 (1.96)</td>
<td>4.31 (1.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>6.99 (1.05)</td>
<td>7.41 (0.72)</td>
<td>7.03 (0.92)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.77)</td>
<td>4.26 (1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.93 (1.23)</td>
<td>7.66 (0.70)</td>
<td>7.18 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.74 (1.74)</td>
<td>4.38 (1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.84 (1.25)</td>
<td>7.37 (0.65)</td>
<td>6.95 (1.03)</td>
<td>5.10 (1.80)</td>
<td>4.35 (2.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.17 (1.34)</td>
<td>7.59 (0.68)</td>
<td>7.03 (1.13)</td>
<td>4.70 (1.77)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.00 (1.26)</td>
<td>7.12 (1.30)</td>
<td>6.56 (1.41)</td>
<td>5.64 (2.12)</td>
<td>4.20 (1.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.91 (1.34)</td>
<td>7.39 (0.91)</td>
<td>6.69 (1.27)</td>
<td>4.84 (1.81)</td>
<td>5.07 (1.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>713 (1.14)</td>
<td>7.59 (0.76)</td>
<td>7.38 (0.84)</td>
<td>5.16 (1.96)</td>
<td>4.03 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sample</td>
<td>7.01 (1.26)</td>
<td>7.48 (0.85)</td>
<td>6.91 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.03 (1.88)</td>
<td>4.27 (1.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:  
SE = Coaching Self-Efficacy  
OV = Preferred Occupational Valence  
CV = Valence of Coaching  
PB = Perceived Barriers  
Pd = Perceived Discrimination

*Females Only
Table 8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>HS M (SD)</th>
<th>2 YR. M (SD)</th>
<th>Div. III M (SD)</th>
<th>Div. II M (SD)</th>
<th>Div. I M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.37 (2.81)</td>
<td>3.42 (2.50)</td>
<td>3.26 (2.38)</td>
<td>3.40 (2.39)</td>
<td>5.00 (2.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.85 (2.84)</td>
<td>2.69 (2.16)</td>
<td>2.91 (2.38)</td>
<td>2.94 (2.36)</td>
<td>4.02 (3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>5.09 (2.97)</td>
<td>3.20 (2.41)</td>
<td>2.85 (2.18)</td>
<td>3.02 (2.34)</td>
<td>4.63 (3.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.21 (3.06)</td>
<td>2.96 (2.38)</td>
<td>2.87 (2.22)</td>
<td>3.04 (2.32)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.05 (2.82)</td>
<td>2.55 (1.90)</td>
<td>2.88 (2.12)</td>
<td>2.83 (2.01)</td>
<td>3.95 (2.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.39 (2.62)</td>
<td>3.39 (2.37)</td>
<td>3.37 (2.47)</td>
<td>3.49 (2.45)</td>
<td>4.90 (3.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.68 (2.91)</td>
<td>3.29 (2.68)</td>
<td>3.24 (2.69)</td>
<td>3.26 (2.69)</td>
<td>4.74 (3.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Head Coach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.14 (2.84)</td>
<td>3.16 (2.42)</td>
<td>3.10 (2.36)</td>
<td>3.20 (2.37)</td>
<td>4.56 (2.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5.10 (2.86)</td>
<td>2.86 (2.23)</td>
<td>3.04 (2.39)</td>
<td>3.08 (2.38)</td>
<td>4.29 (3.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample</strong></td>
<td>5.12 (2.84)</td>
<td>3.04 (2.35)</td>
<td>3.07 (2.37)</td>
<td>3.15 (2.37)</td>
<td>4.47 (3.03)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Summary of results of MANOVA for Self-Efficacy, Occupational Valence, Valence of Coaching, Perceived Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wilk's Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4,169</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>4,159</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>12,447</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of the Head Coach</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>4,172</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(F(4,172) = 4.84, p < .001) were significant. The multivariate effect of race was not significant. Because of the exploratory nature of the present study, it was decided to carry out univariate ANOVA even in the case of race as a grouping variable. The results of the univariate analyses are presented in Table 10. These results are further explained below.

**Coaching Self-Efficacy**

None of the grouping variables had any significant effect on subjects' estimation of their perceived self-efficacy regarding coaching. All of the subjects, irrespective of the group, had a relatively high perception of their coaching self-efficacy as indicated by the mean score of 7.01 on a 9-point scale (see Table 8).

**Preferred Occupational Valence**

Only year in school had a significant effect on preferred occupational valence (F(3,172) = 3.41, p > .05). Post hoc analysis revealed that none of the groups based on year in school differed from any other group. It must be noted that the mean of the total sample was 7.48 indicating that the subjects of this study preferred a high level of need satisfaction from an occupation.

**Valence of Coaching**

The attraction that coaching had for the present subjects was affected by their gender (F(1,172) = 19.82, p < .001) and the gender of the coach of their team (F(1,175) = 16.07, p < .001). Coaching had significantly more valence for females (M = 7.33) than it had for males (M = 6.58). Also, coaching had greater valence for those subjects who had a female coach (M = 7.38) than for those players who had a male coach (M = 6.69). Overall, coaching was attractive to our subjects as indicated by the mean of 6.91 for the total sample.
Perceived Barriers

None of the grouping variables had a significant effect on perceived barriers to entry into coaching. However, the effects of gender approached significance (\(F(1,172) = 3.59, p < .06\)). Females (M = 5.24) scored higher on this variable than males (M = 4.69). The mean for the total sample was 5.03 which indicated that the present subjects perceived only a moderate level of barriers to entry into coaching.

Perceived Discrimination

It must be recalled that only females responded to this scale and, therefore, these results pertain only to the females of the present study. The univariate ANOVAs shown in Table 10 revealed that only gender of the head coach had a significant effect on perceived discrimination (\(F(1,92) = 5.42, p < .05\)). Those female players who had a male coach (M = 5.07) perceived greater degree of discrimination than those female players who played for a female coach (M = 4.03). The effects of race and year in school did not affect perceived discrimination among the female subjects.

Desire to Coach

The results of the MANOVA testing the effects of gender, race, year in school, and gender of the head coach on desire to coach at various levels are provided in Table 11. Only race was shown to have had a multivariate effect on the set of dependent variables. However, the univariate effects (summarized in Table 12) did not show any such effect of race in the desire to coach at any level. In contrast, the univariate results showed that gender had a significant effect on the desire to coach at the two-year college level (\(F(1,180) = 4.55, p < .05\)), and Division I universities (\(F(1,180) = 4.83, p < .05\)). Females scored significantly less (M = 2.69) than males (M = 3.42) on the desire to coach at the two-year college
Table 10

Univariate Effects of Gender, Race, Year in School and Gender of the Head Coach on Coaching Self-Efficacy, Preferred Occupational Valence, Valence of Coaching, Perceived Barriers and Perceived Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching Self-Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Valence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching Valence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Barriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,172</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>2,162</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perceived Discrimination</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1,87</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,89</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,92</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>18.24</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Females only
Table 11

Summary of Results of MANOVA for Desire to Coach at Different Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>5,163</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>15,486</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Head Coach</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>5,179</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12

Univariate Effects of Gender, Race, Year in School, and Gender of the Head Coach on Desire to Coach at Various Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Coaching</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MS (error)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Gender</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year Colleges Gender</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>4.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>19.15</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Colleges</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II Colleges</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 (continued)

Univariate Effects of Gender, Race, Year in School, and Gender of the Head Coach on Desire to Coach at Various Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Coaching</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MS (error)</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division I Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1,180</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>4.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in School</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Coach</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
level. The females also scored significantly less (M = 4.02) than males (M = 5.00) in the desire to coach at the Division I level.

