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Currently, women serve in coaching positions for approximately 2-3% of all men’s
college teams. Meanwhile men serve in coaching positions for over half of all women’s
college teams and approximately 97% of all men’s college teams (Acosta & Carpenter,
2010). College basketball is a sport in which women and men play by nearly identical
rules, play with comparable equipment, and similar techniques. Nonetheless, although
men have a visible role as coaches in women’s college basketball, women remain an
anomaly in men’s college basketball. Through a multilevel framework, this research
sought to examine factors contributing to the lack of women coaching in men’s college
basketball.

The multilevel framework was organized by three distinct, but interconnected
studies. Study 1 used semi-structured interviews to investigate the perceptions of men’s
basketball coaches on this phenomenon. Results suggest that although women are
considered to have the ability to coach men’s college basketball, socio-cultural norms
influence organizational customs, both of which perpetuate gender bias in men’s college
basketball. Study 2 used both qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate the
influence of gender and the gender of previous leaders on attitudes of women’s and men’s college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. Results suggest that women expressed more favorable attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball than their male counterparts and gender of previous leaders did not influence attitudes. However, a content analysis of qualitative data suggests both male and female athletes expressed traditional gender stereotypes in their reasoning for this phenomenon. Finally, study 3 also sampled men’s and women’s basketball players in an effort to investigate gender differences in intentions to coach men’s college basketball. Results suggest there was a significant gender difference in interest, outcome expectations, barriers, and intentions to coach men’s college basketball.

In conclusion results suggest that although both women and men coaches and players alike consider women viable candidates to coach in men’s college basketball, women continue to lack a presence in the sport. Societal norms, the hyper-masculine and male exclusive institution of men’s college basketball, and a lack of interest and intentions by women perpetuate this phenomenon.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

An Overview of Women in Sports

The late Shirley Chisholm, educator and politician, once said, “The emotional, sexual, and psychological stereotyping of females begins when the doctor says, 'It's a girl” (Hoard, 1973, p. 36). Over three decades later, the stereotyping of women still exists and plays an intricate part in the gender roles that are designated to women (Duehr & Bono, 2006). As it stands women are consistently stereotyped as being less fit for leadership roles than their male counterparts (Embry, Padgett, & Caldwell, 2008). In order to counteract the barriers women may face in the organizations within the United States, lawmakers have developed policies to protect the access of women. One such policy is the enactment of Title VII, Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII was passed to prohibit the discrimination of women in the workplace. As articulated by The United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) Title VII states that, “it is illegal to discriminate against someone on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex” (EEOC, 2010, p.1). Another policy enacted by congress is Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX). Title IX was passed in 1972 to prohibit sex discrimination in educational institutions that receive federal funding (Rhode, 2008; Swaton, 2010). Title IX was later applied to athletics within educational institutions as well. Although this policy is part of constitutional law, which regulates the acceptable behavior of United States citizens, it is often misunderstood and taken for granted (Rhode, 2008). Likewise, anecdotal data, descriptive statistics, and empirical studies continue to provide evidence that women are immensely underrepresented as leaders in the American workforce and especially sport organizations.
As it stands women are often marginalized and afforded far less opportunities in the workplace than their male counterparts. For instance, according to the EEOC, women are approximately 44% of the total workforce, with men being 56% (EEOC, 2009). However, women are only 27% of upper-level managers and leaders in the workforce (EEOC, 2009). Sport mirrors society in participation rates of women coaching in sport. In accordance with the NCAA Student-athlete Ethnicity Report 2010 female student-athletes account for 42.8% and male student-athletes 57.2% of all NCAA student athletes (Zgonc, 2010). Therefore, we would assume that the leadership positions in NCAA sports would reflect similar representation of the sexes. However, this is not the case. Currently, women serve as coaches for 20.9% of all college athletic teams, while men coach 79.1% of all college athletic teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). In agreement with the literature, which presumes that the viable pool of college coaches and leaders include college athletes (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998), anecdotal evidence suggest female athletes have unequal representation in leadership positions in college sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010).

Although women are greatly underrepresented in sports as a whole, women in men’s sports are an anomaly. Women currently represent less than 3% of the coaching positions in men’s sports, while men represent more than half of the positions in women sports and roughly 97% of the positions in men's sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). This suggests that more research is needed to explain this phenomenon and propose interventions for positive change. As presented in the data, this poses a dilemma where there is a double standard: men are represented as the majority in both men’s and women’s sports, whereas women are nearly non-existent in men’s sports and
underrepresented as minority leaders in women’s sports. Over the years scholars have become deeply entrenched into the issues that influence the underrepresentation of women in women’s sports. However, very little literature exists on the influences and factors that contribute to the position of women in men’s sports. Therefore, this research will explore from a multilevel perspective the factors that contribute to the lack of women coaching in men’s college sports, specifically men’s college basketball.

**Theoretical Framework: An Introduction to the Multilevel Perspective**

Thus far, the underrepresentation of women in men’s sports has been examined by focusing on how a single factor (e.g., homologous reproduction) effects the representation of women in sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991; Staurowsky, 1990). In the early 1990s, the most significant surge of research describing the role of women as coaches in men’s sports began to surface (Kane & Stangl, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991; Staurowsky, 1990). Much of this research was at the high school level and used homologous reproduction, hegemony, and hegemonic masculinity as theoretical frameworks to explain the lack of women as coaches in men’s sports. Although each theory has merit, none are all encompassing. Inevitably, each study left a conceptual void in explaining the underrepresentation of women in men’s sports, specifically men’s college sports. Also, research pertaining to women’s role in men’s college basketball specifically has been sparse. Although there has been research using multilevel models to explain the many issues in society and sport (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008; Dixon & Cunningham, 2006; Kozlowski & Klein, 2000), none have been specific to women in men’s sports. It would be irresponsible to believe that one study could explain this phenomenon. Therefore, by no means does this research suggest that a single multilevel framework is all
encompassing. However, a multilevel perspective does attempt to leave very little remaining reasoning for the phenomenon. In viewing sports from a sociological lens, race and gender issues have paralleling similarities. By this I mean, the underrepresentation of racial minorities and the underrepresentation of women in sports can be explained using very similar frameworks, theoretical perspectives, and ideologies. Thus, the theoretical framework used in this study is modeled after multilevel frameworks used to describe the role of racial inequities in sport (Cunningham, 2010), the multilevel, multi-model framework described by Chafetz (1990) to describe coercive structures of gender inequities, and previous studies relating sports in a multilevel framework (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008; Dixon & Cunningham, 2006; Kozlowski & Klein, 2000).

Cunningham (2010) provides a multilevel framework for understanding the underrepresentation of African Americans as head coaches of college athletics. Through an in-depth explanation of which factors are influential at each level, Cunningham (2010) identified how factors interact within and between the macro, meso, and micro levels of the multilevel model. Overall, Cunningham (2010) conceptualizes how the underrepresentation of African American coaches influence and is influenced by the multilevel organizational structure of college sports. Chafetz (1990) multilevel perspective suggests that there are four coercive structural levels of gender inequity in the workplace (i.e., macro, meso, micro, and personal). These four levels are sometimes embedded within each other. Nonetheless, they all work in contributing to men’s dominant role in the workplace. Similar to both the Chafetz (1990) and Cunningham (2010) multilevel models, this research aims to conceptualize the
underrepresentation of women in men’s sport, by means of the multilevel model perspective. Thereby, the purpose of this research is to propose and test a multilevel model perspective which models an inclusive and interacting understanding of factors influencing the underrepresentation of women in men’s sports, specifically men’s college basketball.

Macro-level concepts that can influence the underrepresentation of women in the male dominated sport workplace of men’s college basketball include, but are not limited to, hegemonic masculinity, institutionalized practices, and gender ideology. Macro-level influences can be defined as the level at which perceptions and ideologies of a socio-cultural group influence the behaviors of an organization operating within that group (Heilman, 2001; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). In the organization of men’s college basketball macro-level factors are broad ideologies that influence the biases, norms, and organization of men’s college basketball. These factors can be identified in other areas of American politics and culture, however, have very specific consequences in the realm of sport (Anderson, 2008). Macro-level factors influence expectations and perceptions of what coaches should embody (Coakley, 2010).

Meso-level concepts that may influence the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball include stereotypes, gender roles, discrimination and homologous reproduction. Unlike macro-level factors, meso-level factors are very specific to the particular organization of sports. For instance, although stereotypes exist in just about every part of societal perceptions, stereotypes for women in sport, specifically men’s college basketball are very distinct and applicable to the organization of sport (McCabe, 2007; 2008). Findings at the meso-level are expected to be specific
to women coaching in men’s college basketball, as oppose to macro-level factors, in which findings tend to mirror gender dynamics within American culture and society as a whole (Coakley, 2010).

Lastly, micro-level factors that likely influence the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball include intention related variables. Micro-level factors are very different from macro-level and meso-level factors in that they directly influence the individual (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008), as oppose to the organization or society as a whole. In this study, micro-level factors will include Chafetz (1990) personal factors. The focus is on intention related variables, which explain factors that influence the intentions of women pursuing coaching careers in men’s college basketball, the intentions of administrators to hire women to coach men's college basketball and the intentions of athletes to pursue careers as coaches in men’s college basketball.

**Summary.** The multilevel model perspective is an inclusive model for depicting the multiple entities, which are embedded within sport organizations, and how these multiple entities interact amongst three levels of conceptualization. Macro-level factors are based on how an organization is perceived by society. Macro-level factors influence the culture of an organization, but have tenets based on societal views of gender ideology. Meso-level factors are unique to a particular organization. They are influenced by the perceptions of the individuals within that organization, but have little value outside the realm of sports. Lastly, micro-level factors are unique to the individual and influence decisions made by each individual within the organization. Micro-level factors are often linked to socio-psychological theory, but outcomes directly influence whether or not women are represented in men’s sports.
The purpose of applying the multilevel model perspective to the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball is to add an inclusive and more complete understanding of the lack of women coaching in men’s college sports.

**Statement of the Problem**

Currently leaders and scholars of sport management consider the underrepresentation of women in sports a serious socio-cultural problem (Cunningham, 2008; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). The topic of women in the male dominated sport workplace is a relevant topic because it is the “pink elephant in the room” that we all know exists, but rarely consider an issue worthy of investigation. Although, the presence of women as coaches in men's sports is a mere 2-3%, there is very little talk of this as a problem in sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). As it stands, although women make up roughly half of the participants in college sports, women are a meager 28% of the coaching employees in college sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). Even more astonishing is that even though men routinely coach women sports, with over 50% of women’s sports’ coaches being men, women lack any significant representation on the men’s side of sports (Zgonc, 2010). Traditionally, the majority of the 2-3% of women coaches of men’s sport has been represented predominately in non-team sports, which according to Kane and Stangl (1991) would be considered less prestigious than team sports. Women have traditionally coached less than 0.04% of men’s team sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991). Overall women have been and still remain significantly underrepresented in men’s sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). The overall underrepresentation of women poses a significant problem of disparate access of girls and women finishing their participatory eligibility. Women are at a disadvantage, with men having more than 3 times the opportunities to get a coaching position in sports.
after college compared to his female counterpart. The underrepresentation of women in different aspects of college sport has been discussed immensely in the sport management literature. Literature suggesting explanations for the underrepresentation of women in sports are, but not limited to, intention related constructs (Sagas, Cunningham, & Pastore, 2006), gender role attitudes and gender stereotypes (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruening, 2009), homologous reproduction (Kane & Stangl, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991), and hegemony and hegemonic masculinity (Norman, 2010; Whisenant, 2002). However, when searching for answers to why there exists an enormous discrepancy in the representation of women in men’s college sports specifically, the literature has been sparse.

**Gaps in the Literature and Previous Research**

Previous research pertaining to women coaching in men’s sports has been instrumental to the development and progression of literature on the underrepresentation of women in men’s sports. Besides Walker, Bopp, and Sagas (2011) and Walker and Bopp (2011), studies that have investigated the lack of women coaching in men’s sports have been relegated to the high school level. Therefore, the first major gap in the literature that this study looks to address is the lack of literature on women coaching men’s sports at the collegiate level. The next gap in literature that this research aims to address is the introduction of a holistic, multilevel perspective to researching the underrepresentation of women in men’s sports.

To date, most research examining women coaching in men’s sports draws on the theoretical framework of hegemony and homologous reproduction. Sociologically, hegemony has been used to explain the “pink elephant” of college sports, women as coaches of men’s teams. Gramsci’s (1971) hegemony theory suggests that hegemony
is taking place when the unfair treatment of one group over another is accepted by society as commonsense, and the disenfranchised group willingly and consciously accepts their place in society (Norman, 2010; Whisenant, 2002). Overall hegemony and hegemonic masculinity are macro-level concepts that explain the interactions of disenfranchised groups with their “oppressors” or those who benefit most from the disenfranchised group’s place in society. Homologous reproduction refers to individuals having a preference in hiring employees who are most like themselves (Kanter, 1977). In other words, homologous reproduction suggests that men are inclined to hire men, and likewise, women are inclined to hire women. However, considering there are significantly more men in positions of leadership, if this homologous reproduction cycle perpetuates itself, then women will continue to be underrepresented. The presence of homologous reproduction fits into the meso-level perspective, as a concept that is best seen within an organizational level as oppose to a societal level.

