

# Journal of Coaching Education

---

## Collegiate Athletes' Gendered Perceptions of a Hypothetical Male and Female Coach

Lori Rittenhouse-Wollmuth  
Minnesota State University-Mankato

Cindra S. Kamphoff  
Minnesota State University-Mankato

Jon Lim  
Minnesota State University-Mankato

### Abstract

Historically, the world of sport is considered a masculine domain characterized by power, aggression, and physical contact (Hall, 1996). The exclusionary elements of the male culture of sport have created gender inequities in participation (Birrell & Theberge, 1994), and a gendered perception of male and female coaches (Frankl & Babitt, 1998; Weinberg, Reveles, & Jackson, 1984). The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of male and female collegiate athletes of a hypothetical male and female coach, and to determine if female coaches are more accepted compared to Weinberg et al.'s study investigating male and female athletes' perceptions of a hypothetical coach. The Attitudinal Questionnaire (Weinberg, Reveles, & Jackson, 1984) was utilized to determine athletes' attitudes about a hypothetical coach. A 2 x 2 MANOVA indicated a significant interaction between the gender of a hypothetical head coach and the gender of an athlete, and a significant main effect for gender. Univariate ANOVA results indicate that males and females differed in their attitudes and perceptions of both a hypothetical male and female head coach. The female athletes, compared to male athletes, were more likely to be accepting of coaches regardless of the coaches' gender. Furthermore, male athletes were less accepting of female coaches. In addition, when comparing the means of the current study to Weinberg et al.'s (1984) study, results indicate that female coaches were not more accepted than in 1984.



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

## Collegiate Athletes' Gendered Perceptions of a Hypothetical Male and Female Coach

### Introduction

The perceived gender differences and stereotypes in sport have been influenced and reinforced by the historic male hegemony of sport (Birrell & Theberge, 1994; Hall, 1996). More specifically, the sports world is organized around a gender ideology, which creates, perpetuates and reaffirms gender differences, and is a breeding ground for perceptions of gender, gender participation, and gender appropriateness (Birrell & Cole, 1990; Hardin, 2005; Messner, 1988). Researchers have described sport as masculine, which emphasizes characteristics such as aggressiveness, competitiveness, and power (Birrell & Theberge, 1994; Postow, 1980; Weinstein, Smith, & Wiesenthal, 1995). These traits are represented through the physical overpowering of an opponent and direct use of bodily force to achieve success and status. This approach to sports has created a "male preserve" in which female participants are masculinized and views of gender appropriateness are shaped (Thomas & Hicks, 2005).

Furthermore, the exclusionary elements of the male culture of sport have created gender inequities in participation (Birrell & Theberge, 1994). Title IX provided a mechanism to challenge male dominance in sport; however, as scholars have suggested, inequity still exists at all levels of sport (c.f., Hogshead-Makar & Zimbalist, 2007). Acosta and Carpenter's (2010) longitudinal report, for example, indicated that the percentage of females as coaches of female teams remains near an all-time low at 42.6% (compared to over 90% before Title IX was passed). Research also suggests that Title IX and a push for equity in athletics did not create a shift in athletes' perceptions or stereotypes of female coaches (Frankl & Babitt, 1998; Weinberg, Reveles, & Jackson, 1984).

A few researchers have investigated the gender perceptions and stereotypes of coaches more thoroughly (c.f., Frankl & Babitt, 1998; Habif, Raalte, & Cornelius, 2001; Weinberg et al., 1984). Weinberg et al. (1984) examined the biases of junior high, senior high, and collegiate male and female basketball players toward male and female coaches. The authors used a brief description of a hypothetical male or female coach (i.e., John or Mary), and randomly assigned this description to the athletes along with the 11-item Attitudinal Questionnaire. The results indicated male and female athletes displayed significantly different perceptions of female coaches, but no differences in their perceptions of male coaches. Furthermore, male athletes displayed more negative attitudes toward female coaches than female athletes, and female coaches' accomplishments were evaluated less positively than male coaches' accomplishments by male athletes. These findings suggest a disparity in the evaluation of coaches based on an athlete's gender.