It must be pointed out that all subjects irrespective of their groupings expressed greater desire to coach at either the high school level or at the Division I level than to coach at the other levels. It must also be noted that the desire to coach at any level did not exceed the moderate range in the 9-point scale.

Relationships Between Hypothesized Antecedents and Desire to Coach

The relationships between subjects' perceived (a) coaching self-efficacy, (b) occupational valence, (c) valence of coaching, and (d) barriers to entry into coaching and their desire to coach at various levels of educational institutions were assessed through correlational analyses. Because there were very few significant differences in the variables of interest due to the grouping variables (race, gender, year of study, and gender of the head coach), it was decided to carry out these analyses with the total sample. These correlations are found in Table 13.

Coaching self-efficacy. Perceived self-efficacy was significantly but marginally related to desire to coach at the high school level (r = .15, p < .05) and Division II level (r = .18, p < .05). Perceived self-efficacy was more substantially related to desire to coach at the Division I level (r = .35, p < .001). These positive correlations indicate that the higher the perceived coaching self-efficacy the higher the desire to coach at a particular level.

Preferred occupational valence. Preferred occupational valence was negatively correlated with the desire to coach at any level. However, it significantly correlated only with the desire to coach at Division III
Table 13

Correlations Between Subjects' Desire to Coach and Antecedent Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>HS</th>
<th>2-Year</th>
<th>Div. III</th>
<th>Div. II</th>
<th>Div. I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18*</td>
<td>35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Occupational</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-16*</td>
<td>-17*</td>
<td>-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valence</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>-03</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Valence of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers</td>
<td>-20**</td>
<td>-27***</td>
<td>-33***</td>
<td>-38***</td>
<td>-52***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(r = -.16, p < .05) and at Division II schools (r = -.17, p < .05). In these cases, those who scored high on preferred occupational valence were less inclined to coach at the designated levels and vice versa.

Valence of coaching. Valence of coaching was not significantly correlated with the desire to coach at any level.

Perceived barriers. In contrast, perceived barriers were significantly and negatively correlated with the desire to coach at every level. These correlations progressively increased in magnitude from desire to coach at the level of high school, through two-year colleges, Division III colleges, Division II colleges to Division I universities (r = -.20, -.27, -.33, -.38, -.52 respectively). All of these correlations were significant at the .001 level. Those who perceived more barriers tended to express less desire to coach at a given level.

Regression Analyses

In order to identify the cumulative effects of subjects' perceptions of (a) their own coaching self-efficacy, (b) occupational valence, (c) valence of coaching, and (d) barriers to entry into coaching on their desire to coach at various levels of educational institutions, separate regression analyses were carried out with the desire to coach at one of the levels as the dependent variable in each analysis. All of the equations explaining the desire to coach at each of the levels were significant at the .01 level or better. The summary of the results are provided in Table 14.

Desire to coach at the high school level. Only perceived barriers entered the equation explaining 4.2% of the variance in the data. It must be noted that perceived barriers negatively affected the desire to coach at this level. The influence of coaching self-efficacy (which was significantly correlated with the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Entering</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>R2 Change Beta</th>
<th>a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable: Desire to Coach at High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>7.64**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable: Desire to Coach at Two Year Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>13.85**</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable: Desire to Coach at Division III Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>20.90***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Valence</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>12.87***</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable: Desire to Coach at Division II Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>29.48***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Valence</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td>17.78***</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent Variable: Desire to Coach at Division I Colleges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Barriers</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>64.61***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Self-Efficacy</td>
<td>.306</td>
<td>38.60***</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Beta values from the final step
desire to coach at high school level) was apparently subsumed by the influence of perceived barriers.

Desire to coach at the two-year college level. Perceived barriers was the only variable to enter the equation explaining 7.3% of the variance in the data. Those who perceived more barriers desired less to coach at this level.

Desire to coach at the Division III level. Perceived barriers entered the equation in the first step explaining 10.7% of the variance in the data. Preferred occupational valence entered the equation second adding another 2.2% to the explained variance for a total of 12.9 per cent. Both of these variables negatively affected the desire to coach at this level. Those who perceived more barriers and those who wanted more from their jobs expressed less desired to coach at this level.

Desire to coach at the Division II level. Perceived barriers ($R^2 = .144$) and preferred occupational valence entered the equation in that order. They negatively affected the desire to coach at this level, and they jointly explained 17% of the variance in the data.

Desire to coach at the Division I level. As in other cases, perceived barriers was the first variable to enter the equation and it explained 26.9% of the variance in the data. Coaching self-efficacy entered the equation second explaining an additional 3.7% of the variance for a total of 30.6 per cent. It must be noted that while perceived barriers negatively affected the desire to coach at this level, coaching self-efficacy affected the desire positively. In other words, those who perceived less barriers and those whose perceived themselves to be efficacious with regard to coaching expressed more desire to coach at this level than those who scored high on perceived barriers and low on coaching self-efficacy.
In summary, perceived barriers was the most influential variable affecting the desire to coach at various levels. It must also be pointed out that its influence progressively increased from desire to coach at the high school level ($R^2 = .042$) through two year college level ($R^2 = .073$), Division III level ($R^2 = .107$), Division II level ($R^2 = .144$), to Division I level ($R^2 = .269$). In comparison, the other variables had no or minimal influence on the desire to coach.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the study was to examine the perceptions of basketball players from the Big Ten universities regarding their own ability to coach, attraction of coaching as an occupation, barriers to coaching, and extent that they wanted to become coaches at various levels of educational institutions. Within this general trust, differences among subgroups defined by gender and race were also explored.

Scales of the Study

Prior to dealing with the substantive results of the study, a discussion of the scales used in the study is in order. Five scales were used to measure (a) coaching self-efficacy, (b) occupational valence, (c) valence of coaching, (d) perceived barriers, and (e) perceived discrimination. It must also be noted that in the original development of the scales, each scale was deemed to consist of a number of subscales. Single items were also used to measure subjects' desire to coach at the high school, Division III, Division II, and Division I levels.