Although previous frameworks used in the study of women in men’s sports such as hegemony, hegemonic masculinity, and homologous reproduction offer valid explanations for the lack of women in leadership positions in men’s sports, it does not paint a holistic picture of this phenomenon. Therefore, this research adopts a multilevel perspective, in hopes of offering an inclusive and more encompassing framework of the underrepresentation of women coaching in men’s sports.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of this research is intimately tied to the gaps mentioned above. To date, there has been little research on women coaching in men’s collegiate sports (Walker, Bopp, & Sagas, 2011). This study is purposeful and significant to the sport literature by providing a holistic multilevel perspective to the lack of women coaching in
men’s sports. I hope to provoke interest in inquiry related to women entering the traditionally male dominated men’s college sports. Much of the research of women in the sport workplace of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century has focused on women gaining market share of leadership and coaching positions in women’s sports (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008). Now that women have increased proportion and are making gains in leadership roles in women’s sport (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010), this research aims to shift the focus to men’s sports and the barriers that exist which make it a common place for male leaders and untouchable for female leaders. The significance of this research lies in its role as a stimulus to scholarly research in this particular area and reflection in the role of women in men’s sports.

**Purpose, Outline of Dissertation, and Conclusion**

The purpose of this dissertation is to formulate and test an inclusive multilevel framework for explaining the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. By no means, does this research intend to be exhaustive of all factors that influence the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. However, this research does intend to answer questions and act as a pertinent piece of literature which employs a multilevel perspective to explaining the many dimensions which influence gender dynamics in women and men’s sports, specifically, men’s college basketball. This research is guided by a very general, but in the realm of sport, still unique and specific research question which states: Applying a multilevel perspective to examining the phenomenon, what are the underlying factors that contribute to the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball? Again, understanding that this research question is very broad in scope, however specific in realm of study (e.g., only examining the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball), each
individual study will examine very specific research questions, which will as a whole, formulate evidence to informing the overall research question of this dissertation.

Following a 3-manuscript format, this dissertation contains three individual studies. Study one describes macro-level factors, which influence the underrepresentation of women coaching in men’s college basketball. This study took a phenomenological approach to exploring how a culture of hegemonic masculinity may hinder women from opportunities and access to coaching positions in men’s college basketball. Study two describes meso-level factors that may influence the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. Study two used a mixed methods approach to examine the perceptions and attitudes of men’s and women’s college basketball players towards women coaching in men’s college basketball. Interviews were used with a random selection of players, to confirm results found in the quantitative data analysis. The third and final study examined micro-level factors or individual factors that may have an influence on the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. This study used social cognitive career theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) to model factors that influence the intentions of college basketball players to coach men’s college basketball. Gender differences and relational influences of the multilevel factors were examined. Each manuscript serves as an empirical example of each level of the multilevel framework. In conclusion, the aim of this dissertation is to address the need for research of women in men’s sports at the college level and to apply an inclusive, multilevel perspective which serves to expand previous frameworks used in exploring this phenomenon.
CHAPTER 2
MACRO-LEVEL FACTORS

Hegemonic Masculinity and the Institutionalized Bias of Women in Men’s Collegiate Basketball: What do Men Think?

Sport is the most widely accepted preserve for male domination and masculinity (Whisenant, Pedersen, & Obenour, 2002). The enactment of Title IX in 1972 accomplished monumental strides in increasing the opportunities for women to participate in sport. However, little has been done to increase the representation of women as leaders in sport (Cunningham & Sagas, 2008). Although, in most cases representation of women as participants in sport at the collegiate level hovers somewhere around 50%, women as employees at the same level are a meager 27-28% (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). This discrepancy in opportunities for female athletes to pursue jobs in an area where they have invested time and a huge part of their life poses the dilemma of what are female athletes to do with the social capital that they have accumulated. Research has suggested that the pool of candidates for sport related positions should likely be those who have accumulated capital in sports such as former athletes (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998). Therefore, this research investigates whether the social capital, knowledge, and experiences of women are being marginalized as less worthy than their male counterparts? The purpose of this study is two-fold. First, through in-depth, semi-structured interviews, identify the perceptions of men’s basketball coaches on women coaching in men’s college basketball. Second, explore the characteristics of men’s college basketball, which serve as evidence of hegemonic masculinity as a cultural norm and hindrance to women coaching in men’s college basketball.
Women in Men’s College Basketball

A review of Walker and Bopp (2011). This study builds on the work of Walker and Bopp (2011), which explores the experiences of women who have coached men’s college basketball. In an effort to identify barriers unique to women working in men’s college basketball, Walker and Bopp (2011) used a phenomenological lens to explore the essence of this phenomenon. Through in-depth interviews, they employed an interpretive perspective to their interactions with the participants and data. Moustakas (1994) methods for phenomenological analysis were applied to dissect the data and analyze results. Thus, the following overarching themes were suggested from Walker and Bopp’s (2011) research: Double standards, exclusive social networks, and organizational fit issues. These three themes are composed of elements, which are very specific to the individual experiences of the women coaching in men’s college basketball. These elements are: the glass wall, old boys’ network v. old girls’ network, organizational fit, over-compensation, and coaching intentions.

The glass wall refers to the double standard that men boast more opportunity and access to coaching positions in sport than women. As supported descriptively by Acosta and Carpenter (2010) men dominate the coaching proportionality in college sports. Since sports remain a segregated domain (Anderson, 2009) it would make logical sense if men dominated the coaching ranks of men’s sports and women dominated the coaching ranks of women’s sports, but this is not the case. In women’s basketball, women serve as the head coach for approximately 58% of the women’s basketball teams, while men serve as head coach for approximately 99.9% of men’s basketball teams (Zgonc, 2010). Thus, as suggested by Walker and Bopp (2011), a glass wall
seems evident. The following statement exemplifies this overwhelming sense of a glass wall:

Men have different choices. So if you’re a woman and you get fired at the collegiate level, the only opportunities you have are to coach are at women’s high school or college. If you’re a man, you can slide over to the women’s side. You have twice as many opportunities to succeed. You can just go over to the other side. (Walker & Bopp, 2011, p.56)

Another barrier to women in men’s sports suggested by Walker and Bopp (2011) is the strong existence of an old boys’ network. Sport management literature is robust with research, which suggests the existence of an exclusive old boys club in sports (Kane & Stangle, 1991; Lovett & Lowry, 1994; Stangl & Kane, 1991; Theberge, 1993; Walker et al., 2011). Although, much of the research on the presence of an old boy’s club may be dated, Walker and Bopp (2011) results discuss that this subject still has relevance. The results from their study provide quotes of participants blatantly stating, “Yeah, it’s an old boy’s club. They discriminate among women and aren’t thinking of hiring a female to be a coach” (Walker & Bopp, 2011, p.56). Consequently, Walker and Bopp (2011) show that not only does this exclusive network of men who hire predominately within their network (i.e., other men in men’s college basketball) exist, but women are aware that this is a prominent barrier and hindrance in their access to positions in men’s college basketball. Next the authors discuss the elements of respect, organizational fit and overcompensation, all of which are intricately related. Women who have coached in men’s college basketball felt that it was necessary to prove to the players and coaches that they were capable of working in men’s college basketball. Although they stated that “Respect is respect” and that it “is not an issue with the players” (Walker & Bopp, 2011, p. 58), they still maintained that they worked harder to
over-compensate for being a women and to gain respect from the players and staff. Their goal was to “fit in” with the staff and players.

All the above elements of women working in men’s college basketball affect the intentions of women to pursue positions in men’s basketball in the future or their intentions to leave men’s college basketball. Many of the participants from Walker and Bopp (2011) felt as though women may have fewer intentions to coach men’s college basketball. “They’re not interested [in coaching men’s college basketball] because they feel they’re not going to get the opportunity, that it’s already a closed door” (Walker & Bopp, 2011, p. 59). Overt discrimination in the reviewing of resumes and a preference towards male candidates were all responses articulated by the participants as reasons why women lacked a presence in men’s college basketball.

In summary, Walker and Bopp (2011) set the precedent for exploration into the perceptions of women in men’s college basketball. Walker and Bopp (2011) explored the experiences of women in men’s college basketball in hopes of furthering the literature examining the overall underrepresentation of women in men’s sport. Building off of Walker and Bopp (2011) this study looks to interview men who coach in men’s college basketball in hopes of adding to the literature, which explains this phenomenon from another perspective. Through semi-structured interviews of men who are the potential colleagues, decision-makers, and stakeholders in men’s college basketball, our aim is to identify the perceptions and overall attitude towards women in men’s college basketball, as well as the presence of a culture deeply rooted in hegemonic masculinity, and the exclusion of women.
Review of Pertinent Literature

Social ideology can be described as attitudes and beliefs that are formed by a society as norms, which are to be the guiding rules by those within the society (Coakley, 2010; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Gender ideology is based on the notion that society has very specific roles, which they deem fit for women and men (Coakley, 2010). Together, gender ideology and social ideology form norms, which are the basis for individuals’ attitudes and stereotypes (Eagly & Karau, 2002). In sports, gender ideology has lead to the belief that “masculinity is synonymous with sport” (Anderson, 2008, p.7). Therefore, maleness is the norm and seen as superior to femininity. This idea that maleness is the superior trait for sport leadership leads to women being viewed as less traditional or less attractive candidates for leadership positions in men’s sports.

As it stands, women serve as the head coach for 58.3% of women’s college basketball teams, while only serving as the head coach for 0.01% of men’s college basketball teams (Zgonc, 2010). Likewise, women are vastly underrepresented as assistant coaches in men’s college basketball, serving as an assistant for 3.5% of men’s college basketball teams. On the contrary, men’s representation in women’s college basketball is significantly higher at 41.7% for head women’s basketball coaching positions and 33% for assistant women’s basketball positions (Zgonc, 2010). These descriptive statistics provide evidence for vast proportionality differences of gender in men’s and women’s college basketball. Considering the vast similarities in men’s and women’s basketball and the ease at which men coach women’s college basketball, this study examines the role of hegemonic masculinity in men’s college basketball. As Whisenant et al. (2002) has suggested hegemonic masculinity exists within college
sports. However, in men’s college basketball, where women’s presence is nearly non-existent, this study looks to explore the unique characteristics of men’s college basketball that make it such an exclusive male domain.

**Hegemony and Hegemonic Masculinity**

Gramsci first coined the term hegemony in 1971. Gramsci (1971) used hegemony to describe the political and economic strife in Europe during this period. Over the years many researchers of gender have adopted hegemony theory due to its ability to explain and give reason to gender inequity. Hegemony theory states that hegemony exists when society accepts the ruling of a group over another as commonsense and the individuals being treated unfairly consciously and knowingly accepts their role in society (Whisenant et al., 2002). Whisenant et al. (2002) uses hegemonic masculinity as a framework for understanding how gender plays a role in the advancement of athletic administrators. After surveying athletic administrators from NCAA institutions Whisenant et al. (2002) concluded that hegemonic masculinity is present within athletic administration at the college sports level. Overall, men had significantly higher success ratios than women in their job performance. However women had significantly higher success ratios than men at the lower level divisions of the NCAA (i.e., division II and division III). Although the presence of women in powerful positions at the lower levels of NCAA institutions may be a sign of hope, men still dominate the powerful NCAA division I positions. Likewise, hegemonic masculinity as a cultural norm seems to be deeply embedded within NCAA sports.

Women in sports are routinely treated as second-class individuals (Norman, 2010), with men and men’s sports being blatantly viewed as more important and worthy of its position of dominance. In many cases society, men, and even women are
accepting of this hierarchical positioning of women in sports as being valued less than their male counterparts. Connell (1987) and Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) are seminal pieces of literature in which the term hegemony is applied to gender relations. Both contest that societal views of masculinity and the idea of women being “othered” are major reasons for the role women play as outsiders of men’s sports. As soon as boys begin socializing, women are othered as less worthy of “boys play” and inferior participants on the playground (Bird, 1996). Thus, the socialization of women as inferior beings in the world of sports happens before any type of interaction with coaches. Therefore, from a very young age, society reinforces male dominance in sports, including men being more knowledgeable, having a “natural” physical superiority, and the acceptance as superior leaders and participants of sports. Women help perpetuate this cycle by accepting the structural and social role as subordinates in sports (Whisenant, 2008).

The linkage between the role of hegemonic masculinity and societal perceptions of women in men’s college basketball transpires in Walker et al. (2011). This study addresses how traditional gender role attitudes and a lack of congruence between being female and working in men’s sports contributes to the lack of public encouragement in the hiring of women as men’s college basketball coaches. Overall the findings of this study suggest that although society as a whole is accepting and content with the non-existent role of women in men’s sport, which has hegemonic tenets, there was still underlying feelings of inequality and unfairness (Walker et al., 2011). Likewise, Walker and Bopp (2011) provided evidence, which suggest that although women may have increased barriers to coaching positions in men’s college basketball, once in the
system, their experiences were very positive and similar to their experiences in women’s college basketball. Therefore, a major hindrance to the upward mobility of women in the ranks of men’s college basketball seems to lie in the institutionalized hegemonic masculine culture of men’s college basketball. The next section will explore this notion further.

**Institutionalized Practices**

In line with the notion of hegemonic masculinity are social dominance theory and systems justification theory. Similar to hegemonic masculinity, system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) and social dominance theory (Sidanius, Levin, Frederico, & Pratto, 2001) both suggest that ideologies and stereotypes form the way institutions and individuals organize, such that inequalities are perpetuated over time and spawn what becomes accepted norms (Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). More specifically, the commonality between these three theories (i.e., hegemonic masculinity, system justification theory, and social dominance theory) is the understanding that exists between the disenfranchised group (i.e., female coaches) and the dominant group (i.e., male coaches). This mutual understanding is where both men and women acknowledge that the dominant group has more power, control, and access, but neither group is willing to suffer the negative consequences of speaking out against the status quo. For instance, Walker et al. (2011) provide evidence of this contradictory attitude in their study, suggesting optimism towards women coaching in men’s college basketball, but no significant attempt towards changing the status quo. The majority of the participants in their study had a positive gender role attitude towards women coaching in men’s college basketball and felt a qualified woman would be a capable candidate who fit well as a coach in men’s college basketball. However, when given the tasks of
recommending a qualified female applicant for hiring, participants rated the female applicants lower than the male applicants, despite the female applicant’s similar or higher scores on capability of being a men’s college basketball coach and job fit. Individuals understood that women are viable and competent candidates, but they did not want to go against the organizational norm of hiring men for men’s college basketball positions. Thus, after years of perpetuating these gender ideologies and norms, women continue to be in a disadvantaged position in the acquisition of coaching positions in men’s sports.

