

PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER IN COLLEGIATE COACHING:
HOW MEN'S AND WOMEN'S EXPERIENCES ARE DIFFERENT

A Thesis
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Christie Mikyla Chappell

In Partial Fulfillment
of
the Requirements for the
Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Department:
Sociology

March 2012

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

PERCEPTIONS OF GENDER IN COLLEGIATE COACHING: HOW MENS

AND WOMENS EXPERIENCES ARE DIFFERENT

By

CHRISTIE MIKYLA CHAPPELL

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this *disquisition* complies with North Dakota State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

DR. CHRISTINA WEBER

Chair

DR. CHRIS WHITSEL

DR. PAM HANSEN

DR. JOY SATHER-WAGSTAFF

Approved:

MARCH 23RD 2012

Date

DR. GARY GOREHAM

Department Chair

ABSTRACT

The number of men in collegiate coaching, in comparison to women, is overwhelmingly unbalanced. The accessibility men have to the profession of collegiate coaching at a high level in comparison to women's greatly affects women's ability to achieve similar jobs. The ease at which men attain jobs coaching both genders is perpetuated through the desire to maintain collegiate athletics as a male dominated profession. The women's perspective broadens the profession itself and helps to break down the societal roles that have been assigned to women. The lack of women in collegiate coaching discourages other women from entering the profession and the women did not feel supported, accepted, or welcomed as collegiate coaches. The results also show a combination of feeling scrutinized because of their gender, and pressure to prove themselves as valuable members of the profession, which led the women interviewed to question if they should continue to coach.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a thesis has been a mental and emotional growing process for me as an individual. Without the help of many people in my life I do not think I would have had the strength or courage to have completed this project. I want to thank my committee members Dr. Joy Sather-Wagstaff, Dr. Chris Whitsel and Dr. Pam Hansen for giving their time and energy to make this thesis possible. My advisor and chair of my committee Dr. Christina Weber, has been with me for four years as a graduate student. I will be forever grateful to her for giving me a sociological perspective and for teaching me to see beyond what is merely on the surface. I want to thank her for her patience, persistence, and everlasting compassion she has given me ever since I have known her. Christina, thank you for being conscious of how connected I am to the material and for being constructively critical, without that I truly do not think I would have had the bravery to write this. Lastly and most importantly I want to thank my partner, PB. Thank you for the time and love you have dedicated to listening to me, reading my papers and squashing my fears. More than anything, thank-you for your brilliant intellect that has pushed me to be a better writer and critical thinker. This project would not have been possible for me without the support of these individuals.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	6
Title IX Helpful and Harmful.....	6
Althusser’s Ideological State Apparatus: Application to Athletic Institutions.....	8
Bourdieu’s Habitus and Athletics.....	11
Doing Gender: Perceptions of Women in Athletics.....	12
Hegemonic Masculinity and Athletics as an ISA.....	15
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY.....	18
Participants.....	18
Data Collection.....	19
Analysis Procedures.....	20
CHAPTER 4. MEN AND WOMEN IN COMPARISON.....	23
Morgan.....	27
Danielle.....	28
Aubrey.....	28
Laura.....	29
Michelle.....	30
Abbey.....	31
Holly.....	31

Craig.....	32
Rob.....	33
Ricky.....	33
Jake.....	34
Ryan.....	35
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS.....	37
The Institution of Collegiate Athletics: Qualifications Are All About Who You Know.....	38
Losing Sight of the Institution: If Women Wanted to Coach, They Would.....	48
Role Models and the Value of Women Coaches.....	52
How do you Manage Being a Good Mother and a Coach.....	55
Recognizing their Place: Resignation and Resistance within Collegiate Athletics.....	59
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION.....	65
REFERENCES CITED.....	68
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE.....	72
APPENDIX B. TITLE IX.....	75
APPENDIX C. PERSONAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE.....	101
APPENDIX D. IRB LETTER.....	102

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Percentages of Female Head Coaches.....	4
2. Women Coaches.....	24
3. Men Coaches.....	25

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The motive behind this thesis project originally started because I am a collegiate coach. I have been coaching since I was 16, at the youth level, and have progressed to make it my profession at the collegiate level. When I accepted a collegiate coaching job in Fargo four years ago, I decided to get involved with a local youth soccer club and was assigned a boys' team. I experienced surprise from parents of my players, fellow coaches at tournaments, and the players themselves because I am a woman coaching a boys' team. It was not until this experience I started to become curious about how my gender might affect my chosen profession of coaching.

As I was searching for literature on gender in coaching, I found a compelling example about a woman who was treated differently because of her gender, Marianne Stanley the women's basketball coach at University of Southern California (USC). In 1993, she had a very successful year with a record of 22 wins and seven losses which earned her the Coach of the Year award. She was expecting a salary increase because of her continuous success and previous discussions with her athletic director. In Michael Messner's (2002) interview with her he learned that she was hoping for a salary increase that was closer to the USC men's basketball coach George Raveling, whose salary was almost double that of Stanley (p.64). However, the offer was far below her expectations. Stanley tried to negotiate for a higher increase, but it ended up backfiring and she was replaced. She filed a Title IX suit against USC and lost. Title IX is a piece of legislation that was enacted in 1972 to give equal opportunities to men and women and will be explained in detail in the following chapters. George Raveling's overall record at USC was 115-118 (wins-losses) and his career coaching record was 326-292 with no national championships. Messner (2002) stated in contrast, Stanley's record at USC was 71-46, and her career record was an impressive 347-146, with three national championships (p.64). She had

proven her ability to lead the team to a successful season year after year. However, Coach Stanley still could not surpass or equal the salary of the men's coach.

Messner (2002) also learned that the men's basketball coach apparently had more experience and qualifications than Stanley, which meant that his salary was always going to be higher than hers (p.65). Raveling might have had more experience and qualifications than Stanley, but she had built a successful *women's* basketball program. At what point does her success become enough to at least equal or surpass experience and qualifications? The athletic administration used experience and qualifications as an excuse. No matter how well Stanley did with her women's basketball team, she was never going to be paid as much as the men's coach. The inequities were profound between two people in essentially the same position with the only difference being their genders and that of the athletes they coached. This is one of many discouraging examples of challenges women experience in the profession of coaching. In this study, I explore what other challenges women face when they choose to pursue a career in coaching, specifically in college athletics.

Football, baseball, hockey, basketball and soccer are all sports that have national professional leagues for men in the United States. Of those five sports there is one professional league for women athletes, basketball. In fact, two of these sports (football and baseball) are not common sports to see women playing at all. Women are not as generally visible in the athletic realm as men. If we are not seeing women athletes playing these sports, then we are unlikely to see them coaching, which explains why I experienced surprise from people who saw me coaching a men's team. The lack of visibility of women in sports, being an athlete or a coach, keeps women out of the forefront of people's mind. When people do see women in this role, they are startled because it is unexpected. Without more women in coaching, the reaction to women

in coaching will continue to be that of surprise and rather than acceptance. Since men are so visible in athletics people are not surprised when they see men dominating as athletes, coaches, managers, CEO's etc. The visibility reinforces that men belong in the athletics industry; this is mirrored in college athletics, helping to reinforce men's positions but not women's as coaches.

Table 1 below demonstrates how the percentages of women coaches in collegiate athletics have changed dramatically since Title IX's inception in 1972. Carpenter and Acosta's (2010) study shows the advancement of women in athletics that resulted from Title IX hitting a glass ceiling in the area of coaching as "20.9% of intercollegiate athletics teams have a female head coach. Another way to say the same thing is to say that 79.1% of ALL intercollegiate teams are coached by males" (p.18). It is shocking to see how drastically the percentages of women head coaches has declined since Title IX and how low the percentage is now compared to how high it used to be prior to Title IX.

Table 1: Percentages of Female Head Coaches

Percentage of Female Head Coaches Coaching Female Teams (All Divisions All Sports)			
2010	42.60%	1991	47.70%
2008	42.80%	1990	47.30%
2006	42.40%	1989	47.70%
2004	44.10%	1988	48.30%
2003	44.00%	1987	48.80%
2002	44.00%	1986	50.60%
2001	44.70%	1985	50.70%
2000	45.60%	1984	53.80%
1999	46.30%	1983	56.20%
1998	47.40%	1982	52.40%
1997	47.40%	1981	54.60%
1996	47.70%	1980	54.20%
1995	48.30%	1979	56.10%
1994	49.40%	1978	58.20%
1993	48.10%	1972	90.00%
1992	48.30%		

*Carpenter et al., 2010:18

When I looked at this chart for the first time, I was stunned to see that in 1972 the percentage of women head coaches was 90% and in 2010 it was 42.6%. That is a drop of 47.4% in woman

head coaches. It was this chart, my personal experiences, and the theoretical concepts of Louis Althusser (1971) and Pierre Bourdieu (1992) which help me formulate my research questions:

1. What are the perceptions of women coaches in the ideological state apparatus (ISA) of college athletics?
 - a. How do these perceptions affect women's position in college athletics?
2. How does gender impact the habitus of women and men coaches?

The next chapter contains the literature review which will include an explanation of the history of Title IX as well as the theoretical concepts and framework that I utilized throughout this project. In the methodology section, I detail the process of data collection and my use of qualitative interviewing for the 12 coaches in this study. An in-depth description of each coach will be found in the chapter following the methodology. Finally, the analysis section will break down the five themes that emerged as being the answers to the research questions. After all the research and the interviews that I have done for this project I am no longer surprised at the numbers in the Table 1. In fact, it surprises me that the percentages are not lower for women because of all the barriers they face. This thesis project shines light on the lack of women in coaching and why women are valuable to the profession.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

To facilitate an understanding of how women coaches function within an institution such as athletics, I utilize the work of Louis Althusser (1971) and Pierre Bourdieu (1992) to shape the questions driving my research. In order to make sense of Table 1, I first discuss Title IX and how it has affected women athletes, and in turn, had a negative effect on women coaches. Using Althusser's concept of Institutional State Apparatus (ISA) helps explain how ideas are maintained within the institution. Collegiate athletics is a patriarchal institution preserved through inequities experienced by Marianne Stanley, and some of the women interviewed for this project. I used Pierre Bourdieu (1992), Judith Lorber (1994), and Raewyn Connell (1987) to explain how inequities are maintained through interpersonal interactions.

Title IX Helpful and Harmful

In 1972, the implementation of Title IX changed the face of women's athletics in the United States. The full Title IX document can be found in appendix B. There is no doubt it has helped women athletes, but the literature gathered does not show any advancement for women coaches. Ellen Staurowsky (2003) summarizes that Title IX represents a national commitment to end discrimination and establish a mandate to bring the excluded into the mainstream (p.1). Prior to this legislation, some colleges were offering athletic scholarships to women, but not nearly as many as were being offered to men athletes (Staurowsky, 2009, p.53). This change occurred four decades ago, meaning that it is time to see some of its benefits in the world of college athletics. Ellen Staurowsky's (2009) states Title IX "offers protection against sex discrimination for students participating in programs offered by educational institutions that receive federal financial support" (p.56). Title IX gives women athlete's relatively equal opportunities to men in college athletics. It is a public statement saying that men and women

should be treated equally. This is important because it has changed the structure of how the athletic institution treated gender. This major policy change does not only affect college athletics but also women's athletics at the high school and youth level. This change in policy meant an increase in the demand for coaches of women's teams.

Prior to Title IX women and girls were not playing sports at the same frequency as men, meaning that they did not get the experience and knowledge of playing first-hand. Men and boys who were playing and coaching sports logically had more experience coaching and playing than women. Men would be more qualified initially to coach than women simply because they had the experience and a higher number of candidates. The idea of how a coach becomes qualified is a major theme in the analysis section because there is a contention about the definition of what makes a coach qualified based on their gender. After Title IX there was an influx of women's teams, creating a demand for coaches for women's teams. However, there were not very many women with any experience or qualifications, so men were the logical option. Fielding-Lloyd and Meân found that before Title IX, there had been an attitude that coaching women was not as meaningful/prestigious as coaching men (p.33), which resulted in many women coaches of women's teams and very few men coaches of women's teams. However, this changed with Title IX and the attitudes toward coaching women began to be viewed as more desirable (Welch, 2007, p.1418). So although Title IX may have advanced women athletes, it actually negatively affected women coaches.

After four decades of Title IX and women having had the opportunity to play and gain the qualifications and experience that would help their coaching career, there are still many more men coaching than women, especially at the collegiate level. If more women are now qualified and experienced as a result of Title IX, then why are they not holding more jobs? Even though

women are playing the sports and able to gain experience and qualifications, they are still being questioned about their capabilities. The analysis section will talk about what makes a coach qualified and help to explain why the number of women coaches is still so low.

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) has been in existence since 1910 and women were added at the Division I, II and III level in 1980. In the years of collegiate athletics existence it has been dominated by men. Women entering the NCAA challenged the ideology that sports were for men. Title IX has helped to question this ideology of sports only being for men because institutions have had to demonstrate equality among men and women's athletics. The next section will talk about the structure of collegiate athletics and how ideas are maintained throughout it.

Althusser's Ideological State Apparatus: Application to Athletic Institutions

Certain perceptions of women coaches exist. However, the perceptions people have are not just created in that moment. How a person views a women coach is not just the product of that person's own thinking, but is the result of an idea that has been constructed by the world around them. An idea can be formed and manipulated by a personal experience, a story told over the cafeteria table, a strong role model sharing their view, parent's actions; basically anything has the ability to shape an idea. Ideologies are the conscious and unconscious meanings and values that people place on social phenomenon. These meanings deeply impact the way people understand the social world. Individuals may think their ideas are their own but in reality, individuals are influenced more than they realize by a given society's dominant ideology. This dominant ideology is created through social structures that help to perpetuate the maintenance of ideology through ideological structures. Louis Althusser's (1971) conceptual framework of a State Apparatus (SA) and an Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) are mechanisms that maintain the

ideology of the dominant group. These apparatuses are invisible structures but can be thought of like a building. They have been created by people in positions of power to use as ways of exerting and maintaining their power. The power is maintained by ideologies that are passed down from the SA into many ISA's. The structures enable there to be categories much like the rooms and floors of a building that keep people where they are supposed to be. Instead of using walls and floors the apparatus use ideologies to keep people in their place. This enables people in positions of power to remain at the top of the structure much like the penthouse of a building.

Althusser (1971) defines an ISA as “a certain number of realities which present themselves to the immediate observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions” (p.143). The collegiate athletic institution is an ISA. It is a structure that can reflect the ideology of the SA. The SA and ISA are deeply intertwined. Because the ISA of collegiate athletics is dominated by patriarchy, it makes sense that men are more likely to be in control and that women must often conform to the rules established by men. The SA is built on patriarchal beliefs that value masculine traits over feminine. ISA's such as athletics will reinforce these dominant values at the institutional level. The relationship between the SA and the ISA is like an umbrella. The ideas come from the SA and are absorbed by the ISA's that are beneath it. The relationship between the SA and ISA makes it hard for women to challenge the ideology and break professional barriers. It is incredibly hard to change an ideology that has been a part of the culture of the US for centuries. For Althusser (1971) the SA “has no meaning except as a function of State power” (p.140) and groups can harness the state power also hold the ability to utilize the apparatus to reinforce their ideological perspective (p.140). Patriarchy is maintained in the power structures of college athletics. Perceptions of gender preclude women from attaining coaching and leadership positions in university athletics. The lack of women coaches

does not come just from the people in power in the ISA (collegiate athletics in this case); that is, the idea that women are incapable of being competent coaches is not simply the result of individual decisions and prejudices. These decisions are linked to broader societal beliefs about gender.

Men do not face the same challenges that women face; thus, as Messner (2002) states “it is a clear sign of the continued structural asymmetries in sport that women coaches are almost never given the opportunity to break the sex bar that keeps coaching boys and men’s sports an almost entirely male occupation” (p.72). Not only are there few women coaches coaching women but there are even fewer women coaching men. Carpenter et al. (2010) study shows that there are “approximately 175 to 225 female head coaches of men’s teams. Conversely, there are almost 5200 male head coaches of women’s teams” (p.18). The ISA that is collegiate athletics creates barriers for women to coach women and men. Men have the power in the SA and men, as a group, have a vested interest in maintaining that power. As one man coach from Messner’s research (2009) said, “You got a boss, you’ve got a secretary and I think that’s where most of the opportunities for women to be active in sports is, as the secretary” (p.31). Here he is trying to reinforce his power in sport and show that people still hold the belief that women do not belong in coaching. Carpenter et al. (2010) shows men hold many powerful positions in athletic institutions as “13.2% of athletics programs have no females anywhere in their administrative structures” (p.37).

This overarching need for men, as a group, to keep their power and dominance in athletics maintains the structure of keeping women, as a group, out of it. The societal ideas of women are kept in place by smaller interactions and behaviors that unconsciously occur because

they are learned behaviors. Bourdieu's (1992) concept of habitus will help to understand how interactions and behaviors help to maintain ideologies and will be discussed next.

Bourdieu's Habitus and Athletics

In conjunction with Althusser's (1971) structured theory of State Apparatus and Ideological State Apparatus, Pierre Bourdieu (1992) provides a way to understand how these institutional forces impact individual behaviors. The ideologies that are being maintained through the structure of the ISA and SA are translated into everyday interactions and behaviors that Bourdieu (1992) refers to as "habitus": "To speak of habitus is to assert that the individual and even the persona, the subjective, is social, is collective" (p.126). Habitus is the concept of learning and enacting behaviors and mannerisms from our social environment. People have learned how to treat women coaches from the examples that they have seen, read, or heard about from other people. The people they are learning from received the same messages from someone else. These behaviors and mannerisms have endured over time. It is very hard to change the way people act toward women coaches because people are only repeating what they have seen as an acceptable way to behave. Bourdieu (1992) states that habitus is institutionalized deeply, and "the individual is always, whether he likes it or not, trapped, that is within the limits of the system of categories he owes to his upbringing and training" (p.126). Since the individual as Bourdieu states is trapped as being a product of his environment then it will be difficult for individuals to see why they should alter their behavior.