The preliminary item-to-total correlations computed for each scale did not support the hypothesized subscale structure of those scales. Subsequent factor analyses showed that there was only one strong factor in each of the scales. Accordingly, those items that had a .5 or higher loading in at least two of the data sets (males, females, and the total sample) were selected to represent coaching self-efficacy, occupational valence, coaching valence,
perceived barriers, and perceived discrimination (administered to females only).

In one sense, it is disappointing that the hypothesized subscale structures of the scales were not supported. However, the emergence of a strong factor in each scale accounting for more than 50% of the variance in the data is encouraging. Only those items loading .5 or higher were selected. Also, the internal consistency estimates (Cronbach's alpha) were higher than .85 in each instance. These properties of the final scales allow us to place confidence in the scales of the study.

It is not clear why no subscales emerged in the present study. One possible reason could be that the original conceptualization of the subscale was not sound. Even if it were so, it would be expected that the factor analyses would have yielded more than one strong factor in each scale. It must be noted that past literature from the field of general management and career development do envisage such subscales. However, coaching as an occupation could be considered to be unique enough to warrant a single factor of self-efficacy and so on. On the other hand, the emergence of a single factor could be an artifact of the present subjects' perceptions of the coaching situation. That is, a study of a different set of subjects may yield the hypothesized (or some other meaningful) subscale structure. This issue needs to be resolved in future studies.

Subgroup Differences

It is worth noting that, while the subgroups based on gender and race did not differ on coaching self-efficacy and preferred occupational valence, the total sample scored high on both coaching self-efficacy ($M = 7.01$ on a nine point scale) and preferred occupational valence ($M = 7.48$). It is reasonable to
expect that the present subjects who were training and participating in one of the premier leagues in the country would have been exposed to expert coaching from their high school days. Also, they would have experienced coaching from different people with different orientations and would have been exposed to different kinds of players and teams. Therefore, they could have assimilated the nuances of coaching and gained the necessary knowledge and expertise to be effective coaches themselves. Such a line of reasoning would partially explain the high scores on coaching self-efficacy. Another line of reasoning would be that these subjects could have equated their playing ability with coaching ability, and therefore scored themselves high on coaching self-efficacy.

As for preferred occupational valence, it should not be surprising that the present subjects who were pursuing an academic degree from a prestigious university would have had high expectations for their future careers. In addition, these subjects were members of a more popular sport in intercollegiate athletics and were accorded greater recognition and prestige by the university community and media. Such high-profile experiences could have contributed to their high expectations for their future jobs.

The results relating to valence of coaching support the contention of several scholars and administrators for recruiting and hiring of more female coaches. It was found that subjects who had female coaches expressed greater valence in coaching than those subjects who had male coaches. Considering that 77% of the females in the present study had female coaches, and only 23% of the females in the present study had male coaches, we can extrapolate and suggest that females who had females as their coaches perceived greater valence of coaching than those females who had male coaches. Thus, the
argument for more female coaches and more female role models is
strengthened. On a cautionary note, the above discussion assumes that
perceptions of greater valence in coaching would be correlated with the desire
to coach. However, this supposition was not supported by the present study.
This issue is explicated in a later section.

It has been suggested that one explanation for the under-representation
of women in coaching is that women do not apply for coaching positions (e.g.,
Following the literature in career choice (e.g., Ayers, 1980; Hackett & Betz ,
1981; Layton, 1984; Taylor & Betz, 1983; Wheeler, 1983), this lack of aspiration
for coaching positions could be attributed to (a) lower levels of coaching self-
efficacy among women compared to men and (b) lower perceived valence in
coaching. These speculative statements are refuted by the present study
which found that males and females did not differ in either of these variables.
If these results are generalizable to other samples of athletes, then the reasons
for the underrepresentation of women in coaching should lie elsewhere.

Although there is no literature on the status of African-Americans
visa-vis coaching self-efficacy, the present results showing that race did not
have any effect on the variable should be kept in mind in any attempt to
explain the underrepresentation of African-Americans in the coaching ranks.

None of the grouping variables had an effect on perceived barriers to
entry into coaching. However, the effects of gender approached significance
($F (1,172) = 3.59, p = .06$). Females ($M = 5.24$) tended to score higher on this
variable than males ($M = 4.69$). More importantly, these perceptions were
only moderate when considering that these means were on a nine-point
continuum.
The suggestion that females were thwarted from being coaches because they also had to fill the traditional role of maintaining a household is not fully supported by the present results. It may be that modern men have begun to share the household chores with their spouses, and therefore both genders perceive these family commitments to be less of a barrier than in earlier days. It is also possible that the present subjects, most of whom were unmarried, did not have a firm grasp of future social and family commitments. Therefore, they tended to underestimate the extent that those commitments would turn out to be barriers. What is important is that in either scenarios, males and females did not differ significantly in their perceptions of their barriers. Therefore, gender differences in perceived barriers can not be advanced as a reason for the underrepresentation of women in coaching.

In responding to the scale assessing perceived discrimination (administered only to the female subjects), females coached by a male perceived greater discrimination than females coached by a female. The apparently obvious explanation is that the hiring of a male coach could readily be seen as discrimination against women (Acosta & Carpenter, 1986; Parkhouse & Williams, 1986). But such reasoning should equally be applicable in the case of African-Americans. That is, the African-American females in the present study did not perceive any more discrimination than their white counterparts despite the fact that most were coached by whites instead of African-Americans. Therefore, it could be argued that females under a male coach perceived greater discrimination which may be attributed to the attitudes and behaviors of the male coaches toward women. If this
were so, it becomes even more urgent that more women are recruited to coach women’s teams.

The above finding that women under male coaches perceived greater discrimination is somewhat inconsistent with earlier findings that female athletes preferred male coaches over female coaches (Parkhouse & Williams, 1986; Weinberg, et. al. 1984). A possible reconciliation of the apparently conflicting findings could be seen in the differences between the levels of the present subjects (Big Ten university basketball players) versus the high school athletes of the earlier studies cited.

The present subjects expressed a moderate desire to coach. This is evidenced by the highest score in the total sample being 5.12 on a nine-point scale for the desire to coach at the high school level (see Table 8). However, it should be noted that males compared to females expressed a greater desire to coach at every level although such a difference was significant only at the levels of two-year colleges and Division I universities.

It is noteworthy that the races did not differ in their desire to coach at any level. This finding coupled with no differences due to race in coaching self-efficacy or valence in coaching strongly negate any contention that African-Americans lack confidence to coach and/or the aspiration to coach.