Frankl and Babitt (1998) extended Weinberg and colleagues' work at the high school level. They investigated the effect of a coach's gender on male and female high school athletes' perceptions in order to determine if gender bias existed. The authors also administered the Attitudinal Questionnaire (Weinberg et al. 1994) to 216 male and female high school track athletes. The results of the study revealed significant effects between the gender of the athlete and gender of the coach, and found that male athletes were more receptive than female



# Journal of Coaching Education

athletes to being told by a male coach that they had done something wrong. Likewise, Frankl and Babbitt's study also revealed a reciprocal result regarding female coaches: that male athletes were less receptive than female athletes to being told they did something wrong by a female coach.

A follow-up study done by Habib, Raalte, and Cornelius (2001) used the same Attitudinal Questionnaire to assess the attitudes of collegiate basketball and volleyball players at the NCAA Division III level. The authors suggest no difference in the male and female basketball players' attitudes toward male and female coaches, but they found that males displayed a preference for a male coach. Results focusing on the volleyball players indicated no statistically significant difference based on gender in attitudes toward a male or female head coach. The findings of Habib et al.'s (2001) study when compared with Weinberg et al.'s (1984) study may indicate a change in the attitudes of male athletes toward female head coaches in recent years. More specifically, male athletes in Habib et al.'s study did not rate female coaches differently than male coaches.

More research is needed to confirm Habib et al.'s findings and determine if a change has occurred in athletes' attitudes of female coaches 24 years after Weinberg et al.'s original study. Therefore, the purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of male and female collegiate athletes toward a hypothetical male and female coach. Considering Habib et al.'s findings, the research hypotheses for this study are the following:

1. There is no difference between male and female athletes' attitudes toward having a hypothetical male versus female collegiate head coach.
2. There is no difference between male and female athletes in their perceptions of a hypothetical male head coach.
3. There is no difference between male and female athletes in their perceptions of a hypothetical female head coach.

## Method

### *Participants*

The participants in this study consisted of athletes from a Division II university athletic program including the following sports: men's and women's basketball, men's and women's track and field, women's volleyball, and men's wrestling. The sports were chosen based on the Thomas and Hicks (2005) gender-stereotyping scheme which categorized sports as masculine (i.e., wrestling), feminine (i.e., volleyball), or gender neutral (i.e., basketball and track & field). The participants ranged in age from 18 to 22 years.

A total of 108 questionnaires were completed. Only four of the 108 were omitted because of incomplete data. Therefore, 104 completed questionnaires were used in our study. The breakdown of participants based on gender yielded 62 females (59.6%) and 42 males (40.4%). In addition, 92 of the participants indicated they were White/Caucasian (88.5%), 11 indicated they were Black/African American (10.6%), and one indicated Latino ethnicity (1.0%). In terms of year in school, 38 participants were freshmen (36.5%), 32 were sophomores (30.8%), 15 were juniors (14.4%) and 19 were seniors (18.3%).



# Journal of Coaching Education

The participants included 18 women's basketball athletes (17.3%), 11 men's basketball athletes (10.6%), 29 women's track & field athletes (27.9%), 13 men's track & field athletes (12.5%), 15 women's volleyball athletes (14.4%) and 18 men's wrestling athletes (17.3%). Not all athletes from each team participated in the survey due to a variety of factors including illness, injury, schedule conflict and personal choice. The number of athletes who completed the survey compared to total number of athletes on each team include: women's basketball, 18 of 18; men's basketball, 11 of 14; women's track & field, 29 of 45; men's track & field, 13 of 40; women's volleyball, 15 of 15; men's wrestling, 18 of 18.

At the time of the study, the men's basketball, track and field, and wrestling teams, and the women's volleyball team had male head coaches; the women's basketball and track and field teams were coached by women. Therefore, all male athletes who completed the survey ( $n = 42$ ; 100%) and 24% ( $n = 15$ ) of the female athletes who completed the survey had a male head coach, whereas 76% ( $n = 47$ ) had a female head coach. All male and female participants ( $N = 108$ ) who completed the survey had at one time been coached by a male and all of the female participants ( $n = 62$ ) had at one time been coached by a female. Only 7.1% ( $n = 3$ ) of the male participants who completed the survey had ever been coached by a female, and these three male participants competed in men's track and field.

## Questionnaires

Demographic information was collected from the participants regarding their: a) gender, b) age, c) race, d) collegiate sport he/she participated, e) year in school, f) year on team, and g) gender of participant's current head coach. Two additional questions were included that asked if the participant had ever played for a male coach and/or a female coach.