**Methodology**

**Participants**

As suggested by Donaldson (1993), “coaches and sportsmen are the most influential agents” of hegemonic masculinity and the non-inclusive workplace dynamics, which result from a hegemonic culture (p. 646). Thus the sample of participants for this study is formed from purposive sample of both men who have coached men’s college basketball as well as men who have coached both men’s and women’s college basketball. The purpose of this sample is twofold. First, the goal is to identify what characteristics of men’s college basketball make it such a gender exclusive domain. Therefore, there is a need to explore those most intimately connected to men’s college basketball such as those coaches who are currently coaching in men’s college basketball and have been the majority of their careers. Secondly, I want to identify factors that makes men’s college basketball culture different from women’ college basketball in its acceptance and attractiveness to women. Therefore, we need to explore those few men who have had the experiences of coaching both men’s and women’s college basketball.
The first three participants were chosen from a large NCAA division I university in the southeastern part of the United States. After choosing the first few participants based on criterion sampling methods (i.e., male, has coached or is currently coaching men’s college basketball coach, or has been both men’s and women’s college basketball coach) the rest of the sample was chosen based upon criterion and snowball sampling methods. Both criterion and snowball sampling methods were applied by asking the first few participants, who were chosen based on the criterion sampling methods mentioned above, to identify anyone else they may know who fits the criteria. This participant referral continued until the data became saturated and the interviewing process ended (for further sampling methods see e.g., Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; Walker & Bopp, 2011). In order to avoid biases based on certain cultures of the United States (e.g., southern culture), or certain ultra competitive athletic conferences (e.g., Southeastern Conference) we asked participants to refer potential new participants from a different conference and region of the United States. A total of eight participants were sampled. Racially, two participants identified as African American/Black, while six identified as White. All participants identified as being American. Participants ranged in age from 25 to 61 years old. Geographically, participants have lived and coached in the northeast (e.g., Massachusetts, New York, and Connecticut), the southeast (e.g., Florida), west coast (e.g., Arizona), and the central regions of the United States (e.g., Colorado). Therefore, participants were much embedded in American sport cultural norms that may have existed in all parts of the country. Efforts to include participants from a wide range of geographical experience as well as age were done to reduce any
bias that may exist within certain age groups or regions of the United States. Table 2-1 provides a list of participants, as well as individual demographics.

Data Collection

The data collection process consisted of semi-structured interviews. The format of the interview began with the interview guide. The interview guide consists of an introduction of the study, questions which guided the interview, and concluding comments from both the interviewer and interviewee. Interview questions are based on the exploratory nature of a phenomenological study (Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; Moustakas, 1994), previous research on women coaching in men’s basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011), and the theoretical tenets of hegemony and hegemonic masculinity. Items in the interview guide consist of questions such as, “what is your perception of women coaching in men’s college basketball?” (Appendix A) The duration of each interview was from about 47 minutes to the longest being 78 minutes long. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed immediately following the interview.

Data Analysis

NVIVO 8 was used in analyzing the data. Specifically NVIVO 8 increased reliability in the organization of data into nodes (i.e., themes) and the identification of specific quotes. In an effort to remain consistent with previous qualitative work exploring women coaching in men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011), this study used a phenomenological approach to analyzing the data. In accordance with Crotty (1998), phenomenology is a lens used to explore the essence of those most closely involved. In this case, men’s college basketball coaches are those most intimately involved with the phenomenon of extreme underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. Also, by using a phenomenological approach, we allow for easy comparison to the work
of Walker and Bopp (2011). Specifically, we will adhere to Moustakas (1994) methods for analyzing phenomenological data which is a modification of the methods of analysis suggested by Stevick (1971), Colaizzi (1973), and Keen (1975). We will use the exact steps adapted and adopted from Moustakas (1994) and used by Walker and Bopp (2011).

Each interview was first transcribed. Next the data underwent the following process: 1) listing and preliminary grouping, 2) reduction and elimination, 3) clustering and thematizing invariant constituents, 4) final identification of invariant constituents and themes by application (validation), 5) construction of individual textural description of the experience for each participant (including verbatim examples from the transcribed interview), 6) construction of individual structural descriptions of the experience based on individual textual descriptions, 7) composition of a textual-structural description of the “meanings and essences of the experiences, incorporating the invariant constituents and themes” (p.121) and finally, 8) compilation of a composite depiction of the meanings and essence of the phenomenon. (p. 55)

This method for data analysis has been successfully applied to qualitative data in many fields (Creswell, 1998; Lee & Koro-Ljungberg, 2007; Moustakas, 1994; Walker & Bopp, 2011). The primary advantage to this method of data analysis is that the perceptions, attitudes and experiences which are “regarded as the primary source of knowledge, the source that cannot be doubted” can be easily sifted and systematized so that the essence of the phenomenon surfaces and is easily acknowledged (Moustakas, 1994; Walker & Bopp, 2011). Invariant constituents and themes were member checked by an outside researcher, familiar with the topic and literature. The outside researcher checked to ensure themes and the verbatim quotes that followed each theme were accurately categorized and interpreted. Only those themes and verbatim examples that were agreed upon were used in the results section.
Results and Discussion

The results of this data suggest that there is a masculine culture present in men’s college basketball, which is acknowledge by most participants as being hyper masculine, gender exclusive, and resistant to change. The preceding sections provide the major themes that were emerged from the data, verbatim quotes from participants, which reaffirm the meaning of each theme, and contextual discussion on how thematic evidence from this study may act as barriers to women in men’s college basketball.

Masculinity and Culture: “Men’s College Basketball is a Masculine Culture”

Most participants expressed feelings that the natural masculinity present in men’s college basketball is a major hindrance to men accepting women into their culture. One participant in particular described the influence of masculinity in men’s college basketball below.

In the locker room, on the floor, and in coaches-players relationships masculinity is often toughness, the idea of toughness, the idea of being a man, playing like a man. Those things are all prominent in college basketball and then on coaching staffs there is a locker room mentality environment that exists within the dynamics of a coaching staff. I have been to three different places and it has existed like that at all three places. In my experience it has been a consistent thing, so to bring a woman into that type of masculine environment would be uncomfor for a lot of men. Men would not want to do it because it is an old boys club to be honest and bringing a woman into that would be a challenge.

The notion that men’s college basketball is a masculine culture is echoed by another participant, who suggests that this masculine environment is evident in staff meetings and locker room conversations.

I have been in meetings before where there are conversations that would be different if a woman was in the room. I have even been on the practice floor where things that were said by a head or assistant coach, or the terminology used to express signs of weakness would be different if a woman was in present because the present language used would be offensive to women. I think this environment is a heavily masculine based environment.
In accordance with the above statement, another participant states, "It’s [men’s college basketball] definitely a culture of manliness and probably some jokes that would affect the day to day culture of things that may be said in practice or meetings". In the same regard, another participant stated that, “they [men] would feel a need to adjust their behavior which could make men feel restricted and awkward in their job, because if we have woman we would have to be polite and take extra measure”. The presence of this masculine culture is men’s college basketball is directly in line with previous societal studies of masculinity (Connell, 1987). As Bird (1996) suggested women are “othered” from the very beginning of boy-girl interactions. The strong masculine culture of men’s college basketball has become so established as a male domain that women are seen as foreign intruders on the current cultural norms. Participants expressed that if women were present they would change their language and terminology because much of what they currently use would be offensive towards women. The current environment and culture of men’s college basketball is not welcoming to women and as stated before, would not only make men feel “awkward”, but would also be offensive to women. All eight participants agreed that men’s college basketball was a very masculine culture in which women would most likely not feel comfortable entering unless the men within changed their way. Therefore, the current data and participant quotes suggest that the masculine culture of men’s college basketball serves as an influential factor influencing the lack of women as coaches. As suggested by Anderson (2008) this exclusion of women from men’s sports supports the recreation of a strong male-exclusive culture and reinforces the masculine hegemonic culture of sport.
Access and Opportunity: “The Biggest Challenge Would Be Just Getting in the Door”

Although there are very few women coaching in men’s college basketball, previous research has shown that women may face barriers that hinder their access to men’s college basketball coaching positions (Walker & Bopp, 2011). Participants in this study also believed that one of the most difficult barriers to women coaching in men’s college basketball would be “just getting in the door”. As one participant proclaims, “I don’t think the biggest challenge is a woman being on the staff or being with the players, I think the biggest challenge is getting hired”. Access discrimination in men’s college basketball has been relevant to other minorities such as African American coaches in NCAA Division I men’s basketball (Cunningham & Sagas, 2005). Therefore, it is not a surprise to find that the men’s college basketball coaches in this study believed that access discrimination is a factor that hinders women from gaining access to men’s college basketball coaching positions. Another participant believed that “it’s just so many challenges that come with it [women gaining access to coaching positions in men’s college basketball], it would have to be a special individual that could rise above the messy little tedious things that would present themselves”. Another participant suggested that “if a woman steps into that, she would be under a microscope”. In the same accord as the previously mentioned statements, when asked whether access discrimination takes place in men’s college basketball, one participant, who has coached both women and men’s college basketball, replied with “yeah I definitely think there is discrimination and it’s unfortunate when it happens, but I can just think of people I have associated with”. This participant in particular continued to recount a
situation when the culture of his staff in particular, led to inappropriate comments about a fellow staff member.

I can remember sitting in a men’s coaching staff meeting and they were making some very derogatory statements about women. There were four to five men in the room, we were doing some scouting and one of the female coaches poked her head in the room. After she left they closed the door and had something to say about her. Those comments were of the sexual nature, nothing violent or anything, just about how they would not mind being with her in a sexual manner.

As suggested in the previous section, the culture of men’s college basketball is hypermasculine, male exclusive, and as the statement above suggest, a organization where heterosexual commentary is the norm. Men’s basketball culture appears to be an environment where masculinity and masculine characteristics are praised as the norm and the way all members should behave (Anderson, 2009; Connell, 1995). Therefore, the environment of men’s college basketball seems to be one in which women would not only feel unwelcomed, but if women were to enter into this culture in its current state, the culture would have to change. When participants were asked whether women were unwelcomed because of their knowledge of the game, experiences or other competencies related to coaching, all of eight participants agreed that this was not the case. One participant in particular stated that, “It’s not that men know the game better than women, it’s not that women can’t coach the way men can, it’s a matter of opportunity”. The fact that women do not have perceived access to coaching positions means that there are less opportunities for women to see other women coaching in men’s college basketball. One participant, who has been coaching in men’s college basketball for over 15 years, and is a minority believes that the two minorities have similar roads to equality. He states, “until they [women] see someone and are exposed to the possibility it doesn’t register as an opportunity and they are just doing what they
see. What I see is women coaching women and men coaching women and men”. This participant goes on to parallel the plight of women coaching in men’s college basketball to the struggles African Americans have had in coaching men’s college basketball. “It only takes one and eventually when I look at any type of social justice, civil rights in particular, typically as time goes on, progression moves toward equality”. This participant was hopeful that just as African Americans have had a small, yet significant increase in coaching position in men’s college basketball, one day women too will have a presence and increase in access and opportunities.

**Societal Norms: “I Think it’s Probably Just a Part of Society”**

Although participants as whole felt as though women may suffer from differential access and opportunities in men’s college basketball as well as cultural barriers due to the hyper masculine culture of men’s college basketball, most felt that this was “just a part of society”. Participants felt as though societal gender roles were unchangeable, as one participant put it:

> I would say that societal gender roles are established. If you look at what a coach is and what a coach is supposed to be, it’s a very authoritative position and if you ask people what a coach does, most of the traits or characteristics that they would say, are those things related to the male gender in terms of social norms.

Another participant stated that, “in terms of society’s gender roles, the coach position is seen as a very male position of power. It’s authoritative, it’s tough, it has a presence to it and if you ask a kindergarten to draw a picture of a coach, they would draw a male”. Participants’ comments were geared toward the notion that preference for men as coaches in general was normal and natural. Therefore, preference for men coaching men’s college basketball over women should also be perceived as normal. The concept that men are the natural coaching choice for men’s college basketball has been
suggested in Walker and Bopp (2011). They too found that participants, who were all women, felt as though society was more welcoming and accepting of men as coaches. Walker and Bopp (2011) also found that most participants felt as though the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball was “just the way things are” (p.55). Both Walker and Bopp (2011) and this current study portray undertones of understanding that this inequity exists, but unsure as to whether change should take place. One participant, who has worked under both male and female head coaches in both men’s and women’s college basketball suggested that gender stereotypes and social norms play a significant role for the nonexistence of women in men’s college basketball.

For women there are stereotypes and boundaries that will have to be broken down. People will say she is not going to be tenacious and she can’t handle players getting in her face and the confrontations that happen off the court behind the scenes with the players. A lot of people think of women as having a more passive nature about them and they are seen as less aggressive. This perception would be a major barrier to women gaining access to coaching in men’s college basketball.