What is interesting is the curvilinear patterns of desire to coach at various levels by both genders. As shown in Figure 2, subjects’ expressed the greatest desire to coach at the high school level (M = 5.12). This desire was considerably lowered at the levels of two-year colleges (M = 3.04), Division III (M = 3.07), and Division II (M = 3.15). The desire to coach was elevated at the Division I level (M = 4.47). It may be that the subjects would have preferred more to coach at the high school level because it is easier to obtain a job and
Figure 2. Athletes Desire to Coach on a Full-Time Basis
coaching is less demanding at this level than at other levels. The greater desire to coach at the other extreme, i.e., Division I level, could be attributed to the high status and prestige associated with Division I coaching. The other intermediate levels are neither less demanding relative to high school coaching nor prestigious relative to Division I coaching. Hence the lower preference for coaching at that level. But these arguments would remain speculative until future studies actually assess subjects' perception of the relative merits of coaching at various levels.

**Antecedent Factors and Desire to Coach**

The relationships of the antecedent factors of self-efficacy, preferred occupational valence, valence of coaching, and perceived barriers with the desire to coach at various levels were not as strong as expected. In fact, valence of coaching was not at all related to the desire to coach at any level. One has to presume that whatever attraction coaching would have had as an occupation was overshadowed by the valence of other occupations the subjects might have contemplated. This speculation is partially supported by the finding that preferred occupational valence was negatively and significantly correlated with the desire to coach at the Division II and Division III levels. Apparently, coaching at the Division II and III levels was least attractive to our subjects. As noted before, any explanation of this finding should be based on a clear analysis of the job of coaching at different levels.

The construct of self-efficacy has been viewed as a significant factor in the choice of an occupation (e.g., Ayers, 1980; Hackett & Betz, 1981; Layton, 1984; Taylor & Betz, 1983; Wheeler, 1983). Yet, the construct had minimal effect on the desire of our subjects to coach. Although self-efficacy was
significantly correlated with the desire to coach at the high school \((r = .15, p < .05)\) and Division I level \((r = .18, p < .05)\), such correlations do not have any practical significance. The shared variance between self-efficacy and desire to coach was less than 3.5 per cent. On the other hand, the correlation of self-efficacy with the desire to coach at the Division I level was more substantial \((r = .35)\) with a shared variance of 12.25 per cent.

In contrast to the other antecedent variables, perceived barriers was significantly correlated with the desire to coach at all levels. These negative correlations progressively increased in magnitude from the high school level to the Division I level \((from r = -.20 \text{ to } r = -.52)\). Perceived barriers accounted for 27% of the variance in the desire to coach at the Division I level. The explanation for this finding is fairly obvious. Perceived barriers such as the amount of time and travel involved and the interference into social and family life progressively increase with the level of coaching, and hence perceived barriers could be expected to reduce the desire to coach at higher levels.

The purpose of the regression analysis was to assess the total variance explained by the antecedent factors in the desire to coach, and the unique variance attributable to these factors. It turned out that perceived barriers was the one factor that consistently influenced the desire to coach at each of the listed levels. It entered the equation first in all cases. In fact, it was the only variable to enter the equation in the case of desire to coach at the high school and two-year college levels. Also, as noted earlier, its influence progressively increased from the high school level \((R^2 = .042)\) to Division I level \((R^2 = .269)\). This finding suggests that perceived barriers is the most critical variable in assessing career aspirations in coaching. Thus, future studies need to
incorporate this variable. As a matter of fact, the present results would also indicate that this variable should be controlled before assessing the effects of any other variable (e.g., self-efficacy) on coaching aspirations.

In addition to perceived barriers, preferred occupational valence contributed to the explained variance in the desire to coach at Division III colleges (R² Change = .022) and Division II colleges (R² Change = .026). Obviously, the subjects did not feel that coaching at these levels would satisfy their personal values and needs. If the present sample were representative of all aspirants to coaching, it would be difficult for administrators at these levels to recruit and hire coaches of either gender. If offering intercollegiate athletics at these institutions is a worthwhile venture, then it becomes necessary to recruit and hire qualified coaches to serve the student-athletes better. To do so, the job of coaching at these levels should be made more attractive for aspiring coaching. A first step in this regard would be to compare and contrast the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards associated with coaching at these levels with other levels. Then the administrators should strive to enhance as far as possible the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of coaching at these levels to make them commensurate with such aspects of coaching at other levels.

Self-efficacy had an additional influence on the desire to coach only at the Division I level (R² Change = .037). Its influence, if any, on the desire to coach at other levels is subsumed under the influence of perceived barriers. As noted before, all of the subjects expressed a great deal of self-efficacy in their ability to select players for their strategies, deal with problems and assess the ability of their players.
One of the issues not dealt with in the present study relates to the career opportunities that are opening up for women outside of intercollegiate athletics. In wondering why the number of women coaches has declined while the number of female participants in sports has increased dramatically, we have tended to look at several causes. The one significant cause has not been investigated. That is, while women have begun to assert themselves in the work force, society as a whole and its government and private enterprises have also awaken to the fact that women constitute 50% of the available human resource. It could be argued that the effects of these two thrusts have resulted in greater opportunities for women everywhere. To extrapolate, women who were constrained to seek employment in conventional sectors like nursing, high and elementary school teaching now find that there are other more attractive opening available to them. This maybe why women tend to leave the coaching profession and/or do not aspire to enter the profession.

Conclusions

The study was designed to assess male and female student-athletes' perception of coaching in so far as self-efficacy, occupational valence, valence of coaching and perceived barriers were concerned. The following conclusions summarize the results of the study.

1. The total sample and the subgroups had a high level of self-efficacy perceptions regarding coaching as an occupation. Their playing experiences and exposure to various coaches and/or styles might have contributed to this level of coaching self-efficacy.

2. Females and males did not differ in their self-efficacy regarding coaching. Similarly, African-Americans perceived the same degree of self-efficacy toward coaching as the whites did. Assuming that these
results are generalizable, low self-efficacy can not be advanced as a reason for the underrepresentation of women or African-Americans in coaching.

3. While all subjects were attracted toward coaching as an occupation, females were more attracted to coaching than males were. These results do not support the contention that lower coaching valence among women could be a reason for their underrepresentation in coaching.

4. Women who had a female coach were more attracted to coaching than those who had a male coach. Also, women who were coached by a female perceived a lower level of discrimination than those women coached by a female. These results support the call for more female role models in coaching to the extent such role models are associated with higher coaching valence and lower perceptions of discrimination.

5. The subgroups did not differ in perceived barriers to entry to coaching. While these perceptions were moderate, they had a significant effect on the desire to coach at every level. In fact, the negative association between perceived barriers and desire to coach progressively increased from coaching at the high school level to coaching at the Division I level.

**Recommendations**

Only a few studies have examined the student-athletes' intent to enter coaching as an occupation (George, 1989; NCAA, 1991; Pease & Drabelle, 1988). The following are recommendations of this study that merit further examination:
1. The hypothesized subscale structure of the scales used in the study was not supported. Future studies should verify if the hypothesized subscales would be supported with other samples of subjects.

2. Broaden the scope of the investigation by adding the sports which are popular among women (volleyball, basketball, tennis, and cross-country).