The Attitudinal Questionnaire (AQ; Weinberg et al., 1984) was also administered which was designed to reveal athletes' attitudes and feelings about a hypothetical male or female coach (i.e., John or Mary). The AQ contains 11 items and utilizes a Likert scale (1 = not at all to 11 = very much). The questionnaire versions (i.e., John or Mary) were randomly distributed to the male and female athletes. Weinberg et al. established test-retest reliability for the AQ at .80.

The AQ items were written for sports played on a court such as basketball; therefore, to allow the questionnaire to be applicable to track and field and wrestling athletes, the wording was changed slightly based on the recommendation of each sport's head coach. For example, the original AQ item 2, "His being on the court might break my concentration," was changed to, "His being on the track [or mat] might break my concentration." These slight alterations did not alter the meaning of the question.

## Procedure

Written approval was obtained from the IRB to conduct this study. Permission was also obtained by a member of the designated team's head coach prior to the administration of the questionnaire packets, which contained a



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

cover letter, demographic questionnaire and an AQ. An equal number of John and Mary AQs were given to each administrator stacked in an alternating fashion similar to Weinberg et al.'s study (1984). To accommodate time consuming schedules of the participating teams, one member of each team's coaching staff (i.e., head, assistant, or graduate assistant coach) administered the packet on a convenient day and time of their choice. Location choices included before practice, after practice and on bus trips to competitions. To ensure confidentiality, completed questionnaires were placed in a single envelope and returned to the primary researcher by one of the athletes.

## *Data Treatment*

Descriptive statistics such as frequency distributions, means, and standard deviations were calculated for both the demographic and items on the AQ. A 2 (gender of the hypothetical coach) x 2 (gender of the athlete) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to explore research hypothesis 1 and to determine if there was a main effect for gender of the athlete, a main effect for gender of the hypothetical head coach, and a significant interaction between the gender of the athlete and the gender of the hypothetical head coach. Multiple one-way analysis of variance tests (ANOVAs) were conducted to explore research hypothesis 2 and 3. ANOVAs were appropriate for research hypothesis 2 and 3 because athletes' perceptions of a hypothetical male coach (hypothesis 2) were analyzed separately from a hypothetical female coach (hypothesis 3). As explained in the *Publications Manual for the American Psychological Association* (2001), an alpha level of .05 was established to determine significance.

## **Results**

### *Hypothesis One*

Based on Habif et al.'s (2001) findings, the first research hypothesis stated that there is no difference between male and female athletes' attitudes towards having a male versus female collegiate head coach. Following the procedures of Habif et al., a 2 (gender of the hypothetical coach) x 2 (gender of the athlete) MANOVA was conducted and indicated a significant interaction (Wilks' Lambda = .733,  $F(11, 89) = 2.95$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta^2 = .27$ ) as well as a main effect for gender of the athlete (Wilks' Lambda = .781,  $F(11, 89) = 2.26$ ,  $p = .017$ ,  $\eta^2 = .22$ ) but not a main effect for gender of the hypothetical head coach.

Univariate results were analyzed for each dependent variable, the AQ items, to examine which items contributed to the multivariate interaction and the main effect for gender of the athlete. Results indicated that AQ items 2, 8 and 9 contributed to the multivariate interaction. Specifically, when compared to female athletes, male athletes were more likely to indicate that a hypothetical female coach might break their concentration more often than a hypothetical male coach (item 2;  $F(1, 100) = 9.20$ ,  $p = .002$ ,  $\eta^2 = .10$ ); also, male athletes were more likely to indicate they could not take punishment from a hypothetical male coach compared to a hypothetical female coach (item 8;  $F(1, 100) = 4.41$ ,  $p = .035$ ,  $\eta^2 = .04$ ); and male athletes were more likely to



# Journal of Coaching Education

indicate that they could tell things to a hypothetical male coach compared to a hypothetical female coach (item 9;  $F(1, 100) = 4.67, p = .031, \eta^2 = .05$ ). See Table 1 for the mean results of research hypothesis 1.