Previous research have suggested that gender stereotypes have influenced perceptions of what gender should or should not occupy collegiate sport positions (Burton, Barr, Fink, & Bruening, 2009). Likewise, participants of this study suggest that society has a perceived bias for men having a more natural role as a leader or coach in men’s sports, specifically men’s college basketball. Like previous studies, which found that most people would agree on the characteristics that are necessary for a good manager (Duehr & Bono, 2006), participants in this study too believe that in women’s and men’s college basketball “you still need the same traits to be a great coach”. However, “in terms of society, men are more qualified to fill that role regardless of what the sport is” because “society views men as more dominant and it is just easier to accept [men
coaching men as oppose to women coaching men]. Participants also believed that “it’s a boys club because the sport is male dominated industry. The strong male dominance comes with social pressures of being a society where males dominate”. Therefore, most participants felt that the risks of hiring a woman in that culture would bring about strong social and career threatening repercussions. Overall participants felt as though society and social norms play a large role in the nonexistence of women in men’s college basketball. They felt that gender roles and stereotypes were against women and although they agreed that inequity did exist, one participant summed of many of their sentiments by stating, “I don’t perceive it as a real problem; I just perceive it as America. It’s the way it is. It’s a reality”.

**Phenomenon: “The Main Barrier is the Non-Existence of Women”**

The last major theme that emerged from the data was the phenomenon-like characteristics that this topic exemplifies. Most participants mentioned that in discussing this topic with their peers, most of their colleagues admitted to the fact they never even considered women coaching in men’s college basketball. Women coaching in men’s college basketball is not a relevant topic of discussion amongst men in men’s college basketball. As one participant describes, “the first time it [women coaching in men’s college basketball] was brought up to me, I was blindsided. It’s something you don’t even think about because it doesn’t exist. It’s not even like it’s rare, it’s nonexistent at the Division I level”. Although these men have coached with women at some point in their careers, they still consider this topic unimportant because it does not have any relevance in their current positions. As one participant explained,

> It is not even going to cross his [a men’s basketball coach] mind to hire a woman. If a women applied, or someone said, ‘hey this women is a great coach’ then all of a sudden a flurry of challenges would enter that coach’s head and there would
be way more reasons why not to hire her than to hire her. Chances are, if she is a good candidate, then her skill set is probably very similar to a man’s skills set who does present the same risk and challenges as she would.

Overall participants felt that because they do not feel “women are standing up and complaining about a lack of opportunities to coach in men’s college basketball” then why change. Participants also believed that the perceived lack of interest by women was also a phenomenon in itself.

My question is how many ladies even exists right now who would want to be coaches or who have been exposed to the idea of coaching in men’s college basketball? Until you are exposed to the fact that the possibility exists, it does not register as an opportunity. I remember when I was a kid growing up as a African American boy, I did not think black people could be positive characters on television. I did not think blacks could be doctors and lawyers until I watched the 

_Cosby Show_ and realized black people can be lawyers, doctors, and actors. I didn’t realize that opportunity exist until I saw someone who look like me in that role.

Another participant suggest due to societal norms, the male dominated culture of men’s basketball culture, and the lack of a presence by women, men in men’s college basketball do not even think of women and men’s college basketball as being in the same domain.

I think the main issue [barriers to women] is that it has rarely happened before and I think so many things in the environment is regenerative. So from generation to generation you learn the norms within the organization wherever you are. There is a set of norms that exists in the coaching profession that has existed for a long time. The norms have evolved in some ways, but in most ways they haven’t. That’s why women coaching in men’s college basketball would not even dawn on most coaches. That’s why it is a phenomenon.

Previous studies examining women coaching in men’s college basketball have found similar results (Walker & Bopp, 2011; Walker, Bopp, & Sagas, 2011). Both studies found that this issue is indeed a phenomenon due to the rarity of it presence, the lack of
research on the topic, and an overall acknowledgement and acceptance of the lack of women in men’s college basketball.

Overall these results support the theoretical tenets of hegemonic masculinity and hegemony. As suggested in Walker and Bopp (2011) and well as the first theme of this study, women are aware that they are being disadvantaged by the male exclusive and male dominant norms of men’s college basketball. Likewise, men are aware that they have a clear advantage in more opportunities and proportions of positions in men’s college basketball over their female counterparts. However, both men and women accept these unequal and prejudice norms as a part of the culture of men’s college basketball. This dynamic is the very root of hegemonic masculinity and has been examined throughout the history of hegemony in political and economical situations (Gramsci, 1971).

Further, the consent of women in this phenomenon can be examined through the lens of social dominance theory (Sidanius et al., 2001) and system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994). Both women and men coaches of college basketball are entrenched in an institution where they build different organizations (e.g., WBCA or Women’s Basketball Coaches Association) in an effort to establish exclusive networks for their particular sports. Although women have formed a strong alliance through the use of the WBCA and other women’s basketball organizations, they have also given themselves a false sense of power in basketball or sports as a whole. The WBCA does plenty for the advancement of women in women’s college basketball. However, the WBCA has little power outside of women’s basketball. Meanwhile, the college institution of basketball (e.g., NCAA) continues to support women’s basketball and their
organizations, as long as the power and proportions continue to favor those in power, men. This system, in which the institutional norms of NCAA college basketball is for women to coach women’s basketball and men to coach basketball in general both men and women, continues to disadvantage women. Women continue to stay in women’s sport and gain little social and work capital in men’s college basketball, while men such as Geno Auriema, continue to be an example that men are welcomed and can succeed in basketball as a whole, regardless of the gender of the sport. Men in this study acknowledged the obvious double standards, but questioned whether women had interest or intentions to coach in men’s college basketball. However, as expressed in Walker and Bopp (2011) any person would be discouraged to go against organizational norms that support them in their current position. Overall the results of this study suggest the institutional and systems justification beliefs (e.g., norms), form system justification systems, which perpetuate the current state of women in college basketball.

The questioning of whether or not women have interest in coaching men’s college basketball will be addressed in chapter 4 (e.g., study 3). However, now that we have reviewed the perceptions of both men and women coaches towards women coaching in men’s college basketball and the lack of a female presence in men’s college basketball, the next stakeholder to be examined are the players. Besides coaches, players are the most invested stakeholders in college basketball. Therefore, chapter 3 (e.g., study 2) will examine the attitude NCAA Division I men’s and women’s basketball players have towards women coaching men’s college basketball.
CHAPTER 3
MESO-LEVEL FACTORS

Factors Influencing the Underrepresentation of Women in Men’s Collegiate Basketball: The Players’ Voice

Since the enactment of Title IX in 1972, men have dominated the leadership positions in both men and women’s sports (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). For example, before 1972 and the enactment of Title IX, women coached 90% of women’s teams, currently women coach only 42.6% of women’s team (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). Meanwhile, the percentage of women coaching men’s teams has remained static at 2-3%. This unequal representation sends a very strong message to those looking to pursue coaching careers in college sports: men coach sports and women coach women’s sports. Sagas and Cunningham (2004) investigated the differential role that human and social capital play in the success of administrators. Results of this study suggest that women have less return on their social capital than their male counterparts. Returns usually come in the form of promotions, which in the college coaching profession means more opportunities to become head coaches and coach elite Division I teams. According to Cunningham, Sagas, and Ashley (2003) playing experience could represent the most significant and powerful dimension of human capital. Although women and men participate in collegiate sports at a nearly equal rate, and have the same opportunities to gain human capital (i.e., playing experience) men advance in the coaching ranks more frequently than women. In line with the belief throughout sport management literature that athletes represent the pool of candidates for coaching positions (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998), both male and female athletes should have equal opportunities to coach men’s and women’s sports at the college level. Considering women are objectively, just as equal as men as potential candidates for
coaching positions in college sports, why then, do men dominate the college sports workplace?

The purpose of this study is to identify and explore meso-level factors, which contribute to the underrepresentation of women in men’s college basketball. Student-athletes possess the highest level of social capital in becoming a college basketball coach, second only to professional athletes and current coaches. Therefore, this study will explore the perceptions of student-athletes. Also, student-athletes have yet to be investigated on the topic of women coaching in men’s college sports. Previous work related to women coaching men’s college basketball has explored the perceptions of women who coach both men and women’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011), and students (i.e., students who are neither a student-athlete nor coach; Walker et al., 2011). However, considering student-athletes are intimately connected to their coaches, their perceptions on women coaching in men’s college basketball are imperative to moving the literature on this phenomenon. By administering both quantitative and qualitative methods, this study seeks to identify gender stereotypes, the influence of homologous reproduction, and perceptions of college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball.

**Gender Stereotypes**

Stereotypes have been identified as meso-level factors which influence the underrepresentation of minority groups (Cunningham, 2010; Cunningham & Sagas, 2007). Some sport management researchers imply that gender stereotypes in sports mirror societal stereotypes such as those of managers (Coakley, 2010; Sartore & Cunningham, 2007). Stereotypes and gender roles are inherently intertwined in that gender roles are typically based on stereotypes as to how women and men should
behave and perform. Generally speaking, in management, women are stereotyped as possessing more expressive and communal traits, whereas men are stereotyped as being more instrumental and agentic. Embry, Padgett, and Caldwell (2008) investigated the presence of managerial stereotypes by using vignettes. Vignettes were made to either express more communal traits, representing female managers or agentic traits representing male managers. Overall results support the researchers’ hypotheses, which stated that participants would match the communal vignette to the female leader and the agentic vignette to the male leader. Embry et al. (2008) also found that overall, participants were biased in that 70% of participants, assumed the leader to be male regardless of the whether the vignettes expressed communal or agentic traits. These results support the notion that in general, gendered stereotypes depict women as less likely to be a leader or manager than men.

In the sport setting, Senior Women Administrators (SWAs) were surveyed in an effort to measure their inclusion in decision-making roles and tasks (Grappendorf, Pent, Burton, & Henderson, 2008). SWAs are considered at most institutions to be the senior most female administrator. Therefore, if any women within an athletic department would be making important managerial decisions, it would be the SWA, unless there was a woman in the role of athletic director, associate athletic director, or assistant athletic director. In assessing the decision-making task of SWAs, Grappendorf et al. (2008) found that SWAs were excluded from many agentic-like responsibilities such as engaging in financial decisions. Instead, SWAs “often felt left ‘out of the loop’ regarding decision-making” (Grappendorf et al., 2008, p.38). Grappendorf et al. (2008) explains this phenomenon through the framework of gender role congruity, which suggest that
the lack of congruence between being female and being an administrator leads to
women having a senior leadership title, but still not participating in senior administrator
type of tasks (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Eagly (2007) and Eagly and Karau (2002) suggest
that society and organizations feel uncomfor when women are placed in leadership
roles that do not align with traditional roles (i.e., communal traits) possessed by women.
So although SWAs may have the title, which suggest that they are high-level
administrators, the lack of congruity between being a female and being a leader,
relegates them to less decision-making roles, even when in a decision-making position.

Gender stereotypes in the field of sport are not isolated to women working in
high-level administration positions. Burton, Barr, Fink, and Bruening (2009) investigated
the gender stereotyping of other administration positions in college sports. The
researchers chose three administrative positions in college sports: one which is typically
overrepresented by men (e.g., athletic director), one typically overrepresented by
women (e.g., life skills coordinator), and one equally represented by both men and
women (e.g., compliance coordinator) and examined the gender typing of these
positions. Results indicate that although masculine traits were most closely related to
the position of athletic director; feminine traits were equally pertinent to all three
positions (Burton et al., 2009). Thereby, although feminine traits are deemed necessary
for the athletic director position, women continue to be underrepresented as athletic
directors. Researchers concluded that women may be vastly underrepresented as
athletic directors, even though results suggest feminine traits are important because of
the overwhelming culture of masculine hegemony in sport (Burton et al., 2009;
Whisenant, 2008).
Similar to previous studies, women in men’s sport, specifically men’s college basketball face similar gender stereotyping. Walker et al. (2011) examined the role of gender-role attitude and gender role congruity in the evaluating of candidates for a men’s college basketball assistant coach position. Results suggest that although participants were optimistic that women are capable of coaching men’s college basketball, women were recommended for hire significantly less than their equally qualified or less qualified male counterparts (Walker et al., 2011). In assessing gender-role attitude, results provide evidence of gender stereotyping in some of the comments gathered from the qualitative analysis of the data. Participants made comments such as ‘No, men have too much testosterone and need a coach that could get up in their face if they need to and yell and push their players’ (Walker et al., 2011, p.168). This statement is an example of how traditional gender-role attitude and stereotypes of masculinity in sport serve as a barrier to the acceptance of women as coaches and leaders in sport. Women coaching in men’s college basketball not only have gender stereotypes serving as barriers, but the lack in physical representation of women in men’s college basketball serves as another meso-level factor, which influences the lack of women in men’s college basketball.

Research Question 1: Do gender stereotypes play a role in college basketball players’ attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball?

**Homologous Reproduction**

Homologous reproduction was first coined in organizational literature for the application to organizational behavior (Kanter, 1977). Kanter (1977) suggest that power, opportunity, and proportion influences the hiring processes in many business-based organizations. Power is the idea that one holds an influential position in their respective
organization (Kanter, 1977). An influential position is one in which they have influence over major financial, operational, and managerial decisions within the organization. Power can also mean the influence over media, society, and significant others within a field. In college sports and for the purpose of this study, positions of power are athletic directors, high-level administrators and coaches. Opportunity refers to the possibility that one can advance to top-level leadership positions within their organization. Opportunity is the realistic chance that with all else being equal, an individual has just as equal of chances as anyone else to advance in their careers (Kanter, 1977). In college sports and in reference to the focus of this paper, opportunity can be operationalized as the chance for a woman to progress to higher ranks in coaching, administration, and other leadership positions in sport, specifically men’s sports. Finally the last construct associated with homologous reproduction is proportion. Proportion is the ratio of people who “look like” an individual in a particular position within an organization (Stangl & Kane, 1991). In the case of collegiate sports, proportion is the ratio of male to female head coaches in NCAA Division I sport. Kanter (1977) suggests that the proportion of certain individuals in powerful positions will influence the opportunities to under-proportioned groups in the hiring process. In reference to college sports, the proportion of men in powerful positions such as athletic directors will negatively influence the opportunities for women because men will have a bias to hire other men for powerful positions such as athletic director or head coach.