3. Investigate African-American female and male athletes with regard to career-related self-efficacy in other sport related occupations.

4. Compare non-athletes to athletes concerning self-efficacy, valence and perceived barriers in regard to occupational choice including coaching as an occupational choice.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO EXPERTS AND SURVEY CRITERIA
December 10, 1991

Dear

I am a doctoral candidate at The Ohio State University in the School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Space is available for your comments under each section of the instructions and under each question. To facilitate the present exercise, the various items in each section are grouped into different categories. Each category is first defined, and then the relevant items are listed under the definition. You are requested to verify if (a) the categorization is appropriate, (b) any category(s) should be added or deleted, (c) the items under each category belong to the specified category or in another category, and (d) if additional item(s) should be added or deleted under each category.

I realize this is a very busy time for you so I am especially grateful for your help. If possible I would like to have the surveys returned by January 6, 1992. A self-addressed return envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

C. Bonnie Everhart
School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation
Section I

Career Self-Efficacy

Instructions

The following section contains a list of tasks associated with coaching basketball at Division I universities of the NCAA. Please read carefully and indicate how much confidence you have that you could accomplish each of these tasks by circling the appropriate number on the right side. There are no right or wrong answers. Please remember to focus on coaching basketball at the NCAA Division I level when responding to each item.

Example:

How much confidence do you have that you could:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop a new offensive strategy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If you feel that you have “no confidence” in developing a new offensive strategy you would circle the number “1” on the right hand side. If you feel that you have a great deal of confidence, you will circle 7,8, or 9. For each statement circle only one number.
A. Political shrewdness in dealing with groups.

1. identify the group of people who would help your program/team

2. be politically shrewd in dealing with interest groups

3. be effective in promoting your team

4. resist attempts by parents, alumni and other groups

5. get along well with faculty members/administrators in your university

6. be tactful in dealing with the media

7. take the responsibility for the team

8. adhere to the rules of the university and the NCAA
B. **Team Management** - skills necessary to direct, supervise and control the activity of a basketball program

1. accurately assess the ability of your players

2. figure out if your players have the ability needed for specific strategies

3. select the players best suited for your strategies

4. be firm in dealing with your players

5. motivate the players to work hard

6. resolve conflicts among your players

7. punish players by dropping them off the team/beaching them

8. maintain strict discipline within the team

9. successfully manage the recruiting process

10. seek information about players for recruiting purposes

11. find out information about your opponents

12. establish goals for the team

13. take control of problems as they arise

14. attend to details

15. counsel players with adjustments in the classroom and on the court
C. Personal Management - personal skills used to cope with the demands of coaching basketball

1. decide what you most value in coaching

2. determine your coaching strengths

3. appraise periodically your work effectiveness

4. communicate your thoughts effectively

5. keep your cool at all times

6. be self-assured in dealing with problems

7. cope with lack of information

8. be resistant to stress arising out of coaching

9. sacrifice other needs and pleasures for the sake of coaching

10. make a plan of your goals for the next five years

11. come up with the strategy to deal with players
D. Decision Making - firm determination in resolving conflicts, and confrontation, or to giving direction.

1. make quick decisions

2. determine the steps to take for achieving your coaching goals

3. determine the steps to take if one of your players is having academic trouble

4. change strategies if they do not work

5. make intelligent choices

6. make a decision and then not worry about whether it is right or wrong.

7. stick to your plans even when frustrated

8. choose a strategy that others may not approve of

9. making decisions under uncertainty
This last section is designed to identify your preference to be a paid full-time basketball coach at various levels. There are no right or wrong answers. Some people may prefer to be a coach and others may not.

How much would you like to coach a basketball team on a full-time basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in high schools</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in two year colleges</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Division III</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>in Division II institutions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Division I</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2

Valence

Instructions

When a person is employed in any job, he/she may have several experiences from that employment. Some of the experiences may be desirable while others may be undesirable. Below is a list of some of those experiences. Using the scale provided, please express the extent of your desire for each outcome by circling the appropriate number on the right hand side. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Desirable</th>
<th>Most Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example**

a challenging job

If you do not desire a challenging job at all you would mark 1 on the scale on the right. If you desire little challenge in the job, you would circle 2, and so on. If a challenging job is desirable you would mark 6, 7 or 8 and if the challenge is most desirable, you would mark 9 on the right hand side. For each statement circle only one number.
A. Achievement - a sense of achievement

1. a feeling of worthwhile accomplishment

2. a sense of achievement

3. a sense of self-esteem

4. a sense of self-fulfillment

B. Altruism - selfless regard or concern for the well-being of others

1. the opportunity to give help to others

2. work without feeling morally wrong

3. being honest

4. being fair to everybody
D. Growth - the process of maturing professionally

1. advancement to high administrative responsibility

2. opportunity for professional growth and development

3. opportunity for personal satisfaction

4. opportunity for promotion

E. Interpersonal - interaction with others

1. meeting and speaking with many other people

2. the opportunity to develop close friendships

3. interaction with new people
F. Security - stability of the job in terms of income and benefits
   1. job security
   2. the opportunity to earn a high income
   3. good fringe benefits
   4. job security
   5. income security
   6. high income
   7. adequate vacation time
   8. the feeling of security

G. Responsibility - to direct and supervise others
   1. supervising others
   2. being able to tell other people what to do
   3. the authority over others
   4. opportunity to direct others
H. Recognition - to be acknowledged by others
1. respect from others
2. high social status
3. prestige among peers
4. being important in the organization
5. being recognized in the profession

I. Challenge - the energy and resourcefulness needed in the job
1. change and variety in duties and activity
2. exciting work
3. a challenging job

J. Job Itself - coaching basketball
1. spending a lot of time in the office
2. unfavorable working hours
3. job stress
4. doing a lot of traveling
Section 3

Perceived Hindrances

Instructions

The following statements refer to some drawbacks to coaching basketball at Division I universities of the NCAA. Indicate the extent to which each of the following statements would hinder you from entering a coaching career. Please mark your answers according to the following 9-point continuum. There are no right or wrong answers.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would not hinder</th>
<th>Completely hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of social life</td>
<td>At All 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that lack of social life will hinder you completely, you would circle number 1 in the right hand column, and if you feel it will hinder you somewhat, you would circle the number 5 and so on. Circle one number for each statement.
A. Family/Social - concerns about family-job conflicts, time shortage, job and social life interference, lack of support and promotions

1. coaching basketball is not compatible with parenting

2. coaching basketball conflicts with family life

3. coaching basketball means a lack of family life

4. coaching basketball means interference with family commitments

5. coaching basketball means interference with social life

6. there is no encouragement to become a basketball coach

7. coaching basketball means a lack of family support

8. coaching basketball provides little opportunity for promotions
B. Work Schedule - concerns about inflexible work hours, long working hours and the amount of time spent to do the job