Furthermore, items 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 contributed to the main effect for gender of the athlete. Specifically, females, when compared to males, were more likely to state the following: they would like the coach (item 1,  $F(1, 100) = 17.4, p = .000, \eta^2 = .15$ ), the coach would make them want to play better (item 3,  $F(1, 100) = 10.85, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$ ), the coach would be a head coach in 20 years (item 4,  $F(1, 100) = 7.29, p = .008, \eta^2 = .07$ ), the coach could tell them they did something wrong (item 5,  $F(1, 100) = 12.23, p = .001, \eta^2 = .11$ ), they would have confidence in the coach (item 6,  $F(1, 100) = 12.14, p = .001, \eta^2 = .11$ ), they could take orders from the coach (item 7,  $F(1, 100) = 13.07, p = .001, \eta^2 = .12$ ), and they could take punishment from the coach (item 8,  $F(1, 100) = 4.36, p = .033, \eta^2 = .04$ ). Therefore, the first research hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that there were differences between male and female athletes' attitudes toward a hypothetical male versus female collegiate head coach.

## *Hypothesis Two*

Again, based on Habib et al.'s (2001) findings, the second research hypothesis in this study stated there is no difference between male and female athletes in their perceptions of a hypothetical male head coach. A series of one-way ANOVAs revealed significant differences between male and female athletes' perceptions of a male head coach for AQ items 1, 5, 6, 7 and 8. More specifically, results indicated that male athletes, when compared with female athletes, were less likely to like a hypothetical male head coach (item 1;  $F(1, 51) = 11.62, p = .001, \eta^2 = .19$ ); were less able to take criticism from a hypothetical male head coach (item 5;  $F(1, 51) = 7.14, p = .01, \eta^2 = .12$ ); had lower confidence in a hypothetical male head coach (item 6;  $F(1, 51) = 12.92, p = .001, \eta^2 = .20$ ); stated that they were less willing to take orders from a hypothetical male coach (item 7;  $F(1, 51) = 5.92, p = .019, \eta^2 = .10$ ); and were more likely to indicate they could not take punishment from a hypothetical male coach (item 8;  $F(1, 51) = 9.38, p = .003, \eta^2 = .16$ ). Therefore, based on these significant findings, the second research hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that male and female athletes differed in their perceptions of a hypothetical male head coach. See Table 2 for mean results.

## *Hypothesis Three*

The third research hypothesis stated there is no difference between male and female athletes in their perceptions of a hypothetical female head coach. However, a series of one-way ANOVAs revealed a significant difference between male and female athletes' perceptions of a hypothetical female head coach for AQ items 1 through 5, 7 and 9. More specifically, female athletes, when compared with male athletes, responded more favorably that they would like a new hypothetical female head coach (item 1;  $F(1, 51) = 6.8, p = .012, \eta^2 = .12$ ). Male athletes, when compared with female athletes, perceived a hypothetical female coach as more likely to break their concentration (item 2;  $F(1, 51) = 5.32, p = .025, \eta^2 = .10$ ); less likely to indicate that a hypothetical female coach could make them play better (item 3;  $F(1, 51) = 10.78, p = .002, \eta^2 = .18$ ); more likely to still be a head



# Journal of Coaching Education

coach in 20 years (item 4;  $F(1, 51) = 9.39, p = .004, \eta^2 = .16$ ); less likely to indicate they could take it when a hypothetical female coach told them they did something wrong (item 5;  $F(1, 51) = 5.54, p = .023, \eta^2 = .10$ ); less willing to take orders from a hypothetical female coach (item 7;  $F(1, 51) = 6.64, p = .013, \eta^2 = .12$ ); and less likely to indicate that they could tell a hypothetical female coach things easily (item 9;  $F(1, 51) = 4.03, p = .05, \eta^2 = .08$ ). Considering these significant findings, the third research hypothesis was rejected and it was concluded that male and female athletes differed in their perceptions of a hypothetical female head coach. See Table 2 for mean results.

## Discussion

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of male and female collegiate athletes towards a hypothetical male and female head coach. Results of the current study indicated there were significant gender differences in attitudes and perceptions. In general, female athletes were more likely to accept a coach regardless of the coach's gender (see the main effect for gender of the athletes results in research hypothesis 1). For example, when compared to male athletes, female athletes were more likely to state they would like the coach, the coach would make them want to play better, the coach could tell them they did something wrong, they would have confidence in the coach, and they could take orders and punishment from the coach.

Male athletes, however, were particularly less accepting of female coaches (see the results from research hypothesis 3). When compared to female athletes, male athletes rated the hypothetical female coach lower in a number of ways including that a female coach was more likely to break their concentration, a female coach would not make them play better, they could not take it when a female coach told them they did something wrong, they were less willing to take orders from a female coach, and the male athletes were less likely to indicate that they could tell a female coach things easily.