Kane and Stangl (1991) investigated the under-representation of women in men’s sports. By means of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and chi-square, archival data was descriptively analyzed. Findings suggest that not only was homologous reproduction
taking place, but that women coaching in men’s sports were marginalized and tokenized (Kane & Stangl, 1991). To further explain, the researchers concluded that since, women were only represented as head coaches in less than 2% of men’s sports and of that 2%, only 0.03% were in the “more prestigious” team sports (e.g., basketball and soccer) and all others were in “less prestigious” individual sports (e.g., tennis, track, and swimming), women were marginalized and tokenized (Kane & Stangl, 1991). Women coaching men were tokenized because the percentage was just a token or minute number of women and marginalized to coach sports that were deemed less important financially, socially and by the media. This marginalization and tokenism contributes to the occupational segregation of women in sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991). This study was one of the first and remains one of the few studies to directly measure women coaching in men’s sports.

Stangl and Kane (1991) explored the decreased representation of women at the high school level as a trend following the enactment of Title IX in 1972. Using archival data from a state high school directory, they analyzed the ratios of male and female athletic directors to male and female head coaches. Using chi-square and ANOVA as the method of analysis, researchers found that there was a significant effect in the gender (male/female) of the athletic director and Title IX time periods. Results are significant evidence toward the notion that male athletic directors are biased to hiring male head coaches and homologous reproduction is a factor, which helps perpetuate hegemony in sports (Stangl & Kane, 1991). Considering that the number of male athletic directors far outweighed female athletic directors, this evidence of homologous reproduction suggests a clear disadvantage for women pursuing head coaching.
positions. Finally Lovett and Lowry (1994) followed up Stangl and Kane (1991) by replicating the study but adding the gender of the high school principle as a variable in measuring homologous reproduction at the high school level. Again, homologous reproduction was shown to take place amongst male and female principles and athletic directors, in that they too hired individuals of the same gender (Lovett & Lowry, 1994). Overall, all three studies used homologous reproduction as a theoretical framework to explain the under-representation of women as head coaches in high school sports.

Although women represent roughly half of the proportion of athletes, who are recognized as the viable pool of candidates for college coaching positions (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998), women still seemingly lack access to half of the coaching positions in college sports (i.e., men’s college sports). Therefore, this study employed a mixed method approach to identify gender stereotypes, the influence of homologous reproduction impacting attitudes and perceptions of college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball.

Hypothesis 1: There are gender differences in college basketball players’ attitude towards women coaching in men’s college basketball.

Hypothesis 2: Those athletes who experience a high diversity proportion of leaders (i.e., a woman as a previous athletic leader) will have favorable attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. Likewise, those athletes who experience a low diversity proportion (i.e., have not had a woman as a previous athletic leader) will have unfavorable attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball.

Methodology

As suggested by Adcock and Collier (2001) triangulation adds to the validity and reliability of the data collected. Therefore, this study has applied a mixed method approach to investigate attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball.
Participants

Data was collected from a random sample 130 NCAA Division I college basketball players (41 male, 89 female). The majority of participants were Caucasian/White (n = 68; 51.9%), followed by African American/Black (n = 52; 39.7%), Hispanic (n = 2; 1.5%), and “other” (n = 9; 6.9%). The majority (69.2%) of participants were between ages of 19 to 21 year.

Instrumentation

Attitude toward women (ATW). Four items have been developed to assess the attitude of college basketball players, toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. An example of an item assessing attitude toward women coaching in men’s basketball is “I believe women should coach in men’s college basketball”. These items were pilot tested with a sample (n = 17) with a Cronbach’s alpha reliability (α = .85) for measures (Pallant, 2007). All items were scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Further reliability and validity measures (i.e., criterion and face validity) were assessed through use of a panel composed of 11 sport management doctoral students at a large southeastern university. Minor grammatical changes were made after panel review.

Diversity proportion. Participants were asked to complete items pertaining to the history of their current and past athletic leaders. Items included in this section are: “What was the sex of your high school athletic director?” “What was the sex of your high school women’s basketball coach?” “What was the sex of your high school men’s basketball coach?” “What is the sex of your current athletic director?” “What is the sex of your current women’s basketball coach?” and “What is the sex of your current men’s basketball coach?” Using these six items, a diversity proportion was computed. The
diversity proportion variable is the sum of the sex of previous athletic leaders (i.e., 1 = male, 2 = female) divided by the total number of previous athletic leaders (i.e., 6 previous athletic leaders). Once the ratio was computed, all participants who did not have a woman as a previous or current leader was given a score of 1, every other participant who did have a woman as a previous or current leader was given a diversity score of 2. The purpose of the diversity proportion is to compute a variable that can account for the amount of previous gender diversity each participant has had. This allowed me to use this diversity proportion variable as an independent variable in analyzing its effect on attitude towards women coaching in men’s college basketball. This concept of operationalizing relational demography has been adapted from the works of Blau (1977) and Harrison and Klein (2007).

**Qualitative interview question.** Qualitative data was used to enrich the results of quantitative measures assessing attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball and to assess gender stereotypes that may shape college basketball players’ attitude towards women as men’s basketball coaches. Both constructs are assessed by use of open-ended items (Walker et al., 2011 for similar methods). One open-ended item will give participants an opportunity to openly express their perceptions of women coaching in men’s college basketball. The qualitative item used to assess gender stereotypes and attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball is “What is your attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball?”

**Procedures**

Online surveys were administered to examine men’s and women’s college basketball players’ perceptions of women coaching in men’s college basketball, gender stereotypes, and the influence of gender of previous athletic leaders on attitude toward
women coaching in men’s college basketball. A recruitment letter was sent via email to a random sample of 950 NCAA Division I basketball players, both men and women. After four follow-up email reminders, 130 participants responded, for a response rate of 13.7%. The recruitment letter asked for their participation in a study assessing and exploring the attitude toward women working in men’s college basketball. The survey took approximately 10-15 minutes and assessed the college basketball players’ attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball and the gender of their previous athletic leaders (i.e., head coach and athletic director).

After all quantitative data was collected; seven randomly chosen participants were interviewed using the one qualitative item, in an effort to confirm the quantitative data. This method of post hoc interviewing of participants not only allowed for data confirmation, but also richer, more in-depth analysis (Adcock & Collier, 2001).

### Analysis

In analyzing the data the aim was to explore the influence of sex on attitudes. A two-way ANOVA was applied to the data to test for the impact of sex of participants and gender diversity on the attitudes of players towards women coaching in men’s college basketball. Content analysis of the qualitative data was applied to identify thematic trends in the data (Baumgartner & Hensley, 2006).

### Results

Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3-2. Preliminary assumption testing was conducted to check for normality, outliers, and homogeneity of variance. There was no major violation of assumptions noted. Results of the two-way ANOVA suggest significant effects for sex $F(1, 123) = 20.71$, $p < 0.001$, partial eta squared 0.17 (women: $M = 4.70$, $SD = 1.40$; men: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.63$); but not for
diversity proportion $F(1, 123) = 2.34, p = 0.13$; or the interaction effect of sex by diversity proportion $F(1, 123) = 0.13, p = 0.72$. In support of Hypothesis 1, there was a significant sex difference in the attitudes of college basketball players towards women coaching in men’s college basketball. Women ($M = 4.70, SD = 1.40$) expressed a more favorable attitude towards women coaching in men’s college basketball than their male counterparts ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.63$). Hypotheses 2 and 3 were not supported in that there was no significant diversity proportion effect, as well as no significant interaction effect between sex and diversity proportion. Therefore, the data suggest that gender of previous athletic leaders (i.e., head coach, athletic director) did not influence the attitudes of both men’s and women’s college basketball players towards women coaching in men’s college basketball.

In analyzing the qualitative data, results suggest that gender stereotypes influence the attitudes of players towards women coaching in men’s college basketball. Although players did feel as though women were capable, they were very apprehensive as to whether women would get hired. One female player felt as though “men may not listen to women considering she never played men’s college basketball”. Another male player said that the woman would have to be “an amazing athlete and really good shooter, since women cannot dunk consistently, nor teach the athletic part of the game”. Both of the previous comments suggest that the stereotypical characteristic of women, as being athletically inferior to men is a major barrier to women coaching in men’s college basketball. Overall, all seven athletes agreed that they would expect to see more women coaching in men’s college basketball in the future because “society is moving towards women and men being treated with more equality in sports”. Both a female and
male player expressed similar sentiment in that “some women’s college basketball players are just as good, if not better than a good portion of the men’s basketball players at shooting and other fundamentals”. One player even stated that since “the majority of women’s basketball players graduate and the majority of men’s basketball players are not going to the NBA, women basketball coaches could bring a more grounded approach to men’s college basketball”. Overall all seven participants were very positive towards the idea of women coaching in men’s college basketball, but felt as though the current culture of men’s college basketball is “too competitive and professional for men to welcome women in to compete with for jobs”. One participant even went as far as to say, “It isn’t women keeping women out of men’s college basketball; its men keeping women out of men’s college basketball”. Although these athletes are not currently in the job market for coaching positions, five of the seven players stated interest in coaching once they graduate. Therefore, these players’ attitudes and perceptions of the gender dynamics in men’s college basketball are relevant and provide insight into the culture of college basketball.

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. To date, there has been increased research on the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball. Walker and Bopp (2011) examined the perceptions of women who have coached in men’s and women’s college basketball. Walker and Bopp (2011) suggest that women perceive that there are barriers hindering women from opportunities in men’s college basketball. Factors such as double standards (e.g., glass wall), exclusive social networks (i.e., old boys network), and organizational fit issues (i.e., respect and overcompensation for
being a woman) are all factors that influence the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball. Study 1 of this dissertation built on the work of Walker and Bopp (2011) by examining the perceptions of men who have coached with women in men’s and women’s college basketball. Again, the purpose of study 1 was to add to the body of work examining the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball. Study 1 suggest that the hyper masculine culture of men’s college basketball, lack of opportunity and access to positions, societal norms, and the fact that women coaching in men’s basketball is an anomaly influence the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball dramatically. Like the previous two studies, the goal of this research, was to add to the body of literature on women working in the male dominated sport workplace of men’s sports, specifically men’s college basketball.

Results of this study suggest that although homologous reproduction has previously been suggested as influencing the leadership roles of women in men’s sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991; Stangl & Kane, 1991), there was no clear relationship between players favoring those who were most like their previous leaders. The gender of previous athletic leaders did not influence the attitude of players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. However, women did portray more favorable feelings toward women coaching in men’s college basketball than their male counterparts. Although previous management research (Riordan & Shore, 1997) has suggested that relational demography (e.g., differences or similarities in demographic categories such as race and gender) or gender diversity has had little influence on the current culture, both the work of Walker and Bopp (2011) as well as the results of this study suggest otherwise. This study suggests that there are gender differences in the
attitude of men’s and women’s college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. Qualitative results suggest that traditional gender stereotypes may influence the attitudes of players towards women. Both men and women players stated physical and athletic differences between men and women as barriers to women coaching in men’s college basketball. Nonetheless, similar to the results of the quantitative data, women basketball players who are coached by majority women coaches expressed more positive attitudes toward women coaching men’s basketball than their male counterparts. Although, some participants were optimistic that someday women would coach in men’s college basketball, there was a clear underlying feeling of apprehension towards women in men’s sports.

The results of this study are significant to organizational literature and literature that examines institutional gender dynamics because it provides progression in the study of contact theory research. To begin, the results of this study suggest that coming in contact with a female leader at some point in an athlete’s career does not influence their attitude toward women as coaches in men’s sports. Although on the surface this may seem to suggest that proportion does not matter, in that, regardless of how many women are head coaches or athletic directors, women will still be viewed negatively as leaders in men’s sport; this is not true. In this particular study, the occurrences of women as previous leaders did not influence the attitude toward women as coaches in men’s college basketball because there were so few women as coaches of men’s teams. The majority of athletes who had experienced a woman as a previous leader only saw these women as coaches of women’s basketball or as a high school athletic director. Considering, an overwhelming majority have never experienced a women as a
men’s basketball coach, they are unable to attribute positive attitudes toward them in that position. Intergroup contact hypothesis suggests that the more a majority group and minority group interact amongst each other, the less prejudice and discrimination will take place (Allport, 1954). However, although the majority of female basketball players are in contact with women serving as their coaches, and men basketball players interact with women coaches in other sports, this interaction did not have an influence on their attitudes. Therefore, the results of this study suggest women must be seen as leaders in men’s sports, specifically men’s college basketball before their interaction has influence on attitude toward them coaching in men’s sports.
CHAPTER 4
MICRO-LEVEL FACTORS


The enactment of Title IX in 1972 accomplished monumental strides in increasing the opportunities for women to participate in sport. However, little has been done to increase the representation of women as leaders in sport. Although, in most cases representation of women as participants in sport at the high school and collegiate level hovers somewhere around 50%, women as coaches at the same levels is a meager 27-28% (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). This discrepancy in opportunities for female athletes to pursue jobs in an area where they have invested time and capital poses the dilemma of: what are female athletes to do with all the social and human capital that they have accumulated? Considering that the pool of candidates for sport related positions should likely be those who have accumulated capital in sports such as former athletes (Chelladurai & Everhart, 1998), why are these female athletes underrepresented in sports as a whole and significantly lacking representation in men sports?

Despite recent scholars’ call for added research of women working in the male dominated sport workplace, very little research has explored this phenomenon (Walker, Bopp, & Sagas, 2011). Although women participate in sports at a rate almost equal to their male counterparts, women are treated as a token hire in men’s college sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991) and nearly non-existent in men’s college basketball. Currently, at the collegiate level women serve as the head coach of less than 3% of men’s teams, while men coach roughly 57.4% of women’s team (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). These numbers are exponentially worse in men’s college basketball. Although men serve as the head coach of fewer women’s basketball teams than women’s sports in general
(41.7%), women are nearly non-existent as head coaches in men’s college basketball at 0.01% (Zgonc, 2010). Therefore, in men’s college basketball, women are tokenized and marginalized to minute representation and the majority of that representation being at the assistant coach level (Zgonc, 2010).

In response to these astonishing numbers, research that examines women in men’s college sports is becoming more prevalent. Walker, Bopp, and Sagas (2011) examined gender bias towards women coaching men’s college basketball in the hiring process. Scenarios were used in a quasi-experimental study in which the hiring recommendation, capability, and job-fit were assessed for potential candidates of both sexes. Participants were given a job description from a university with a pseudonym. They were then given a qualified male candidate, qualified female candidate, or an overqualified female candidate. As their names suggest, the qualified male candidate and the qualified female candidate both had identical qualifications. The overqualified female candidate qualifications were significantly better than both the qualified male candidate and the qualified female candidate. Finally they were instructed to rate the candidate based upon items for each of the three variables (i.e., capability, job-fit, and hiring recommendation). Results suggest that although women were scored relatively equal to men on capability to coach men’s college basketball and job-fit, women were rated significantly lower than men on the variable of hiring recommendation (Walker et al., 2011). This means that although participants deem women just as qualified as men, they were less likely to recommend hiring them, solely because they were a women.

Walker and Bopp (2011) examined the perceptions of women who have coached in men’s college basketball. Through in-depth interviews with participants, researchers
were able to identify themes, which were then organized into barriers, environmental perceptions. Results provide evidence that gendered opportunities, male-exclusive social networks, and pressures to over-compensate for being female were strongly influential on the intentions of women to pursue careers in male dominated workplaces such as men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011). Participants suggested that the reason why many women do not pursue positions in men’s college basketball was that they simply did not want to deal with the obstacles that come with coaching in men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011). Overall, women were optimistic and believed someday women would coach in men’s basketball on a regular basis. However, it was broadly echoed that today’s society was not yet ready for women to coach men (Walker & Bopp, 2011).

Although sparse, there is literature that pertains to women coaching in men’s sports. Examples of literature examining women coaching in men’s sports include the role of homologous reproduction in women being treated as tokens and marginalized in men’s high school sports (Kane & Stangl, 1991), gender bias in the evaluating of women as potential candidates for men’s college coaching positions (Walker et al., 2011), and perceptions of women coaching in men’s basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011). All previously mentioned studies examine barriers impeding the access of women to enter men’s sports, specifically men’s college basketball. However, there has not been a study to date which explores the intentions of women to coach men’s college basketball. Therefore the purpose of this study was to examine the intentions of college basketball players to coach men’s college basketball. Previous literature has examined intentions of student-athletes being influenced by racial inequities (Cunningham &
Singer, 2010), but few have attempted to examine gender differences in intentions and what factors may influence the gender differences. Through an application of social cognitive career theory (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994) this study examined the influence of sex on college basketball players’ perception about, interest in, and behavioral intentions to coach men’s college basketball.

**Social Cognitive Career Theory**

Lent et al.’s (1994) social cognitive career theory was developed largely from Bandura’s (1986) social cognitive theory. Social cognitive theory suggests that self-efficacy, outcome expectations, and goals interact with environmental factors to influence an individual’s decision about whether to engage in any behaviors (Bandura, 1986; Lent et al., 1994). Lent et al. (1994) used many of Bandura’s (1986) theoretical constructs to build onto their concept that contextual factors have a bearing on decisions. These contextual factors in the sport literature have been associated with barriers and supports (Cunningham, Bruening, Sartore, Sagas & Fink, 2005). Cunningham et al. (2005) found that these contextual factors (i.e., barriers and supports) have received minimal attention in social cognitive career theory research, however were very significant to self-efficacy, which is an imperative construct in the study of social cognitive career theory.

Social cognitive career theory has been used in the sport management literature to explain the underrepresentation of women coaching in college sports (Cunningham, Doherty, & Gregg, 2007), as well as student-athlete intentions to become head coaches (Cunningham & Singer, 2010). Social cognitive career theory suggests that three person-cognitive variables interact with environmental factors to predict behavior (i.e., intentions to coach men’s college basketball) (Cunningham & Singer, 2010). This study
will significantly add to the literature by applying the social cognitive career theory framework, to explore the intentions of college basketball players to coach men’s college basketball. See Figure 4-1 for social cognitive career theory model.

**Self-Efficacy**

Bandura (1986) defines self-efficacy as, “people’s judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances” (p.391). Self-efficacy has been examined extensively in the sport management literature such as, gender differences in preferences for coaching as an occupation (Everhart & Chelladurai, 1998), gender differences in desire to become a head coach (Cunningham et al., 2007; Cunningham, Sagas, & Ashley, 2003), and racial difference in the intentions of student athletes to enter the coaching profession (Cunningham & Singer, 2010). Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) provide evidence that although not statistically significant; the self-efficacy of women was higher than that of men when asked about their capabilities as a coach. This finding is important to note because as a reviewer for Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) noted, “males rarely have lower self-efficacy in anything compared to females” (p.197). Another important discovery from Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) is that the “reasons for the underrepresentation of women in the coaching ranks do not reside in the women” (p. 201). Therefore, Everhart and Chelladurai (1998) are suggesting that blaming women for not having the self-efficacy or being confident enough to be a coach may not be valid. By measuring self-efficacy of women to coach men’s college basketball, we are able to infer, from evidence produced in the data, gender differences in self-efficacy. Consequently, this is the hypothesis that was tested in relation to the self-efficacy construct:
Hypothesis 1: Compared to men, women will have lower self-efficacy to coach men’s college basketball.

Outcome Expectation

Outcome expectation is the belief about the outcome of taking part in a particular behavior (Lent et al., 1994). In the context of this study, outcome expectations are beliefs, both negative and positive, about what the expected outcome are from being a head coach in men’s college basketball. Considering that Walker et al. (2011) found that women of equal qualifications were rated lower for a hiring recommendation, the following hypothesis was developed:

Hypothesis 2: Compared to men, women will perceive less positive outcome expectations associated with being a men’s college basketball coach.

Choice Goals

Choice goals can be defined as the intention an individual has to realistically partake in a behavior (Lent et al., 1994). Choice goals are seen as the closest variable to measuring actual behavior. This study would propose that since descriptive data provides evidence of fewer women in coaching positions in men’s college basketball (Zgonc, 2010), women will have lower choice goals to coach in men’s college basketball than men.

Hypothesis 3: Compared to men, women will have lower intentions (i.e., choice goals) to be a men’s college basketball coach.

Environmental Factors

Environmental factors for the purpose of this study and in accordance with Lent, Brown, and Hackett (2000) are defined as supports and barriers. Previous research examining the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011; Walker et al., 2011) have suggested that barriers (e.g., social networks) influence
the intentions of women to coach in men’s college basketball. According to Cunningham et al. (2007) environmental factors, “impact people, their efficacy, expectations concerning various behavioral choices and ultimately, the behavioral choices they make” (p.367). Therefore, this study measured the influence of sex on environmental factors (e.g., barriers and supports).

Hypothesis 4: Compared to men, women will perceive there are more barriers associated with being a men’s college basketball coach.

Hypothesis 5: Compared to men, women will perceive there is less support associated with being a men’s college basketball coach.

Vocational Interest

Vocational interest is the level of interest an individual has in a particular behavior or to pursue a particular career (Lent et al., 1994; Cunningham et al., 2007). Theoretically in past research, vocational interest has influenced choice goals (Lent et al., 1994). Also in study 1 of this dissertation as well as previous research examining women coaching in men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011; Walker et al., 2011), participants, both men and women have questioned the level of interest women have in coaching men’s college basketball. Therefore, although vocational interest has in previous studies been examined as items under the variable choice goals, we will discuss the variable of interest separately.

Hypothesis 6: Compared to men, women will express less vocational interest in being a men’s college basketball coach.
Methodology

Participants

Data was collected from a random sample of 130 NCAA Division I college basketball players (41 male, 89 female). The majority of participants were Caucasian/White (n = 68; 51.9%), preceded by African American/Black (n = 52; 39.7%), Hispanic (n = 2; 1.5%), and “other” (n = 9; 6.9%). The majority (69.2%) of participants were between ages of 19 to 21 year.

Measures

Participants were given a questionnaire in which they provided demographic data and respond to items used to measure outcome expectations, vocational interest, choice goals, barriers, and supports (Appendix A). A composite mean was used for each variable. The development of all measures were heavily influenced and at times adapted and adopted by the work of Lent et al. (1994), Cunningham et al. (2007), and Cunningham and Singer (2010).

Self-efficacy. Self-efficacy was measured using nine items adapted and adopted from Everhart and Chelladurai (1998). In accordance with measures used by Cunningham and Singer (2010) (α = .82) to measure self-efficacy, participants read questions focused on activities men’s basketball coaches would perform. Participants were then asked to rate the level of confidence they would have completing the activities listed. Sample items include, “Be self-assured in dealing with problems” and “Make intelligent coaching choices”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (no confidence) to 7 (complete confidence).

Outcome expectation. Outcome expectations were measured by adapting and adopting Cunningham et al.’s (2005) and Cunningham and Singer’s (2010) nine-item
measure (α = .84). Participants were asked to “respond to the following items concerned with the outcomes you might expect from being a men’s college basketball coach”. Sample items include, “I would earn approval from my peers if I became a men’s college basketball coach” and “Becoming a men’s college basketball coach would be very satisfying to me”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Choice goals.** Hagger, Chatzisarantis, and Biddle (2002), Cunningham et al.’s. (2007), and Cunningham and Singer’s (2010) (α = .76) scale items were adapted and adopted and used to measure choice goals. The conceptualization of behavioral intention and choice goals were measured by asking participants the extent to which they plan to, intend to, and will try to become a men’s college basketball coach (Cunningham et al., 2007). An example of a choice goal item is “I intend to become a men’s college basketball coach during my career”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Barriers.** Barriers were measured using six items, which were developed based on previous literature examining barriers to women coaching men’s college basketball (Walker & Bopp, 2011; Walker et al., 2011) and Cunningham and Singer (2010). An example of an item measuring barriers is “It would be difficult for society to accept people with the same gender as myself in a men’s college basketball coaching position”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). SPSS was used to conduct reliability test in assessing Cronbach’s alpha reliability for measures (α = .95; Pallant, 2007). Further reliability and
validity measures were assessed through use of an expert panel of sport management doctoral students and pilot test \((n = 17)\).

**Supports.** Supports were also measured by six items, which were developed based on the previous work of Walker et al. (2011), Walker and Bopp (2011), and Cunningham and Singer (2010). An example of an item measuring supports is “I feel I know enough people in the field to secure a men’s college basketball coaching position”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). SPSS was used to conduct reliability test in assessing Cronbach’s alpha reliability \((\alpha = .92)\) for measures (Pallant, 2007). Further reliability and validity measures were assessed through use of an expert panel of sport management doctoral students and pilot test \((n = 17)\).

**Vocational interest.** Three items were developed to measure vocational interest. These items are “Becoming a men’s college basketball coach is something that interest me”, “I have thought about becoming a men’s college basketball coach in the past”, and “I really have no interest in becoming a men’s college basketball coach”. All items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). SPSS was used to conduct reliability test in assessing Cronbach’s alpha reliability \((\alpha = .85)\) for measures (Pallant, 2007). Further reliability and validity measures such as face and criterion validity were assessed through use of an expert panel of sport management doctoral students and pilot test \((n = 17)\).

**Procedures**

Online surveys were administered to examine men’s and women’s college basketball players’ intentions to coach in men’s college basketball. A recruitment letter was sent via email to a random sample of 950 NCAA Division I basketball players, both
men and women. After four follow-up email reminders, 130 participants responded, for a response rate of 13.7%. A low response rate of 13.7% would suggest non-response bias. Therefore, to examine the influence of non-response bias, early responders were compared to late responders in a method used by Sagas et al. (2006). This method of examining the influence of non-response bias is supported by previous literature that suggests there are similarities between late respondents and non-respondents (e.g., Dooley & Linder, 2003). After comparing these two groups, no differences were found amongst variables between early responders and late responders. The recruitment letter asked for their participation in a study assessing and exploring the attitude toward women working in men’s college basketball. The survey took approximately 10-15 minutes and assessed the college basketball players’ self-efficacy, outcome expectations, barriers, supports, interest, and choice goals (i.e., intentions) associated with coaching in men’s college basketball.

**Analysis**

A MANOVA was conducted to explore group difference between sex and social cognitive career theory variables. Hypotheses 1 to 5 predicted gender differences on social cognitive career theory variables and were tested by use of a one-way MANOVA, while hypothesis 6 was tested by means of a one-way ANOVA. Means and standard deviations were computed for all variables.