1. coaching basketball means inflexible work schedules

2. coaching basketball means working evening and week-ends

3. coaching basketball takes too much time

C. Job Opportunities - concerns referring to salary, promotions and security

1. low salary

2. lack of promotion

3. lack of security

D. External Pressures - refers to interaction or conflict with the media, alumni, parents and high schools coaches, etc.

1. hassles with the media

2. intrusions by alumni

3. problems in recruiting

4. pressure to win
E. Organizational - refers to concerns about the hiring process, status and treatment of female coaches, support from supervisors, access to informal gatherings and information opportunities

1. women basketball coaches are given low status

2. women are discriminated against in the hiring process

3. women basketball coaches are treated unfairly

4. male basketball coaches are treated preferentially

5. there is a lack of training for women basketball coaches

6. lack of support for women basketball for superiors

7. lack of access of informal gatherings of coaches

8. inadequate information on opportunities

9. lack of entry level positions

10. lack of promotions for women's basketball teams
F. Femininity - refers to a fear of being unattractive and unfeminine to males as well as having, in general, a negative image

1. women have a negative image as basketball coaches

2. perception of homosexuality among basketball coaches

3. female basketball coaches are perceived as unattractive

4. perception to female basketball coaches as unfeminine

D. Subordinate Resistance/Lack of Acceptance - resistance from basketball players and male coaches to accept female basketball coaches

1. non-acceptance of female coaches by female players

2. non-acceptance of female coaches by male coaches

E. Lack of Support/Network - refer to a lack of support from within the system, from other female and male coaches and a lack of informal work groups for female coaches

1. lack of support systems for female coaches

2. lack of support from males coaches

3. lack of women coaching basketball

4. lack of role models among female basketball coaches

5. lack of informal work groups for women
APPENDIX B

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO GRADUATE STUDENTS AND SURVEY CRITERIA
December 15, 1991

Dear

For my dissertation, I am developing an instrument which examines coaching basketball as a viable occupational choice for intercollegiate basketball players. This letter is a request for your expertise in the composition of the instrument.

The instrument contain three sections. Section 1 will measure the efficacy expectations of the subjects. That is, what level of confidence do intercollegiate basketball players have that they can successfully complete the tasks associated with coaching basketball at the Division I level. Section 2 seeks to determine if coaching basketball is an attractive occupation in comparison to the attractiveness of other jobs. And, Section 3 ask questions about the hindrances which players may perceive in regard to entering into the coaching profession.

Three areas of the instrument are identified and defined. Under each area is a list of categories followed by statements relative to these categories. You are requested to (a) identify the category for each statement and (b) indicate your choice by placing the alphabetical letter of that category under the statement in the space provided. Please choose one category for each statement.

I realize this is a very busy time for you so I am especially grateful for your help. If possible I would like to have the surveys returned by January 9, 1992. My mailbox is on the fourth floor in Larkins Hall.

Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

C. Bonnie Everhart
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Section 1

**SELF-EFFICACY**: THE CONVICTION THAT ONE CAN SUCCESSFULLY PERFORM A TASK OR BEHAVIOR.

| A. Political                     | Shrewdness in dealing with groups |
| B. Team Management              | Skills necessary to direct, supervise and control the activity of a basketball program |
| C. Personal Management          | Personal skills used to cope with the demands of coaching basketball |
| D. Decision Making              | Firm determination in resolving conflicts, and confrontation, or to giving direction |
1. be firm in dealing with your players
2. be politically shrewd in dealing with interest groups
3. appraise periodically your work effectiveness
4. be effective in promoting your team
5. resist attempts by parents, alumni and other groups
6. take the responsibility for the team
7. adhere to the rules of the university and the NCAA
8. accurately assess the ability of your players
9. figure out if your players have the ability needed for specific strategies
10. identify the group of people who would help your program/team
11. select the players best suited for your strategies
12. resolve conflicts among your players
13. maintain strict discipline within the team
14. communicate your thoughts effectively
15. choose a strategy that others may not approve of
16. making decisions under uncertainty
17. motivate the players to work hard
18. find out information about your opponents
19. establish goals for the team
20. take control of problems as they arise
21. make intelligent choices
22. punish players by dropping them off the team/benching them
23. make a decision and then not worry about whether it is right or wrong.
24. determine the steps to take for achieving your coaching goals
25. attend to details
26. counsel players with adjustments in the classroom and on the court
27. stick to your plans even when frustrated
28. come up with the strategy to deal with players
29. decide what you most value in coaching
30. determine your coaching strengths
31. get along well with faculty members/administrators in your university
32. cope with lack of information
33. successfully manage the recruiting process
34. seek information about players for recruiting purposes
35. be resistant to stress arising out of coaching
36. be tactful in dealing with the media
37. keep your cool at all times
38. be self-assured in dealing with problems
39. sacrifice other needs and pleasures for the sake of coaching
40. make a plan of your goals for the next five years
41. make quick decisions
42. determine the steps to take if one of your players is having academic trouble
43. change strategies if they do not work
44. stick to your plans even when frustrated
Section 2

**VALENCE: JOB ATTRACTIVENESS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>a sense of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Altruism</td>
<td>selfless regard or concern for the well-being of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>job independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>the process of maturing professionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>interaction with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>stability of the job in terms of income and benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>to direct and supervise others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>to be acknowledged by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>the energy and resourcefulness needed in the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Job Itself</td>
<td>coaching basketball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. a sense of self-esteem
2. the opportunity to give help to others
3. using your ingenuity and inventiveness
4. work without feeling morally wrong
5. being honest
6. being fair to everybody
7. the responsibility for taking risk
8. opportunity to try out some of your own ideas
9. autonomy to make decisions on your own
10. being able to work alone
11. the opportunity to develop close friendships
12. adequate vacation time
13. a sense of achievement
14. the opportunity to earn a high income
15. a sense of self-fulfillment
16. opportunity to direct others
17. respect from others
18. the opportunity for independent thought and action

19. supervising others

20. authority to make important decisions

21. being able to tell other people what to do

22. the feeling of security

23. advancement to high administrative responsibility

24. opportunity for professional growth and development

25. the opportunity to set goals yourself

26. unfavorable working hours

27. high income

28. opportunity to use your own unique skills

29. meeting and speaking with many other people

30. interaction with new people
31. job security.