To a certain extent, the individual is limited to what they can change because they are bound to the environment they experience. For example, at a soccer camp, if the director has a woman take all the girls and has a man take all the boys, the director probably does not believe s/he is perpetuating an ideology. S/he is simply acting out a dominant way of socially organizing

people in the world. The concept of habitus does not include these actions (such as the soccer camp directors) as conscious decisions to exclude women from coaching men. Yet, they do set the stage for gender differentiation and valuation. If the soccer camp director were to look at other camps, recreational clubs, and collegiate athletics, s/he would not see as many women coaching men as they would see men coaching men or women. Consciously or not, the director is learning from what he or she sees. Habitus takes the form of practices and interactions that are repeated to maintain the ideology of men's dominance in athletics.

Doing Gender: Perceptions of Women in Athletics

Women are not typically the first gender that comes to mind when we imagine an athlete. Burton, Barr and Bruening (2009) state in their study that strong, authoritarian, aggressive, muscular are not words that are typically associated with women athletes as these traits are typically associated with men (p.417). When a woman does depict some of these typically masculine qualities, it is contradictory to how society views women. Messner (2009) notes that some "women coaches disrupt the gender regime and contribute to change in ways that go beyond their mere presence. Some see themselves as pioneers who are blazing a trail for other women" (p.89). These women are trying to change society's views of how women should look and behave.

Everyday people 'do gender' without even realizing it. It is such a routine behavior that it is hard for people to understand how they are gendering their activities. Lorber (1994) says that because "gender is so much the routine ground of everyday activities that questioning it's taken-for-granted assumptions and presuppositions is like thinking about whether the sun will come up" (p. 13). Lorber's analogy is a brilliant way to describe doing gender. It is not a

conscious thought - just like people do not consciously think of the sun coming up because they expect and know that it will.

Doing gender ties in with Bourdieu (1992) and his concept of habitus because it is the practice of doing mundane routine actions that perpetuates the differences in gender. Lorber (1994) theorizes that humans have created gender it “is a human invention, like language, kinship, religion, and technology; like them, gender organizes human social life in culturally patterned ways” (p.6). It is important to note here that gender is conceptualized as a social phenomenon; it is something that is socially constructed to categorize biological differences. I want to be clear that gender and sex are two different things. As Lorber (1994) states “gender and sex are not equivalent, and gender as a social construction does not flow automatically from genitalia and reproducing organs” (p.17). Sex is anatomical, whereas gender is the performance of the ideas, habits, behaviors and mannerisms of what we associate with sex. A person can have the anatomical body parts of a woman, but dress and live as a man. Society defines what is feminine and masculine, so it is very challenging if you choose to associate with a gender different than the anatomical body parts you are born with. Coaching within collegiate athletics is defined by society as a masculine profession, so for women to be accepted into a masculine dominated field, such as coaching, it challenges what is accepted for their gender.

It is hard for a woman to coach because she is in a profession that is viewed as having masculine characteristics. Some characteristics of a coach are to be vocal, demanding, aggressive and tough, not words that would typically be used to depict a woman. Since most people do not consciously think about ‘doing gender’ it is hard for people to understand that gender is constructed and reconstructed from interactions between people (Lorber, 1994, p.13). The language that is used to describe a women coach is gendered in itself. Messner (2009) gives

a great example in saying that “when the person holding the position is in the statistical minority we attach a modifier, such as male nurse, male secretary, woman judge, woman doctor. Or women head coach” (p.29). Why not just call her a coach? A person is ‘doing gender’ when they attach the word “woman” in front of a job that is typically not associated with her gender.

Along with the characteristics that society associates with how women should behave there are also societal norms that are tied to the biological make up of women. Women’s bodies are equipped to give birth and men’s are not, which in the coaching profession can be a blessing and a curse. Since women possess the capability to have children there is the expectation that she will and in order to create a family she will need a man. Although the societal norm is for women to need a man to give birth and have a family, however the definition of family is changing. The emergence of homosexual lifestyles in society creates difficulty for women in the coaching profession who identify as lesbian. In Pearlman’s (2010) article he shares that a head woman’s soccer coach was fired for telling her team that her partner was pregnant and they were expecting a baby (p.1). This example of how a lesbian coach was treated by being open and wanting to share very monumental news with her team. It does not inspire other coaches with the same lifestyle to be open. Being a lesbian coach presents its own set of challenges that are coupled with the above struggles a woman coach is already dealing with. Eng (2008) states that lesbian women are “linked to the myth of the mannish-women. She can be seen as unwomanly and unattractive. An informant living openly as lesbian could therefore be seen as threatening to the woman sport settings reputation and position as an attractive arena for proper women in general”(p.110). With all these informal rules of how a woman should be, whom they should date, what they should look like and what they should do make it feel like she can never do anything to meet these expectations or change the rules. This tends to keep women in the boxes

created by these rules and keep them out of man dominated professions as we will see below with the concept of hegemonic masculinity.

Hegemonic Masculinity and Athletics as an ISA

The concept of hegemonic masculinity helps me explain how athletics functions as a patriarchal institution. According to Connell (1987) hegemony means to have power or control over something and “‘hegemonic masculinity’ is always constructed in relation to various subordinated masculinities as well as in relation to women” (p.183). Hegemonic masculinity is a set of masculine characteristics that are socially revered and legitimate men’s power over women and other groups of men (Connell, 1987). Men, like women, have a set of characteristics assigned to them in terms of what it means to be a man, being powerful is one of them. As Brod and Kaufman (1994) argue,

...the hegemonic definition of manhood is a man in power, a man with power and a man of power. We equate manhood with being strong, successful, capable, reliable and in-control. The very definitions of manhood we have developed in our culture to maintain the power that some men have over other men and that men have over women (p.125).

The power that men have in the athletic institution comes from this desire to maintain power over other men and women. As Brod et al. (1994) state “everywhere we look we see the institutional expression of that power and national legislatures on the boards of directors of every major US Corporation or law firm, and in every school and hospital administration” (p.136).

The idea of what it means to be a man comes from the examples that we see around us. The SA is striving to keep masculine hegemony over some groups of men and all women. This ideology is built into the ISA’s that are controlled by it; the institution of athletics is one of these ISA’s.

In order to understand what is acceptable for a man, society has had to determine what is not acceptable for a man. Connell (2005) says, “women are central in many of the processes constructing masculinities—as mothers; as schoolmates; as girlfriends, sexual partners and wives; as works in the gender division of labor (p.848), the idea of what a woman should and should not be and do has been constructed by the ideologies’ of the people who are in control of the SA. Connell (1987) states “the conventional division of labor in working classes families in western cities assigns most childcare and housework to the wife-and-mother; and femininity is constructed in a way that defines the work of caring for other family members as womanly” (p.140) and the ideology that women should be a mother and a wife is still dominant today. It is hard to change ideology because it is so built into the SA and the ISA. It is built into those structures and reinforce through the habitus and how people do gender on a day to day basis.

A woman coach does not fit into the hegemonic masculinity and power relations within the ISA. Women coaching collegiate athletics threaten hegemonic masculinity because they create more competition and offer an alternative perspective on coaching. Women challenge something that has been *theirs* for a very long time and they do not want it to change. In contrast, as Connell (2005) states, “men can adopt hegemonic masculinity when it is desirable; but the same men can distance themselves strategically from hegemonic masculinity at other moments. Consequently, “masculinity” represents not a certain type of man but, a way that men position themselves through discursive practices” (p. 841). A man can tap into hegemonic masculinity through athletics.

The ideologies of the men in positions of power are being reinforced through the interactions of coaches which greatly affect a women’s position in collegiate coaching. The next chapter is the methodology section. It will explain the methods I used to collect my data and

how it was analyzed. This is followed by a descriptive chapter on the participants themselves and some of the similarities and differences they had. The chapters below will build upon the literature above and offer the participants perspectives and their experiences in the institution of collegiate athletics.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

The goals of this research were to find out the perceptions of women in the ideological state apparatus of college athletics, if those perceptions affect a woman's position and if gender impacts the habitus of men and women coaches. In order to get a rich and deep account of the perceptions of women coaches and how women experience college athletics, it was necessary to utilize qualitative interviewing. As Taylor and Bogdan (1998) state, qualitative data “produces descriptive data—people’s own written or spoken words and observable behavior” (p.3). Herbert and Irene Rubin (2005) exemplify the value of qualitative interviewing by saying, “if what you need to find out cannot be answered simply or briefly, if you anticipate that you may need to ask people to explain their answers or give examples or describe their experiences then you rely on in-depth interviews” (p.30). The following chapter discusses the participants, data collection and the analysis procedures.

Participants

Requirements for participation in the study included men and women who currently held a coaching position at a collegiate institution. My position as a coach and experiences in collegiate athletics as a coach for six years and an athlete four years prior to that allowed me to use the contacts I had made to find my participants. I used snowball sampling to get additional participants based on my connection with other coaches in the area. The 12 participants, seven women and five men, worked in three separate institutions in the upper Midwest region in collegiate athletic programs. At the time of the interview, they were employed at a collegiate athletic institution as a coach. Collegiate athletics for this study encompasses any university or college that is affiliated with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). Their titles

included head coach, associate head coach, assistant coach or graduate assistant which are included to show their position in the institution of collegiate athletics. More details about the participants will follow in the analysis section as well as in Appendix E.

Data Collection

Initial contact was made with coaches through an email that explained who I was and the purpose of the study. The rules and protocols set by the IRB were followed in order to respect the integrity and confidentiality of the participants and their experiences. The initial email included an attachment with the informed consent document (see Appendix D) that stated the purpose of the study, risks and benefits. All of the information in the email was also in the informed consent document but was reiterated in the body of the email. After receiving a response from the participant, a time and location were chosen at their convenience. I let the participant choose the location so that s/he would feel comfortable. All interviews were conducted in the participant's office with the exception of one that was conducted in a coffee shop of the participant's choice. Prior to the beginning of each interview, I handed the participant a hard copy of the informed consent document and asked if they had any questions. They were then asked to fill out a questionnaire (see Appendix C) with some background information on their coaching history.

I conducted in-depth interviews with participants utilizing a semi-structured interview schedule, which consisted of 23 open-ended questions (see Appendix A). This enabled me greater flexibility in the interviewing process as I simultaneously maintained consistency in key themes I wanted to cover in the interview as well as adapt to where the discussion naturally went. I share Taylor et al.'s (2005) sentiments that "asking everyone the same questions makes little sense in qualitative interviewing, an interview is a window on a time and a social world that is

experienced one person at a time, one incident at a time” (p.14). Qualitative interviewing allowed me to have the flexibility of adjusting questions during the interview which helped to paint an in-depth picture of the perceptions and experiences they had in coaching. The one question that was asked the same to every participant was a reaction to a quote stating the percentages of men’s head coaches in comparison to women’s head coaches. The interviews lasted between 30 minutes to 90 minutes. After the conclusion of each interview I left the recorder running to catch any of the additional discussion after asking the last question.

The interviews were conducted over a two month period. After each interview, I audibly took notes about my reactions and thoughts on the participant’s actions and answers. I wanted to create an environment where the participants felt that they were being heard, which is why I chose not to take notes during the interviews. Directly after each interview I listened to what I had recorded and took handwritten notes to begin my preliminary analysis. When I transcribed the interviews, I continued to add to this analysis. I transcribed all of the interviews prior to pulling out any themes or starting anything other than the preliminary analysis.

Analysis Procedures

There is a vast amount of data that could be pulled from each interview. Prior to beginning the analysis process it was necessary to review the literature. As I read each transcript for the second time I looked for any comments on structure, gender, power, behaviors and interactions, reinforcing dispositions and the interaction of the individual and the structure. I coded these comments as I went. Having these themes from the literature gave me some clarity and a place to start. The next step I took in the analysis was to put all the surface level data collected from the questionnaire conducted prior to the interview (see Appendix C) into an Excel spreadsheet which provided a visual comparison of their age, years of coaching experience,

relationship status, presence of a role model and gender of role model. I chose these categories because ideas are passed down through the ISA of collegiate athletics so it was important to establish some of these details to determine where the coaches were in their exposure to the profession. This allowed me to see some of the experiential differences between men and women and start to formulate themes based on gender.

After pulling out the surface level data and getting a grasp on each coach's background I was able to establish some major categories from the comments on structure and gender that I coded above. The major categories were: athletics, challenges, decision to coach, future, gendered comments, importance of gender, perceptions of woman coaches, qualified, reaction to percentages of head coaches quote, role model, style, success, and Title IX. The women had two additional categories that were: barriers to coaching boys and coaching boys. The men also had two additional categories that were: perceptions of men coaches and difference in coaching genders. This was the best way for me to start to answer my research questions was to pull out important direct quotations, similarities, differences, connections to the literature and contradictions. Specifically I was consciously thinking about gender and the way an individual was reacting to and within the structure of collegiate athletics

After identifying instances where references were made to gender and structure within these major categories I identified above I made a Word document for each. I then allowed myself the opportunity to free write about each of the major categories. From there I was able to develop a distinction between what was happening between the coach and the institution as well as what was going on between coaches. This led me to split the analysis into how the coach

navigates the institution and how the interactions between coaches reinforce ideologies which lead to women deciding not to continue coaching or not to enter the profession.

CHAPTER 4. MEN AND WOMEN IN COMPARISON

In order to be able to compare the experiences of the coaches themselves it is important to understand their background prior to being a coach as well as their current position within collegiate athletics. Their background and their position give a sense of the individual themselves as well as how they entered the ISA of collegiate athletics. It also shows how an individual's position can change within the structure depending upon several factors such as age, years of experience, relationship status. This chapter will give some background information about how each coach interacts with the structure of collegiate athletics as well as an introduction to the coaches.

Table 2 shows a picture of the women interviewed for this project and Table 3 the men. Age, sport, gender coached, years coaching, relationship status, position, role model, desire to coach men, collegiate playing experience are major categories that affect a coaches position within collegiate athletics. Following the tables there will be a discussion of each of the column headings showing the similarities and differences between the men and women.

Table 2: Women Coaches

Name	Age	Sport	Gender Coached	Years Coaching	Relationship Status	Position	Role Model	Desire to coach men
Morgan	30	Hockey	Women	5	Single	Assistant Coach	Yes-man	Yes
Danielle	30	Soccer	Women	9	Married	Head Coach	Yes-woman	Yes
Aubrey	23	Softball	Women	1	Engaged	Graduate Assistant	Yes-man	No
Laura	31	Softball	Women	8	Single	Associate Head Coach	No	No
Michelle	42	Basketball	Women	18	Single	Head Coach	Yes-Parents	Yes
Abbey	29	Volleyball	Women	7	Single	Assistant	Yes-All previous coaches	No
Holly	43	Basketball	Women	19	Single	Head Coach	Yes-man	No

Table 3: Men Coaches

Name	Age	Sport	Gender Coached	Years Coaching	Relationship Status	Position	Role Model	Desire to Coach men
Craig	41	Soccer	Women	15	In a Relationship	Associate Head Coach	Yes-man	Yes
Rob	40	Football	Men	18	Married with Kids	Head Coach	Yes-man	Yes
Ricky	32	Soccer	Women	5	Single	Head Coach	Yes-man	No
Jake	35	Volleyball	Women	13	In a relationship	Head Coach	Yes-man	No
Ryan	41	Golf	Men	8	Married with kids	Head Coach	Yes-man	Yes

The age of the coaches is important because it shows the position each coach is currently in and how long they have been coaching. The average age of women was 32.5 and the average age of men was 37. The years of experience show each coach's exposure to the profession. The average years of experience for women is 9.5 and for men 11.8. The gender the coaches' coach demonstrates the discrepancy between men coaching women and women not coaching men. All of the women coach women whereas only two of the men actually coach men. Relationship

status of the coaches is worthy of noting because it shows the difference between the men and women's personal life outside of coaching. Of the women interviewed five are single, one married and one engaged. Of the men interviewed two were married with kids, one single and two in a relationship.

The position each coach holds shows the level of power they have in the structure of collegiate athletics. The head coach holds the most powerful position within the team and is overseen by the athletic director. The associate head coach has the same position as the head coach but will vary dependent upon the amount of responsibility the head coach gives them. An assistant coach assists the program in whatever facets of the program the head coach assigns them to. A graduate assistant is attending graduate school which means that a tuition waiver is part of the position as well as a stipend. The head coach determines the amount of responsibility and time commitment for all positions but is governed by the athletic director. Of the women, three are head coaches, one is an associate head coach and one is a graduate assistant. Of the men, four are head coaches and one is an associate head coach.

Role models play a large part in many of the coaches' decisions to enter the profession as well as their development. Three of the women had men coaches as role models, one had a woman coach and the remaining three had a collaboration of people. Of the men interviewed all of them had men as role models. The desire to coach men exists for both men and women coaches. Three of the women expressed a desire to coach men and four did not. Of the men interviewed three wanted to coach men and two only wanted to coach women. Combining some of these categories together starts to highlight some of the differences between men and women as coaches. The age difference between the men and women in the study shows that the men have been able to make coaching a career. If we look at the age of the women as well as their

relationship status and years of experience we can see that they are not as established in the profession as the men. As I examine the interviews in more depth in the following chapter, I start to understand better how the institutional forces affect the lack of women's presence in collegiate coaching.

Morgan

Morgan is the associate head coach of a women's hockey team and has held the position for five years. Prior to this position she was an assistant at a high school for four years and following that she played hockey at the collegiate level for four years. She did not intend on making coaching a career but could not find a job in her undergraduate degree field. She was approached by a family friend who offered her the assistant job and has been coaching ever since. She grew up playing with boys and had men coaches throughout her youth hockey career, which she refers to as her role models. Her staff is comprised of two other men coaches. She finds the time commitment, disciplining the players, and the age of the athletes to be her biggest challenges. Her definition of success is having the kids graduate and being able to be a positive influence in their life. She has coached men at the youth level and has the desire to coach men at the collegiate level if the opportunity ever presented itself. She believes that hockey is still an old boys club and would be hard to break into. She believes that it is important to have positive women role models for women athletes but that disposition matters more than a coach's gender. Her role in the staff is to be a confidant/friend for the players. She is planning on staying in coaching either at her current job or as a head coach but is worried about the ability to have a family and have the lifestyle of being a coach.

Danielle

Danielle is the head coach of a women's soccer team and has held the position for four years. Prior to this position she was a head coach at a different institution for three years and a graduate assistant for two years. She played soccer at the collegiate level for four years. She did not intend on making coaching a career but could not play at the professional level overseas because of a career ending injury. Her former coach who is a woman and also her role model helped her make the decision to go into coaching. Her staff is comprised of one other woman graduate assistant. She finds player/staff management, maintaining the energy for each player and recruiting to be her biggest challenges. Her definition of success is if a player is giving their best effort along with getting results. She has coached men at the youth level and has the desire to coach men at that the collegiate level but feels that she would have to climb the ladder on the men's side to be given an opportunity. Since she is married and trying for a baby. She believes that it is important to have positive women role models for women athletes. She believes society places importance on gender in coaching but that it is not important. Athletics to her represents a way for people to learn informal and formal lessons as well as learning how to deal with ups and downs. She is unsure if she will continue coaching once her contract is up, it depends on her husband's income and if they can support a family on it.

Aubrey

Aubrey is the graduate assistant for a women's softball team. She has held the position for one year. Prior to the position she was playing at the collegiate level for four years. Her role model is her Dad who is also a coach and gave her the desire to go into coaching. Her staff is comprised of two other coaches a man head coach and a woman associate head coach. She finds being able to read players as well as balance their individual needs with the team needs to be

most challenging. She does not like the arrogance of men athletes and for this reason has never coached them and has no desire to do so. In regards to gender she feels that it is important to have balance within a staff meaning that a staff should not be all men or all women. She believes that men balance out the emotions of women coaches and help with being able to discipline players. She views herself, as well as her women colleague as sensitive and tough. It does not surprise her that men dominate the coaching profession because in society men are in control most of the time. Because of the women's position in society she thinks athletic directors have a hard time thinking women are capable of that kind of job. She believes that the better and more successful teams have a man as a head coach. She is undecided in if she wants to continue coaching as a career because of the schedule.

Laura

Laura is the associate head coach for a women's softball team. She has held the position for six years. Prior to the position she was a graduate assistant for two and a player before that for four. She does not have a role model and knew at a young age that she wanted to coach. Her staff is comprised of two other coaches a men head coach and a woman graduate assistant. She finds dealing with different personalities to be the most challenging. She defines success as making the players better at their sport and in life. She has never coached men and doesn't have a desire to. She also feels she wouldn't know enough about baseball to be able to do it and does not enjoy how men are. She believes it is important to have a man and woman on staff because men and women see things differently. Her style is to be understanding but not soft. It does not surprise her that men dominate athletics because she feels the work force is dominated by men and women are a second class citizen so doesn't feel athletics would be any different. She does

not plan on staying in coaching because she is tired of the lifestyle and desires to have something else in her life other than work.

Michelle

Michelle is the head coach for a women's basketball team. She has held the position for 11 years. Prior to this position she was an assistant for five and a graduate assistant for two. She played for four years at the collegiate level. She feels that the profession chose her but she was given an opportunity to be a graduate assistant by an alumnus of her alma mater. She describes herself as disciplinarian and having high expectations on the court and in the classroom. Her parents are her role models because they taught her the meaning of hard work. She finds recruiting and the entitlement that parents give their children to be challenging. Her definition of success is having the players become better people but also not losing. She was asked to an assistant coach a men's collegiate team by the players themselves but she did not take it because she could not be both a head women's basketball coach and an assistant men's basketball coach at the same time. She believes she coaches more like a man but feels that in order to coach men's basketball she would need to recruit a certain type of man. She identifies as a lesbian and finds herself having to be very careful about the situations she puts herself in so nothing is misinterpreted. Athletics and coaching are her life but she strives to have more balance with her personal life. She is the only woman coach in her athletics department. If she were to quit her job the ratio of applicants would be 90% men's applying and she attributes this to women have opportunities to make money in other jobs and the responsibilities of being a mother. She cannot imagine doing anything other than coaching yet wants to have more of a personal life.

Abbey

Abbey is an assistant women's volleyball coach and has held the position for four years. Prior to that position that she was a graduate assistant for two years and a student assistant for one. She played for four years at the collegiate level. She went into coaching because she didn't want to get away from volleyball completely and also wanted to do graduate school. She describes herself as not overly positive, and not a yeller but technique orientated. Her role models are all the former coaches she has had and been able to take pieces she liked and did not like away from their coaching style. She finds the dynamic between her head coach and her to be the most challenging thing about coaching. Success for Abbey is the wins and losses as well as the players enjoying what they are doing. She coached men in high school track and field. The experience made her a better coach because she had to approach things differently with the men. She doesn't want to pursue coaching men at the collegiate level because women's volleyball is more prestigious and the job market is better. She believes that gender is a factor because men coaches automatically get more respect initially than women coaches but that it is more about the disposition of the coach. She plans to stay in coaching as long as she can maintain some balance in her life.

Holly

Holly is a head women's basketball coach and has held the position for two years. Prior to that position she was an associate head coach for one year and an assistant coach for 16. She played for four years at the collegiate level. She went into coaching instead of playing overseas or pursuing her PHD because she wanted to give back to the game. She describes herself as businesslike and task orientated. Her role model was a man high school coach. She finds players entitled attitude to be the most challenging thing about coaching. It is more common to

see players transferring out if they are not playing instead of working to earn a spot. She defines success as seeing kids growing over their time in her program. She has never coached a different gender to her own and doesn't wish to because she does not like the egos of men. She does not think gender is important in coaching but that players have a tendency to migrate towards a man or woman. She views athletics as an incredible life lesson. She is not surprised by the number of men coaches compared to women coaches because she thinks that it is the same in other professions. She plans on staying in coaching.

Craig

Craig is an associate women's soccer coach and has held that position for eight years. Prior to this position he was a head coach for two years and an assistant for five years. He played at the collegiate level for four years and at the professional level for eight years. He started coaching because one of his coaches asked if he wanted to be the goalie coach for his professional team. His role models were several of his man coaches he had when he was playing. He describes his style as allowing players to make mistakes but at the same time demanding focus so they get the skills right. Craig finds the schedule to be the most challenging part of coaching. He defines success by how good the players get by the senior year and if they filled the potential that he saw in them initially. Craig has coached men and women. He feels the difference between coaching both genders is that you must be harder on men because if they lose respect for you it is very hard to get it back where as women give their respect more often. He was coached by a woman in a licensing course and felt that she would have no problem coaching men because she had control over the session. He would consider coaching men again if an opportunity arose. He got into coaching women because the head coach he was working for asked him to be his assistant when he got a women's head coaching job. He was frustrated by

women's technical ability compared to men's and found that challenging when he initially started. He does not think gender is important in coaching but that it comes down to a person's ability to coach. Craig felt that the reason there are not more women coaches is because women are relatively new in athletics and that it would take time for them to be more established. He plans to stay in coaching as either a head coach or as a coach for a men's professional team.

Rob

Rob is the head coach of a men's football team and has held that position for nine years. Prior to this position he was an assistant coach for seven and a graduate assistant for two. He played collegiately for four years. He started coaching because when he was finished playing his coach asked him to stay on as a graduate assistant. He describes himself as a teacher. Rob finds the unpredictability of 18-21 year olds as well as technological advances to be most challenging. His role models were all the coaches he had growing up who were all men. He defines success as coming together as a team. He has never coached women and does not have a desire to. He believes that women could coach men's football but they are not interested in doing so. He does not believe gender is important in coaching but that it comes down to style and the ability to teach. Rob sees athletics as something our culture loves because of the competition aspect. He believes the lack of women coaches has a lot to do with women wanting to start a family. He plans to stay in coaching.

Ricky

Ricky is a head women's soccer coach and has held the position for one and a half years. Prior to that position he was an assistant for two years and a graduate assistant for two years. He played for four years in collegiate athletics. He got into coaching because he didn't have a lot of good coaches growing up and wanted to fill that need. His eighth grade man basketball coach

was his role model because he really cared about his players. He describes himself as a teacher of the game. Ricky finds it challenging to accept that his goals are not always going to match the administrations goals. He defines success as having a 3.0 cumulative GPA, being active in the community and having a winning season. The difference between men and women players are that women need to know that the coach cares about them where as men do not need that reassurance. He also said that men in general are more competitive than women and that women find the social aspect to be more important. He prefers coaching women because of the connection with the players. He does not plan to coach men again. He believes gender in coaching is only important at the highest professional level; that women would not be able to coach the men's national team. He attributes the lack of women coaches to them being more family orientated and that men are more willing to sacrifice time away from their family. Athletics is an opportunity for people from all walks of life to relate. Ricky plans on staying in coaching unless his family situation changes.

Jake

Jake is a head women's volleyball coach and has held the position for three years. Prior to that position he was a head coach for five, an assistant for three and a graduate assistant for two. He did not participate in collegiate athletics. He played men's volleyball as a club sport at a Canadian university. He got into coaching because he fell in love with it at a young age and has done it at various levels ever since. His role models are all the coaches he has had. He describes his style as process orientated. Jake finds the location, conference and matching the right group of kids together to be the most challenging aspect of coaching. His staff consists of himself and a women assistant. He defines success as how well the team works together. Jake has coached both men and women and prefers coaching women. He says women give you

problems and men give you attitude and problems. Jake feels that being a good coach is more important than the gender of the coach. Athletics is his life and feels it provides a valuable asset to a university. He attributes the lack of women coaches to the fact that women's athletics are relatively new but feels that there is an influx of women's interest in continuing in athletics as coaches because they now know it's an option. He plans on staying in coaching for the rest of his career.

Ryan

Ryan is a head men's golf coach that has held the position for 8 years. He was a counselor prior to this and played golf in junior college. He started coaching in college when they started a men's golf team and he had some experience playing and coaching high school golf. He describes himself as a counselor who puts a lot of responsibility on the student athlete. His role models were the man coaches he had growing up. Ryan finds having other responsibilities as an assistant athletic director to be the biggest challenge as a coach. He defines success as seeing a player move forward in some way either athletically or in the classroom. He also used to coach the women's golf team on campus for three years but then the responsibility was given to a different coach. He says the women's team was more emotional than coaching the men's team and that the women took criticism personally whereas the guys took it as just criticism. It wasn't a personal choice to stop coaching them it was logistical because both teams play in the same season but not at the same locations. He doesn't have a preference just that he wants to only coach one team. He does not think gender is important and stated that there are several women who coach the men's golf team in their conference. He thinks athletics is a very positive experience in any athlete's life. Since he is also an assistant athletic director he has been on many search committees and expressed that the number of women applicants is always

extremely low. He does not see himself coaching for that much longer because it takes away too much time from his family.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Women coaches have been fighting to find a place for themselves within collegiate athletics. As stated in the introduction Marianne Stanley lost her job as a successful women's basketball coach because she challenged the athletic administration to close the salary gap between hers and the men's head coach. The treatment of Marianne Stanley is an example of the difference in the way women and men are treated in collegiate athletics. Collegiate athletics is an Ideological State Apparatus (ISA) that through interactions and behaviors between the people within it maintains the patriarchal ideologies constituting the State Apparatus (SA). The women interviewed experienced the inequalities that exist between men and women coaches similarly to Marianne Stanley.

The questions that drove my research were: 1) what are the perceptions of women coaches in the ideological state apparatus (ISA) of college athletics and do these perceptions affect women's position in college athletics? And 2) Does gender impact the habitus of women and men coaches? The women coaches interviewed were set up for failure in collegiate athletics. The habitus of both the men and women coaches was directly influenced by the ideologies of the SA. The values and beliefs that reinforce the ideologies of the SA are ingrained in the structure of the ISA of collegiate athletics. The perceptions the coaches have of their gender as well as the opposing gender are shaped by the beliefs and values they have been taught throughout their life. For the women interviewed in this project, the outlook is intentionally bleak because the lack of women coaching men only reinforces men's dominance in college athletics. The men interviewed in this project, whether conscious of it or not, justified why women are not coaching in a variety of ways. The women interviewed tried to disassociate themselves from other women coaches because they did not want to be tied to the negative perceptions about women coaches.

As you will see in my analysis, there were clear differences in the way men and women talked about their careers in collegiate athletics. By first looking at the difference between these men and women's initial entry as a coach I am able to establish that the men in the study have a significant advantage. The advantage for the men allows them to surpass a woman who essentially has the same level of experience coaching. This advantage greatly enhances their career and formation of their habitus as a coach. In turn this puts the women in this study at a disadvantage. Secondly, I examine three beliefs that show how the ideologies from the SA are ingrained in the institutional structure of collegiate athletics. These include: the assumption that women as individuals are not interested in coaching, the influence of role models and lack of value placed on having women in coaching, the role family plays on being a coach and the affect the marginalization has on the women coaches. These beliefs, in turn, affect the perceptions of the women coaches in this study and formation of their habituses. The patriarchal message being spread through the structure of collegiate athletics negatively affects the perceptions of women coaches and formation of their habitus which in turn impacts their decision to coach.

The Institution of Collegiate Athletics: Qualifications Are All About Who You Know

As defined by Merriam Webster dictionary the word *qualified* means "fitted (as by training or experience) for a given purpose and having complied with the specific requirements or precedent conditions (as for an office or employment)" (Qualified, para. 1). The word itself is synonymous with words such as competent, eligible, capable, equal, suitable and able. Within the collegiate coaching world there are few requirements in a job posting. A typical posting on the NCAA website for a collegiate coaching job looks like this: Requirements: Bachelor's degree required. Successful playing and/or coaching experience required. Collegiate and/or professional playing experience and recruiting experience. Master's degree preferred (NCAA.org, 2010). The

language used in this posting is extremely vague. For example, what is *successful*? If someone played every single minute and won no games in their playing career it might be viewed as a success by that individual but not as a success by other people's definitions. In addition, *coaching experience required* is unclear. Could that be experience in coaching softball when the job they are applying for is a basketball job? Technically it is coaching experience. When an administration is looking to hire a coach they can choose adapt the definition for whomever they feel is most qualified. The lack of a common definition for being qualified as a coach only benefits the people in positions of power because they can manipulate it to hire whomever they choose. Since athletics have been and continues to be male dominated, men hold the powerful positions and have the power to determine who is most qualified. Having more women in coaching directly affects men coaches' position because it threatens their livelihood.

A coach can have many encounters with the institution of college athletics prior to actually getting a job as a coach. All of the coaches in this study except for one played at the collegiate level, so they have already developed a particular understanding of and relationship within the structure of college athletics. The coaches will have been influenced by the beliefs and ideas within the ISA by simply being a part of the institution as a player. However, being a player in collegiate athletics and being a coach are very different. Each coach was asked about what makes a coach qualified and there were a variety of definitions including personal characteristics a coach needs, professional licensing, playing experience and varying levels of coaching experience. For the men coaches their entry into the ISA as a coach was easier because of their ability to gain experience and qualifications based on who they knew. The women coaches had a more difficult time getting a job because they did not have connections and had to prove themselves before they got any kind of job. The definition of *qualified* from the coaches

interviewed was different depending on the gender of the coach. The women coaches felt they had to prove themselves as a coach even though they played at a high level whereas the men coaches automatically got respect as a coach from playing at a high level. This double standard is a problem because it reinforces the man's dominant position in athletics and keeps women on the outskirts.

Of the seven women interviewed, two of the women were approached about coaching high school and two at the collegiate level as student assistants for their first coaching job. The opportunities that were offered to the men were at much higher levels than were offered to the women even though all of the coaches were entering the institution as a coach for the first time. Of the five men coaches interviewed, three of them were *asked* to coach for their first job. The position was handed to them. Two of these jobs were at the collegiate level and one of them at the professional level. Ryan shares how he got his job as a head coach of the golf team, "when I was out here at the university, they wanted to start golf and I was already employed in the counseling area so I talked with the athletic director about that and I ended up, getting a position I guess." It was so easy for Ryan to get his first coaching job as a college head coach. Craig was finishing up a professional playing career and his entry into coaching came easily, "I just did some stuff, for money cuz the money was good and towards the end of my career one of the coaches came up to me and asked if I wanted to be their goalie coach, so it kinda worked that way, so even though I was doing some coaching in-between I never thought about making it my career, until that time." Being able to put collegiate and professional coaching experience on a resume looks very impressive especially for an entry-level coach. The qualifications and experience the coaches acquire will affect their ability to get a job as well as the type of job they are getting. The women, although they are still acquiring qualifications and experience,

coaching at a youth club or high school does not have the same weight as coaching professionally or collegiately which puts them at a disadvantage to that of a man entry level coach. At the start of the women's career as a collegiate coach they are already faced with a disadvantage in comparison to the men coaches.

The word qualified in the coaching world is different for almost every coach I asked. The vagueness of the word qualified in collegiate coaching institution allows it to be used to achieve the agenda of whoever is in charge of the hiring committee. The hiring committees are put together by the people in positions of power within the institution. Ricky, a women's soccer coach, had this to say about qualifications,

At regional camp we had discussions about young female coaches that are getting opportunity's that they weren't prepared for or that they weren't qualified for. This gives other women coaches a bad rap too. There was an older woman coach there and she's like, "I am a good coach. I have been doing this for a long time but that gives me a bad rap" and she's said if she was offered a coaching job at Notre Dame or... she wouldn't accept because she would want the experience of being an assistant or.... she works in a club. It's interesting how it's becoming like a black market band aided thing that you have to hire females at certain schools and I really think it's putting people in bad positions and not rewarding the right people.

Ricky is 32, which I would still consider young in coaching, and he has only been coaching for five years. Yet, he is a head coach of a women's team. His view has been affected by the values and beliefs shaping his habitus as a man in collegiate athletics. This includes a lack of respect for women in coaching, especially ones who are young.

His habitus also leaves him unable to recognize that he is a contradiction to what he is saying, because he is also young with limited experience coaching. Ricky's habitus has been affected by the ideas within the ISA that genders the term qualifications through the lens of playing (not coaching) experience. Ryan as well as Craig had zero coaching experience when they were hired into top quality coaching positions. When Ricky says that the schools are not rewarding the right people, it is important to understand that comment in relation to his position in the institution. He reinforces how the fuzziness of the term qualifications enables gender hierarchies to be maintained. He later goes on to say that he would have been the assistant at a Division I women's soccer program if the head coach did not have to hire a woman. His justifications come out of personal frustrations because he felt he was unfairly passed over as a Division I assistant because of his gender. To him this experience justifies how he already feels about young women coaches. He is clouded by his habitus and anger which he feels give him the right to generalize about all young women coaches not being qualified or experienced. If Ricky is comfortable enough to say these comments during our interview then he clearly feels supported and justified in these beliefs by the institution itself. He is fulfilling his role within the ISA by perpetuating the ideologies that have come from the State apparatus.

Abbey, an assistant volleyball coach, shared an experience about her discussions with other coaches about being qualified she said,

I was around a lot of male coaches at the time. Both of the assistants were male and the head coach was female, she's been coaching forever a very successful coach. And there would be a Division 1 head coach job and some girl would get the job. A female would get the job that doesn't have that much experience; she

only has a few years' experiences and stuff like that. They would be totally upset at the fact that that was happening. I get that and I get that that sucks but you are in a female sport so you can't fault people for wanting to hire a female. Now is she more qualified or not, I'm like, "you guys don't know that, you weren't in on the interviewing process," you know? And years of experience is the one thing that drives me crazy, cuz that doesn't equate to you being a good head coach.

Unlike Ricky, Abbey is able to articulate that when a young woman gets a coaching job it could be because she deserved it and not just because she is a woman. From the experiences the women interviewed shared, when a woman gets a coaching job it is common for her to be ridiculed and questioned about the legitimacy of her qualifications to coach. The reinforcement of the patriarchal ideology that a young woman coach is not experienced or qualified emerges from an ISA that relies on reinforcement through micro level conversations like the one Abbey had and comments that Ricky made. Ryan and Craig were young coaches and they held high positions as coaches at a young age and did not experience the ridicule and doubt that the young women in Ricky's and Abbey's comments automatically received. It is perfectly acceptable for the young men to get high-level coaching jobs without much the same level of critique of their qualifications as the women Abbey referred to experienced. The difference in the treatment of these coaches is largely based upon their gender and that is because the ISA of college athletics normalizes the image of men as coaches, making it challenging for women to gain acceptance as a coach. The habitus of the coaches is shaped by the patriarchal ideologies within college athletics and by the interactions that are happening between coaches, which reinforce the SA's ideas about gender relations.

From Woitalla's (2011) interview with Miriam Hickey (2011), former Netherlands youth national team coach says "you've gotta have been a pretty good player because we want to make sure they can show the skills" (p.3) when she is looking to hire a coach. Playing experience is often equated to being a good coach because it shows your knowledge of the game to be very high and your skills to be well developed. None of the women interviewed had any professional playing experience. For most women who play sports, college is the highest level they will ever reach. There are very few professional opportunities for women in the United States or even in other countries. Holly, a head women's basketball coach, "had aspirations of playing on at that time you could only play internationally, none of those really came to fruition so I went the academic route." As stated above there are more national sports leagues for men including hockey, football, baseball and basketball etc. in the United States which gives men more opportunities to play professional. For Craig, who did play professionally, he can put that on his list of qualifications which is impressive to a hiring committee. This is a disadvantage because even if a woman aspired to play professionally as Holly along with Danielle did they are very few opportunities for them to do so in their own country. They will not be able to put professional playing experience on their resume because the chance to play is much slimmer than that of a man coach.

In collegiate soccer, coaching licensing courses offer a way of measuring the level of knowledge a coach has as well as their ability to teach the game. These licenses are recognized throughout the soccer community. Soccer was the only sport that has this type of education for the coaching community. It offers a scale by which to equate being qualified to coach. Craig said "I think just the easy one is licensing it is kinda of a scale and you have an idea what they know soccer wise and then from there years of experience and types of levels of experience".

The coaching courses offer a great deal of knowledge that is very helpful to a coach as well as a way to network and see other styles of coaching. Unfortunately, because the ratio of men coaches to women coaches is so lopsided, it is not an easy situation for a woman to be in. In Woitalla's (2011) interview, Miriam Hickey, shares her thoughts about women at coaching courses "we need to get more women to go to the coaching courses. But it's pretty scary at times to go to a course to get your D license and you're the only female and the testosterone is flying around like crazy because all these men at age 30 still want to prove how good they are" (p.1), she goes on to say that at the A license course she was the only women in the whole course. It suits the men coach's positions if women do not want to do the licensing courses. It gives men more of an advantage in the job search by being able to say they have completed such courses. This only reinforces the men coaches' position within the institution of athletics. By the women not participating in these courses they not only hurt the formation of their habitus but also give the perception that woman are unconfident in their ability as a coach.

I have participated in two of these coaching courses and I felt marginalized throughout these trainings. Once the 60 candidates were split up into three groups there were two women in each group and only myself in a group of twenty men. During the coaching sessions the coaches are the players while the other coaches are practicing how to run a session. I felt extremely inadequate as a player in the group because although I had a higher level of skill than some of the other men their athleticism trumped my skill in almost every situation. When it came time for me to run my session I was not feeling very confident establishing dominance over players who had just dominated me on the field and whom also looked at me and saw a women and not a coach. Since I could not prove that I was a better or equal player to them I had additional pressure to be a good coach and run a great session. The coaching courses are supposed to be a

place to learn and many women choose not to or do not want to attend these courses because of this feeling of inadequacy that has nothing to do with their coaching ability and everything to do with being a minority. By making these courses so daunting for women coaches the men coaches are able to prove their qualifications are higher than a women coach in the soccer community.

Ricky who coaches the same sport said:

It shows that you have a level of experience. You can't just pass a B license if you just started coaching yesterday, or even in the last year. I think it's a good measure but I don't think it's a complete measure. I think someone who has had experience, in the situation where they have been mentored by a knowledgeable coach...I guess I think a lot people are coaches and haven't had the opportunity to be mentored. They are in positions that you could consider, successful positions, and I don't feel that they are qualified so someone that has paid their dues for lack of a better term and have had mentors.

For a woman to “pay their dues” as Ricky puts it, she would have to have the same opportunities to do so as a man coach. This is coming from the same man who feels slighted by the fact that he would be a Division 1 assistant if it weren't for women in coaching. Ricky is repeating acceptable treatment of women coaches that he has learnt through his interactions within the ISA. His position as a man coach in the structure of collegiate athletics is affecting his perception of women in coaching and what it means for a woman to be qualified. Neither man comprehends how challenging this could be for a woman to be in this situation. They are just thinking it is an easy way to determine qualifications, but it is not easy for a woman. A woman can enroll in a coaching course but when the coaching courses are as unfriendly to women as

they are even though she has the desire to do so her experience at the coaching course does not leave her feeling accepted and confident but like an intruder.

In conclusion these experiences lead to, when a coach enters the institution as a collegiate coach; a hiring committee must determine if the coach fits the requirements of the job, which are often vague. In this study, because of the vagueness of the definition of the term qualified it allows men to tailor it to exclude or include whomever they would like to get the job. This can only mean that for the coaches interviewed in this study experiences and qualifications are determining factors in the decision to bring them into interview. The opportunities afforded to the men in this study for their first job were much more prestigious than those afforded to the women coaches. This automatically puts the qualifications of the men interviewed above their women colleagues. The chance to play professionally for a man is greater simply based upon the amount of professional teams for various different sports in the United States than for a woman, another higher qualification difficult to attain for a women. Lastly, when a woman does try to further her knowledge the courses themselves are so overpopulated with men that she feels like an outcast and must prove herself as a player when she is there to learn how to be a coach. Perhaps the most frustrating thing about the coaching courses is that the men interviewed did not see how it might be hard for a woman to even participate in those. By not recognizing how it would it would be difficult, they do not see a need for anything to change, which is perpetuating the patriarchal ideologies from the State Apparatus. These differences that existed between the men and women coach's opportunities to gain qualifications and experience are tailored to give men an advantage. Therefore it is not surprising that men have more jobs as coaches than women. The combination of these factors makes it difficult for women to break into coaching as a profession in the institution of collegiate athletics. As I said earlier women are set up for

failure because as long as men hold positions of power to higher whomever they want without having to be held to any kind of standard, there is no drive to change the uneven ratio of men and women coaches.

Losing Sight of the Institution: If Women Wanted to Coach, They Would

A study done by Simon (2005) on the repercussions of Title IX stated, “women are not less interested in playing sports than men. This unlawful stereotype is contradicted by the facts which show huge increases in women’s participation since Title IX. Women’s lower level of participation reflects persistent discrimination against them not lack of interest” (p. 36). Having been an athlete my whole life and a sports fan I was sure this stereotype was extinct. However I found out I was mistaken. A number of interviews assumed that women’s lack of presence within the coaching field was the result of their lack of interest in sports.

Rob exemplified the assumption that women just were not interested in sports. As a head men’s football coach, he responded to the question of whether or not a woman could be football a coach by saying,

It’s all about knowledge. There would be some push back from the old boys club, but if you know the material you know the material. It’s like teaching a class. You know techniques and how to teach those. If you know the schemes and book work stuff, you can put that together. You could certainly do it, it’s definitely possible. I think as with anything there has gotta be an interested level there. If there is enough females that have that interest then they will create those opportunities.

Rob said that if there was interest in coaching football from women it should be easy for them to create opportunities to be a coach of a men’s football team. None of the women interviewed coached men. In fact three of the women expressed a desire to coach men

but felt the opportunities for them would be minimal to none. For Rob to assume the reason we do not see women coaching men's football is because women are not interested reflects how his habitus has been shaped by a traditional understanding of gender. If women are not present in coaching positions, it must be because they do not want to be there. This is precisely what Bourdieu means by one's habitus being a "structuring structure" which reinforces institutional values. This plays out in his lack of ability to recognize institutional hurdles that women might face as they work to enter a field such as coaching. Rob's inability to consider that women might not be present because institutional forces limit women's ability to attain the qualifications revered by college athletics leaves him assuming the problem is at the individual level—with women and that if women wanted to be coaching, they would be. When Rob shares this message with fellow coaches and players he is in turn spreading the message that women are not interested in football and that is why we do not see them coaching or playing it.

Jake, a head women's volleyball coach, says "I think also more and more women today are getting interested in coaching because they want to continue in athletics. It's not just a means to an end to them to do something else. You know it's now an opportunity to go out there and create a career where 20 years ago I don't think many women thought of that necessarily being a career so I think that's changed too." This statement shows Jake's lack of awareness about women coaches' position in collegiate athletics. He is unaware that prior to Title IX, 90% of all women's teams were coached by women. Jake's habitus has been shaped through the ISA of college athletics, as well as broader cultural beliefs about gender. Similar to Rob, Jake justifies the lack of women in athletics as a lack of interest instead of seeing that women have made coaching a career for years. That there is ignorance about the history of coaching and women's

participation reflects institutional forces. Craig and Ricky also mentioned how it is great that Title IX has helped women in athletics but, felt it was a relatively new policy change which meant the benefits would not be seen for a while. Craig, Ricky and Jake are all reinforcing the values within the ISA of college athletics which is dominated by patriarchal ideology by making justifications about why there are so few women in coaching. By reducing the issue to individual interest, it undermines the importance of examining how the institution constructs gender hierarchy through many of the day-to-day practices within the institution. In other words, the habitus of the men in my sample reflects the strength of gender hierarchies in the ISA of college athletics.

Prior to Title IX, coaching women was not something men viewed as acceptable or desirable. Danielle shares her frustration, “ugh, when education took on female athletics, you know we were completely separate from the NCAA. Guys wouldn’t touch us, we were out of their realm and as it got bigger all of a sudden guys started entering it... and obviously they have taken it over”. After Title IX evened the amount of men’s and women’s sports, men have been quick to recognize and capitalize on an opportunity. Even in the sample I have taken of men coaches, three of the five are head coaches of women’s teams. Danielle had not realized that the statistic was so lopsided. “It does make me mad just ‘cuz, I believe in giving whatever team the best quality coach; even if it’s a guy for a women’s team... If it’s down to two candidates and the female is obviously less qualified, hire the male. That’s only fair to the girls on the team. But if they have two candidates that are equally qualified and one’s a guy, one a girl, I think it’s necessary to hire the girl because that stat is ridiculous”. Women dominated coaching women prior to Title IX and now coaching women is dominated by men within this sample and in Table 1 in the introduction.

We simply do not see many women in coaching at any level. The coaching world being predominantly men means that most players have had man coaches as well as men for role models which results in few or no woman role models for men and women. Jake, a women's volleyball coach, said "I'm not saying women shouldn't coach women, that's fine. For me, athletes at this level want good coaches. They could care less if they are men and women, most athletes that I have ever contacted with a subject like gender they would rather emulate their male coaches than their female coaches". Jake's point here could be partially true for other athletes because if a woman has never been coached by a woman then how would she know that women can be good coaches? How would a woman gain confidence in the possibility of being a coach? When a woman looks around and only sees men who have coached her and men who are her colleagues it can be daunting because where are the examples of success for her to follow. It feeds into the perception that women coaches are inferior to men coaches which is why they are not higher in numbers. If women never make a surge in numbers as coaches then men and women will not be able to recognize the value they bring to the profession as role models and coaches. All of the woman coaches in this study had a man coach at one time and none of the men coaches had a woman coach. For the woman coaches in this study to come in contact with only man coaches as either a player or a colleague her habitus is going to be affected by that. A woman's habitus is going to be molded by the perceptions she has of other women in collegiate coaching and the perceptions the men have of women in collegiate coaching. All of the coaches except one were quick to express how influential their role models were in their development as a coach. Since mentoring and role models are such a large part of the coaches in this study development such a lack of women in the profession means a lack of women role models. This in turn is going to affect the habitus of both the men and women coaches interviewed.

Role Models and the Value of Women Coaches

Morgan a woman coach, who grew up playing with boys and for men compares her experience as a player and a coach by saying,

for as much as I think I flourished under having male coaches and playing with the guys and being in that male dominant environment, now it's not the same for girls. It's more communication. It's really breaking it down and almost more teaching than anything else. Being the only female assistant, it's also the communication that the kids feel comfortable coming to me. And it's almost more of being someone that is there for them and that they can listen. They can just tell me anything. I'll listen and then it's almost—I don't want to say a friend role, but it's closer to that than it is for either our head coach or our assistant.

Morgan recognizes the difference in her role as a woman coach and the role her coaches played for her growing up. She realizes she could have benefitted from having someone who fills the role she now plays for the athletes she coaches. She also recognizes that coaching men and women are different; there are different needs for each gender. Morgan mentions how it was hard for her as a player to adapt in college, “I guess growing up playing boy's hockey and being coached by a guy it's very different from what I can tell; from what we need to do with the girls. So it was hard for me because my experiences were being coached by a male and being coached with males; to playing with females at the college level and being coached by male and then now being a female and coaching females.” Morgan is aware of how athletes are going to react to her as a woman in comparison to how she reacted to the men that coached her growing up. She sees that she could have benefitted from having a woman coach while she was a player. If she had a woman coach growing up, she would have been exposed to this earlier, which would have been

beneficial to her development and habitus as a coach. Since she did not get this chance, she had to learn it on the job. If she was a man she would have had the opportunity initially.

Morgan recognizes the benefit she brings to the profession because she is a woman from her past experiences. Morgan can see the value in being coached by both men and women. Within college athletics the appreciation for women in coaching is non-existent because if they were valued they would hold more coaching positions. None of the men coaches interviewed talked about how they could have benefited from being coached by a woman. It was not something that had to consider given the lack of presence of women coaches. Morgan mentioned how when she coaches at hockey camps the boys give her grief for the first 10-15 minutes then realize she knows what she is doing and end up loving the experience. Ryan, a men's golf coach and an administrator, said that as an administrator they are looking for women coaches to be positive role models to young women and he has seen some head women's coaches of the men's and women's golf teams which provides that kind of role model for both genders.

Danielle is one of the few woman coaches who had a woman role model said "I think looking at her style unconsciously I model myself after her". Danielle was the only woman coach to specifically refer to her woman role model as having a large part in her development and habitus as a coach. In the rest of her answer she ended by saying "they need to have more quality females in the profession". Having a woman coach that became a mentor and role model for Danielle makes her aware of the value of women coaches. She sees the benefits for a woman to learn from another woman in a field that is dominated by men. To have had a positive role model, who believed in her could have a valuable impact on the habitus that women create within the ISA of college athletics.

Holly thinks “players have a potential to migrate towards a man or a woman, I have ran into that sometimes. ‘Why didn’t you come or choose us?’ ...and they just prefer to have a male coach”. If a woman athlete has never had a women coach then, as Holly stated, she might be more inclined to pick a university that has a man coach because that is what she is comfortable with. All the women interviewed recognize that being a woman allows them different insight into athletes than a man. If a woman coach or player does not have another woman coach to learn from or observe then all she has to learn from are men. Men’s habitus is shaped in an environment in which they have many men to pick from as role models. Again being around men as a player and a coach means that women are learning from that man’s actions, which will affect their habitus and the way they act. It could impact the way they understand their position within college athletics in numerous ways. For the women in my sample when they described their style as a coach they used masculine characteristics because the role models they learnt from were male and they inherited their mannerisms. However when they tried to use the same words they had learnt from their men role models the women they were coaching reacted differently to them saying it that than they would have if they had been a man. The women coaches shared that woman players react differently to women coaches than they do to a man coach. Since most of the women interviewed had been mentored by men they do not learn the difference in the way they will be received by their players in comparison to a man. This affects their position because it will create a negative reputation for the woman coach. This could affect her team’s success, the ability to recruit and retention of her job. The women are also a product of their environment and will repeat the values and beliefs they learnt from their role models which more often than not are a reflection of the patriarchal ideology they are surrounded by.

When I read Michelle the same quotation that was read to every coach (see appendix A) she shared “it doesn’t surprise me, we have six sports, seven, eight sports with golf...So there’s 12 teams, basically. I am the only female in the department. I’m the only female coach head or assistant”. What kind of example does this set to players who aspire to be coaches? With such a lack of women in the athletic department, how can it even encourage women to want to be a part of it? The lack of women in Michelle’s department will not only shape Michelle’s habitus as a coach but also any women athlete who notices there are no other women in leadership positions other than Michelle at this particular institution. If Michelle were to quit she believes there would be 90 out of 100 men applicants. Jake agrees by saying “the thing about that for me is that I have been on quite a few hiring committees at the college level. And obviously the applicant pool is the same way or worse”. The applicant pool has a low number of woman coaches because the institution of collegiate athletics is set up to maintain the man’s position.

How do you Manage Being a Good Mother and a Coach

Another place of discrepancy between the way men and women negotiate their positions as a coach is in the area of family life. While the women’s experiences with this issue were fraught with tension, the men did not experience such turmoil. Ricky’s comments exemplify men’s experiences. “I think there are a lot of women who leave the profession or aren’t interested because of the family but do I think it’s a problem? I don’t think it’s a problem”. Here we see how the ISA of collegiate athletics works with the ISA of the family to reinforce a traditional understanding of family for Ricky. As a man, family issues do not play out the same way as they do for the women in my sample. As Laura commented,

I think looking at men and females, it depends. The way that our society is made up men can like have a family. They don’t have to carry the baby, they get to go

out and work and come home and the wife is always going to be there, even when they are travelling. So they get to be little boys forever and it will never affect their social life, because they like to be social, they love to have a beer after they get done and come home and the foods there, or and that's just kind of it, fits how they are, generally speaking of course.

The view of how a family should be does not fit with the collegiate coaching profession for women. Laura was not the only coach to recognize this, Aubrey, a women's softball coach, also felt that men were more apt to be able to be a coach and a family man. She went on to say that women are more family orientated which is exactly the kind of ideology that keeps women out of the profession, she has been shaped by the beliefs and values ingrained in the ISA of college athletics. Women are viewed in society in a motherly role and maintaining that ideology keeps them out of the profession and maintains a man coach's position. Morgan, a women's hockey coach, combines her fear of family along with the lack of visible women to follow by saying,

I have a hard time understanding why in our sport at least we have 1 female coach who is married with children. And I don't understand why because we have so many male head coaches that have children. Why it is so different for both? Females everybody takes into the equation if they want to get married, if they want to have a family how long's that's going to be. And I don't necessarily think the males think about that as much and it's frustrating. It's frustrating for me because that's... I don't want to say it's not a positive example but it's not a proven track record of you can do this you can be a coach.

This double standard of men having a family and lack of women doing the same thing keeps the profession of collegiate coaching scary to women with the aspiration to have both.

Michelle, a head women's basketball coach, describes how she got into coaching, "it's hard to say that I chose it. Sometimes I think it chooses you. You know I had some opportunities that just happened to be the same. I love the game, I love competing. I am very competitive in everything. I think for the most part I love the game, the game itself the x's the o's the strategies come easy to me". For Michelle to coach was an easy choice; however the longer she stays in it the longer she questions if it is the right place for her. When asked if she would continue to coach she said, "I can't imagine not. I think there might come a time when I have to decide between my personal life, and it's what I love it's who I am I can't see myself doing anything else. You get pressure to have a life and move." Michelle identifies as a lesbian which only increases the pressure she feels to choose between her lifestyle and her profession because her lifestyle is not conventional.

Clearly Michelle believes herself to be a coach yet because her lifestyle does not conform to the societal and institutional perceptions of a coach she has to choose between what she loves doing and who she loves. When asked why she thought there was such a lack of women in the profession she said

I think part of it is that they have other responsibilities as a mother; it's not the same if you're a father. It's a societal pressure norm whatever you want to call them. My case it will be because I want to have a life, in the place I am living right now. I couldn't you know. I can to a certain extent. It's still taboo it's becoming better but it's not just like I can just have my girlfriend show up at my

games and move in with me. I think that is a huge part of why they get out of it. I want to live my life and I don't want to hide. My kids all know but it's not the same. People use it against me in recruiting. Part of why many of them get out because they can't be who they are. I could be wrong about that.

Michelle is also demonstrating she has learnt through her life that there is societal pressure for women to have children. Yes her lifestyle is different than of the societal norm of a man and a woman but it does not change the fact that she can still carry a child and will still feel the same pressure even if she were heterosexual. She is not only dealing with the social pressure to be a woman but also how to navigate an alternative lifestyle. When Ricky a women's soccer coach was asked about his future plans he stated "I don't know. I don't define myself as a coach so if something changed from a family stand point, from an opportunity that would make me happier I could see myself changing". Each of the men was asked about their future plans all of their answers were nonchalant like Ricky's because they do not have the pressure to conceive a child by a certain age. The traditional roles women in the family are affecting the woman coach's position because they feel pressure to be a traditional mother.

Abbey has some of her own concerns "some of the coaches that I have known and met especially female ones who never get married, never have a family and are seriously all alone when they are older. I don't want that at all." Obviously family and the choices a woman coach has to make are different to that of men coaches. Some of the pressures women feel being the only biological way to bear children in a relationship or having a relationship that is not socially accepted and just afraid of the time commitments of a family with the job are reasons that they leave the profession. These fears shape a woman's habitus as a coach and are directly going to affect if she stays in coaching because the women interviewed expressed a lot of anxiety about

coaching and having a family. It is beneficial to men in coaching for women to have doubts about having a family and coaching because it keeps fewer women in the profession.

Rob has concerns about family and his future as a coach, “what could take me out of it would be coaching my son. There could be a time where I say you know what I’d like to watch all my kids play. That’s a few years away. I have seen coaches that have only seen their kids play once the whole time threw, that might bother me we will see when I get there”. Rob already has a family and has been able to coach and be a father. He is 40 years old and has been coaching for 18 years and he says that he still has time before he would consider getting out of coaching for his family. His experience is much different than that of the women interviewed because none of them have a family. None of the women have kids and two are over 40 so Rob has had the opportunity to experience both and coach.

Women are assumed to have this motherly role in the household because they can bear the children. In the coaching field it seems to be one main justification to keep women out of the profession. There is a double standard that men coaches can have a family and make it work and that women cannot. It ties in with the lack of women role models. There are not a lot of older woman coaches with families. So without role models that demonstrate being a mother and a coach this escalates the need to get out of coaching if women have a family.

Recognizing their Place: Resignation and Resistance within Collegiate Athletics

Throughout all of the analysis in the sample there was this overwhelming lack of support of women in the profession. Unfortunately this came not only from the men but also from the women. Aubrey, an assistant softball coach, went as far as to say, “this is going to sound really bad but the better teams; the most successful teams have males as the head coach.” Aubrey was very blatant in her dislike and disregard for women coaches in our interview. She disassociated

herself from all other women coaches because the perception of women coaches in general is not how she wishes to be viewed as a woman coach. She disrespects and distances herself as a woman coach from all other women coaches because she is blinded by the institutional forces that have tainted her opinion. Instead of seeing her position as a woman coach in athletics as being marginalized she views herself as different or an outlier. Her habitus has been formed from beliefs and values she has encountered which mean that she does not want to associate herself with other women coaches. She also went on to say that a staff of coaches should never be all women. This implies that a group of women cannot be a successful coaching staff on their own that they must have a man's presence. The way Aubrey speaks about women in the same profession as hers is because of her exposure to the institution. Aubrey's response to women coaches is that of denial that she is a part of the group women coaches whether she wants to be or not.

The women coaches interviewed could see their lack of support within the institution because they are the group of individuals who are marginalized. Aubrey attributes it to, "how our society is and males are in control most of the time. And being able to control a situation and have the best organization I guess you could say within that many people feel, like a lot of athletic directors or departments think females aren't capable of that big of a job". Aubrey's habitus has been formulated to view women as unequal to men. Her response accepts women as being inferior but ignores that she herself is one of these women. Her comments about women coaches allow her to feel equal because she sees herself differently than all other women coaches. Aubrey has conditioned her mind to make herself feel that she belongs in coaching because she is different/better than all the other women. As a coping mechanism this works for

Aubrey but it does not help other women to feel supported when one of their own is in agreement with the current treatment of women collegiate coaches.

Holly's reaction to women's position in coaching is different than Aubrey's. She sees that it is not only in athletics women face these problems but also in business. Holly states that "if you go to the percentage of CEO's and stuff I don't think they are much greater I think they are probably less". She is referring to the lack of women in leadership positions as CEO's and in athletics. She seemed resigned to the fact that this is just how the world works. Laura sees her marginalized status as a woman similarly to Holly by saying "it is a male dominated work force, if you are a female you are second class." Laura was bitter about women's position in coaching and in society as a whole because she is frustrated. She has some resistance to how women are viewed in the institution of athletics but has been coaching for a long time and she gets tired of proving herself as valuable.

There were three women that were resistant to the marginalization of women in the institution of athletics. In this sample it is common to see men coaching women but it is uncommon to see women coaching men. Of the five men interviewed three of them coached women and none of the women coached men. All of the women coaches were asked if they would like to coach men at some point in their career. Only three women expressed a desire to coach men but none felt it would ever be allowed by an athletic institution. Danielle, a women's soccer coach, coached boys at the youth level, "It was U14 boys, and I absolutely loved it. Their hard working, they want to compete they are not like girls. Guys just care way more, they wanna win and it was fun because if you are a female coach that's how you are programmed. You wanna win. You don't care who it is against, and you just compete. Majority of girls don't do

that. I love coaching boys”. When I asked her if she had a desire to coach men at the collegiate level she said

I wish I was coaching guys but um I haven’t because I really like being a head coach right now. And I think to coach men you have to gain their respect and I really don’t want to start at the bottom again. With my situation in life now, getting married and stuff, even to go coach as an assistant we can’t afford it right now. SO financially I wouldn’t be able to go start as being an assistant for a men’s program and then work up. I think I could but I don’t think administration or the team would allow that. For some reason whatever it is, and it makes me upset, but guys can coach girls and it’s not an issue but the other way around it’s always like ah what?!! You know so I just really am not in a stage in my life where I am going to fight that battle.

Danielle has been at multiple programs, she played at the highest level in college athletics, she has been a head coach as well as an assistant and she has won numerous *Coach of the Year* awards. If she were a man with this background she would have no problem switching from the men’s side to the women’s but when she thinks about it the opposing way she knows she would encounter some barriers. How is it that a current head coach of a woman’s team feels that she would have to *start at the bottom* again? She clearly can see that her place in the institution of athletics is different than if she were a man. It seems so backward that a woman of this caliber cannot even apply for the same level she is currently at on the men’s side because she is a woman. Ricky also believes women don’t have much of a chance, “I think it would be hard for the men on the full national team to be able to accept a females coaching weather that’s right or

not”. Institutionally the women coaches interviewed do not think they even have a shot at a head coach of a men’s team even if they are a head coach of a women’s team.

Morgan, the second coach to have the desire to coach men had similar concerns as Danielle in regard to barriers she said,

there are a ton of barriers to enter. Our sport is still male dominated it’s still very much an old boys club...The governing body over both is very much still kind of that old boys club and for me that’s something that I am interested in. Being a young female and liking a challenge, cuz I look at it and I go I kind of want to break into that not necessarily to be on the coaching side of it but to be on the administrative side of it. I think that breaking into that and having that voice um... from our side of things would be interesting and to see how receptive people would be. It’s not horrible and it’s not awful by any means but it’s just not...I don’t think it’s as conducive to females as it is to just males.

Unlike Danielle, Morgan has the energy and desire to be the trailblazer not necessarily as a coach but even an administrator but she is also single and does not have the same financial responsibilities that Danielle has. She also brought up an interesting reason as to why men athletes perhaps are a little more competitive than woman athletes, “I think the girls listen very well but for us like I said there is no prize at the end of the stick other than a degree and now we are booting you out into the real world and you have to get a job. For the boys it’s like there trying to get to the NHL or a pro contract so there not that they have any more drive”. As previously mentioned there are not many woman sports which have national leagues for women. For a coach who has the desire to train the caliber of player who has the ability and opportunity to play professionally, there is little opportunity for women.

Michelle, my last and final woman who was interested in coaching men, actually had a men's team that asked her to be their coach. This is most interesting for several reasons because the young men aged, 18-21, wanted her to coach them so they had the belief and were able to see past her gender to see that Michelle would in fact have been the coach they wanted to coach them. She shares her experience,

they had a men's coach who was a softie and he knew more about basketball in his left pinky than I did still to this day. He wasn't tough enough and he wasn't disciplinary, and they took advantage of that. I just didn't let them get away with anything; I just called them on anything. You expected to be treated like adults but act like you are in junior high that's what you are going to get. You know if I had an opportunity in my younger years I probably would have taken it, I would have had a big enough ego to think I could do anything, so that's part of it.

This recognition from men athletes that a woman would be a better more disciplinary coach than their man head coach gives me hope that trailblazing is possible.

Thus, there is a lack of support from other women towards women, a lack of support from men, a lack of support from administration and an even greater lack of support for women coaching men. All of these factors are not presenting a very good career path for women who aspire to be coaches or who are already coaches.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSION

My research highlights a number of important findings about the perceptions of women coaches and how those perceptions shape the way men and women engage with the institution of college athletics. If it were as simple as answering that there are negative perceptions of women in collegiate athletics and it affects their position and their habitus, the message might be heard quicker. Unfortunately, the answer is far more complicated. The women do struggle with their positions, yet they find ways of articulating the value that women bring to college athletics. The patriarchal ideologies found in the institution of college athletics are a reflection of society's beliefs and values about men and women. It is these commonly held societal values and beliefs about women that lead them to be undervalued in the coaching profession. It is the women coaches experience in the institution that leads to women getting out of coaching or not entering the profession at all.

My research contributes that the availability of the qualifications for men and women are not equal meaning that the standard for men coaches is always going to be higher as long as they have better access to superior qualifications. This research project shows that women want to coach but they want to enjoy the experience and not be questioned and compared to men every step of the way. My significant findings are that the experiences for men and women are very different, simply put there are different standards that are acceptable for a man coach than for a woman coach. A man can have a family, coach either gender and have a male role model to look up to. The women coaches do not have these same opportunities and it contributes to the lack of them in the profession.

My research is modest, but it highlights the need for more sociological research on gender in coaching within the institution of college athletics. Through expanded qualitative and quantitative research that reaches to other regions of the country as well as all divisions of collegiate athletics, an expanded dialogue on gender relations in the ISA of college athletics would help expand my findings. In addition, including the athletes' perspective on having women coaches would help broaden the benefits and challenges that women coaches bring to college athletics. It is my intention to expand to other aspects of athletics such as athletic administrators, referees, academic athletic support staff and athletic trainers to see if women face the same difficulty as the women coaches interviewed for this study. It is my belief that the challenges the women faced in this study are not unlike the challenges women in academia, business and government. A critical evaluation of Title IX and how it has affected more than just athletes would aid to research regarding gender in sport. I have always believed that gender is unimportant in the decision making process but that women can bring valuable qualities to the institution of collegiate coaching.

Every coach interviewed expressed that coaching is a memorable and rewarding profession. To be a part of an athlete's journey, watch them grow as they face adversity and learn new skills feels incredible. I feel that, by keeping women on the outskirts in the profession of collegiate coaching, we are denying valuable opportunities for the women, the student athletes and the institution. Messner (2009) accurately describes what is happening to the women interviewed for this study, "the masculine space of playing field sometimes make women feel like intruders and thus less likely to be willing to take on a coaching position" (p. 71). By not recognizing that women coaches can successfully contribute to the profession we are limiting and denying athletes opportunities to have women as educators and mentors in coaching.

Throughout my work as a sociology masters student I have had to really open my eyes and see the world around me for what it is as a woman. I am not naïve enough to think that my values, beliefs, opinions, mannerisms have not been affected by my journey as a collegiate athlete and coach. My position as a coach and sociological perspective has enabled me the opportunity to explore the institution of college athletics through men and women coaches. I started this project with a lot of gumption and desire to change how women coaches are perceived. I wanted to prove that women are just as capable of coaching as any man. I wanted to prove to myself and the coaching community that I could coach men if I wanted to. At times, my intentions were selfish. What I have been able to do with this project is share the voices of the women coaches instead of just my own.

REFERENCES CITED

- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (notes towards an investigation). In Brewster, B. (Ed.), *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127-176). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Atkinson, P. & Delamont, S. (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brod, H. & Kaufman, M. (1994). *Theorizing masculinities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Burton, L., Barr, C., Fink, J., & Bruening, J. (2009). "Think Athletic Director, Think Masculine?": Examination of the Gender Typing of Managerial Subroles Within Athletic Administration Positions. *Sex Roles, 61*(5/6), 416-426. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9632-6
- Carpenter, L. & Acosta, R. (2010). Women in intercollegiate sport: a longitudinal, national study thirty three year update. <http://www.acostacarpenter.org/>
- Chand, V. (2005, August). Gender and Communication: Communication Strategies for Athletes. *Current Anthropology, 46*(0), 499. Retrieved September 30, 2009, from Science Reference Center database
- Coad, d. (2008). *The metrosexual: gender, sexuality and sport*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Connell, R. & Messerschmidt. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: rethinking the concept. *Gender Society*, 19(829-859).
- Eng, H. (2008). Doing sexuality in sport. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 54(1/2), 103-123.
- Fielding-Lloyd, B., & Meân, L. (2008). Standards and Separatism: The Discursive Construction of Gender in English Soccer Coach Education. *Sex Roles*, 58(1-2), 24-39.
<http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Hardin, M., & Greer, J. (2009). The Influence of Gender-role Socialization, Media Use and Sports Participation on Perceptions of Gender-Appropriate Sports. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 32(2), 207-226. <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Hogshead-Makar, N., & Zimbalist, A. (2007). *Equal play: title IX and social change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Place.
- Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Messner, M. (2002). *Taking the field: women, men and sports*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minneapolis Press.
- Messner, M. (2007). *Out of play: critical essays on gender and sport*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Messner, M. (2009). *Its all for the kids: gender, families and youth sports*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association. (2010). Retrieved from <http://ncaamarket.ncaa.org/jobs>
- Pearlman, J. (2010, December 7). Pearls of wisdom. *Sports Illustrated*, 1-3.

- Qualified. (n.d.). In *Merriam Webster online*. Retrieved from
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/qualified>
- Rubin, H. & Rubin, I. (2005). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications.
- Ruderman, M., & Ohlott, P. (2005). Leading Roles: What coaches of women need to know. *Leadership in Action*, 25(3), 3-9. <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Sagas, M., Cunningham, G., & Pastore, D. (2006). Predicting Head Coaching Intentions of Male and Female Assistant Coaches: An Application of the Theory of Planned Behavior. *Sex Roles*, 54(9), 695-705. <http://search.ebscohost.com>
- Simon, R. (2005). *Sporting equality: title IX thirty years later*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction publishers.
- Staurowsky, E. (2009). Gender equity in two-year college athletic departments: Part II. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2009(147), 63-73. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1002/cc.378
- Staurowsky, E. (2009). Gender equity in two-year athletic departments: Part I. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2009(147), 53-62. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1002/cc.377
- Staurowsky, E. (2003). *Title IX and college sport: the long painful path to compliance and reform*. *Marquette Sports Law Review*, 14(1), 1-29.

Taylor, S. & Bogdan, R. (1998). Introduction to qualitative research methods: a guidebook and resource. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Welch, S., & Sigelman, L. (2007). Who's Calling the Shots? Women Coaches in Division I Women's Sports. *Social Science Quarterly (Blackwell Publishing Limited)*, 88(5), 1415-1434. <http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2007.00509.x

Whisenant, W. (2008). Sustaining Male Dominance in Interscholastic Athletics: A Case of Homologous Reproduction...or Not?. *Sex Roles*, 58(11/12), 768-775.
<http://search.ebscohost.com>, doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9397-3

Wuotalla, M. (2011). Coaching still a boys club, 'says Vardar's Miriam Hickey. *Youth Soccer Insider*. 1-3.

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Career

1. Tell me about how and why you got into coaching.
2. Describe your coaching style
3. Was there anyone who was affected your decision to go into coaching?
 - a. Describe the relationship
4. What is most challenging about being a coach?
5. Do you have a role model?
 - a. Are they a coach?
 - b. Why are they your role model?
6. Have any of your former players become coaches?
7. How do you define success?
 - a. In the program
 - b. For yourself as a coach
 - c. For yourself as a player
8. Can you tell me a story about your greatest success as a coach?
 - a. To what do you attribute that success?
 - b. Did it impact your future experiences/behaviors as a coach?
9. Can you tell me a story about your greatest challenge as a coach?
 - a. How did you handle this challenge?
 - b. Were you satisfied with the result?
 - c. Did it impact your future experiences/behaviors as a coach?

Gender Issues

1. Have you ever coached a different gender to your own? (If they currently do ask how they feel about it.)
 - a. Or had a coach of a different gender?
 - b. Please describe your experiences
2. Have you ever considered coaching a different gender at the college level to the one you currently coach?
 - a. Why yes/no?
3. What would stop you from coaching a different gender to your own?
 - a. What problems/struggles might you encounter?
4. What advice would you give to anyone considering a career in coaching an opposite gender to their own?
5. Is gender important in coaching?

Institutions

1. What does athletics mean to you?
2. How many athletic institutions have you worked at?
 - a. Which did you feel was most conducive to growing as a coach? Why?
 - b. Describe the other staff's of coaches you have worked with.
 - c. Do you feel supported?
3. How do you feel about the rules and regulations in your program?
 - a. What works well? What doesn't work?
4. Are there any informal rules that have affected your experiences as a coach?
 - a. If so, can you explain those?

5. When we look at intercollegiate coaching as an entire workplace unit, we find that only 20.9% of intercollegiate athletics teams have a female head coach. Another way to say the same thing is to say that 79.1% of ALL intercollegiate teams are coached by males” (Carpenter et al, 2010:18) Does this surprise you? Why/why not?
6. How many women coaches are in the athletic department?
7. What are your opinions of Title IX?
 - a. Do you think it has helped or hindered collegiate athletics?
 - b. Do you think it has helped or hindered women’s position in collegiate athletics?

Closing

1. Are you planning on staying in coaching?
2. What is next in your career?

APPENDIX B. TITLE IX

A Policy Interpretation: Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics

Federal Register, Vol.44, No. 239 - Tuesday, Dec. 11, 1979

Intercollegiate athletics policy interpretation; provides more specific factors to be reviewed by OCR under program factors listed at Section 106.41 Of the Title IX regulation; explains OCR's approach to determining compliance in inter-collegiate athletics; adds two program factors, recruitment and support services to be reviewed; clarifies requirement for athletic scholarships - 34 C.F.R. Section 106.37(C). The document contains dated references, and footnote 6 is out of date; however, the policy is still current.

Federal Register / Vol. 44, No. 239 / Tuesday, December 11, 1979 / Rules and Regulations

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office for Civil Rights

Office of the Secretary

45 CFR Part 26

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; a Policy Interpretation; Title IX and Intercollegiate Athletics

AGENCY: Office for Civil Rights, Office of the Secretary, HEW.

ACTION: Policy interpretation.

SUMMARY: The following Policy Interpretation represents the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's interpretation of the intercollegiate athletic provisions of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and its implementing regulation. Title IX prohibits educational programs and institutions funded or otherwise supported by the Department from discriminating on the basis of sex. The Department published a proposed Policy Interpretation for public comment on December 11, 1978. Over 700 comments reflecting a broad range of opinion were received. In addition, HEW staff visited eight universities during June and July, 1979, to see how the proposed policy and other suggested alternatives would apply in actual practice at individual campuses. The final Policy Interpretation reflects the many comments HEW received and the results of the individual campus visits

EFFECTIVE DATE: December 11, 1979

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Colleen O'Connor, 330 Independence Avenue, Washington, D.C. (202) 245-6671

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

1. Legal Background

A. The Statute

Section 901(a) of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 provides:

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

Section 844 of the Education Amendments of 1974 further provides:

- The Secretary of [of HEW] shall prepare and publish ! ! ! proposed regulations implementing the provisions of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 relating to the prohibition of sex discrimination in federally assisted education programs which shall include with respect to intercollegiate athletic activities reasonable provisions considering the nature of particular sports.

Congress passed Section 844 after the Conference Committee deleted a Senate floor amendment that would have exempted revenue-producing athletics from the jurisdiction of Title IX.

B. The Regulation

The regulation implementing Title IX is set forth, in pertinent part, in the Policy Interpretation below. It was signed by President Ford on May 27, 1975, and submitted to the Congress for review pursuant to Section 431(d)(1) of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA).

During this review, the House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education held hearings on a resolution disapproving the regulation. The Congress did not disapprove the regulation within the 45 days allowed under GEPA, and it therefore became effective on July 21, 1975.

Subsequent hearings were held in the Senate Subcommittee on Education on a bill to exclude revenues produced by sports to the extent they are used to pay the costs of those sports. The Committee, however, took no action on this bill.

The regulation established a three year transition period to give institutions time to comply with its equal athletic opportunity requirements. That transition period expired on July 21, 1978.

II. Purpose of Policy Interpretation

By the end of July 1978, the Department had received nearly 100 complaints alleging discrimination in athletics against more than 50 institutions of higher education. In attempting to investigate these complaints, and to answer questions from the university community, the Department determined that it should provide further guidance on what constitutes compliance

with the law. Accordingly, this Policy Interpretation explains the regulation so as to provide a framework within which the complaints can be resolved, and to provide institutions of higher education with additional guidance on the requirements for compliance with Title IX in intercollegiate athletic programs.

III. Scope of Application

This Policy Interpretation is designed specifically for intercollegiate athletics. However, its general principles will often apply to club, intramural, and interscholastic athletic programs, which are also covered by regulation. Accordingly, the Policy Interpretation may be used for guidance by the administrators of such programs when appropriate.

This policy interpretation applies to any public or private institution, person or other entity that operates an educational program or activity which receives or benefits from financial assistance authorized or extended under a law administered by the Department. This includes educational institutions whose students participate in HEW funded or guaranteed student loan or assistance programs. For further information see definition of "recipient" in Section 86.2 of the Title IX regulation.

IV. Summary of Final Policy Interpretation

The final Policy Interpretation clarifies the meaning of "equal opportunity" in intercollegiate athletics. It explains the factors and standards set out in the law and regulation which the Department will consider in determining whether an institution's intercollegiate athletics program complies with the law and regulations. It also provides guidance to assist institutions in determining whether any disparities which may exist between men's and women's programs are justifiable and nondiscriminatory. The Policy Interpretation is divided into three sections:

- Compliance in Financial Assistance (Scholarships) Based on Athletic Ability: Pursuant to the regulation, the governing principle in this area is that all such assistance should be available on a substantially proportional basis to the number of male and female participants in the institution's athletic program.
- Compliance in Other Program Areas (Equipment and supplies; games and practice times; travel and per diem, coaching and academic tutoring; assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors; locker rooms, and practice and competitive facilities; medical and training facilities; housing and dining facilities; publicity; recruitment; and support services): Pursuant to the regulation, the governing principle is that male and female athletes should receive equivalent treatment, benefits, and opportunities.
- Compliance in Meeting the Interests and Abilities of Male and Female Students: Pursuant to the regulation, the governing principle in this area is that the athletic interests and abilities of male and female students must be equally effectively accommodated.

V. Major Changes to Proposed Policy Interpretation

The final Policy Interpretation has been revised from the one published in proposed form on December 11, 1978. The proposed Policy Interpretation was based on a two-part approach. Part I

addressed equal opportunity for participants in athletic programs. It required the elimination of discrimination in financial support and other benefits and opportunities in an institution's existing athletic program. Institutions could establish a presumption of compliance if they could demonstrate that:

- "Average per capita" expenditures for male and female athletes were substantially equal in the area of "readily financially measurable" benefits and opportunities or, if not, that any disparities were the result of nondiscriminatory factors, and
- Benefits and opportunities for male and female athletes, in areas which are not financially measurable, "were comparable."

Part II of the proposed Policy Interpretation addressed an institution's obligation to accommodate effectively the athletic interests and abilities of women as well as men on a continuing basis. It required an institution either

- To follow a policy of development of its women's athletic program to provide the participation and competition opportunities needed to accommodate the growing interests and abilities of women, or
- To demonstrate that it was effectively (and equally) accommodating the athletic interests and abilities of students, particularly as the interests and abilities of women students developed.

While the basic considerations of equal opportunity remain, the final Policy Interpretation sets forth the factors that will be examined to determine an institution's actual, as opposed to presumed, compliance with Title IX in the area of intercollegiate athletics.

The final Policy Interpretation does not contain a separate section on institutions' future responsibilities. However, institutions remain obligated by the Title IX regulation to accommodate effectively the interests and abilities of male and female students with regard to the selection of sports and levels of competition available. In most cases, this will entail development of athletic programs that substantially expand opportunities for women to participate and compete at all levels.

The major reasons for the change in approach are as follows:

(1) Institutions and representatives of athletic program participants expressed a need for more definitive guidance on what constituted compliance than the discussion of a presumption of compliance provided. Consequently the final Policy Interpretation explains the meaning of "equal athletic opportunity" in such a way as to facilitate an assessment of compliance.

(2) Many comments reflected a serious misunderstanding of the presumption of compliance. Most institutions based objections to the proposed Policy Interpretation in part on the assumption that failure to provide compelling justifications for disparities in per capita expenditures would have automatically resulted in a finding of noncompliance. In fact, such a failure would only have deprived an institution of the benefit of the presumption that it was in compliance with the law. The Department would still have had the burden of demonstrating that the institution was

actually engaged in unlawful discrimination. Since the purpose of issuing a policy interpretation was to clarify the regulation, the Department has determined that the approach of stating actual compliance factors would be more useful to all concerned.

(3) The Department has concluded that purely financial measures such as the per capita test do not in themselves offer conclusive documentation of discrimination, except where the benefit or opportunity under review, like a scholarship, is itself financial in nature. Consequently, in the final Policy Interpretation, the Department has detailed the factors to be considered in assessing actual compliance. While per capita breakdowns and other devices to examine expenditure patterns will be used as tools of analysis in the Department's investigative process, it is achievement of "equal opportunity" for which recipients are responsible and to which the final Policy Interpretation is addressed.

A description of the comments received, and other information obtained through the comment/consultation process, with a description of Departmental action in response to the major points raised, is set forth at Appendix "B" to this document.

• VI. Historic Patterns of Intercollegiate Athletics Program Development and Operations

In its proposed Policy Interpretation of December 11, 1978, the Department published a summary of historic patterns affecting the relative status of men's and women's athletic programs. The Department has modified that summary to reflect additional information obtained during the comment and consultation process. The summary is set forth at Appendix A to this document.

VII. The Policy Interpretation

This Policy Interpretation clarifies the obligations which recipients of Federal aid have under Title IX to provide equal opportunities in athletic programs. In particular, this Policy Interpretation provides a means to assess an institution's compliance with the equal opportunity requirements of the regulation which are set forth at 45 CFR 88.37(c) and 88.4a(c).

A. Athletic Financial Assistance (Scholarships)

1. The Regulation. Section 86.37(c) of the regulation provides:

- [Institutions] must provide reasonable opportunities for such award (of financial assistance) for member of each sex in proportion to the number of students of each sex participating in ! ! ! inter-collegiate athletics.

2. The Policy - The Department will examine compliance with this provision of the regulation primarily by means of a financial comparison to determine whether proportionately equal amounts of financial assistance (scholarship aid) are available to men's and women's athletic programs. The Department will measure compliance with this standard by dividing the amounts of aid available for the members of each sex by the numbers of male or femaLe participants in

the athletic program and comparing the results. Institutions may be found in compliance if this comparison results in substantially equal amounts or if a resulting disparity can be explained by adjustments to take into account legitimate, nondiscriminatory factors. Two such factors are:

a. At public institutions, the higher costs of tuition for students from out-of state may in some years be unevenly' distributed between men's and women's programs. These differences will be considered nondiscriminatory if they are not the result of policies or practices which disproportionately limit the availability of out-of-state scholarships to either men or women.

b. An institution may make reasonable professional decisions concerning the awards most appropriate for program development. For example, team development initially may require spreading scholarships over as much as a full generation [four years) of student athletes. This may result in the award of fewer scholarships in the first few years than would be necessary to create proportionality between male and female athletes.

3. Application of the Policy - a. This section does not require a proportionate number of scholarships for men and women or individual scholarships of equal dollar value. It does mean that the total amount of scholarship aid made available to men and women must be substantially proportionate to their participation rates.

b. When financial assistance is provided in forms other than grants, the distribution of non-grant assistance will also be compared to determine whether equivalent benefits are proportionately available to male and female athletes. A disproportionate amount of work-related aid or loans in the assistance made available to the members of one sex, for example, could constitute a violation of Title IX.

4. Definition - For purposes of examining compliance with this Section, the participants will be defined as those athletes:

a. Who are receiving the institutionally-sponsored support normally provided to athletes competing at the institution involved, e.g., coaching, equipment, medical and training room services, on a regular basis during a sport's season; and

b. Who are participating in organized practice sessions and other team meetings and activities on a regular basis during a sport's season: and

c. Who are listed on the eligibility or squad lists maintained for each sport, or

d. Who, because of injury, cannot meet a, b, or c above but continue to receive financial aid on the basis of athletic ability.

B. Equivalence in Other Athletic Benefits and Opportunities

1. The Regulation C The Regulation requires that recipients that operate or sponsor interscholastic, intercollegiate, club or intramural athletics. "provide equal athletic opportunities for members of both sexes." In determining whether an institution is providing equal opportunity

in intercollegiate athletics the regulation requires the Department to consider, among others, the following factors:

- (1)
- (2) Provision and maintenance of equipment and supplies;
- (3) Scheduling of games and practice times;
- (4) Travel and per diem expenses;
- (5) Opportunity to receive coaching and academic tutoring;
- (6) Assignment and compensation of coaches and tutors;
- (7) Provision of locker rooms, practice and competitive facilities;
- (8) Provision of medical and training services and facilities;
- (9) Provision of housing and dining services and facilities; and
- (10) Publicity

Section 86.41(c) also permits the Director of the Office for Civil Rights to consider other factors in the determination of equal opportunity. Accordingly, this Section also addresses recruitment of student athletes and provision of support services.

This list is not exhaustive. Under the regulation, it may be expanded as necessary at the discretion of the Director of the Office for Civil Rights.

2. The Policy - The Department will assess compliance with both the recruitment and the general athletic program requirements of the regulation by comparing the availability, quality and kinds of benefits, opportunities, and treatment afforded members of both sexes. Institutions will be in compliance if the compared program components are equivalent, that is, equal or equal in effect. Under this standard, identical benefits, opportunities, or treatment are not required, provided the overall effects of any differences is negligible.

If comparisons of program components reveal that treatment, benefits, or opportunities are not equivalent in kind, quality or availability, a finding of compliance may still be justified if the differences are the result of nondiscriminatory factors. Some of the factors that may justify these differences are as follows:

- a. Some aspects of athletic programs may not be equivalent for men and women because of unique aspects of particular sports or athletic activities. This type of distinction was called for by the "Javits' Amendment" to Title IX which instructed HEW to make "reasonable (regulatory) provisions considering the nature of particular sports" in intercollegiate athletics.

Generally, these differences will be the result of factors that are inherent to the basic operation of specific sports. Such factors may include rules of play, nature/replacement of equipment, rates of injury resulting from participation, nature of facilities required for competition, and the maintenance/upkeep requirements of those facilities. For the most part, differences involving such factors will occur in programs offering football, and consequently these differences will favor men. If sport-specific needs are met equivalently in both men's and women's programs, however, differences in particular program components will be found to be justifiable.

b. Some aspects of athletic programs may not be equivalent for men and women because of legitimately sex-neutral factors related to special circumstances of a temporary nature. For example, large disparities in recruitment activity for any particular year may be the result of annual fluctuations in team needs for first-year athletes. Such differences are justifiable to the extent that they do not reduce overall equality of opportunity.

c. The activities directly associated with the operation of a competitive event in a single-sex sport may, under some circumstances, create unique demands or imbalances in particular program components. Provided any special demands associated with the activities of sports involving participants of the other sex are met to an equivalent degree, the resulting differences may be found nondiscriminatory. At many schools, for example, certain sports (notably football and men's basketball) traditionally draw large crowds. Since the costs of managing an athletic event increase with crowd size, the overall support made available for event management to men's and women's programs may differ in degree and kind. These differences would not violate Title IX if the recipient does not limit the potential for women's athletic events to rise in spectator appeal and if the levels of event management support available to both programs are based on sex-neutral criteria (e.g., facilities used, projected attendance, and staffing needs).

d. Some aspects of athletic programs may not be equivalent for men and women because institutions are undertaking voluntary affirmative actions to overcome effects of historical conditions that have limited participation in athletics by the members of one sex. This is authorized at '86.3(b) of the regulation.

3. Application of the Policy - General Athletic Program Components C

a. Equipment and Supplies ('86.41(c)(2)). Equipment and supplies include but are not limited to uniforms, other apparel, sport-specific equipment and supplies, general equipment and supplies, instructional devices, and conditioning and weight training equipment.

Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) The quality of equipment and supplies;
- (2) The amount of equipment and supplies;
- (3) The suitability of equipment and supplies;

- (4) The maintenance and replacement of the equipment and supplies; and
- (5) The availability of equipment and supplies.

b. Scheduling of Games and Practice Times (' 86.41(c)(3)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) The number of competitive events per sport;
- (2) The number and length of practice opportunities;
- (3) The time of day competitive events are scheduled;
- (4) The time of day practice opportunities are scheduled; and
- (5) The opportunities to engage in available pre-season and post-season competition.

c. Travel and Per Diem Allowances (' 86.41(c)(4)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) Modes of transportation;
- (2) Housing furnished during travel;
- (3) Length of stay before and after competitive events;
- (4) Per diem allowances: and
- (5) Dining arrangements.

d. Opportunity to Receive Coaching and Academic Tutoring (' 86.41(c)(5)). (1) CoachingCCompliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors:

- (a) Relative availability of full-time coaches:
 - (b) Relative availability of part-time and assistant coaches; and
 - (c) Relative availability of graduate assistants.
- (2) Academic tutoring-Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:
- (a) The availability of tutoring; and
 - (b) Procedures and criteria for obtaining tutorial assistance.

e. Assignment and Compensation of Coaches and Tutors (' 86.41(c)(6)). In general, a violation of Section 86.41(c)(6) will be found only where compensation or assignment policies or practices deny male and female athletes coaching of equivalent quality, nature, or availability.

Nondiscriminatory factors can affect the compensation of coaches. In determining whether differences are caused by permissible factors, the range and nature of duties, the experience of individual coaches, the number of participants for particular sports, the number of assistant coaches supervised, and the level of competition will be considered.

Where these or similar factors represent valid differences in skill, effort, responsibility or working conditions they may, in specific circumstances, justify differences in compensation. Similarly, there may be unique situations in which a particular person may possess such an outstanding record of achievement as to justify an abnormally high salary.

(1) Assignment of Coaches - Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men's and women's coaches of:

(a) Training, experience, and other professional qualifications;

(b) Professional standing.

(2) Assignment of Tutors-Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men's and women's tutors of:

(a) Tutor qualifications;

(b) Training, experience, and other qualifications.

(3) Compensation of Coaches - Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men's and women's coaches of:

(a) Rate of compensation (per sport, per season);

(b) Duration of contracts;

(c) Conditions relating to contract renewal;

(d) Experience;

(e) Nature of coaching duties performed;

(f) Working conditions; and

(g) Other terms and conditions of employment.

(4) Compensation of Tutors - Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men's and women's tutors of:

- (a) Hourly rate of payment by nature subjects tutored;
- (b) Pupil loads per tutoring season;
- (c) Tutor qualifications;
- (d) Experience;
- (e) Other terms and conditions of employment.

f. Provision of Locker Rooms, Practice and Competitive Facilities (' 86.41(c)(7)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) Quality and availability of the facilities provided for practice and competitive events;
- (2) Exclusivity of use of facilities provided for practice and competitive events;
- (3) Availability of locker rooms;
- (4) Quality of locker rooms;
- (5) Maintenance of practice and competitive facilities; and
- (6) Preparation of facilities for practice and competitive events.

g. Provision of Medical and Training Facilities and Services (' 86.41(c)(8)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) Availability of medical personnel and assistance;
- (2) Health, accident and injury insurance coverage;
- (3) Availability and quality of weight and training facilities;
- (4) Availability and quality of conditioning facilities; and
- (5) Availability and qualifications of athletic trainers.

h. Provision of Housing and Dining Facilities and Services (' 86.41(c)(9)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

- (1) Housing provided;

(2) Special services as part of housing arrangements (e.g., laundry facilities, parking space, maid service).

i. Publicity (' 86.41(c)(10)). Compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence for men and women of:

(1) Availability and quality of sports information personnel;

(2) Access to other publicity resources for men's and women's programs; and

(3) Quantity and quality of publications and other promotional devices featuring men's and women's programs.

4. Application of the Policy-Other Factors (' 86.41(c)). a. Recruitment of Student Athletes. The athletic recruitment practices of institutions often affect the overall provision of opportunity to male and female athletes. Accordingly, where equal athletic opportunities are not present for male and female students, compliance will be assessed by examining the recruitment practices of the athletic programs for both sexes to determine whether the provision of equal opportunity will require modification of those practices.

Such examinations will review the following factors:

(1) Whether coaches or other professional athletic personnel in the programs serving male and female athletes are provided with substantially equal opportunities to recruit;

(2) Whether the financial and other resources made available for recruitment in male and female athletic programs are equivalently adequate to meet the needs of each program; and

(3) Whether the differences in benefits, opportunities, and treatment afforded prospective student athletes of each sex have a disproportionately limiting effect upon the recruitment of students of either sex.

b. Provision of Support Services. The administrative and clerical support provided to an athletic program can affect the overall provision of opportunity to male and female athletes, particularly to the extent that the provided services enable coaches to perform better their coaching functions.

In the provision of support services, compliance will be assessed by examining, among other factors, the equivalence of:

(1) The amount of administrative assistance provided to men's and women's programs;

(2) The amount of secretarial and clerical assistance provided to men's and women's programs.

5. Overall Determination of Compliance. The Department will base its compliance determination under ' 86.41(c) of the regulation upon an examination of the following:

- a. Whether the policies of an institution are discriminatory in language or effect; or
- b. Whether disparities of a substantial and unjustified nature exist in the benefits, treatment, services, or opportunities afforded male and female athletes in the institution's program as a whole; or
- c. Whether disparities in benefits, treatment, services, or opportunities in individual segments of the program are substantial enough in and of themselves to deny equality of athletic opportunity.

C. Effective Accommodation of Student Interests and Abilities.

1. The Regulation. The regulation requires institutions to accommodate effectively the interests and abilities of students to the extent necessary to provide equal opportunity in the selection of sports and levels of competition available to members of both sexes.

Specifically, the regulation, at ' 86.41(c)(1), requires the Director to consider, when determining whether equal opportunities are availableC

Whether the selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of members of both sexes.

Section 86.41(c) also permits the Director of the Office for Civil Rights to consider other factors in the determination of equal opportunity. Accordingly, this section also addresses competitive opportunities in terms of the competitive team schedules available to athletes of both sexes.

2. The Policy. The Department will assess compliance with the interests and abilities section of the regulation by examining the following factors:

- a. The determination of athletic interests and abilities of students;
- b. The selection of sports offered; and
- c. The levels of competition available including the opportunity for team competition.

3. Application of the Policy C Determination of Athletic Interests and Abilities.

Institutions may determine the athletic interests and abilities of students by nondiscriminatory methods of their choosing provided:

- a. The processes take into account the nationally increasing levels of women's interests and abilities;
- b. The methods of determining interest and ability do not disadvantage the members of an underrepresented sex;
- c. The methods of determining ability take into account team performance records; and

d. The methods are responsive to the expressed interests of students capable of intercollegiate competition who are members of an underrepresented sex.

4. Application of the Policy - Selection of Sports.

In the selection of sports, the regulation does not require institutions to integrate their teams nor to provide exactly the same choice of sports to men and women. However, where an institution sponsors a team in a particular sport for members of one sex, it may be required either to permit the excluded sex to try out for the team or to sponsor a separate team for the previously excluded sex.

a. Contact Sports - Effective accommodation means that if an institution sponsors a team for members of one sex in a contact sport, it must do so for members of the other sex under the following circumstances:

- (1) The opportunities for members of the excluded sex have historically been limited; and
- (2) There is sufficient interest and ability among the members of the excluded sex to sustain a viable team and a reasonable expectation of intercollegiate competition for that team.

b. Non-Contact Sports - Effective accommodation means that if an institution sponsors a team for members of one sex in a non-contact sport, it must do so for members of the other sex under the following circumstances:

- (1) The opportunities for members of the excluded sex have historically been limited;
- (2) There is sufficient interest and ability among the members of the excluded sex to sustain a viable team and a reasonable expectation of intercollegiate competition for that team; and
- (3) Members of the excluded sex do not possess sufficient skill to be selected for a single integrated team, or to compete actively on such a team if selected.

5. Application of the Policy - Levels of Competition.

In effectively accommodating the interests and abilities of male and female athletes, institutions must provide both the opportunity for individuals of each sex to participate in intercollegiate competition, and for athletes of each sex to have competitive team schedules which equally reflect their abilities.

a. Compliance will be assessed in any one of the following ways:

- (1) Whether intercollegiate level participation opportunities for male and female students are provided in numbers substantially proportionate to their respective enrollments; or
- (2) Where the members of one sex have been and are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, whether the institution can show a history and continuing practice of program expansion

which is demonstrably responsive to the developing interest and abilities of the members of that sex; or

(3) Where the members of one sex are underrepresented among intercollegiate athletes, and the institution cannot show a continuing practice of program expansion such as that cited above, whether it can be demonstrated that the interests and abilities of the members of that sex have been fully and effectively accommodated by the present program.

b. Compliance with this provision of the regulation will also be assessed by examining the following:

(1) Whether the competitive schedules for men's and women's teams, on a program-wide basis, afford proportionally similar numbers of male and female athletes equivalently advanced competitive opportunities; or

(2) Whether the institution can demonstrate a history and continuing practice of upgrading the competitive opportunities available to the historically disadvantaged sex as warranted by developing abilities among the athletes of that sex.

c. Institutions are not required to upgrade teams to intercollegiate status or otherwise develop intercollegiate sports absent a reasonable expectation that intercollegiate competition in that sport will be available within the institution's normal competitive regions. Institutions may be required by the Title IX regulation to actively encourage the development of such competition, however, when overall athletic opportunities within that region have been historically limited for the members of one sex.

6. Overall Determination of Compliance.

The Department will base its compliance determination under ' 86.41(c) of the regulation upon a determination of the following:

a. Whether the policies of an institution are discriminatory in language or effect; or

b. Whether disparities of a substantial and unjustified nature in the benefits, treatment, services, or opportunities afforded male and female athletes exist in the institution's program as a whole; or

c. Whether disparities in individual segments of the program with respect to benefits, treatment, services, or opportunities are substantial enough in and of themselves to deny equality of athletic opportunity.

VIII. The Enforcement Process

The process of Title IX enforcement is set forth in ' 88.71 of the Title IX regulation, which incorporates by reference the enforcement procedures applicable to Title VI of the Civil Rights

Act of 1964. The enforcement process prescribed by the regulation is supplemented by an order of the Federal District Court, District of Columbia, which establishes time frames for each of the enforcement steps.

According to the regulation, there are two ways in which enforcement is initiated:

- Compliance Reviews - Periodically the Department must select a number of recipients (in this case, colleges and universities which operate intercollegiate athletic programs) and conduct investigations to determine whether recipients are complying with Title IX (45 CFR 80.7(a))
- Complaints - The Department must investigate all valid (written and timely) complaints alleging discrimination on the basis of sex in a recipient's programs. (45 CFR 80.7(b))

The Department must inform the recipient (and the complainant, if applicable) of the results of its investigation. If the investigation indicates that a recipient is in compliance, the Department states this, and the case is closed. If the investigation indicates noncompliance, the Department outlines the violations found.

The Department has 90 days to conduct an investigation and inform the recipient of its findings, and an additional 90 days to resolve violations by obtaining a voluntary compliance agreement from the recipient. This is done through negotiations between the Department and the recipient, the goal of which is agreement on steps the recipient will take to achieve compliance. Sometimes the violation is relatively minor and can be corrected immediately. At other times, however, the negotiations result in a plan that will correct the violations within a specified period of time. To be acceptable, a plan must describe the manner in which institutional resources will be used to correct the violation. It also must state acceptable time tables for reaching interim goals and full compliance. When agreement is reached, the Department notifies the institution that its plan is acceptable. The Department then is obligated to review periodically the implementation of the plan.

An institution that is in violation of Title IX may already be implementing a corrective plan. In this case, prior to informing the recipient about the results of its investigation, the Department will determine whether the plan is adequate. If the plan is not adequate to correct the violations (or to correct them within a reasonable period of time) the recipient will be found in noncompliance and voluntary negotiations will begin. However, if the institutional plan is acceptable, the Department will inform the institution that although the institution has violations, it is found to be in compliance because it is implementing a corrective plan. The Department, in this instance also, would monitor the progress of the institutional plan. If the institution subsequently does not completely implement its plan, it will be found in noncompliance.

When a recipient is found in noncompliance and voluntary compliance attempts are unsuccessful, the formal process leading to termination of Federal assistance will be begun. These procedures, which include the opportunity for a hearing before an administrative law judge, are set forth at 45 CFR 80.8-80.11 and 45 CFR Part 81.

IX. Authority

(Secs. 901, 902, Education Amendments of 1972, 86 Stat. 373, 374, 20 U.S.C. 1681, 1682; sec. 844, Education Amendments of 1974, Pub. L. 93-380, 88 Stat. 612; and 45 CFR Part 86)

Dated December 3, 1979.

Roma Stewart,

Director, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dated December 4, 1979.

Patricia Roberts Harris,

Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Appendix A-Historic Patterns of Intercollegiate Athletics Program Development

1. Participation in intercollegiate sports has historically been emphasized for men but not women. Partially as a consequence of this, participation rates of women are far below those of men. During the 1977-78 academic year women students accounted for 48 percent of the national undergraduate enrollment (5,496,000 of 11,267,000 students). Yet, only 30 percent of the intercollegiate athletes are women.

The historic emphasis on men's intercollegiate athletic programs has also contributed to existing differences in the number of sports and scope of competition offered men and women. One source indicates that, on the average, colleges and universities are providing twice the number of sports for men as they are for women.

2. Participation by women in sports is growing rapidly. During the period from 1971-1978, for example, the number of female participants in organized high school sports increased from 294,000 to 2,083,000 C an increase of over 600 percent. In contrast, between Fall 1971 and Fall 1977, the enrollment of females in high school decreased from approximately 7,600,000 to approximately 7,150,000 a decrease of over 5 percent.

The growth in athletic participation by high school women has been reflected on the campuses of the nation's colleges and universities. During the period from 1971 to 1976 the enrollment of women in the nation's institutions of higher education rose 52 percent, from 3,400,000 to 5,201,000. During this same period, the number of women participating in intramural sports increased 108 percent from 276,167 to 576,167. In club sports, the number of women participants increased from 16,386 to 25,541 or 55 percent. In intercollegiate sports, women's participation increased 102 percent from 31,852 to 64,375. These developments reflect the growing interest of women in competitive athletics, as well as the efforts of colleges and universities to accommodate those interests.

3. The overall growth of women's intercollegiate programs has not been at the expense of men's programs. During the past decade of rapid growth in women's programs, the number of

intercollegiate sports available for men has remained stable, and the number of male athletes has increased slightly. Funding for men's programs has increased from \$1.2 to \$2.2 million between 1970-1977 alone.

4. On most campuses, the primary problem confronting women athletes is the absence of a fair and adequate level of resources, services, and benefits. For example, disproportionately more financial aid has been made available for male athletes than for female athletes. Presently, in institutions that are members of both the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women (AIAW), the average annual scholarship budget is \$39,000. Male athletes receive \$32,000 or 78 percent of this amount, and female athletes receive \$7,000 or 22 percent, although women are 30 percent of all the athletes eligible for scholarships.

Likewise, substantial amounts have been provided for the recruitment of male athletes, but little funding has been made available for recruitment of female athletes.

Congressional testimony on Title IX and subsequent surveys indicates that discrepancies also exist in the opportunity to receive coaching and in other benefits and opportunities, such as the quality and amount of equipment, access to facilities and practice times, publicity, medical and training facilities, and housing and dining facilities.

5. At several institutions, intercollegiate football is unique among sports. The size of the teams, the expense of the operation, and the revenue produced distinguish football from other sports, both men's and women's. Title IX requires that "an institution of higher education must comply with the prohibition against sex discrimination imposed by that title and its implementing regulations in the administration of any revenue producing intercollegiate athletic activity." However, the unique size and cost of football programs have been taken into account in developing this Policy Interpretation.

Appendix B-Comments and Responses

The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) received over 700 comments and recommendations in response to the December 11, 1978 publication of the proposed Policy Interpretation. After the formal comment period, representatives of the Department met for additional discussions with many individuals and groups including college and university officials, athletic associations, athletic directors, women's rights organizations and other interested parties. HEW representatives also visited eight universities in order to assess the potential of the proposed Policy Interpretation and of suggested alternative approaches for effective enforcement of Title IX.

The Department carefully considered all information before preparing the final policy. Some changes in the structure and substance of the Policy Interpretation have been made as a result of concerns that were identified in the comment and consultation process.

Persons who responded to the request for public comment were asked to comment generally and also to respond specifically to eight questions that focused on different aspects of the proposed Policy Interpretation.

Question No. 1: Is the description of the current status and development of intercollegiate athletics for men and women accurate? What other factors should be considered?

Comment A: Some commentors noted that the description implied the presence of intent on the part of all universities to discriminate against women. Many of these same commentors noted an absence of concern in the proposed Policy Interpretation for those universities that have in good faith attempted to meet what they felt to be a vague compliance standard in the regulation.

Response: The description of the current status and development of intercollegiate athletics for men and women was designed to be a factual, historical overview. There was no intent to imply the universal presence of discrimination. The Department recognizes that there are many colleges and universities that have been and are making good faith efforts, in the midst of increasing financial pressures, to provide equal athletic opportunities to their male and female athletes.

Comment B: Commentors stated that the statistics used were outdated in some areas, incomplete in some areas, and inaccurate in some areas.

Response: Comment accepted. The statistics have been updated and corrected where necessary.

Question No. 2: Is the proposed two-stage approach to compliance practical? Should it be modified? Are there other approaches to be considered?

Comment: Some commentors stated that Part II of the proposed Policy Interpretation "Equally Accommodating the Interests and Abilities of Women" represented an extension of the July 1978, compliance deadline established in ' 86.41(d) of the Title IX regulation.

Response: Part II of the proposed Policy Interpretation was not intended to extend the compliance deadline. The format of the two stage approach, however, seems to have encouraged that perception; therefore, the elements of both stages have been unified in this Policy Interpretation.

Question No. 3: Is the equal average per capita standard based on participation rates practical? Are there alternatives or modifications that should be considered?

Comment A: Some commentors stated it was unfair or illegal to find noncompliance solely on the basis of a financial test when more valid indicators of equality of opportunity exist.

Response: The equal average per capita standard was not a standard by which noncompliance could be found. It was offered as a standard of presumptive compliance. In order to prove noncompliance, HEW would have been required to show that the unexplained disparities in expenditures were discriminatory in effect. The standard, in part, was offered as a means of simplifying proof of compliance for universities. The widespread confusion concerning the significance of failure to satisfy the equal average per capita expenditure standard, however, is one of the reasons it was withdrawn.

Comment B: Many commentors stated that the equal average per capita standard penalizes those institutions that have increased participation opportunities for women and rewards institutions that have limited women's participation.

Response: Since equality of average per capita expenditures has been dropped as a standard of presumptive compliance, the question of its effect is no longer relevant. However, the Department agrees that universities that had increased participation opportunities for women and wished to take advantage of the presumptive compliance standard, would have had a bigger financial burden than universities that had done little to increase participation opportunities for women.

Question No. 4: Is there a basis for treating part of the expenses of a particular revenue producing sport differently because the sport produces income used by the university for non-athletic operating expenses on a non-discriminatory basis? If, so, how should such funds be identified and treated?

Comment: Commentors stated that this question was largely irrelevant because there were so few universities at which revenue from the athletic program was used in the university operating budget.

Response: Since equality of average per capita expenditures has been dropped as a standard of presumed compliance, a decision is no longer necessary on this issue.

Question No. 5: Is the grouping of financially measurable benefits into three categories practical? Are there alternatives that should be considered? Specifically, should recruiting expenses be considered together with all other financially measurable benefits?

Comment A: Most commentors stated that, if measured solely on a financial standard, recruiting should be grouped with the other financially measurable items. Some of these commentors held that at the current stage of development of women's intercollegiate athletics, the amount of money that would flow into the women's recruitment budget as a result of separate application of the equal average per capita standard to recruiting expenses, would make recruitment a disproportionately large percentage of the entire women's budget. Women's athletic directors, particularly, wanted the flexibility to have the money available for other uses, and they generally agreed on including recruitment expenses with the other financially measurable items.

Comment B: Some commentors stated that it was particularly inappropriate to base any measure of compliance in recruitment solely on financial expenditures. They stated that even if proportionate amounts of money were allocated to recruitment, major inequities could remain in the benefits to athletes. For instance, universities could maintain a policy of subsidizing visits to their campuses of prospective students of one sex but not the other. Commentors suggested that including an examination of differences in benefits to prospective athletes that result from recruiting methods would be appropriate.

Response: In the final Policy Interpretation, recruitment has been moved to the group of program areas to be examined under ' 86.41(c) to determine whether overall equal athletic opportunity

exists. The Department accepts the comment that a financial measure is not sufficient to determine whether equal opportunity is being provided. Therefore, in examining athletic recruitment, the Department will primarily review the opportunity to recruit, the resources provided for recruiting, and methods of recruiting.

Question No. 6: Are the factors used to justify differences in equal average per capita expenditures for financially measurable benefits and opportunities fair? Are there other factors that should be considered?

Comment: Most commentors indicated that the factors named in the proposed Policy Interpretation (the "scope of competition" and the "nature of the sport") as justifications for differences in equal average per capita expenditures were so vague and ambiguous as to be meaningless. Some stated that it would be impossible to define the phrase "scope of competition", given the greatly differing competitive structure of men's and women's programs. Other commentors were concerned that the "scope of competition" factor that may currently be designated as "nondiscriminatory" was, in reality, the result of many years of inequitable treatment of women's athletic programs.

Response: The Department agrees that it would have been difficult to define clearly and then to quantify the "scope of competition" factor. Since equal average per capita expenditures has been dropped as a standard of presumed compliance, such financial justifications are no longer necessary. Under the equivalency standard, however, the "nature of the sport" remains an important concept. As explained within the Policy Interpretation, the unique nature of a sport may account for perceived inequities in some program areas.

Question No 7: Is the comparability standard for benefits and opportunities that are not financially measurably fair and realistic? Should other factors controlling comparability be included? Should the comparability standard be revised? Is there a different standard which should be considered?

Comment: Many commentors stated that the comparability standard was fair and realistic. Some commentors were concerned, however, that the standard was vague and subjective and could lead to uneven enforcement.

Response: The concept of comparing the non-financially measurable benefits and opportunities provided to male and female athletes has been preserved and expanded in the final Policy Interpretation to include all areas of examination except scholarships and accommodation of the interests and abilities of both sexes. The standard is that equivalent benefits and opportunities must be provided. To avoid vagueness and subjectivity, further guidance is given about what elements will be considered in each program area to determine the equivalency of benefits and opportunities.

Question No. 8: Is the proposal for increasing the opportunity for women to participate in competitive athletics appropriate and effective? Are there other procedures that should be considered? Is there a more effective way to ensure that the interest and abilities of both men and women are equally accommodated?

Comment: Several commentors indicated that the proposal to allow a university to gain the status of presumed compliance by having policies and procedures to encourage the growth of women's athletics was appropriate and effective for future students, but ignored students presently enrolled. They indicated that nowhere in the proposed Policy Interpretation was concern shown that the current selection of sports and levels of competition effectively accommodate the interests and abilities of women as well as men.

Response: Comment accepted. The requirement that universities equally accommodate the interests and abilities of their male and female athletes (Part II of the proposed Policy Interpretation) has been directly addressed and is now a part of the unified final Policy Interpretation.

Additional Comments

The following comments were not responses to questions raised in the proposed Policy Interpretation. They represent additional concerns expressed by a large number of commentors.

(1) Comment: Football and other "revenue producing" sports should be totally exempted or should receive special treatment under Title IX.

Response: The April 18, 1978, opinion of the General Counsel, HEW, concludes that "an institution of higher education must comply with the prohibition against sex discrimination imposed by that title and its implementing regulation in the administration of any revenue producing activity". Therefore, football or other "revenue producing" sports cannot be exempted from coverage of Title IX.

In developing the proposed Policy Interpretation the Department concluded that although the fact of revenue production could not justify disparity in average per capita expenditure between men and women, there were characteristics common to most revenue producing sports that could result in legitimate nondiscriminatory differences in per capita expenditures. For instance, some "revenue producing" sports require expensive protective equipment and most require high expenditures for the management of events attended by large numbers of people. These characteristics and others described in the proposed Policy Interpretation were considered acceptable, nondiscriminatory reasons for differences in per capita average expenditures.

In the final Policy Interpretation, under the equivalent benefits and opportunities standard of compliance, some of these non-discriminatory factors are still relevant and applicable.

(2) Comment: Commentors stated that since the equal average per capita standard of presumed compliance was based on participation rates, the word should be explicitly defined.

Response: Although the final Policy Interpretation does not use the equal average per capita standard of presumed compliance, a clear understanding of the word "participant" is still necessary, particularly in the determination of compliance where scholarships are involved. The word "participant" is defined in the final Policy Interpretation.

(3) Comment: Many commentors were concerned that the proposed Policy Interpretation neglected the rights of individuals.

Response: The proposed Policy Interpretation was intended to further clarify what colleges and universities must do within their intercollegiate athletic programs to avoid discrimination against individuals on the basis of sex. The Interpretation, therefore, spoke to institutions in terms of their male and female athletes. It spoke specifically in terms of equal, average per capita expenditures and in terms of comparability of other opportunities and benefits for male and female participating athletes.

The Department believes that under this approach the rights of individuals were protected. If women athletes, as a class, are receiving opportunities and benefits equal to those of male athletes, individuals within the class should be protected thereby. Under the proposed Policy Interpretation, for example, if female athletes as a whole were receiving their proportional share of athletic financial assistance, a university would have been presumed in compliance with that section of the regulation. The Department does not want and does not have the authority to force universities to offer identical programs to men and women. Therefore, to allow flexibility within women's programs and within men's programs, the proposed Policy Interpretation stated that an institution would be presumed in compliance if the average per capita expenditures on athletic scholarships for men and women, were equal. This same flexibility (in scholarships and in other areas) remains in the final Policy Interpretation.

(4) Comment: Several commentors stated that the provision of a separate dormitory to athletes of only one sex, even where no other special benefits were involved, is inherently discriminatory. They felt such separation indicated the different degrees of importance attached to athletes on the basis of sex.

Response: Comment accepted. The provision of a separate dormitory to athletes of one sex but not the other will be considered a failure to provide equivalent benefits as required by the regulation.

(5) Comment: Commentors, particularly colleges and universities, expressed concern that the differences in the rules of intercollegiate athletic associations could result in unequal distribution of benefits and opportunities to men's and women's athletic programs, thus placing the institutions in a posture of noncompliance with Title IX.

Response: Commentors made this point with regard to ' 86.6(c) of the Title IX regulation, which reads in part:

"The obligation to comply with (Title IX) is not obviated or alleviated by any rule or regulation of any * * * athletic or other * * * association * * *"

Since the penalties for violation of intercollegiate athletic association rules can have a severe effect on the athletic opportunities within an affected program, the Department has reexamined this regulatory requirement to determine whether it should be modified. Our conclusion is that modification would not have a beneficial effect, and that the present requirement will stand.

Several factors enter into this decision. First, the differences between rules affecting men's and women's programs are numerous and change constantly. Despite this, the Department has been unable to discover a single case in which those differences require members to act in a discriminatory manner. Second, some rule differences may permit decisions resulting in discriminatory distribution of benefits and opportunities to men's and women's programs. The fact that institutions respond to differences in rules by choosing to deny equal opportunities, however, does not mean that the rules themselves are at fault; the rules do not prohibit choices that would result in compliance with Title IX. Finally, the rules in question are all established and subject to change by the membership of the association. Since all (or virtually all) association member institutions are subject to Title IX, the opportunity exists for these institutions to resolve collectively any wide-spread Title IX compliance problems resulting from association rules. To the extent that this has not taken place, Federal intervention on behalf of statutory beneficiaries is both warranted and required by the law. Consequently, the Department can follow no course other than to continue to disallow any defenses against findings of noncompliance with Title IX that are based on intercollegiate athletic association rules.

(6) Comment: Some commentators suggested that the equal average per capita test was unfairly skewed by the high cost of some "major" men's sports, particularly football, that have no equivalently expensive counterpart among women's sports. They suggested that a certain percentage of those costs (e.g., 50% of football scholarships) should be excluded from the expenditures on male athletes prior to application of the equal average per capita test.

Response: Since equality of average per capita expenditures has been eliminated as a standard of presumed compliance, the suggestion is no longer relevant. However, it was possible under that standard to exclude expenditures that were due to the nature of the sport, or the scope of competition and thus were not discriminatory in effect. Given the diversity of intercollegiate athletic programs, determinations as to whether disparities in expenditures were nondiscriminatory would have been made on a case-by-case basis. There was no legal support for the proposition that an arbitrary percentage of expenditures should be excluded from the calculations.

(7) Comment: Some commentators urged the Department to adopt various forms of team-based comparisons in assessing equality of opportunity between men's and women's athletic programs. They stated that well-developed men's programs are frequently characterized by a few "major" teams that have the greatest spectator appeal, earn the greatest income, cost the most to operate, and dominate the program in other ways. They suggested that women's programs should be similarly constructed and that comparability should then be required only between "men's major" and "women's major" teams, and between "men's minor" and "women's minor" teams. The men's teams most often cited as appropriate for "major" designation have been football and basketball, with women's basketball and volleyball being frequently selected as the counterparts.

Response: I here are two problems with this approach to assessing equal opportunity. First, neither the statute nor the regulation calls for identical programs for male and female athletes. Absent such a requirement, the Department cannot base noncompliance upon a failure to provide arbitrarily identical programs, either in whole or in part.

Second, no subgrouping of male or female students (such as a team) may be used in such a way as to diminish the protection of the larger class of males and females in their rights to equal participation in educational benefits or opportunities. Use of the "major/minor" classification does not meet this test where large participation sports (e.g., football) are compared to smaller ones (e.g., women's volleyball) in such a manner as to have the effect of disproportionately providing benefits or opportunities to the members of one sex.

(8) Comment: Some commenters suggest that equality of opportunity should be measured by a "sport-specific" comparison. Under this approach, institutions offering the same sports to men and women would have an obligation to provide equal opportunity within each of those sports. For example, the men's basketball team and the women's basketball team would have to receive equal opportunities and benefits.

Response: As noted above, there is no provision for the requirement of identical programs for men and women, and no such requirement will be made by the Department. Moreover, a sport-specific comparison could actually create unequal opportunity. For example, the sports available for men at an institution might include most or all of those available for women; but the men's program might concentrate resources on sports not available to women (e.g., football, ice hockey). In addition, the sport-specific concept overlooks two key elements of the Title IX regulation.

First, the regulation states that the selection of sports is to be representative of student interests and abilities (86.41(c)(1)). A requirement that sports for the members of one sex be available or developed solely on the basis of their existence or development in the program for members of the other sex could conflict with the regulation where the interests and abilities of male and female students diverge.

Second, the regulation frames the general compliance obligations of recipients in terms of program-wide benefits and opportunities (86.41(c)). As implied above, Title IX protects the individual as a student-athlete, not all a basketball player, or swimmer.

(9) Comment: A coalition of many colleges and universities urged that there are no objective standards against which compliance with Title IX in intercollegiate athletics could be measured. They felt that diversity is so great among colleges and universities that no single standard or set of standards could practicably apply to all affected institutions. They concluded that it would be best for individual institutions to determine the policies and procedures by which to ensure nondiscrimination in intercollegiate athletic programs.

Specifically, this coalition suggested that each institution should create a group representative of all affected parties on campus.

This group would then assess existing athletic opportunities for men and women, and, on the basis of the assessment, develop a plan to ensure nondiscrimination. This plan would then be recommended to the Board of Trustees or other appropriate governing body.

The role foreseen for the Department under this concept is:

(a) The Department would use the plan as a framework for evaluating complaints and assessing compliance;

(b) The Department would determine whether the plan satisfies the interests of the involved parties; and

(c) The Department would determine whether the institution is adhering to the plan.

These commenters felt that this approach to Title IX enforcement would ensure an environment of equal opportunity.

Response: Title IX is an antidiscrimination law. It prohibits discrimination based on sex in educational institutions that are recipients of Federal assistance. The legislative history of Title IX clearly shows that it was enacted because of discrimination that currently was being practiced against women in educational institutions. The Department accepts that colleges and universities are sincere in their intention to ensure equal opportunity in intercollegiate athletics to their male and female students. It cannot, however, turn over its responsibility for interpreting and enforcing the law. In this case, its responsibility includes articulating the standards by which compliance with the Title IX statute will be evaluated.

The Department agrees with this group of commenters that the proposed self-assessment and institutional plan is an excellent idea. Any institution that engages in the assessment/planning process, particularly with the full participation of interested parties as envisioned in the proposal, would clearly reach or move well toward compliance. In addition, as explained in Section VIII of this Policy Interpretation, any college or university that has compliance problems but is implementing a plan that the Department determines will correct those problems within a reasonable period of time, will be found in compliance.

APPENDIX C. PERSONAL BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

Code: _____

Personal & Coaching Background

1. Year of Birth: _____
2. Marital Status (circle one):
 - i. Single In a Relationship Married Divorced Widow
3. Do you have children? _____
 - a. If yes, how many? _____
4. Highest level of education: _____
5. Did you participate in athletics in College? _____
 - a. If Yes Where? _____
6. What sport did you participate in? _____
7. Current Position held: _____
 - a. How long have you held it? _____
8. How many years experience coaching College athletics: _____
9. How many institutions have you been employed as a coach? _____
10. Please specify the years spent at each level:
 - a. Div 1 _____
 - b. Div 2 _____
 - c. Div 3 _____
 - d. NAIA _____
11. Please specify the years spent at each position:
 - a. Head coach _____
 - b. Associate Head Coach _____
 - c. Assistant Coach _____
 - d. Graduate Assistant _____
 - e. Other (please specify) _____
12. Have you attended any coaching education courses? _____
 - a. If yes please list any qualifications obtained at these coaching education courses.

APPENDIX D. IRB LETTER

NDSU **North Dakota State University**
Sociology
Bentson Bunker Field House 7G
Fargo, ND 58105
701-799-5783

Perceptions of Female Coaches

Dear Coach:

My name is Christie Mikyla Chappell. I am a graduate student in Sociology at North Dakota State University, and I am conducting a research project attempt to gain an understanding for why there are few female coaches at the university level and why there are even fewer coaching males. The goal of the research is to learn why we do not see more females coaching and what could be ways to help foster more support for females coaching males. It is our hope, that with this research, we will learn more about perceptions of gender in coaching.

Because you are currently coaching at a division 1-3 institution you are invited to take part in this research project. Your participation is entirely your choice, and you may change your mind or quit participating at any time, with no penalty to you.

It is not possible to identify all potential risks in research procedures, but the researcher(s) have taken reasonable safeguards to minimize any known risks. These known risks include: emotional or psychological distress or a loss of confidentiality.

By taking part in this research, you may benefit by being able to share your experience and voice and concerns or suggestions you may have. However, you may not get any benefit from being in this study. Benefits to others and or society are likely to include advancement of knowledge and or possible benefits to your prospective of gender in coaching.

It should take about 60 minutes to complete the questions about your perceptions of gender of coaches based upon your experiences and knowledge. The questions will be administered in an interview that will be done at your convenience in a public location. I will be asking the questions and they will be recorded on an audio device. The information recorded will be analyzed and then destroyed. The recordings will be kept in a secure locked drawer in my apartment.

We will keep private all research records that identify you, to the extent allowed by law. Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study, we will write about the combined information that we have gathered. You will not be identified in these written materials. We may publish the results of the study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private.

If you have any questions about this project, please call me at 701-799-5783, or call my advisor at Christina Weber, 100 D Barry Hall Fargo ND, 701-231-8928 or email at Christina.D.Weber@ndsu.edu.

You have rights as a research participant. If you have questions about your rights or complaints about this research, you may talk to the researcher or contact the NDSU Human Research Protection Program at 701.231.8908, ndsu.irb@ndsu.edu, or by mail at: NDSU HRPP Office, NDSU Dept 4000, PO Box 6050, Fargo, ND 58108-6050.

Thank you for your taking part in this research. If you wish to receive a copy of the results, please request a copy via email at christie.chappell@ndsu.edu or by calling at 701-799-5783.