**Results**

Results from the MANOVA were used to identify whether there was variation by sex on the variables related to social cognitive career theory. All means and standard deviations are provided in Table 4-3. Preliminary assumption testing was performed to check for normality, outliers, linearity, homogeneity of variance, and multicollinearity.
There was no serious violation of assumptions observed. Results of the MANOVA demonstrate significant multivariate effects for sex, Wilks’ λ = 0.34, \( F(5, 120) = 47.39, p < 0.001 \). Considering that significance was found in the multivariate analysis, it was warranted to examine the relationship of each dependent variable with the independent variable of sex. Also, because I am looking at a number of different analyses, it is suggested that the Bonferroni method be used to set a higher alpha level and reduce the chance of a Type 1 error (Pallant, 2007). Therefore, I divided the alpha level of 0.05 by the five individual analyses. The new alpha level set by the Bonferroni method was 0.01. Results of the individual between-subjects effects were only considered significant at or below the 0.01 alpha-level. Therefore, subsequent univariate analyses demonstrated significant effects for outcome expectations, \( F(1, 124) = 6.44, p = 0.01 \), partial eta squared = 0.05 (women: \( M = 4.19, SD = 1.35 \); men: \( M = 4.84, SD = 1.30 \)); barriers, \( F(1, 124) = 213.77, p < 0.001 \), partial eta squared = 0.63 (women: \( M = 5.76, SD = 1.09 \); men: \( M = 2.35, SD = 1.46 \) ); and choice goals, \( F(1, 124) = 17.67, p < 0.001 \), partial eta squared = 0.13 (women: \( M = 2.73, SD = 1.67 \); men: \( M = 4.09, SD = 1.76 \) ).

Results from the one-way ANOVA demonstrate a significant sex difference in interest, \( F(1, 127) = 21.32, p < 0.001 \), partial eta squared = 0.14 (women: \( M = 3.02, SD = 1.89 \); men: \( M = 4.67, SD = 1.86 \)).

Hypothesis 1 was not supported considering there was not a significant sex difference in self-efficacy. However, hypothesis 2 was supported in that women (\( M = 4.19, SD = 1.35 \)) did perceive there to be less positive outcomes expectations related to pursuing a coaching career in men’s college basketball than men (\( M = 4.84, SD = 1.30 \)). Hypothesis 3 was supported in that women (\( M = 2.73, SD = 1.67 \)) did express fewer
intentions or choice goals to coach men’s college basketball than men (M = 4.09, SD = 1.76). In support of hypothesis 4 women (M = 5.76, SD = 1.09) did perceive there to be more barriers to their pursuit of a men's college basketball coaching position than men (M = 2.35, SD = 1.46). There was no significant sex difference in perceived support to coach men’s college basketball; therefore hypothesis 5 was not supported. Lastly, hypothesis 6 was supported in that women (M = 3.02, SD = 1.89) expressed less interest in coaching men’s college basketball than their male counterparts (M = 4.67, SD = 1.86).

**Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the perception, interest, and intentions of college basketball players to coach men’s college basketball. Overall the results suggest that although women and men may not differ in self-efficacy, men have higher intentions to coach men’s college basketball than women. Women also had more negative outcome expectations than men, who expressed more positive outcome expectations associated with coaching in men’s college basketball. These results are contrary to the literature, which suggest that women traditionally have lower self-efficacy than their male counterparts in regards to coaching (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007). These results on self-efficacy is consistent with Walker et al. (2011), Walker and Bopp (2011), study 1, and study 2 results, which suggest that women are just as capable and confident as men to coach men’s college basketball. As stated by a male NCAA Division I men's basketball player in study 2, “It isn’t women keeping women out of men’s college basketball, it’s men”. Therefore, considering men are gatekeepers to positions in men’s college basketball, women must find interest in coaching men’s college sports and men must welcome them into their networks before
men’s basketball becomes a gender diverse institution. Also, consistent with recent work on women coaching in men’s college basketball is the presence of barriers as a major deterrent to women pursuing coaching positions in men’s college basketball. Although both women and men felt supported in their intentions to coach men’s college basketball, women perceived there to be more barriers to their pursuit in the profession of men’s college basketball. This significant sex difference in perceived barriers may be unique to women coaching in men’s college basketball. This assumption is based on the fact that these results are in contrast to Cunningham et al. (2007) findings, which suggest that there is not a significant sex difference in perceived barriers to coach women’s college sports. Nonetheless, the influence of barriers is a reoccurring trend in examining women coaching in men’s college basketball. Whether it is societal barriers such a social norms or organizational barriers such as the old boys network, environmental factors seems to be the biggest obstacle keeping men’s college basketball a male-exclusive institution, which remains impermeable by women.

In the previous two studies of this dissertation, participants questioned whether women had any interest in coaching men’s college basketball. Results of this study suggest that women’s interest in coaching men’s college basketball is significantly lower than their male counterparts. However, considering the strong presence of barriers and the negative outcome expectations that women express, the work of Lent et al. (1994) would suggest that women would also have low interest and intentions in coaching men’s college basketball. This too is consistent with research examining women intentions to become head coaches in women’s college basketball (Cunningham et al., 2007). Overall these results add significantly to the research by examining sex
differences to coach men’s college basketball using a very applicable sample, women
and men’s college basketball players.

The results of this study suggest more work needs to be done examining the
construct of barriers. In study one, the barriers seemed to be obvious, in that they were
institutional and societal barriers. In study two negative attitudes seemed to be a barrier
to women, which were influenced by stereotypes. However, in this study, although
results suggest barriers had the most influence on intentions to coach, it is unclear
exactly what these barriers are and how they are materialized by women pursuing
coaching positions in men’s sports.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

Summarizing Women in Men’s Sports and the Perceptions of the Most Relevant Stakeholders: Coaches and Players

The purpose of this dissertation was to investigate factors that influence the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball. Although women and men make up comparatively equivalent proportion of athletes at the NCAA collegiate level, men dominate the coaching ranks in both men’s and women’s sports (Zgonc, 2010). I chose to investigate the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball due to the media attention that women’s basketball receives and its place in American sports as arguably the most successful professional women team sport (McCabe, 2007). Women’s and men’s basketball is played with nearly identical rules, equipment, courts, and techniques. Therefore, the transition for men to coach women’s basketball is nearly seamless. However, women and men alike perceive there to be numerous barriers to the access of women who may want to coach in men’s college basketball. In previous literature this phenomenon, which is the lack of women coaching in men’s college basketball has been investigated with methods such as quasi experimental research (Walker et al., 2011) and semi-structured interviews (Walker and Bopp, 2011). Therefore, this dissertation chose to implement both quantitative and qualitative methods in investigating this phenomenon. Overall findings suggest that both women and men alike believe that although women may be just as capable in ability to coach in men’s college basketball, societal norms and environmental factors are influential in keeping women out of men’s college basketball coaching positions.

Study 1 of this dissertation used semi-structured interviews to examine the perceptions of men who coach in men’s college basketball. The men interviewed in
study 1 not only coach in men’s college basketball, but have experienced working with women at some point in their careers. Results suggest that men’s college basketball is a hyper-masculine institution in which masculine hegemony and sociocultural norms work together in perpetuating a male exclusive organization. Although these men believed that society is changing and women may be capable coaches in men’s college basketball, the masculine culture of the male coaches in men’s basketball is not ready to make the necessary cultural changes in their organization to be more inclusive to women. Although most coaches felt that the players would not react differently to a female coach in men’s college basketball, few did question whether players would have a positive attitude toward women in this non-traditional role. Participants also questioned how many women would have interest in coaching men’s college basketball. These two uncertainties by the coaches in study 1 led to study 2 and study 3, which investigated the attitudes of college basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball and their intentions and interest to coach in men’s college basketball.

Study 2 examined the attitude of players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. Results suggest that although as a whole, players attitudes were mostly impartial toward women coaching in men’s college basketball, women did have significantly more positive attitudes toward women coaching in men’s college basketball than their male counterparts. These results support study 1 of this dissertation in that men did not see women entering the ranks of men’s college basketball as socially and culturally acceptable, thereby their attitude toward women coaching is negative. Also, the nonexistence of women in men’s college basketball may lead men’s basketball players to believe that women are incapable of being a men’s basketball coach. This
justification would explain their slightly negative attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball. The negative attitudes of men’s basketball players toward women coaching in men’s college basketball, coupled with the hyper-masculine sociocultural norms of men’s college basketball suggest that men’s college basketball and men’s sports in general may act as an impermeable institution for women. Men would need to accept and see a need to welcome women into their social networks and culture and women would need to express interest and intentions in order for these sociocultural barriers toward women in men’s college basketball to change.

Study 3 examined the intentions of women and men’s college basketball players to coach men’s college basketball. Results from this study suggest that although women and men are comparably equivalent in self-efficacy and supports, women perceive less favorable outcome expectations and more barriers associated with becoming a men’s college basketball coach. Therefore, their intentions and interest in coaching men’s college basketball were also significantly lower than their male counterparts. At this point in the dissertation, these results are not surprising. Comparable to other studies using Lent et al. (1994) social cognitive career theory, negative outcome expectations, and increased barriers are highly correlated with lower vocational interest and intentions (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007). However, women being nearly equivalent on self-efficacy and supports, but expressing significantly lower intentions and interest than their male counterparts are unique to women coaching in men’s college basketball. Certainly more research needs to be done investigating the relationship of these variables in relation to gender in male dominated workplaces. Nonetheless, study 3 provides evidence that supports of both study 1, study 2, Walker
and Bopp (2011) and Walker et al., (2011). Coaches and players believe that women are just as capable and have the ability and confidence to coach in men’s college basketball. However, the perception of barriers, negative attitudes of men, coupled with a lack of interest by women helps perpetuate men’s college basketball as a male dominated, male exclusive, hyper-masculine institution.

**Contributions to Literature and Implications**

The major contribution of this research to literature is that the multilevel perspective provided evidence of the unique embedded nature of this phenomenon. By examining this phenomenon through a multilevel lens, results emerged which suggest that not only are many of the barriers and “glass wall” factors embedded within each other, but that the relationships may also be cyclical. For instance, Study 1 provided evidence of institutional beliefs and hegemonic masculinity, which are said to exist in the macro-level perpetuating stereotypes in the meso-level and influencing intentions in the micro-level. This depicts the embedded nature of the factors in each level of the multilevel model. However, although results suggest the embedded nature of the factors, they are also cyclical. Although hegemonic masculinity, negative attitudes and stereotypes, and the lack of intentions by women act as a “glass wall” to women coaching in men’s college basketball; this “glass wall” (i.e., barriers) loops back to the individual factors that are present in the multilevel model. The existence of the “glass wall” is acknowledged by men and women, coaches and players. Therefore, knowing that they have little chance of obtaining a position in men’s college basketball influences women coaches and players’ intentions. Likewise, men acknowledging the “glass wall” influence their hiring decisions in that, they know institutional norms are for men to hire men to work in men’s college basketball. Finally, society has grown to expect only men
to coach in men’s college basketball. They too know that this “glass wall” exists. Therefore, stereotypes serve as tools used by society to justify the current institutional system of disadvantaging women in men’s college basketball. Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3 are visual depictions of the embedded and cyclical nature of this multilevel model and its unique contribution to the literature.

Another significance of this study is that it contributes to the sparse body of literature examining women working in the male dominated sport workplace. Little research has examined women coaching in men’s college basketball. Therefore, this dissertation not only investigates the perceptions of male coaches, but also men and women’s college basketball players. This dissertation adds to the work of Walker and Bopp (2011) and Walker et al. (2011) by adding the perceptions of men and women’s college basketball players, as well as men’s basketball coaches. The literature now has a more complete view from the majority of the stakeholders in college basketball. By applying a multilevel framework, I was able to examine both qualitative and quantitative methods to examining this phenomenon. As a result, both data that may be generalizable to broader scopes of society, as well as data that is unique to this sample and institution were produced from this research. The relationship of the social cognitive career theory variables need to be tested in other environments in which participants express high self-efficacy and support, but outcome expectations, intentions and interest remain low. This result adds significantly to the body of literature on social cognitive career theory, in that these results contradict previous sport studies using social cognitive career theory (Cunningham et al., 2003; Cunningham et al., 2007).
Finally, this research contributes to institutional theories. As suggested in study 1 institutional theories such as system justification theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994) and social dominance theory (Sidanius, Levin, Frederico, & Pratto, 2001) suggest that institutional norms are established over the span of an organization’s existence and become organizational justifications for the way said organization operates. Regardless of how unfair the norms may be, the institution finds a way to justify their norms and rituals. As stated before, although women are nonexistent in men’s basketball, they were comfortable of their perceived dominance in women’s basketball. Likewise, although men are aware that a double standard exists and women have unequal opportunities and access to positions in men’s college basketball, they too justify this norm by suggesting that women may not have the intentions or desire to coach in men’s college basketball. Regardless of how men and women coaches may justify this organizational double standard for men and women in men’s college basketball, the presence of this phenomenon has influence on societal norms and progression. Coakley (2009) has posed the question of whether society mirrors sport or sport mirrors society. Regardless of your opinion, with the likes of figures such as Jackie Robinson and Arthur Ashe, it would be naïve to not understand the influence sport has on social justice and civil rights movements in this country and globally. Therefore, this research is significant in exposing an institution of inequity that many have come to accept.

Although, I have only discussed theoretical contributions, this research has implications related to practitioners. To begin, results from all three studies suggest that both male and female players, as well as men’s basketball coaches believe that women have the ability to coach men’s college basketball. Society expects to see men coaching
women. Coaching associations and the NCAA could help circumvent gender bias in leadership positions by combining national conferences for men’s and women’s college basketball coaches. Intergroup contact hypothesis suggest that under controlled circumstances, where women and men can work together on equal status, toward a common goal, cooperative circumstances, and under the guidance and support of the NCAA, then many norms which discriminate or are prejudice against women, are lessened over time (Allport, 1954). Therefore, giving men and women coaches an environment where they can socialize and interact at a NCAA sanctioned event, would be beneficial to breaking down stereotypes and institutional norms that disadvantage women. Also, currently the women’s and men’s final four tournament is typically held in different cities. If the NCAA held these national tournaments in the same city, then women and men basketball coaches would have more opportunities to network and socialize together. Networking and socializing in a professional environment may add to the acceptance of women and men working together as leaders in sport.