32. good fringe benefits

33. opportunity for personal satisfaction

34. being important in the organization

35. a feeling of worthwhile accomplishment

36. being independent of supervisors

37. opportunity for promotion

38. the authority over others

39. high social status

40. prestige among peers

41. income security

42. exciting work

43. a challenging job

44. spending a lot of time in the office
45. job stress

46. doing a lot of traveling

47. being recognized in the profession

48. change and variety in duties and activity
Section 3

Hindrances: Perceived Obstacles Which May Hinder One from Entering Into an Occupation

A. Family/Social concerns about family-job conflicts, time shortage, job and social life interference, lack of support and promotions

B. Work Schedule concerns about inflexible work hours, long working hours and the amount of time spent to do the job

C. Job Opportunities concerns referring to salary, promotions and security

D. External Pressures refers to interaction or conflict with the media, alumni, parents and high schools coaches, etc.

E. Organizational refers to concerns about the hiring process, status and treatment of female coaches, support from supervisors, access to informal gatherings and information opportunities

F. Femininity refers to a fear of being unattractive and unfeminine to males as well as having, in general, a negative image

G. Subordinate Resistance/Lack of Acceptance resistance from basketball players and male coaches to accept female basketball coaches

H. Lack of Support/Network refer to a lack of support from within the system, from other female and male coaches and a lack of informal work groups for female coaches
1. coaching basketball is not compatible with parenting
2. coaching basketball means interference with family commitments
3. coaching basketball means a lack of family support
4. coaching basketball means inflexible work schedules
5. coaching basketball takes too much time
6. low salary
7. lack of security
8. lack of support for women basketball for superiors
9. hassles with the media
10. intrusions by alumni
11. coaching basketball means a lack of family life
12. coaching basketball conflicts with family life
13. coaching basketball means working evening and week-ends
14. lack of support from male coaches
15. lack of role models among female basketball coaches
16. problems in recruiting
17. women are discriminated against in the hiring process
18. women basketball coaches are treated unfairly
19. there is a lack of training for women basketball coaches
20. lack of promotions for women's basketball teams
21. coaching basketball means interference with social life
22. lack of informal work groups for women
23. non-acceptance of female coaches by male coaches
24. lack of support systems for female coaches
25. perception to female basketball coaches as unfeminine
26. non-acceptance of female coaches by female players
27. lack of entry level positions
28. women have a negative image as basketball coaches
29. pressure to win
30. women basketball coaches are given low status
31. male basketball coaches are treated preferentially
32. coaching basketball provides little opportunity for promotions
33. lack of promotion
34. perception of homosexuality among basketball coaches
35. female basketball coaches are perceived as unattractive
36. lack of women coaching basketball
37. lack of access of informal gatherings of coaches
38. inadequate information on opportunities
39. there is no encouragement to become a basketball coach
APPENDIX C

CATEGORIZATION OF CRITERIA FOR SURVEY
Criteria Categories of Dimensions

Self-Efficacy

Political

1 being political shrewd in dealing with interest groups
5 become a part of networks
10 be effective in negotiating
14 have a good relationship with faculty members and administrators
15 determine your coaching strength
16 be tactful in dealing with media
25 resist the interference by parents, alumni and other groups
30 identify groups and individuals who could help your program/team
34 take the responsibility for the team

Team Management

2 effectively manage the recruiting process
6 plan an effective practice
9 control players and assistant coaches in game situations
12 maintain strict discipline on the team
18 be firm in dealing with your players
20 make sure athletes work to their capacity
22 establish reasonable goals and objectives for the team
24 develop tactics and strategies to suit the skills and talents of players
26 accurately assess the ability or your players
29 select the players best suited for your strategies
31 attend to the details of eligibility, team travel, etc.

Personal Management

3 decide on what you most value in coaching
7 manage stress arising out of coaching
11 appraise your work effectiveness
19 keep your compose at all times
21 sacrifice other needs and pleasures for the sake of coaching
32 be self-assured in dealing with problems
35 communicate your thoughts effectively

Decision Making

4 make intelligent choices
8 make decisions under conditions of uncertainty
Decision Making (continued)

13 stick to your plans under conditions of uncertainty
17 be confident in your decisions
23 make quick decisions under pressure
27 select an effective staff
28 change coaching strategies if they do not work
33 modify your strategies according to the strength and weakness of your opponent
Valence

Achievement/Recognition

2 a sense of achievement
7 respect from others
11 being important in the organization
14 recognition from the profession
20 prestige among peers
23 using your ingenuity and inventiveness
25 advancement to higher possibilities

Altruism/Job

1 being honest
15 being fair to everybody
26 making athletes attain their potential

Autonomy/Challenge

3 being independent in thought and action
8 making the best of available talent
12 change and variety in duties and activities
16 being able to work alone
22 overcoming odds
24 setting goal yourself
27 making decisions on your own

Growth/Interpersonal

4 meeting new people
9 helping others
10 interacting with people
17 personal growth and development
18 developing close friendships

Security/Responsibility

5 good fringe benefits
6 authority over others
13 job security
19 high income
21 directing others
28 supervising others
Perceived Hindrances

Family/Social

2 public scrutiny of personal life
11 coaching basketball interferes with social life

Work Schedule

1 coaching basketball takes too much time
4 having to do a lot of traveling
7 unfavorable work hours
12 coaching basketball means working evenings and weekends

Job Opportunity

3 lack of opportunity for promotions
8 low salary
10 lack of job security

External Pressures

4 pressure to win
6 intrusions by alumni
13 hassles with the media
Discrimination

Organization

14 women basketball coaches are discriminated against
19 lack of training programs for women basketball players
21 biases of the old boys club network
25 women basketball coaches are treated unfairly

Femininity

15 women basketball coaches are perceived to be unattractive
18 perception of homosexuality among basketball coaches
23 perception of women basketball coaches as unfeminine

Lack of Acceptance

20 female players prefer male coaches
22 male coaches do not accept female coaches

Lack of Support

16 lack of support system for female basketball coaches
17 lack of support for women basketball coaches from superiors
24 lack of role models among female basketball coaches
APPENDIX D

THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT
GENDER DIFFERENCES IN THE CHOICE OF COACHING AS AN OCCUPATION: THE ROLE OF SELF-EFFICACY, VALENCE, AND PERCEIVED BARRIERS
In this study, three perspectives on occupational choice are used to examine the perceptions of collegiate basketball players regarding a coaching career. First, occupational self-efficacy postulates that individuals estimate their own talents and dispositions in terms of the job requirements. Second, occupational valence is used to examine the attractiveness of the coaching job to the individual. And, third perceived barriers in regard to entering an occupation are examined.

You are requested to respond to questions relating to the above three perspectives. Please be assured that your responses will be kept in strict confidence. No individual responses will be identified in reporting of the results.

Age_______ Sex________

Rank in school__Fr. ____So.____Jr.____Sr.

Number of years on the team_______

Race___________

Gender of your head basketball coach____female____male

This question is designed to identify your preference to be a paid full-time basketball coach at various levels. There are no right or wrong answers. Some people may prefer to be a coach and others may not. Please circle the response which indicates your desire to coach basketball on a full-time basis.

How much would you like to coach a basketball team on a full-time basis?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in high schools</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in two year colleges</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Division III institutions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Division II institutions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Division I institutions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please continue to the next page.
Section I

Career Self-Efficacy

Instructions

The following section contains a list of tasks associated with coaching basketball at a university. Please read carefully and indicate how much confidence you have that you could accomplish each of these tasks by circling the appropriate number on the right side. There are no right or wrong answers. Please remember to focus on coaching basketball at a university when responding to each item.