When determining if athletes' perceptions have changed since Weinberg et al.'s (1984) study, means were compared (see Table 2). Interestingly, six of the 11 AQ item means for the male athletes' responses to a hypothetical female coach were higher in this study than in the Weinberg et al. (1984) study. This indicates that perceptions of a hypothetical female coach among male athletes may have changed since 1984, although male athletes still rate a hypothetical female coach lower than female athletes, as discussed above. Habif et al.'s (2001) research suggested a change in the attitudes of male athletes towards female head coaches in recent years, and this research may also support this conclusion given that six of the 11 AQ item means of male athletes' responses to a female coach were higher in this study than in the Weinberg et al. (1984) study. Increased sport participation by females during the 25-year time frame may have facilitated a change in men's perceptions and acceptance of a female head coach.

When comparing the AQ item means of the female athletes' responses to a hypothetical female coach, however, 9 of the 11 AQ items means were lower in this sample than in the Weinberg et al.'s study. Although Weinberg et al.'s sample (junior high, senior high, and collegiate male and female basketball players) was different than



# Journal of Coaching Education

the sample used in this study (Division II collegiate male and female athletes from various sports), this comparison may mean that female athletes' perceptions of a female coach have not changed since 1984. Recent research has indicated that sport, and specifically collegiate athletics, may be a difficult work environment for female coaches (Inglis, Danylchuk, & Pastore, 2000; Kamphoff, in press; Theberge, 1993; Thorngren, 1990). The percentage of collegiate female head coaches of women's teams has steadily declined since the passage of Title IX and female coaches remain practically non-existent for men's teams (Acosta & Carpenter, 2010). Several reasons have been offered to explain this decline including athletes' gender bias and preference for a male coach (Frankl & Babitt, 1998; Weinberg et al., 1984), which is supported by these findings. Other suggested reasons behind the decline include: the change in structure of women's sport since the passage of Title IX (Hult, 1994), homogeneous reproduction and the bias of the 'good old boys' network (Stangl & Kane, 1991), lower salaries earned by females compared to their male counterparts (Humphreys, 2000), gender discrimination in hiring practices (Hasbrook, Hart, Mathes, & True, 1990), lower likelihood of women to apply for head coaching positions (Sagas, Cunningham, & Ashley, 2000), a lower interest of females compared to males entering the coaching profession (Kamphoff & Gill, 2008) and a higher rate of burnout among women (Kelley, Eklund, & Ritter-Taylor, 1999).

In addition, Kamphoff's (in press) research suggests that women coaches in collegiate sports often face marginalization, devaluation, and homophobia. The former women coaches that she interviewed suggested that they received fewer resources, lower salaries, more responsibilities, and less administrative support than their male counterparts. She describes collegiate coaching as a "male domain" and suggested that the gendered nature of U.S. collegiate coaching has presented challenges and influenced women's decisions to leave coaching. Additional research suggests that females intend to leave the coaching profession sooner than their male counterparts and gender bias among female athletes toward male coaches could account for this trend. For example, Knoppers, Meyers, Ewing, and Forrest (1991) found that 12.3% of the female coaches, compared to 50.3% of male coaches, planned to stay in the coaching profession until they were 65. Similarly, Sagas, Cunningham and Ashley (2000) found that 68% of the women assistant coaches, compared to 15% male assistant coaches, anticipated leaving the coaching profession by the time they turned 45.

There is a need for a conscientious effort by the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) as well as specific athletic departments and athletic administrators throughout the U.S. to take action and implement policies geared towards understanding and combating athlete gender bias favoring male over female coaches. More specifically, a core value of the NCAA is to provide "an inclusive culture that fosters equitable participation for student-athletes and career opportunities for coaches and administrators from diverse backgrounds" (NCAA, 2007). Certainly, the NCAA and athletic departments must make a stronger commitment to developing an inclusive culture for *all* female coaches.

## *Practical Implications for Coaching Education*

These findings have several practical implications for current coaches and coaching education programs. If you coach a combined gender team (i.e., both males and females on the same team), these findings suggest that you



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

may experience less resistance and more acceptance from your female athletes than from your male athletes. These findings also suggest that if you are a female coach of a men's team, you may experience resistance.

More specifically, this study suggests that when compared to female athletes, male athletes may be less accepting of a female coach. Again, this is not surprising given that there are very few female coaches of men's collegiate teams (between 1.5-3% according to Acosta & Carpenter, 2010), and it is likely that male athletes in collegiate sport today have had few if any female coaches. In addition, other research suggests that women who coach a men's team may experience workplace discrimination, a lack of support from athletes, other coaches, parents, and administration, and difficulty establishing credibility (Yiamouyiannis, 2006; Kamphoff, Armentrout & Driska, in review). These findings, coupled with the research cited above, point to the importance of educating coaches and athletic administrators that gender inequities and bias persist, particularly for women who coach a men's team.

The National Standards for Sport Coaches developed by NASPE provides direction for coaching educators and current coaches, and is the standard by which coach education programs are developed (NASPE, 2006). Within The National Standards for Sport Coaches, this study directly applies to at least one domain, Domain 1 – Philosophy and Ethics. Domain 1 indicates that it is important for coaches to develop and understand their coaching philosophy as well as reinforce ethical behaviors among those in the sport program. As Standards 3 and 4 state, within Domain 1, coaches should teach and reinforce personal, social and ethical behavior (Standard 3) as well as demonstrate ethical conduct in all facets of the sport program (Standard 4). It is particularly important that a person coaching a team of the opposite gender is aware of and educated about gender stereotyping so they are prepared to constructively address potential gender biases of their athletes. If a coach experiences gender-based resistance from athletes, he or she could use the standards developed by NASPE to guide their actions.

## *Limitations and Future Research*

Of course, this is only one study and additional research is needed to confirm the findings and more fully understand the gender-related attitudes of male and female athletes towards coaches, and to determine if changes have occurred since Weinberg et al.'s (1984) study. More specifically, the level and sports of athletes in this sample (Division II men's and women's basketball, men's and women's track and field, women's volleyball, and men's wrestling athletes) could account for differences in these findings versus Weinberg et al.'s findings (based on a sample of junior high, senior high, and collegiate male and female basketball players). Collegiate athletes in Divisions I and II carry extra pressures associated with athletic scholarships and media attention, which could explain results differing from those found in previous research. As Habif et al. suggested, a comparison of attitudes of male and female athletes at various levels in collegiate sports could improve our understanding of gender bias. Furthermore, it is worth noting the student-athletes' attitudes and perceptions of male and female head coaches may be influenced by the overall campus and athletic department culture. These cultural factors are not accounted for in this study, but cultural variations may influence patterns of success among male and female coaches from one campus to another.



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

Future research should also compare responses of athletes in different sports to better understand gender bias of athletes towards male and female coaches. This may yield results beneficial in creating policies specific to each sport. In addition, it may be that athletes are more accepting of female coaches in certain sports. Acosta and Carpenter (2010), for example, report several women's sports with a large percentage of female coaches, including synchronized swimming (100%), field hockey (96.1%) and lacrosse (87.5%). Having a large percentage of female coaches may create a context in which there is greater acceptance. Qualitative research is also needed to accurately identify the sources of the gender bias toward male and female coaches. The findings could assist in the creation of policies aimed toward creating an atmosphere of greater acceptance for female coaches.

## About the Authors

### *Lori Rittenhouse-Wollmuth*

Lori Rittenhouse-Wollmuth is currently in her sixth year as the assistant volleyball coach at Minnesota State University, Mankato. A career athlete, Rittenhouse-Wollmuth graduated from the University of Wisconsin - Madison as a member of the Badger Volleyball Program. She continued her athletic career playing professionally in the FIVB for Barcelona, Spain and Zagreb, Croatia. After retiring from professional volleyball, Rittenhouse-Wollmuth earned her Masters in Sport Management from Minnesota State University, Mankato.

### *Cindra S. Kamphoff, Ph.D.*

Cindra S. Kamphoff, Ph.D. is an assistant professor and graduate coordinator in the Department of Human Performance at Minnesota State University, Mankato. She also coordinates the graduate program in Sport and Exercise Psychology and is a Certified Consultant (AASP-CC) in sport psychology through the Association for Applied Sport Psychology. Her research focuses on gender issues in sport and physical activity including projects related to women leaving collegiate coaching, women's experiences coaching men's teams, and athletic director's perceptions of Title IX.

### *Dr. Jon Lim*

Dr. Jon Lim is an associate professor and also serves as the coordinator of graduate and undergraduate sport management programs in the Department of Human Performance at Minnesota State University, Mankato. Dr. Lim has published a number of articles in the national and international refereed journals and has given a variety of presentations at state, regional, national, and international conferences in the areas of sport management, online learning, and technology use in education. Currently, he serves as an editorial reviewer board member for the International Journal of Sport Management.



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

## References

- Acosta, V. R., & Carpenter, L. J. (2010). Women in intercollegiate sport: A longitudinal, national study thirty three year update 1977-2010. *Women in Intercollegiate Sport*. <http://www.acostacarpenter.org>. Retrieved March 18, 2010.
- Birrell, S., & Cole, C. L. (1990). Double fault: Renee Richards and the construction and naturalization of difference. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7, 1-21.
- Birrell, S., & Theberge, N. (1994). Ideological control of women in sport. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie (Eds.), *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 341-360). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Frankl, D., & Babbitt, D. G. (1998). Gender bias: A study of high school track & field athletes' perceptions of hypothetical male and female head coaches. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 21(4), 396-418.
- Habif, S., Van Raalte, J. L., & Cornelius, A. (2001). Athletes' attitudes toward and preferences for male and female coaches. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, 10(1), 73-88.
- Hall, M. A. (1996). *Feminism and sporting bodies: Essays on theory and practice*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hardin, M. (2005). Stopped at the gate: Women's sports, "readers interest," and decision making by editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 62-77.
- Hasbrook, C. A., Hart, B. A., Mathes, S. A., & True, S. (1990). Sex bias and the validity of believed differences between male and female interscholastic athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 61(3), 259-267.
- Hogshead-Makar, N., & Zimbalist, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Equal play: Title IX and social change*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hult, J. (1994). The story of women's athletics: Manipulating a dream 1890-1985. In D. M. Costa & S. R. Guthrie, *Women and sport: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 83-106). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Humphreys, B. R. (2000). Equal pay on the hardwood: The earnings gap between male and female NCAA Division I basketball coaches. *Journal of Sport Economics*, 1(3), 299-307.
- Inglis, S., Danylchuk, K. E., & Pastore, D. L. (2000). Multiple realities of women's work experiences in coaching and athletic management. *Women in Sport & Physical Activity Journal*, 9(2), 1-14.



# Journal of Coaching Education

---

- Kamphoff, C. S., & Gill, D. L. (2008). Collegiate athletes' perceptions of the coaching profession. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(1), 55-72.
- Kamphoff, C. S. (in press). Bargaining With patriarchy: Former women coaches' experiences and their decision to leave collegiate coaching. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*.
- Kamphoff, C. S., Armentrout, S., & Driska, A, (in review). Women's experiences as Division I head coaches of men's teams. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kelley, B. C., Eklund, R. C., & Ritter-Taylor, M. (1999). Stress and burnout among collegiate tennis coaches. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 21, 113-130.
- Knoppers, A., Meyer, B. B., Ewing, M., & Forrest, L. (1991). Opportunity and work behavior in college coaching. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 15(1), 1-20.
- Messner, M.A. (1988). Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 7, 136-153.
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (2007). *Our mission*. Retrieved May 7, 2007, from the NCAA website: [www.ncaa.org](http://www.ncaa.org).
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education (2006). *National standards for sport coaches: Quality coaches, quality sports* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Oxon Hill, MD: AAHPERD Publications.
- Postow, B. C. (1980). Women and masculine sports. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 7, 51-58.
- Publications Manual for the American Psychological Association* (5<sup>th</sup> edition). (2001). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Sagas, M., Cunningham, G. B., & Ashley, F. B. (2000). Examining the women's coaching deficit through the perspective of assistant coaches. *International Journal of Sport Management*, 1, 267-282.
- Stangl, J. M., & Kane, M. J. (1991). Structural variables that offer explanatory power for the underrepresentation of women coaches since Title IX: The case of homologous reproduction. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 8, 47-60.
- Theberge, N. (1993). The construction of gender in sport: Women, coaching, and the naturalization of difference. *Social Problems*, 40, 301-313.



# Journal of Coaching Education

- Thomas, A. R., & Hicks, C. M. (2005). Peer attitudes towards adolescent participants in male- and female-oriented sports. *Adolescence, 40*, 273-281.
- Thorngren, C. M. (1990). A time to reach out – Keeping the female coach in coaching. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, & Dance, 61*(3), 57-60.
- Yiamouyiannis, A. (2007). *Occupational closure in intercollegiate athletics female head coaches of men's sport teams at NCAA colleges*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The George Washington University.
- Weinberg, R., Reveles, M., & Jackson, A. (1984). Attitudes of male and female athletes towards male and female coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 6*, 448-453.
- Weinstein, M.D., Smith, M.D., & Weisenthal, D.L. (1995). Masculinity and hockey violence. *Sex Roles, 33*, 831-847.

## Tables

**Table 1**  
**Mean Results of the Multivariate Interaction in Hypothesis 1**

Athletes' Gender:	Male		Female	
Hypothetical Coaches' Gender:	Male	Female	Male	Female
AQ2 – Break Concentration	1.8 ± 1.2	4.4 ± 2.5	2.8 ± 1.9	2.8 ± 2.0
AQ8 – Punishment	6.1 ± 3.1	4.5 ± 2.7	3.6 ± 2.6	4.6 ± 3.1
AQ9 – Tell Things	7.0 ± 2.0	5.0 ± 2.1	6.4 ± 2.0	6.4 ± 3.0

Note. AQ items based on a 1-11 likert scale and represented above as Mean ± Standard Deviation.



# Journal of Coaching Education

**Table 2**  
**Attitudinal Questionnaire Item Means and Standard Deviation**

Study: Athletes' Gender: Hypothetical Coaches' Gender:	Weinberg, et al. 1984				The Current Study, 2009			
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
AQ1 – Like as Coach	7.8 ± 1.9	6.9 ± 3.1	8.9 ± 1.9	9.5 ± 2.0	6.4 ± 2.5	5.6 ± 3.1	8.5 ± 1.8	7.5 ± 2.3
AQ2 – Break Concentration	2.6 ± 1.7	3.7 ± 3.0	2.5 ± 2.4	2.5 ± 2.1	1.8 ± 1.1	4.2 ± 2.5	2.8 ± 1.9	2.8 ± 1.9
AQ3 – Play Better	7.3 ± 3.3	5.4 ± 2.8	7.9 ± 2.3	11.5 ± 5.5	6.5 ± 2.8	5.0 ± 2.7	7.6 ± 2.6	7.4 ± 2.5
AQ4 – Head Coach	7.9 ± 3.3	5.6 ± 3.1	8.2 ± 2.7	9.2 ± 2.3	7.5 ± 2.3	6.1 ± 2.1	7.9 ± 2.3	8.4 ± 2.4
AQ5 – Something Wrong	7.3 ± 3.0	6.8 ± 3.2	8.3 ± 2.2	9.0 ± 1.9	7.8 ± 2.8	6.5 ± 3.0	9.3 ± 1.4	8.4 ± 2.5
AQ6 - Confidence	8.1 ± 2.6	6.0 ± 2.9	9.5 ± 1.5	9.9 ± 1.2	6.4 ± 2.7	6.4 ± 2.8	8.7 ± 1.8	7.4 ± 2.1
AQ7 – Take Orders	8.9 ± 2.0	5.8 ± 3.1	7.8 ± 3.3	8.3 ± 2.5	7.1 ± 2.7	5.9 ± 2.9	8.8 ± 1.7	7.8 ± 2.1
AQ8 – Punishment	7.6 ± 2.8	6.7 ± 3.2	7.5 ± 3.3	7.9 ± 2.6	6.0 ± 3.0	4.6 ± 2.7	3.6 ± 2.6	4.5 ± 3.1
AQ9 – Tell Things	7.4 ± 2.9	5.8 ± 2.9	6.4 ± 3.1	8.5 ± 3.1	7.0 ± 2.0	5.0 ± 2.0	6.4 ± 1.9	6.4 ± 2.9
AQ10 – Give Praise	6.4 ± 2.5	5.8 ± 3.5	6.3 ± 3.4	6.8 ± 3.4	6.0 ± 2.3	6.4 ± 2.3	6.3 ± 2.6	6.9 ± 3.0
AQ11 – Feel Angry	4.0 ± 3.3	3.7 ± 2.9	5.0 ± 3.5	6.2 ± 3.4	4.7 ± 2.7	4.8 ± 2.5	4.5 ± 2.5	4.4 ± 2.4

Note. AQ items based on a 1-11 likert scale and represented above as Mean ± Standard Deviation.