Limitations and Future Research

Although results of this study are significant and make several contributions to literature, there are limitations. First, my personal bias cannot be accounted for or removed in the developing of qualitative items, as well as collecting and analyzing data. Although I did attempt to bracket my opinions and personal biases, it would be irresponsible to believe that the qualitative research in this study was completely objective and free of bias. My experience as a NCAA Division I basketball player, coach, and fan may make me an expert, but also may bias my interpretation. Nonetheless, it must be acknowledged. Second, only NCAA Division I athletes and coaches were sampled. With the exception of the Olympic Games, NCAA Division I is
the most competitive amateur athletic league in America. Therefore, examining less competitive leagues, in which players and coaches may see more women in non-traditional roles, may offer a different understanding into this phenomenon. Finally, although the sample sizes used in this dissertation met minimal requirements necessary for sample size assumptions, a larger and more inclusive sample size certainly would add to the notion of generalizing results.

Future research should apply social cognitive career theory to other male dominated sport workplaces. The results of this study in which women expressed high self-efficacy and support, but low intentions, suggest barriers should be tested as a moderator on the effect of self-efficacy on outcome expectations, intentions, and interest in similar settings. Also, comparing structural models on social cognitive career theory by sex could add insight to gender differences. The moderating effects of variables such as personality, career goal orientation, athletic achievement, and family structure (e.g., having a male figure in the home) may also add interesting discussion to this topic. In examining intentions further, it may be worthwhile for future research to explore which variables amongst the situational, societal/environmental, personal, and barriers become the most significant predictors of future intentions to coach men's teams. Interviewing athletic directors could prove instrumental in furthering the research on women working in men’s college basketball as well. Many of the coaches in study 1 expressed that if they did hire a woman as an assistant coach and had a losing season, their athletic director may believe they were not taking their job seriously due to them hiring a candidate outside of the organizational norms. Interviewing athletic directors
may lend insight into the amount of support coaches receive in hiring women into the organization of men’s college basketball.
APPENDIX: TABLES, FIGURES AND INSTRUMENTS

Figure A-1. Social Cognitive Career Theory Model.

Figure A-2. Pictorial depiction of the multilevel perspective
Figure A-3. Variables tested for their influence in the underrepresentation of women in men's college basketball.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>Jake</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>35 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Ricky</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Atlantic 10</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Big 12</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>24 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Garth</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Atlantic-Sun</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Atlantic-Sun</td>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pac-10</td>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A-2. Results from Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Men M</th>
<th>Men SD</th>
<th>Women M</th>
<th>Women SD</th>
<th>Overall M</th>
<th>Overall SD</th>
<th>Men M</th>
<th>Men SD</th>
<th>Women M</th>
<th>Women SD</th>
<th>Total M</th>
<th>Total SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATW</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means and standard deviations for attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball (ATW).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$M$</td>
<td>$SD$</td>
<td>$M$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-efficacy</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome expectations</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice goals</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY 1: INSTRUMENT

Interview Guide

Title: Hegemonic masculinity and the institutionalized bias of women in men’s collegiate basketball: What do men think?

Research Purpose: To examine the perceptions of men’s college basketball coaches and players on the concept of women coaching men’s college basketball.

Research Questions: What are male collegiate coaches and players attitudes toward women coaching men’s collegiate basketball? How do they describe their knowledge and interpretation as to why there is a lack of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball?

Interview Questions:
1. Describe your perception of the role of women in collegiate sports?
   a. PROBES: Do women have a dominate role? Passive role? Active role?

2. Describe the “phenomenon” which is the lack of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball.
   a. PROBES: Is there a lack of interest by women? Lack of social acceptance? Lack of role models for women in men’s collegiate basketball? Presence of discrimination? Are women’s and men’s basketball different sports? If so, how?

3. How would having a woman as a men’s basketball coach affect a coaching staff? Players?
   a. PROBES: Positive outcomes? Negative outcomes?

4. Can you describe any barriers to women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball? If so, name and describe some barriers to women that inhibit them from coaching in men’s collegiate basketball. If not, how would you explain the lack of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball?

5. Describe the presence or non-presence of discrepancies, inequalities, discrimination that may hinder women from coaching in men’s collegiate basketball. (Types of discrimination: access, occupational, treatment, implicit/explicit) of women in collegiate basketball?
   a. PROBES: More Specifically women’s collegiate basketball? Men’s collegiate basketball?
6. Would you ever consider hiring or coaching with a woman as a men’s college basketball coach? Why or why not? Are their advantages/disadvantages to having a woman coach on a men’s collegiate basketball team? If so, what are they?

7. Explain your knowledge of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball?
   a. PROBES: Do you know of any women who have coached men’s basketball? Have you ever coached with a female men’s college basketball coach? If so, what is your perception of your/their experiences in general?

8. What is your perception of women coaching in men’s sports? Specifically men’s collegiate basketball?
   a. PROBES: Are women welcomed, recruited or encouraged to coach men’s collegiate basketball? Are women allowed to participate in practices, summer skill camps, team camps, internships?

9. Do you think there will ever be an increase of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball? Why or why not?
   a. PROBES: Disadvantages? Access discrimination?

10. What is the cause for the double-standard in collegiate basketball today (women having less/non-existent access to men’s college basketball coaching positions, while men have open access to coaching positions in women’s college basketball)?

11. Do you believe that this phenomenon is a problem? If so, describe why? If not, describe why not? Is there anything that you think could be done to help promote the acceptance, recruitment, and promotion of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball? If so, what? If not, why? Do you have anything else you would like to add to this conversation? Is there any other topic area that you would like to discuss?
Recruitment Letter

Hello,

The purpose of this email is to request your participation in my research study, which serves examine gender differences and perceptions towards women coaching in men’s college basketball.

My name is Nefertiti Walker and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management at the University of Florida. I work under the advising of Dr. Michael Sagas, Chair of the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Sport Management. My research interest is in women working in male dominated sport workplaces and organizations. More specifically and at the heart of this research is to understand gender dynamics in men’s collegiate basketball.

As a former collegiate basketball player and a professional basketball prospect, the concentration of my interest lies in basketball. Having been deeply entrenched in basketball at all levels for the past 15 years, I have seen the best and worst of the sport I cherish. Although there are many men coaching in women’s collegiate basketball, women are almost nonexistent in men’s collegiate basketball. From the age of 11 until I was 18, I was coached by a male women’s basketball coach, who served as a father figure to many of my teammates. This being said, I have an added interest in discovering gender dynamics in men's and women’s college basketball.

Here are some statistics from the 2007-08 NCAA Race and Gender Demographics Report:

Let’s take a look at the head coaches’ discrepancies:
- In women’s collegiate basketball 57.4% of the head coaches were women; 42.5% were men.
- In men’s collegiate basketball 0% of the head coaches were women; 100% were men.

Let’s take a look at the assistant coaches’ discrepancies:
- In women’s collegiate basketball 65.8% of the assistant coaches were women; 34.2% were men.
- In men’s collegiate basketball 0.1% of assistant coaches were women; 99.9% were men.

The implications of this research is to gain insight into gender dynamics in collegiate basketball specifically, and sports in general.

Your participation will include a 30 minute interview at the location of your choice or by phone. There is the possibility of a short follow-up interview, but this is highly doubted. Your identity will be anonymous to anyone except the researchers and you will be known exclusively by use of pseudonyms.
The subject area of the questions will be as follows: your perception of women coaching men’s collegiate basketball and any other thoughts or feelings you would like to provide to add to the research.

I chose you to participate in this research because I believe that the voice of those most intimately connected to this topic area needs to be heard. I believe that you are most knowledgeable in the content of my research and your expertise is needed to add to the literature and knowledge of this phenomenon. Your time and contribution is not only needed for the study of this topic, but appreciated and valued. Please know that your voice is important to providing knowledgeable research on this topic. If you are willing to be a participant, please respond to this email at your earliest convenience for more information. Thank you for your time and I look forward to working with you very soon!
Informed Consent

Protocol Title: Hegemonic masculinity and the institutionalized bias of women in men’s collegiate basketball: What do men think?

Please read this content document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of this research study: To describe through the perceptions of male collegiate coaches as to why there is a lack of women coaching in men’s collegiate basketball.

What you will be asked to do in the study: You will be asked to answer and discuss 11 interview questions. The interview will be audio recorded and the recording will be confidentially archived. You may also be asked to respond via email to a list of 5-11 open-ended questions.

Time required: 20-60 minutes.

Risks and benefits: No more than minimal risk. There is no direct benefit to the participant in this research.

Compensation: There is no compensation for participating in the study.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. The names of the participants will not be used in any research reports or presentations.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequences. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to answer.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study:

Nefertiti Walker
FLG Room 300
PO Box 118208
Gainesville, FL 32611
nefertitiwalker@ufl.edu
352-392-4042 x1392

Dr. Michael Sagas
FLG Room 300
PO Box 118208
Gainesville, FL 32611
msagas@hhp.ufl.edu
352-392-4042 x1415

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study:
UFIRB Office, PO Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250 Tel.
352-392-0433
I have read the procedure outlined above. I voluntarily agree to participate in the study and have received a copy of this description.

If you agree to participate in this research study and agree to the terms above, please respond to this email to schedule an interview appointment, as a confirmation of your consent.
STUDY 2: INSTRUMENT

Study 2: Qualitative Items

1. What is your attitude toward women coaching in men’s college basketball? Should women coach in men’s college basketball? Why or why not?

Study 3: Qualitative Questions (For Future Studies)

1. Have you ever considered pursuing a college coaching career following graduation? Does it matter if it’s women or men’s basketball? If so, why?
   a. Career goal orientation can be used as a moderator for all variables used in this study.

2. What would be some of the factors that would make you want to be a men’s college basketball coach?

3. Do you anticipate any barriers in being a men’s college basketball coach? If yes, how do you plan to overcome those barriers?

4. How much discrimination do you think you would encounter in trying to be a men’s college basketball coach? Why?

5. What are some of the outcomes you would expect if you were to become a men’s college basketball coach? That is, what would it mean for you, personally, to be a men’s college basketball coach?
### Table 1

The following questions focus on activities college basketball coaches for men's teams would perform. Please rate the level of confidence you have that you could complete these tasks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Confidence</th>
<th>Complete Confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Resist the interference by parents, alumni, and other groups.
2. Accurately assess the abilities of your players.
3. Change coaching strategies if they did not work.
4. Select the players best suited for your strategies.
5. Identify individuals and groups who can help your program or team.
7. Modify your strategies according to the strengths and weaknesses of your opponent.
8. Determine your coaching strengths.
9. Make intelligent coaching choices.
Table 2

Please respond to the following items concerned with the outcomes you might expect from being a men’s college basketball coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Becoming a men’s college basketball coach will mean high status.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will earn a high salary by becoming a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would have a meaningful career if I were to coach men’s college basketball.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would earn approval from others if I became a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People close to me think I should become a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would have the social support needed to become a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Becoming a men’s college basketball coach would be very satisfying to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My career satisfaction would be high if I became a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Becoming a men’s college basketball coach is important for me to feel complete as a person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Please respond to the following items concerned with the factors that might influence your decision to become a men’s college basketball coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>People of my gender have a hard time obtaining a men’s college basketball coaching position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>It would be difficult for society to accept people with the same gender as myself in a men’s college basketball coaching position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I anticipate having a hard time obtaining a men’s college basketball coaching position because of my gender.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Gender discrimination would make it hard for me to be a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There is a lack of opportunities to become a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>It would be hard for me to become a men’s college basketball coach because there are so few positions available.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I have the experience needed to become a college men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I have all the training needed to become a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I have sufficient contacts to help me become a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I have a large enough network of contacts to make becoming a men’s college basketball coach possible.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel I know enough people in the field to secure a men’s college basketball coaching position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

Please respond to the following items concerning your interest in becoming a men’s college basketball college coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Becoming a men’s college basketball coach is something that really interests me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have thought about becoming a men’s college basketball coach in the past.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I really have no interest in becoming a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Please respond to the following items concerning your interest in becoming a men’s college basketball college coach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I intend to become a men’s college basketball coach following graduation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I will try to pursue men’s college basketball coaching sometime during my career.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have no plans on becoming a men’s college basketball coach.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Please respond to the following items concerning your attitude towards women coaching in men’s college basketball.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe women should coach in men’s college basketball.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would play for a woman coaching in men’s college basketball.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Men’s college basketball is a viable coaching career for women.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Women should not have access to coaching positions in men’s college basketball.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

Please tell us the sex of your previous coaches and athletic directors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sex of the current men’s basketball head coach at your college or university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex of the current women’s basketball head coach at your college or university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex of the current athletic director at your college or university.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sex of the high school women’s basketball coach at your previous high school or prep school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sex of the high school men’s basketball coach at your previous high school or prep school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sex of the high school athletic director at your previous high school or prep school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics: Please tell us a bit about yourself

Sport: Men’s basketball_______ Women’s basketball_______

Sex:  Male _____  Female _____

Race: African American _____  Asian _____  Caucasian _____
      Hispanic _____  Native American _____  Other _____

Age: _____ years

Major:  _______________________________________________________________________

Sex of Head Coach: Male _____  Female _____

Race of Head Coach:  African American _____  Asian _____  Caucasian _____
      Hispanic _____  Native American _____  Other _____

Sex of Position Coach: Male _____  Female _____

Race of Position Coach:  African American _____  Asian _____  Caucasian _____
      Hispanic _____  Native American _____  Other _____

Thank you for your participation!!
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