Example:

How much confidence do you have that you could:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a new offensive strategy:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that you have "no confidence" in developing a new offensive strategy you would circle the number “1” on the right hand side. If you feel that you have a great deal of confidence, you will circle 7,8, or 9. For each statement circle only one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. be politically shrewd in dealing with interest groups</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. effectively manage the recruiting process</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. decide on what you most value in coaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. make intelligent choices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. become part of networks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. plan and conduct effective practices</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. manage stress arising out of coaching</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>make decisions under conditions of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>control players and assistant coaches in game situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>be effective in negotiating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>appraise your own work effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>maintain strict discipline within the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>stick to your plans under conditions of uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>have a good relationship with faculty members and administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>determine your coaching strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>be tactful in dealing with media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>be confident in your decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>be firm in dealing with your players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>keep your composure at all times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>make sure that athletes work to capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>sacrifice other needs and pleasures for the sake of coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>establish reasonable goals and objectives for the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>make quick decisions under pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>develop tactics and strategies to suit the skills and talents of players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>resist the interference by parents, alumni and other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>accurately assess the ability of your players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>select an effective staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>change coaching strategies if they do not work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>select the players best suited for your strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>identify groups and individuals who could help your program/eam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>attend to the details of eligibility, team travel, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>be self-assured in dealing with problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>modify your strategies according to the strength and weakness of your opponent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>take the responsibility for the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>communicate your thoughts effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2

Occupational Valence

Instructions

When a person is employed in any job, he/she may have several experiences from that employment. Some of the experiences may be desirable while others may be undesirable. Below is a list of some of those experiences. Using the scale provided, please express the extent of your desire for each outcome by circling the appropriate number on the right hand side. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Least Desirable</th>
<th>Most Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a challenge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you do not desire a challenging job at all you would mark 1 on the scale on the right. If you desire little challenge in the job, you would circle 2, and so on. If a challenging job is desirable you would mark 6, 7 or 8 and if the challenge is most desirable, you would mark 9 on the right hand side. For each statement circle only one number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Least Desirable</th>
<th>Most Desirable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>being honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a sense of achievement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>being independent in thought and action</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>meeting new people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>good fringe benefits</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>authority over others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>respect from others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>making the best of available talent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>helping others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>interacting with people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Least Desirable</td>
<td>Most Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>being important in the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>change and variety in duties and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>job security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>recognition from the profession</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>being fair to everybody</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>being able to work alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>personal growth and development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>developing close friendships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>prestige among peers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>directing others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>overcoming odds</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>using your ingenuity and inventiveness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>setting goals yourself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>advancement to higher possibilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>making athletes attain their potential</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>making decisions on your own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>supervising others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3
Valence of Coaching

Instructions

Below is a list of some experiences that may result from a person’s work. Please indicate the extent to which you believe that the experiences are prevalent in coaching basketball at a university. Please circle the appropriate number on the scale provided on the right hand side. There are no right or wrong answers. Please note that the items in this section are the same as in the previous section. But in this section you are asked to indicate the extent to which these experiences are prevalent in coaching.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Least Prevalent</th>
<th>Most Prevalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a challenge</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you think that coaching is not challenging at all you would mark 1 on the scale on the right. If you think it is a little challenging, you would circle 2, and so on. If you think it is very challenging you would mark 6, 7, or 8 and if it is most challenging you would mark 9. Circle one number for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Least Prevalent</th>
<th>Most Prevalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>being honest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a sense of achievement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being independent in thought and action</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting new people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good fringe benefits</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority over others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect from others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>making the best of available talent</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>helping others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interacting with people</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Least Desirable</td>
<td>Most Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>being important in the organization</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>change and variety in duties and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>job security</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>recognition from the profession</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>being fair to everybody</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>being able to work alone</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>personal growth and development</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>developing close friendships</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>high income</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>prestige among peers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>directing others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>overcoming odds</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>using your ingenuity and inventiveness</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>setting goals yourself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>advancement to higher possibilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>making athletes attain their potential</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>making decisions on your own</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>supervising others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4
Perceived Hindrances

Instructions

The following statements refer to some drawbacks to coaching basketball at a university. Indicate the extent to which each of the following statements would hinder you from entering a coaching career. Please mark your answers according to the following 9-point continuum. There are no right or wrong answers. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would not hinder at all</th>
<th>Completely hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lack of social life</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel that lack of social life will hinder you completely, you would circle number 9 in the right hand column, and if you feel it will hinder you somewhat, you would circle the number 5 and so on. Circle one number for each statement.

1. coaching basketball takes too much time 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2. public scrutiny of personal life 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3. lack of opportunity for promotions 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4. pressures to win 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
5. having to do a lot of traveling 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
6. intrusions by alumni 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
7. unfavorable work hours 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
8. low salary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
9. coaching basketball conflicts with family commitments 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
10. lack of job security 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
11. coaching basketball interferes with social life 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
12. coaching basketball means working evenings and weekends 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
13. hassles with the media 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Would not hinder At All</th>
<th>Completely Hinder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>women basketball coaches are discriminated against</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>women basketball coaches are perceived to be unattractive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>lack of support systems for female basketball coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>lack of support for women basketball coaches from superiors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>perception of homosexuality among basketball coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>lack of training programs for women basketball coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>female players prefer male coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>biases of old boys network</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>male coaches do not accept female coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>perceptions of women basketball coaches as unfeminine</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>lack of role models among female basketball coaches</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>women basketball coaches are treated unfairly</td>
<td>2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO BIG TEN CONFERENCE ACADEMIC COUNSELORS
March 10, 1992

Dear

I am a PhD candidate at The Ohio State University in the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. For my dissertation I am surveying male and female collegiate basketball players in the Big Ten Conference. My dissertation topic centers around the role of self-efficacy, valence, and perceived barriers in choosing to coach basketball as an occupation. For your information, I have enclosed a copy of the abstract for the study.

I am required to travel to the Big Ten institutions to collect data for this study. This letter is a request for your assistance in data collection. I will need to administer the questionnaire to both male and female basketball players. It is not imperative that I meet with the teams as one group. The questionnaire will take only 15 to 20 minutes to complete. Since I am not familiar with the structure of the academic counseling area at your institution, I seek your recommendation as to how the instrument should be distributed.

I am requesting that the student-athletes' participation in the study be voluntary. I assure you that the data collected from the student-athletes at all institutions will be held in strict confidence. There will be no identification of the student-athlete nor the university.

If you should have any questions of the study, please contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. P. Chelladurai, at 614-292-7701.

I am prepared to remain on campus at each institution all day to secure as many questionnaires as possible. I will call you within the next week for your response.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

C. Bonnie Everhart
School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation